VIEWPOINTS IN THE DISCUSSION OF ISAIAH'S HOPES FOR THE FUTURE[1]

KEMPER FULLERTON
OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

IN reading Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* some years ago, I was struck by the analogy between the problem of the significance of Jesus and the problem of the significance of Isaiah. The two schools of thought which have followed different paths in the quest of the historical Jesus have followed different paths in the quest of the historical Isaiah. According to one of these schools, the controlling interest both of Jesus and Isaiah is eschatological, supernaturalistic, even apocalyptic; according to the other, it is ethical and spiritual. It is an easy charge for the eschatologists to make that the rival interpretation is only an attempt to modernize Jesus and the prophets, to make their teachings intelligible to the modern man and serviceable to the needs of modern life. The ethical school might retort that the eschatologists, in the laudable desire not to subordinate historical research to the practical interests of the present, have

[1] The Introduction and Second Part of the present essay, now somewhat expanded, were given as the Presidential Address before the Society at its annual meeting in December, 1921. The essay seeks to present a resumé of the more important points of view in Isaiah-research, but a resumé which is at the same time an argument, and which suggests a conclusion. Naturally, however, even in the exceptionally roomy space which has been so generously allotted to me in the JOURNAL, the exegetical basis of the argument could not be introduced except in a few more important instances. I hope some day to make good this deficiency in another connection.

become so obsessed by the alien idiom in which the timeless truths of the spiritual world are expressed as to ignore these eternal truths themselves; the fascination of a foreign tongue, the curiosity which it excites, have proved too much for them. These mutual recriminations get us nowhere, except in so far as they warn us of the necessity constantly to correct our personal equations—the most necessary, as it is the most difficult, thing for a historical investigator to do. In the case of Isaiah, the neo-critical school,[2] which has dominated Isaiah research during the past generation, has in general inclined to the ethical and spiritual interpretation of the prophet, though with one notable exception. Duhm has always contended for a theory of the prophet's significance, which, while by no means ignoring the ethical and spiritual elements in his teachings, has greatly emphasized the eschatological and supernatural. Of course, the scholars of conservative convictions have always rejoiced in the eschatological interpretation, for it is supposed to do justice to the Messianic idea in prophecy which has played the leading role in ecclesiastical exegesis of the Old Testament. In recent years the conservative positions have been supported from a most unexpected quarter. The archaeological school[3] of criticism, represented especially by Gunkel and Gressmann, has done much, it is claimed, to strengthen the conservative defense of the genuineness of certain prophecies attributed to Isaiah, in which the eschatological element is especially prominent, and upon which the attack of the neo-critical school has been most

[2] By the neo-critical school is meant that group of scholars who accept in general the principles of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis and who, starting with the rejection of the Babylonian and kindred prophecies in Isaiah (cc. 12; 13 1—14 23; 21 1-10; 24—27; 34; 35) have steadily advanced to more drastic eliminations. The neo-critical movement was initiated by Stade in a series of articles on Zechariah in the ZATW 1881—84; it received its greatest impetus from Duhm's great commentary on Isaiah in 1892.

[3] I select the name "archaeological school" because it is chosen by Gressmann, himself, to differentiate his method of investigation from that of the neo-critical school. (See *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, pp. 2, 246.) The significance of this designation will appear in the sequel.

determined. But I would warn conservative friends to fear the Trojans bearing gifts. Sellin, however, who has been the quickest to perceive the new strategy provided by the archaeological school for the defense of the conservative position and who has made the shrewdest use of it, claims that the neo-critical school has not only failed to carry this new system of defense, but has failed even to make the attempt to do so. This accusation has a certain measure of truth in it. The debate between the two schools of interpretation, which was beginning to be so interesting just before the war, was prorogued indefinitely. Little, at least little that has been accessible to me, has been done to meet Sellin's challenge.[4]

[4] For Sellin's challenge see *Der A. T. Prophetismus*, p. 111. The following Bibliography does not claim to be exhaustive, but it aims to give a list of those works which have contributed directly to the following discussion.

Commentaries.

1724. Vitringa, Commentarius in librum prophetiarum Jesaiae.
1779—'81. Koppe, Jesaias.
1821. Gesenius, Der Prophet Jesaia.
1833. Hitzig, Der Prophet Jesaja.
1867. Ewald, Propheten des Alten Bundes. 2. Ausg.
1872. Knobel, Der Prophet Jesaia. 4. Ausg. (revised by Diestel).
1884. Cheyne, The Prophecies of Isaiah. 5. Ed., 1889.
1887. Bredenkamp, Der Prophet Jesaia.
1887. Orelli, Die Propheten Jesaja und Jeremia.
1889. Delitzsch, Commentar über das Buch Jesaia. 4. Aufl.
1890. Dillmann, Der Prophet Jesaia. 2. Aufl. (Kittel), 1898.
1892. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia. 2. Aufl., 1902; 4. Aufl., 1914.
1895. Cheyne, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah.
1896. Skinner, Book of the Prophet Isaiah (Cambridge Bible). 2. Ed., 1915.
1897. Geo. Adam Smith, The Book of Isaiah (Expositors Bible).
1900. Marti, Das Buch Jesaja.
1905. Whitehouse, Isaiah (New Century Bible).
1911. Wade, Isaiah (Westminster Commentaries).
1912. Gray, Isaiah (International Critical Commentary).
1915. Hans Schmidt, Jesaia (Schriften des A. T. in Auswahl).

General Works, Monographs and Special Articles.

1875. Duhm, Theologie der Propheten.
1882. Robertson Smith, Prophets of Israel. 2. Ed., 1895.
1881—'84. Stade, Deuterozacharja and miscellaneous articles.

It is one of the aims of this address to examine the Gunkel-Gressmann theories and methods as applied to Isaiah. Have these men furnished a really adequate basis for the defense of

1881—'85. Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Vol. I; Vol. II, 1888.
1884. Cornill, Composition des Buches Jesaia. ZATW, pp. 83—105.
1884. Smend, Über die Bedeutung des Tempels. STK, p. 689 ff.
1885. Guthe, Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaias.
1885. Sörensen, Juda und die Assyrische Weltmacht (Chemnitzer Programm).
1886. Wellhausen, Prolegomena z. Geschichte Israels. 3. Ausg. Chapters I and XI, especially.
1888. Driver, Isaiah, his Life and Times (Men of the Bible).
1888. Giesebrecht, Die Immanuel-Weissagung. STK.
1890. Giesebrecht, Beiträge z. Jesajakritik.
1892. Kuenen, Historisch-kritische Einleitung etc. Deutsche Ausg.
1892. Winckler, Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen. pp. 26—49 (On the Isaiah Narratives).
1893. Hackmann, Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia.
1895. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit.
1895. Porter, A Suggestion regarding Isaiah's Immanuel. JBL, pp. 19—36.
1897. Brückner, Die Composition des Buches Jesaia. cc. 28—33.
1897. Volz, Die Vorexilische Prophetie und der Messias.
1898. Meinhold, Die Jesaiaerzählungen.
1899. Smend, Lehrbuch der A. T. Religionsgeschichte. 2. Aufl.
1901. Sellin, Studien z. Entstehungsgeschichte d. Jüdischen Gemeinde.
1902. Boehmer, Der ATliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes.
1902. Nagel, Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem.
1902. Nowack, Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels in der Assyrischen Zeit (Festschrift Holtzmann's, p. 33 ff.).
1902. Procksch, Geschichtsbetrachtung und Geschichtliche Überlieferung bei den Vorexilischen Propheten.
1903. Gunkel, Forschungen z. Religion und Literatur des Alten u. Neuen Testaments.
1903. Meinhold, Der heilige Rest. Studien z. Israelitischen Religionsgeschichte, Bd. I.
1903. Prášek, Sanherib's Feldzüge gegen Judah.
1904. Kautzsch, Religion of Israel. H. D. B. extra Vol.
1905. Stade, Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments.
1905. Wilke, Jesaja und Assur.
1906. Gressmann, Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie.
1906. Kennett, The Prophecy in Is. 9 1-7. Journal of Theological Studies (April).

those prophecies in the first thirty-nine chapters against which the neo-critical school has delivered its most formidable attacks?

In order to understand the strategy of the defense it is

1906. Küchler, Die Stellung des Propheten Jesaia z. Politik seiner Zeit.
1907. Guthe, Jesaia, Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher.
1908. Baentsch, Prophetie und Weissagung. ZWTh, p. 457 ff.
1908. Caspari, Echtheit, Hauptbegriff u. Gedankengang der Messianischen Weissagung. Is. 9 1-7.
1908. Oesterley, Evolution of the Messianic Idea.
1908. Staerk, Das Assyrische Weltreich im Urtheil der Propheten.
1908. Westphal, Jahweh's Wohnstätten.
1909. Herrmann, Der Messias aus Davids Geschlecht. ZWTh, p. 260 ff.
1909. Kittel, Geschichte des Volkes Israels. Bd. II, 2. Ausg.
1910. Kennett, Composition of the Book of Isaiah.
1910. Sellin, Einleitung in d. Alte Testament. 2. Aufl., 3. Aufl., 1920.
1912. Sellin, Der Alttestamentliche Prophetismus.
1914. Beer, Zur Zukunftserwartung Jesajas (Festschrift Wellhausen, pp. 15—35).
1914. Buttenwieser, The Prophets of Israel.
1914. Dittmann, Der heilige Rest im A. T. STK.
1914. Hölscher, Die Propheten.
1914. J. M. P. Smith, שאר ישוב, ZATW, pp. 219—224.
1914. Wellhausen, Israelitische u. Jüdische Geschichte. 7. Ausg., Nachdruck, 1919.
1915. König, Geschichte der Alttestamentlichen Religion.
1916. Duhm, Israels Propheten.
1917. Louise B. Smith, The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah. JBL, pp. 158—172.
1918. Mitchell, Isaiah on the Fate of his People and their Capital. JBL, p. 149 ff.
1919. Sachsse, Die Propheten des A. T. und ihre Gegner.
1920. Aytoun, The Rise and Fall of the Messianic Hope in the Sixth Century. JBL, pp. 24—43.
1920. Feigin, The Meaning of Ariel. JBL, pp. 131—137.
1920. Reisner, Discoveries in Ethiopia. Harvard Theological Review, pp. 23—44.

To the above list I append the following articles of my own which have immediately to do with the subject:

1905. A New Chapter in the Life of Isaiah. AJTh (Oct.).
1906. The Invasion of Sennacherib. Bibliotheca Sacra, Oct.
1907. Shebna and Eliakim. A Reply to Professor König. AJTh, July.
1913. The Book of Isaiah. Harvard Theological Review, Oct.
1916. Isaiah's earliest Prophecy against Ephraim. AJSL, April.

necessary to understand the strategy of the attack. Our study falls, therefore, into two main divisions, the presentation of the neo-critical thesis, and the presentation of the 'archaeological' antithesis. But within each of these two main divisions we discover two subdivisions. The neo-critical school directs its attack from a common base of operations, namely the general position of criticism represented by Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*. But it soon develops that there are two very different attacking columns, one led by Duhm and the other by Stade. The one champions the eschatological interpretation, the other the ethical and spiritual. The 'archaeological' school carries on its defense, if we may elaborate our military figure a little farther, by a flanking movement. It, too, occupies Wellhausen territory, but in the rear of the enemy, and it seeks to turn, very ingeniously, the tactics of the neo-critical forces against themselves. Sellin represents an independent unit within the defensive positions of the 'archaeologists'. The struggle thus appears to be a sort of four-cornered one and presents much the same impression of confusion as the melée in which Jonathan and the Philistines were involved at the pass of Michmash, and which 'melted away hither and thither' before the eyes of Saul.

Fortunately for our purposes there is a considerable acreage of what may be called neutral territory upon which the clashing forces have agreed to meet on equal terms. In the first place there is a fairly large amount of material which is admitted on all hands to be genuine. This material is found in the prophecies of doom. It is sufficient in amount to permit of reasonably secure conclusions as to Isaiah's general style, and as to some of the ideas in which he was most profoundly interested. The doom prophecies, therefore, furnish invaluable criteria for the

1916. Studies in Isaiah. JBL, pp. 134—142.
1918. The Problem of Is. Chap. X. AJSL, April.
1918. Immanuel. AJSL, July.
1920. The Stone of the Foundation. AJSL, Oct.
1921. The Problem of Isaiah. Journal of Religion, May.

In what follows the above mentioned books and articles are usually referred to simply by the name of the author, except where a more precise reference to the particular work is necessary in order to avoid confusion.

discussion of the disputed prophecies. Again, the outlines of the larger historical background of Isaiah's age are now, thanks to the monuments, fairly clear. Yet in two important particulars there is still, unfortunately, room for debate. The first of these concerns the year of Hezekiah's accession, the second and more pressing question is: What really happened in 701? The first point bears upon the question: When did the pro-Assyrian policy of Ahaz change to the anti-Assyrian policy of Hezekiah, and that in turn upon the question of the circumstances under which Isaiah delivered a number of his threats. The problem of what happened in 701 is the central problem of Isaiah. Were Isaiah's promises vindicated at that time, or his threats? This at once raises the question of the relationship of Isaiah's hopes to his threats.

As I have brought out elsewhere,[5] there are four great doctrines in the first thirty-nine chapters which have been supposed to express Isaiah's hopes for the future: the doctrines of the Day of the Lord, of the Remnant, of the Messianic King, and of the Inviolability of Zion. The first of these is allied more closely to the threats, the second hovers between the threats and the hopes, the last two are the great expressions of hope. The first two doctrines are unanimously admitted to be genuine elements in Isaiah's teaching. It must, therefore, be borne in mind in all that follows that the genuineness of one important element of hope, namely the doctrine of the Remnant, is conceded. It is around the question of the genuineness of the second pair of ideas that the battle has raged most fiercely. The doctrine of the Messianic King is found by the great majority of scholars in the two prophecies of the Wondrous Child and the Twig of Jesse,[6] and by some in the two Immanuel passages, 8 8 and 7 14. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion is either expressed or implied in the great anti-Assyrian group of prophecies.[7] Our

[5] Harvard Theological Review, Oct., 1913.

[6] 9 2-7 and 11 1ff. 32 1ff. and 33 17 need not be considered, as the specifically Messianic interpretation of these passages is now generally given up.

[7] The anti-Assyrian prophecies may be divided into three groups 1) Those found in cc. 6—8 (the Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies), i. e. 8 9f.

first task, therefore, is to trace the fortunes of these two groups of prophecies at the hands of the neo-critical school.

PART I

THE NEO-CRITICAL SCHOOL

The gradual Elimination of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian Prophecies and the Concentration upon the ethical and spiritual Elements in the Teachings of Isaiah.

I. Wellhausen, Smend, and Robertson Smith.

In the earliest stage of the neo-critical development, the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies were accepted unquestioningly as genuine. This phase may be best represented by Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena*, and by his two disciples, Smend in Germany and Robertson Smith in England.[8] If a composite picture of the views of these scholars may be drawn, ignoring differences in detail, it would be something as follows. 1) The first and chiefest characteristic of eighth century prophecy is its supreme emphasis upon the doom of the nation. "Only you have I known out of all the families of the earth; therefore I will

2) Those found in cc. 28—32 (the anti-Egyptian prophecies) 29 5-8; 30 27-33; 31 5-9.

3) Those independent of their contexts:
   a) Brief prophecies, 14 24-27; 17 12-14 (cf. 8 9 f.; 29 5-8)
   b) Longer prophecies: 10 5-34; c. 18; c. 33; 37 22 ff. (this last embedded in the Isaiah narratives).

4) To these anti-Assyrian prophecies may be added certain others in which the inviolability of Zion has been supposed to be expressed or implied: 14 28-32; 28 16; and c. 6; 8 18 in both of which the temple is prominent. It is important to notice that at 8 9 f.; 17 12-14; 29 5-8 and in cc. 18 and 33 Assyria is not mentioned by name, and in all but c. 18 "many nations" or "all nations" or "peoples" appear in its place. In 14 24-27 "all nations" are mentioned along with Assyria. This subordinate group will be hereafter referred to as "the many-nations" group.

[8] See *Prolegomena*; Smend, *Lehrbuch der ATlichen Religionsgeschichte*; and Smith, *Prophets of Israel.*

visit upon you all your iniquities."[9] This threat of national destruction has for its major premise a rigorously ethical conception of Jahweh and for its minor premise the fact of the nation's sin. The inevitable conclusion is national doom. 2) But such a conclusion is, in turn, the beginning of a new premise, namely, that religion must be dissociated from nationalism. A god who can destroy his own people in the interest of an ethical ideal is a god whose interests are not confined to his people. The religion of the prophets thus becomes incipiently universalistic; monotheism begins to develop. A fundamentally ethical god and a fundamentally national god have nothing really in common.[10] 3) Yet the judgment upon the nation is not an end in itself. It is only a means to an end. Beyond the judgment there is hope. But the circumstances in which the early prophets labored demanded warnings rather than comforts. Hence threats predominated in their prophecies over promises. 4) But in what forms did hope express itself? In the case of Isaiah, principally in two forms: in the doctrine of the Messianic king and in the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion.

A. Isaiah was the first prophet whom we know of to cherish the idea of a Davidic Messiah. As the breakdown of the monarchy during the Assyrian wars became steadily more obvious and more painfully felt, it was natural for the people to look back to the good old days of David and Solomon and to wish for their return. Is. 1 21–26, though not referring specifically to the Messianic king, is fundamental to the Wellhausen interpretation. The Messianic hope takes on the historical character of a hope for a restored kingdom. The Messianic kingdom is to be the continuation of the old Davidic monarchy. "The kingdom of God is for Isaiah absolutely identical with the kingdom of David."[11] The duties Isaiah ascribes to the Messiah are of political nature, such duties as one would demand today of the Turkish government. He is to give victory over the nation's enemies and to administer justice.[12] Such a hope could

[9] Amos 3 2.

[10] Cf. Smend, pp. 185, 193, 196, 199.

[11] *Proleg.* 434. Cf. R. Smith, 257, 302, 313.

[12] *Proleg.*, l. c.; Smend, 235, n. 2.

have naturally arisen, it is claimed, only in the eighth century. It could not have arisen *before* the monarchy, because it was attached to the monarchy. It could not have arisen *after* the fall of the monarchy in the post-exilic period, for at that time the hopes of the future became detached from history. The condition of the people scattered in exile no longer suggested a continuity in the political life of the nation. The hopes for the future now took on an eschatological character. The miraculous entered in. Furthermore, the particular hope of a Messianic King was no longer cherished, because another ideal had taken its place. The idea of the theocracy had, by this time, largely supplanted the idea of the kingdom (cf. Deuteronomy and P.); the church-state had supplanted the state-church and nationalism had succumbed to ecclesiasticism. Hence the doctrine of the Messiah could scarcely have originated at that time.[13] But if this doctrine could not have originated before the monarchy had arisen or after its fall, and must have sprung up sometime during its existence, there was no time so favorable for its birth as the eighth century. The Messianic hope was the natural antithesis to the Assyrian disaster.

In this construction four things stand out. (1) The rise of the Messianic hope is psychologically explained. The importance of this fact will appear hereafter.[14] (2) The Wellhausen view emphasizes the historical and ethical element in the Messianic figure. The supernatural is everywhere eliminated. 11 6 ff. is reduced to poetry and rhetoric. Continuity between the present and the future is insisted upon. The Messianic King is an ideal king, but the ideal is quite attainable. The charism which descends upon the Messiah (11 1 ff.) is not different from that which descended upon the ancient worthies except in its completeness and permanence.[15] "In his so-called Messianic prophecies Isaiah does not paint dream pictures of the future greatness and glory of his people for the realization of which there was not the smallest prospect, but sets up a goal which is or should be attainable in the present. The strong and just king

[13] This argument was worked out especially by Wellhausen, *Proleg.* 439.

[14] See Part II.

[15] Smith, 304.

of David's line in whose coming he hopes has nothing shadowy about him, and nothing is attributed to him which passes beyond the range of possibility under the conditions existing in Judah at that time."[16] This insistence upon the ethical and the historical in the figure of the Messiah is consistent with the emphasis upon these elements in the prophets generally, which is so characteristic of the neo-critical school; whether it is exegetically defensible in the case of 9 1 ff. and 11 1 ff. is another question. But at another point there is a latent discrepancy with the prophetic ideal. (3) How does the incipient breakdown of nationalism, due to the supreme place which ethics plays in prophecy, consist with the rehabilitation of nationalism involved in the Messianic hope? Smend is quite conscious of this difficulty.[17] He therefore holds that Isaiah's Messianic hope is no integral part of his thinking, a *merely passing phenomenon* in his life. Smend even goes so far as to suggest that it could not have originated with Isaiah, but must have been earlier connected in some way with the popular formulation of the doctrine of the Day of the Lord as a day of victory over Israel's enemies (Amos 5 18).[18] These observations of Smend will play an important part in what follows. (4) Lastly, it is rather significant that Wellhausen lays all his emphasis upon the view that the theocracy supplanted the nationalistic ideal in the post-exilic period, and ignores almost entirely the very striking Messianic movement under Zerubbabel. In treating of this movement he is concerned only with the importance of the temple in it. This leads us to our second point, the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion.

16 Well., *Geschichte*, 123. In his final edition of his history Wellhausen thus maintains the position originally adopted by him.

17 "Under the pressure of the Assyrian domination and in sympathy with the misfortune that had overtaken Israel in 734, there arose in Isaiah a nationalistic feeling which appeared to have utterly died out when he prophesied the doom of Israel at an earlier time. Again, that the Messianic king should be a descendent of Jesse shows us that the expectation of his coming grows out of the Jewish nationalistic feeling of the prophet." Smend, p. 232.

18 Smend, 233; 235. Kautzsch also suggests the possibility of some older prophecy underlying 2 Sam. 7, in which this hope is expressed (H. D. B. Extra Vol. p. 695).

B. This doctrine we have found to be either expressed or implied in the anti-Assyrian prophecies which were accepted by all the early members of the neo-critical school with the exception of Stade. But why did Isaiah hold to the inviolability of Zion? This was a difficult question. The inviolability of Zion would seem, at first sight, to imply its sanctity in the cult sense. But this would not harmonize with Isaiah's known antipathy to the cult (1 10ff.; 29 13ff.), or with the supreme emphasis upon ethics in the prophetic message. Accordingly we find various answers, all intended to avoid the cult implications of the doctrine of inviolability. Zion, it is claimed, has no significance for Isaiah as a cult centre, but only as the seat of Jahweh's kingship. It is not thought of as his altar-hearth, but as his throne.[19] But would such a distinction ever occur to an ancient, even to an ancient prophet? Where does a deity manifest himself, where does he dwell, if not at the *sanctuary*? Isaiah, himself, saw Jahweh in the temple (c. 6). It is at this point, if anywhere, that the Wellhausen view exposes itself most clearly to the charge of modernizing the prophet. And further, does the inference of the inviolability of Zion as naturally flow from the idea of Zion as Jahweh's throne as it does from the idea of Zion as Jahweh's altar? The thought of inviolability almost inevitably suggests the thought of sacrilege rather than the thought of *lèse majesté*, and sacrilege suggests the cult significance of Zion. It is because these scholars feel this difficulty that they resort to another reason to account for the inviolability of Zion? It is connected by them with the doctrine of the Remnant, in the very characteristic form of that doctrine current in the neo-critical school. The idea of the Remnant, like the idea of the Messianic kingdom, is historicised and

19 "We must not forget that the importance of Jerusalem in Isaiah's view did not depend upon the temple of Solomon, but on the fact that it was David's city and the focal point of his kingdom, the centre, not of the cult, but of the reign of Jahweh over his people. The holy mountain was for him the whole city as a political commonwealth, with its citizens, advisers, judges (1 26). [Note that its priests are not referred to!] His faith in the immovable foundation stone (28 16) on which Zion stood was nothing but a faith in the living presence of Jahweh in Israel's camp." (*Proleg.*, 25; for the same view see Smith, 361.)

moralized. The Remnant is the means by which continuity between the present and the future is established. It is the link between the two. It is a flesh and blood reality in history; it has a local habitation and a name. In essence it is the prophetic party, which began to form originally around Isaiah in the person of his immediate followers, gradually became consolidated into the Reform party, and ultimately put through the Deuteronomic law.[20]

But now the question would arise in Isaiah's mind, how is this Remnant upon whom his hopes became centered to be saved in the approaching national disaster? The way of escape is found in the preservation of Zion. Secure in an inviolable Zion, the Remnant is able to weather the storm.[21] In this way the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, which can so easily be interpreted in the non-moral terms of a taboo, also becomes moralized, and we arrive at a consistent interpretation of the Messiah, the Remnant, and the Inviolability of Zion, which emphasizes in each case the ethical and spiritual elements and tones down or entirely ignores the cult elements and the supernatural. But is this explanation of the doctrine of Zion's inviolability quite convincing? In general the anti-Assyrian prophecies either simply *assume* that Zion is inviolable, without giving any reason for it, or actually express the thought of its cult sanctity, as at 29 5–8; 31 9; 18 7. The view that it is to be preserved in order to afford a refuge to the Remnant is a pure construction of these scholars.[22]

[20] See Well., *Geschichte*, 123ff.; Smend, 229 ("The Remnant was not an object of hope"); Smith, 275. The main reliance of these scholars for this conception of the Remnant is 8 11-18, and, indeed, the passage is of supreme importance.

[21] "The sanctity of Zion rests at bottom, in Isaiah's view, only on the fact that in this place is the community of Jahweh" (Smend, 230). "Because the community of Jahweh [the Remnant] is indestructible, the state of Judah and the kingdom of the house of David cannot be utterly overthrown. The capital and the court appeared to him as the natural centre of the true Remnant" (Smith, 259; 289; cf. 263). This theory is worked out most fully in Meinhold's *Der heilige Rest.*

[22] The only two texts in Isaiah which by any possibility could be interpreted to express such a thought are 14 32 and 28 16. The first of

It is interesting, also, to observe that Smith is not quite satisfied with this explanation and suggests that the doctrine of inviolability is connected with Isaiah's nationalism. Isaiah simply could not believe that the state or its capital would fall. "The sphere of Jehovah's purpose and the kingdom of Judah are identical."[23] This means that the nation can no more be destroyed than can Jahweh's purposes be thwarted. But if Isaiah could not emancipate himself from a nationalistic interpretation of religion, is it so certain that he could rid himself of the idea of the ceremonial sanctity of Zion? When state and religion are one, the only way in which a national religion can express itself is through some sort of a ceremonial. If we run back the doctrine of inviolability to nationalism, it is, indeed, difficult to avoid the connotation of ceremonial sanctity. If, on the other hand, Isaiah *does* abandon the idea of ceremonial sanctity, and there seems to be very strong reason to hold that he did, is it not possible that he may have abandoned the nationalistic conception of religion with which the temple cult is so closely connected? In that case, did he, after all, teach the doctrine of inviolability? We have already seen how Smend felt the latent disagreement between the nationalistic doctrine of the Messianic King and the incipient breakdown of nationalism in the prophetic theology. We now seem to have uncovered, in the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, another disagreement of the same sort. Both doctrines, but particularly the latter one, present difficulties in the way of the Wellhausen moralizing interpretation of Isaiah, *provided they are genuine elements in the prophet's teaching.* This leads to the work of Duhm and Stade.

these expresses the thought that the Remnant (the poor and the afflicted) are saved because Zion is inviolable in itself, rather than the thought that Zion is inviolable because of the Remnant. I waive the question of the genuiness of 14 28-32; but see Duhm and especially Buttenwieser, JBL, 1917, p. 240 ff. The attempt to discover a Remnant at 28 16 (see, especially, Meinhold, *Der Rest*, p. 133 ff.) is labor wasted (see the author's article on *The Stone of the Foundation*).

[23] Smith, 263 f.

II. Duhm and Stade.

A. Duhm.

The significance of Duhm's work lies, first, in his peculiar interpretation of the teachings of Isaiah, the man, and, secondly, in his theory of the revision of Isaiah, the book.[24] 1) Duhm's interpretation of Isaiah's teachings is the exact reverse of the Wellhausen interpretation. Wellhausen lays all the emphasis upon the historical and the ethical, Duhm upon the supernatural, the religious. Wellhausen emphasizes the idea of continuity between the present and the future. The future is only an idealized present. Duhm insists upon the idea of discontinuity between them. He tells us expressly that Isaiah's "hope of the future is *not* in the idealization of the present".[25] Isaiah did, indeed, have the ethical interests which the other great eighth-century prophets had; these were expressed in his prophecies of woe. But his originality did not lie in them. It lay in his hopes; and these hopes are religious as distinct from ethical, supernaturalistic as distinct from historical. In other words, Isaiah's importance lies in the fact that he is the *creator of eschatology*.[26] The main proof of this thesis is found in the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies. a) The Messiah is not a merely human king, he is a miraculous figure. His enduement by the spirit (11 1 f.) is a miraculous charism. The spirit does not *become* the spirit of the king, that would be an ethical conception; it *remains* Jahweh's spirit, that is a religious and supernatural idea. 11 3 does not refer to the ability to judge impartially, that again would be ethical; it refers to immediate intuition, due to the supernatural charism. The peace of nature in 11 6–8 is not a mere play of fancy, not allegory, not even symbol. It represents a real hope. It is to be noted that Duhm

[24] See his *Theologie der Propheten*, his great *Commentary*, and *Israel's Propheten*, 1916. Duhm's criticism went through a considerable evolution in these works, but his interpretation, curiously enough, remained practically the same.

[25] *Theologie*, 167.

[26] See, especially, his remarks at 1 17, and the additional statements in ed. 3 at 18 4.

carefully avoids the word 'mythological' in his interpretation of vs. 6–8, though he is impressed with the non-Semitic character of the passage. Again, the child of 9 1–6 is surrounded with an atmosphere of marvel. He belongs to the eschatological wonder-world *after* the judgment. All this is the exact reverse of Wellhausen's position. It may be noted in passing that the Wellhausen interpretation of the Remnant is also denied by Duhm. The Remnant is no longer the link between the present and the future. It, too, belongs to the eschatological era. Isaiah does not appear at the head of a prophetic reform party. "In the new creation he has no share because he is only a man. As any other man, he can only wait for it with faith and longing. It is an absolute miracle of Jahweh, and from it all human cooperation is jealously excluded."[27] b) But the most remarkable proof of Isaiah's fondness for the supernatural is found in the anti-Assyrian prophecies. The struggle with Assyria takes on the character of a mighty duel between Jahweh and this arrogant world power. "In an instant, suddenly (29 5), when apparently just about to accomplish its designs, Assyria is struck down by Jahweh." The conception is that of the *deus ex machina.* "The emphasis upon the suddenness corresponds to the tendency of Isaiah's politics and eschatology as a whole; not the smallest part of the victory must be ascribed to the people. Jahweh alone shall be exalted in that day."[28] Perhaps the most characteristic expressions of this thought are found in c. 10 and in the Ariel prophecy 29 1–8, the last verses of which compare the vanishing of the enemy to the vanishing of a dream. This last passage in its original form is said to be written *mit echtjesaianischem Schwung und Feuer.* Accordingly, Duhm views the attempts to interpret Isaiah along the Wellhausen-Smend-Smith lines as illegitimate attempts to modernize him. It must be admitted

[27] See the remarks on c. 6. The passage is considerably toned down in the 3rd ed. The same idea is still expressed, though more cautiously, in *Israel's Propheten*, 202. The failure to give an adequate analysis of the Remnant idea in any of Duhm's work on Isaiah is very striking. In keeping with this is the slight attention paid to Is. 8 16-18. The passage is not even mentioned in the *Theologie.*

[28] See remarks at 29 1-8.

that if the Messianic and anti-Assyrian groups are accepted in their present forms as genuine, this criticism of Duhm is correct. Duhm's exegesis of these prophecies does far more justice to their peculiar features than Wellhausen's. This is particularly true in the case of cc. 28—32, where the abrupt transitions from doom to hope lend themselves very naturally to Duhm's conception of a sudden, miraculous deliverance. But at this point we arrive at the second great contribution which Duhm's commentary has to give.

2) While in his *Theologie* Duhm still accepts only the results of the stage of criticism represented by Ewald, in his *Commentary* he subjects the first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah to the most thorough-going criticism to which they had as yet been exposed. The results are astonishing. Never before had the extent of the revision been so clearly seen, never before had its purpose been so clearly recognized. For the first time we have in Duhm's commentary a thought-through theory of the revision of Isaiah.[29] Duhm advances what may be called a fragmentary hypothesis of Isaiah. The book is a prophetic anthology. The connections between the various fragments are for the most part artificial and due to revision,[30] and particularly glaring instances of them are now found in cc. 28—32, the very chapters upon which Duhm had specially relied in his *Theologie* to prove the abruptness and hence the miraculousness of the transition from despair to deliverance. The revision was, for the most part, made in the late post-exilic period and in the interest of late Jewish eschatology. *The original prophecies of Isaiah are thus set in a great eschatological framework.*

But the supposition that Isaiah, the man, was the creator of eschatology on the one hand, and that Isaiah, the book, has been subjected to a late eschatological redaction on the other, creates

[29] Stade had already suggested the outlines of such a revision, ZATW, 1881, p. 170ff.; 1883, p. 3; and in his *Geschichte*, I. p. 186, n. 1, but Duhm was the first *systematically* to apply Stade's principles to Isaiah. Cornill's theory of revision (ZATW, 1884, p. 83ff.), which combines a principle of chronological arrangement with a principle of catch-words, is by no means adequate.

[30] In the delimitation of the fragments Duhm's theories of Hebrew poetry play a large part.

a rather delicate problem. How is the early eschatology of the original prophecies to be distinguished from the late eschatology of the redaction? Of course it is easy to say that Isaiah's eschatology represents the seed and the later eschatology the full-blown flower. But in the realm of ideas this distinction is not always so easy to make. What Duhm fails to do is to provide us with adequate criteria in all cases for making the nice distinctions necessary. When Duhm tells us that the eschatology of Isaiah is fluid and the later eschatology has hardened into dogma, this is only the prose interpretation of the seed and flower metaphor.[31] But this gets us nowhere. In what respect are 10 12 and 14 32 allusions to accepted dogmas, while 29 5-8 and 31 9 are not?[32] As a matter of fact, I get the impression from Duhm's criticism that he trusts largely to style and poetic power in making his decisions. On this basis alone he might very well reject such slovenly and opaque prophecies as 29 16–24 or c. 4 and accept such forcible fragments as 8 9 f. or 17 12–14. But, though the presence of a bad style, when one is dealing with such a master stylist as Isaiah, may be confidently accepted as a mark of spuriousness,[33] it by no means follows that the presence of a good style within cc. 1—39 is necessarily the mark of genuineness. Later authors were quite capable of writing with force and even with grandeur.[34] After all, from the point of view of the critical school one must fall back finally upon the all-important *criterion of ideas*, and in idea are the anti-Assyrian prophecies so different from the later eschatological prophecies as to enable us to affirm with confidence that the former are seed and the latter are flower?

At this point a very disturbing admission by Duhm is encountered. We have seen how, in the case of the Messianic

[31] See his remarks at 10 12; 29 16 ff.; 30 18.

[32] Attention was called to this difficulty in Duhm's position already in 1913, Harvard Theol. Rev., p. 492. It is of sufficient importance, I think, to be worth repeating.

[33] Of course, a good style may at times become splotched with corruptions of the text (see c. 2), but in general it is not so difficult to distinguish between a passage that has become opaque for this reason and a passage that is opaque because there is an opaque mind behind it.

[34] Compare c. 14 for example.

prophecies, Smend admits a lack of connection between them and Isaiah's most fundamental convictions, and how, in the case of the anti-Assyrian prophecies, the same lack of connection is seen in Smith's interpretations, though Smith himself does his best to avoid this admission. What is our surprise to find Duhm cheerfully conceding both groups of prophecies to be fundamentally out of touch with Isaiah's great sermons of doom. The main interest in the prophecies of doom is ethical; the main interest in the eschatological prophecies is religious. The former come with divine authority, a "thus saith the Lord"; the latter are Isaiah's own private affair! This view-point, which meets us already in the *Theologie*,[35] is maintained by Duhm, with only slight modifications, in the three editions of his *Commentary* and in his *Israel's Propheten*. In all three works the Messianic picture in cc. 9, 11 and 2 2–4 are treated as poetry rather than as prophecy, originally written, not spoken; not designed for the people, but for the heart of the poet himself and for his immediate followers.[36] It is quite in keeping with this theory to find that Duhm refuses to explain the figure of the Davidic Messiah in chapters 9 and 11 out of the internal or external conditions in Judah. It springs out of Isaiah's own thoughts and character and experiences. Duhm suggests that Isaiah's nearness to the court and his respect for the royal prerogatives, as seen in the Shebna prophecy, might account in part for the rise of the hope in a Davidic Messiah![37]

[35] The passage is so important that I cite it in full. It is the opening paragraph of the section on Isaiah's eschatology. "Though directly attached to the immediately prophetic discourses, to those, namely, which are concerned with the present people and present conditions, the discussions more especially of the future glory appear to be quite independent of them. Through the omission of the formula, "Thus saith the Lord", these [oracles] permit us to see that the prophet speaks more on his own authority and for his own benefit, and does not intend to give his free expressions the authority which belongs to the word of Jahweh... It is important to observe that the predictions of Isaiah [Duhm has in mind particularly the Messianic passages] are his own private affair and have no divine authority for others" (p. 158).

[36] Cf. *Israel's Propheten*, p. 179.

[37] *Israel's Propheten*, 186. He does not discuss the origin of the conception either in the *Theologie* or the *Commentary*.

Here is a singular situation! The importance of Isaiah is found in the fact that he is the creator of eschatology, and yet this eschatology is almost completely out of touch with his prophetic activity and with the great ethical interests which seem to have controlled him as a prophet. Our surprise is not lessened when we find Duhm pointing out both in the *Theologie* and in the *Commentary* that this same material, which is so little related to Isaiah's prophetic interests, is very closely related to Ezekiel and Deutero-Zechariah! Zechariah we are told "has the same heart-felt interest in miracle as Isaiah did."[38] In view of what may fairly be called the unstable equilibrium of Duhm's interpretation and criticism, the work which had been earlier initiated by Stade gains a new significance.[39]

B. Stade.

Stade's importance in the history of Isaiah-interpretation lies mainly in two things: his criticism of the Isaiah narratives,[40] and his criticism of the anti-Assyrian prophecies. 1) For the first time he subjected the Isaiah narratives to a rigorous criticism and showed that only the abbreviated annalistic notice in 2 K. 18 13–16 can lay claim to strict historical accuracy. The other two accounts which he unravelled out of the present compilatory tangle were regarded as legendary, and the anti-Assyrian poem attached to them (37 22 ff.) *and agreeing with their point of view* was rejected.[41] This conclusion was ominous for the future. Here was the only anti-Assyrian poem in Isaiah which seemed to be organically connected with a datable event (the campaign of Sennacherib) now regarded as spurious.

2) Equally disturbing was Stade's attack upon certain other anti-Assyrian prophecies. The point of view from which this attack was launched should be noticed. In determining the

[38] *Theologie*, p. 277; cf. p. 211. Compare also remarks in *Comm.* at 31 9, and the new passage in ed. 3 at c. 18, p. 114, and especially the change in ed. 3 at 29 5-8, p. 183.

[39] See his articles in the debate on Deutero-Zechariah in ZATW, 1881—'84, and *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1881—'85, passim.

[40] Cc. 36, 37, cf. 2 K. 18 13-19 37.

[41] *GVI*, p. 617 ff.; ZATW, 1886, p. 173 ff.

genuineness of a prophecy *the criterion of ideas* was pushed to the front. If an idea appeared in one passage in a self-explanatory context and in another passage in an unorganized and unintelligible way, the priority must be with the self-explanatory passage.[42] Now the Gog prophecy in Ezekiel has been admitted on all hands to be a characteristic prophecy of Ezekiel and an integral part of his system of thought. It is a 'child of Ezekiel's reflection', to use a famous phrase of Smend. According to this prophecy, Gog marches at the head of "many peoples", mysterious hordes from the north, to attack the Holy Land in one last mighty effort to crush the people of God. But Jahweh's power and holiness are brilliantly vindicated in Gog's complete overthrow. Upon the mountains of Palestine his armies meet destruction, a sure proof that Jahweh's hand has accomplished it. But within the anti-Assyrian prophecies there is a small group, the "many-nations" passages (8 9 f.; 17 12–14; 29 5–8, and cf. 14 24–27 where "all nations" as well as Assyria are referred to), in which the same *motif* is found as in the Gog prophecy and expressed in much the same way. Here are many mysterious, unnamed peoples arrogantly combining against Judah but ultimately overwhelmed by Jahweh's power. Now, whereas the Gog prophecy is in the most intimate relation with Ezekiel's theological views, the "many-nations" passages, it is claimed, are out of harmony with Isaiah's views. The universalism implied in them is too advanced for eighth-century prophecy. But apart from this argument, which is not entirely convincing, the fact remains that these three brief prophecies are in fundamental disagreement *with their contexts*. In accordance with Stade's method it would seem reasonable to conclude that the *motif* in these prophecies originated with Ezekiel, and that the "many-nations" passages were incorporated into Isaiah after the time of Ezekiel.[43] This conclusion would also agree with one of the most celebrated dicta of Wellhausen. "Earlier", he tells us, i. e. in the preexilic period, "it was always an enemy already threatening in the background, a danger actually approaching; after the exile, fancy created a general conspiracy of God knows what people

[42] ZATW, 1881, p. 10 ff.

[43] ZATW, 1883, pp. 1—16; 1884, p. 260 n. 1.

against Jerusalem, for which in reality there was no occasion. Prophecy lost its connection with history and its foundation in history".[44] This statement would seem to fit exactly the "many-nations" passages in Isaiah. But may we not take one more step? The same *motif* is found in the other anti-Assyrian passages as well as in the "many-nations" group. It is interesting to observe how Robertson Smith characterizes Is. 10 in almost exactly the same language as Stade and Smend characterize Ezek. 38 and 39.[45] In both Jahweh's honor is at stake; in both the destruction of Assyria or Gog is necessary to the vindication of his honor. But in one particular c. 10 and certain others of the anti-Assyrian group differ from the Gog prophecy. They are expressly anti-*Assyrian.* They seem to oppose the *historical* nation, Assyria. The relationship of the anti-Assyrian prophecies in Isaiah to the Gog prophecy would then seem to be a good example of the seed and flower theory. The Isaianic prophecies could naturally be accounted for as originating in the great Assyrian crisis, an historical crisis. Ezekiel would take up the *motif* of the Assyrian prophecies and theologize or rather mythologize it. Unfortunately, the problem is not quite so easy of solution as that. Is Assyria in these anti-Assyrian prophecies always the historical Empire of the Tigris? At 14 24–27, a prophecy very much like the "many-nations" prophecies in style and temper, and in addition referring to the destruction of the enemy on the mountains of Palestine (cf. the Gog prophecy), Stade himself identifies Assyria with the Seleucid power.[46] But if this can be done in one case, why not in another? The question arises: When is Assyria not Assyria? When once the "many-nations" passages have been rejected, the fat is in the fire so far as the group of anti-Assyrian prophecies is concerned. It is impossible to prevent the question of their genuineness being seriously raised and discussed.[47]

[44] *Proleg.* 433.

[45] Smith, pp. 297—300, 333, 336; Smend, *Ezechiel,* at cc. 38, 39; Stade, ZATW, 1881, p. 44.

[46] ZATW, 1882, p. 291 f.; Duhm makes the same identification at 10 24; 11 11, and 19 23.

[47] Stade also rejected the Messianic passages, 9 1-6 and c. 11 (see *GVI*

Thus far I have sought to show 1) how Wellhausen, Smend, Smith and Duhm accepted the genuineness of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian groups of prophecies, and how two very divergent theories of the significance of Isaiah were based upon them; in one case all the emphasis was laid upon the historical and ethical, in the other upon the eschatological and the supernatural; 2) how, in the ethical interpretation, latent contradictions were discovered between the nationalism of Isaiah's eschatology and the fundamental conceptions of prophecy, and how, in the eschatological interpretation, all links betwen Isaiah's eschatology, which had a literary origin, and his prophecy, which was expressed in his spoken sermons, were practically destroyed; 3) how, in the third place, Duhm showed that the present book of Isaiah is a prophetic anthology compiled during the late post-exilic period in an eschatological interest, and how it became at times very difficult to distinguish the original eschatology of Isaiah from the eschatology of the redaction, and 4) how, in the case of the anti-Assyrian prophecies in particular, Stade established the closest connection between them and the peculiar views of Ezekiel. It is evident that the theory of a post-exilic eschatological redaction is entering into the problem of the genuineness of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies in a most disconcerting way. If it could once be shown that the groups of prophecies in question can not be adequately related to those prophecies of woe which are unanimously accepted, and can not be explained out of Isaiah's ministry, it would immediately follow that they must belong to this redaction. Hitherto only the more general discrepancies between these prophecies and Isaiah's fundamental ideas have been pointed out. It will be next in order to examine them more in detail in the light of the circumstances of Isaiah's day and of the purposes of his ministry.

vol. I, 596 n. 2, and vol. II. 209 ff.). But as he did not develop his argument against them, his hints at first made little impression. Not so his attack upon cc. 32 and 33 (ZATW, 1884, pp. 256—271). This was a powerful one. It so shook confidence in c. 33 that few have since dared to defend it; and c. 32, when accepted at all, has been accepted only with the greatest caution.

III. Attempts to Relate Isaiah's Hopes to his Threats.

In what follows I can select only the most outstanding problems presented by the prophecies of hope and treat them in the most general way.

A. The Messianic Group.

The first problem concerns the date and position of the Messianic prophecies in the life and teachings of Isaiah, provided they are accepted as genuine. So long as 6 1–9 6 is regarded as an organically constructed section, and Immanuel at 7 14 and 8 8 is identified with the Messiah, it follows that the doctrine of the Messiah was entertained at an early stage in Isaiah's career, for this section is definitely located at the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis in 735/734. But did Isaiah teach this doctrine later? The answer to this question depends upon the date of c. 11. The date of c. 11 was supposed to depend, in turn, upon the date of the foremost anti-Assyrian prophecy, c. 10, with which c. 11 appears to be connected. If, now, c. 10 is placed in the Sennacherib period, and that at first sight seems to be the most natural place to put it, it follows that c. 11 belongs to that period also. In that case Isaiah taught the doctrine of the Messiah at the end of his life as well as at the beginning.[48] But if c. 10 is placed in the Sargon period, as many scholars have held,[49] and c. 11 is still connected with it, then it follows that in the Sennacherib period, which is generally regarded as the climax of the prophet's career, the doctrine of the Messiah played no part. This is curious. But was c. 11 originally connected with c. 10? Guthe denied it,[50] and the work of Duhm confirmed his view.[51] But if c. 11 is cast loose from its present

[48] This is the view of Ewald. I omit, again, any consideration of 32 1 ff. and 33 17, for the reason that both dating and interpretation of these passages are extremely doubtful. The case for the genuineness of the doctrine of the Messiah in Isaiah depends upon the acceptance of 9 1-6 and c. 11.

[49] See R. Smith, and Cheyne in his commentary.

[50] See his *Zukunftsbild des Jesaia.*

[51] I think nothing is surer in the criticism of Isaiah than that 10 33, 34 are due to the later eschatological revision. The antithesis, therefore,

moorings, where is it to find a new anchorage? Guthe answered, at 9 1–6, the prophecy most closely akin to it. The result is to locate *all* the Messianic prophecies early, in 735/734. But how, then, is the disappearance of the Messiah in the later periods to be accounted for? According to Robertson Smith the doctrine of the Messianic King originated in the Syro-Ephraimitic period as an antithesis to the wicked Ahaz. The doctrine was still cherished as late as the Sargon period in Hezekiah's reign, for in his earlier years Hezekiah was not so good as he is generally supposed to be. But when Hezekiah repented in the Sennacherib campaign, it was not so necessary to rely upon a Messiah. The Messiah being only an ideally human king (the Wellhausen interpretation), Isaiah was able to emphasize the glorious reign of Jahweh, himself, through his historical representative, Hezekiah, now turned from his evil ways. In other words, the Messiah becomes so humanized by Smith along the Wellhausen lines that the rule of a good human king, even though he has just been converted, makes him superfluous. Guthe, on the contrary, adopts the eschatological interpretation of the Messiah in cc. 6—9. In 735 the situation was so bad that Isaiah was unable to hope for deliverance except through the miraculous intervention of an eschatological Messiah (again set in antithesis to Ahaz). But later the situation became improved in the reign of the good king Hezekiah (good all through his reign). Jerusalem was now practically identified with the Remnant, or at least the Remnant, as the reformed party, was located in Jerusalem. Consequently, when danger threatened from Assyria, Isaiah's view changed. He no longer expected a miraculous deliverance, but an historical one. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, interpreted in the interest of historical continuity (Wellhausen), took the place of the Messiah eschatologically interpreted.[52] This theory of Guthe is followed by Giesebrecht[53] and Procksch.[54] The latter introduces

which seems now to exist between the felled Assyrian forest and the twig of Jesse is not an original antithesis, but an artificially created one. I cannot feel that Miss Smith (JBL 1917, p. 167 f.) has succeeded in disproving this critical result.

[52] *Zukunftsbild*, p. 12 ff. [53] *Beiträge*, p. 76 ff.

[54] *Geschichtsbetrachtung*, 38, n. 1; 43, n. 1.

an interesting variation. He recognizes that the Messianic idea is essentially nationalistic. Therefore, when the great doctrine of faith, Isaiah's supreme acquisition in 735, had been given time logically to work itself out, and when a non-nationalistic interpretation of the Remnant had dawned on him, the more nationalistic doctrine of the Messiah gradually faded away. But Procksch sees that the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, which takes the place of the doctrine of the Messiah, has its own nationalistic limitations. He therefore seeks to spiritualize the latter doctrine. It does not grow out of a conception of Zion as a cult centre, or as a royal city, but rather as the seat of God's spiritual presence, to be apprehended by faith alone (28 16).[55] The artificiality of all these expedients is obvious, and their forced character betrays the difficulties of the problem.

Duhm strikes out on a different path, but on a very dangerous one. The identification of Immanuel with the Messiah at 7 14 is rightly denied,[56] and the Immanuel of 8 8, 10 is dislodged by a text-critical process. With these two anchors gone, Duhm is prepared to take the next step and disconnect 9 1–6 altogether from the Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies.[57] The consequence is that the only two prophecies, 9 1–6 and c. 11, the Messianic interpretation of which is secure, are cast completely adrift. They

[55] P. 58ff.

[56] See Porter's article JBL 1895, and my article in AJSL July, 1918, which seek to confirm, along a different line, the non-Messianic character of Immanuel.

[57] The Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies come to an appropriate and effective conclusion in the epilogue, 8 16-18. What follows in vs. 19-22, whatever it may mean, has nothing to do with the subject of cc. 6—8. 8 23 is altogether too uncertain to furnish a reliable connection between 9 1-6 and the historical situation. It is a gloss to connect 9 1 with 8 19-22. There is also another reason why 9 1-6 cannot have originally been connected with the Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies. The only adequate reason which has ever been offered for the present position of c. 6 is that it was placed here by Isaiah himself as an introduction to the account of the events in 735 recorded in cc. 7 and 8, in order to explain the failure of Isaiah at that time to carry through his policies. In that case it would be most unlikely for him to end his account of the events of this crisis with a passage, 9 1-6, which robs the introduction (c. 6), which he himself had provided, of all its point.

cannot be connected with any known fact or period of Isaiah's life. Duhm evidently feels this difficulty. He attempts to find a place for 9 1–6 in the midst of the Sennacherib campaign,[58] but he pushes c. 11 and 2 2–4, which is closely akin to it, to a time *after* this campaign at the end of Isaiah's life. These prophecies are supposed to be Isaiah's swan-songs, the yearnings of an old man. They were not prepared for a public audience, but for the inner circle of his followers. This is in accordance with Duhm's theory that Isaiah's eschatological poems have nothing to do with his prophetic career.[59] We see, now, what this boils down to. Because no place can be found for them in that part of Isaiah's life which we know something about, they are transferred to that period of his life which we know nothing about.[60] But if we have to go to the very edge of Isaiah's life to find a place for these prophecies, why may we not step over the edge altogether and look for them in a situation in which they can be explained more satisfactorily? Granted that the origin of the Messianic prophecies might be explained, as Wellhausen explained it, out of the general situation in Isaiah's day, *yet when they are examined in the light of Isaiah's other teaching and of his prophetic career,* a serious doubt arises whether they originated with *him.*

B. The Anti-Assyrian Group.

We have seen how certain scholars have held that the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion gradually supplanted the doctrine of the Messiah in the latter part of Isaiah's life. This means that

58 His only argument is that v. 3 must refer to Assyria and v. 4 to the army of Sennacherib. Why?

59 See above, n. 35.

60 It would have been well if 9 1-6 had been placed with c. 11 and 2 2-4. In my article on *A New Chapter in the Life of Isaiah,* I have suggested that some light may be thrown upon the closing days of Isaiah by the Shebna prophecy, but even if the suggestions there given were accepted, they would furnish no explanation of these Messianic prophecies in this late period. Staerk (*Das Assyrische Weltreich,* p. 216 f.), gives up the attempt to date the Messianic prophecies more precisely or to constitute a development in them.

the anti-Assyrian prophecies, in which this doctrine finds expression, are pushed down into this later period. Is this admissible? Can we find an intelligible place for them either here or anywhere else in Isaiah's life? If this cannot be done, then, of course, the close connection established between this group of prophecies and Ezekiel's theology becomes doubly significant. In the criticism of the anti-Assyrian prophecies there are three crucial questions: 1) The historicity of the Isaiah narratives; 2) the date of c. 10; and, more important than this; 3) the date and integrity of the anti-Egyptian prophecies cc. 28—33.[61] The first of these questions has already been treated. We are now to consider the second and third.

1) So far as c. 10 is concerned, wherever it goes the remaining anti-Assyrian prophecies usually follow. The date of c. 10 is therefore a controlling date for the group as a whole. But in what period is it to be located? This prophecy has been variously dated, at or about the time of Samaria's fall, 722,[62] about 711 (Sargon's campaign against Ashdod),[63] in the Sennacherib period (705—701).[64] The last date, which is favored, by the great majority of scholars, is the most natural date so long as the Isaiah narratives, including the anti-Assyrian poem c. 37 22 ff., are accepted. C. 10 in its present form echoes the same tones of assurance on the one hand and defiance on the other as 37 22 ff. But if Stade's criticism of the Isaiah narratives and the poem embedded in them is accepted, a serious difficulty arises. Is the great challenge to Assyria in c. 10 justified by the event? Does the picture of the abject submission of Hezekiah in the only passage allowed by Stade to be strictly historical (2 Kings 18 13-16),

[61] I call these chapters the anti-Egyptian group because cc. 30 and 31 refer expressly to an Egyptian alliance, and cc. 28 and 29 can be best interpreted if this alliance is assumed to be the historical background out of which they come (see *The Stone of the Foundation*, p. 15 f.).

[62] Eichhorn, Ges., Di., Kit. (but with inclination to 711), R. Smith, König.

[63] Hitzig, Guthe, Giesebrecht, Cheyne, Kuenen.

[64] Koppe, Eichhorn (with reference to vs. 5-27), Ew., Bredenkamp (?), De., Du., Hackmann, Volz, Whitehouse, Skinner, Wade, Marti, Wilke, Küchler. Gray does not commit himself to any date except one sometime after 717.

harmonize with the supreme confidence manifested in c. 10? Were the hopes in c. 10 fulfilled? If they were, then were the threats in which Isaiah so frequently indulged *not* fulfilled? If the threats were fulfilled, what of the hopes? Were they only dreams? This leads to our second question, the date and integrity of cc. 28—33, with which c. 22 is probably to be combined.

2) The section, cc. 28—33, has led, in the course of criticism, much the same sort of wandering life as c. 10, but there has been a growing consensus of opinion in favor of a date in the Sennacherib period, and c. 22 is also best explained out of the same period.[65] This date for cc. 28—31 (32, 33) and 22 may be

[65] The data which have been utilized to determine the date of cc. 28—33 are the following: 1) 28 1-4, which presupposes a date before the fall of Samaria (722); 2) c. 33, which is supposed to refer to the Sennacherib period; 3) the Egyptian alliance mentioned in cc. 30 and 31; and 4) the connections between cc. 28 and 29 on the one hand and cc. 30 and 31 on the other. 1) The entire group has been located in the Sennacherib period. So Hitzig, on account of c. 33. This position was soon abandoned, a) because of the impossible retrospective interpretation of 28 1-4 which it necessitated, and b) because it was soon discovered (Ewald) that c. 33 was an appendix to cc. 28—32 and therefore not determinative for their dating. 2) C. 33 having become detached, the group was located before the fall of Samaria (722) on account of 28 1-4 (so Ewald, Duhm in his *Theologie*, Delitzsch, Dillmann). 3) Meanwhile the suggestion was made that the group was not chronologically homogeneous. In particular c. 32 as well as c. 33 came under suspicion or at least was regarded as also an appendix. Accordingly, we have the following mixed theories which postulate different dates for the different sections of the group, cc. 28—31. (a) Cc. 28—30 placed early on account of 28 1-4, but c. 31 assigned to the Sennacherib period. So König, because of the supposed difference in the historical situations implied at 30 1-7 and 31 1-4. In this König has had no followers. (b) C. 28 early (cf. 28 1-4), and cc. 29—31 assigned to the Sargon period at the time of the Ashdod campaign (ca. 711). So Cheyne in his *Commentary*. (c) C. 28 early (cf. 28 1-4), and cc. 29—31 placed in the Sennacherib period. So Robertson Smith, Kuenen, Guthe (*Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*), Bredenkamp, Orelli. (d) Only 28 1-4 early, the rest of c. 28 and c. 29 assigned to the late Sargon period, after 711, and cc. 30 and 31 to the Sennacherib period. So Duhm and Küchler. (e) 28 1-4 early, and the remainder of cc. 28—31 assigned to the Sennacherib period. So Stade, Giesebrecht, with some qualifications, Hackmann, Volz, Cheyne in his *Introduction*, Wilke, Staerk, Hölscher. It will be seen from the foregoing that there is the strongest tendency to bring the

regarded as the first great premise of a new construction of Isaiah in which the anti-Assyrian prophecies are rejected. The second premise is derived from the criticism of these prophecies.

When cc. 28—31 are attentively examined, a most curious phenomenon is discovered, the regular interchange of hope and threat.[66] The alternation is so consistent as to warrant the conclusion that it is deliberate. In the earlier stages of criticism this curious fact does not seem to have attracted much attention. Ewald, it is true, felt the difficulty, for he says that in these chapters Isaiah is addressing different groups of people. Duhm in his *Theologie*, accepts the sequences as they stand, and, as we have seen, derives from the abruptness of the changes from gloom to hope support for his theory of the miraculousness of the future era. The change to it is so sudden and complete that it must be effected by Jahweh himself. Guthe, also, accepts the sequences, apparently without misgiving. Giesebrecht, however, was somewhat staggered by one instance of them, namely 28 5f.

group as a whole, with the exception of 28 1-4, down to the Sennacherib period, and I will assume the correctness of this view. It is based on two premises: a) the immediate connection between cc. 28 and 29 with cc. 30 and 31, and b) the identification of the Egyptian alliance in cc. 30 and 31 with the one known to have existed in the Sennacherib period. It would take us too far afield to attempt to establish the validity of these two premises in the present discussion, but they underlie all the argument that follows. Anyone who wishes to attack its conclusions must show the incorrectness of these premises. As to c. 22, for our purposes only the dating of 22 1-14 need be noticed. a) It is placed just after the accession of Hezekiah. So Ewald; according to him in 727. b) Assigned to the Sargon period. So Kleinert, Bredenkamp, Cheyne in his *Commentary*. c) Assigned to the Sennacherib period *before* or *during* the invasion. So Lowth, Koppe, Eichhorn, Gesenius, Hitzig, Knobel, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Orelli, Giesebrecht, Stade, Robertson Smith, Duhm, Wilke, Küchler. d) Assigned to the Sennacherib period *after* the invasion. So Sörensen, Guthe, Kuenen, Hackmann, Volz, Marti, Meinhold, Staerk. The passage is not homogeneous, and I shall assume in what follows that the date of vs. 1-5 and 12-14, the passages which more immediately concern us, can safely be fixed in the Sennacherib period, but *before* the invasion. Hence these verses are to be grouped with cc. 28—31. See an outline of the argument for this date of c. 22 in the writer's article on *The Book of Isaiah*, The Harvard Theological Review, pp. 516 ff.

[66] See Table p. 70.

These verses are in flat contradiction with what Giesebrecht considered to be Isaiah's earliest messages of doom. He advanced the theory that these early threats were subsequently modified by Isaiah himself through the addition of vs. 5 and 6, when the historical condition had changed, and that, still later, the passage was revised again by the addition of the threats in vs. 7–22 which came out of the Sennacherib period and which in turn recalled the promise in vs. 5, 6.[67] In connection with his assignment of 28 7–22 to the Sennacherib period Giesebrecht made another observation of fundamental importance. Hitherto the general tendency had been to push the hopes in cc. 28—31 into the foreground and the threats into the background. *But when these chapters were placed in the Sennacherib period a difficulty arose.* On other occasions, as in the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis (cc. 6—8) or the Ashdod campaign (711), Isaiah threatened king and people if his advice, that is Jahweh's, was not followed. In the Sennacherib period the anti-Assyrian party which Isaiah had always opposed had got the upper hand and were leading the country into revolt. In cc. 28—31 Isaiah opposed this policy as earnestly as Jeremiah opposed a similar policy in later days. *Under such circumstances we would expect threats rather than encouragements*, and in consequence Giesebrecht laid all the emphasis upon the threatening elements in cc. 28—31. But have the hope elements in this group any place at all in such a situation? Of course, it is conceivable that both the threats and the hopes could have been expressed conditionally, according as the people refused or accepted the prophet's advice. But unfortunately both are regularly expressed unconditionally. Twice in the course of these chapters Isaiah, himself, says that the alternative had been presented earlier to them but that they had refused to follow the right way.[68] As a matter of fact the anti-Assyrian party did

[67] See his *Beiträge*, pp. 65, 68-71. This theory of various revisions by Isaiah of his own works is also utilized to account for the equally abrupt changes at 8 8-10 and 17 12-14. The similar changes in cc. 29-31 were explained exegetically. Giesebrecht's theory was of great value in calling attention to the problem of these curious changes, but his solution of it has died a natural death. It was too artificial to survive long.

[68] 28 12; 30 15.

have its way; the revolt was precipitated. How, then, could Isaiah give such encouragements as we find in these chapters when the people refused to follow him? At this point a formidable difficulty is uncovered. It is rendered still more acute when, on the one hand, c. 10 with all its trailers is brought down to the Sennacherib period and thus becomes associated with the hope elements in cc. 28—31, and, on the other hand, 22 1–14 is associated with the threats in these chapters. The unmediated transitions from threat to hope in Isaiah, especially in the anti-Assyrian prophecies, have occasioned more difficulty than any other single problem in the book. If both these threats and hopes are located in the same period, the Sennacherib period, as in the case of cc. 28—31, c. 22, and c. 10, the problem of their relationship to each other becomes doubly difficult, for the unchanging opposition to Isaiah's policies in this period would lead us to expect only denunciations, not promises. Furthermore, the question must again be raised: Were the hopes or the threats fulfilled? This depends upon one's views of the historicity of the Isaiah narratives which we have seen was seriously attacked by Stade. What happened in 701, a terrible disaster or a triumphant deliverance? Such are the factors in the problem of the anti-Assyrian prophecies with their expressed or implied doctrine of the inviolability of Zion. The chief attempts to solve this problem are the following.

1) Robertson Smith held that the change from threats to promises was due to the reforms of Hezekiah which he locates in the midst of the campaign.[69] This is in agreement with the Wellhausen insistence upon the ethical element in Isaiah. Deliverance is inconceivable without repentance. Smith assumed the present order and historicity of the Isaiah narratives according to which 2 K. 18 13–16 is the first episode in the Sennacherib campaign against Judah, and he locates the reforms between 2 K. 18 13–16 and 18 17 ff. But if Stade's criticism of the

[69] Delitzsch and Orelli seek to mediate from threat to promise also through the goodness of Hezekiah. The main interest of these men is in the principles of prophetic fulfilment, and their work is therefore dominated by the apologetic, rather than the historical, interest in the above questions.

Isaiah narratives is accepted, Smith's theory cannot be carried through.

2) Dillmann assigns both cc. 28—32 and c. 10 to earlier periods in Isaiah's life[70] and thus seems to relieve the violent contrast between them which exists if both groups of prophecies are placed in the Sennacherib period. But this is of little avail as long as he keeps the equally contradictory prophecies, c. 22 and c. 37 22ff., in this period. He says: the former threats have been fulfilled in 2 K. 18 13–16; as the facts speak for themselves, it is no longer necessary to renew them; the time is now ripe for promises. But is not c. 22 a threat and the most unqualified of all? Yes, but though it is also placed after 2 K. 18 13–16, it is only an episode, Dillmann tells us, only a momentary outburst of anger!

3) The usual theory has been that Isaiah was so outraged by the blasphemous arrogance of Assyria as to overlook, for the time being, the sins of Judah. This theory is based mainly on 10 5–15 and it emphasizes the religious rather than the ethical interest. Assyria is guilty either of *lèse majesté* against Jahweh or sacrilege against his temple. This theme is repeated with almost endless variations by scholars of all schools.[71] The fundamental objection

[70] See above, n. 62, 65.

[71] E. g. Ewald (a classic formulation of this theory), Stade (in his *Geschichte*), Guthe, Giesebrecht, Driver (*Isaiah*, in the Men of the Bible Series), Küchler, Wilke, Kittel. Sometimes the conflict between the hope and the doom prophecies is dulled a little by referring them to different periods. Ewald places cc. 22, 28—32 before 722 but c. 10 and the anti-Assyrian prophecies in the Sennacherib period. Guthe and Giesebrecht reverse this and place cc. 22, 28—31 (in part) in the Sennacherib period and c. 10 earlier. Such methods do nothing to relieve the difficulties of the abrupt changes within cc. 28—31 or between c. 22 and 37 22f. when both are located in the Sennacherib campaign. According to Driver, Isaiah forgot all party interests in the great national crisis, just as Aristides did in the crisis of Athenian history, and promises took the place of denunciations (as if Isaiah would encourage those who repudiated his policy!). The arrogance of Assyria must be challenged. "There are bounds which even a despot cannot pass" (*Isaiah, his Life and Times*, p. 69). Similarly Kittel: "When Asshur trespasses upon Zion, where Jahweh has his altar and where Isaiah himself in the most exalted moment of his life was honored with a vision of him, then is Judah's guilt forgotten for a

to it is that in the situation of the Sennacherib campaign promises are the last thing we would expect Isaiah to indulge in. He had spent his life in protesting against foreign alliances. Faith in Jahweh, not in Egypt, was his solution for the ills of the times. "Egypt is man and not God; his horses are flesh and not spirit. In returning and rest ye shall be saved; in quietness and confidence your power shall be. If you do not believe you shall not be established."[72] These are the expressions of the fundamental religion of Isaiah. His kingdom is the kingdom of the spirit and he sets it in irreconcilable antithesis to the kingdom of force. They are to trust in the gently-flowing waters of Siloah, symbol of the power of the spirit, not in the muddy, swirling flood of the Euphrates, symbol of the power of the material and the

moment—not for ever—and the judgment upon Assyria becomes controlling." (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*[2] II, p. 511). According to Dillmann the *anger* of c. 22 was a passing mood; according to Driver and Kittel, in the *promises* to Judah Isaiah momentarily ignored its sins. One of these explanations is just as improbable, when the historical situation is realized, as the other. Stade, in his *History*, having thrown doubts upon the historicity of the Isaiah narratives, logically holds that both threats and promises were fulfilled in the Sennacherib campaign, the former in the laying waste of Judah, the latter in the withdrawal of Sennacherib. But he has so reduced the glory of the deliverance that it is hard to think that it represented any adequate fulfilment of the triumphant challenges to Assyria expressed in the anti-Assyrian prophecies. In Küchler's view Judah does not escape by any virtue of its own but solely because Assyria, owing to its brutality and arrogance, is not a fitting instrument with which to punish it. But further, he adopts Stade's criticism of the Isaiah narratives and draws the inference, which Stade himself did not at first draw so bluntly, that Isaiah's promises were not fulfilled in any true sense. Jerusalem was spared, but Sennacherib accomplished all he desired to do. Wilke draws a sharp distinction between Isaiah's attitude down to the Sennacherib period and his attitude *in* that period. Before the campaign he had been consistently favorable to Assyria, but in the Sennacherib period he was opposed to it. The primary reason was not a change in Judah, though Wilke refers to Hezekiah's reforms, but a change in Assyria! Wilke, following Winckler, draws a contrast between the reforming king, Tiglath-Pileser, and the later savage brutality of Sennacherib! The attempt of Winckler and Wilke to construe the so-called pro-Assyrian policy of Isaiah as a policy in any true sense favorable to Assyria is totally to misconceive the real teachings of the prophet.

[72] Is. 31 3; 30 15; 7 9.

fleshly.[73] All this was impractical idealism, if you will, but it was the heart of Isaiah's message to the world. Now the point is, in the Sennacherib campaign Judah did the very thing against which Isaiah had protested all his life and in no oracles more powerfully than in cc. 28—31. The anti-Assyrian party got complete control, repudiated the advice of Isaiah and formed an alliance with Egypt. Would Isaiah now turn around and, in the face of this complete apostasy, promise deliverance? It is unthinkable. The suggestion that even for a moment he could have forgotten the sin of Judah, now in open rebellion against the word of Jahweh spoken through him, cannot be, itself, for a moment entertained. It would mean that he had not only forgotten Judah's sins, but the very essence of his own mission.

4) Though Duhm does not refer to the difficulty just mentioned, he seems to be subconsciously aware of it. At least that seems to be the clue to his treatment of the anti-Assyrian prophecies. Like the Messianic prophecies, they are not intended for a general audience, but rather for the group of believers which gathered round him.[74] This theory would get rid of the difficulty which inheres in the supposition that these challenges to Assyria were hurled against it in public, in which case Isaiah would have only strengthened the anti-Assyrian policy which he was in reality opposing. But is there any evidence in the anti-Assyrian prophecies as they now stand that they were spoken in private? Not one bit of reliable evidence is produced for such a theory.[75] It is possible to hold it only after the most drastic criticism of this group has been made.[76]

[73] 8 5-8.

[74] See *Commentary*, Ed.[1], at 29 1-8; 30 27-33, pp. 182, 195, 201. Staerk, also, p. 123, avails himself of this theory, though his final solution of the problem is a different one (see below).

[75] Duhm's treatment of the entire group of anti-Assyrian prophecies incidentally suggestive as it is, must be considered quite inadequate. The dates for those which are received are generally assumed rather than proved; the criticism of them is in unstable equilibrium, for some are rejected while others are retained without adequate justification for the discrimination; and the problem which they present, if placed in Isaiah's life-time, and the conflict between them and Isaiah's message receive no adequate discussion.

[76] See below, p. 49, n. 107.

5) Overwhelmed by the difficulties of finding any place or meaning for the anti-Assyrian group of prophecies in the lifetime of Isaiah down to and including the Sennacherib campaign of 701, Staerk seeks a place for them still later, in connection with a conjectured second campaign of Sennacherib. His two chief reasons for this solution are: a) his acceptance of the logic of Stade's criticism of the Isaiah narratives and consequent denial of any marvelous deliverance of Jerusalem in 701; and b) the psychological impossibility of Isaiah promising deliverance in 701 to a people who were in the act of rebelling against Jahweh's will.[77] The terrible devastation to which Judah was subjected in 701 caused Isaiah to change his views of Assyria. The ὕβρις of this military power must be rebuked; hence, when Sennacherib came again against Jerusalem, Isaiah prophesied his overthrow.[78] It is interesting to observe how Staerk pushes the anti-Assyrian group down into an unknown period of Isaiah's life, just as Duhm pushes the Messianic group into the same period. This feeling that neither group of prophecies can be adequately explained out of that part of Isaiah's life of which we have definite information is a very suspicious circumstance. Further, the fact that thus far no reliable evidence of a second campaign against Jerusalem has been discovered is an obstacle of the most formidable kind to the solution which I originally proposed, and, failing such evidence, I have been reluctantly compelled to resort to another solution (see below).

[77] *Das Assyr. Weltreich*, pp. 81 ff., 86 ff., 105—124. The theory of two campaigns of Sennacherib was first proposed by Winckler (*Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, 1892). This solution of the problem of the anti-Assyrian prophecies was already suggested by me two years before the appearance of Staerk's work in a discussion of the two-campaign theory of the Isaiah narratives. (See *The Invasion of Sennacherib*, in particular p. 634, n. 134.) I still believe that this theory affords the readiest means yet proposed for the defense of the anti-Assyrian group. It is also adapted by Baentsch (ZWTh, 1908, p. 470).

[78] Staerk thus ranges himself with the writers referred to above in n. 71, though he places the change in Isaiah's attitude toward Assyria *after* 701 rather than in the campaign.

IV. The Final Neo-Critical Assault upon the Messianic and Anti-Assyrian Prophecies.

In view of the foregoing discussion, it is not to be wondered at that in the later phases of the neo-critical movement the genuineness of both the Messianic and anti-Assyrian groups of prophecies should have been seriously questioned. Hackmann, Cheyne and Volz[79] delivered the main attack against the Messianic group; Marti, Stade, and Beer carried on the operations begun by Stade against the anti-Assyrian group.[80]

A. The Messianic Group.

In the case of the Messianic prophecies, two main features in them, to which the earlier criticism had failed to do justice, were now urged against them.[81] 1) The first is their nationalism. Is the Messiah a political figure with a dash of religion and morals, or a religious and ethical figure with a dash of politics? Because of the close association of the Messianic king with the Davidic dynasty the former view would seem to be the more nearly correct one. His functions are neither priestly nor prophetic. But in that case there is a latent contradiction between the Messianic ideal and the prophetic opposition to nationalism. We have seen how Smend seemed to be dimly aware of this contradiction.[82] Volz throws it into high relief.[83] He claims that not only is prophecy in general antagonistic to nationalism, but Isaiah in particular is in the most pronounced opposition to it. He unceasingly combatted the various expressions of nationalist activities, intrigues, alliances, trust in military power. Throughout his life he was in conflict with the Davidic dynasty, sometimes in the most violent conflict, as in 735, when he opposed

[79] *Zukunftserwartung; Introduction; Die Vorexilische Jahweprophetie.*

[80] *Kommentar; Biblische Theologie; Festschrift Wellhausen.* This phase of the neo-critical development is conveniently summed up in Hölscher's *Die Propheten.*

[81] Cf., especially, Volz for what follows.

[82] See above, p. 11.

[83] When König, in criticising this position, insists on the *Patriotismus* of the prophets (*Geschichte des ATR*, p. 410, cf. 382, 400, a. 4), he should define more carefully just what he means by it.

the pro-Assyrian policy of Ahaz, or in 705—701, when he opposed the pro-Egyptian policy of Hezekiah.[84] Would a man of these convictions clothe his hopes in a nationalist form? Of course, it is psychologically quite conceivable that Isaiah might not have realized the implications of his own theological position, and that, consequently, contradictory views might have been entertained by him. There is also the important prophecy, 1 21–26, which seems to look forward to the restoration of the golden age of the Hebrew monarchy, the idealized era of David and Solomon.[85] But several considerations make against this psychological explanation. a) So far as 1 21–26 is concerned, Isaiah no doubt seems to embody his ideals in a state organization, but this is the one undisputed passage in which he does do this, and it is highly significant that in just this prophecy, where, if anywhere, we would expect to find a reference to the Messianic king, it is absent. One can hardly speak of nationalism in connection with 1 21–26. b) Again, in the doctrine of the Remnant Isaiah developed a hope of the future which was bound up with his doctrine of faith, and which was the appropriate expression of the anti-nationalistic trend of eighth-century prophecy.[86] But the fact that he expressed his hope in a form

[84] Isaiah, it is true, does not seem to attack Hezekiah personally as he does Ahaz. Was this because Hezekiah really tried, though unavailingly, to make head against the anti-Assyrian party of his day? Or have Isaiah's attacks upon Hezekiah been deleted by the redactors of Isaiah because there was a tradition that the king had undertaken some reforms which these same revisers construed as deuteronomic in character? The fragmentary state of our sources permits of no final answer to these questions.

[85] The prophecy, 1 21-26, has often been used as a basis for the defense of the Messianic prophecies. Cf. Nowack, *Zukunftshoffnungen Israels*, p. 50.

[86] In cc. 7 and 8 there are hints of an important change in Isaiah's conceptions of the Remnant, due to the experiences of 735. The fact that Isaiah takes his son, Shear-jashub, with him when he makes Ahaz a promise of deliverance if he would believe (7 1-9), strongly suggests that Isaiah was still cherishing the thought of the possibility of Judah being saved, though the negative form of the condition also suggests that he thought the possibility to be remote. But when Isaiah turned to his disciples (8 11-18), after his vain appeals to the court (7 10-17), and to the

so entirely in agreement with his fundamental convictions shows that he must have been aware, to some extent at least, of the implications of these convictions. This makes the supposition that he was able to adopt the doctrine of the Messianic King because he was not aware of its latent contradiction with the essence of his own views quite unlikely. c) Finally, the psychological defense of the genuineness of the Messianic prophecies, which points to the possibility of a man entertaining contradictory views while they are still inchoate, and while their different implications are not yet fully realized, breaks down at another point. The hopes under discussion are not integral parts of any of Isaiah's prophecies, whose disagreement with their contexts would be obvious only to one who was familiar with the later developments of the doctrine. The Messianic prophecies are, on the one hand, in themselves very highly developed literary compositions, but, on the other, they are isolated blocks among Isaiah's prophecies and only connected with them by links demonstrably redactional.[87] Granted that it is quite possible for a writer who is unaware of the conflict of his own ideas to merge them at times into a *literary* unity, this is not the case with the prophecies under discussion. The idea of the Messianic King is nowhere merged with the doctrines of the Remnant or the Day of the Lord, or with national repentance or the doctrine of faith. Whatever points of attachment the Messianic prophecies may have with

people (8 1-4, 5-8 a), it is difficult not to believe that he saw in his disciples the Remnant, and in so doing caught at least a glimpse of that distinction which we now know as the distinction between church and state, and which has proved such a decisive factor in the spiritualization of religion. It is true, the name, Remnant, does not occur again in any unquestioned passage in Isaiah, and even in c. 8 Isaiah does not directly call his disciples the Remnant. But the progress of the two chapters, 7 and 8, and the insistence upon faith as the fundamental fact in religion, which is Isaiah's great contribution to religion, unavoidably suggest the identification of the company of believers with the Remnant. This theory of the Remnant is particularly emphasized by Wellhausen (the Remnant is the party of reform) and Robertson Smith.

[87] Cf. the impossible verse, 8 23, and the artificial contrast between the forest and the twig at 10 33 f. and 11 1.

Isaiah's thoughts they are not revealed by the prophet himself, but are left to the exegete to discover. In view of the peculiarly detached character of these prophecies, the abstract possibility that Isaiah may have entertained fundamentally conflicting ideas cannot be regarded as an adequate basis for their defense.[88] Accordingly, the nationalism expressed in the conception of the Davidic Messiah is not what we would expect if Isaiah were the creator of the Messianic eschatology, and the psychological explanation that Isaiah could have entertained conflicting ideas without being aware of the disagreements, while abstractly possible, does not account for the peculiar literary isolation of these prophecies. In this connection the argument from the style of 9 1 ff. and 11 1 ff. might be introduced, but in the present instance this argument has, admittedly, little force.[89] Far more decisive is the argument from the historical background implied in cc. 9 and 11, particularly from 11 1, which seems to presuppose that the Davidic dynasty is no longer reigning. But to follow up the evidence would lead to a discussion of exegetical details which would divert us from our main argument.[90]

2) The second objection to the genuineness of these prophecies to which I would call attention is the large amount of the miraculous element in them. At this point Duhm senses their true nature more correctly than Wellhausen. The figure of the Wondrous Child and of the Descendant of Jesse is not a merely human figure, even though idealized, as Wellhausen and Smith would have us believe; it is an eschatological, that is, a miraculous figure, though strangely enough with historical connections. The child with the mysterious four names is no ordinary child. The attributes of equity and righteousness ascribed to the descendant of Jesse are supernatural charisms, and above all the peace of

[88] By way of contrast, 8 18b involves an idea, the localization of Jahweh on Mt. Zion, which is in latent contradiction with the incipient universalism of eighth century prophecy, but which is nevertheless, from a literary point of view, an organic part of the context (against Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, I. 107, n. 2, and Volz, p. 43, who reject it).

[89] Hackmann, Volz, and Marti lay little emphasis upon it; Cheyne develops it somewhat more

[90] See especially Hackmann's forcible treatment of the argument from the historical background, pp. 135 f., 138 ff.

nature is a miraculous peace, a peace of the golden age.[91] All this contrasts sharply with the intense realism of Isaiah, with his vivid ethical and historical interests. At the same time it reminds of Wellhausen's dictum that it was in the post-exilic period that prophecy gradually came to be detached from history. It is no wonder, therefore, when criticism became fully aware of the perplexing problem created by the presence of these prophecies among Isaiah's literary remains, that it was gradually led to relegate them to a much later period. This is not capriciousness. It is method, and an honest method, too. Once granted Wellhausen's premise on the one hand and Duhm's exegesis on the other, and the attempt to bring these prophecies down to the post-exilic period becomes almost inevitable. Of course, if neither premise nor exegesis is accepted, the conclusion drawn from them might have to be revised. But here a third datum is to be considered.

3) Until the time of Ezekiel there is no reference whatever to a Davidic Messiah, and when he appears he is a very modest figure indeed. Little is made of him by Ezekiel.[92] If the usual views of cc. 40—48 are accepted, the figure of the Messiah becomes quite faded in Ezekiel's later period; if the views advanced in recent years by Begrich[93] and Herrmann[94] are adopted, and there is excellent reason for doing so, it is washed out altogether. This absence of all reference to the Messiah for over a hundred years is the strangest sort of fact if the Messianic passages in Isaiah are original. Its strangeness is increased by the further fact that when Ezekiel does refer to the Messiah, there is no evidence that he was acquainted with the passages in Isaiah. The same thing is true of the references to the Messiah in Jeremiah. Whether genuine or not, they show no literary

[91] It is interesting to observe how Wellhausen (*Geschichte*, p. 123, n. 2 f.) and Smith (pp. 301, 303) concentrate their attention upon 11 1-5 and turn vs. 6-8 into poetry, whereas Duhm and Hackmann (p. 145 ff.) emphasize the latter verses.

[92] Cf. 17 22-24; 21 32; 29 21 (?): and the more important passages 34 23 f. and 37 24-28.

[93] *Das Messiasbild des Ezechiel*, ZWTh 1904, p. 433 f.

[94] *Ezechielstudien*, 1908.

dependence upon Isaiah. Now Is. 9 and 11 are so striking that in later times it became customary to interpret Isaiah's other prophecies in the light of them, and yet we must suppose that they had no effect upon Isaiah's immediate successors![95] This

[95] It is this argument which gives pause even to the very cautious Kautzsch (see his article on *The Religion of Israel*, H. D. B., Extra Vol., p. 696). The argument would lose only a little of its force even if the prophecies of a Davidic Messiah in Jeremiah were admitted to be genuine. But I think it can be almost demonstrated that they are not. It would require another essay the size of the present one adequately to discuss the Messianic element in Jeremiah, but in view of Cornill's defense (see *Das Buch Jeremia* 1905) of the controlling passage, 23 5-6, a word upon it may not be amiss. 1) C. 22 is a later redaction of genuine criticisms passed by Jeremiah upon the last kings of Judah. With the exception of Josiah (22 10a) they are bad kings and come to an untimely end. The prophecy in its present form ends with the curse upon Jeconiah (vs. 24-28), the nucleus of which is certainly genuine; it says nothing about the fate of Zedekiah. 2) 23 1-4 is the usual antithesis appended to such grim passages in the prophetical books. The evil shepherds, i. e. the wicked kings in c. 22, will be removed (a quite unnecessary generalization after the concrete denunciations which had just preceded), and good shepherds will be put in their place, who will rule over the remnant of Jahweh's flock, now scattered abroad but one day to be brought back. Observe that vs. 3-4 are the appropriate antithesis to vs. 1-2 both in thought and form, and the passage, so far as it is intended to offset the gloom of c. 22, is complete in itself. 3) But upon 23 1-4 there follows the prophecy of the personal Messiah, vs. 5 and 6. This prophecy contrasts with the one in vs. 1-4 in form; vs. 1-4 are prose, vs. 5-6 are poetry. It contrasts in thought; vs. 1-4 refer to the dynasty, vs. 5-6 to the individual Messiah. Strictly speaking, vs. 5-6 are quite superfluous after vs. 1-4. Thus vs. 5-6 have every appearance of being an addendum. 4) But vs. 3-4 imply the exile and are therefore late (note that the word 'remnant', שאריח, is found again in its technical, theological sense only in the doubtful passage 31 7; in cc. 40—44 it refers to the historical group left in Judah at the time of the exile, most of whom afterwards went to Egypt). But if vs. 3-4 are late, they carry with them vs. 1-2. If, now, the whole passage, vs. 1-4, is late and vs. 5 and 6 are an addendum to it, it follows that vs. 5 and 6 are still later. 5) Again, the word צמח in v. 5 is left unexplained. Why did Jeremiah choose just this word? Neither the noun nor the verb occur again in Jeremiah except in the spurious parallel, 33 14 ff. Jeremiah cannot be dependent upon Is. 11 1, as is sometimes supposed, for he employs a different word from those found there. Further, the word, though figurative in meaning, has no effect upon its context. If Jeremiah applied this name for the first time to the personal Messiah, we would expect its figurative

is almost incredible. Accordingly, when 9 1ff. and 11 1ff. have once been dislodged from their present connections, especially, as in the case of 9 1ff., from the prophecies definitely dated in

suggestiveness to pervade the prophecy. This is not the case. It stands absolutely unexplained and without influence upon the thought or expression of the prophecy. In other words it has already become a technical term. This is the really significant thing for the criticism of this prophecy, but commentators have strangely ignored it. This is probably because almost all commentators have been obsessed with the idea that Zech. 6 12f. is dependent upon Jer. 23 5f. The reverse of this is the true relationship. In Zechariah the word affects its context (v. 12b. The clause, מתחתיו יצמח, is improperly rejected by Mitchell, International Critical Com. ad loc.). Above all, in Zechariah the choice of it can be naturally and historically explained. It is a play upon the name Zerubbabel, which is best explained as meaning the "seed" or "sprout" of Babylon (So Sellin, *Serubbabel*, p. 23, and *Studien*, II 83. For this etymology see also Ed. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judenthums*, V, following Meissner and Strassmaier, Siegfried, *Ezra und Nehemiah* ad Ez. 3 2, Bertholet, *Ezra und Nehemiah* ad Ez. 1 8, Buhl, Mitchell, *Commentary on Haggai* ad 1 2. The etymology suggested by Haupt, JBL 1913, p. 108, n. 3, seems to me far less probable. But even if it were correct, it would not prevent Zechariah's punning play on the name). The attempt to get rid of the name in Zech 6 12 by the supposition of text corruption (Duhm and Marti) cannot be admitted as legitimate for a moment. The passage is corrupted, but not at that point. 6) When once the true relationship of Jer. 23 5-6 to Zech. 6 12 is recognized, another interesting possibility comes to light. Coniah is rejected though he is a signet ring upon Jahweh's hand. But Zerubbabel is to be a signet ring (Hag. 2 23). One who recognized the allusion to Zerubbabel in Zechariah's word, צמח, and remembered at the same time Haggai's reference to the signet ring, may very well have placed this oracle in its present position in Jeremiah as an offset to the terrible prophecy against Coniah. Cornill sees that vs. 3 and 4 are spurious and frankly rejects them. This has the effect of bringing vs. 5-6 into an antithesis to vs. 1-2. But this is to substitute a very poor antithesis for a very good one. Again, Cornill completely ignores the way in which the name צמח is introduced, which is the critically important datum in the prophecy, and concentrates his whole attention upon צדקנו. This name in his view is a play upon the name of the last king of Judah and occurs just at the point in the sequence of cc. 22 and 23 where we would expect a reference to him. Cornill paraphrases as follows: "Thou, Zechariah, wilt meet thy fate. State and kingdom will be destroyed. But one will come sometime who will be in reality what thy name signifies and what thou shouldst have been." The trouble is, there is nothing of all this in the text. On the basis of Cornill's own showing, vs. 5-6 are brought

735, and set adrift on the stream of criticism, it is by no means a surprising thing to find them landing upon the farther shores of the post-exilic period. In spite of the fact that Wellhausen originally defended these prophecies, it was the inward urge of his own principles that led his followers in the neo-critical school to this final conclusion. But can a proper psychological environment for them be discovered even in this late period? Before an attempt to answer this question is made, it will be well to follow the further fortunes of the other group of prophecies which have especially interested us, namely the anti-Assyrian.

B. The Anti-Assyrian Group.

The data already brought to light for the solution of the problem presented by the anti-Assyrian prophecies are the following: a) The legendary character of the Isaiah narratives. This character raises in an acute form the question of their reliability. Was there such a magnificent deliverance of Zion as is described in them? b) The similarity of the group of "many-

into antithesis to the many bad kings in vs. 1-2, and not to Zedekiah. If the purpose were to contrast vs. 5-6 with Zechariah, we would certainly expect an express reference to him such as we find to the other kings in c. 22. Furthermore, is it likely that Jeremiah would take Zedekiah's name as the key to a prophecy of the Messiah? Granted that Jeremiah does not indulge in such bitter personal attacks upon him as he does upon the other Jewish kings, and that he was a weak king rather than a bad king, he says nothing good of him, either. If a play upon his name were intended in the sense of the above paraphrase, it would certainly have to be expressed and not left to the ingenuity of later exegetes. Cornill's defense of this passage is ingenious, but anything but convincing. But if 23 5-6 are rejected, the other Messianic passages in Jeremiah can scarcely stand the test of serious criticism. Caspari (*Echtheit der Messianischen Weissagung, Is. 9 1-6*, p. 32 f.) gives a curious explanation of Jeremiah's failure to allude to Is. 9 1-6. The central idea of this prophecy is "*peace*". This idea was taken up by the uncanonical prophets and became their watchword in Jeremiah's day (6 14; 8 11). His opposition to the uncanonical prophets and their mistaken use of Isaiah's idea of peace accounts for his own failure to make use of it. In view of what follows Caspari's attempt to show a connection between Is. 9 1-6 and uncanonical prophecy is noteworthy.

nations" passages among the anti-Assyrian prophecies to the Gog *motif* in Ezekiel cc. 38, 39. c) The dating of cc. 28—33 and c. 22, *as a group*, in the Sennacherib period. d) The strong tendency to date c. 10 and therefore the other anti-Assyrian prophecies in the same period. e) The wellnigh insoluble difficulties presented by the abrupt changes from threat to promise within cc. 28—33, by the presence of threats in 705—701 if there was a glorious deliverance, and by the presence of promises in the same period when the historical occasion called only for warnings. In the face of such conflicting data is it any wonder that there has been a resort to criticism? In what follows I shall follow the logical rather than the chronological development of the attack upon this group.

1) In the first place, Meinhold followed a correct instinct when he began his series of Isaiah studies (unfortunately unfinished) with a thorough discussion of the Isaiah narratives.[96] The correct appraisal of these narratives is fundamental to the solution of the problems of Isaiah. The result of the discussion, which is based on Stade's analysis, is to show that, whatever happened in 701, nothing took place at that time to justify the feeling of absolute security and of proud defiance expressed in the anti-Assyrian prophecies in their present form. 2 K. 18 13–16 give us the only authentic description of the condition in which Sennacherib left Jerusalem. But the growing recognition of the legendary character of the Isaiah narratives inevitably carried with it a suspicion of the anti-Assyrian prophecy, 37 22 ff., included in them. These narratives, including the prophecy, did not originally belong to the collection of Isaiah's prophecies, but were taken from Kings, in itself a suspicious circumstance. Further, the prophecy agrees entirely with the temper of the narratives. If the narratives are untrustworthy, it becomes difficult to defend the prophecy which is embedded in them and agrees with them.

2) The present form of cc. 28—33 cannot be original. This has been a steadily growing conviction among all scholars of the neo-critical school, those of the right wing as well as those of the left.

[96] *Die Jesajaerzählungen*, 1898.

Ewald was the first to express suspicions of c. 33, which he assigned to a disciple of Isaiah. But it was Stade who first delivered the attack upon its genuineness from which it has never really recovered, and which at the same time swept away c. 32 along with it.[97] The appendices to the group having been thus disposed of, Sörensen, in 1885, raised the question of the integrity of the main body of prophecies cc. 28—31, by calling attention to the abrupt changes from threat to hope in them. But he gave only brief hints of the difficulties, and his work seems to have had little immediate influence. In 1890 Giesebrecht made a formidable attack upon the integrity of c. 28, but obscured the significance of his criticism by his untenable theory of a revision of the chapter by Isaiah himself.[98] Two years later (1892) Duhm's commentary appeared, in which he completely shattered the integrity of cc. 28—31 and discarded the bulk of the hope material in them as reflecting late eschatology. His criticism, however, remained in unstable equilibrium.[99] He still left to Isaiah 28 16, 28 23–29 and, above all, the three anti-Assyrian prophecies, 29 5–8 (written *mit echtjesaianischem Schwung und Feuer*), 30 27–33, and the nucleus of 31 5–9, especially v. 9. In these three prophecies the inviolability of Zion is either expressly taught or implied. Duhm's criticism was confirmed and the logic of it still further applied by Hackmann (1893), Cheyne (1895), Brückner (1897), and Marti (1900), with whose criticisms I venture to associate my own article on the *Stone of the Foundation* (1920). The result of all this work is to eliminate all the hopes from cc. 28—33.[100] These chapters now stand out grim

[97] ZATW, 1884, pp. 256—271.

[98] *Beiträge* pp. 54—71, 76—84.

[99] See above, pp. 18, 20.

[100] It is interesting to observe the effect of this further criticism upon Duhm in spite of his protests against what he regards as its artificial schematizing. In the third edition of his commentary (1914) he finally gives up the genuineness of 29 5-8 and 31 9. The importance of these concessions cannot be overestimated. They are the most significant changes in the new edition. In view of them, it is strange to find Duhm still clinging to the genuineness of 30 27-33. This turgid outburst of vindictive fury against Assyria is as little likely to have been written by the author of c. 6 as any passage in the book. Can it be that Duhm feels the

and unrelieved in their denunciations of the pro-Egyptian party and in their predictions of national disaster. We saw that our major premise for determining the attitude of Isaiah in 701 was the dating of cc. 28—33 in this period.[101] The minor premise is now furnished by the criticism of the group. The conclusion is inevitable: Isaiah was a prophet of woe in this period. But this, as we have seen, is in strict accord with what we should expect, for in 705—701 Isaiah carried on a desperate but losing fight against the pro-Egyptian, i. e. the anti-Assyrian, party. If, now, this conclusion is combined with the results of the criticism of the Isaiah narratives, we arrive at the further enormously important conclusion that *in the Sennacherib period Isaiah was not triumphantly vindicated in his promises but was tragically vindicated in his threats.*[102] The criticism of the Isaiah narratives has carried away 37 22 ff.; the criticism of cc. 28—33 has carried away c. 33, 29 5–8, 30 27–33 and 31 5–9. What becomes of the other anti-Assyrian prophecies?

3) C. 33 and 29 5–8 (remember Duhm's final rejection of the latter as well as the former) belong to the group of "many-nations" prophecies, 8 9 f., 17 12–14 and 14 24–27, which Stade had originally associated with the Gog *motif* of Ezekiel and accordingly rejected. 8 9 f. and 17 12–14 share with 29 5–8 the guilt of contradicting their contexts in the most flagrant fashion. 14 24–27 does not sin in this respect and, further, refers specifically to Assyria as well as to "all nations"; on the other hand, in tone and temper it is exactly like the other "many-nations" passages and is especially closely related to Ezekiel, cc. 38, 39.[103] When c. 33 and above all 29 5–8 are once rejected, it is not at all surprising to find Stade's original suspicions of the remaining

ground slipping from under his eschatological, supernaturalistic interpretation of Isaiah, and therefore clings desperately to a few remaining patches such as this? If this is so, his footing is very insecure.

[101] Above p. 29 f.

[102] Many scholars have been dimly aware of this revolutionary result to which their own criticism has been forcing them. But, so far as I have observed, they have not formulated it to themselves as precisely as I have tried to do in the above statement.

[103] Cf. the destruction of Jahweh's enemies upon the mountains of Palestine with Ezek. 39 2-4.

prophecies of this small group becoming gradually intensified. There are left of the great anti-Assyrian group only cc. 18 and 10.

4) C. 18 is one of the obscurest prophecies in the book; but the conventional interpretation can hardly be correct, and any deductions from it as to Isaiah's attitude toward Assyria, which is not even mentioned in the prophecy(!), or toward the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, are precarious in the extreme.[104] There remains only c. 10. The case for the anti-Assyrian prophecies stands or falls with this chapter.[105] But here again Duhm led the way. All the chapter was rejected by him except vs. 5–9 and 13–14. His grounds for this drastic treatment have seemed convincing to most of his successors in the neo-critical school.[106] But, if even these remnants are left standing,

[104] The prophecy is usually understood to express Isaiah's polite refusal of an offer of assistance by an Ethiopian embassy, accompanied with an assurance that at the proper moment Jahweh will protect his own, and Judah's enemies will be food for birds and beasts of prey. But a) the land from which the embassy is supposed to come is not Cush but is located *beyond* the rivers of Cush, if the present text is accepted. b) The supposition that Isaiah addresses the embassy at v. 2b is very doubtful. We should at least expect שובו rather than לכו. c) The current interpretation of v. 1a as "an insect-infested land" is a singular mode of address for one who is supposed to be expressing himself with diplomatic courtesy. d) The interpretation of the description of the people in vs. 2 and 7 as complimentary is beset with the gravest philological difficulties. No one has felt this more keenly than Gray (International Critical Com., ad loc.), yet, after pointing out very ably the difficulties in the current interpretation, he lapses into it at the end of his discussion. Herodotus' description of the Ethiopians (III 20) has too much influenced the interpretation of v. 2. e) I would also call attention to the subjectless verb, יעזבו, at v. 6. It is usually assumed that the subject of this plural verb is the Assyrians or the "many nations"; but there is no evidence in the prophecy itself for such an assumption. Moreover, what is the force of יחדו? If we might judge from an original prophecy, 31 3, the יחדו would naturally suggest Egypt and Judah as the associated victims. C. 18 very insistently demands a renewed investigation. Cf. also, Buttenwieser, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 278 ff. The above note was prepared before I was familiar with his similar criticisms.

[105] See my article on *The Problem of Isaiah*, C. 10. So also Beer. Beer's essay appeared before mine, but it was not accessible to me when my own article was written.

[106] The rejection of vs. 27b-32 may, however, be questioned.

they still imply the inviolability of Zion. Assyria would destroy it, but in so doing goes beyond the intention of Jahweh. Hackmann, Marti, Volz and Buttenwieser deny this inference, but their denials are quite unconvincing.[107] Hence my attempt at a solution in the article just cited along a somewhat different line. Vs. 5–7 a and 13–14 belonged originally together (vs. 7 b–9 may have been a parallel). The subject of these verses does not concern the *extent* of Assyria's conquests, but the *theory* upon which they were made. Assyria claims to make them in her own strength; Isaiah says, Assyria is only an instrument in the hand of Jahweh. The problem of the Assyrian conquests was the burning theological problem of the day as well as the burning political problem. Could Judah still trust in Jahweh who was not able even to protect his land from the invasion of Asshur? Isaiah, who was so preoccupied with the religious significance of the political crisis precipitated by Assyria, could not have avoided this question. At some time or other he must have answered it. His answer was not that Jahweh would eventually step in and save his people. That might have passed among the people. His faith reached higher than that. In spite of the coming destruction of the nation, he saw in Assyria only the instrument of Jahweh's righteous wrath. C. 10 in its original form, if my view is correct, is the highest expression of supernationalism to be found in eighth-century prophecy. To infer from it the ultimate deliverance of Zion would be the exact reverse of what Isaiah intended.[108]

5) But above and beyond the difficulties already encountered in the way of accepting the anti-Assyrian prophecies, there are three characteristics of them as a group to which, in spite of their obviousness, sufficient attention has not been paid. a) In this group we have a fairly large number of prophecies, some of them also quite long, purporting to deal with the military

[107] *Zukunftserwartung*, p. 106 n. 1; *Jahwehprophetie*, p. 53; *Commentary*, ad loc.; *Prophets of Israel*, p. 285 ff. Their exegesis is improbable, especially in Hackmann's and Buttenwieser's case who accept v. 12 also! Marti suggests striking out the initial והי as well as v. 12.

[108] In this reduced form c. 10 may have been first spoken to the prophet's immediate followers (see above, p. 35), but this cannot be proved.

power which dominated the horizon of every Jew and conditioned the mission of Isaiah for forty years; and yet, if the internal evidence of these prophecies alone is consulted, we could not date one of them with any certainty at a particular time in Isaiah's life. This is a most singular phenomenon when one stops to think of it. We would expect Isaiah to be as concrete in facing this terribly imminent fact of Assyria as he is in facing the anti-Assyrian party; yet not once does he allow a hint to escape him of the historical background out of which these challenges are supposed to be uttered.[109] Every one of them is expressed idealistically, rather than historically. They are theological rather than political. b) This fact gains further significance when it is associated with another fact. It might be supposed that the contexts would provide the historical framework out of which these prophecies are to be understood, even if the prophecies themselves do not do so. On the contrary, these prophecies are, as we have seen, frequently in historical or literary conflict with their contexts. It is they which furnish a large part of the material for the eschatological framework which surrounds the original prophecies of Isaiah and which so regularly cancels their threatening import.[110] c) Finally these prophecies regularly assume that Jahweh will protect Jerusalem. Such protection is taken as a matter of course. It is never explained, never justified. The ethical element is almost entirely absent. Immanuel, God is with us (8 10 b)—that text might be prefixed to all these prophecies. But is this not an extreme instance of religion in the service of nationalism?[111] If difficulty has been found with the nationalism of the Messianic passages, certainly this difficulty is greatly intensified in the case of the anti-Assyrian prophecies. Thus from every point of view—the difficulty of relating them to the various historical contexts of Isaiah's life, their suspicious relationships to their literary contexts in the

[109] We have seen that the interpretation of c. 18 as anti-Assyrian is more than questionable. 10 9 furnishes only a *terminus a quo* for v. 8f., but nothing further.

[110] See the Table. The original part of c. 10 has been remoulded by the redaction in the same interest.

[111] See the prophetic criticism of this at Amos 5 14.

book of Isaiah, and the pronounced type of nationalism expressed in them combined with their general lack of ethical interest — these prophecies come under the gravest suspicion, and it should occasion no surprise that criticism has slowly but surely advanced toward their complete elimination from the collection of Isaiah's genuine prophecies.[112]

6) In the case of the Messianic prophecies we have seen how the silence that settles down upon them in the writings of Isaiah's successors is almost impossible to explain, if they were really composed by Isaiah. This silence was found to give added significance to the difficulties which an attempt to explain these prophecies as Isaiah's must encounter. Similarly, the doubts of the anti-Assyrian prophecies which originate in the discovery of their fundamental conflict with Isaiah's mission and message are also greatly increased when they are examined in the light of subsequent developments. Here two facts, far more striking than the later silence with respect to the Messianic prophecies, are observable. a) In the first place, in proportion as the *motif* of this group disagrees with the fundamental conceptions of Isaiah, it is in harmony with the fundamental conceptions of Ezekiel.

[112] In view of the above discussions Staerk's severe criticism of Marti is not pertinent. He says: "What Marti scraps together by way of exegetical arguments out of his own and others' notions with respect to the prophecies just mentioned, without once shrinking before the mutilated figure of Isaiah [lying] in the Procrustes bed of the 'religionsgeschichtlichen' theories, deserves to be commemorated as a document of an era in Old Testament science finally, it is to be hoped, superseded" (*Das Assyrische Weltreich*, p. 215 f.). This is spoken of Marti's view of the Messianic prophecies, but Staerk would undoubtedly apply it to Marti's attack upon the anti-Assyrian prophecies (cf. his remarks upon Marti's treatment of c. 10, p. 212). Kittel also protests against these admittedly drastic eliminations. He says with special reference to this method of avoiding the difficulties created by the anti-Assyrian prophecies: "In view of the no small number of such oracles, and in view of their character which, for the most part, either betrays its Isaianic origin or strongly recommends the assumption of it, I hold this way out to be absolutely impassable" (*Geschichte Israels*[2] II. p. 509). The wholesale denial of laws to Moses at one stage in Old Testament criticism seemed equally drastic to some scholars. The severity of the surgery in this present case is admitted; it is a major operation. The real question, however, to be decided is whether the disease is not so deep-seated as to require it.

Stade's original observation of the close relationship between the "many-nations" passages and Ezekiel has been substantiated, but it has been extended to the group as a whole. b) But equally important is a second fact of a very different kind. Jeremiah is in as violent antagonism to this group at one point as Ezekiel is in hearty sympathy with it at another. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion which is preached in these prophecies is the doctrine preached by those great exponents of nationalism, the uncanonical prophets, in other words, the doctrine which Jeremiah spent the greater part of his life in opposing. Scholars have vainly tried to tone down this aggressively obvious fact. What for Isaiah is a matter of faith is, they tell us, for his followers a dead dogma. Isaiah did not base his doctrine of the inviolability of Zion on the fact that it was the cult centre, as those who came after him supposed; the Deuteronomists, who regarded Zion in this light, quite misunderstood him. That is, according to these scholars, they quite misunderstood the anti-Assyrian prophecies. But did they? Duhm, who argues along these lines, has to admit that not the Deuteronomists, but he, himself, has misunderstood a couple of the most important of these prophecies.[113] After explaining, in the first edition of his commentary, their relationship to the later eschatology as that of seed to flower, in the third edition he concludes that they themselves are the flower. No, if Isaiah was responsible for the anti-Assyrian prophecies, the Deuteronomists did *not* misunderstand him, but built upon his work and could do so with a perfectly good conscience. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion expressed in these prophecies is not explained or justified; it is simply assumed. In other words, it has already become a full-blown dogma, ready to the Deuteronomist's hands. In that case a violent and most unfortunate contradiction is constituted between Jeremiah and Isaiah, the two most outstanding figures in Old Testament prophecy.[114] Here is a remarkable situation.

[113] See above pp. 18, 46 on 29 5-8 and 31 5-9.

[114] Westphal recognizes, quite frankly, the fact of this contradiction. "The conviction of Zion's inviolability, apparently first cherished and expressed by Isaiah, burned intensely among the people; it became a popular idea against whose dangerous consequences the later prophets,

In their fundamental religious and ethical outlook there is a remarkable agreement between the two men. Isaiah's doctrine of faith and his doctrine of the Remnant naturally lead on to that great development of inwardness in religion and of the importance of the individual which makes Jeremiah's message so epochal in the history of religion. In Jeremiah we see the break with a nationalistic conception of religion, implicit in the two doctrines of Isaiah just mentioned, still further accentuated. The hearts of the two prophets beat in unison. On the other hand, the two doctrines which have been discovered to be most out of accord with Isaiah's theology and political activities, namely the doctrine of the Messianic king and the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, are either entirely ignored[115] or positively opposed by Jeremiah. But, it may be said, the fact that Jeremiah does not agree with Isaiah does not necessarily make against the genuineness of the doctrine of inviolability in Isaiah. It is not necessary, except on the traditional theory of inspiration, that prophets should always agree. As a matter of fact, does not Ezekiel disagree with Jeremiah at a point closely allied to the disagreement predicated between Jeremiah and Isaiah? He does, but the disagreement in the former case can be very readily accounted for. Ezekiel has adopted *con amore* the deuteronomic theories of the central sanctuary and its holiness; but in the circumstances this was the natural thing for him to do. It was the deuteronomic theory of the cult significance of Zion

like Micah and Jeremiah, were obliged to contend" (*Jahwe's Wohnstätten*, p. 176). The later theory, he tells us again, is to be referred back to "possibly *in part* misunderstood sayings of Isaiah". What is the reason for this cautious qualification "in part"? Does it betray Westphal's uneasy feeling that after all these prophecies were *not* misunderstood? In an article in the Church Quarterly Review for 1912 on *The Book of Isaiah. A New View*, Burney has this significant sentence: "We can imagine Jeremiah's opponents quoting Isaiah's words against him and reminding him how the earlier prophet's patriotic [note the word] policy had been triumphantly vindicated in the event" (p. 107). Cf. Smend's statement at the end of his discussion of the anti-Assyrian prophecies: "Isaiah prepared the way for Judaism" (*Religionsgeschichte*, p. 239). See, also, above, n. 95, end, and Sellin, *Prophetismus*, p. 52.

[115] See above, n. 95.

that helped to preserve the unity of the people in the suffering of the exile. Whatever criticism may be passed upon the doctrine of centralisation from the point of view of a pure spiritual religion, undoubtedly it did a great service during the exile, and a deeply religious man, such as Ezekiel unquestionably was, may well have attached himself to this theory, even though it had been opposed by Jeremiah at a time when the historical circumstances were quite different.[116] But in the case of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the circumstances which they had to face were almost exactly analogous. The conflict between them, if the anti-Assyrian prophecies are genuine, would be a conflict in the fundamental conceptions of religion, unrelieved by differences in circumstances which might explain it. The fact is, Jeremiah's opposition to the doctrine of Zion's inviolability only serves to throw the disagreement between the anti-Assyrian prophecies and Isaiah's fundamental conceptions into still higher relief.

7) But not only Jeremiah was opposed to the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, Isaiah's own contemporary, Micah, was also opposed to it. And it is important to notice that this doctrine was a popular doctrine in Micah's and Isaiah's day exactly as it was in Jeremiah's.[117] Would Isaiah have been less true to his

[116] Into the vexed question of Jeremiah's general attitude toward Deuteronomy it is impossible to enter in this connection. There were certain elements in the deuteronomic reform with which Jeremiah might well have had some sympathy, but he was undoubtedly opposed to its fundamental idea, the centralization of the sanctuary at Zion, for he tells us this himself, or at least his biographer, Baruch, does, in a passage (c. 26) the substantial historicity of which is admitted even by the most sceptical of critics. Compare also c. 7, the essence of which must be regarded as genuine, even though, with Duhm, a considerable amount of redaction may be admitted. 11 1-14, on the other hand, must be regarded as wholly redactional (Duhm, Cornill, Puukko, *Jeremias Stellung zum Deuteronomium*, 1913). Erbt's ingenious attempt (*Jeremia und seine Zeit*) to save some of it for Jeremiah is quite unconvincing.

[117] "Jahweh is in our midst; evil shall not come nigh us" (Mi. 3 11 f.). "Let Jahweh, God of Hosts be with you as ye have said" (Amos 5 14). Both prophets put the same sentiment into the mouths of the people, but the context in Micah shows that it involves the belief in the inviolability of Zion. Immanuel at Is. 8 8b-10 expresses exactly the same thought.

great prophetic convictions than Micah was? Would he have made concessions at this point to popular fanaticism that Micah sturdily refused to make? The fact that Micah repudiated the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion should give us pause.[118]

V. The Place of the Anti-Assyrian and Messianic Prophecies in the Religion of Israel, and the Theory of the Revision.

But there are three objections which may be urged against the neo-critical attack upon the anti-Assyrian prophecies and which demand an answer. A brief consideration of them will also give opportunity to round out the neo-critical theory of this group.

a) It has often been held that the anti-Assyrian prophecies precede the deuteronomic reform and prepare the way for it, and hence are to be located in Isaiah's day. b) Again, if there was no glorious deliverance in 701, how is it possible to account for the rise of the legend found in the Isaiah narratives? c) Finally, if Isaiah's message was one of national disaster, how did it come to pass that the anti-Assyrian prophecies as well as the Messianic prophecies were attributed to him? Is not the supposition of a revision so totally alien to the original intent of Isaiah's message most unlikely?[119]

1) In the first place, granted that the anti-Assyrian prophecies might be regarded as precursers of the deuteronomic reform if their genuineness were once established, is it necessary to accept

[118] Robertson Smith and Smend felt this difficulty, but their attempts to solve it are most inadequate. Micah's attitude toward Jerusalem is supposed to be that of a provincial for whom the capital is a kind of Sodom. He would therefore contemplate the destruction of the city with more equanimity than Isaiah was able to do. The latter lived in the capital and had a more aristocratic turn of mind (Smith, p. 289 f.; Smend, p. 237, n. 2 f.). Smend also suggests that Micah may have anticipated the destruction of the city without at the same time anticipating the destruction of the nation. A difficult abstraction in the days of city-states, when the fall of the capital usually meant the destruction of the nation also!

[119] For this last objection compare, especially, Westphal, p. 176, and Miss Louise Smith, *The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah*, JBL 1917, p. 190.

their genuineness in order to account for that reform? By no means. A brief sketch of the development of the idea of a central sanctuary will make this plain.[120] Fortunately, the idea can be studied in the broad light of history, from its origin in the time of David and Solomon to its culminating expression in Deuteronomy. The origin of the doctrine is to be found in David's purchase of the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite for the purpose of erecting an altar there, in order to commemorate the cessation of a plague which threatened the city in his day.[121] On this site Solomon later erected the temple. The temple was the royal sanctuary. The prestige acquired by the monarchy under David and Solomon accrued to the temple, and it speedily became the most famous sanctuary in the land, in spite of the fact that it was later in origin than many other holy places. Undoubtedly the priests who ministered at this royal shrine took advantage of the royal favor to elaborate a ceremonial corresponding in magnificence to the splendor of the court. After the Schism, two royal sanctuaries sprang up at Bethel and Dan, but this did not lower the prestige of the Jerusalem temple in the minds of the citizens of Judah. On the contrary, its supremacy was all the more insisted upon. When Judah became vassal to Israel and the monarchy suffered political eclipse, it was the temple alone that represented the ancient glory of the kingdom. It was in the temple that the national

120 See especially, Well. *Proleg.*[3], pp. 18—26; Smend, *Die Bedeutung des Tempels*, (STK, 1884, p. 689 ff.); Westphal, *Jahwes Wohnstätten, passim.* These scholars all emphasize the great importance of Isaiah and of the events in 701 for the growth of the centralization idea. What follows suggests modifications of the general Wellhausen theory at these points.

121 2 Sam. 24. There is no good reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of the narrative in this chapter. (See especially Westphal, 161, and Budde's *Commentary on Samuel* ad loc.). This implies that the rock which fixed the site of the temple had not been a sanctuary in pre-Davidic times (See Kittel, *Studien zur Hebräischen Archaeologie*, I. Der Heilige Fels, for a different view). The sanctuary of the old Canaanite town was more probably at Gihon. It was there that the tent for the ark seems to have been pitched (1 Kings 1 32-40). Smith's doubt of the reason for the choice of the temple site assigned in 2 Sam. 24 seems to be unduly sceptical (see his *Commentary on Samuel* ad 2 Sam. 24).

pride could still find expression.[122] Further, Wellhausen rightly calls attention to a striking difference between the two Hebrew kingdoms which would greatly favor the temple. Whereas in Israel outstanding personalities were developed, in Judah institutions were developed.[123] The priesthood as well as the monarchy was far more stable in the southern kingdom than in the northern. The power of the priesthood at the capital and therefore the prestige of the temple would thus tend constantly to increase. When Israel finally succumbed to the first great rushes of Tiglath-Pileser IV, Shalmaneser V and Sargon, and Samaria fell in 722, whereas Judah escaped, the priests at the temple of Jerusalem would not have failed to point the lesson, and the unscathed temple at the Jewish capital must have still further gained in prestige. Hence, even before the events of 701 the temple must have come to exercise a great fascination upon the minds of Isaiah's contemporaries, and, as we see from the pages of Micah, the dogma of Zion's inviolability was already beginning to exercise its baleful influence. It is therefore entirely superfluous to call in the aid of the anti-Assyrian prophecies in order to understand the later development of the deuteronomic idea. The current which was setting in the direction of Deuteronomy was already running strong. But it was a current which ran in a very different channel from that in which Isaiah's thoughts were accustomed to flow. The waters of Siloah that flow softly could mingle scarcely more readily with this great popular flood of nationalism than they could with the waters of the Euphrates (Is. 8 5-8[a]). I do not mean to deny that Isaiah

[122] The immediate connection between the temple, as the *royal* sanctuary, and nationalism is obvious. It is still more obvious if the usual view of the ark may still be retained, which regards it as the most sacred cult object of Israel and connects it very closely with Jahweh as a war-god The war-like and nationalistic associations which gathered around the ark would thus come to centre in the temple. The recent brilliant monograph of Arnold (*Ephod and Ark*, 1917) would modify the current conception of the importance of the ark very materially, if its conclusions were adopted. They have been subjected to a searching criticism by Budde (ZATW, 1921). It is, perhaps, too early to pronounce a final judgment upon them.

[123] *Geschichte*, p. 68.

was at times attracted by the temple. It was there he had his vision (c. 6) and it was there that Jahweh seemed to him to dwell (8 18). If one wishes to find a psychologically *natural* inconsistency in Isaiah, he can find it at this point.[124] But such an instinctive participation in the current modes of expressing a belief in the nearness of Jahweh is very different from sharing in the popular dogma of the temple's inviolability. As a matter of fact, Isaiah as distinctly repudiates that dogma in the Ariel prophecy as Micah himself does. The enigma of Ariel is only an enigma to those who are still dreaming in the older exegesis and criticism and who sadly need to be awaked. This prophecy in its present form in 29 1-8 illustrates, perhaps more clearly than any other single prophecy, how thoroughly nationalistic the anti-Assyrian prophecies are, and how flatly they contradict Isaiah's own convictions.[125]

[124] See above p. 39 f.

[125] It is unwise to begin the interpretation of 29 1-8 by attempting to determine the precise philological meaning of the very obscure term 'Ariel. It is better first to ascertain how it is used in this passage. The following points seem to be clear. 1) 'Ariel is evidently the name of a city. 2) The city can be no other than Jerusalem; at least it was understood to mean that by the writer of v. 8. 3) The name, and this is all important, *must be capable of a double meaning*, one suggesting honor and the other dishonor. The latter meaning is absolutely required by vs. 2, 3. In view of Jahweh's terrible dealing with her, 'Ariel shall be as 'Ariel! The former meaning is required by v. 1. Isaiah does not explain the name in this verse; it is therefore altogether probable that he uses a name or title of Jerusalem already familiar to the people. If so, it must have been used by them in an honorific and not in a derogatory sense. Thus the name which the people were accustomed to give to Jerusalem in reverence Isaiah gives to it as a threat. This conclusion seems to be absolutely necessary. It follows that no interpretation of 'Ariel which is unable to explain it in two opposite senses will meet the demands of the context. 4) But there is another antithesis in the passage which is often overlooked. וחניתי, v. 2, is clearly used in a hostile sense. One reason why Jerusalem is likened to 'Ariel is because Jahweh is to encamp against it (עליך). But in what sense is חנה used in v. 1a? There is no defining word like עליך to tell us. It is commonly supposed to have a favorable sense in v. 1a e. g. to 'take up his abode'. This would agree with the meaning of 'Ariel in v. 1 and with the interpretation which the hearer would no doubt give when he heard the opening phrase of

2) But, it is usually said, the events of 701, as well as the anti-Assyrian prophecies, contributed very greatly to the strengthening of the tendency toward a centralization of the

the prophecy. The phrase is a reminder of the capture of the city by David, who thereupon made it his capital (2 Sam. 5 4-9). The auditor would understand Isaiah to be alluding to Jerusalem, which David made his capital and which is rightly called 'Ariel, a title of honor. But the phrase קריית חנה דוד is, like the name 'Ariel, capable of a double meaning The ellipsis suggested by the construction might be שם . . . אשר, "the city *where* David encamped", or it might be עליה . . . אשר, "the city *against which* David encamped", as the LXX actually understands it (ἣν ἐπολέμησεν). The question at once arises whether the phrase in v. 1 is not purposely ambiguous, exactly as the title, 'Ariel, is ambiguous. But in that case, since Isaiah makes it clear that he intends to use 'Ariel in an unfavorable sense in v. 2, it is probable that at v. 3 he intends to use חנה in its unfavorable sense. Accordingly, the two phrases are to be brought into the same sort of antithesis as the two uses of the name 'Ariel. This can be done very effectively and at the same time the impossible כדוד of the M.T. be eliminated by reading with the LXX "as David". The people think of Jerusalem as 'Ariel, in the favorable sense of that term; Isaiah thinks of it in the unfavorable sense of the term. The people think of it as the city where David encamped, i. e. made it his capital; Isaiah thinks of it as the city against which David once fought. There is nothing intrinsically inviolable about Jerusalem. David once fought against it and captured it; Jahweh can do the same. The subtle but stinging irony of the passage on this interpretation is parallelled almost exactly by 28 21, where Isaiah uses another historical allusion with which pleasant associations were attached in the popular mind in an exactly opposite sense; and compare, also, what I believe to be his ironical use of Immanuel at 7 14. Thus the passage can be very well understood even though the exact nature of the play on 'Ariel eludes us. The two interpretations of the word most current in recent years which do most justice to the demand of the context that it should be capable of a double meaning are 'altar' or 'altar-hearth', and 'mountain of the world' and 'underworld'. The latter meaning is based on the Babylonian *'aral(l)u*. The former is the usual Jewish interpretation and has been given special currency by Duhm. The latter was suggested by Jeremias (ATAO^2 p. 558), was tentatively adopted by Staerk, p. 206, and has recently been championed by Feigin and Albright (JBL 1920, 131 ff., 137 ff.). Either view suggests a very forcible play on the name. If "altar-hearth" is adopted, the contrast is between the popular conception of the altar, as symbolic of all that is sacred and inviolable, and the prophet's very unconventional conception of it, as a place of blood and fire, where the victims are slaughtered or burned. Jerusalem, which is Jahweh's sacred altar in the popular view,

cult at Jerusalem. If there was no such signal deliverance at this time, we lose the benefit, it is claimed, of one of the most interesting historical events out of which the growth of the deuteronomic idea could be explained. And again the question presses: How can the legend of such a deliverance have grown up if there was no historical fact to which it could attach? But we have seen that the tendency toward centralization was already in existence, and therefore a signal deliverance in 701 was no more *necessary* to account for the culmination of the tendency in the deuteronomic reform of Josiah's day than were the anti-Assyrian prophecies. Nevertheless, the events of 701 probably *did* stimulate this tendency, though in a somewhat different way than has been commonly supposed. If the views of the Isaiah

will become a shambles, dripping with the blood of its own citizens. It is interesting to realize that Calvin already suggested this interpretation. If the view of Jeremias is adopted, then Isaiah says that Jerusalem, the sacred mountain, will become a Hades where only shades live their ghostly life (cf. v. 4). The significance of the passage is the same on either view. In favor of the former, however, is the fact that Ezekiel actually uses 'Ariel in the sense of 'altar-hearth', and also the fact that Isaiah had little respect for the ceremonial (cf. 1 10ff.). Professor Clay explains 'Ariel as meaning "Uru is God", with reference to the original chief deity of Jerusalem. This name we are told "was *appropriately* substituted by Isaiah for the name Jerusalem in his address to the city, which, doubtless, had continued to worship that god" (Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society I, p. 32). But what is the exegetical significance of the adverb "appropriately"? Not only 'Ariel in v. 1, but 'Ariel in v. 2 must be explained. Now the point of this discussion for our purposes is this. However 'Ariel is explained, it is clear that Isaiah is playing upon it and using it in v. 2 *in a totally different sense from the popular use of it in v. 1.* But in vs. 5-8 'Ariel is undoubtedly used in the popular sense. Mount Zion as 'Ariel is sacrosanct and inviolable. Those who wage war against her will be scattered as a dream, a rather adventurous suggestion in view of the fact that Jahweh himself is to encamp against her according to v. 3. A denial of the real thought intended in vs. 1-4 could not be more expressly formulated than is done in vs. 5-8. The popular conception of the inviolability of the sacred city which Isaiah repudiates in vs. 1-4 is reasserted in vs. 5-8. The astonishment at v. 9f. is not occasioned by the "enigma" of 'Ariel's sudden glorious deliverance out of its deep humiliation (cf. Delitzsch), but by the fact that this supposedly sacrosanct city is to be the scene of pillage and massacre. Strange and outlandish is Jahweh's work (28 21)!

narratives presented above are adopted, there was no deliverance which would seem *at the time* to be any justification of the unqualified promises in the anti-Assyrian prophecies. What contemporaries of the events must have thought can be gathered from c. 1, where Jerusalem is described as "a tent in a vineyard, a shack in a cucumber-patch". Isaiah evidently assumes that his hearers will realize the melancholy character of the situation as vividly as he does himself. But *with the lapse of time* a very different theory might grow up about what happened in 701. As a matter of fact Jerusalem was not sacked; the temple still stood. Sennacherib is as clear on this subject as the Bible itself. What seemed to Isaiah's contemporaries to be a complete vindication of the prophet's predictions of disaster could easily take on a very different aspect in the eyes of a later generation. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, in the confidence in which the nationalist party had revolted against Assyria, no doubt received a rude shock when, at the time of the invasion, Hezekiah had to strip the temple doors in order to pay his indemnity (2 K. 18 13–16). But as the memory of the bitter desolation gradually faded out, as such memories almost always do fade out, the fact that the capital and the temple were saved began to assume greater and greater importance. How was it possible for Jerusalem to escape the fate that overtook so many of its sister cities? Jahweh's hand must have signally intervened to deliver it. If so, he must have especially chosen Zion to place his name there. The countryside had been devastated. Its altars had been desecrated. Jerusalem alone must be the place to worship Jahweh in; Jerusalem alone is inviolable. Surely there is no difficulty in accounting both for the development of the deuteronomic legend in the Isaiah narratives and the strengthening of the deuteronomic doctrine on the basis of the actual facts in 701 after "the unimaginable touch of time" had begun to soften their original asperities.[126] As time went on doctrine and legend

[126] The above argument is an expansion of hints by Meinhold (*Jesajaerzählung*, p. 103). Retrospective judgments upon the significance of Sennacherib's invasion and contemporary judgments upon it by those who experienced its horrors could be very different. It is this distinction between contemporary and subsequent impressions upon which I would

supported each other, and when it is remembered that it was to the various interests of both priests and prophets at the time of Josiah's reform to cultivate the one and confirm the other, it is not surprising to find them blossoming and burgeoning ever more luxuriantly.[127] The anti-Assyrian prophecies are not the precursors of this development but the reflections of it. But how did these prophecies, along with the Messianic prophecies, become attributed to the man whose ideas are so diametrically opposed to them? In order to answer this question it is necessary to trace the development beyond the time of Deuteronomy.

3) If the suggestions thus far made have been approximately true, it will, by this time, be realized that the doctrines of the Messianic king and of the inviolability of Zion, which have been the special subjects of our study, are closely allied with nationalism. But in the deuteronomic reform the ecclesiastical theory of the state began to encroach upon the political theory of it. It is interesting to observe that the law for the king in Deuteronomy (17 14–20), even if its originality is admitted, does not emphasize the political duties of the office.[128] The downfall of

lay special emphasis. Some of the concrete details in the Isaiah narratives, certainly the mention of Tirhaka, and possibly the plague, are confusions with later events. The recent excavations of Reisner at Napata (Harvard Theological Rev. Jan. 1920) show how increasingly difficult it is to suppose that Tirhaka could have been called king of Cush in 701. The plague may have been a confused reminiscence of what seems to have been a failure of Esarhaddon in the Egyptian campaign of 675 (673?). See Winckler, KAT 88. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 351 for this defect. It is a pity, however, that Reisner revives Winckler's mythical kingdom of Musri. It was to be hoped that Meyer's and Olmstead's attack had forever put to flight the forces of that shadow realm (see Meyer, *Israel und seine Nachbarstämme*, p. 459ff., and Olmstead, *Sargon of Assyria*, p. 56—71). So far as Reisner argues against the credibility of the Isaiah narratives on the basis of Winckler's speculations, his argument must be discounted, but apart from this he shows how unlikely it was for Tirhaka to take the position in 701 ascribed to him in the Isaiah narratives.

127 Is it fanciful to think that the deuteronomic reformers may have utilized the legend to carry through their reforms, which no doubt met with a considerable resistance on the part of the conservative peasantry?

128 Cf., especially, Boehmer, *Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes*, pp. 65—67. The law is quite generally regarded as a later addition (e. g. by Wellhausen, Cornill, Steuernagel, Puukko).

the dynasty and the temple in 586 might have proved equally disastrous to both institutions, but as a matter of fact it was not. The temple stood the test of the disaster better than the monarchy. The great theocratical development which now set in, stimulated as it was by the exigencies of the political situation, worked to the advantage of the former rather than of the latter. Ezekiel's hopes centre in a restored temple rather than in a restored monarchy, though hopes of the latter are not altogether wanting.[129] In Ezekiel 37 24–28, for the first time in our documents, temple and monarchy are brought together in the picture of the glorious future.[130] The two kingdoms are to be united, indeed, under one head; David, probably an individual rather than the dynasty, shall be their prince or king (v. 24, 25). But the culminating feature in the eschatological landscape is the temple, not the palace: "The nations shall know that I am Jahweh that sanctifieth Israel when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore" (v. 28). It was this vision of Ezekiel, in which monarchy and temple are combined, which seems to have moulded the hopes of the leaders of the returning exiles some seventy years later. At the return under Zerubbabel we have the one distinct attempt of prechristian times to realize the Messianic royal ideal. It is therefore very interesting to see how closely Haggai and Zechariah associated the Messiahship of Zerubbabel with the temple. It is the completion of the temple that is to usher in the Messianic kingdom.

Now the most remarkable characteristic of this movement, at least in its inception, is its idealistic *abandon*. Haggai and Zechariah are not (consciously at least) political intriguers. They eschew all political means to accomplish their ends. "Not by might, nor by power but by my spirit, saith Jahweh of Hosts" (Zech. 4 6) – that was their slogan. The people were not even

[129] Cf. 34 23-24; 37 22-23, 24-27. Aytoun has recently suggested the elimination of these prophecies as spurious (JBL., 1920, p. 35, n. 30); but see Begrich (ZWT, 1904, pp. 433 ff.), and Herrmann (*Ezechielstudien*, pp. 124—126) for their relation to Ezekiel's hopes of the future, on the more probable supposition of their genuineness.

[130] In the later passage, Jer. 30 21, the אדיר and the משל seem to have much the same position as Ezekiel's נשיא in cc. 40—48.

to begin with building the walls of Jerusalem; Jahweh himself would be a wall of fire (Zech. 2 9). The only thing the people were to do in order to insure the great Messianic epiphany was to build the temple; Jahweh would see to the rest. He would shake the nations, the Persian empire would fall, and the temple would be glorified (Haggai c. 2). It is a singular mixture of realism and idealism, of the historical and the miraculous, that we have in these prophecies. The hopes attach to an historical character, Zerubbabel, and to the historical foundation of the temple, but they are incapable of historical realization in any literal sense. Do we not see in this episode actually unfolding before our eyes the dissociation of history and eschatology to which Wellhausen refers as so characteristic of the post-exilic forms of prophecy? Is it not out of such a time, or at least out of the ideas and hopes which controlled this period that prophecies like cc. 9 and 11 can be most satisfactorily explained? In these prophecies, as in the visions of Haggai and Zechariah, the supernatural is prominent, though attached to history through the Davidic dynasty. The insistence upon peace as one of the prime characteristics of the Messiah's reign, the lack of emphasis upon any warlike activities, are in exact agreement with the idealism of Haggai and Zechariah.[131] The nationalism in the figure of the Messiah has been sublimated by the close association of the Messiah with the temple. Those elements in Is. cc. 9 and 11 which have been held to express Isaiah's revolt against nationalism and have therefore served as a basis for the defense of these prophecies,[132] are far more easily explained, not as an antithesis to the nationalism of Isaiah's day, but as the natural expression of the new conception of nationalism in the post-exilic period, in which the nation is no longer, strictly speaking, the nation, but is rather a nascent church, and the king is a servant of the temple. Duhm himself has pointed out the close affinity of Is. 2 2–4 (5) with the Messianic prophecies in cc. 9 and 11. It is by no means an improbable supposition that the three poems are by the same author, even if he is not Isaiah. In that case

[131] Hag. 2 9; Zech. 8 12 (read: "I will sow peace", and cf. LXX).

[132] See Caspari, *Echtheit der Messianischen Weissagung*, Is. 9 1-6.

we have exactly the same association of temple and Messiah in these three prophecies as we have in the prophecies of Ezekiel, Haggai and Zechariah.[133] As for the anti-Assyrian prophecies, those which have been denied to Isaiah, even by the more cautious critics, have been usually referred to the Greek period, on the supposition that Assyria refers to the Seleucid kingdom. But it is by no means impossible that some of these may come

[133] The above paragraph suggests, very tentatively, the association of Is. 2 2-5, 9 1-6 and 11 1-9 with the ideas of Haggai and Zechariah. This is the date to which they are assigned by Sellin in his *Serubbabel* (not accessible to me) and his *Studien* (II, p. 172 ff.), and by Marti, and very cautiously by Gray, with variations as to the more precise time. (Sellin, whose agile mind is as sensitive to new impressions as Lloyd George's, has since accepted once more the genuineness of these prophecies, under the influence of the Gunkel-Gressmann methods. See his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 71, and *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus*, p. 150, and *passim*). Hackmann, Cheyne, and Volz do not seek to date the prophecies with any exactness. They refer them, generally, to the post-exilic period. Stade (*Geschichte*, II, p. 209) seems to assign them to the period between Nehemiah and Alexander the Great. Kennett (Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. VII, p. 321 ff., and *Composition of the Book of Isaiah*, p. 85) assigns these prophecies to the Maccabean period. Similarly Aytoun (JBL, 1920, p. 40 ff.). The same objection might be urged against a date in the early post-exilic period that has been urged against the Isaianic origin of these prophecies: Should we not expect some reference to them in the later literature (see Gray, *Commentary*, p. 166)? There seems to be such a reference at Is. 65 25 (cf. Is. 11 7, 9). But the meagreness of allusions to them must be admitted. However, this can be better accounted for on the supposition that they came out of the time of Haggai and Zechariah than if they were written by Isaiah. In the former case they were anonymous prophecies and would presumably not have the weight that they would have in the latter case (Hackmann, p. 156). But far more important than this consideration is the fact that, if these prophecies are associated with the Messianic movement in the time of Zerubbabel, they are associated with a movement which ended in a fiasco. At that time it is quite clear that the Messianic hopes received a blow from which they did not soon recover. Oracles which encouraged these hopes would naturally lose influence when the hopes were disappointed. But into a detailed discussion of the real date of these prophecies it is not necessary for my purpose to go. All I am concerned to do is to show that they can be better understood out of the political situation and theological convictions of a later age than they can out of Isaiah's day.

out of the pre-exilic period and refer to the Assyrian empire itself. Nahum is not likely to have been the only nationalist prophet to cherish a fierce hatred of Assyria. Beer has suggested that 10 5–19 came out of the time of Nahum and Zephaniah.[134] If the views advanced above are accepted, the original part of this prophecy is by Isaiah himself, but a renewed consideration of a date before the fall of Nineveh for some of the anti-Assyrian prophecies is desirable.

When we turn to examine the Book of Isaiah in the light of the development just sketched out, we can, for the first time, fully understand the significance of its peculiar structure. Under the changed conditions of the post-exilic period the original threats of eighth-century prophecy have become surrounded with a great framework of eschatological hope. How long it was in preparing, whether any materials for it were furnished by pre-exilic sources, these are questions of detail which do not immediately concern our problem. The one thing needful is to realize that there was such a revision. It is the great merit of Duhm to have concentrated upon the fact and the importance of this revision for the proper understanding of Isaiah. With the assumption of such a revision we have at last arrived at the place where it is in order to attempt an answer to the third objection to the critical view urged above. How is it possible to suppose that the two great groups of hope prophecies became attributed by the redactors to a man whose fundamental convictions they so flatly contradicted?

a) In the first place, Isaiah was the most out-standing figure in eighth-century prophecy. Moreover, this greatest of all the early prophets was a citizen of Judah. What a deep impression the fulfilment of the warnings of these pre-exilic prophets made upon the post-exilic Jewish community is revealed in the very instructive passage Zech. 7 7–14.[135] But did the significance of the message of such a man apply only to pre-exilic times? This would hardly seem credible to those of a later day. But after the exile threats were no longer in order. There must have

[134] *Wellhausen-Festschrift*, pp. 15—35.

[135] Delete v. 8, with Well., Marti, and Mitchell; perhaps also v. 9a (Marti).

been a message of hope also in the great prophets, adapted to the needs of the returned exiles. Thus there would be the strongest dogmatic interest in the attempt to make Isaiah, the greatest of the pre-exilic prophets of Judah, serviceable to the needs of post-exilic Judaism.

b) Again, there are admittedly genuine hopes in Isaiah (1 21–26, the doctrine of the Remnant, and the doctrine of faith), to which the dogmatic eschatology of the later times might conceivably attach itself. When the post-exilic community identified itself with the Remnant,[136] it would be very natural for them to read back *their* ideas of the Remnant into Isaiah's, though Isaiah meant something quite different. They could even make capital out of Isaiah's doctrine of the Day of the Lord. That, too, became popularized again in later times, and was construed as implying hope for the Jews. Since it is unquestionably one of Isaiah's doctrines, it would not be a difficult task for post-exilic revisers, who were without an historical sense but were controlled by a very strong theological bias, to construe it in a sense favorable to themselves, just as Christians of the present day often read back their own ideas into New Testament passages which originally meant something quite different from what they suppose. Thus there are a number of genuine passages in Isaiah which later could be utilized as starting-points for a dogmatic revision. But much more important than these considerations are three other special facts which will account for the incorporation of the two groups of prophecies under discussion into a collection of Isaiah's prophecies.

c) We have seen how there gradually grew up a very different judgment upon the events of 701 from the judgment of contemporaries. The bare escape of capital and temple from massacre and pillage became construed as a signal deliverance, wrought by Jahweh, himself. But Isaiah was the outstanding figure at that time. Was it possible for a prophet not to be aware of Jahweh's intentions to save the city, and, being aware of them, was it possible for him to keep silent?[137] Once grant

[136] Hag. 1 12, 14; 2 2; Zech. 8 6, 11, 12.

[137] Cf. Amos 3 7, 8.

the development of the legend of deliverance, and it is an easy step to associate Isaiah with that deliverance and to suppose that he must have defied Assyria.

d) This last conclusion would be confirmed by a very natural misunderstanding of one of his most striking prophecies. If our view of the original meaning of 10 5–15 is correct, Isaiah did defy Assyria and threaten its final overthrow, though he did not draw any inferences from this as to the deliverance of Judah. But it was certainly a very natural inference that he must have done so. The revision of c. 10, which brought it into harmony with the legend of the Isaiah narratives and the dogma of the inviolability of Zion, was a most natural revision to make, and this could furnish the starting-point for the gradual incorporation of the remaining anti-Assyrian prophecies into the original collections.

e) A similar very natural misunderstanding probably led to the incorporation of the Messianic prophecies. In 7 14 Isaiah predicted the birth of a child who should be given the name Immanuel. The name sounded to the ear full of promise. It was the most natural thing in the world for later students of the old texts to interpret it in an altogether favorable sense and even to see in it a reference to the Messiah. The later Messianic interpretation seems clear at 8 8b–10. But granted the originally independent existence of 9 1–6, where again the birth of a child of Messianic significance was prophesied, it was almost inevitable that the two children should be identified, and 9 1–6 be incorporated into the collection of Isaiah's prophecies in order to confirm the interpretation of 7 14; 9 1–6 would, of course, carry along with it its companion piece, 11 1–9. Thus the presence of the two great groups of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies among Isaiah's oracles can be very readily accounted for as due (1) to the very strong dogmatic desire of the post-exilic Jewish community to interpret the great Jewish prophet in a way serviceable to the later religious needs, and (2) to the ease with which many genuine elements of Isaiah's prophecies could be misunderstood by commentators who were indifferent to historical investigations.

It is not claimed that the revision must have worked exactly

along the lines just indicated. But it is claimed that it could have done so. The drastic nature of the revision, if both the great groups of prophecies under discussion are eliminated, is admitted. But I have tried to show that there is nothing either incredible or even unlikely about it. The theory of Isaiah, the book, here advanced results in the ethical and spiritual interpretation of Isaiah, the man, which Wellhausen, Smend and Robertson Smith advocated, as opposed to the supernaturalistic and apocalyptic interpretation of Duhm. But this interpretation is arrived at, not by means of an improbable exegesis of the oracles in question, but by their critical elimination. Wellhausen's theory of Isaiah, the man, was correct; but his exegesis of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies was wrong. Duhm's exegesis of these oracles is more nearly correct than Wellhausen's, but his criticism is in unstable equilibrium, and this leads him to a false estimation of Isaiah, the man. Neither scholar should take it amiss if his principles have been carried out a step farther than he himself was willing to go. That is usually the fortune of men of original ideas. They are unable to check the momentum of their own creative thoughts. The work initiated by Wellhausen, Duhm, and Stade has thus logically culminated first, in the relegation of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies to a later date, secondly, in a theory of Isaiah, the man, which emphasizes as no other theory does what is permanently valuable in his message, and thirdly, in the only theory of Isaiah, the book, which does any sort of justice to its peculiar nature. These are great accomplishments. Are they to be repudiated as artificial schematization, as an illegitimate attempt to modernize Isaiah? A formidable attack has been made in recent years upon the whole development of the neo-critical school, and before it is possible to rest at ease in its interpretation of Isaiah, it will be necessary to examine with some care this attack.

Table, illustrative of the Revision of cc. 1– 39.

I

Chaps. 1—12.

C. 1	Judgment	cancelled	by	2 2–4 (5)	Eschatological	hope	
2 6—4 1	„	„	„	4 2–6	„	„	
5 1–29	„	„	„	5 30	„	„	
6 1—8 18 (19–22)	„	„	„	9 1–6 (see 8 8b–10)	„	„	
9 7—10 4	„	„	„	10 5—12 6	„	„	

or

C. 1—9 as a whole culminating in cc. 10—12 „ „

II

Chaps. 13—27.

Cc. 13—23 Judgments on the several nations, culminating in cc. 24—27, the Eschatological world-judgment.

Note. 17 1–11 cancelled by 17 12–14, and compare 17 12–14 with 8 8b–10 and 29 5–8.

III

Chaps. 28—35.

28 1–4	Judgment	cancelled	by	28 5, 6	Eschatological	hope	
28 7–22	„	„	„	28 23–29	„	„	
29 1–4	„	„	„	29 5–8	„	„	
29 9–15	„	„	„	29 16–24	„	„	
30 1–17	„	„	„	30 18–26, 27–33	„	„	
31 1–4	„	„	„	31 5–9	„	„	

Cc. 28—31 as a whole culminating in { cc. 32, 33 Append I / cc. 34, 35 Append II

IV

Chaps. 36—39.

Historical Narratives.

PART II

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

The Attempt to rehabilitate the Doctrines of the Messiah and the Inviolability of Zion as authentic Elements in Isaiah's Teaching, and the renewed Emphasis upon the Supernaturalistic in Terms of the Mythological.

I. Principles and Methods. Gunkel.

If the attempt is made to sum up the chief characteristics of the neo-critical hypothesis so far as its results and its methods of arriving at them are concerned they are the following:

1) The present book of Isaiah is a prophetic anthology in the compilation of which Isaiah himself had little share. 2) The evidence for this is found, at the outset, in two main groups of phenomena: a) in the presence of certain prophecies in cc. 1—39 (the Babylonian) which cannot have been composed by Isaiah because of their historical backgrounds; and b) in the peculiar nature of the transitions between the prophecies of threat and consolation. These are not of the character that Isaiah himself would have been likely to make. Isaiah was a creative genius and a master stylist. He had full power to express his thoughts in the way he saw fit, whereas the transitions are artificial and suggest the hand of one who was working over material furnished by tradition. Moreover, in the most of these transitions a distinct tendency is observable, namely, to supply to the prophecies of woe consolatory additions. This purpose cannot be attributed to the prophet himself, for it results in a conscious cancellation of the threats by the hopes. 3) But it is conceivable that, while the present sequence of the oracles is not due to Isaiah, the consolatory passages themselves, or at least the greater part of them, may still be genuine. It may be conjectured that the hopes and the threats were spoken under different circumstances and were only at a later time brought together in their present singular sequences. The next step is, therefore, to examine each of the prophecies with respect to its genuineness. Again two lines of investigation are open, the literary and the historical.

a) The literary investigation involves an examination of the style and vocabulary of the disputed prophecies. In what has preceded, this argument has hardly been touched upon. This is because the argument, though yielding excellent results in the case of some of the prophecies (e. g. c. 4 or 29 16–24), is of much less certain application in the case of the more important ones. b) The historical investigation involves an examination of the historical background of the hope prophecies, and when that fails, as it usually does, *an examination of their ideas.* Could their ideas be understood in the age of Isaiah and were they likely to be entertained by him? 4) At first glance it might seem as if the task were a hopeless one. The danger of the vicious circle is obvious. Fortunately, however, there is a considerable body of material as to the genuineness of which there is universal agreement. This material is marked by a uniform style of the greatest originality and power. In subject matter it agrees with the commission given to the prophet in his inaugural vision to announce destruction to his nation. It also corresponds to the known political and religious situation in Isaiah's times. In its political aspects this material regularly urges a policy of non-interference in world-politics. Religiously and ethically it castigates without mercy the sins and excesses in the national life. In view of the political antagonism to the prophet on the part of the king and people, reflected in this material and corroborated by the Assyrian inscriptions, which show that Judah inclined to follow a political policy the reverse of that advocated by Isaiah, and in view of the religious antagonism reflected in the same material with equal clearness, Isaiah's anticipations of destruction are readily understood. Not so easy to understand are the groups of prophecies which deal with the Messianic King and the Inviolability of Zion. When judged by the admittedly genuine prophecies these prophecies come under the gravest suspicion. They are found to be out of harmony with Isaiah's most characteristic thoughts and deepest convictions and at the same time with the needs of the political and religious situation in his day as he understood it. 5) But in proportion as they are out of touch with Isaiah's own modes of thinking, they are in agreement with the hopes which prophecy cherished

from the time of Ezekiel on. It is the prophecies of Ezekiel which form the great watershed between the pre-exilic and the post-exilic canonical eschatology.[138] The prophecies of eschatological hope in cc. 1—39 are in general accord with the ideas of Ezekiel and his successors. 6) It is this observation which has led to the neo-critical conclusion that the original Isaianic material has been surrounded by a great frame-work of eschatology which was constructed in the post-exilic period.

In the mode of arriving at this conclusion three things are especially noteworthy. a) The neo-critical school operates chiefly with *the criterion of ideas.* If an idea is alien to Isaiah, it is concluded to be spurious and *therefore later.* b) But in operating with the criterion of ideas, the neo-critical school is operating in the sphere of psychology; its criticism may be called a *psychologizing criticism.* It seeks to explain the genesis of ideas, just so far as it can, out of known historical situations. Or when it pronounces an idea to be alien to Isaiah, this is also a *psychologizing judgment*; the idea cannot be understood in the light of Isaiah's other ideas or his mission to his generation. c) In the third place, the neo-critical school is primarily a school of literary, or, more precisely, documentary criticism. By this is meant that it has sought to explain the development of the religion of Israel out of the Old Testament itself. It has first attempted to disentangle the various documents now found in the Old Testament and then has attempted to date them. Next, it too often makes the assumption that the dates of the first literary expression of ideas are largely determined by the dates

[138] The substantial genuineness of Ezekiel is here assumed, in common with the great majority of scholars, and also the propriety of the distinction of pre-exilic and post-exilic. The attack made upon this distinction in Professor Torrey's brilliant *Ezra Studies* (cf. p. 289 especially) seems to me to be exposed to practically insurmountable difficulties. It certainly cannot be carried through so long as the substantial genuineness of Ezekiel is admitted. It is therefore very interesting to discover in a modest little foot-note, (p. 288, n. 8, cf. also his *Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel,* in Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. XV, p. 248, n. 1) that Ezekiel is relegated to the Greek period! Until that foot-note is established by a completely wrought-out argument, one may be permitted at this point in Judah's history still to travel in the beaten paths.

of the documents in which they occur. Thus the history of the religion of Israel has been very largely constructed on the theory that the relative position of an idea in the religious development is to be determined by the time of its first certain appearance in the literature. Again, and this is all-important, the place where an idea is supposed to appear for the first time with certainty is where it is found in a self-explanatory passage, where it is expressed in a distinct and intelligible fashion and is in some sort of an organic connection with its context. (Note the psychologizing interest at this point.) On the other hand, in case an idea happens to occur in two passages, if in one of them it is expressed intelligibly and in organic connection with its context and in the other only allusively and in a way that cannot be fully understood, the second passage is commonly held to be secondary to the first. If the allusive passage happens to be attributed to an author earlier than the time of the clear passage, then the inclination is to deny the authenticity of the allusive passage. We have seen how the anti-Assyrian passages in Isaiah were gradually weeded out because it was difficult to explain them out of Isaiah's life-time, but easy to explain them out of Ezekiel's.[139]

This method of utilizing the criterion of ideas has played a large part in the views of the Old Testament commonly accepted at the present time. And there is a good reason for this. In all historical study the documentary evidence, provided it exists at all, must be the controlling evidence. It is the first duty of the historian to register the phenomena of his documents and to start from these in any attempted reconstruction. Yet there are two other factors which must be reckoned with in estimating the value of the criterion of ideas. In the first place, an idea may be unintelligible or seemingly allusive because it is inchoate. When is an idea unintelligible because it is inchoate and when is it unintelligible because it is allusive? To decide this question is not always easy. In the second place, the school of criticism which uses this criterion most freely also admits that the documents we now have in the Old Testament represent only the

[139] Cf. Stade's formulation of this principle above, p. 20 f., and n. 42.

wrecks of pre-exilic literature. But when this is recognized, the method of argument just described becomes at times somewhat precarious.[140] Of two passages in which the same idea occurs, will the allusive passage always be subsequent to the self-explanatory, and in case the allusive passage is ascribed to an earlier writer, must its genuineness necessarily be denied? May not both the allusive and the self-explanatory passage alike depend, at times, upon some primitive tradition, either written or oral, but now lost? In that case the origin of an idea may be, hypothetically, much earlier than the time of its first appearance in a given document. Late documents may now be likened to fossil beds; the literary strata may be very late, but many ancient ideas may be found in them.[141] The criticism which thus seeks to get back of the documentary evidence in its investigation of the development of ideas may be called, for want of a better name, the archaeological school of criticism as distinct from the documentary.[142] Yet at one point the schools are in striking agreement. Both start from the assumption, usually a correct one, that a passage in which an idea is only allusively or obscurely referred to is secondary. The difference between them lies in this, that, whereas the literary school tries to show that the allusive passage is secondary to some known document in which the idea is more clearly developed, the archaeological school raises the question whether both passages may not at times be secondary to a still earlier and undocumented tradition. The result of the application of this suggestion to the study of the religion of Israel in general or to Isaiah in particular may easily become revolutionary. For example, the neo-critical school argued that because an idea was alien to Isaiah, therefore it was spurious and *therefore later,* but the archaeological school argues that, if an idea is alien to Isaiah, therefore it *may* be earlier. But if earlier, it is quite conceiv-

[140] To take an illustration out of another field, an analysis of the development of the doctrine of the Trinity should not place too much weight on the fact, even though it is a very interesting one, that the word *trinitas* first occurs, so far as we know, in Tertullian (*Ad Prax.*, c. 2).

[141] Compare the "Priests Code".

[142] See above, n. 3.

able that in spite of its alien character Isaiah may have borrowed it. The archaeological school thus seeks to develop the strategy of a flanking movement against the attack of the neo-critical forces.

But this is by no means all of it. Has anything really been gained, it might be asked, for the defense of the disputed passages in Isaiah? Is not the idea in question *still* alien and can it, therefore, even yet be admitted to be genuine? At this point the second main feature in archaeological criticism comes to view. It scorns the psychologizing of the neo-critical school. If it can only be once established that a given idea is older than Isaiah but is now found in Isaiah's prophecies, its genuineness cannot be rejected just because it happens to be out of touch with Isaiah's thinking. By the time it gets to Isaiah the idea may have lost its original meaning and become simply a convention and Isaiah may have used it without being aware of its real conflict with his views. Luther undoubtedly carried a large amount of Roman Catholic ballast over into Protestantism without being aware of its inner disagreement with his own fundamental conceptions. Why may not Isaiah have done the same? Thus the attempts of the neo-critics always to relate a given idea in Isaiah to his other ideas, and, if this cannot be done, to declare it to be spurious is, it is claimed, an illegitimate attempt at psychologizing. But how can it be proved that a given idea is earlier than Isaiah, or the eighth-century prophets? In certain cases, it is maintained, by a very easy method. If the idea is *mythical*, it is primitive and therefore pre-prophetic. At this point the archaeological school advances beyond the limits of the Old Testament into the field of comparative religions in order to point out analogies and show the essentially mythical character of certain ideas that had never before been suspected. Thus, over against the neo-critical insistence a) upon the criterion of ideas, b) upon their documentation within the Old Testament canon, and c) upon psychological considerations in the endeavor to relate them to each other, the archaeologists lay the emphasis a) upon the great body of undocumented tradition of which there are many hints in the documents themselves, b) upon the larger background of ancient oriental thought

outside the canonical scriptures, and c) upon the mythological character of much of this tradition and thought. In a word, where the neo-critic insists upon psychology, the archaeological critic is apt to insist upon mythology. Now the danger in archaeological criticism is even more apparent than in literary criticism. As soon as the historian leaves his documents, he embarks on the uncharted sea of conjecture. Still, that is what Columbus did, and he discovered a continent. It remains to be seen whether the archaeological critic will be as successful.

Gunkel may fairly be called the founder of the archaeological school. He was very happy in his choice of a field in which to try out the new method. "In his *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (1895) he proved that in many passages in the Bible, and particularly in the first chapters of Genesis, there are borrowings, reminiscences, and allusions which can be traced to the Babylonian Cosmogonic Poems. The method he pursued was to take many phrases, words, and ideas in the Bible, and show that by themselves they were unintelligible; to be understood they must be set in a larger context. The Babylonian creation epic furnishes this context. In the application of the method it appeared that many ideas which are now found only in late portions of the Bible and which, for this reason, were supposed to be themselves late, had a long antecedent history in Hebrew literature and tradition. Gunkel himself suggested that the same method should be applied to the subject of Hebrew eschatology generally, and in (Bousset und Gunkel) *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Heft I (1903) he sketched out a history of the eschatological idea of the Day of the Lord on the basis of this new method of research. But it remained for Gressmann in his *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1906) to subject for the first time the whole problem of Old Testament eschatology to a reexamination in the light of Gunkel's new method".[143] But at the outset it should be observed that in dealing with the ἔσχατα Gressmann is at a decided disadvantage as compared with Gunkel who dealt with the πρῶτα. Gunkel had actual

[143] See for the above paragraph the authors article in the Harvard Theological Review, Oct. 1913, p. 504.

documents to fall back on, even if they were not biblical documents. The Babylonian accounts of creation were in existence. But there is no epic of the end of the world. There is no eschatological myth as there is a creation myth, at least there is none such that is clearly recognizable. The application of the new method to eschatology is therefore beset with far more pitfalls than was its application to the creation myth.

Now it is from the point of view of archaeological criticism that Gunkel and, especially, Gressmann attempt to defend the genuineness of those prophecies in Isaiah which the neo-critical school have so vigorously assailed. Into an examination of the various conjectures of these scholars, often brilliant, sometimes convincing, it is impossible to enter. It is enough to note that in the following four particulars which immediately concern us they have either proved their case or at least the benefit of the doubt may be allowed them. 1) They have proved with certainty that the doctrine of the Day of the Lord existed before Amos in a popular form. It was a day in which Jahweh was to deliver his people. The prophets moralized this popular nationalist doctrine and turned the day of deliverance into one of destruction because of the people's sins.[144] 2) They have made probable the pre-prophetic[145] existence of the doctrine of the Remnant, also in a popular form in which Israel was the Remnant. This, of course, depends upon the genuineness and interpretation of Amos 5 15. The genuineness of this verse is not undisputed, yet usually accepted, as for example by even so radical a critic as Marti. Its interpretation is not so certain, but the interpretation by the archaeological school, according to which the Remnant is identified with Joseph, is certainly attractive. 3) They have also maintained the pre-prophetic character of the doctrine of the Messiah. This was supposed to be originally a mythological conception which later became attached to the Davidic dynasty and so historicised. A main proof for this thesis, and it is certainly a striking one, is the connection of the Golden Age with the Twig of Jesse in Is. 11. 4) Finally, Gressmann has produced

[144] This much has always been recognized by the neo-critical school; the implications of Amos 5 18 are too plain to be ignored.

[145] 'Pre-prophetic' is used by Gressmann of the period before Amos.

considerable evidence that the Gog prophecy in Ezekiel is not simply "the child of reflection" which it is usually taken to be, but contains many mythological and therefore pre-historic elements. But we have seen that the Messianic and especially the anti-Assyrian prophecies have been brought down to a later date partly because of their striking similarity to the *theologoumena* of Ezekiel. Thus Gunkel and Gressmann seek to cut in behind the neo-critical school and to show that the main features of the eschatology of hope which were supposed to be late post-exilic are in reality early pre-prophetic, having existed in popular form long before the eighth-century prophets, and some of them, because of their mythological character, being even pre-historic. This position may be regarded as the major premise of the archaeological school. Granting it to be true for the sake of the argument, does the archaeological school provide an adequate system of defense based on this premise to meet the attack of the neo-critics? I shall confine myself in what follows to a discussion of Gressmann's and Sellin's positions because these have been the most elaborately worked out.[146]

II. Gressmann and Sellin.

Gressmann begins by attacking the criteria utilized by the documentary school to cast doubt on the genuineness of the eschatology of hope. 1) In the first place, the criterion of language is inadequate, especially when drawn from a comparatively few verses. The justice of this criticism is increasingly recognized by scholars. Attention has already been called to the very subordinate place the argument occupies in the discussion of the disputed doctrines in Isaiah.[147] 2) The argument from difficulties in style, defective parallelisms etc. in the disputed prophecies is held to be equally unconvincing, for, it is claimed, the same phenomena meet us in the undisputed passages. This generalization needs considerable qualification. It is not true that the prophecies of doom, taken as a whole, are as stylistically defective as the prophecies of hope. The latter have not the charm

[146] See in particular *Ursprung*, pp. 238—250.

[147] See above p. 72.

of "winged words" which is so characteristic of the genuine passages. Further, Gressmann fails to draw a distinction between the stylistic defectiveness of a passage due to text-corruption and the stylistic defectiveness of a passage which is an inherent quality of it, where the stammering tongue betrays the stammering mind.[148] But the argument by which Gressmann seeks to support his criticism of the criteria of language and style is the really important thing. He claims that neither of these criteria can be successfully utilized because of the hopeless state of corruption of the original texts. This corruption is by no means due only to accident; it is attributable very largely to intentional changes. Even the original authors may have worked over their speeches and made them more prosaic![149] One wonders just what the purpose of such a performance might be. "Again, later exegetes and copyists have remodeled the text... emending, supplementing, abbreviating, explaining . . . just as happens in hymn-books to-day"[150]. Thus the argument against the genuineness of a passage drawn from its vocabulary and style is met by the assertion that, owing to extensive textual changes both accidental and deliberate, it is difficult to say just what the vocabulary and style originally were. "Our attitude toward the text must be in principle suspicious".[151] 3) But a third objection is advanced, which is most far-reaching in character and leads from the criticism of the criteria of vocabulary and style to the criticism of the criterion of ideas. It is a consideration which seems to be advanced in order to meet the objection drawn from the fact that the Messianic passages were never referred to by Isaiah's immediate successors. In the prophecies of hope, we are told, the prophets were peculiarly dependent upon the popular mythological eschatology: "The content is only to a limited extent their own original product; how far the form is

[148] Compare 2 6-22 (a badly corrupted text) with c. 4 (a badly corrupted style).

[149] *Ursprung*, p. 240.

[150] *Ib.*

[151] *Ib.* At this point Gressmann and Harold Wiener are remarkably alike in their apologetic method, though in everything else they are poles apart.

theirs we cannot know. But when we reflect how relatively many are the mythological elements contained in the few passages of eschatological hope, we will not dare to deny that the prophets also depended in their expressions on their predecessors".[152] From this alleged dependence upon the earlier eschatology Gressmann infers that we are not to expect a recurrence of their characteristic style and ideas, "since they are absolutely isolated, and speak of things which are never touched upon elsewhere in a peculiar way".[153]

All this means, if the logic of Gressmann's first three arguments is accepted, an almost total lack of originality in the hopes of the eighth-century prophets. The texts have been so badly preserved that we cannot be sure of what the original style was. And even when we get back to the approximately original texts, we find that both the style and ideas are borrowed from earlier undocumented sources. Gressmann arrives at the revolutionary conclusion that *ideas no longer can serve as a critical criterion.* The only valid criterion he admits is the historical background.[154] This means, in principle, the abandonment of most of the hard-won results of neo-criticism, which, as we have seen, operates principally with the criterion of ideas, the abandonment even of any attempt to criticise the tradition implied in the present position of a prophecy in a given book, unless its historical background is clearly proved to be later, as in the case of the Babylonian prophecies. Dogma in the guise of tradition is thus practically reinstated. But why is Gressmann so sceptical of the traditional text and so trusting with respect to the traditional arrangements of the canon? A classic illustration of the lengths to which our author is prepared to go is found in his treatment of Is. 9 1–6.[155] Gressmann's analysis of the real character of this passage is probably correct. It is by

[152] P. 241. An admission, by the way, that the style in these prophecies *did* differ considerably from the style in the doom prophecies.

[153] P. 242. He says of Is. 9 1 ff. that the earlier it is dated, the more likely it is to have preserved an ancient tradition which later faded away completely, p. 283.

[154] P. 243.

[155] Pp. 279–284.

no means a self-explanatory passage and is full of difficulties on the supposition of its Isaianic authorship. These difficulties are fully admitted by Gressmann, but they make no more impression on his view of its genuineness than they would upon a post-Reformation theologian's. The general style of the passage, we are told, is not Isaiah's; it belongs either to the 'court' style or the 'eschatological' style, and in either case is borrowed from traditional formulas. The particular form of the passage must not be attributed to him; it is too loosely put together to be the work of such an excellent stylist. Lastly the ideas are not Isaiah's; they are mythical and hence could not have originated with him, but must have been borrowed from primitive tradition. I have never before chanced upon an apologetic method which seeks to defend the genuineness of a passage by pointing out that in not one single particular has it any relationship to the reputed author's style or thought.[156] Such a defense has the merit of originality, at any rate. Can the existence of a conventional style and a body of conventional ideas, by the assumption of which this astonishing result is achieved, really take the place of the coherence of thought which we have a right to expect in a man of Isaiah's mental powers? This raises once more the question of the legitimacy of the criterion of ideas in critical discussion. But before this can be more fully treated it is necessary to consider the way in which Gressmann disposes of another objection raised against the genuineness of the hope prophecies by the documentary school. 4) This objection is drawn from the contexts of most of the disputed prophecies. They stand in the most impossible contexts, and from this their spuriousness has been inferred. Gressmann, as usual, admits the premise but denies the conclusion. He turns the argument in the same way as he sought to turn the preceding arguments. The lack of connections observable in the case of the hope prophecies are also seen in the case of the doom prophecies. *All* the prophetic

[156] Gressmann seeks to avoid the inevitable consequences of his position when he says: "Because of the dependence of the prophets upon such a conventionalized style, their originality, of course must not be minimized, though it cannot always be proved in detail" (p. 281). This assertion in general of what is denied in particular fails to carry any conviction.

utterances are fragmentary and unconnected. The analogy is drawn between them and the synoptic Gospels in which so many unconnected logia are found.[157] Thus Gressmann adopts the fragmentary hypothesis of Isaiah in its extremest form and makes capital out of it for his own purposes. Everything in the book being fragmentary, the argument from the lack of connection is claimed to be no longer pertinent. This counter is ingenious but not adequate. The neo-critical argument is not simply from the lack of connection, but from the *contradictory character of the connection* which is established in the present compilation. The analogy with the Gospels would be more exact if, after every passage which opposed the legalism of the Pharisees, we should find a passage which would support that legalism, such as we actually do find at Mt. 5 19. The prophecies of hope not only lack organic connection with their contexts, they usually paralyse the prophecies of doom, and this is done so regularly as to appear to be deliberate. Gressmann feels this difficulty and introduces a new consideration in order to meet it, namely, Style. Possibly the juxtaposition of hope and doom "is the remnant of an eschatological style according to which the singer first recited a song that treated of the time of doom and in immediate connection therewith another song that glorified the time of blessing. *We cannot adequately estimate the mighty power of the Style*".[158] In the American Journal of Theology for 1913 (p. 176) Gressmann suggests a somewhat different explanation: "The promises are as different from the threats as love songs from funeral dirges. . . . But unless special reasons force us to do so, we have no right to establish a connection between a threat and a promise, for a poem rounded out in itself is not to be joined to another poem complete in itself. This simple consideration disposes of nearly all the arguments against the authenticity of . . . the Messianic hopes . . . It is said the prophet could not threaten and promise at one and the same time. But he does not do so. The conjunction of the two is purely arbitrary. But there is no reason why a prophet should not threaten at one time and promise at another, just as the poet may now mourn the death of a friend and again sing as

157 P. 239. 158 P. 244.

a lover". A simple consideration indeed! Granted that the poet may sing a dirge or a love-ditty at different times, is it his habit to combine them: dirge and ditty, dirge and ditty, dirge and ditty? Is it not possible to group poems of similar nature together? The compiler of the Lamentations certainly had a sense of the fitness of things and so did the compiler of Songs; if Lamentations and Songs were combined together, we would no doubt have a new and remarkable instance of Gressmann's "style" and just about as intelligible as the examples we now find in Isaiah. But Gressmann's analogy breaks down at another point. Isaiah is neither a troubadour nor a professional elegist. He is a prophet, and a prophet who, on Gressmann's own showing, took his work very seriously. The dirge-and-ditty theory cannot possibly apply to his work. Why should a prophet whose message is one of warning (c. 6) regularly accompany it with happy tunes. Is it conceivable that Isaiah deliberately set about to polarize his own lightning in this fashion? Even Gressmann seems to have qualms at this point. He is not quite clear at times as to whether the sequence of fear and hope is due to the original author or to the compiler. If the later alternative is adopted, Gressmann's defense of the genuineness of the hope passages is seriously weakened. Once admit the compiler's hand in these suspicious sequences, and the question will inevitably be raised whether his work consists *only* in arrangement. If the later revisers are ready to emend texts as freely as Gressmann admits, what is to hinder them from supplementing the ancient oracles by observations of their own? On the other hand, if the prophets themselves were responsible for these sequences, is not their mental integrity seriously compromised? Thus far Gressmann has sought to meet (as I believe unavailingly) the argument from vocabulary, style, ideas, and contextual relationships against the genuineness of the hope prophecies. But there is a fifth argument against them which Gressmann admits to be the strongest of all. 5) The fact of the contradictory connections between the threats and the hopes cannot be properly estimated apart from the further fact that the eschatology of hope is in fundamental opposition to the eschatology of doom. In view of this second fact the

present artificial connections between the two groups gains a new significance. It is noticeable that Gressmann does not bring these two objections together as he should do; he prefers to destroy them separately. In this he follows the Hengstenberg-Keil method of apologetic, which always went on the supposition that critical arguments follow the analogy of a chain which is destroyed when its separate links are broken, and not the analogy of a rope which is by no means rendered useless even though separate strands may be severed. But Gressmann places himself squarely on the neo-critical hypothesis that the pre-exilic prophets are messengers of doom, and he distinguishes these "stormy petrels" from those birds of calm, the post-exilic prophets who preach hope. However, says Gressmann, the prophets were after all human beings. They were patriots; they loved their nation. We cannot expect them to be everywhere and always absolutely logical. They must have yielded at times to the popular hopes. The few, and Gressmann admits there are but few, genuine prophecies of hope, are the concessions which they made to the popular eschatology.[159] This sounds plausible and psychologically quite intelligible as an abstract proposition.[160] It appeals to us of the present day. Moreover (and here Gressmann plays his trump card), the documentary critic must admit that at one point Isaiah actually took over one of the great doctrines in the eschatology of hope, namely the doctrine of the Remnant. But "with [the acceptance of] the doctrine of the Remnant, the rigid eschatology of doom is broken through. A breach has now been made through which the whole, or at least the greater part, of the eschatology of hope can enter. Whether a little more or a little less, that was left to the taste of the individual prophet".[161] Bud did Isaiah have a taste for the old popular eschatology of hope with its many mythical features, which Gressmann takes particular pains to tell us must be pre-prophetic because it could not possibly have arisen out of the advanced ethical theology of the prophets? How are we to decide this question? We

159 P. 242 ff., 236, 68.

160 Perhaps at this point Gressmann himself does not escape the danger of modernizing the prophets which the neo-critics are supposed to run.

161 P. 243.

have just three data to guide us: a) The precise definition of his message given by the prophet himself in the account of his call (c. 6), namely, to announce the doom of the nation; b) the general historical and religious situation which is known with some particularity—a time of political crisis occasioned by the Assyrian advance and a time of ethical abuses and religious apostasy; c) finally, our estimate of the man's creative power, which can be gathered from his undisputed prophecies and which show him to be a man of genius. Now, to hold that a man of such force and originality, a man, also, of such literary skill, profoundly convinced as he was of the people's apostasy from God and with no evidence of their repentance, should be responsible for the artificial sequences of fear and hope existing in the present book is simply inconceivable. Scorn of psychologizing criticism and the suggestion that Isaiah is dependent in the present arrangement of his prophecies upon a prophetic style are trivial. The present connections cannot be his work. But once more the question presses: May the prophecies be by him even though the connections between them are not? Here the point urged by Gressmann must be admitted. Isaiah did borrow the thought of the Remnant in all probability out of the popular eschatology of hope. But this very example, instead of making in favor of Gressmann's thesis, makes decidedly against it, for the thought of the Remnant, which seems to have been without any clear moral significance in the popular eschatology, has been moralized by Isaiah in exactly the same way as the popular eschatological doctrine of the Day of the Lord was moralized by Amos. When Isaiah adds his ישוב to שאר at 7 3 and follows this up by a promise of deliverance only on condition of faith (7 9), he has infused a profound moral meaning into the idea of the Remnant. The Remnant implies punishment for sin and is thus connected with the eschatology of doom; but the "shall return" implies repentance and thus the modulation from doom to hope which the Remnant idea implies is given a deeply ethical significance.[162] Thus, in the case of the Remnant, we

[162] Professor J. M. P. Smith's recently proposed solution of the name שאר ישוב (ZATW, 1914, pp. 219—224) which robs it of its spiritual meaning, seems to me to be against the context with its insistence upon faith.

really have a detail out of the eschatology of hope taken over by the prophet but characteristically fused with his own distinctive doctrines. The contrast at this point with the disputed eschatological doctrines is most instructive. For example, if Isaiah had really adopted the doctrine of the Messianic King out of the tradition as Gressmann maintains, we would certainly expect him to have assimilated it to his own thinking more fully than according to Gressmann's representations he actually did do. Our author's interpretation of 7 14, 9 1–6, 11 1 ff. is only a new confirmation of the neo-critical contentions that the idea of the Messiah was fundamentally alien to Isaiah's thinking. Granted that he might have adopted such a doctrine out of the popular eschatology, would he not have excluded from it the mythical elements which in Gressmann's view were attached to it and which conflicted with his theology? Was he not a clear enough and logical enough thinker to do that? Gressmann himself speaks of the "grand one-sidedness" of the eighth-century prophets.[163] They follow out a premise to its bitter conclusion. Are such men likely to confuse their thinking by the admission into it of popular elements which would compromise their theology and their exhortations at the same time?[164] What is true of the Messianic group is preeminently true of the anti-Assyrian group. They are much less moralized than the Messianic prophecies[165] and are admitted

163 "The more we sink ourselves in them the more we discover upon what an isolated height they stand, in their grand one-sidedness without compare" (p. 141).

164 It is not denied that there are certain moral features and that, too, attractive ones, in the portraiture of the Messiah in Is. cc. 9 and 11, but it is claimed the figure does not embody the peculiar religious and ethical interests of Isaiah in the way we would expect, if he was its painter (cf. above, pp. 37—40, 64). He does not relate the doctrine of the Messianic King to his message of doom, or to his doctrine of faith, or to his doctrine of of the Remnant.

165 10 12 might be thought to inject a moralizing tone into the greatest of the anti-Assyrian prophecies and because of this it was defended by Hackmann (see above n. 107). But the style of the verse makes heavily against it and, further, it is interesting to observe how the chastisement of Judah is pushed into a subordinate clause. It becomes only a passing incident in the development of Jahweh's plan which, when v. 12 is accepted as genuine, really culminates in the destruction of Assyria and the deliver-

by Gressmann to be out of harmony with their contexts and with the essence of Isaiah's message.[166] But we are asked to believe that he uttered these oracles, though they were opposed to his profoundest convictions and most prejudicial to the effect of his message, as concessions to the people, and because his patriotism and natural instincts prompted him to indulge in these fancies, and that the extent to which he indulged in them was only a matter of taste! This might do for other prophets, but not for Isaiah. In his case, if anywhere, the criterion of ideas would seem to be applicable. Judged by the commission originally given him, by the demands of his times, and by the creative power displayed in the undisputed prophecies, the unorganized and contradictory character of the eschatology of hope, exclusive of the Remnant idea, must arouse the gravest suspicion. Therefore, is not the neo-critical denial of its genuineness legitimate? By no means, says Gressmann. Such a conclusion ignores the fact of STYLE.

Style—that is the final word in Gressmann's defense of the eschatology of hope in Isaiah. Let us see just how this golden key is perfectly fitted to unlock all the mysteries which have hitherto barred the way to an intelligible theory of Isaiah's prophecies if the great body of cc. 1—39 is accepted as genuine. To begin with, while the disorganization of the eschatology of hope is admitted, we must not take it too seriously. The eschatology of doom is also fragmentary. But just as each half of the whole eschatological construction is disintegrated, so the connection between the two halves is disintegrated. Isaiah is not to be blamed for this state of affairs. Both the eschatology of doom and the eschatology of hope had already become disintegrated before they reached him. Gressmann assumes that in prehistoric times there was a great myth of the destruction of the world and its subsequent restoration, and that the eschatologies of doom and hope both go back to this myth. But by the time these fragments reached the prophets their original connections had been largely forgotten and they had ceased to

ance of Judah, according to the present form of the chapter. 10 21-23 can only be defended as Isaiah's when separated from their anti-Assyrian context, and even then they are very doubtful.

[166] Cf. pp. 177—179 with special reference to 8 9 f., 17 11 ff., 29 7.

have any clear and definite meaning. Their ideas had become transformed in the popular eschatology into mere conventions, in other words into a style! Because the prophets adopted these faded-out mythological ideas and the technical terms in which they were expressed from tradition as a part of a conventional eschatological apparatus, they did not trouble themselves about the exact meanings either of the ideas or the terminology, and for the same reason the modern exegete is absolved from all responsibility to discover the original meaning of many of these eschatological details. It is not necessary, we are told, for a style to have any meaning.[167] Thus mythology, faded-out into a convention, a style, takes the place of psychology in criticism and interpretation.[168] How far Gressmann is willing to drive this argument at times is seen in his exposition, if it can be called such, of Is. 7 14. The prophet was using materials furnished by the tradition, which had ceased to have any clearly defined meaning. Thus all the difficulties which have from time immemorial plagued the psychologizing exegesis in its attempts to find a meaning in this passage are airily brushed aside by the assumption that the ideas in this oracle had little meaning for Isaiah himself. The ideas had already become very largely only style for Isaiah; they need remain only style for us also.[169]

[167] "Where there is a style no one asks whether is has any sense or not" (p. 256, cf. 277, 311).

[168] Compare for the substitution of mythology for psychology pp. 193, 195, 196, 198, 216, 244, 253, 255 etc.

[169] Cf. pp. 270—278 "As soon as one assumes that the material is borrowed by Isaiah from the tradition, one is relieved of the above-mentioned difficulties [i. e. the difficulties which have always been found in the Immanuel prophecy]. For from now on one need no longer attach any importance to details, because they are not created *ad hoc* but are handed down in the tradition" (p. 276 f.). It is this utter irresponsibility in the exegesis of the archaeological school which must be deplored. There is undoubtedly a truth in this discovery of a style which must be reckoned with. Gressmann makes very suggestive use of it in his treatment of the idea of the Day of the Lord as expressed in Is. 2. But the fact of style is a fact which must be handled with the greatest care, or it will land him who trusts to it in absurdity. Style is a fire lit to consume away exegetical briars and thorns, but it soon gets beyond control, if one is not very careful.

But why did the prophet resort to these conventional ideas and this meaningless terminology? It was in order to lend his thoughts impressiveness. He spoke ἐν μυστηρίῳ. Can such suggestions really relieve the difficulties of 7 14? Can it be supposed that at one of the greatest crises of Isaiah's life, when, if ever, a message of vital significance was to be expected from him, the prophet was ready to indulge in abracadabra? The fact is, the more Gressmann resorts to style in his defense of the disputed passages, the more he is unconsciously driven to revive the patristic theory of prophecy in a new form. Clement of Alexandria compares Isaiah to the Pythian Apollo who is called Loxias, a title supposed to signify 'oblique',[170] and Tertullian tells us that "God conceals by his preparatory apparatus of prophetic obscurity, the understanding which is open to faith".[171] But is it really credible that a man of such mental integrity and profound seriousness of purpose as Isaiah would cultivate a prophetic style at the expense of prophetic sincerity? A defense of the genuineness of the disputed passages in which mythology and style have become substituted for moral meaning and coherence of thought is one which can afford little comfort, I fancy, to those who are still looking for some cement with which to mend the shattered unity of Isaiah.

But has this defense any scientific advantage over the hypothesis of the neo-critical school? Is it really more probable that the *disjecta membra* of the eschatology of hope were borrowed by Isaiah himself and scattered through his prophecies in the weird fashion in which we now find them, than that they were incorporated by editors of a later day? At this point Gressmann's own admission of revision threatens to undermine the defense which he has so laboriously built up. 6) "A final judgment [upon the question of genuineness] will be possible only when we get a clear idea of the literary composition of the prophetical books, and of the principles by which the sayings

[170] *Stromata*, V. 4.

[171] *Against Marcion*, IV. 25. It is interesting to see how followers of the Gunkel-Gressmann method also go back at times to the theory of the double sense of Scripture without being aware of it. Cf. Herrmann, *Der Messias aus Davids Geschlecht*, ZWTh, 1909, p. 264.

have been arranged."[172] This statement of Gressmann is fundamental. *The question of the genuineness of the disputed prophecies is bound up with the question of an adequate theory of compilation.* Such a theory the neo-critical school actually offers; the critical movement culminates in it,[173] but such a theory the archaeological school fails to offer. Yet the astonishing thing is that Gressmann unhesitatingly adopts the premises upon which the neo-critical theory of revision is based. a) As we have seen, he admits the most extensive revision in the text. But if the texts can be so drastically edited, may not the contents of certain passages also be due to later compilers? Is it not easier to suppose that the incongruous eschatological passages were inserted during the changed conditions after the exile than that Isaiah was guilty of such hackwork? b) This supposition is strengthened by another observation for which Gressmann is indebted to his opponents. He realizes how small a part the eschatology of hope plays in pre-exilic prophecy, but how it absorbs the attention and becomes more coherent in post-exilic prophecy. "What a strange riddle," he exclaims, "first the ruin [the fragmentary eschatology of the pre-exilic period], then the stately castle [the organized eschatology of the post-exilic period]".[174] How is this to be explained? It must be due, we are told, to two migrations of eschatological material into Palestine, one in prehistoric times, upon the fragments of which the early prophets depended, the second much later, when the fusion of oriental religions was much more pronounced.[175] But has not Gressmann endangered the success of his whole campaign by this admission? In attempting to flank the neo-critical attack by the assumption of a pre-prophetic eschatology, has he not exposed his own flank to a very dangerous counter attack? He admits the fact of later extensive revisions, and the fact that when they were made the interest in the eschatology of hope was paramount. What, then, is more natural than the neo-

[172] P. 243.

[173] See above p. 69.

[174] P. 247.

[175] Gressmann admits his indebtedness to Gunkel for this suggestion. See p. 247, n. 1.

critical theory, according to which the revision was made in the interest of this dominant eschatology? Gressmann is on the watch for just this use of his admissions. He answers: "One might be able to regard the mythical elements in the eschatology of hope which, in themselves, must be ancient, as possibly a post-exilic dependence of Israel upon another people; but these mythical fragments of the eschatology of hope are inseparably connected with the eschatology of doom. The Israelite religion would be an insoluble enigma if the two eschatologies . . . . which belong to each other as the two shells of a clam, had migrated into Israel at different times. With what probability could it be supposed that the Israelites borrowed all that was connected with doom before the exile and all that was connected with hope, carefully sifted from the doom, after the exile?"[176] This posing of the question, so far as it concerns the problem of the disputed passages in Isaiah, is entirely misleading. It leaves out of consideration another alternative. The question is not whether all doom entered Israel before the exile and all hope after it; it is whether, granted a pre-prophetic eschatology of hope as well as of doom, Isaiah absorbed the former as well as the latter. It is not only conceivable that Isaiah may have resisted the encroachments of the eschatology of hope, but altogether probable that he did do so. The incongruity of the eschatology of hope both with Isaiah's thought and in the arrangement of his prophecies is admitted by Gressmann. Is the creative genius of Isaiah so powerless in the presence of this traditional material as Gressmann's representations would imply? Gressmann is fond of picturing the various elements in the eschatology of hope as isolated stones or columns, the fragmentary ruins of a once glorious temple.[177] Is Isaiah so unimaginative an architect that he cannot build these fragments up again into something like unity, if he cared to do so? One of these fragments is the doctrine of the Remnant, and this fragment Isaiah *did* use most effectively. Why did he not use the doctrines of the Inviolability of Zion and the Messianic King in the same artistic way instead of in the mechanical way which Gressmann compels us to assume?

[176] P. 245.

[177] P. 238, cf. 232, 191.

What Gressmann's theory amounts to when reduced to its simplest terms is just this: He has substituted for the criterion of ideas a blind faith in tradition. Because the disputed doctrines are found attributed to Isaiah in the present anthology known as the Book of Isaiah, therefore they are by Isaiah. The utter confusion and disorganization in the book and in Isaiah's message which this tradition implies are of no moment. Their evidence can be explained away by the newly discovered solvent of all critical difficulties—Style. Once more the question must be pressed: Can such a theory have any scientific advantage over the theory of the neo-critical school?[178]

[178] At this point an adequate criticism of Sellin's work, *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus*, ought to be introduced, but limitations of time and space prevent any detailed discussion of it. A few remarks upon his general method and aims must suffice. 1) Sellin is an ardent champion of the archaeological method and with all Gressmann's zeal seeks to deduce from present documented obscurities earlier undocumented ideas. He is therefore an opponent of psychologizing in exegesis (cf. the discussion of principles, pp. 105—112, 167 f.) and an advocate of style (cf. p. 170). 2) But at an all-important point he introduces a modification of Gressmann. Gressmann operated extensively with mythology; eschatology for him, both in its threats and in its promises, was rooted in mythology. The most convincing proof that Gressmann has to offer that eschatology is pre-prophetic is the fact that it is mythological. But Sellin seems instinctively to feel the difficulty at this point. The more the mythological character of eschatology is emphasized, in order to prove its pre-prophetic origin, the less likely it becomes that the prophets would make use of it. Hence Sellin labors to substitute morals for mythology in the pre-prophetic eschatology. Sellin will have nothing to do with Gressmann's primeval eschatological myth which reached Israel in a thoroughly disintegrated state. Eschatology goes back to the experiences at Sinai. From the outset Jahweh has the quality of a world-king, but his kingship was to be only gradually manifested. "The origin of the entire Old Testament eschatology is found in the act of revelation at Sinai, through which the germinal hope of a future analogous appearance of Jahweh for the purpose of entering on his world rule, was implanted deep in the heart of the people" (p. 148). At the conquest Jahweh's kingship was partially manifested, but under the Canaanite and Philistine oppression it was gradually realized by the more thoughtful that its complete manifestation was still in the future (cf. p. 184, a lapse into the sin of psychologizing against which Sellin should have more carefully guarded himself). As king, Jahweh was to exercise the functions of

Conclusions.

But are we, then, to conclude that Gressmann's brilliant monograph is only a meteoric flash in the exegetical firmament? Far from it. Gressmann's defense of the disputed prophecies in

Judge and Savior, two thoughts which provide the basis for the eschatologies of doom and hope. These are no longer regarded as disconnected; they are united in the idea of Jahweh's functions as king (p. 132), and as the judgment and salvation are moralized by Sellin, the eschatology which is based on them also becomes moralized. The evidence for all this is admitted to be most meagre (p. 184 f.), and it may be added that such evidence as is offered is of a highly questionable character. Furthermore, Sellin's attempt to banish all mythology behind the mountain barrier of Sinai breaks down. To be sure, he tries to destroy the life of any myths that might chance to cross this mountain wall and to turn them into dead pictures and metaphors, and he suggests that most of the eschatological hopes take their coloring not from myths but from the historical experiences at Sinai and at the conquest of Palestine (cf. 146 ff., 167). But he admits that it is difficult to distinguish at times between the mythical and what he calls the historical (p. 147). In the case of the Messiah the distinction completely breaks down. Sellin finds the roots of the doctrine of the Messiah in the ancient oriental conception of a primeval man, a Paradise-King. But he must resort to hypothetical extra-biblical sources for this conception, since he admits it is not found in the account of Paradise in Gen. 2 and 3 (p. 183). 3) Sellin does not discuss the problem of the doctrine of the Inviolability of Zion, for, strictly speaking, it hardly belongs to his particular subject. Apart from the above very questionable speculations, he seeks to prove the ancient character of the Messianic idea from three groups of passages: a) Is. 7 14, which refers to the well-known 'almah of the eschatological tradition (cf. Gressmann), 9 1 ff., 11 1 ff.; b) the royal psalms, which, it is claimed, can only be explained by the supposition that the eschatological style has been adopted into the court style, and therefore, because these royal psalms must be pre-exilic, the eschatological style which they imply must be still earlier; and c) such passages as Gen. 49 10, the Balaam oracles, and Dt. 33 13 ff. (pp. 167—172). Sellin's use of Is. 7 14 is like Gressmann's and that has already been sufficiently considered. The last group of passages will be considered hereafter, and it will be shown that they make *against* the originality of the Messianic hopes in Isaiah. The argument for the early date of the doctrine of the Messiah drawn from the royal psalms is of the most precarious character, but even if it is granted, it cannot be used to support the genuineness of the disputed passages in Isaiah any more than Gen. 49 19, the Balaam oracles and Dt. 33 13 (see below). 4) And here we arrive at the fundamental weakness of Sellin's

Isaiah is a failure; yet I believe archaeological criticism, when soberly used, will prove to be a valuable corrective to the method of documentary criticism. He has established with great probability the fact of a mythological background for eschatology and therefore a background of high antiquity, out of which much that has hitherto escaped attention gains a new significance and much that has been a source of perplexity is explained. If the fact of a pre-prophetic eschatology is once accepted and combined with one further fact to which Gressmann calls attention, an entirely new perspective is opened up in which to view the problem of Isaiah. The passage in which this combination is made is so important that I venture to quote it at length. "Since eschatology is earlier than Amos, there must have once existed before our canonical worthies certain prophetical schools which glorified the eschatological facts in word and song. The Nebi'im emerge in Samuel's day. In their circles ecstasy was cultivated, which flamed out especially at times of national excitement. Religious patriotism was constantly kindled anew by these men,

book. He assumes that, if once the pre-prophetic date of the Messianic eschatology is accepted, the genuineness of the disputed passages in Isaiah has been established. "We are certain", he says, "that this expectation [of a Messiah] is primitive, already in existence in the prophetic period, and that *in consequence the Tradition as to the origin of the most of the Messianic passages in the scriptures of this period is trustworthy*" (p. 172, see above, p. 93). In view of this assumption, Sellin feels himself to be relieved of the obligation to discuss what we have seen to be the controlling factor in the whole problem, namely the peculiar method of compiling the Book of Isaiah. This point is referred to but once, so far as I have observed, and then very briefly. Sellin advances the two explanations already proposed by Gressmann (see above, p. 82 ff.). Either the prophecies of threat and hope were uttered at different times and were later brought together by compilers, or it may have been a "poetic-prophetic" style to connect them as they are now connected (p. 149). It is unnecessary to repeat the criticisms already passed upon these suggestions. In Sellin's work we have only one more example of the tendency of thought to move in cycles and return to its original starting-points. Gressmann sought to defend the originality of the Messianic passages by the archaeological method of exegesis and the assumption of a great pre-historic eschatological myth. Sellin adopts the exegetical method, rejects the myth in part and goes back only to Sinai. It remains for a still more resolute spirit to rehabilitate Hengstenberg's *Christologie*.

and at times they took a hand in the political crises. These pre-canonical and extra-canonical prophets were half politicians, half soothsayers; only we must deny to them on the average the ethical and religious greatness of our prophets. Although it is not recorded, there is nothing to hinder the supposition that the Nebi'im already cultivated eschatology[179] and handed down the stylistic forms which the canonical prophets made use of. From whom should the latter have received their traditions, if not from those who bore the same name with them? We must ... hold that in the ancient period ... the Nebi'im cultivated eschatology in its entirety, but in the form which we have characterized as popular. Afterwards, beginning with Amos, *a cleavage arose within prophecy, in consequence of which the prophetical development ran parallel to the popular development*".[180] This passage gives food for thought. Gressmann makes use of it to defend the eschatology of hope in Isaiah. Granted the existence of both a pre-prophetic eschatology of hope and also of doom, which "belong together like the two shells of a clam, how should one group of the prophets have sung exclusively of disaster while the other group sang exclusively of hope"?[181] But may not the argument be just reversed, and the connection established by Gressmann between uncanonical prophecy and the eschatology of hope be an additional argument against its genuineness? Here the following facts are to be considered.

1) Gressmann points out how the uncanonical prophets probably utilized the current eschatology in an aggressive nationalistic interest.[182] They were the one hundred per cent patriots of their day. Isaiah, like Jeremiah, was nothing of the kind. Throughout his life he was opposed to the political ventures of Judah. Would such a man have a "taste" for an eschatology that was proclaimed in the interest of a dangerous nationalism? 2) Again, Gressmann argues that because the doom and the hope sides of eschatology belong to each other as the two shells of a clam, it is unlikely

[179] The priests may also be included (cf. Volz, ThLZ 1906, Col. 675).
[180] P. 155 ff.
[181] Pp. 156, 245.
[182] See also above, n. 95, end.

that the uncanonical and the canonical prophets, like the walrus and the carpenter, divided up the bivalves so exactly between them.[183] But elsewhere, when Gressmann wishes to account for the present impossible sequences in Isaiah, he is at pains to demonstrate that the original connection between the two clam-shells had been completely broken down and the prophets themselves were no longer conscious of it. In that case Isaiah may very easily have selected those elements in the popular eschatology which could be made to emphasize his message and have rejected those elements which confused it. 3) As a matter of fact, that is just what he did do in the case of the doctrines of the Day of the Lord and the Remnant. He reformulated them in opposition to the popular eschatology. Was it likely that he would insert into his great prophetic construction still other blocks of the eschatology of hope without attempting to square them off into some sort of symmetry with the rest of his material?[184] On the contrary, if Gressmann's theory of the existence of a popular pre-prophetic eschatology is accepted, have we not a new gauge of the forcefulness and originality of Isaiah? He resisted the temptation to yield to the pseudo-patriotism of his day or to encourage its false hopes. Thus Gressmann supplies just the background needed to throw the isolated grandeur of our prophet into strong relief. But he does something more than this. 4) His theory of a pre-prophetic popular eschatology furnishes at once a needed corrective and a welcome support to the neo-critical theory of the compilation of Isaiah. This theory tended to transfer all the eschatology of hope to the exilic or post-exilic periods. The result was that the Messianic eschatology appeared to be too much of a surprise in the historical development. It arose too suddenly, was too little prepared for; hence the attempt in the neo-critical school to explain it as a 'child of reflection'. Gressmann's protest against this is timely. He calls attention to many elements in the eschatology of hope

183 P. 156.

184 It is interesting to observe how Sellin (pp. 186—190) admits that Isaiah and the other prophets set much of their own eschatology into the sharpest antithesis to the popular eschatology, but in the case of the Messiah this was not done. Why not?

(especially the golden age) which cannot well be so explained. The documentary critics, or at least their popularizers, have too often made the same mistake here as they have made in the case of the P material. Because its present form and meaning are late, the fact is often overlooked that a large part of its contents is not only pre-exilic but actually primitive in origin. Gressmann's investigations supply the means by which the post-exilic eschatology can be recognized as organically connected with the past without at the same time endangering the neo-critical theory. They go to show that the Messianic eschatology had its roots sunk deep into the past, though they were sunk, not in the soil of pre-exilic canonical prophecy as Gressmann and Sellin maintain, but in the soil of pre-exilic uncanonical prophecy.[185] Even in that case it sprang out of the deep rich soil of history and was not simply the fruit of reflection. It is not only conceivable but highly probable, in view of what has been said, that Amos, Isaiah, and Micah, and possibly Hosea, set their faces as a flint against the popular eschatology of their day, whereas the later prophets may not have done so as consistently.[186] The changed historical situation would easily account

[185] When Volz (pp. 74—78) suggested that the doctrine of the Messiah appeared in connection with the Deuteronomic reforms, he, too, evidently felt the difficulty of supposing that it sprang into existence fully developed, and therefore he suggested that this doctrine had been previously cultivated by the uncanonical prophets (pp. 88, 91).

[186] In this connection I would raise the question whether a much larger amount of material in the Old Testament than is commonly supposed did not originate within the circles which we are accustomed to characterize as uncanonical prophets. Strictly speaking, the use of the terms 'canonical' and 'uncanonical' prophets is inaccurate in this connection. At the time when this material was composed there was of course no division between canonical and uncanonical prophets, for there was as yet no canon. Our prophets speak of their opponents as 'false' prophets. But would the distinction between the false and the true prophets have always been obvious to contemporaries? By no means. Furthermore it would be as much against historical analogy to suppose that all the prophets of the eighth century were bad except Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah as it would be to suppose that all Pharisees in New Testament times were bad. There must have been gradations of all sorts within the general movement of prophecy. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah were four individuals within this general movement, who held a common

for the changed attitude, and from the time of Ezekiel on, the eschatology of hope could easily gain an ascendency over the eschatology of doom. The development of Messianic eschatology

point of view. But it was a minority point of view, and so far as we can gather it had little effect upon their contemporaries. There must also have been a considerable literature representing majority opinions. Just because it *did* represent majority opinion, that is, current opinion, it could easily lapse into the anonymity which is the usual characteristic of Semitic literature. On the other hand, the very fact that the writings of the four great prophets differed so startlingly from the writings of their contemporaries would tend to the preservation of the names of their authors, especially when their attitude was, at least, in part, justified by the events. Now the point of all this is, that it is altogether probable that we have also preserved to us prophecies or poetry which represented the majority views. Sachsse, who admits gradations among the uncanonical prophets (*Die Propheten des A. T. und ihre Gegner*, p. 8) should go further and also admit gradations in the prophetical literature which afterwards became canonized. The fact that the majority views were not always vindicated by the event would by no means signify that they would be ultimately repudiated altogether. They expressed the general hopes and beliefs of the people, and people are not so ready to give up what they like, even though they have incurred disappointments in holding on to it. One clear case of a prophecy representing the popular point of view, though out of a somewhat later time, is that of Nahum. There are also a few precious fragments out of a much earlier time which reflect the same general point of view. These are the poems or prophecies upon which Gressmann and Sellin especially rely to prove a pre-prophetic eschatology of hope. They are Judges 5, Gen. 49, Dt. 33 and the Balaam oracles (Numbers 23, 24). These fragments are generally supposed to antedate the prophetic movement. In all of them a very intense nationalism is expressed. Now it is a striking fact that instead of building upon the ideas in these fragments, our eighth-century prophets are in violent opposition to them. Indeed, it almost seems, at times, as if they were consciously preaching against them. The significance of this antithesis so far as I have observed has been largely overlooked. a) Compare the blessings upon Joseph in Gen. 49 25-26 and Hosea's terrible curses in 9 11, 12, 14, 16, and 10 1, 13 1. b) Compare Dt. 33 17 and 1 Kings 22 11. The passage in Kings, even though it may be much later than the eighth-century prophecy, reflects quite accurately the opposition of that prophecy to what it considered to be false prophecy. c) I would call especial attention to Nu. 23 21b, according to which the claim is made that Jahweh is with Israel, contrasted with the exhortation in Amos 5 14, "Let Jahweh God of Hosts be with you *as ye have said*". The contradiction is not only in idea but in the words themselves. d) Finally compare Nu. 23 9b

would then be precisely analogous to the development of the Law. This, too, as cult practice, originated in primitive times. The early prophets denounced it in the most uncompromising terms. Yet it managed to secure a good orthodox position within the canon later on.[187] Similarly, we may surmise, the eschatology which had been repudiated by the earlier prophets of the eighth century was gradually adopted by the prophets of later ages. As prophecy in spite of its great leaders made terms with the Law in Deuteronomy, so it made terms with eschatology in the post-exilic period. We need not predicate two distinct migrations of eschatology as Gressmann does, one very ancient and the other in post-exilic times. Rather, the ancient

with the prologue to Amos. In the Balaam oracle there is the most intense national self-consciousness and feeling of superiority to other nations; in Amos Israel is included in the common doom of the nations (Amos 1 and 2). In all these early poems nationalism is highly developed; it is the stock in trade of the majority prophets from the time of Jonah the son of Amittai (2 K. 14 25) to the time of Jeremiah's opponents. But it is this very nationalism that is rebuked by eighth-century prophecy and later by Jeremiah. Accordingly, these poems are the last places to look for support in defending the eschatology of hope in eighth-century prophecy. On the contrary, the prophetic opposition to them shows how unlikely it would be for the prophets to share their hopes. If Sellin's view could be proved, that the royal psalms were early and had borrowed a still earlier eschatological style, the prophets would be found in the same opposition to them as to these other poems.

[187] This analogy was first suggested to me by Professor J. M. P. Smith in a personal conversation in which I was sketching out to him the general positions advanced above. In this connection the statement of Stade is important: "The reconciliation of the prophetic thoughts about religion with the popular thoughts and customs is completed in the exile" (*Biblische Theologie* I. p. 209). This statement applies to eschatology as well as to the cult. When Stade says that the catastrophe of the Exile led to the rejection of the prophecies of Jeremiah's opponents, so that nothing of this literature has come down to us (p. 216), he goes too far. The ideas of Jeremiah's opponents certainly persisted after a fashion, and at least some of the still earlier literature which reflected the same doctrines may well have been preserved. Its antiquity would clothe it with sanctity. The Psalter is the great store-house of this popular eschatology in the post-exilic period. In the Psalter the tendencies of legalism, majority prophecy and minority prophecy are found in the most interesting juxtaposition.

eschatology, suppressed for a time by the stern puritanism of the early prophets, gradually worked its way to the surface in their post-exilic successors[188] and became particularly influential in the revision of the ancient texts.[189] As has often happened in the history of religion, the popular, the superficial, the dogmatic, triumphed over the essential, the inward, the spiritual. The early prophets did not make concessions to popular hopes, but prophecy in its later developments did do this. Prophecy was many-sided, but the early prophets were one-sided. They drove their ethical premises to the limit. Therein they were not modern, and it is at *this* point that we must be on our guard against the temptation to modernize them. Their ethical abandon had, as Hölscher well brings out, a touch of the ancient nabi' in it, his intenseness, his ecstatic temperament.[190] That interpretation which emphasizes the ethical and spiritual in them rather than the supernaturalistic and apocalyptic is not an attempt to modernize them, but is a hard-won recognition of their real character. They were the great protesters. They protested against magic and sorcery, that is, against the superstition of a materialistic spiritism, against the popular morals of the time, against the popular cult, against the popular eschatology and most important of all, though it has been largely overlooked, *against the popular political nationalism which is implied in that eschatology.* In these respects their message still claims attention. In fact, none is more sorely needed at the present time. And among all who first proclaimed this message Isaiah is the chief.

188 Cf. also Sellin, p. 189.

189 This possibility Sellin pays no attention to on p. 189 or 191, where he rejects Gressmann's theory of two migrations.

190 *Die Profeten*, p. 204.