

of the modern critics. Not only is the second half cut away altogether, but a large part of the first half is not allowed to be Isaianic. The first twelve chapters are genuine, but chapter xiii. and the first twenty-three verses of xiv. is supposed to belong to the exile. "The Jews are represented here as being in exile in Babylon, but shortly to be released through the intervention of the Medes." We have in chapter xiii. an account of the conflict, capture, and sack of the city, the great slaughter attending this event, and the utter desolation that will finally mark the site of the city. Chapter xiv. 1, 2, tells why this destruction is sent upon Babylon; it is because the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, etc.

The critic proceeds to say: "This does not belong to Isaiah's age" (Driver, 201); which opinion is based on the canon of criticism we have quoted: "It is the office of a prophet to address himself to the need of his own age," etc.

And we are directed to Jeremiah i. and li. as the best commentary on this section of Isaiah; which chapters of Jeremiah, we are told, "were written on the eve of, or during, the exile." Well, we turn to these chapters of Jeremiah, and we find them just as marvellous as the passage before us would be on the supposition that Isaiah wrote it. For Jeremiah gives in these chapters a most thrilling and circumstantial account of the ruin of Babylon by the Medes, and the utter overthrow of the empire. Now, if Jeremiah could give such an account on the eve of the exile, so many years before the event, there is no serious objection to supposing that Isaiah could give a similar account a century earlier. For the prediction in Jeremiah is most minute; not giving in general terms only the overthrow of the city, but giving particulars of the dreadful event as they actually occurred. It must therefore be allowed that we have here evidently the finger of God, or else these chapters were written after the event. If written after, why was Cyrus not mentioned? If written long enough before to allow the author to see the Medes in threatening attitude, while Cyrus had not yet appeared upon the horizon as the great agent, how shall we account for the circumstantial character of the prophecy in describing the fall of the city and the after desolation?

Anxious to know how these difficulties are disposed of in the new theory, we turn to the analysis of these chapters by Driver,