

there is so much of unfulfilled prophecy as to destroy the common popular argument. Holding that the sole purpose of the prophets was to influence the men of their day, he maintains that predictions not fulfilled in that generation were no prediction at all. The predictions against Babylon, for example, in the days of Nebuchadnezzar were no predictions, because Babylon continued to flourish after Nebuchadnezzar's death. But whatever may have been true of particular cases, it is absurd to say that predictions of long date could have been of no use to existing generations. Men are not all of Hezekiah's temperament; patriotic souls will be profoundly moved by the thought of good or of evil coming on their country for long ages to come.

As to prophecy unfulfilled, it seems as if all rationalist writers had a particular ill-will to the prophets that foretold the doom of Tyre. Theodore Parker, Professor Jowett, Dr. S. Davidson, and Dr. Kuenen have all fastened on one or other of the predictions against Tyre as unfulfilled. But with little success. Take, for instance, the prophecy in Ezek. xxvi., where the utter desolation of Tyre is foretold. It has been objected that the prophet foretells that under the famous siege of Nebuchadnezzar, the city would undergo a destruction more thorough than that which actually occurred. All is to be destroyed; but in reality, after Nebuchadnezzar, Tyre was strong enough to sustain a very long siege under Alexander the Great. But here, as in not a few cases, the objection proceeds on a careless reading of the prophecy. For it is not said that Tyre would suffer all this from Nebuchadnezzar, but that (v. 3) God would cause "*many nations* to come up against Tyre, *as the sea causeth his waves to come up.*" Nebuchadnezzar was only one of the waves; after him many more were to follow. Another instance of careless reading is found in the charge of Professor Jowett against Amos, who foretold (vii. 9), according to the Professor, that King Jeroboam would die of the sword; whereas he died in his bed. But the critic must have actually failed to read a few verses further on, else he would have seen that the enemies of Amos brought a charge of disloyalty against him for prophesying that the King would be slain; to which the prophet replied that he had prophesied nothing of the kind, but only that *the house* of Jeroboam would be given to the sword.

We have but touched the fringe of a great subject, and have had to omit many things that we should have wished to say. The conclusion to which we desire to come is, that the evidential value of prophecy has not been impaired by the discussion that has been raised recently on the subject. We will not say that no new difficulties have been brought up, or that no new reasons for care and caution in the interpretation of the prophetic scriptures have been shown; but with due allowance for these, we hold that nothing has been made out to weaken our faith in the truth that "the prophecy came not of old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."