

done at the demand of the canon we have described, and to save the theory. For if these two chapters are allowed to Jeremiah, no valid reason can be given for denying xiii. and xiv. to Isaiah, or, indeed, for denying to him xl.-lxvi. So at all hazards, against the claim of the writer, against the demands of a similar phraseology, against the opinions of antiquity, Jeremiah l.-li. must be made out a forgery.

Isaiah xv., xvi. The dates of these chapters are in doubt. The style is thought to differ from Isaiah's, and hence they are supposed to be borrowed by Isaiah from some earlier prophet.

Chapter xxiv. 1-13. This passage is not from the pen of Isaiah, for the following sapient reasons:

(1) "It lacks a suitable occasion in Isaiah's age." Of course the critics know all about that age; they know every event of importance in Israel and the neighboring countries of that time. The fact that we have few records of the period, and that those we have are not very trustworthy, according to the critics, has not prevented them from thoroughly mastering the history of that age.

(2) "The literary treatment (in spite of certain phraseological points of contact with Isaiah) is in many respects unlike Isaiah's."

Here is another strong point with the critics. They know the literary peculiarities of every sacred writer, and the literary characteristics of every period to a nicety. So accurate, minute, and infallible is their instinct here that, if you give them only a dozen verses, they will tell you out of hand the author and the age. Nor can you perplex them by giving a passage whose phraseology resembles a certain writer. Their unfailing literary instinct brushes these resemblances aside, and detects at once the decisive characteristics. If there is any one feature in which your modern critic excels specially, it is literary insight.

(3) "There are features in the representation that seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah's."

This third reason is very delicate and dainty, indeed. Only the nicest and most exquisite sense can appreciate it. It requires the very highest attainments in the critical art to substantiate it with cogent reasons. For to do so one must know his author not simply in a general way; he must be very familiar with him,