

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## Where Was Isaiah XL-LXVI Written?

WILLIAM H. COBB

CONGREGATIONAL LIBRARY, BOSTON

**D**URING the nineteenth century these chapters suffered an exile from Palestine to Babylon for just seventy years; beginning in the eighteen hundred twenties, when Gesenius took up the opinion of a few critical scholars and changed it from a minority to a majority; and ending in the eighteen hundred nineties, when Bernhard Duhm, like another Sheshbazzar, led his captivity captive. But according to the prevalent view this return was only partial, as in the days of Cyrus; the better portion of these chapters refused to follow their leader into Phœnicia. Now, as of old, it is the good figs that are left in Babylon. Trito-Isaiah, the Palestinian, by the testimony of his creator and of those who believe in him, is a prophet of inferior rank, not worthy to be compared with Deutero-Isaiah his model. The works of the latter comprise, some say nine chapters, most say thirteen, others sixteen, from which are to be subtracted, however, according to Duhm and many more, the four poems on the Servant. I believe that not even nine chapters belong in Babylonia, but that all are Palestinian.

If we were to plunge into the problem of the Servant of Jahwe, — whose ramifications Feldmann<sup>1</sup> has so patiently explored of late, — we should find confusion worse confounded; we could only say with Cornill (*Theol. Rundschau*, 1900, S. 414 ff.), “I should like to see the man whose head would not spin around like a top from surveying these opinions, which run through all possible permutations, and contradict one another at all conceivable points.”

<sup>1</sup> *Der Knecht Gottes*, 1907. By attempting to cover the whole ground Feldmann takes some things at second-hand, and falls into a few natural

There are three different subjects which can hardly be separated—the question of date, the question of integrity, and the question of locality. Although the last is the question before us, it seems best to orient oneself on the other two. The question of date ought to be attacked (and decided, if possible) by *historical* evidence. What is the situation in these twenty-seven chapters? Were they written under Nabûna'id or Darius or Artaxerxes, or earlier than any of these, or later, or at various times? I answer with confidence: We cannot tell. The historical allusions are insufficient; they affect different minds, and even the same mind, differently. I am fond of quoting Kuenen's dictum in his *Godsdienst*: "We know for certain that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah are the productions of a later prophet, who flourished in the second half of the sixth century B.C." Despite the precision of this statement, Kuenen himself admitted, a few years after, that we know but in part; he reduced the twenty-seven chapters of the Babylonian prophet to nine, extended the one author of the twenty-seven to a circle of authors, and the period of composition to the fifth century. And yet no new historical evidence had dawned upon him, nor has any been discovered in our generation, when König still dates the whole within the single decade 549–540, and Torrey (who also believes in the unity of the poems) brings them down to the fifth or fourth century, while Cheyne and Kittel allow a range of two full centuries, from Cyrus to Ochus, and Bertholet requires for his theory almost two centuries more, to the Maccabees. The very same material, in the hands of Sellin, points to Zerubbabel in 1898, to Jehoiachin in 1901. In 1907 we have Workman regarding the tyrant oppressor in these chapters as the Babylonian power; we have also Thirtle identifying him with Sennacherib; and I would undertake to prove in the same way that he was Napoleon Bonaparte, as pious Englishmen believed only a

error. Thus, on page 28 he gives verbatim from Budde the correct statement of my general position (*JBL*, 1895), and then wrongly infers on the next page that I included 50 ~~←~~ among the Servant passages.

hundred years ago. In short, any man with a plausible theory and a lively historical imagination can use these chapters as a nose of wax and conform them to his particular notion of chronology.<sup>2</sup>

To pass now to the other preliminary subject, I think that one main reason why opinions are so divergent upon this second point is that each critic imports his own view of the date or dates into the question of integrity, a question which ought to be settled (and can be) not on historical, but on *literary* grounds. Cornill in his *Introduction* (1905) makes the following statement: "In any case, the conviction that chapters 56-66 are to be dissevered from Deutero-Isaiah, and are younger than the latter, may now be regarded as the prevailing view." One can see at a glance both the truth and the extent of this prevalence by means of the folding sheet appended to Karl Cramer's able monograph, *The Historical Background of Isaiah 56-66*.<sup>3</sup> Here are eighteen critics, from Eichhorn, Ewald, and Bleek to Marti, Baudiassin, and Cramer, each having his own analysis of these chapters, and all agreeing to separate them wholly or partly from 40-55. A year later Zillessen in Stade's *Zeitschrift* (1906) tried to establish the same partition by an elaborate argument from diction; but in spite of the high commendation which Volz, in the *Jahresbericht*, pronounces upon this study, Zillessen has only reduced his own case to an absurdity. The complicated system of double borrowing by Trito- from Deutero-Isaiah, for which he argues, is credible only in the case of a modern scholar with a printed text before him. The real relation here is the conscious or unconscious harmony of a great poet with himself. It would be hard to find a plainer instance

<sup>2</sup> Sellin's *Das Rätsel des deuterofjes. Buches* (1908) defends the Jeholachin theory. T. H. Weir, in the *Westminster Review* for March, 1908, holds that the Servant of Jehovah is Cyrus throughout, and yet that the name "Cyrus" is probably spurious in the only passages where it occurs! Condamin, *Le Serviteur de Jahvé* in the *Revue Biblique* (April, 1908), supports the position of his *Isate* (1906), agreeing in the main with Feldmann.

<sup>3</sup> This essay was awarded a gold medal by the University of Dorpat in 1902, but remained unpublished until 1905, when the author inserted some later references. My attention was first called to Cramer's work by a letter from Professor Driver.

of a disputant who proves the position he means to demolish and demolishes the position he means to prove.

As with the argument from diction, so with the rest — critics find what they look for. I cannot but regard as a great extravagance the assertion of Duhm (*Jesaja*, 1902, S. 380) that Trito-Isaiah differs as a writer from Deutero-Isaiah “so stark wie möglich.” The poetical vigor and beauty of the former are well sustained, instead of “sinking down for the most part into versified prose.” In this and in all respects the cycle of poems forming chapters 40–66 belongs together, and stands at the summit of extant Hebrew literature. It would be easy to prove by Duhm’s methods that the author of the Second Part of *Faust* could never have written the First Part; and I say this after long and careful study of both parts. The fact that we happen to know Göthe to be the author of the whole cannot affect the axiom that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. If the arguments in question disprove the unity of Isaiah 40–66, *a fortiori* they disprove the unity of *Faust*.

In the midst of the general craze for dissecting Deutero-Isaiah a clear note of opposition is sounded by two of our associates in this Society<sup>4</sup> — Professor Torrey, in his Harvard Summer School lectures (soon to be published, it is hoped), and Professor Beecher, in his Stone lectures at Princeton.<sup>5</sup> The latter declares flatly (p. 278): “The unity [of Isaiah 40–66] is disputed, but really there is no room for dispute. The twenty-seven chapters, however they originated, are a single poem.” Professor Torrey goes into particulars. There is one author for the whole, he says, and one great argument, occupying in its complete form nearly all of chapters 40–48, while the details are worked out with consummate ability and perfect consistency in 49–66.

I fully accord with this position, which I hope to fortify by some further considerations. Let us suppose the twenty-

<sup>4</sup> The present paper was read before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in December, 1907.

<sup>5</sup> Published in 1905, with the title *The Prophets and the Promise*.

seven chapters had been just dug out of the ground without a clue to their history. Literary criticism, unentangled with any controversy respecting time or place, would pronounce on such questions as these: "Is this poetry or prose? Is there one predominant theme or several detached ones? Do the various parts agree or differ in their mode of thought, in the elevation or plainness of their style, in the quality and character of their diction?" Thus isolated, the debate becomes simplified; the chapters as we have them give no uncertain sound, I believe, upon all these points, but I shall touch upon only two. The answer to the first question is that this is poetry and not prose; poetry of a highly imaginative order and of a sustained and lofty tone, cruelly misapprehended when its glowing figures are treated like statements of dry fact. The very form is poetry, of two marked and definite types; so well transmitted also that, although it has come down to us through centuries of ignorant copyists, but slight changes are needed to bring out the beautiful melody.<sup>6</sup> Far greater changes in the text are postulated by the criticism that is prevalent today.

As to the next point there is one great theme, presented in two aspects, which, with constant variations, are sounded from beginning to end. That theme is by no means what Driver states it to be in his *Introduction*. Chapters 40 to 66 deal, he says, "throughout with a common theme, viz. *Israel's restoration from exile in Babylon*." The italics are his. On the contrary, the theme is the supremacy of Jahwe, and the call of Israel to be his Servant, to reveal his light and truth to all mankind. Israel is unworthy; he is chastised and scattered for his sins. But Jahwe, who hath loved him, will bring home his banished from the four winds, and purify them, and glorify them; the incorrigible shall be destroyed

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Professor Briggs's "Analysis of Isaiah 40-62," in the Harper Memorial Volumes, published since this paper was read. But to argue from difference of poetic form to difference of authorship is no more legitimate in "Deutero-Isaiah" than in Tennyson. Professor Briggs attributes both "the two great poems" to "the great prophet of the Exile" (p. 68).

and the nations shall be redeemed; then shall heaven and earth break forth into a shout of triumph.<sup>7</sup>

Stand at the centre and the twenty-seven chapters fall into harmony around you; stand out of focus and they fall into fragments, as Kusters and Cheyne, Duhm and Gressmann, Littmann and Marti have been proving.

We come in the third place to the question of locality. Even if the integrity of 40-66 were established, that would not settle the place of composition. We might hold, with Seinecke, that the author wrote in Palestine at the very time when his fellow-countrymen were exiled in Babylonia; or with H. P. Smith (apparently, see *Old Testament History*, p. 371), that he wrote in Palestine at a later period; or with Ewald, that he wrote in Egypt; or with König, that he wrote in Babylonia; or with several other critics that he wrote the earlier chapters in Babylonia, then came to Palestine with the returning exiles and finished the book there. But in this matter we should be ruled by the axiom that the whole is greater than a part. What is plain interprets what is obscure, and the larger prospect includes the smaller. The tender expostulation in 43 23. 24 is a plain passage, whether read as a reproach: "Thou hast not brought me the small cattle of thy burnt-offerings," or as a question: "Hast thou not brought me?" It would be wholly out of place in Babylonia; how should they bring the Lord's offerings in a strange land? In the same chapter, vs. 5, 6, our author's position is distinctly in the Holy Land, and his subject is the gathering thither of the children of God from *all* lands. "I will bring thy seed from the east and gather thee from the west. I will say to the

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Seinecke, *Der Evangelist des alten Testaments*, p. vi., "Der Inhalt der Weissagung ist das neue Heil, die Herstellung und Vollendung des Reiches Gottes bis ans Ende der Welt. Was mehrfach als Zweck der Schrift dargestellt ist, die Exulanten würden ermahnt ins Vaterland zurückzukommen, solche Dinge sind blosse Folgerungen aus dem Hauptgedanken. Ist Kanaan das Land des göttlichen Segens, so versteht es sich von selbst, dass die versprengten Kinder aufgefordert werden in das freie Vaterhaus zurückzukehren."

north, Give up, and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the end of the earth."

That is the real Captivity,—the Dispersion, which began with Tiglath-Pileser, in 734 B.C., which continues under the Turk in 1908 A.D., and which some people suppose is just about to cease after lasting twenty-six centuries. Deutero-Isaiah lived in the time of the exile, it is true, but we must enlarge our conception of the exile. The fifty years (not seventy) which a few Jews spent in Babylonia after the fall of the Holy City were simply a sample of what was going on in many lands in the time of our prophet, whoever, whenever, and wherever he was. 43 5. 6 is not an isolated passage; its parallel is 49 12: "Lo, these shall come from far: and lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim." If the Polychrome Bible is right, read *Syene*, which is in the far South. Professor Torrey conjectures *Teman*, which means the South. The Assuan papyri discovered in 1904 would favor the former view, as Lofthouse remarks in his *Commentary* (1907) on Ezekiel 29 10. Thus, the banished are called home from at least three points of the compass — north, west, and south; and the first clause of the verse, "these shall come from far," would naturally refer to the far east, since the Hebrews were wont to face the east when reckoning direction. So, then, it is not true that Deutero-Isaiah wrote chapters 40–52 or 40–55 in Babylonia and then came to Palestine, for indications that point clearly to Palestine are in 43 and 49.

When we use the phrase, "the great prophet of the Babylonian exile," it is Ezekiel whom we ought to have in mind. For, as his latest commentator, whom I just cited, has observed (p. 12): "The exile was the period in which the Jewish nation seemed to stand between two worlds, 'one dead, one powerless to be born.' That what was best in the old revived, and that the new really did come to the birth, was the result of Ezekiel's activity." And then he adds,—with charming *naïveté*, from my standpoint,— "Even the other great prophet of the exile, vastly more familiar to

most people as he is to-day, had far less influence, as far as we can see, either on the Jews of the exile, or on their successors who returned to Palestine, than the exiled priest who lived among them by the river Chebar." <sup>8</sup>

But whither is this leading us? Is not the very *rationale* of a Babylonian habitat for Deutero-Isaiah the necessity of positing that prophet among the exiles there, to account for the great facts that the fidelity of the people was preserved in the furnace of affliction and that the restoration was effected? Have we not been told with constant iteration for the last hundred years,<sup>9</sup> that "the persons whom the prophet addresses, the people amongst whom he lives and moves, whose feelings he portrays, *whose doubts he dispels, whose faith he confirms* [my italics], are . . . the *Jewish exiles in Babylonia*" [Driver's italics]? That "to arouse the indifferent, to reassure the wavering, to expostulate with the doubting, to announce with triumphant confidence the certainty of the approaching restoration [from Babylon] is the aim of the great prophecy"? If we are to understand that this work was accomplished by Ezekiel instead of Deutero-Isaiah, we are certainly making some progress in comprehending the history of the period in question.

I grant, to be sure, that the forty-seventh chapter of Isaiah treats of Babylon, and so do the first two verses of chapter 46, but Babylon here is regarded as the best known example of foreign idolaters and oppressors in the time then present, just as the *past* bondage in Egypt is so often referred to in these chapters. This fact, by the way, does not go far toward fixing the date; for during several centuries Babylon was the natural representative in the eyes of the Jews of the great world-power in the East.

There are a few other places in our present text of Isaiah 40-66 where the names Cyrus and Babylon occur;

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Toy, *Enc. Bib. s. v.* "He [Ezekiel] was the last of the prophets—prophetism accomplished its work in securing substantially the victory of monotheism. The writers who are massed under the name of the Second Isaiah are seers rather than prophets."

<sup>9</sup> The quotations are from Driver, *Isaiah: His Life and Times*, p. 133.

but six years ago Professor Torrey showed, in a paper before this Society, that these are awkward insertions by a late editor, who wished to connect our chapters with the book of Ezra. The secondary character of the name Cyrus in the most important passage of all, 45 1, can be made very clear. The subject presented in the whole section, 45 1-7, is not Cyrus at all, but the Servant of Jahwe, who is characterized precisely as in 41 and 42. In all three passages, Jahwe upholds him by his right hand, and gives him victory over all foes, in order that the world may know that Jahwe and he alone has done it. It is not strange that Sellin (*Das Rätsel*, pp. 57, 58) finds numerous parallels between Cyrus and the Servant!

There is a well-known poem by James Montgomery, beginning somewhat like this: "Hail to the Lord's Anointed, to Cyrus, great David's greater Son." That cannot be quite correct, however, for it is not poetry at all. This single test enables us to expel the interpolation, not only from the hymn book, but also from Isa. 45 1; for the latter is as truly metrical as the former, the rhythm as regular, the assonances nearly so.

Hail to the Lord's Anointed,  
Great David's greater Son.  
Hail, in the time appointed,  
His reign on earth begun.

כה אמר יהוה למשיחו  
אשר החזקתי בימינו  
לרד לפניו גוים  
ומתני מלכים אפחה

Thus saith Jahwé to his Anointed,  
Whose right hand I have holden  
To bring down nations before him,  
And the loins of kings I will loose.

Turn now to 48 20, 21, where the imagery is drawn from the Exodus, when the water gushed from the rock, but the theme is the redemption of Israel, or Jacob, who is called

the Servant of Jahwe here also. His great salvation, a spiritual blessing, is to be proclaimed to the end of the earth. The prosaic editor inserts מַכְבֵּל and to balance it מַכְשָׁדִים, just as at 48 14 and 49 14. Even so, modern commentators, equally prosaic, degrade this frequent spiritual metaphor of water for the thirsty, and springs in the desert, into the literal picture of watering a returning caravan; whereas the author's own interpretation appears at 44 3, "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty and streams upon the dry ground; I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring."

Whether or not the words מַכְבֵּל and מַכְשָׁדִים have been inserted into the passages noted above, at all events the writer's own standpoint remains fixed at Jerusalem. The return from exile is not alone from the east, but the whole includes the part. This is seen again at 60 4. 9, which thus will supply another link between Deutero-Isaiah and the supposed Trito-Isaiah. Thy sons shall come from far; the ships of Tarshish are waiting to bring them home. As Torrey well remarks, this would be an impossible feat if they were to be brought from Babylon.

The kind of evidence that determines the locality of an author may be historical or literary or both, but often it belongs to a third class — *circumstantial* evidence. This has the advantage of letting its victim reveal his habitat unconsciously, as in the case of Simon Peter; the more fervently he cursed, the more surely he betrayed himself, for no Galilean would have been in that company unless he were a friend of the Nazarene teacher.

Thirty years ago the attention of the world was focussed on a celebrated trial, now so far forgotten that it is no impeachment of the intelligence of our young people if they never heard of Arthur Orton, the English butcher. Laying claim to the Tichborne estates, he was shrewd enough to acquaint himself beforehand with the history and habits of the family in England; but one thing he did not know was that the man he was personating spent a good part of his boyhood in France. It was proven, in the course of the

long trial, that Orton was utterly ignorant of many things which the real Sir Roger must have known, while he knew much of which the other must have been ignorant. He was convicted and sentenced; in good part on the circumstantial evidence of locality. Let us see if the same kind of evidence applies to the case in hand. The learned counsel for this assumed prophet of Babylonia assert that he lived there, and wrote many of these chapters there. How is it, we reply, that he does not know Babylonia? that his environment, down to the minutest particulars, is Palestinian and not Babylonian? It cannot be because there was nothing in Babylon which would interest a Jewish patriot. One absorbs his surroundings even against his will. Ezekiel furnishes an instructive contrast here. Never was there a prophet with intenser Jewish feeling. Moreover, he grew up to maturity in Jerusalem, and served there in the temple, while Deutero-Isaiah, according to the prevailing view, passed his whole formative period, and did his chief work, in Babylonia; in fact, it is doubtful if he ever saw Palestine. Ezekiel's youth was passed under the powerful influence of Jeremiah and his associates; his latest writings were occupied almost solely with the restored ritual sketched for the Holy Land; his heart was there perpetually. How can it but be that we shall find Deutero-Isaiah far more saturated with the Babylonian environment than is Ezekiel? But precisely the reverse is what we do find.

The numerous illustrations in Professor Toy's Polychrome Ezekiel picture to the eye at a glance the objects amid which that prophet lived and moved. As Dean Stanley puts it (*Jewish Church*, II, p. 523), "He had wandered through the vast halls of Assyrian monuments and there gazed on all that Assyrian monuments have disclosed to us of human dignity and brute strength combined,—the eagle-winged lion, human-headed bull." There is no suggestion of such scenes in Deutero-Isaiah. Mark, again, the contrast between the two with respect to the products of nature. Ezekiel's references are mainly commercial; Deutero-Isaiah's mainly agricultural. For instance, he describes like an eye-witness

the process of threshing and the dissipation of the chaff. Ezekiel's words for wheat, barley, and spelt are in the plural, and refer to the product, not the growing grain; he has no word for threshing. The only peculiar tree he mentions is the plane tree, 81 א, ערמוֹן, a word occurring only once elsewhere, namely in J's narrative, where Jacob peels the wood of that tree in this very Mesopotamia. In Isaiah 40-66, but nowhere in Ezekiel, we read of דשא and חציר *grass*, briars, נעצוֹן *thorns*. Ezekiel has, it is true, his own rare word for thorn, סלון or סלון, found but twice in the Hebrew Bible, and both times in Ezekiel. But נעצוֹן also occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible, once in Deutero-Isaiah, and once in a prophet of Jerusalem. Is it not plain, then, that Ezekiel had before him a Babylonian thorn (possibly סלון is a Babylonian word) and Deutero-Isaiah a Palestinian; especially as there are twenty-two Hebrew words for thorn, and among them these two are selected in just this way? Thus we impale the defendant on the point of his own thorn.<sup>10</sup>

Passing from natural to artificial objects, we find in Deutero-Isaiah the simple implements of the carpenter, the farmer, and the household, e.g. מעצד *axe*, מקצעה *chisel*, שרד *graver*, מחונה *compasses*, מסמר *nails*, דבק *soldering*, דל *bucket*, וקים *chains*, מורג *threshing-sledge*, מקבת *hammer*, אשפה *quiver*, מכמר *net*, נת and פורה *wine-press*, דק *curtain*, הים *stool*, פשתה *wick*, קבעה *goblet*.

Not one of these is in Ezekiel. His artificial objects present a bewildering variety; none of the following are in Deutero-Isaiah, and many more might be adduced. תרן *mast*, משוש *oar*, כנור *harp*, צמיד *bracelet*, שן *ivory*, בניד הפש *carpets*, שפתים *hooks*, סוגר *cage*, תפל *whitewash*, רקיע *pavement*, כגורש *area*, נג *roof*, אתיק *gallery*. Unconsciously these prophets are revealing the fact that Ezekiel, and not Deutero-

<sup>10</sup> Note also *branch*, Eze. פארה, Dt. Isa. נצר; *twig*, Eze. ומורה, Dt. Isa. נץ; *willow*, or rather *poplar*, Eze. צפצה, Dt. Isa. שרבה. It would seem probable that both refer to the *Populus euphratica*. See the article "Willow" in *Enc. B.W.*, by Norman M'Lean and Thistleton Dyer; cf. on the other side the article "Willow" in *Jewish Enc.*, by Löw and Hirsch.

Isaiah, is familiar with commerce. In fact, it is doubtful if half a dozen words in the latter's works could be called commercial terms, apart from such general expressions as מִדָּ and תֵּבֵן to *measure*, מְדָר *price*, כֵּס *purse*, מֵאֵנִים *balances*.

Ezekiel has מְשׁוּרָה and תֵּבֵן *measure*, רֶכֶּל to *traffic*, רֶבֶּזָה, and תְּבוּאָה *merchandise*,<sup>11</sup> מִדָּ to *exchange*, קִנְיָן *goods*, תְּבוּאָה *increase*, נִשְׁךְ *interest*, חֹב *debt*, חֶבֶל and חֶבְלָה *pledge*, עֲוֹנֹת *wares*, חֵסֶן *treasure*, שֶׁקֶל *shekel*, אֵיפָה *ephah*, בַּת *bath*, הִין *hin*, חֹמֶר *homer*, גֵּרָה *gerah*, כֹּר *cor*, מִנָּה *pound*, אַמָּה *cubit*.

None of these are in Deutero-Isaiah. The contrast between the two is especially significant in their allusions to precious stones. Ezekiel has כֹּדֶם *ruby*, אֶדְמָה *carnelian*, טֹפָז *topaz*, נֶפֶךְ *carbuncle*, רֵאמֹת *corals*, יַשְׁפָּה *jasper*, יַשְׁפֵּי *yellow jasper*, יְהֵלִם *onyx(?)*, בְּרִיקָתַי *emerald*, סַפִּיר *sapphire*, שֹׁמֵר *diamond or adamant*.

Deutero-Isaiah, on the other hand, mentions only three precious stones, all used figuratively in the same connection (54 11. 12), סַפִּיר *sapphire*, כֹּדֶם *ruby* (both these are in Ezekiel, as above), and the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, אֶקְדָּח, of doubtful meaning.<sup>12</sup>

The accumulating testimony might well justify us in exclaiming to the defendant: "Thou art a Palestinian, and thy speech bewrayeth thee." I can only hint, however, at the variety and fulness of the similar evidence which patient research discovers in the documents as they lie before us. It is more important to direct attention to the nature of the proof in question.

Twenty-six years ago, when I published, for another purpose, a mass of material like this,<sup>13</sup> the argument was misapprehended in two directions. The force of it lies, first, in the accumulation of a multitude of particulars, no one of

<sup>11</sup> But most critics read the verb here, 27 *is*, as in vv. 12, 16, 18, 21 (*his*), 26. Ez. 27 is crowded with commercial details. Contrast the two occurrences of the root סָוַר in Dt. Isa.; "the labor of Egypt and the *traffic* (סָוַר) of Cush" 45 14; and 47 15 "thy merchants," referring to Babylon.

<sup>12</sup> Wellhausen, Cheyne and others would read נֶפֶךְ for נֶפֶךְ in Isa. 54 11.

<sup>13</sup> *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1882.

which may be of more consequence to the final result, proportionally, than a single thread to a strong rope; and, secondly, in the unconscious fidelity with which any given author absorbs and reproduces his own environment, which may thus be detected. An instance of the one kind of misconception appears in Cheyne's *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*. I had mentioned, among scores of similar data, the fact that Deutero-Isaiah speaks of snow as a common phenomenon, "the snow cometh down from heaven," whereas Ezekiel, in Babylonia, has no occasion to mention snow. Upon this Cheyne remarks, p. 274: "That the writer of chaps. xl.-lv. has a good knowledge of Palestine may be granted, though Mr. Cobb surely attaches too much importance to the mention of snow in lv. 10."<sup>14</sup> The fallacy here is that which Whately's *Logic* illustrates by an extreme instance, as follows: "All the apples on the tree are worth twenty shillings; this is an apple on the tree; therefore this is worth twenty shillings."

The other kind of misconception is exemplified by Delitzsch in the fourth edition of his *Commentary on Isaiah*, p. 402, Anm. 1: "Ueberhaupt sind die Naturbilder eines Schriftstellers kein sicheres Anzeichen seiner wirklichen Naturumgebung. . . . Von Gazellen-Augen, Rhinoceros-Dickhäutigkeit, Hippopotamus-Plumpheit kann reden wer diese Tiere nur etwa aus zoologischer Schaustellung kennt. Ich finde nicht durch Cobb erwiesen, dass Ezechiel babylonische und Jes. II dagegen palästinische Naturumgebung verrät." The fallacy here lies in obscuring the difference between conscious and unconscious allusions. In the same unspecialized way in which Delitzsch's assumed visitor to the Museum tells what he saw there, Deutero-Isaiah discourses in chapter 47 about the astrologers and necromancers of Babylon. But his Palestinian references are *minute* and *particular*, and run through all the departments of life, in a fashion that could not be counterfeited without great risk of detection. If the man whom Delitzsch depicts

<sup>14</sup> This is the only reference which his *Introduction* makes to my researches.

as frequenting the zoölogical gardens should claim to have studied those animals in their native haunts, he would be pretty sure to be tripped up in his narrative by the circumstantial evidence of locality.

In 1877 William Urwick devoted ten pages of his monograph on the *Servant of Jehovah* to a study of the agricultural terms used in Isa. 40-66, and drew the natural inference that the author lived among the gardens and vineyards, the hills and valleys, of Palestine, rather than among what he termed "the vast, dry, monotonous plains of Babylon." Professor Driver replied (in *Isaiah, his Life and Times*) that for all we know the writer may have been a tiller of the soil in some country district of Babylonia outside the great city. When Driver wrote thus, the belief prevailed among Old Testament critics that the historical background throughout the twenty-seven chapters was the exile in Babylonia, and that this fact ruled the entire situation, overriding all other evidence. At present the eminent scholars who hold that theory are extremely few, and the case reduces to a mere *argumentum ab ignorantia*. For the existence of a great Jewish prophet in Babylonia in the sixth century, other than Ezekiel, there is not a particle of historical evidence, unless the book of Daniel is historical; nor is there a solitary tradition to put in the balance. On the other hand, the belief that our chapters proceed from Palestine is not a hypothesis, but the uniform historical tradition, which is fortified by the local color of those chapters so manifoldly and so minutely that it cannot be offset by theories assumed simply to meet objections.<sup>15</sup>

To conclude: since it is conceded by most critics that chapters 56-66 are Palestinian, let us glance through 40-55, and observe the chief marks of place not already mentioned.

<sup>15</sup> König's use of the argument from locality is instructive; see *The Exiles' Book of Consolation*, pp. 126-132. He labors (literally) to show that the word of the prophet in 52 11, "Go ye out from thence," means "from Babylon," though the prophet was there himself; and that when Jahwe says in 52 4, "What do I here?" he means "in Babylon," although Jerusalem and Zion are mentioned four times in the immediate context, and Babylon not at all.

The scene in 40 2 is Jerusalem, and there is no suggestion of Babylon in the whole chapter. The reference in this verse to the seventy years' exile is a fancy of the commentators. To Jerusalem, like a king, comes Jahwe (vs. 3) through the wilderness, as in the highly poetical parallel, Ps. 68 5: "Sing unto God, make melody to his name; Cast up a highway for him that rideth through the deserts." I prefer to give the received text rather than, with Briggs, to conjecture another text.<sup>15</sup>

In 40 9 Jerusalem shouts the good news from the mountain top to the cities of Judah. Some scholars imagine that in 40 10. 11 Adonai Jahwe's reward which is with him is the ransomed people, whom they picture him as leading across the Arabian desert. As well introduce the same imagery into the 23d Psalm. If not appropriate there, what is the occasion for it here? In 40 16 the reference to Lebanon, by a poet whose daily vision was bounded by that glorious range, is certainly natural; coming from a resident of Babylonia, it would be less natural.

In 41 9 Abraham, the Babylonian, is said to have been called from the ends of the earth; of course, then, the writer was not in Babylonia himself. Critics have tried to show that the reference here is to Jahwe's calling Israel out of Egypt, but see the discussion in my "Servant of Jahweh," *JBL*, 1895. In 41 27 the scene is still Zion and Jerusalem. In 42 11 Kedar and Sela have nothing to do with pilgrims through the desert, who are nowhere suggested. In 42 16 the prophet is in the Holy City, for the blind are to be brought, not sent. 43 3 is simply an Oriental and poetical way of saying that Israel is more precious to Jahwe than Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba. The "new thing" in 43 19-21 is not a literal march through the wilderness, but as always, under the image of the Exodus, there is depicted the coming

<sup>15</sup> The above parallel is adduced in Sellin's *Serubbabel*, replying to which König asks if Sellin really thinks that Jahwe needs a path made for him through the desert. "Ω βάρβαροι! Sellin's section, "Babylonian influences on the author of the Servant passages" (*Das Rätsel*, pp. 98-111) is most likely to convince those who already believe that the author in question was in Babylonia to be influenced.

redemption and home-gathering of scattered Israel. 43 28, if the text is right, points to the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The sarcasm on idol-making in 44 belongs as naturally to Palestine as elsewhere. 45 13 refers to the Servant of Jahwe. This passage, as Torrey points out, may lie at the basis of all these interpolations. The Servant will build up Jerusalem, and will redeem the exiles everywhere. In 46 11, if we read (with Torrey) עבד for the strange word ע"ב, the whole context is harmonious. 48 14. 15 condenses all the Servant passages. Here at any rate the standing interpolation is obvious; "Jahwe hath loved him (*i.e.* Israel); he shall execute his counsel and his might. I have spoken, I have called him, I have brought him, he shall prosper." As 49 12 has been already shown to refer to the great home-coming from every land, so the same subject runs through the whole preceding and following context. 50 1 gives the reason for *all* Israel's chastisements, not merely for Nebuchadnezzar's conquest. Zion is the object in 51 3. 51 11 is a universal, not local, return. In 51 14 the margin of R. V. is right; the bowed one shall be loosed. 51 17 to 52 12 is an extended address to Jerusalem, the mother of us all, who is to welcome her elect that come from the four winds. 53 has no mark of place, but in 54 Zion enlarges her tent, or as 55 5 puts it, nations run unto her. In 55 12, to go out with joy and be led forth with peace, is not to emigrate from Babylon, but (under the image of the Exodus) to receive all the spiritual security that the phrase connotes; cf. Alexander *in loco*.

To recapitulate: from first to last Jerusalem is the centre of interest, and the natural standpoint for the development of the twofold theme. Jahwe is exalted; for he dwelleth on high; he hath filled Zion with judgment and righteousness. Jahwe hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.