

# The Criticism of Isaiah II

by August Pieper

[From Jesaias II by August Pieper, Introduction, pp. XX–XLII, translated by Reinhart J. Pope]

## Historical Resume

Aside from the veiled hints Aben-Ezra made about the Second Part in his commentary on Isaiah (1155), the Isaiah authorship of the entire book—including the Second Part—remained unassailed for almost 2500 years. It was reserved for Rationalism first to impugn the prophet's authorship of the entire Second Part, and then a series of passages in the First Half, and to ascribe them to a Deutero-Isaiah, who was supposed to have lived in the last third of the Exile. After J. B. Koppe first referred to the fact that chapter 50 obviously presupposed the Exile, Doederlein was the first to express strong doubts about the Isaiah authorship of the entire Second Half in his commentary of 1775. Thereupon the inventive Koppe, in his supplement to and remarks on Richerz' translation (1781) of Bishop Lowth's commentary, declared Isaiah to be a collection of 85 distinct fragments. Now Rosenmueller joined others in an attack also on the First Part, and it was discovered that whole series of passages were related to the Second Part in thought content, spirit, and language, and they were assigned to Deutero-Isaiah, whom Ewald magnanimously dubbed "the great unknown," "the great anonymous."

Even though a great deal remained in disagreement among the various critics, still around the year 1850 some twelve chapters of the First Part (12; 13:1–14; 23; 15; 16; 23–27; 33–35; and many smaller sections) were ruled out as non-Isaianic, together with the whole Second Part. Eichhorn, DeWette, Gesenius, Vatke, Hitzig, Ewald were the leaders of this critical work. Since unbelief ruled this period, defenders of the authenticity of both parts, like Hengstenberg, Haevernick, Keil, Kleinert, Fechsler, Hahn, Stier, Delitzsch, and others, did not prevail. Yes, even Delitzsch himself, the greatest scholar of Hebrew and of Semitic literature of his time, infected by the spirit of the times, fell into doubt about the Isaiah authorship of the Second Part and the related sections of the First Part. He did, however, vindicate their authenticity in this sense that, if Isaiah himself did not write these parts, at least they were written by disciples of Isaiah in his spirit, and combined quite properly with his prophecies into an organic whole. "These are *probably* the facts of the case. It seems logical and almost certain to me, that this is the way it happened, but I am not sure beyond all doubt, and I shall die without getting over this vacillation." Thus wrote Delitzsch in the 4th edition of his commentary, 1889, dedicated to Cheyne and Driver, after his own son, the well-known orientalist and cuneiformist, Fritz Delitzsch, had long since gone over to the enemy.

Delitzsch, however, had fallen victim, not so much to the rationalistic spirit, as to the new Naturalism. The same thing happened to him, though not as seriously, that happened to the Englishman Cheyne, who changed in a relatively short time under the influence of the new times from a positive critic to a negative one. The Enlightenment and Rationalism, which issued from England since 1700, deserves the credit for having mightily advanced historical and scientific studies. As a result, the trend in philosophy went quickly from the Rationalism of Kant and the idealistic Pantheism of Hegel to the evolutionistic Naturalism of Spencer. Herbert Spencer forced the whole scientific world into his direction by means of his "natural science" philosophy, his distinction between the *unknowable* and the *knowable*, and his logically sharp investigation of all scientific matters on the basis of the principle of evolution. "Thorough" German science—long dissatisfied with the residue of "divine" religion and morality which Rationalism had still bequeathed to her—went beyond Spencer, Darwin, Tyndall, Wallace, Huxley in the new teaching, and set aside even the Unknowable of Spencer, and thereby the possibility of a God who might have been able to bring about this world of energy-endowed matter, and could intervene in its activities. The German names, Vogt, Buechner, Helmholtz, Haeckel, Wundt, Oswald, indicate the trend of this philosophy, which ended practically in Monism, and against which the feeble idealism of Eucken could make no headway.

The theology of Europe, particularly of Germany, which had to be scientific at all costs, fell all the more quickly and easily into the English trend when, after Grotefend's discovery, the cuneiform inscriptions of the Assyrian excavations revealed their secrets to the world of scholarship. Here was the historical and factual parallel to the Old Testament, Babel—Bible! Now it was clear as day: the religion of Israel, if not from Babel, was at least similar to Babel, only here and there nobler, more ideal. But the cuneiform writings were a hundred times more reliable than the Bible, and convincingly showed the Bible to be almost everywhere in error on dates. The inference for scientific theology became more and more unavoidable: Israel's history and religion developed exactly according to the same natural laws as did the Babylonian and every other. Faith in revelation, in miracles, in a particular intervention by God in the natural course of things or in the life of a people or of an individual, which Rationalism had actually almost emptied of its content, now completely collapsed. Henceforth the basic axiom of faith was: Everything happens naturally. Even Israel's religion, even prophetism, even the law and priesthood of Israel, is to be explained naturally; historically the law belongs after the prophets and is therefore a forgery.

This transition from Rationalism to Naturalism occurred in the 60's and 70's very soon after Spencer's *First Principles* and Darwin's *The Origin of Species*. In German theology it is marked by the rise of Wellhausen's religio-historical school, which was inaugurated by the latter's *Geschichte Israels*, later called *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Ewald was still a rationalist, but his pupil Wellhausen was already a complete naturalist. The school had its roots in the "historical" criticism of DeWette, found its pioneers in Leopold George, Wilhelm Vatke and Ed. Reuss, its theoretician in Karl Graf of Meissen, and its most magnificent advocate in Wellhausen. It not only became the reigning school in Germany in a short time, but also found a great number of enthusiastic representatives in England, in other countries of Europe, and then in our country. Proceeding on its evolutionistic-naturalistic basis, it made its attack first with the thesis of the post-Exilic origin of the "original document" (P) of the Pentateuch, and gradually molded all Bible criticism according to its views. With the exception of Ezekiel (and hardly that) it left no single book of the Old Testament intact. The great leaders of such criticism were or are: Reuss, Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Sinend, Stade, Wildeboer, Cornill, Giesebrecht, Gressmann, Budde, Kautzsch, Benzinger, Baentsch, Steuernagel, Duhm, Marti, Holzinger, Volz, Hackmann, W. R. Smith, Wm. R. Harper, and Chas. Briggs. People like Dillmann, Koenig, Kittel Strack, Orelli, Gunkel, Merx, Guthe, Sellin, Cheyne, Driver, Whitehouse, Black, Hastings, Addis, Sanday, Kennett and many others differ *in principle* from the Wellhausen school in the religio-historical problem, but are under the spell of its spirit in the literary-critical problem. Only Klostermann has kept an independent position for himself, which approaches somewhat that of Franz Delitzsch.

In reference to the First Part of the Book of Isaiah, the result of the criticism according to Cornill (Intro. p. 158) is: "Of undisputed authenticity, even though considered more or less revised, are only 1; 2:6-4:1; 5; 6; 7:1-8, 18; 9:7-10:4; 10:5-15; 17:1-11; 18; 20; 22; 28-31. Also recognized in part by critics of repute are 4:2-4; 8:19-9:6; 10:16-11:9; 14:24-27, 28-32; 15; 16; 17:12-14 and 32. In contrast, the following are generally considered to be *unauthentic*: 2:2-4; 4:5, 6; 11:10-14, 23; 19; 21; 23-27; 33-35, as are also the discourses of Isaiah in the historical section, 36-39." These discourses themselves have their origin in II Kings 18ff. In opposition, Sellin says, for example, (Ein. p. 70): "The following parts have in the main proved themselves against all criticism to be genuine: 1-12; 14:24-20:6; 22 (23:1-14?); 28-33." Unquestionably not genuine according to him are 13:1-14:23; 21; 24-27; 34; 35; 36-39. Duhm lets much less stand than Cornill, and Cheyne even less than Duhm. While the former eliminates only verses 27 and 28 in chapter I as spurious, in addition to the superscription, Cheyne (in the "Rainbow Bible," S.B.O.T.) not only eliminates these, but also in the "notes" puts a question mark behind verses 2-4, and has the redactor add verses 29-31 as another Isaianic prophecy (*Isaiah* in S.B.O.T., p. 162). To give a few more examples: Duhm considers 9:2-14 to be genuine, Cheyne, only 9:8-14, declaring 2-7 to be spurious. In chapter 30 Duhm considers verses 27-33 to be genuine; Cheyne declares them to be "post-Exilic" (S.B.O.T., p. 34).

### **Deutero-Isaiah, Trito-Isaiah, Etc.**

As far as the Second Part of our book is concerned, chapters 40–66, it was already considered to be non-Isaianic in its entirety by the rationalists. The author was placed into Babylon in the middle of the Exile, in the time between the eastern (549) or the western conquest of Cyrus, 546, and the fall of Babylon in 538, and was called Deutero-Isaiah. But Gesenius already saw an older composition in the conclusion from chapter 63 on. It was the opinion of the inventive Ewald that 56:9–57:11a (“All ye beasts of the field, come etc.—And of whom hast thou been afraid etc.”) were borrowed from a contemporary of Ezekiel, and that the conclusion from the great prayer in 63:7 on (“I will mention the loving-kindness of the Lord etc.”) had been added after the return from the Exile. This did not cause too much concern, since he retained his “great unknown” as the author. There was contention basically about the residence of the author. Some placed him in Babylon, others in Jerusalem, a third group in Egypt, and others in the north. But soon it was also clear that a different atmosphere reigned from chapter 49 on than in 40–48, where Cyrus and Babylon and a great deal of the previous theology disappeared and made way for a new situation and for a realm of somewhat different ideas. Here must lurk a second author, and so the Deutero-Isaiah authorship was limited to chapters 40–48. Kuenen assigned to Deutero-Isaiah everything to chapter 49 inclusive, in addition 52:1–12, possibly also the following portion about the great Sufferer 52:13–15 and chapter 53. Everything that follows is supposed to be written after the return to Jerusalem, and from 64:10 on everything is apparently written at the time of Nehemiah.

So they guessed back and forth perplexed, until in the year 1892 Bernhard Duhm declared, and naturally then also “proved,” that chapters 49–55 undoubtedly still originated from Deutero-Isaiah, but everything from 56 on to the close was composed by a Trito-Isaiah from the time of Ezra-Nehemiah. He took his proof principally from the external legalism, which was so insistently imposed in the Sabbath commandment in 56:1–8, and in the divorce from the heathen, which clearly indicates the time of Ezra 9 and 10 and Nehemiah 9, 10 and 13. From 56:9 on the Samaritans and the unfaithful Jews are the foil for the faithful Jews, and 66:1ff. was declared to be spoken against the Samaritan schismatics.

Duhm sorted out still another series of spurious passages from Deutero-Isaiah and finally also 42:5–7, 20–22a, and declared the so-called *Ebed Jahveh* songs (42:1–7; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12) to be the product of another author. Duhm’s theory apparently brought final concord to the problem of the composition of Isaiah II. People like Marti, Count Baudissin, Kittel, Cornill, Budde, even the Englishmen Cheyne and Whitehouse declared their assent. But the very independent Cheyne went Duhm one better and showed that Trito-Isaiah did not have one person as author, but that it was put together from various authors of different times. He found support for this not only in Kittel and Budde, but also, and above all, in his own country and in America. At present the pupils of Duhm and Cheyne are engaged in surpassing the almost unsurpassable dissection of their masters.

### **“An Indelible Scholarly Blot”**

We cannot think of refuting the criticism in detail; but we must come to an explanation of its chief principles.

The Book of Isaiah has been transmitted to us in its present form from the Jewish Church. We may have a reference to this book in II Chronicles 32:32. It is not possible to elicit whether more than chapters 1–39 was available to the Chronicler, who in any case wrote after the Exile. But it is clear from chapter 48:20–25 of *Ecclesiasticus* that its author also had the second part before him. The LXX likewise has it. And though Ben Sirach may have first written around 130 B.C., he already knows about the Greek translation of the Prophets. Concerning the latter we must conclude that it was finished by 250 B.C. The Massorettes have even given us the number of its verses, 1295, with 33:21 as the middle verse, “in 26 series.” In the New Testament Isaiah II is quoted or used more than fifty times, either as “Isaiah,” or “the prophet Isaiah,” or as “the prophet,” or as “Scripture,” namely from 40:3 on till the closing verse 66:24, with chapter 53 and the preceding verse appearing in 8 different places. Thus the Church of all times and all places has accepted all of Isaiah as a book of the prophet—we confess, quite “uncritically.” It was the *enemies* of the Church, the old rationalists and the new naturalists, who first proclaimed all of Book II and much of Book I to be spurious, and converted many friends

of the Church to their viewpoint with the catchword, “scholarly.” The result is that today there are no longer any “scholarly” theologians who in the fullest sense hold to the Isaianic authorship of the Second Part and of the related passages of the First Part. There is today only pity for those who still believe this. They are ignoramuses, people who are not competent to grasp a scientific proof, or they are simply not honest. People even today put a question mark behind a name like Klostermann and Bredenkamp and would very much like to eject them from the ranks of scientific theologians.

The writer of the following commentary renounces from the start the designation of a scholarly theologian. I am biased in favor of the Isaianic authorship of the whole Book of Isaiah, and particularly in favor of the Second Part, because of the New Testament references. To be sure, I do not contend that the method and way in which the New Testament asserts the authorship of Isaiah precludes the admission of earlier or completely foreign material, even if others should have added it later. I hold, e.g., in spite of the Documentary Source Theory, to the authorship of Moses for the whole Pentateuch, even though I do not believe that he described his own death, burial, funeral and the closing remarks, verses 10–12 of chapter 34 of Deuteronomy, or that he himself added the list of Edomite kings and family heads in Genesis 36:31ff. I believe that there are some Post-Mosaicisms in the Pentateuch, just as there are some Ante-Mosaicisms. In spite of all this I consider the source theory to be the grandest hoax that has ever crept into theology under the name of scholarship, and I consider Wellhausen’s “History of Tradition” school, together with its literary-historical thesis, to be an indelible scholarly blot on the theological world. Thus I can consider it to be well possible that in Isaiah we will have textual corruptions here and there, and even passages written by other hands, be they Isaiah-disciples as Delitzsch, Bredenkamp, and Klostermann assumed, or not Isaiah’s disciples. Through such additions and interpolations the book does not lose the right to the name of the great prophet. I consider it possible that chapters 36–39 were inserted by another hand, that later people edited the text here and there, and added this or that particle. Besides, I also have the conviction that, if this is so, it happened by God’s will and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit through called and inspired people, and that the word of the Lord applies to the whole, “The Scripture cannot be broken,” John 10:35.

At the same time I consider the accumulated criticism of Isaiah from Doederlein to Duhm and Cheyne, who ascribe Isaiah II to a Deutero-Isaiah who lived in Babylon between 548 and 538, chapters 56–66 to a Trito-Isaiah or a group of writers from the Ezra-Nehemiah period, and then assign the passages of Part One “related” to Deutero- or Trito- or Tetarto- or Tesseracto-Isaiah to this second or hundredth Isaiah—this I consider to be just as great a scientific hoax as the Pentateuch criticism. Surely, if there would be scientifically stringent proofs, what intelligent person would not bow before them? But where are they?

### **The Argument from Analogy**

We proceed at once to the first great principal argument. In order that the average person might clearly understand it, we offer it in the form of a syllogism.

1. All genuine prophecy has its roots in the historical period of a prophet and is relevant to his time, that is, to the people of his time.
2. Isaiah II does not have its roots in the historical period of the prophet Isaiah and is not relevant to his contemporaries but rather has its roots in the Exile (between 549 and 538), or in the post-Exilic period, and is relevant to people in the Exile or to those who returned from the Exile.
3. Therefore the Prophet Isaiah, who lived 150-200 years earlier, did not write Isaiah II and all passages of the First Part, which take the same point of view (13:1–14:23, exilic; 21:1–10, exilic; 24–27, post-exilic, Delitzsch; 34–35, exilic). Rather, one writer or various writers who lived during the Exile or after the Exile wrote it.

The conclusion is unavoidable, if the two premises are correct.

*With some limitation we admit the minor premise.* But here the situation is common in false deductions:  
**THE MAJOR PREMISE IS FALSE!**

Because the matter is so important, we rearrange the syllogism of the Isaiah critics somewhat:

1. Every genuine prophecy of the prophet Isaiah has its roots in his times.
2. Isaiah II does not have its roots in the times of the Prophet Isaiah.
3. Therefore, Isaiah II is not a genuine prophecy of the Prophet Isaiah.

It would be like this:

1. Every true child of the tailor H. in S. has 10 fingers and 10 toes.
2. A so-called child of the tailor H. in S., Pastor H. in M., Wis., has 11 toes and 10¼ fingers.
3. Therefore, Pastor H. in M., Wis., is no true child of the tailor H. in S.

Once again:

1. No light rays can penetrate a firmly closed six to seven inch thick *Webster's Dictionary*.
2. X-rays can penetrate it.
3. Therefore, X-rays are not light rays.

Now I know Pastor H. in S. as a true son of his ten-fingered and ten-toed parents, and as a true brother of his seven ten-fingered and ten-toed brothers and sisters. Together with other persons I have at times seen keys, nails, etc. through a *Webster* sharp and clear. What is wrong with the above syllogisms? *In each case the major premise is wrong*; nothing more! That is the logic of the Isaiah critics. The major premise that *every* prophecy of a prophet is rooted in his times, that Isaiah could prophesy for the future only from the historical circumstances of his own times, and only in such a way that he would be relevant with his prophecy to the people of his time, that he could not take a viewpoint of 200 years later—in the Exile or after the Exile—and could not direct his prophecy to people of that future time, this assertion, which the critics make the major premise for their conclusion, is nothing but pure arbitrariness. How so? This is attained simply by *Analogy*. “Judged by the analogy of prophecy,” says Driver (Intro., p. 237), “this constitutes the strongest possible presumption that the author (cf. chapters 40–66) actually lived in the period which he thus describes, and is not merely (as has been supposed) Isaiah immersed in spirit in the future, and holding converse, as it were, with the generation yet unborn. Such an immersion in the future would be not only *without parallel* in the OT, it would be *contrary to the nature* of prophecy. The prophet speaks always, in the first instance, to his own contemporaries; the message which he brings is intimately related with the circumstances of his time: his promises and predictions, however far they reach into the future, nevertheless rest upon the basis of the history of his own age, and correspond to the needs which are then felt. The prophet never abandons his own historical position, but speaks from it. So Jeremiah and Ezekiel, for instance, predict first the exile, then the restoration. They contemplate both as still future. Both are viewed from the period in which they themselves live. In the present prophecy (Isa. 40–66) there is no prediction of exile: the exile is not announced as something still future; it is presupposed, and only the release from it is predicted. By analogy, therefore, the author will have lived in the situation which he thus presupposed, and to which he continually alludes.”

The major premise for the conclusion is thus, as just said, and gained by analogy. Jeremiah and Ezekiel and all other prophets prophesy from the historical basis of their times into the future, and do that either to warn or comfort their contemporaries. So Isaiah does it too. But here (chaps. 40–66; 13; 14, etc.) the historical viewpoint of the prophet is the Exile and the post-Exilic period, from which he encourages, warns, comforts, and teaches. There is no analogy for this in Scripture. Therefore, the writer of these addresses cannot be Isaiah, but according to all analogy the writers must be exilic and post-exilic men. This is what analogy teaches. Whatever otherwise is so, whatever commonly, regularly, previously, without exception is so, must always and

everywhere and under all circumstances continue to be so. Ordinarily people have ten toes; thus there are none with eleven. Heretofore twins have always come into the world singly and separated from one another. Therefore, there cannot be such a thing as Siamese twins. That is “without parallel” in the history of twins, “it would be contrary to the nature of the birth of twins.” X-rays are without parallel contrary to the nature of light. Therefore there are none. “For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation,” II Peter 3:4. Therefore there is no coming of our Lord Christ on the last day! Fiction views matters either in the past or in the present; *Looking Backward* has its viewpoint in the year 2000. Therefore *Looking Backward* was written in the year 2000 or later! As a matter of fact, Edw. Bellamy wrote his short story in the year 1888. It is upon such disorderly logic that the whole criticism of Isaiah rests, which so absolutely denies to the prophet more than half of his prophecies. And then the critics shrug their shoulders in scorn over someone who doesn’t bow before their “scholarship.”

But you, Christian theologians, if you now insist upon the absolute stringency of the conclusion from analogy, why don’t you then, together with all unbelieving theologians and scholars say: Actual prophecy and supernatural, infallible forecasting of the future just does not exist. You allow that there is no true prophecy in the whole wide world and in all history outside of Biblical prophecy. According to all analogy even the Biblical cannot be true—as indeed all exacting scholars daily point out to you on the basis of previous experience. When I attended a lecture by Wundt in the *Collegium maximum* at Leipzig University 10 years ago, he ridiculed the theologians who still wanted to believe in something other than natural causes and effects under absolutely inviolable natural laws. Prof. Barth did the very same thing in a Spinoza seminar. Wilhelm Ostwald enumerates for you in all his books how there is only one kind of prediction *possible* for future things: the prediction of the absolutely necessary effects of given causes, and he declares *that* to be the only true scholarship, and therefore ridicules “the Kaiser and his wife” for their table prayer. These people are indeed just as poor logicians as you because their entire system rests upon the proofs of analogy; but they are much better scholars because they are consistent with their thesis of the absolute efficacy and the universal efficacy of the laws of nature. This you Christian theologians do not do because you still believe in a personal, free God, who has not absolutely tied his hands with the laws of nature, and because you believe in a prophecy and in an inspiration—however greatly you may have diluted the ideas—which are not merely an Oswaldian calculation of the physically necessary consequences of cooperating causes, but are rather something given by God over and above all natural, human knowledge.

Yes, everywhere there prevails the same fraudulent logic in the entire realm of scholarship: the practice of drawing a conclusion from that which is to that which is possible or impossible, to that which must be and to that which cannot be; or drawing a conclusion from an incomplete series of inductions. Because the sun has demonstrably risen each day and set each night for about 6000 years, therefore it must continue so eternally, just as the wise men in II Peter 3:4 already knew. There is nothing analogous for the creation of the world, for the creation of the first human pair, for the passage through the Red Sea, for the revelation of the Ten Commandments, for Balaam’s ass talking, for the stopping of the sun in the day of Gibeon and Ajalon. *There is nothing analogous for our Lord Christ*, for the Last Day, for the entire Gospel, nothing analogous for any part of the Gospel or of the Creed. Therefore all of that must be stricken as superstitious and cleansed of everything that has no analogy. Only that may be permitted to stand which can be traced back to a universal law of nature by means of so and so many analogies. To say it a different way and to put it plainly: Even you are naturalists here. You believe in inviolable natural laws which operate in absolute fashion, and which leave no room for *unica*, for a special intervention on the part of God, for miracles, for supernatural inspiration and revelation, for the God-man Christ, for the resurrection and eternal life. You believe that 2 times 2 is 4, that the three angles of a triangle make two right angles, that two pounds of good beef, cooked in a little water for 4 hours with a little seasoning, makes a pretty good soup.

We Christians in America have indeed heard the clamor of science and its presupposition—the inviolability of the laws of nature—that there’s a good reason for everything, as our journeyman locksmiths say; but as philosophers we are supranaturalists and consider the miracle to be possible; as Christians we consider thousands of miracles to be factual. As philosophers we do not believe in the absolute regularity of all

happenings and things, a regularity that renders impossible everything personal, every free activity, yes, finally also every irregularity. Such regularity would mean absolute death, absolute nothingness. Rather we believe in *irregularity in regularity* as the highest law of all things. Expressed in Christian terms: we believe in a God who freely rules in nature. We believe with all seriousness in the miracle of creation and preservation, in the miracle of Christ, and in the miracle of supernatural inspiration and prophecy; and in connection with faith in these great miracles, faith in such minor miracles like a speaking ass or a floating axe head or a resurrected Tabitha no longer causes us any difficulties. I think practice does that to us. We have experienced *one* great miracle: the miracle of which Paul speaks in Galatians 1:15f, “But when it pleased God ... *to reveal his Son in me.*” With that the objective miracle of Christ, God’s and Mary’s Son, our Savior, was assured, as also the miracle of the revelation of Christ in the Word, the Pentecost miracle, the miracle of the inspiration of the content and the words of Scripture (I Corinthians 2:10–13; II Peter 1:19–21), and the miracle of the actual inspiration of the prophets, also of the prophet Isaiah.

While we retain this faith in miracle after miracle, we remain on the path of strict scholarliness. When the Holy Ghost has once assured us unequivocally of one or two miracles, the possibility of thousands of miracles is not excluded, even where specific analogies are missing. Thus we believe that the prophet Isaiah always and everywhere, when and where he prophesied, prophesied by the miracle of supernatural revelation, according to chapter 6 of his book. He produced no passage, not even a single one, by human volition, reckoning, divination, intuition, or anything of the kind; God gave everything to his natural spirit in a supernatural manner. We grant that he ordinarily prophesied from the perspective of his own historical times; *why should not the Spirit of God move him and empower him to prophesy also from a future viewpoint and to speak to a future generation!*

### The Argument from Grammar

Yes, it is a fact that Isaiah II has its standpoint in the future. It was a serious mistake when Christian exegetes up until Delitzsch insisted that passages like 43:22–28, 66:6, 20 and single passages in chapter 57 and elsewhere dealt with circumstances *before* the destruction of Jerusalem and the Exile. It is *a priori* very unlikely that the prophet would here forsake the standpoint he had once taken, and again speak out of his own pre-exilic times. Thereby he would have made his prophecies confused and rendered them unintelligible. Precise investigation shows that he actually never abandoned the future viewpoint once he had taken it. On the other hand, it is arbitrariness for the present day exegetes of Isaiah to determine the standpoint which Isaiah took as the time historically between 548 (Pasargadae), or even 546 (Sardis), and 538 (Babylon). They base their conclusion on the perfects הָעִיר and הָעִירוֹתִי in 41:2, 25; 45:13, and on the fact that in 44:28; 45:1 Koresh [Cyrus] is even mentioned by name and the perfect tenses referring to his calling are repeated.

It can make little difference to us whether Isaiah transports himself a few years earlier or later into the Exile with his prophecy. But we are concerned to have a sure exegetical basis under our feet. *The perfects are not to be construed as historical.* They can just as well be present or future, and a consecutive imperfect like הָיָא following in 41:25 is simply assimilated into the time sphere of the preceding perfect. Or, who else but a naturalistic exegete would take the נָתַתִּי in 42:1 or the קָרָאתִיךָ in 42:6 or the שָׁלַחְתִּי in 43:14, etc., for historical perfects! The time sphere of these perfects can be ascertained only from the context, and this does *not* yield the fact that reference is here made to a Koresh who had already made his appearance, so as to prove that earlier predictions of the Lord about his future appearance had been *fulfilled*. Such earlier predictions about Koresh are nowhere to be found, neither in Isaiah nor anywhere else. These prophecies here in 41 and the following chapters up to 48:14–16 are *the only ones* about Koresh. And—this is the place at which the opponents always shift the argument—the point at issue in these addresses is not, whether the heathen and their idols could produce a *fulfillment* of their predictions, but whether they could parallel this prediction of the Lord about Koresh with something similar, a similar prophecy (naturally such a one whose fulfillment they could

guarantee)—perhaps of a future victorious foe and challenger of Koresh. The heathen and their idols could *predict* nothing with certainty—that is the thing the Lord without exception asserts in these discourses. He constantly holds up to them that they do not *speak, do not open their mouth, and remain dumb* - not that they had not validated previous predictions. Thus after 41:4 follows, not a rejoinder by the heathen, but only consternation. Thus the Lord challenges them in verses 21–24 to *show, declare beforetime, speak*, and says that they are nothing, because they *do not open their mouth*, verses 24, 26, 28. By his *predictions* the Lord distinguishes Himself from the idols and demonstrates His divinity, because He is the one who does all things and causes them to come forth, and fulfills His prophecies (41:4, 25, 27; 42:9; cf. 43:9, 12; 44:7ff.); *here Koresh is as precisely in the future as the downfall of Babylon and the return through the wilderness*, 43:14–20. The reliability of the prophecy about Koresh has those great deeds of God, *which lie in the past* as a guarantee, 43:16–20. He that *did* say to the deep: “Be dry,” etc., also says to Koresh: “Build the city and the temple,” and would thereby *confirm* the prediction of his prophets, 44:26–28. Even chapter 45 and particularly verse 13 is, like 46:11, not a *reference* to a Koresh who has already appeared, but a *prediction* of a future Koresh.

In order to strengthen their allegation that, according to 41:2–7, 21–29; 44:27f, 45:1, 13; 46:11; 48:14ff, Koresh had already come, the naturalistic exegetes (the believing ones merely follow them) point to the fact that Koresh is mentioned by name. This is not only supposed to be the proof that Koresh was there, but also that Isaiah II was written by a man living at the time of Koresh. If you ask, why this is so, the answer is again: the lack of analogy for this kind of prophecy. Since we have above concerned ourselves sufficiently with the value of the proof from analogy, we do not need to refute it here a second time. Behind all this nonsense lurks unbelief, naturalism, which cannot comprehend how a prophet could know of things like the victorious career and the name of a hero beforehand. Even the assertion that prophecy always has its roots in the historical situation of a prophet means to say basically nothing more than that a prophet *estimates* the future on the basis of the present, even though he does it by means of a great, though only natural aptitude. To recognize this, one needs only to read the rationalist Ewald (*Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, I, Introduction, p. 2ff.), the naturalist Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, 6. A. p. 398: “In the prophet the mysterious rapport in which divinity stands toward man becomes active”), and Cornill (*Der Israelitische Prophetismus*, p. 35f.: “The prophet has the *capacity to recognize God in history*. He *feels* it, when catastrophes are in the air... *In this, and only in this sense, does the Israelite prophet foretell the future.*”).

Likewise, our worthy “theologians” do not believe in real prophecy at all. Naturally we cannot come to an agreement with such people. What a tragedy that also the theologians of our time who still believe the Bible are to a large degree under the spell of this unbelief and believe that they have to follow the naturalists. Now, it is the spell of the name *scholarliness* that governs everything in the German universities. Scholarliness is the god whom the German scholars worship. Thus we must understand the matter! Not to join in would mean to be called unscholarly, and that is something the German *theologian* cannot bear, not even those who still accept the Bible. As a result the unbelieving theologians have deprived the poor German people of their faith in the Bible and in the Gospel; have thereby ruined their morality, and have *in summa* ushered in their present [1919] political collapse. And the confessedly Christian theologians have assisted them in this. At the same time they are not aware of the fact that they must become unscholarly in the same moment that they believe in any miracle, above all, when they believe in Christ as their God and Savior in the sense of Paul. For that reason the naturalistic, unbelieving theologians laugh at the Christians, and the professors of natural science and philosophy laugh in turn at the naturalistic theologians. Who would not hereby be reminded of the words of the second Psalm?

### **The Servant of the Lord**

Not only does Isaiah by the Holy Ghost take his standpoint in the Exile in the Second Part of his book, but also in chapter 42 and then from 49 on he takes it in the time of Christ. In chapters 42 and 49 God causes His true Servant, His Son, “His salvation to the ends of the earth,” to arise, and in chapter 49 the Servant Himself turns to the isles and the far-off heathen *of his own time*, and not the time of the prophet. The Lord



promises Zion the coming of the Gentile world. In chapter 50 the prophet suddenly stands again in the Exile and in verse 4 the New Testament Servant, who has appeared, speaks once more. In chapters 51 and 52 no historical standpoint is discernible, if it is not the New Testament time, for they address the pious Diaspora of all the world, and the Zion addressed here is in truth the ideal Zion, to which the physically destroyed Zion lends vividness. And where again is the historical basis either of the Exile or the postexilic age in chapter 53, in which even Duhm finds an individual pictured, and in which as we know so well all theologians who accept the Bible find our Lord Christ described? The Prophet here stands *under the cross*, as Delitzsch rightly says. By the rule of analogy, a contemporary of the apostles must have written these chapters! And from chapter 56 on the Lord's house of prayer is still standing, or standing again—which? With Duhm and Marti and Cheyne and Whitehouse a person is compelled to say: *again*. It is the so tragically prostrate Zion, the city, not the people languishing still in Babylon, which in chapters 59, 60, 61, and 62 is to be restored and glorified. And without any historical basis the Servant of the Lord enters again in chapter 61 with His proclamation of the acceptable year of the Lord! And where are the historical roots for 63:1–6, *if a person is not a naturalist*? But that is enough of the historical viewpoints.

The Holy Spirit of God, the Spirit of revelation, revealed to the prophet Isaiah, whose activities ceased about 700 B.C., that God had rejected the physical Israel, and that it would have to go off to Babylon into captivity. At the same time he revealed to him that a remnant would be preserved and would return, yes, that a remnant of this remnant would continue to be devout throughout all ages; that in His time the Servant of the Lord would emerge from this remnant and would redeem the whole Israel of Jews and Gentiles from all their sins, smash the old outworn Israel entirely, and gather His predestinated Zion from among Jews and Gentiles of the whole world through the Gospel, and in spite of the power of the ungodly world hallow it and eternally glorify it.

The prophet was to preach and write in this way in order that this plan of the Lord might be performed by his preaching and his writing; that the incorrigibles might become hardened and call down judgment on themselves, that a remnant might be saved up to the Exile and through the Exile and after the Exile by his preaching, namely through the correction he brought, the comfort he spoke, the admonition he brought. And to that end the prophet was to preach a good deal by word of mouth to his generation and to record the main points of these sermons in writing, and out of his second half to make a fine, poetical, coherent prophecy in three parts about the deliverance from Babylon, from the guilt of sin, and from all evil, and thereby to take his standpoint at times in the Exile, at others after the Exile, or at still others in the time of the appearance of the Savior, just as the Spirit would inspire him, in order that all the incorrigible unbelievers in the whole world might stumble and fall on his book, just as the two houses of Israel fell on the rock of offense and a preserved remnant be gathered out of all peoples, hallowed and eternally glorified. This is the position of simple faith in the book of Isaiah over against the present-day harebrained higher criticism; at the same time faith is aware that it has not denied a single particle of real scholarliness.

### **The Argument from a Difference in Spirit**

The other argument—to sum up everything else—against the Isaiah authorship of the Second Part, namely that there is a different spirit here and that the language is entirely different from that in the First Part, is just as easy to counter.

Isaiah II has other words, images, and phrases than Isaiah I. His style is flowing, while Isaiah I writes laconically and heavily; his rhetoric is warm, impassioned, that of Isaiah I is grave and restrained; here is pathos, there is majesty; here are images from the populated world, particularly from the sphere of human emotions, as the many personifications show. Even heaven and earth are called upon to rejoice. On the same level is his preference for the dramatic. Moreover his theology is more highly developed than that of Isaiah I. The latter stays with the majesty of God, *he* on the other hand describes His infinity as Creator, Sustainer, Life-Giver, as the Author of all history, as the First and the Last, the Incomparable. “This is a real difference,” writes Driver, from whom we have taken the preceding, because our readers have ready access to him (cf. pp. 238ff.,

*Introduction*). And what in the First Part is mere assertion appears now as the object of reflection. As a second item: *The remnant*, which played such a prominent role there, now almost disappears here. Israel's relationship to the Lord is presented in different terms. Thus: the messianic King disappears and in his place enters "the Servant of the Lord," the Sufferer, and indeed not as a continuation of the king, but as his parallel. God's plan for the nation is more completely developed. "In a word, the prophet moves in a different region of thought from Isaiah" (p. 243).

In both instances we have given Driver so much space in order to be fair to those holding to an opposite view, but also to state their argument as its own refutation. For on the one hand, almost every single one of these assertions is exaggerated. You need only to look into the first chapter. Isaiah II is indeed a man of personifications! He even personifies nature, "he bids heaven and earth shout at the restoration of God's people (44:23; 49:13; cf. 52:9, 55:12)," says Driver (p. 241). Yet we would call attention to this that Isaiah I opened his book of prophecy with a personification, and indeed with the personification of heaven and earth, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, etc.," (1:2). And this is supposed to be an idiom of Isaiah II that he calls out in 44:23, "Sing, O ye heavens, for the Lord hath done it; shout ye lower parts of the earth, etc.!" Every normal human being would conclude the *identity* of the author from the *similarity* of this literary occurrence. Ah, yes, but that just wouldn't be "scholarly"!

"Isaiah's rhetoric is grave and restrained," says Driver; "in these chapters (40–66) it is warm and impassionate" (p. 240f.). And we ask: can there be anything *more impassionate* than chapter 1 in its three strophes? "Ah, sinful nation!" "Ye rulers of Sodom ... ye people of Gomorrah!" "How is the faithful city become a harlot!" And isn't it self evident that the expressions of joy used in describing the hoped-for glory of Zion in chapter 62 would flow more smoothly than the expressions of anger and sorrow used in depicting the incorrigibility of the people? How is the *grandeur* of the First Part different from the *pathos* of the Second? O you critics, you can even hear the grass growing and the lettuce shooting forth!

As to the variations in theology, the "real difference": where is the difference between the concept of *majesty* of the First Part and that of the "infinite" of God in the Second Part? Will not the average person who still thinks concretely find the majesty of God precisely in his "infinite," which Driver describes as, "He is the Creator, the Sustainer of the universe, the Life-Giver, the Author of History (41:4), the First and the Last, the Incomparable One"? To take just one instance from the *first* chapter—is the אֲבִיר יִשְׂרָאֵל of 1:24 less infinite than the אֲבִיר יַעֲכֹב of 49:26 and 60:16, and this one less majestic than the other? And is it not self-evident that the threatening Isaiah of the First Part emphasizes the moral-majestic side of the infinitely mighty God, and that the Isaiah of the Second Part, who promises deliverance, emphasizes the infinite power of the majestic God? To see clear-cut distinctions here is simply toying with self-made abstract concepts, by which you may deceive only those who have given up all concrete thinking.

"Again, the doctrine of the preservation from judgment of a faithful remnant is characteristic of Isaiah. It appears both in his first prophecy and in his last (6:13; 37:31f.); in chapters 40–66, if it is present once or twice by implication (59:20; 65:8f.), it is no distinctive element in the author's teaching; it is not expressed in Isaiah's terminology, and it is not more prominent than in the writings of many other prophets." Therefore Isaiah cannot be the author of Isaiah II! This is only a new deception. Isaiah speaks about the remnant in express terms seven or eight times in Part I, 6:13; 10:20–23; 11:11–16; 24:13f; 28:5, 23–29; 37:31f. Of these almost all critics explain 11:11–16 to be spurious and even the product of Deutero-Isaiah. It belongs thus on the other side, and many do the same with 37:31. Thus there remain five passages in the First Part against two implied passages and one expressed passage in the Second Part. But what person in his right mind would decide from this that the Second Part has a different author? To what end should Isaiah II *say* that a remnant would be saved, when he *directs* all of his discourses directly to this remnant itself, and announces rescue, deliverance, glorification to them, and does so from 40:1 to 66:24? In the quest for "differences" between Part I and Part II the critics have become mechanistic. And it is quite a wonderful art, first to deny the prophet a series of chapters out of purely naturalistic reasons and ascribe them to a Deutero-Isaiah and then to point out the difference between them in phraseology and theology, but where it suits their purpose to reinsert those passages into the First Part and again

say: Don't you see the difference? Indeed, if *that* is scientific scholarship, then you can also prove that a sphere is a cube.

The messianic King of the First Part and the preaching, suffering Servant of the Lord of the Second Part are proof of different authorship! Yet, how would a preaching, suffering Servant fit in the First Part, where Isaiah is preaching rejection and judgment to an incorrigibly hardened royal house and nation? There a different *king* and a different *rule* were fitting as a message from the Lord. The Sufferer would only have experienced mockery. And how could the prophet have come in the Second Part to the faithful remnant to whom he turns with the idea of a new *king* and *kingdom* without again awakening in this remnant the false hope of an earthly king and new earthly glory? Here only the meek, powerless Prophet and suffering Substitute was appropriate. In the First Part the messianic King; in the Second Part the Prophet and High Priest—what could be more natural, fitting, glorious, if you are not a naturalist, and do not impute purely materialistic thoughts to the prophet, but rather believe that through Isaiah the Holy Ghost wanted to reveal Christ, the true Messiah, the Savior from sin! Here lies the basis of all negative criticism, also of Isaiah criticism. There is a great gulf fixed between them and us, which does not permit them to cross over to us, nor us to them. We believe in Christ and see Him everywhere in the Old Testament, just as He Himself saw Himself there. They don't believe. They are naturalists and turn the Scriptures, if not into an intentional deception, at least into a naturalistic book full of superstition, and turn Isaiah into a naturalist and a fanatical materialist, who out of pure religious fanaticism dreamed up and prophesied a materialistic Shangri-la for the Israel of the future, and naturally deceived himself and others.

### The Two Ages of Isaiah

Is it really still worth the effort to go into the differences of linguistic usage in vocabulary, and phraseology? It has become almost universally the fashion among those who cling to the Isaiah authorship of the Second Part to explain the undeniable, stated difference in this way that they say, Isaiah wrote the First Part in his youth and manhood, in the turmoil of the life of the nation; the Second Part, in his old age, in the quietude of retirement. But where are the proofs for this? Why this opinion? I feel that you would do better the other way around. Part II is the revelation of his youthful period, and Part I contains for the most part the discourses of his manhood and old age, and the old man finally bound both parts into a whole by means of chapters 36–39. If I were a modern scholar, I would prove this so stringently by psychology with all the rules of the art, as no modern Isaiah critic has yet proven any part of his negative opinions. It is in youth that a man's hopes bloom, just as the blossoms of the meadow do in spring. In autumn there are only a few late blossoms, and everything green—even in the heart—finally turns to gray. In old age there is awareness in the heart of the seriousness of life, and by experience a man has acquired wisdom, and also moral strictness, inflexible judgment, and a pessimistic state of mind.

The youthful writings of every great man are similar to Isaiah II in spirit; the writings of advanced years, to Isaiah I. You need only to compare Luther's *The Freedom of the Christian Man* and his *Against the Papacy of Rome, Founded by the Devil*. And from the difference in emphasis, in vocabulary, in phraseology, and in the theology of these two Luther writings it would be easier to spell out two entirely different authors, than it is for the modern Isaiah critics to divide the Book of Isaiah into two, three, four, or forty parts. But that would be a psychological-naturalistic explanation of these literary works, and such an explanation I will on principle *not* give, because that is a dead mechanical procedure in the sphere of natural, intellectual life, and for that reason is necessarily false. And even though Isaiah had had as little inspiration as Luther, he could, contrary to all pedantic psychology, have written both parts of his book, just as well as Luther wrote the above writings. What kind of vocabulary I use, what kind of diction I employ, what sort of theology or science I unfold, what sort of spirit pervades my writings, all this depends—assuming that I am a person of moderate gifts and of some ability—on outward circumstances and the impressions which they make upon my soul. One and the same man will make an objective exegesis, a lecture before educated people, and a popular sermon on the same subject each so different in vocabulary and diction, in theology or anthropology, in spirit and fluency, that a modern

psychologist might easily discover three different authors for them, using the manner and method of modern Isaiah critics.

The present-day criticism of Isaiah was manufactured in the study room, and was not obtained from real life. Everywhere it reeks of the lamp. How can you at all expect from it the proper assessment of a divinely inspired book that does not allow itself to be cast into any psychological rules, however much the Holy Spirit may accommodate Himself to the human peculiarities of His instruments! Though it seems humanly probable to me that Isaiah wrote the Second Part of his book in his youthful years and the First Part in his senior years, *proving* it is something that I will not do and cannot do. I would have to tell myself that I would be carrying on the same “scholarly” hoax as the Isaiah critics of today and yesterday. The Book of Isaiah has a greater witness than “the witness of John,” John 5:36.