WHERE DID DEUTERO-ISAIAH LIVE?*

MOSES BUTTENWIESER
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE, CINCINNATI

The question, "Where, in what country, did Deutero-Isaiah live?" is one of supreme importance, inasmuch as that country, it must be assumed, was the seat and center of those activities that led to the rebirth of the Jewish nation in the year 538 B. C., and because on the answer which is to be given to this question will depend whether the prevailing presentation of the new developments in postexilic Jewish history is to be accepted or whether it requires to be revised.

The majority of biblical scholars hold that the anonymous author of Is. 40-55, who wrote his great vision of Israel's deliverance a few years prior to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus,[1] lived among the Babylonian exiles; Ewald[2] and Bunsen,[3] whose view has been accepted also by Marti,[4] think that he wrote in Egypt, while Duhm is of the opinion that he lived in Northern Phoenicia.[5] To my mind, all three views are untenable; a careful examination of Is. 40-55, I am convinced, leaves no other conclusion possible than that their writer lived in Palestine.

* The present article was read before the Theological Society of the Hebrew Union College at its regular monthly meeting, April 1918. My original intention was to develop certain points more fully and to incorporate the whole in the second volume of *The Prophets of Israel,* in preparation; but on reading the article by Professor John A. Maynard, *The Home of Deutero-Isaiah,* in vol. XXXVI (1917), No. III-IV of this journal (issued July 1918), I decided to present my paper in its original form at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, December 1918. It seems to me both interesting and significant when, on such a moot point as the home of Deutero-Isaiah, two students arrive, independently of each other, at the same conclusion, particularly when, as in the present case, they approach the subject from entirely different angles and proceed along entirely different lines of reasoning.

[1] See below.

[2] *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes,* 2d ed., vol. III, p. 30 f.

[3] *Bibelwerk,* herausgeg. von H. J. Holtzmann, vol. VI, p. 490.

[4] *Das Buch Jesaia,* p. XV.

[5] *Das Buch Jesaia,* 2d ed., pp. XVIII and 336.

I

In the first place, the undisguised way in which Deutero-Isaiah speaks about the imminent conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, and his open appeal to the exiles to make ready for their march out of Babylon, make it seem unlikely that he wrote in Babylonia. To address such an appeal to the exiles directly would mean practically to carry on revolutionary agitation among a people held in bondage, and such a course would not have been tolerated by ancient Babylonia any more than by any other nation, modern or ancient. We know from Jer. 29: 21-23 that the prophets Zedekiah and Ahab were burned to death by Nebuchadnezzar, because they encouraged the exiles of the year 597 in their hope of a speedy return to Judah. That the Babylonian government would not have countenanced such an agitation and such predictions as those of Deutero-Isaiah may also be inferred from Ezekiel. Ezekiel devotes one-fourth of his book to detailed predictions of the destruction of the enemy-nations of Israel, inclusive of the world-power Egypt; he considers their destruction as a necessary preliminary to Israel's restoration. His writings, however, contain no prediction, either of an open or a disguised character, against Babylonia, Israel's principal enemy;[6] although there can be no doubt that Ezekiel, even as Deutero-Isaiah later, and the other writers on that question (as Is. 13 and 14, Is. 21; Jer. 50 and 51), must have looked upon the destruction of Babylon as the prime requisite of Israel's deliverance. And what is still more significant, Ezekiel, though he describes at length, with great profuseness even, the nation's restoration, avoids direct mention of Babylonia, in connection with the hoped for return of the people to their country. He speaks instead in a general way of their being brought out from the nations and being gathered from all the countries, or "on every side," or from all the countries to which they have been dispersed (cf. Ez. 20: 34, 41; 28: 25; 34: 12, 13; 36: 24; 37: 21;

[6] That the prophecy, Ez. 38-39, against Gog and Magog is an enigmatic prediction against Babylon is excluded by reason of the fact that 38: 8 and also v. 14 state expressly that Gog and Magog's attack is not to occur until many years after Israel has been reinstated in its country. And even if it were an enigmatic prediction, it would prove my point just the same.

also 38:8).[7] In one passage, 37:13, he employs metaphorical language: וידעתם כי אני יהוה בפתחי את קברותיכם ובהעלותי אתכם מקברותיכם "Ye shall know that I am the Lord when I open your graves and bring you up out of your graves."

This strange feature of the Book of Ezekiel is to be explained, to my mind, in one way only, that Ezekiel, warned by the fate of Zedekiah and Ahab, was extremely cautious in speaking of the future deliverance. He probably reasoned that his guarded references might escape notice because of the prominence he had given in his book to his prophecies of the certain overthrow of Jerusalem by Babylon as also to his predictions of the destruction of Ammon, Tyre, and Egypt by the same power. (Note particularly in this respect Ez. 30:24 f.)

Further proof that Deutero-Isaiah did not live in Babylonia is furnished by the fact that both in his appeal to the exiles to leave Babylon, and in his description of their prospective exodus, he assumes the rôle of an outsider, not the rôle of one who expects to participate in the coming events. Thus in his appeal Is. 48:20 he says:

צאו מבבל ברחו מכשדים
בקול רנה הגידו השמיעו זאת
הוציאוה עד קצה הארץ
אמרו גאל יהוה את עבדו יעקב

"Leave ye Babylon, flee ye from Chaldaea!
With a triumphant voice announce it, make it known,
Spread it to the ends of the earth,
Proclaim: 'God has redeemed His servant Jacob.'"

Had Deutero-Isaiah been one of the exiles, he would not have used the second plural imperative, but the first plural cohortative: נצאה מבבל נברחה מכשדים בקול רנה נגידה ונשמיעה זאת וגו'. Still more telling is the following verse 21: ולא צמאו בחרבות הוליכם מים מצור הזיל למו ויבקע צור ויזבו מים

"They will not suffer thirst when He leads them through deserts:

[7] It is noteworthy in this connection that also Ez. 39:27 G read מארצות הגוים instead of מארצות אויביהם.

He will cause the water to flow out of the rock for them;
He will cleave the rock, and the water will pour forth."[8]

We may be sure that Deutero-Isaiah, when carried away by his vision of divine guidance for the Babylonian exiles, would have included himself among the recipients of God's protection, had he been living among them, and instead of the pronoun of the third person, would have used the pronoun of the first plural.

What has just been remarked in regard to Is. 48: 20 f. applies also to Is. 52: 11-12:

סורו סורו צאו משם טמא אל תגעו
צאו מתוכה הברו נשאי כלי יהוה
כי לא בחפזון תצאו ובמנוסה לא תלכון
כי הלך לפניכם יהוה ומאספכם אלהי ישראל

"Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out thence, touch not any unclean thing!
Go ye out of the midst of her; purify yourselves, ye that bear the weapons of the Lord!
Not in wild haste will ye go out, nor will ye depart in flight;
For the Lord will march in front of you,
And the God of Israel will be your rear guard."

That the appeals of 48: 20 and of 52: 11 are to be understood as made by the prophet himself, and not as emanating from God, may be seen from the fact that both in 48: 21 and in 52: 12, and also in 52: 10, God is spoken of in the third person. Note that in the parallel descriptions Is. 41: 18-19 and 43: 19-20, which are put in the mouth of God, the pronoun of the first person singular is used. There is no need, however, for any further speculation on this point, since in צאו משם "Go ye out thence"

[8] The perfects and imperfects with *waw consecutivum* in v. 21 have not the force of past tenses; the verse is a compound temporal sentence, בחרבות הוליכם being the protasis of both ולא צמאו and מים מצור הזיל למו and also of ויבקע צור ויזבו מים. As often in conditional and temporal sentences, the perfect is used in both the protasis and the apodosis; in the last two clauses of the apodosis the imperfect with *waw consecutivum* is used instead. It should be added that the imperfect with *waw consecutivum* used by itself is quite frequent in the apodosis; cf. e. g. Job. 3: 25a, 6: 20b, 8: 4, 9: 20, 19: 18b.

of v. 11 we have direct proof that the writer did not live in Babylonia. Had he been living there, he would have said צאו מזה "Go ye out hence". The attempt of Cheyne and others to reason this משם out of existence by maintaining that "the expression is used imaginatively," inasmuch as the writer in vv. 7-9 "places himself imaginatively in Palestine,"[9] but illustrates to what extent a preconceived idea may cloud a man's judgment. Why should the writer place himself imaginatively in Palestine when he is addressing himself to the exiles in Babylonia? It must be remembered that Ezekiel's two visionary voyages to Jerusalem (Ez. 8-11 and 40-48) were each for a definite purpose. The object of the first was that he might there receive the revelation of the city's destruction as decreed by God, and then and there prophesy it, and of the second, that he might have revealed to him a minute description of the future Temple and its cult.

מה לי פה of Is. 52:5 cannot be considered as affecting in any way the proof furnished by משם of 52:11, for Is. 52:3-6, it is generally agreed, is an interpolation. These verses, which speak of Israel's suffering in the Babylonian exile as undeserved, directly contradict Deutero-Isaiah's views as expressed throughout his writings. Like his predecessor prophets, Deutero-Isaiah regards the exile as the just punishment from God because of Israel's sinful life.

Another passage which precludes that Is. 40-55 was written in Babylon is 41:9, where, referring to Abraham's call from Ur of the Chaldaeans, Deutero-Isaiah says:

אשר החזקתיך מקצות הארץ ומאציליה קראתיך

"Whom I fetched from the ends of the earth and called from its extreme parts."

The language here clearly shows that Babylonia was for Deutero-Isaiah as remote as it was for Jeremiah and Isaiah, both of whom speak of it in similar terms (cf. Is. 5:26; Jer. 25:32, 31:8).[10]

[9] *Introduction to The Book of Isaiah,* p. 283; see also Dillmann-Kittel, *Jesaia,* 6th ed., p. 446.

[10] In regard to this passage, too, Cheyne remarks that "it supplies no objection" to the view that Deutero-Isaiah lived in Babylon, "for it is clear," he continues, "that the writer places himself imaginatively in Palestine where the home of Abraham would seem as far off as Palestine

But while from the evidence produced up to this point it follows only that Deutero-Isaiah cannot have lived in Babylonia, in Is. 43 : 5-6 there is proof that he must have lived in Palestine; only a person living in Palestine would have a picture of the exiles as returning from the east and the west, the north and the south.

To the same conclusion such passages point as Is. 40: 9-11, 49: 12, 17-19, and 52: 1-2, 7-9, where Deutero-Isaiah describes how in spirit he beholds the return of the exiles with God marching at their head and entering Zion in triumph; or how he beholds Jerusalem transformed, with the exiles hurrying back from all directions. The descriptions are so vivid and direct that the natural deduction for an unbiased reader (one who had never heard of the theory that Deutero-Isaiah lived in Babylonia) would be that their author lived in the ruined cities of Judah. Note particularly הנה אלהיכם in 40 : 9-11, which really means, "Your God is right here!"[11] and its continuation:

> "Behold the Lord God is entering as a mighty one,[12]
> And his arm exercises rulership."

Note further 49 : 17 f.:

> "Thy children hasten back...
> Look about and see them gathered together, how they all come back to thee;"[13] and finally 52 : 7-9:

> "How beautiful on the mountains are the feet
> Of him that brings glad tidings,
> Of him that announces peace,
> That heralds happiness, announces salvation:
> That says unto Zion, 'Thy God reigns.'
> Hark, thy watchmen! They cry aloud, they all shout triumphantly,

seemed to the Jewish exiles in Babylon" (*op. cit. ib.* and "The Prophet Isaiah" in *The Sacred Books of the Old and New Testament* ed. by P. Haupt, p. 176).

[11] Similar examples are I Ki. 18: 8 הנה אליהו, Judg. 8: 15 הנה זבח וצלמנע, I Sa. 9: 17 הנה האיש, and elsewhere.

[12] בְּ of בְּחָזָק is בּ *essentiae;* this reading is superior to that of GJV בְּחֹזֶק and is unquestionably original text.

[13] נקבצו is circumstantial clause.

For they behold eye to eye the return of the Lord to Zion.
Break forth into exultation, all ye ruins of Jerusalem,
For God shall comfort His people, He shall redeem Jerusalem!"

It will be noted that in the passages discussed before, in which he describes the exiles' imminent departure from Babylon and their homeward journey, Deutero-Isaiah writes like one who does not expect to share in their experience, while in the verses cited just now he speaks like one who is right in the midst of the transformation of which he dreams, and who in his exultation beholds the ruins about him clad with a visionary lustre.

As a final proof that Deutero-Isaiah did not write in Babylonia, it may be pointed out that while in Ezekiel there is abundant evidence of his Babylonian environment,[14] in Is. 40-55 there is nothing to suggest that the writer was living in Babylonian surroundings. Yet had Is. 40-55 been written in Babylonia, it would mean under the circumstances that Deutero-Isaiah had been living there practically all his life; in which case his writ-

[14] Note in this respect, first of all, Ezekiel's constant references to his Babylonian environment: cf. Ez. 1: 1 and 3 "I was among the exiles by the River Chebar"; 3: 11 and 15 "I came to the exiles at Tel-abib by the River Chebar, and sat there among them seven days;" *ib.* v. 23, 10: 20 and 43: 3 which make reference to his vision "by the river Chebar;" 8: 1-3 telling of his ecstatic transport from his home in Babylonia to Jerusalem; 11: 24 f. "And the spirit bore me aloft and brought me to the land of the Chaldaeans to the exiles . . . And I told the exiles all that YHWH had shown me;" 24: 26 "On that day will a fugitive come to thee to bring thee the tidings;" 33: 21 "In the twelfth year of our captivity in the tenth month . . . a man that had escaped from Jerusalem came to me with the report, 'The city has fallen;'" 40: 1 f. telling of his second ecstatic transport from Babylonia to Jerusalem; also 21: 1-7, and 33: 24 "the inhabitants of the ruins in the land of Israel"—the text originally, as G shows, did not read האלה, and rightly so, for the writer was at the time living, not in the devastated country of Israel, but in Babylonia.

As to the indirect evidence of Ezekiel's Babylonian surroundings compare the visions Chs. 1 and 10; the use of clay brick as writing material in 4: 1-2; the magic practices referred to 13: 18-21; liver-augury mentioned 21: 26 (also קלקל בחצים *ib.* and following verse describes Babylonian divination); "the sacred mountain of God" 28: 14 and 16, situated in the North as shown by Yahve's coming from the north in 1: 4; also the description of Eden as found 28: 13; and the ערלים = *aralû* in 28: 10, 31: 18, 32: 19, 21, 24-26, 28-30, 32.

ings would, of necessity, show the influence of the Babylonian environment far more even than do Ezekiel's writings.[15]

II

These facts about the place where Is. 40-55 was written have a direct bearing on the question as to the seat and center of the influences at work in bringing about the resurrection of the nation. But before considering this question, it will be necessary to make a few remarks on the date and composition of Deutero-Isaiah, because of the views entertained on these points by a number of scholars. I may briefly say that the various theories advanced as to the composite character of Is. 40-55, whether pertaining to the insertion of the Ebed-Yahve songs by a later editor, or to the subsequent addition of the Cyrus passages, have no basis in the facts of the case, but are the result of certain mistakes in literary and historical method. From a literary point of view it must be emphasized that if one approaches Is. 40-55 without bias, one cannot but be impressed by the fact that the Ebed-Yahve songs are an integral part of the book. Not only do they fit in logically in their context, but in each case the following part of the book is an expatiation on the theme of that particular Ebed-Yahve song. Similarly the Cyrus passages are an indispensable harmonious part of the whole; they could be eliminated only at the expense of the coherence of thought. Sound literary criticism, therefore, precludes the possibility of either the Ebed-Yahve songs or the Cyrus passages being later insertions. Interpolations, particularly such lengthy and material ones as would be the Ebed-Yahve songs and the Cyrus passages, never fit in harmoniously with the work of the original author, but invariably betray themselves through some more or

[15] It is hardly necessary to remark that the mention of Bel and Nebo in Is. 4:61 and the advice 47:13 "Let the astrologers, the stargazers, stand forth and save thee" do not fall under this category. To be conversant with the names of the principal Babylonian gods, and to know that the Babylonians cultivated astrology Deutero-Isaiah did not need to live there. Nor does his familiarity with the Marduk myth (51: 10) point to Babylonian surroundings; for this myth had undoubtedly been known in Israel for centuries, as may be inferred from the fact that the Adonis-Tammuz cult was in vogue in Israel as early as the days of Isaiah (cf. Is. 17: 10 f.) and continued to be practised down to the close of preexilic times (cf. Ez. 8: 14).

less striking discrepancy. This point cannot be too strongly emphasized. To consider the Ebed-Yahve songs and the Cyrus passages as other than organic parts of the writer's conscious creation would contradict not only the fundamental principles of literary criticism but common sense as well.

As to the grave mistake in historical method involved in the view that the Cyrus passages, either in part or as a whole, are later insertions, dating from the middle of the Persian period, it may be pointed out that these passages show the genuine enthusiasm of a contemporary who has been following the rise and victories of Cyrus with eager expectation, because he has visions of the far reaching consequences to follow these victories. The hopes that he places in Cyrus are part and parcel of his dream of Israel's restoration to glory and the regeneration of mankind that is to ensue. It is not conceivable that a writer, living some fifty years after Cyrus had given the Jews permission to return to their country, could have been stirred by such enthusiasm, the less so since the hopes roused among the Jews by this permission had met with bitter disappointment.

This circumstance disposes also of the view held by Ch. C. Torrey,[16] H. P. Smith[17] and others that the whole of Isaiah 40-55 dates from the time after the reign of Cyrus. The date of these prophecies is definitely fixed, on the one hand, by Deutero-Isaiah's reference to those victories of Cyrus already achieved, and on the other, by his prediction of those still in store for him. The former are Cyrus' overthrow of Media 549 B. C. and his defeat of Croesus 546 B. C., the latter, the conquest of Babylon 539-538 B. C. Deutero-Isaiah's prediction of this last conquest can in no wise be classed as *vaticinia post eventum*. In *vaticinia post eventum* the disguise, however skilfully worked out, is by the psychology of the case invariably betrayed—the writer's mind being too full of what has just transpired to be able to maintain the deception; whereas throughout Is. 40-55 the fall of Babylon is consistently described as imminent. In view of the fact that a number of scholars hold nevertheless that Is. 40-55 unquestionably presupposes the downfall of Babylon, some further remarks in elucidation of this point will not be out of place.

[16] *Ezra Studies*, p. 288.
[17] *Old Testament History*, pp. 371 and 379.

A grammatical analysis of any prophecy coming in question will unfailingly show whether it falls under the category of *vaticinia post eventum*, or whether the writer, because of his assurance that the predicted event is bound to come, speaks of it as if it had already occurred. Thus in Is. 47, Deutero-Isaiah's song of derision over the imminent fall of Babylon, נקם אקח of v. 3 shows that the event described is after all viewed as prospective. The same is shown by the fact that while in the concluding verses 14-15 the prophetic perfect is exclusively employed ('לא יצילו את נפשם מיד להבה. 14b. is circumstantial sentence'), in vv. 9-11 the prophetic perfect and the imperfect are used interchangeably. This interchange of the imperfect and prophetic perfect is invariably a sign of genuine prediction, and is carried through the entire prophecies of Is. 40-55, as anyone may verify by examining the following passages which come in question: 41: 10-20; 42: 16-17; 43: 1-4; vv. 13-17; 44: 22 f.; 46: 13; 49: 8; v. 13; vv. 17 ff.; 51: 3; v. 5; v. 11; v. 22; 52: 7-12; v. 15. 46: 1-2 is not in its proper place, as may be seen from the fact that there is a break of thought in v. 3; these two verses in all probability formed originally the opening of the song of derision ch. 47.[18]

In *vaticinia post eventum*, on the other hand, instead of the interchange of the perfect and imperfect, we find the perfect used exclusively throughout the description of the occurrence. As an example, we may consider Is. 21: 1-10, since this oracle will later occupy us further. The oracle claims to be a vision of the imminent fall of Babylon (cf. especially vv. 1-2a, 6, 8, and 10), and although this claim has been commonly accepted on its face-value, an examination of the tenses shows that the fall of Babylon was in reality a *fait accompli*. After stating that "a direful vision" has come to him, the writer, employing perfects throughout, does not describe his own fear and trembling in consequence of his vision, but, as G correctly understood vv. 3-4, the terror and confusion into which Babylon has been thrown by the sudden appearance of the Median warriors at her

[18] The perfects of 45: 16 f. and גאל of 48: 20c are future perfects; the former verses form part of the confession which will be made by the captive heathen nations, while the latter clause states the news which the redeemed exiles are told to proclaim.

gates. It is not the seer but Babylon that is represented as speaking in vv. 2b-4; for on the ground of **G**, *ἐπ' ἐμοὶ οἱ 'Ελαμεῖται, καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις*[19] *τῶν Περσῶν ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἔρχονται*, v. 2b is to be read: עָלַי עילם עָלַי צָרֵי מדי בָּאוּ "The Elamites, the Median[19a] besiegers have descended upon me." There can be no doubt that this is the original reading, since it does away with the strange contradiction, carried into the oracle by the Masoretic reading of v. 2b, that the seer, though gratified at the fall of Babylon, is horrorstricken at the thought of it. With this contradiction, not only have modern exegetes wrestled in vain, but from it they have drawn unwarranted inferences as to the workings of prophetic ecstasy. In the second part, vv. 6-9,[20] to which 22:6 originally belonged,[21] the seer describes how the attack and conquest have been successfully carried out. As in the first part, he uses the perfect tense throughout the description; moreover he repeats נפלה, emphasizing by this repetition that the fall of Babylon is an actual fact.

III

Obviously the fact that the greatest prophet of the exile lived and wrote in Palestine points to the conclusion that, not Babylon, but Palestine was the center of the activities that led to the rebirth of the nation. There can be no objection to this conclusion on the ground of the general situation that existed in Judah during exilic times. From the records in II Ki. 25 and Jer. 39-40 and 52 we know that, even at the time of the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C., only the upper classes were exiled to Babylon.

[19] The original צָרֵי the LXX misread צִרֵי. As to the qualitative genitive כרי cf. גדודי כשדים (II Ki. 24: 2) and as to the phrase as a whole cf. Jer. 4: 16 and Gen. 34: 27.

[19a] The name *Medes* is used for Persians; cf. 'Darius the Mede,'' Dan. 6: 1, 11: 1. The Old Testament has this use of the name in common with the Greek historians and the inscriptions of Southern Arabia; see M. Hartmann in *ZA.*, X, p. 32 f., Ed. Meyer, *ib.* XI, p. 327 f., and E. Littmann, *ib.*, XVII, p. 380 f. Note in this connection that **G** renders מדי with Πέρσαι.

[20] Verse 5 forms the connecting link between the two parts of the oracle; the meaning of this verse has been somewhat obscured through textual corruption.

[21] The original place of the verse was after v. 9a; cf. M. Buttenwieser, *The Prophets of Israel*, p. 288 f.

The lower classes, as the records expressly state, were left in the country to cultivate the land.[22] The exiles, including those of the year 597, amounted, according to a conservative estimate, to about one-eighth, and according to a liberal estimate, to about one-fourth of the population.[23] And that after the assassination of Gedaliah only a small part of the people went to Egypt may be seen from the fact that a few years later disturbances broke out among the Jews who had been left in the country, and that in consequence of this a third deportation, consisting of 745 persons, took place.[24]

It is absurd to argue, as has occasionally been done, that those that were finally left in the country, inasmuch as they were the דלת הארץ, "the poor," had neither the means nor the leisure to undertake the restoration of Jerusalem and the rebuilding of the Temple. Such an argument would more fittingly apply to the Babylonian exiles, for these, however wealthy they may once have been, were taken to Babylonia stripped not only of all wealth, but even of the barest necessaries of life (in accordance with the practice that has always obtained in connection with deportations); and in their bondage they certainly had no opportunity of acquiring wealth. On the other hand, those who had been left in the country, while they may have had to struggle greatly because of the existing desolation, were in reality not so destitute, for they had land, which at all times has been the prime source of wealth. In consequence they were in a far better position than the Babylonian exiles to carry on the work of restoration. This view receives support from Deutero-Isaiah, who, we have no reason to doubt, gives a faithful picture of the condition of the Jews in the Babylonian bondage when he speaks of them as "a down-trodden people, ensnared in dungeons and hidden in prisons," and as "fearing constantly because of the fury of the oppressor;"[25] and when in the fourth Ebed-Yahve song he describes them as abjectly miserable and abhorred.[26] His picture shows that the liberation of Jehoiachin from prison

[22] Cf. II Ki. 25: 12; Jer. 39: 10.

[23] Cf. H. Guthe, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3d ed., p. 266 f.

[24] Cf. Jer. 52: 30.

[25] Is. 42: 22, 51: 13; cf. also 41: 17, 42: 7, 47: 6, 49: 9, 50: 10, and 51: 14.

[26] Cf. Is. 52: 14, 53: 2-9.

by Evil-Merodach (or Neriglossor) can have brought no general change in the lot of the exiles. The erroneous view that these enjoyed prosperity and social standing rests primarily on the fictitious picture of their position given in the Book of Daniel. We know that the rôle ascribed in the book to Daniel and his companions has no basis in historical facts, but is a pure invention of the Maccabaean writer. It will be remembered that in the time of Ezekiel, the very time in which the book claims that he lived, the central figure, Daniel, was already a legendary character, classed and revered as such in the popular mind alongside of Noah and Job.[27] The story about the exalted position that Daniel and his companions attained at the royal court at Babylon was suggested no doubt by the position which Ezra and Nehemiah enjoyed at the court of the Persian kings. It was not until the time of the Persian rule that the status of the Babylonian Jews, through the liberal policy of the Achaemenides, was changed from that of an enslaved people to that of freemen, and that they were able to attain prosperity and social distinction. In Is. 21: 1-10, written immediately after the news of the fall of Babylon reached Palestine,[28] we have further confirmation that even during the latter part of the exile the condition of the Jews in Babylonia had undergone no change. The writer of the oracle refers in v. 1 to Babylonia as "the terrible land," a fact which in itself would have no special significance, but which in the light of the two words with which in conclusion he describes the situation of his own people, מדושתי ובן גרני, "my people threshed and flayed without cease" (v. 10), points unmistakably to the conclusion that to the very close of the exile the Jews in Babylonia were held in cruel subjection.

Further proof that Palestine was the main seat of the activities that led to the rebirth of the nation is furnished by the fact that the permission given by Cyrus to return to Jerusalem was far from meeting a hearty response on the part of the Babylonian exiles (primarily, we may assume, because these lacked the means to migrate and also probably because they had not the spiritual incentive). This point, however, can only be touched upon in the present paper; its adequate discussion would

[27] Cf. Ez. 14: 14-20.

[28] See below.

require a lengthy paper in itself. I must limit myself to mentioning that the view advanced by some scholars that there was no return from exile prior to Ezra and Nehemiah nor any permission for a return by Cyrus is quite untenable.[29] The permission given the Jews by Cyrus to return to Jerusalem and to rebuild the Temple, though there is no mention of it in the Persian and Babylonian edicts of Cyrus, is in accord with the liberal policy and religious tolerance practised by Cyrus and Darius toward the conquered nations throughout their empire. The permission is authenticated by the document in Ezra 6: 1-12, which contains Darius' answer to the report sent to him by Sisines and gives excerpts from the Cyrus-edict permitting the rebuilding of the Temple. This document, as Eduard Meyer showed, is undoubtedly genuine.[30] Cyrus' permission as recorded in it is free from the exaggeration and embellishment found in the record Ezra ch. 1. Conclusive proof that Cyrus gave permission to rebuild the Temple is furnished, to my mind, by the consideration that without such a permission the rebuilding could not have been undertaken either in Cyrus' reign or in the second year of Darius' reign; it would have been outright sedition, and would have been treated as such by Darius, we may be sure. However, a careful examination of Ezra and Nehemiah as well as of the literature in general of the time shows that prior to the days of Ezra and Nehemiah there was no return of the exiles on any large scale, and therefore, that the restoration in 538 B. C. must have been principally the work of the Jews that had been left in the country.

IV

As a contributory proof of the view that the restoration was primarily the work of the Palestinian Jews, it may be pointed

[29] See principally W. H. Kosters, *Die Wiederherstellung Israels in der persischen Periode*, übersetzt von A. Basedow (1895), and Ch. C. Torrey, *op. cit.* pp. 285 ff. Kosters and Torrey recognize that the Babylonian exiles did not have the part in the restoration of the nation with which they have customarily been credited; they go to the other extreme, however, and deny that the Babylonian exiles had any share whatever in the rebuilding of the nation. Torrey also represents the life of the exiles in Babylonia in a light that is far from correct.

[30] See *Entstehung des Judentums*, pp. 8-71.

out that at the time Deutero-Isaiah wrote his work literary activity was carried on in Palestine by other writers of marked ability. Of the products we have from these writers I shall mention:

(1) Isaiah 21: 1-10—This oracle, we have found, was written, not before, but after the conquest of Babylon. It was written in Palestine on the arrival, doubtless, of the news of Babylon's fall. Its Palestinian origin is shown first by כסופות בנגב לחלף "Like the tempests sweeping the South," i. e., the south of Palestine—an expression which, it is obvious, can have been used only by one writing in Palestine; and further by the statement with which the writer continues, that it is across the desert—that is, the Syrian desert—that "the direful vision" of the fall of Babylon has come to him (v. 1 f.). The oracle reflects the profound stir created among the Jews of Palestine by the news of the fall of Babylon,[31] and gives evidence throughout of superior authorship.

(2) Isaiah 13—This prophecy was written on the news reaching Palestine that the Medes and Persians under Cyrus' leadership had invaded Babylonia. This follows from the express reference to Cyrus' invasion of Babylonia, in verses 4-5 and 17. combined with the evident expectation of the writer that the invasion would end in the utter destruction of Babylon—an expectation which was not realized. Had this prophecy been written after the surrender and fall of Babylon, the writer would have made it agree with the actual course of events. That Is. 13 was not written in Babylonia but in Palestine is shown by באים מארץ מרחק מקצה השמים, "have arrived from a distant land, from the ends of the heavens" (v. 5), for inasmuch as Media and Persia bordered on Babylon, it is clear

[31] Even in the case of this product, strange to say, Cheyne, who with other scholars holds that it was written in Babylonia, resorts to his favorite theory of ecstatic transport. "He" (the seer), he writes, "is carried away in ecstasy to Jerusalem," adding, "and across the desert which separates Judah from the *terrible land* (Babylonia) visionary sights and sounds are borne swiftly towards him." ("The Prophet Isaiah" in *op. cit.*, p. 172.) Needless to say, an ecstatic transport under such circumstances—a man living in Babylonia, and writing of the exciting events there which he has just witnessed, is carried in ecstasy to Jerusalem in order to have visions of those events in Babylonia—would be contrary to common sense, and without analogy in Ezekiel or any other writer.

that a writer living in Babylon would not have spoken of them as if they were far distant countries. Yet for a Palestinian writer to refer to them in these terms was perfectly natural and customary.

There is such a marked difference in style between Is. 21 and Is. 13 that they must be considered the products of two different authors. Equally distinct is the style of these two products from that of Deutero-Isaiah.

(3) Psalms 85 and 126, which I shall translate in full for the reason that the customary translation of these Psalms tends to obscure their meaning. It will be more advantageous for our purpose to consider Ps. 126 first.

Psalm 126.

1. When God restores captive Zion, we shall be like dreamers:[32]
2. Then our mouths will be filled with laughter
   And our tongues with rejoicing:
   Then it will be said among the nations,
   God has dealt wonderfully with this *people*.
3. When God deals wonderfully with us, we shall rejoice.[33]
4. O God, bring about for us a change of fortune—
   A change such as is brought about in the streams of the South.
5. Those who sow in tears shall reap with joy:
   He who carries the seed for sowing walks weeping with measured steps,
   But he who carries the sheaves speeds along joyfully.[34]

It is important for our purposes to note, first of all, that in the expression (v. 4) "The streams of the South"—i. e., the south of Palestine—there is direct proof of the Palestinian

[32] From the vocalization שִׁיבַת I conclude that the text is not to be emended שְׁבִית but שְׁבִיַּת, the construct of the fem. adj. שְׁבִיָּה; as to the expression שְׁבִיַּת צִי׳ cf. שְׁבִיָּה בַּת צִיּוֹן Is. 52: 2, where the adjective is used in the attributive, instead of as here in the construct, position. The perfect in v. 1b does not denote a past event, but is to be considered as perfect used in the apodosis of conditional and temporal sentences.

[33] Verse 3 forms another temporal sentence with the perfect used in both the protasis and the apodosis.

[34] By "measured steps" and "speeds along" I try to render the meaning expressed by the absolute infinitives הלוך and בא.

origin of this Psalm, since the expression can have been used only by one living and writing in Palestine; further, that by the comparison, "A change such as is brought about in the streams of the South," the situation existing at the time the Psalm was written is most fittingly illumined: just as the rivers of "the South" dry up in summer and practically cease to exist as rivers, even so has Israel ceased to exist as a nation. This comparison makes it clear, as does also "When God restores captive Zion," (v. 1) that the Psalm must have been written prior to the restoration of 538 B. C.

In the light of this comparison of Israel to the dried up streams of the South, the meaning of the following verses 5-6 is plain. By a simple figure, which must come home to everybody, the writer suggests rather than describes the task to which he and his co-workers have set themselves, as also the hope which spurs them on in their work, and the fear that occasionally besets them: they are working to bring about the resurrection of the nation. Unquestionably this Psalm is a gem. It ranks with Is. 40-55, and if not by Deutero-Isaiah himself, is the work of an equally great poet.

Psalm 85.

1. Mayest Thou be gracious to Thy Country, O God,
   Mayest Thou bring about a change of fortune for Jacob.
2. Mayest Thou forgive the guilt of Thy people.
   Mayest Thou cover up all their sins.
3. Mayest Thou withdraw Thy wrath,
   Mayest Thou turn from Thy fierce anger.[35]
4. Return unto us,[36] O God of our salvation,
   And suppress Thy indignation toward us.

[35] The perfects in vv. 1-3 are precative perfects. The frequent occurrence of the precative perfect in the Psalms and its necessarily limited occurrence in other Biblical writings I discussed in a paper "The Importance of the Tenses for the Interpretation of the Psalms," read at the meeting of the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society held in Cincinnati, Feb. 22, 1918. As I showed in this paper (which I expect to publish soon) the interpretation of the Psalms has seriously suffered from the persistent refusal of the exegetes and Hebrew grammarians to reckon with the precative perfect.

[36] שׁובינו requires no emendation; the pronominal suffix is not direct but indirect object; for similar constructions cf. תנשני Is. 44: 21. צמתֻני Zech. 7: 5, יְגֻרְ־ Ps. 5: 5.

5. Wilt Thou be angry with us forever?
Wilt Thou continue Thy anger from generation to generation?
6. Wilt Thou not revive us again, so that Thy people may rejoice in Thee?
7. Show us, O God, Thy love and vouchsafe Thy help unto us.
8. O that I might perceive what God has promised:[37]
For He has promised[37] peace for his people and his pious ones,—
For all those that return to him with sincere heart.[38]
9. Verily His salvation is near for those that fear Him.
His glory is sure to dwell[39] in our land.
10. Love and truth shall meet, righteousness and peace shall kiss each other.[39a]
11. Truth shall sprout out of the earth,
And righteousness shall look down from Heaven.
12. Yea, God shall grant happiness,
And our land shall yield its produce.
13. Righteousness shall blossom before Him,
And direct the mind[40] to the way of his footsteps.

As vv. 1-6 clearly show, this Psalm was written, like Ps. 126, before the restoration, that is, before Cyrus issued the decree permitting the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the return of the exiles. In common with Ps. 126, too, it has close relationship with Deutero-Isaiah. Both Psalms reveal the same buoyant hope as Deutero-Isaiah's writings. Further, Ps. 126:2 epitomizes the opening thought of the fourth Ebed-Yahve song (Is. 52:13-53:1); and Ps. 85:11 voices the same lofty thought that is expressed Is. 45:8—the thought that in the ideal future righteousness shall descend from Heaven to earth, and Heaven

[37] ידבר is imperfect of reiterated action: the promises made through the prophets are meant.

[38] Read in accordance with G יארי שָׁבֵי כרבָּם לה; cf. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen*, *ad. loc.* and others.

[39] לשכן is emphatic infinitive; see M. Buttenwieser, *op. cit.*, p. 107, note 3.

[39a] The perfects of this verse are prophetic perfects, as the continuation with imperfects in the following verses shows.

[40] ישם is ellipsis for ישם לב

and earth unite for the realization of the perfect order of things. From their close relationship with Is. 40-55 it would follow that Ps. 85 and 126 were written either by Deutero-Isaiah himself or by writers thoroughly imbued with his spirit. And the fact that the Palestinian origin of Ps. 126 is certain, and that, if the product of a follower of Deutero-Isaiah, it was obviously written immediately after Is. 40-55 furnishes additional proof that Deutero-Isaiah wrote in Palestine. If Ps. 126 was written by Deutero-Isaiah himself, the proof would be still more cogent.

The obvious inference from all this, it may be indicated, is that it was not primarily through the work of Ezekiel in Babylonia, but through the activity of Deutero-Isaiah and his co-workers in Palestine that the hope of the preexilic literary prophets for a rebirth of the nation was realized. Ezekiel, in spite of his advance theoretically, always remained really subject to the limitations of his own times, he lacked the vision and the breadth to outgrow these—he was not the one (to use his own figure) to breathe new life into Israel's dead body. This task called for men who should be the spiritual peers of the preexilic prophets—men who should be thoroughly imbued with the true essence of their great predecessors' teachings, and inspired by their own visions of the universal dominion of God and the regeneration of mankind.[41]

[41] Through Maynard's article my attention was drawn to the article by Cobb, "Where Was Isaiah XL-LXVI Written?" in *JBL.*, 1908, pp. 48 ff. Cobb points out the Palestinian origin of Is. 40-55, but takes the view that these chapters together with chs. 56-66 are a uniform work of postexilic times—a view which cannot be maintained in view of the fact (to mention only one reason) that chs. 56-66 are a composite work, comprising the products of various authors and even of different times.