

undoubtedly have been drawn toward Babylon, and prophesying against her he could speak nothing but the truth. There is therefore no a priori reason for doubting that Isaiah should have prophesied against Babylon.¹

It will be convenient to list for our consideration the prophecies dealing with Babylon:

From the Burdens on the Nations - - - - - 13: 1-14: 23.
21: 1-10.

From the Historical section - - - - - 39: 1-8.

From the Second Division (ch.40-46) - - - 41:1-29 (?)
42:24-48:22.

In accordance with our purpose, therefore, we shall study not so much the criticism of these sections dealing with Babylonia and her ^{disastrous} overthrow ~~xxx~~ as with their exegesis. Our first section, 13: 1 to 14: 23 occurs in the beginning of a verse of condemnation which is headed simply "The burden of Babylon which Isaiah the son of Amos did see." The passage simply says that judgment is determined upon the city of Babylon, that God is bringing against her His "sanctified one", He is mustering His host to the battle. That it says in 13: 6 that the day of the Lord is at hand is no argument against the reference of this section exclusively to Babylon. We recognize that in Joel 2: 11 the Day of the Lord is cited as a day of great and terrible wrath upon the children of Israel. Yet as we have shown in the case of the words עַל־יְהוָה יוֹם־אֵל, "in that day", the expression, or any technical expression such as this, has not the technical significance which some would load upon it, but rather means simply the day or the time of which the context speaks. It seems so especially in this chapter, for the "day of the Lord" is specified very carefully as the day of the destruction of Babylon and the day of deliverance of the children of Israel, whereas in Joel and also in

1. We recognize that we have given a very small portion of the argument for and against the authenticity of these passages, and what we may say must remain inconclusive. But in order to say more we would have to consider the critical position as a whole and show how the premises of a mild criticism have logically led to the complete disintegration of the book, which can be