

of the expression "Darius the Mede", we will not allow them to argue that this prophecy of Isaih was written at the time of the conquest because he too speaks of a conquest by the Medes. The bolder conservative position would seem to be that both Isaiah giving the prophecy years before, and Daniel who wrote the history, as we believe, actually at the time of the conquest, were exactly right, and that although the invasion can be said to have been by the Persians, still the first step in the conquest was taken, as Isaiah and Daniel agree, by the Medes.

We pass onto chapter 21, the section which Dr. Naegelsbach has called the "libellus emblematicus", because the burdens there given ~~are~~ inscribed with emblematic headings. There are four prophecies listed-- those against Babylon, Egypt, Arabia, and Jerusalem, ending with a section concerning Shebna. Again Babylon, called "the wilderness of the sea", heads the list. There is here, however, no difficult problem either of exegesis or of criticism. These verses, ^{is} as mentioned by Alexander¹, are denied to Isaiah by many of the German critics, and, we may add, by all of the modern critics.² The decision here, however, rests on very slight evidence. As Alexander says, it is "founded partly on alleged diversities of phraseology, but chiefly on the wonderful coincidences with history both sacred and profane." It should be noted that in other sections of Isaiah the critics doubt the Isaianic authorship because there the author is said to presuppose the times of the captivity. But in this section no mention is made of the captivity of Israel. Only the overthrow of Babylon is described, just as in the next verses the overthrow of Arabia is given.

1. Commentary, in loc.

2. Thus Wade, Westminster Commentaries, in loc.