

now those of the Medes and Persians and the rulers were no longer those of the old nation. Now obviously such revolutions do not take place without some great events. There Cyrus entered the city more by stealth than by storm, but we are not to suppose that after Belshazzar and a few henchmen were disposed of the old city life went on about the same as ever. Kingdoms don't fall that way, especially strong and proud nations like Babylonia, even though they be seeped with inward rottenness. And neither do conquerors act so mildly. When the barbarians sacked Rome, at least, the story was different. It stands to reason that if Babylon fell, whether in a drunken debauch or in a hard-fought field, she fell as a giant.

The second observation of this nature is that the Biblical history points rather unanimously to the great overthrow. Jeremiah 50 ff. repeats the very language of Isaiah in long tirades against Babylon. Now Jeremiah prophesied approximately from 627 to 586<sup>1</sup>, whereas Cyrus's first year was 538. Now surely if Jeremiah's representation (to say nothing of that of the hypothetical Deutero-Isaiah) were in serious error, as the critics aver, it would not either have attained such sanction in the brief fifty or so years before its inclusion in the canon that it could not have been edited. If it had not been venerated, it would have been fixed up. If it were not basically true, it would not have been venerated. In short, this prophecy of Isaiah is quite similar to others which were accepted by the contemporaries of the events described as true. They should therefore be accepted by us as true to the extent intended (allowing for poetry and figure), and if true as having been literally fulfilled.

Our last remark concerns the quotations of chapters 47 and 48 found

-----  
 1. Davis, Bible Dictionary, articles on "Jeremiah" and "Chronology".