

more stage in a program of salvation for Israel that shall last "till the stars grow old and the sun grows cold and the leaves of the judgment book unfold", yes, even beyond. But why we should make it refer to anything but literal Israel is more than we can understand, and Alexander indeed urges hardly any serious reasons to the contrary.

The critical objections to the Cyrus passage we are not at liberty to take up except to point to possible answers. The work has been done by Dr. Oswald T. Allis.¹ He proves by the artistic and powerful literary arrangement of the poem 44: 24-28 that the whole point of the section is that the prediction is for the ~~xxxx~~ far-distant future. The emphasis also in chapter 45 is that the wonderful element in the prophecy was to predict long beforehand the very name of this colossal knight on the chessboard of Divine Providence. Dr. Allis's work adds point to Naegelsbach's sharp observation: "What ~~ix~~ representation can one make to himself of a man who continually affirms: Jehovah ~~ix~~ alone is God because He alone knows the future, which he evinces by naming the man Cyrus,--but who by fraudulent conversion of a res acta ~~is~~ a res agenda abstracts the very ground under his feet in reference to his argumentation, in fact transforms it into a proof of the contrary. What a hypocrite he must have been."² No, the critics are wrong. We have here not a nameless post-exilic ghost writer forging a theistic argument out of a tissue of lie. It is instead what the church has always thought it to be--the great and holy prophet exhibiting in a very marvellous way the deep counsels of the Lord of all the earth.

In the final three chapters of this division the fall of Babylon holds the chief place. In a sense there is a recapitulation and even anti-climax, because the important thing--that Israel would be returned to Palestine--had been foretold. But God will punish those that oppress His people, and their end is certain destruction. We may not forget that through the

1. Biblical and Theological Studies, by the faculty of Princeton Theol. Sem., pp. 579-

2. Lange Commentary, in loc.