



Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Part of the  
ADDISON ALEXANDER LIBRARY,  
which was presented by  
MESSRS. R. L. AND A. STUART.

*Case.*

*Shelf.*

*Book.*

ES1515

A376

v. 2

cap 1

J. Boyd Smith.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation





THE



LATER PROPHECIES

OF

ISAIAH.

BY

JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

NEW-YORK & LONDON:  
WILEY AND PUTNAM.

1847.

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1847, by

JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER,

in the Clerk's Office of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.



## P R E F A C E.

---

THIS volume is a sequel to the one which appeared about a year ago, under the title of the Earlier Prophecies, the two together forming a continuous Commentary on Isaiah. While the same plan has been here retained without alteration, I have aimed at greater uniformity of execution, as well as a more critical selection of materials. The reasons for a separate investigation of these later chapters have been stated in the introduction to the other volume. In addition to the authors there enumerated, I have carefully compared the English version and remarks of Noyes (second edition, Boston, 1843) and *die Cyro-jesaianischen Weissagungen* of Beck (Leipzig, 1844); the first of which, though elegant and scholarlike, is too closely modelled on Gesenius to afford much new matter, and the other is remarkable chiefly for the boldness of its ultra-rationalistic doctrines, and the juvenile flippancy with which they are expressed. Of both these works occasional citations will be met with in the present volume.

In the exposition of the last seven chapters, too polemical an attitude, perhaps, has been assumed with respect to a distinguished living writer, Dr. Henderson, to whose abilities and learning I have elsewhere endeavoured to do justice. The prominence here given to his book has arisen from his happening to be not only the best but the sole representative of certain views among the professed expounders of Isaiah. As to the question in dispute, the ground which I have taken and endeavoured to maintain is the negative position, that the truth of these "exceeding great and precious promises" is not suspended on the future restoration of the Jews to Palestine, without denying such a restoration to be possible or promised elsewhere.

In this, as well as in the other volume, I may possibly have pushed the rule of rigorous translation to an extreme ; but if so, it is an extreme from which recession is much easier and safer than recovery from that of laxity and vagueness. By the course thus taken, I am not without hope that some light may be thrown upon the darker parts of Hebrew Grammar, and especially the doctrine of the tenses, which can never be completely solved except by a laborious induction of particulars.

While I deem it proper to observe that I have read only two sheets of this volume during its progress through the press, I am happy to add that it has passed through the hands of Mr. W. W. Turner, to whom so many other works in this department are indebted for the accuracy of their execution.

I have still kept steadily in view, as my immediate readers, to whose wants the work must be adapted, clergymen and students of theology, considered as the actual or future teachers of the Church. Through them I may perhaps indulge the hope of doing something to promote correct opinions, and a taste for exegetical pursuits, as means of intellectual and spiritual culture, even though this should prove to be my last as well as first contribution to the stores of sacred learning.

*Princeton, March 20, 1847.*

## INTRODUCTION.

---

ONE of the most important functions of the prophetic office was the exposition of the Law, that is to say, of the Mosaic institutions, the peculiar form in which the Church was organized until the advent of Messiah. This inspired exposition was of absolute necessity, in order to prevent or to correct mistakes which were constantly arising, not only from the blindness and perverseness of the people, but from the very nature of the system under which they lived. That system, being temporary and symbolical, was necessarily material, ceremonial, and restrictive in its forms; as nothing purely spiritual could be symbolical or typical of other spiritual things, nor could a catholic or free constitution have secured the necessary segregation of the people from all others for a temporary purpose.

The evils incident to such a state of things were the same that have occurred in many other like cases, and may all be derived from the superior influence of sensible objects on the mass of men, and from the consequent propensity to lose sight of the end in the use of the means, and to confound the sign with the thing signified. The precise form and degree of this perversion no doubt varied with the change of times and circumstances, and a corresponding difference must have existed in the action of the Prophets who were called to exert a corrective influence on these abuses.

In the days of Hezekiah, the national corruption had already passed through several phases, each of which might still be traced in its effects, and none of which had wholly vanished. Sometimes the prevailing tendency had been to make the ceremonial form of the Mosaic worship, and its consequent coincidence in certain points with the religions of surrounding nations, an occasion or a pretext for adopting heathen rites and usages, at first as a mere extension and enlargement of the ritual itself, then more boldly as an arbitrary mixture of heterogeneous elements, and lastly as an open and entire substitution of the false for the true, and of Baal, Ashtoreth, or Moloch, for Jehovah.

At other times the same corruption had assumed a less revolting form and been contented with perverting the Mosaic institutions while externally

and zealously adhering to them. The two points from which this insidious process of perversion set out were the nature and design of the ceremonial law, and the relation of the chosen people to the rest of men. As to the first, it soon became a current and at last a fixed opinion with the mass of irreligious Jews, that the ritual acts of the Mosaic service had an intrinsic efficacy, or a kind of magical effect upon the moral and spiritual state of the worshipper. Against this error the Law itself had partially provided by occasional violations and suspensions of its own most rigorous demands, plainly implying that the rites were not intrinsically efficacious, but significant of something else. As a single instance of this general fact it may be mentioned, that although the sacrifice of life is every where throughout the ceremonial law presented as the symbol of atonement, yet in certain cases, where the circumstances of the offerer forbade an animal oblation, he was suffered to present one of a vegetable nature, even where the service was directly and exclusively expiatory,—a substitution wholly inconsistent with the doctrine of an intrinsic virtue or a magical effect, but perfectly in harmony with that of a symbolical and typical design, in which the uniformity of the external symbol, although rigidly maintained in general, might be dispensed with in a rare and special case without absurdity or inconvenience.

It might easily be shown that the same corrective was provided by the Law itself in its occasional departure from its own requisitions as to time and place and the officiating person ; so that no analogy whatever really exists between the Levitical economy, even as expounded by itself, and the ritual systems which in later times have been so confidently built upon it. But the single instance which has been already cited will suffice to illustrate the extent of the perversion which at an early period had taken root among the Jews as to the real nature and design of their ceremonial services. The natural effect of such an error on the spirit and the morals is too obvious in itself, and too explicitly recorded in the sacred history, to require either proof or illustration.

On the other great point, the relation of the Jews to the surrounding nations, their opinions seem to have become at an early period equally erroneous. In this as in the other case, they went wrong by a superficial judgment founded on appearances, by looking simply at the means before them, and neither forwards to their end, nor backwards to their origin. From the indisputable facts of Israel's divine election as the people of Jehovah, his extraordinary preservation as such, and his undisturbed exclusive possession of the written word and the accompanying rites, they had drawn the natural but false conclusion, that this national pre-eminence was founded on intrinsic causes, or at least on some original and perpetual distinction in their favour. This led them to repudiate or forget the funda-

mental truth of their whole history, to wit, that they were set apart and kept apart, not for the ruin and disgrace, but for the ultimate benefit and honour of the whole world, or rather of the whole church which was to be gathered from all nations, and of which the ancient Israel was designed to be the symbol and the representative. As it had pleased God to elect a certain portion of mankind to everlasting life through Christ, so it pleased him that until Christ came, this body of elect ones, scattered through all climes and ages, should be represented by a single nation, and that this representative body should be the sole depository of divine truth and a divinely instituted worship; while the ultimate design of this arrangement was kept constantly in view by the free access which in all ages was afforded to the gentiles who consented to embrace the true religion.

It is difficult indeed to understand how the Jews could reconcile the immemorial reception of proselytes from other nations, with the dogma of national superiority and exclusive hereditary right to the divine favour. The only solution of this singular phenomenon is furnished by continual recurrence to the great representative principle on which the Jewish church was organized, and which was carried out not only in the separation of the body as a whole from other men, but in the internal constitution of the body itself, and more especially in the separation of a whole tribe from the rest of Israel, and of a single family in that tribe from the other Levites, and of a single person in that family, in whom was finally concentrated the whole representation of the Body on the one hand, while on the other he was a constituted type of the Head.

If the Jews could have been made to understand or to remember that their national pre-eminence was representative, not original; symbolical, not real; provisional, not perpetual, it could never have betrayed them into hatred or contempt of other nations, but would rather have cherished an enlarged and catholic spirit, as it did in the most enlightened,—an effect which may be clearly traced in the writings of Moses, David, and Isaiah. That view of the Mosaic dispensation which regards this Jewish bigotry as its genuine spirit is demonstrably a false one. The true spirit of the old economy was not indeed a latitudinarian indifference to its institutions, or a premature anticipation of a state of things still future. It was scrupulously faithful even to the temporary institutions of the ancient church; but while it looked upon them as obligatory, it did not look upon them as perpetual. It obeyed the present requisitions of Jehovah, but still looked forward to something better. Hence the failure to account, on any other supposition, for the seeming contradictions of the Old Testament, in reference to the ceremonies of the Law. If worthless, why were they so conscientiously observed by the best and wisest men? If intrinsically valuable, why are they disparaged and almost repudiated by the same men? Simply because

they were neither worthless nor intrinsically valuable, but appointed temporary signs of something to be otherwise revealed thereafter; so that it was equally impious and foolish to reject them altogether with the skeptic, and to rest in them for ever with the formalist.

It is no less true, and for exactly the same reason, that the genuine spirit of the old economy was equally adverse to all religious mixture with the heathen or renunciation of the Jewish privileges on one hand, and to all contracted national conceit and hatred of the gentiles on the other. Yet both these forms of error had become fixed in the Jewish creed and character long before the days of Hezekiah. That they were not universal even then, we have abundant proof in the Old Testament. Even in the worst of times, there is reason to believe that a portion of the people held fast to the true doctrine and the true spirit of the extraordinary system under which they lived. How large this more enlightened party was at any time, and to how small a remnant it was ever reduced, we have not the means of ascertaining; but we know that it was always in existence, and that it constituted the true Israel, the real church of the Old Testament.

To this class the corruption of the general body must have been a cause not only of sorrow but of apprehension; and if express prophetic threatenings had been wanting, they could scarcely fail to anticipate the punishment and even the rejection of their nation. But in this anticipation they were themselves liable to error. Their associations were so intimately blended with the institutions under which they lived, that they must have found it hard to separate the idea of Israel as a church from that of Israel as a nation,—a difficulty similar in kind, however different in degree, from that which we experience in forming a conception of the continued existence of the soul without the body. And as all men, in the latter case, however fully they may be persuaded of the separate existence of the spirit and of its future disembodied state, habitually speak of it in terms strictly applicable only to its present state, so the ancient saints, however strong their faith, were under the necessity of framing their conceptions, as to future things, upon the model of those present; and the imperceptible extension of this process beyond the limits of necessity, would naturally tend to generate errors not of form merely but of substance. Among these we may readily suppose to have had place the idea that, as Israel had been unfaithful to its trust, and was to be rejected, the Church or People of God must as a body share the same fate; or in other words, that if the national Israel perished, the spiritual Israel must perish with it, at least so far as to be disorganized and resolved into its elements.

The same confusion of ideas still exists among the uninstructed classes, and to some extent among the more enlightened also, in those countries where the Church has for ages been a national establishment, and scarcely known

in any other form ; as, for instance, in Sweden and Norway among Protestants, or Spain and Portugal among the Papists. To the most devout in such communities the downfall of the hierarchical establishment seems perfectly identical with the extinction of the church ; and nothing but a long course of instruction, and perhaps experience, could enable them to form the idea of a disembodied, unestablished Christian church. If such mistakes are possible and real even now, we have little reason either to dispute their existence or to wonder at it, under the complicated forms and in the imperfect light of the Mosaic dispensation. It is not only credible but altogether natural, that even true believers, unassisted by a special revelation, should have shunned the extreme of looking upon Israel's pre-eminence among the nations as original and perpetual, only by verging towards the opposite error of supposing that the downfall of the nation would involve the abolition of the church, and human unbelief defeat the purposes and make void the promises of God.

Here then are several distinct but cognate forms of error, which appear to have gained currency among the Jews before the time of Hezekiah, in relation to the two great distinctive features of their national condition, the ceremonial law and their seclusion from the gentiles. Upon each of these points there were two shades of opinion entertained by very different classes. The Mosaic ceremonies were with some a pretext for idolatrous observances ; while others rested in them, not as types or symbols, but as efficacious means of expiation. The pre-eminence of Israel was by some regarded as perpetual ; while others apprehended in its termination the extinction of the church itself. These various forms of error might be variously combined and modified in different cases, and their general result must of course have contributed largely to determine the character of the church and nation.

It was not, perhaps, until these errors had begun to take a definite and settled form among the people, that the Prophets, who had hitherto confined themselves to oral instruction or historical composition, were directed to utter and record for constant use discourses meant to be corrective or condemnatory of these dangerous perversions. This may at least be regarded as a plausible solution of the fact that prophetic writing in the strict sense became so much more abundant in the later days of the Old Testament history. Of these prophetic writings, still preserved in our canon, there is scarcely any part which has not a perceptible and direct bearing on the state of feeling and opinion which has been described. This is emphatically true of Isaiah's Earlier Prophecies, which, though so various in form, are all adapted to correct the errors in question, or to establish the antagonistic truths. This general design of the predictions might be so used as to throw new light upon their exposition, by connecting it more closely with the prevalent errors of the ancient church than was attempted in the other

volume. Guided even by this vague suggestion, an attentive reader will be able for the most part to determine with respect to each successive portion whether it was specially intended to rebuke idolatry, to rectify the errors of the formalist in reference to the ceremonial system, to bring down the arrogance of a mistaken nationality, or to console the true believer by assuring him that though the carnal Israel should perish, the true Israel must endure for ever.

But although this purpose may be traced, to some extent, in all the prophecies, it is natural to suppose that some part of the canon would be occupied with a direct, extensive, and continuous exhibition of the truth upon a subject so momentous; and the date of such a prophecy could scarcely be assigned to any other period so naturally as to that which has been specified, the reign of Hezekiah, when all the various forms of error and corruption which had successively prevailed were co-existent, when idolatry, although suppressed by law was still openly or secretly practised, and in many cases superseded only by a hypocritical formality and ritual religion, attended by an overweening sense of the national pre-eminence of Israel, from which even the most godly seem to have found refuge in despondent fears and skeptical misgivings. At such a time,—when the theocracy had long since reached and passed its zenith, and a series of providential shocks, with intervals of brief repose, had already begun to loosen the foundations of the old economy in preparation for its ultimate removal,—such a discourse as that supposed must have been eminently seasonable, if not absolutely needed, to rebuke sin, correct error, and sustain the hopes of true believers. It was equally important, nay, essential to the great end of the temporary system, that the way for its final abrogation should be gradually prepared, and that in the meantime it should be maintained in constant operation.

If the circumstances of the times which have been stated are enough to make it probable that such a revelation would be given, they will also aid us in determining beforehand, not in detail, but in the general, its form and character. The historical occasion and the end proposed would naturally lead us to expect in such a book the simultaneous or alternate presentation of a few great leading truths, perhaps with accompanying refutation of the adverse errors, and with such reproofs, remonstrances and exhortations, promises and threatenings, as the condition of the people springing from these errors might require, not only at the date of the prediction but in later times. In executing this design the Prophet might have been expected to pursue a method more rhetorical than logical, and to enforce his doctrine not so much by dry didactic statements as by animated argument combined with earnest exhortation, passionate appeals, poetical apostrophes, impressive repetitions, and illustrations drawn both from the ancient and the later



history of Israel. In fine, from what has been already said, it follows that the doctrines which would naturally constitute the staple of the prophecy in such a case, are those relating to the true design of Israel's vocation and seclusion from the gentiles, and of the ceremonial institutions under which he was in honourable bondage. The sins and errors which find their condemnation in the statement of these truths are those of actual idolatry, a ritual formality, a blinded nationality, and a despondent apprehension of the failure of Jehovah's promise. Such might even *a priori* be regarded as the probable structure and complexion of a prophecy or series of prophecies intended to secure the end in question. If the person called to this important service had already been the organ of divine communications upon other subjects, or with more direct reference to other objects, it would be reasonable to expect a marked diversity between these former prophecies and that uttered under a new impulse. Besides the very great and striking difference which must always be perceptible between a series of detached compositions, varying, and possibly remote from one another as to date, and a continuous discourse on one great theme, there would be other unavoidable distinctions springing directly from the new and wide scope of prophetic vision, and from the concentration in one vision of the elements diffused through many others. This diversity would be enhanced, of course, by any striking difference of outward circumstances, such as the advanced age of the writer, his matured experience, his seclusion from the world and from active life, or any other changes which might have the same effect; but even in the absence of these outward causes, the diversity would still be very great and unavoidable.

From these probabilities let us now turn to realities. Precisely such a book as that described is extant, having formed a part of the collection of Isaiah's Prophecies as far back as the history of the canon can be traced, without the slightest vestige of a different tradition among Jews or Christians as to the author. The tone and spirit of these chapters are precisely such as might have been expected from the circumstances under which they are alleged to have been written, and their variations from the earlier chapters such as must have been expected from the change in the circumstances themselves.

A cursory inspection of these Later Prophecies is enough to satisfy the reader that he has before him neither a concatenated argument nor a mass of fragments, but a continuous discourse in which the same great topics are continually following each other, somewhat modified in form and combination, but essentially the same from the beginning to the end. If required to designate a single theme as that of the whole series, we might safely give the preference to Israel, the Peculiar People, the Church of the Old Testament, its origin, vocation, mission, sins and sufferings, former experience and

final destiny. The doctrine inculcated as to this great subject may be summarily stated thus. The race of Israel was chosen from among the other nations, and maintained in the possession of peculiar privileges, not for the sake of any original or acquired merit, but by a sovereign act of the divine will; not for their own exclusive benefit and aggrandizement, but for the ultimate salvation of the world. The ceremonies of the Law were of no intrinsic efficacy, and when so regarded and relied on became hateful in the sight of God. Still more absurd and impious was the practice of analogous ceremonies not in obedience to Jehovah's will, but in the worship of imaginary deities or idols. The Levitical rites, besides immediate uses of a lower kind, were symbols of God's holiness and man's corruption, the necessity of expiation in general, and of expiation by vicarious suffering in particular. Among them there were also types, prophetic symbols, of the very form in which the great work of atonement was to be accomplished, and of Him by whom it was to be performed. Until this work was finished, and this Saviour come, the promise of both was exclusively entrusted to the chosen people, who were bound to preserve it both in its written and its ritual form. To this momentous trust a large part of the nation had been unfaithful, some avowedly forsaking it as open idolaters, some practically betraying it as formal hypocrites. For these and other consequent offences, Israel as a nation was to be rejected and deprived of its pre-eminence. But in so doing God would not cast off his people. The promises to Israel, considered as the people of Jehovah, should enure to the body of believers, the remnant according to the election of grace. These were in fact from the beginning the true Israel, the true seed of Abraham, the Jews who were Jews inwardly. In these the continued existence of the church should be secured and perpetuated, first within the limits of the outward Israel, and then by the accession of believing gentiles to the spiritual Israel. When the fulness of time should come for the removal of the temporary and restrictive institutions of the old economy, that change should be so ordered as not only to effect the emancipation of the church from ceremonial bondage, but at the same time to attest the divine disapprobation of the sins committed by the carnal Israel throughout their history. While these had every thing to fear from the approaching change, the spiritual Israel had every thing to hope; not only the continued existence of the church, but its existence under a more spiritual, free, and glorious dispensation, to be ushered in by the appearance of that great Deliverer towards whom the ceremonies of the Law all pointed.

From this succinct statement of the Prophet's doctrine, it is easy to account for some peculiarities of form and phraseology, particularly for the constant alternation of encouragement and threatening, and for the twofold sense or rather application of the national name, Israel. This latter usage

is explained by Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans (ch. 2 : 17-29. 9 : 6-9. 11 : 1-7), where the very same doctrine is propounded in relation to the ancient church that we have just obtained by a fair induction from Isaiah's Later Prophecies. There is in fact no part of the Old Testament to which the New affords a more decisive key in the shape of an authoritative and inspired interpretation.

Another peculiarity of form highly important in the exposition of these Prophecies is the frequent introduction of allusions to particular events in the history of Israel, as examples of the general truths so constantly repeated. The events thus cited are not numerous, but of the greatest magnitude, such as the calling of Abraham, the exodus from Egypt, the destruction of Babylon, the return from exile, and the advent of Messiah. These events have sometimes been confounded by interpreters, and even so far misconceived as to put a new and false face on the whole prediction, as we shall have occasion more explicitly to state below. At present, let it be observed that the prophetic discourse is continually varied and relieved by these historical allusions.

The fairest and the most decisive test by which the foregoing views of the design and subject of these Later Prophecies can be tried, is one within the reach of any reader who will take the trouble to apply it, by a careful perusal of the prophecies themselves, even without any other comment than the general suggestions which have been already made. If this should still prove insufficient to establish the correctness of the exegetical hypothesis proposed, that end may still be answered by comparing this hypothesis with others which have more or less prevailed among interpreters.

Let us first compare with the hypothesis just stated, the one assumed wholly or in part by Cocceius and others, who appear disposed to recognise in these Later Prophecies specific periods and events in the history of the Christian church. Of this abundant illustration will be given in the Commentary on the Prophecies themselves. Meantime, it may be stated in the general, that besides the arbitrary character of such interpretation, and the infinite diversity which it exhibits in the hands of different writers, it creates the necessity of putting the most forced interpretations on the plainest terms, and of denying that Babylon, Israel, etc. were intended to mean Babylon, Israel, etc. in any sense warranted by Hebrew usage. And even in those parts of the Prophecy which do refer to later times and to the new dispensation, these interpreters are under the necessity of violating one of the most strongly marked peculiarities of this whole book, viz. the general view which it exhibits of the new dispensation as a whole, from its inception to its consummation, as contrasted with the more specific mention of particular events before the change, even when future to the Prophet's own times. This mode of exposition, at least in its extreme

forms, has received its most effective refutation from the lapse of time. When we find such writers as Cocceius, and less frequently Vitranga, seeking the fulfilment of grand prophecies in petty squabbles of the Dutch Church or Republic, which have long since lost their place in general history, the practical lesson thus imparted is of more force than the most ingenious arguments, to show that such interpretation rests upon a false hypothesis.

A very different fate has been experienced by the ancient and still current doctrine that the main subject of these Prophecies throughout, is the restoration from the Babylonish exile. While this hypothesis has been assumed as undeniable by many Christian writers, it affords the whole foundation of the modern neological criticism and exegesis. It is worth while, therefore, to examine somewhat closely the pretensions of this theory to general reception.

In the first place, let it be observed how seldom, after all, the book mentions Babylon, the Exile, or the Restoration. This remark is made in reference to those cases only where these subjects are expressly mentioned, i. e. either named *totidem verbis*, or described in terms which will apply to nothing else. An exact enumeration of such cases, made for the first time, might surprise one whose previous impressions had been all derived from the sweeping declarations of interpreters and critics. It is true the cases may be vastly multiplied by taking into the account all the indirect allusions which these writers are accustomed to assume, i. e. by applying to the Exile all the places and particular expressions which admit by possibility of such an application. Having first inferred from the explicit prophecies respecting Babylon, that this is the great subject of the book, it is perfectly easy to apply to this same subject hundreds of phrases in themselves indefinite and wholly dependent for specific meaning upon some hypothesis like that in question.

The necessary tendency of such a method to excess, is illustrated by the gradual advances of the later German writers in the specific explanation of these chapters. Where Rosenmüller and Gesenius were contented to find general poetical descriptions of the Exile and the Restoration, Hitzig detects precise chronological allusions to particular campaigns and battles in the progress of Cyrus; and this again is pushed so far by Hendewerk and Knobel, that they sometimes find more striking and minute coincidences between this Hebrew writer and Herodotus or Xenophon, than any of the old-fashioned orthodox writers ever dreamed of finding between him and the New Testament. To hear these writers talk of the battle of Pasargada, the defeat of Neriglassar, the first and second attack on Babylonia, the taking of Sardis, etc. etc. we might fancy ourselves listening to Eusebius or Cocceius, with a simple substitution of profane for sacred history.

The fallacy of this mode of interpretation lies in the fact that the indefinite expressions thus applied to one event or series of events, might just as naturally be applied to others, if these others were first fixed upon as being the main subject of the whole composition. Thus, all admit that there are frequent allusions in these later chapters to the exodus from Egypt. Now if any interpreter should be intrepid and absurd enough to argue that they must have been composed by Moses, and that the great deliverance then wrought must be the subject of the whole book, whatever difficulties, and however insurmountable, this doctrine might encounter in a different direction, it could find none in adapting what is said of crossing seas and rivers, opening fountains, journeys through the desert, subjugation of enemies, rest in the promised land, etc. etc. to the original exodus, with far less violence than to the restoration from captivity. It is equally true, but in a less degree, that Grotius, who refers some portions of this book to the period of the Maccabees, is perfectly successful, after having once assumed this as the subject, in accommodating to it many of the very same expressions which another class of writers no less confidently claim as clear allusions to the Babylonian exile.

The fallacy of such exegetical reasoning may be further exposed by applying the same process to a distinct but analogous case. In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul is now almost universally regarded as foretelling the restoration of the Jews to the favour of God. Assuming this to be the theme not only of those passages in which it is expressly mentioned, but of the whole Epistle, an interpreter of no great ingenuity might go completely through it, putting upon every general expression a specific sense, in strict agreement with his foregone conclusion. All that relates to justification might be limited to the Jews of some future day; the glorious truth that there is no condemnation to believers in Christ Jesus, made a specific and exclusive promise to converted Jews; and the precious promise that all things shall work together for good to them that love God, made to mean that all events shall be so ordered as to bring about the future restoration of the Jews. The very absurdity of such conclusions makes them better illustrations of the erroneous principles involved in similar interpretations of the more obscure and less familiar parts of Scripture.

Setting aside the cases which admit of one application as well as another, or of this application only because of a foregone conclusion, the truth of which cannot be determined by expressions deriving their specific meaning from itself, let the reader now enumerate the instances in which the reference to Babylon, the Exile, and the Restoration, is not only possible but necessary. He must not be surprised if he discovers as the fruit of his researches, that the Prophet speaks of Babylon less frequently than Egypt;

that the ruins, desolations, and oppressions, which he mentions in a multitude of places, are no more Babylonian than Egyptian or Roman in the text itself, and only made so by the interest or fancy of some writers, the authority of others, and the easy faith of the remainder.

In opposition to these strained conclusions, we have only to propound the obvious supposition that the downfall of Babylon is repeatedly mentioned, like the exodus from Egypt, as a great event in the history of Israel,—but that the subject of the prophecy is neither the Egyptian nor the Babylonian bondage, nor deliverance from either, but the whole condition, character, and destiny of Israel as the chosen people and the church of the Old Testament.

All the hypotheses which have been mentioned are agreed in assuming the unity of these predictions as the product not only of a single age, but of a single writer. This unity, however, was by no means recognised by those who first applied the principles and methods of the Higher Criticism to Isaiah. The earliest hint of any new discovery is commonly ascribed to Koppe, who in a note upon his German edition of Bishop Lowth's work suggests that the fiftieth chapter may have been written by Ezekiel or some other Jew in exile. A similar opinion was expressed about the same time by Döderlein and Eichhorn with respect to the entire latter part of Isaiah. The same hypothesis was then carried out in detail by Justi, and adopted by Bauer, Paulus, Bertholdt, and Augusti; so that not long after the beginning of this century, it was established as the current doctrine of the German schools.

This revolution of opinion, though ostensibly the pure result of critical analysis, was closely connected with the growing unbelief in inspiration, and the consequent necessity of explaining away whatever appeared either to demonstrate or involve it. It must also be noted, as a circumstance of great importance in the history of this controversy, that the young theologians of Germany for fifty years were almost as uniformly taught and as constantly accustomed to assume the certainty of this first principle, as their fathers had been to assume the contrary. This fact will enable us to estimate at something like their real value the pretensions to superior candour and impartiality advanced by the neological interpreters, and more especially by some of recent date, who are in truth as strongly biassed by the prejudice of education as their immediate predecessors by the love of novelty and passion for discovery.

The defenders of the unity of this part of Isaiah were in process of time relieved from much of the irksome task which they had undertaken by the concessions of the adverse party, that the Higher Criticism had been pushed too far, and made to prove too much; in consequence of which a retroces-

sion became necessary, and in fact took place under the guidance of new leaders, not without an earnest opposition on the part of the original discoverers.

This retreat was effected with great skill and conduct, but with no small sacrifice of logical consistency, by Gesenius in the Introduction to his second volume. Without any appeal to general principles or any attempt to distinguish clearly between what he abandons as "extreme" and what he adopts as rational conclusions, he proceeds, by his favourite method of accumulation and arrangement of particulars, to prove that these twenty-seven chapters are the work of the same author, and that in the main they are still in the same order as at first, the only material exception being a surmise that the last chapters may possibly be older than the first; which seems to have been prompted by a natural reluctance to acknowledge that an ancient composition could remain so long unchanged, not without a misgiving with respect to the influence which this concession might exert hereafter on the criticism of the earlier chapters.

Although Gesenius's argument in favour of the unity of these predictions is entirely successful, a large proportion of his detailed proofs are quite superfluous. It is an error of this German school, and of its imitators elsewhere, that identity of authorship must be established by minute resemblances of diction, phraseology, and syntax, which are therefore raked together and displayed with a profusion far more confounding than convincing to the reader. To the great mass of cultivated minds, conviction in such cases is produced by data not susceptible of exhibition in the form of schedules, catalogues, or tables, but resulting from a general impression of continuity and oneness, which might be just as strong if not a single phrase or combination occurred more than once, and the want of which could never be supplied by any number or servility of verbal repetitions. It is thus that the modern imitators of the classics may be almost infallibly detected, though their diction be but a cento of quotations from their favourite author, renewed and multiplied *usque ad nauseam*; while the original is known wherever he appears, however innocent of copying himself.

This error of the higher or lower criticism, even when enlisted on the right side of a question, it is important to expose; because many of its boasted triumphs in behalf of error have been gained by the very *petitesse* of its expedients. The readers of Isaiah, in particular, have often been bewildered and unfairly prepossessed against the truth, by the interminable catalogues of Hebrew words and phrases which are crowded into prefaces and introductions as preliminary proofs of a position that can only be established, if at all, by the cumulative weight of a detailed interpretation; the effect of which is often to expose the absolute futility of arguments, considered

one by one and in their proper place, which seem to gain reality and force by insulation from the context, and by being thrown together in crude masses, or forced into unnatural protrusion by the forms of a systematic catalogue.

The minute details which constitute this portion of Gesenius's argument against the fragmentary theory, must be sought in his own work, or in those which have transcribed it. Much more important and conclusive is that part of his argument derived from the unquestionable fact, that certain threads may be traced running through the entire texture of these Later Prophecies, sometimes dropped but never broken, crossing each other, and at times appearing to be hopelessly entangled, but all distinguished, and yet all united in the *dénouement*. The perpetual recurrence and succession of these topics is correctly represented by Gesenius as the strongest proof of unity. In opposition to Augusti, who alleges that some topics are more prominent at first than afterwards, and vice versa, Gesenius replies that progress and variety are perfectly consistent with the strictest unity; that the author's ideal situation is the same throughout; and that all the topics which become more prominent as he proceeds, had at least been lightly touched before, to which he adds another list of verbal parallels between the parts described as most dissimilar. (See Gesen. Comm. vol. II. p. 15.)

This reasoning is worthy of particular attention, on account of its remarkable affinity with that by which the defenders of the old opinions have maintained the genuineness of disputed places in the Earlier Prophecies, against objections of Gesenius himself, precisely analogous to those of Augusti which he here refutes. It would greatly contribute to the correct decision of these questions, among men who are accustomed to the weighing of evidence on other subjects, if their attention could be drawn to the facility with which the same degree and kind of proof are admitted or excluded by the Higher Critics, according to the end at which they happen to be aiming. Perhaps one of our most valuable safeguards against German innovations is afforded by our civil institutions, and the lifelong familiarity of our people, either through the press or by personal participation, with the public administration of justice and the practical discrimination between truth and falsehood,—an advantage which can never be replaced by any method or amount of mental cultivation.

If then these twenty-seven chapters are confessedly the work of one man, and indeed a continuous discourse on one great subject, and if a perfectly uniform tradition has attached them to the writings of Isaiah, it remains to be considered whether we have any reason to deny or even to dispute the fact so solemnly attested. All the presumptions are in favour of its truth. For two thousand years, at least, the book was universally regarded as Isaiah's, and no other name has ever been connected with it even by mistake or accident. It is just such a book as the necessities of



that age might have been expected to call forth. Its genuineness, therefore, as a writing of Isaiah, is not a fact requiring demonstration by detailed and special proof, but one attested both by its external history and its internal structure, unless positive reasons can be given for rejecting a conclusion which appears not only obvious but unavoidable.

Among the objections to Isaiah as the author of these later chapters, there are two upon which the whole weight of the argument depends, and to which all others may be reckoned supplementary. The first of these has reference to the matter of the prophecies, the second to their form. The latter is entirely posterior in date, and has been growing more and more prominent as the necessity of something to sustain the first and main objection has been forced upon its advocates by the resistance which it has encountered. This chronological relation of the two main objections is here stated not only as a curious fact of literary history, but also as directly bearing on the issue of the whole dispute, for reasons which will be explained below.

The first and main objection to the doctrine that Isaiah wrote these chapters, although variously stated by the writers who have urged it, is in substance this: that the Prophet every where alludes to the circumstances and events of the Babylonish Exile as those by which he was himself surrounded and with which he was familiar, from which his conceptions and his images are borrowed, out of which he looks both at the future and the past, and in the midst of which he must as a necessary consequence have lived and written.

This objection involves two assumptions, both which must be true, or it is wholly without force. One of these, viz. that the Babylonish exile is the subject of the whole book, has already been disproved; and there is strictly, therefore, no need of considering the other. But in order that the whole strength of our cause may be disclosed, it will be best to show that even if the supposition just recited were correct, the other, which is equally essential to the truth of the conclusion, is entirely unfounded. This is the assumption that the local and historical allusions of a prophet must be always those of his own times.

Some of the later German writers try to rest this upon general grounds, by alleging that such is the invariable practice of the Hebrew Prophets. But as the book in question, i. e. the latter portion of Isaiah, is admitted by these very critics to deserve the highest rank among prophetic writings, and to have exercised a more extensive influence on later writers and opinions than any other, it is unreasonable to appeal to a usage of which the book itself may be considered as a normal standard. It is in fact a begging of the question to deny that such was the prophetic usage, when that denial really involves an allegation that it is not so in the case before us.

Another answer to this argument from usage may be drawn from the analogy of other kinds of composition, in which all grant that a writer may assume a "*Standpunkt*" different from his own, and personate those earlier and later than himself. The classical historians do this when they put their own words into the mouths of ancient heroes and statesmen; the dramatic poets when they carry out this personation in detail; and still more imaginative writers, when they throw themselves into the future, and surround themselves by circumstances not yet in existence. If it be natural for poets thus to speak of an ideal future, why may not prophets of a real one? The only answer is, *because they cannot know it*; and to this point all the tortuous evasions of the more reserved neologists as surely tend as the positive averments of their bolder brethren. In every form, this argument against the genuineness of the book before us is at bottom a denial of prophetic inspiration as impossible. For if the Prophet could foresee the future, his allusions only prove that he did foresee it; and the positive assertion that the prophets never do so, unless it be founded upon this hypothesis, is just as foolish as it would be to assert that historians and poets never do the like. Unless we are prepared to go the same length, we cannot consistently reject these prophecies as spurious, on the ground that they allude to events long posterior to the writer's times, even if these allusions were as numerous and explicit as we have seen them to be few when clear, and in all other cases vague and doubtful.

It has indeed been said, in confirmation of this main objection, that a real foresight would extend to more remote as well as proximate events, whereas in this case what relates to the period of the Exile is minutely accurate, while all beyond is either blank or totally erroneous; in proof of which we are referred to the extravagant descriptions of the times which should succeed the Restoration.

Both parts of this reasoning rest upon a false assumption as to the space which is occupied in this book by the Babylonish Exile. If, as we have seen or shall see, the alleged minute descriptions of that period are imaginary, and if the alleged extravagant descriptions of its close relate to events altogether different, then this auxiliary argument must share the fate of that which it is brought in to sustain. To this same category appertains the special objection founded on the mention of Cyrus by name. That it may readily be solved by an application of the same principle, will be shown in the exposition of the passage where the prophecy occurs. (See below, p. 116 seq.)

Another erroneous supposition, which has tended to confirm this first objection to the genuineness of the Later Prophecies, is that they must have been intended solely for the contemporaries of the writer. This hypothesis is closely connected with the denial of divine inspiration. The idea that

Isaiah wrote for after ages is of course a "*nichtige Annahme*" to an infidel. The prophet's work, according to this theory, is more confined than that of the orator or poet. These may be said to labour for posterity; but his views must be limited to those about him. Ewald alone of those who deny a real inspiration (unless Umbreit may be likewise so described) admits a far-reaching purpose in the ancient prophecies. The rest appear to be agreed that nothing could be more absurd than consolation under sorrows which were not to be experienced for ages. Here again may be seen the working of a double error, that of making the Exile the great subject of the book, and that of denying that it could have been foreseen so long beforehand. Of all the evils afterwards matured, the germ, if nothing more, existed in Isaiah's time. And even if it did not, their appearance at a later date might well have been predicted. If the book, as we have reason to believe, was intended to secure a succession of the highest ends,—the warning and instruction of the Prophet's own contemporaries, the encouragement and consolation of the pious exiles, the reproof and conviction of their unbelieving brethren, the engagement of the Persians and especially of Cyrus in the service of Jehovah, the vindication of God's dealings with the Jews both in wrath and mercy, and a due preparation of the minds of true believers for the advent of Messiah,—then such objections as the one last cited must be either unmeaning and impertinent, or simply equivalent to a denial of prophetic inspiration.

To the same head may be referred those objections which have been derived from the alleged appearance of opinions in these chapters which are known to have arisen at a later period. Besides the palpable *petitio principii* involved in such an argument, so far as it assumes that to be late which these prophecies if genuine demonstrate to be ancient, there is here again a confident assumption of a fact as certain which at best is doubtful, and in my opinion utterly unfounded, namely, that the strict observance of the Sabbath and a particular regard to the Levitical priesthood and the sanctuary, all belong to a species of Judaism later than the times of the genuine Isaiah. It is by thus assuming their own paradoxical conclusions as unquestionable facts, that the Higher Critics of the German school have been enabled to construct some of their most successful arguments.

All that need be added in relation to the arguments against the genuineness of these chapters drawn from their matter or contents, is the general observation that their soundness may be brought to the test by inquiring whether they do not either take for granted something as belonging to the prophecy which is not found there by a simple and natural interpretation, or proceed upon some general false principle, such as the denial of prophetic inspiration as impossible. If either of these flaws is fatal to the argument affected by it, how much more must it be vitiated by the co-existence of the

two, which is the case in many minor arguments of this class, and emphatically true of that main argument to which they are auxiliary, namely, that Isaiah cannot be the writer of these chapters on account of their minute and constant reference to the Babylonian Exile. The alleged fact and the inference are equally unfounded.

The other main objection to the genuineness of these prophecies is founded not upon their matter but their manner, or in other words, their diction, phraseology, and style, which are said to be entirely unlike those of Isaiah. The minute specifications of this argument, so far as they can lay claim even to a passing notice, are reserved for the exposition of the passages from which they are derived, and where they may be calmly viewed in their original connexion, and without the artificial glare produced by an immense accumulation of detached examples, which may blind the reader by their number and variety, without affording him the means of judging for himself how many may at best be dubious, how many inconclusive, and how many more entirely irrelevant. For the same reason no reliance will be placed upon a similar display of minute resemblances between these later chapters and the undisputed writings of Isaiah, although such are furnished in abundance by Kleinert, Hävernick, and others. On the value of such proofs and the soundness of the inferences drawn from them, a reference may be made to the General Introduction (Earlier Prophecies, pp. xxix-xxx). At the same time it cannot be denied that the counter-proofs collected by these writers are of great importance, as establishing the fact of their existence upon both sides of the controversy, and as serving, if no higher purpose, that of cancelling such proofs when urged against the genuineness of the prophecies by writers who to all alleged resemblances reply that "such trifles can prove nothing," or that the style has been assimilated by a later hand. For this reason some of the most striking coincidences of expression will be noticed in the exposition, as well as the discrepancies which have been alleged in proof of later origin.

It has been already mentioned that this argument from difference of language is much later in its origin than that derived from the historical allusions. This is a significant and important circumstance. Had the Higher Criticism set out from some palpable diversity of diction as a starting point, and, after vainly trying to identify the writers upon this ground, been compelled to own a corresponding difference of matter and substantial indications of a later age than that of Isaiah, the critical process, although still inconclusive, would at least have been specious, and the difficulty of defence proportionally greater. But what is the true state of the case? Eichhorn and Bertholdt, though disposed to assume not only a later date but a plurality of authors, could find nothing to sustain this assumption in the language of the book itself. Augusti, who occupied the same ground, went

so far as to account for the traditional incorporation of these chapters with Isaiah from their perfect imitation of his style and manner. Rosenmüller dwells altogether on the first objection drawn from the allusions to the Babylonish Exile. Even Gesenius admits that the peculiarities of this class are less numerous than might have been expected, but succeeds in specifying some which had been overlooked. From that time the discovery (for such it may well be termed) of these philological diversities has been in constant and accelerated progress. Even Maurer, who is commonly so sparing of details, adds to the black list several particulars. Hitzig enlarges it still further, but unluckily admits that some of the expressions which he notes are not to be found either in the earlier or later books. Ewald as usual supplies the want of detailed proofs by authoritative affirmations. Umbreit considers the work done already, and declines attempting to refute Hengstenberg and Kleinert as a work of supererogation. But this forbearance is abundantly made good by the zeal of Hendewerk and Knobel, who have carried their citation of neologisms so far, that little now seems left for their successors but to gather the remainder of the book by way of gleanings.

But although the general course of this peculiar criticism has been onward, there have not been wanting certain retrograde movements and obliquities to break the uniformity of progress. Every one of the later writers above mentioned rejects some of the examples cited by his predecessors as irrelevant, and not seldom with expressions of contempt. But still the aggregate has grown, and by a further application of the same means may continue growing, until the materials are exhausted, or the Higher Criticism chooses to recede from this extreme, as it receded five and twenty years ago from that of Eichhorn and Augusti, who would no doubt have looked down upon the notion that these twenty-seven chapters were the work of the same hand, with almost as much contempt as on the old belief that this hand was Isaiah's. It is indeed not a matter of conjecture but of history, that Eichhorn in the last edition of his Introduction finds fault with Gesenius for having abandoned the plurality of authors, and evidently pities him as one who from excess of light had gone back into darkness. By a similar reaction we might look for some concession in favour even of Isaiah as the writer; but although such an expectation need not be discouraged by the fear of any scrupulous regard to logic or consistency among the Higher Critics, it is rendered hopeless for the present by the obvious necessity which it involves of abandoning their fundamental principle, the impossibility of inspiration or prophetic foresight. For to this, as the original, the chief, and I had almost said the only ground of the rejection of these chapters, we are still brought back from every survey of the arguments by which it is defended. The obvious deduction from the sketch which has

been given of the progress of discovery in this department is, that the philological objection would have slept for ever, had it not become absolutely necessary to secure the rejection of a book, which, if genuine, carried on its face the clearest proofs of inspiration.

Be it remembered, then, that the rejection of these chapters was not forced upon the critics by a palpable diversity of style and diction, but that such diversities were hunted up, laboriously and gradually brought to light, in order to justify the previous rejection. By parity of reasoning it may be foreseen that whoever cannot be convinced of the reality of inspiration, will consider these detailed proofs of later date conclusive; while the reader who knows better, or at least has no misgivings upon that point, will as certainly pronounce them "trifles light as air." If we gain nothing more by this investigation, it is at least satisfactory to know that all depends upon a foregone conclusion, and that as to faith in such things no less than in higher matters, he that hath receiveth, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath.

The objection drawn from other more indefinite diversities of tone and manner, such as a more flowing style and frequent repetitions, is so far from having any force, that the absence of these differences would in the circumstances of the case be well adapted to excite suspicion. In other words, Isaiah writing at a later period of life, and when withdrawn from active labour, with his view directed not to the present or a proximate futurity, but one more distant, and composing not a series of detached discourses, but a continuous unbroken prophecy, not only may but must have differed from his former self as much as these two parts of the collection differ from each other. This antecedent probability is strengthened by the fact that similar causes have produced a still greater difference in some of the most celebrated writers ancient and modern, who exhibit vastly more unlikeness to themselves in different parts of their acknowledged writings than the most microscopic criticism has been able to detect between the tone or manner of Isaiah's Earlier and Later Prophecies.

The only other objections to the genuineness of these chapters which appear to deserve notice are those derived from the silence or the testimony of the other books. That these are not likely to do more than confirm the conclusions previously reached on one side or the other, may be gathered from the fact that they are urged with equal confidence on both sides of the question. Thus Gesenius argues that if these later chapters had been known to Jeremiah, he would have appealed to them in self-vindication, as he did to Micah. On the other hand, Hengstenberg alleges that by parity of reasoning, Micah 4 : 10 could not have been extant, or the enemies of Jeremiah would have quoted it against him. At the same time, he maintains that there are obvious traces of these chapters in the writings of that prophet.

The truth is, that the advocates on both sides first determine which is the older writer, and then explain the appearances of quotation or allusion accordingly. The same is true of similar appearances in Nahum, Zephaniah, and Habakkuk; which Hitzig cites as proofs of imitation on the part of the Pseudo-Isaiah, while Hävernick claims them all as proofs of his priority. It is a very important observation of the last mentioned writer, that the influence of Isaiah on these later prophets is not to be estimated by detached expressions, but by more pervading indications, which he thinks are clearly perceptible throughout the writings both of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

As samples of the arguments in favour of their genuineness drawn from the same quarter, may be cited Zech. 7 : 4-12, where "the former prophets," who cried in the name of Jehovah to the people "when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity," must include the writer of these chapters. In reference to all these minor arguments, however, it will be felt by every reader that they have no practical effect, except to corroborate the main ones which have been discussed, and with which they must stand or fall.

Enough has now been said to show that there is no sufficient reason for rejecting the traditional ascription of these chapters to Isaiah. Let us now turn the tables, and inquire what objections lie against the contrary hypothesis. These objections may be all reduced to this, that the oblivion of the author's name and history is more inexplicable, not to say incredible, than any thing about the other doctrine can be to a believer in prophetic inspiration. This is a difficulty which no ingenuity has ever yet been able to surmount. That a writer confessedly of the highest genius, living at one of the most critical junctures in the history of Israel, when the word of God began to be precious and prophetic inspiration rare, should have produced such a series of prophecies as this, with such effects upon the exiles and even upon Cyrus as tradition ascribes to them, and then have left them to the admiration of all future ages, without so much as a trace of his own personality about them, is a phenomenon of literary history compared with which the mystery of Junius is as nothing. It would be so even if we had no remains of the same period to compare with these; but how immensely is the improbability enhanced by the fact that the other prophets of the exile, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, are not only well known and easily identified, but minutely accurate in the chronological specifications of their prophecies, a feature absolutely wanting in these chapters, though alleged to be the work of a contemporary writer. It is in vain to say, with Ewald, that the suppression of the author's name and the oblivion of his person may be accounted for by the peculiar circumstances of the times, when the other writings of those times still extant not only fail to prove what is alleged, but prove the very opposite.

Even this, however, though sufficiently incredible, is still not all we are

required to believe ; for we must also grant that these anonymous though admirable writings were attached to those of a prophet who flourished in the preceding century, and with whose productions they are said to have scarcely any thing in common, and that this mysterious combination took place so early as to lie beyond the oldest tradition of the Hebrew Canon, and was so blindly acquiesced in from the first that not the faintest intimation of another author or another origin was ever heard of for two thousand years, when the Higher Criticism first discovered that the prophecies in question were the work of many authors, and then (no less infallibly) that they were really the work of only one, but (still infallibly) that this one could not be Isaiah !

It is in vain that the Germans have endeavoured to evade this fatal obstacle by childish suppositions about big rolls and little rolls, or by citing cases of concealment or oblivion wholly dissimilar and far less wonderful, or by negligently saying that we are not bound to account for the fact, provided we can prove it ; as if the proof were not dependent in a great degree upon the possibility of accounting for it, or as if the only business of the Higher Critics were to tie knots which neither we nor they can untie. The question here at issue only needs to be presented to the common sense of mankind, and especially of those who are accustomed to weigh evidence in real life, to be immediately disposed of by the prompt decision that the modern hypothesis is utterly incredible, and that nothing could make it appear otherwise to any man acquainted with the subject, but an irresistible desire to destroy a signal proof and instance of prophetic inspiration.

To this intrinsic want of credibility now add, as positive considerations, the ancient and uniform tradition of the Jews ; the testimony of the general title, which must be regarded as inclusive of these chapters, in the absence of all countervailing evidence ; the influence exerted by these prophecies, according to Josephus, on Cyrus and the Restoration, implying their antiquity and previous notoriety ; the recognition of the whole book as Isaiah's by the Son of Sirach (48 : 22-25) ; and the indiscriminate citation of its different parts in the New Testament.

Again, to these external testimonies may be added, as internal proofs, the writer's constant representation of himself as living before some of the events which he describes, and as knowing them by inspiration ; his repeated claim to have predicted Cyrus and the Restoration, long before the first appearances of those events ; the obvious allusions to Jerusalem and Judah as the writer's home, to the temple and the ritual as still subsisting, and to idolatry as practised by the people, which the Higher Critics can evade only by asserting that the Jews did not cease to be idolaters in Babylon ; the historical allusions to the state of the world with which the writer was familiar, precisely similar to those in the genuine Isaiah ; the very structure



of the prophecies relating to the exile, clear enough to be distinctly verified, and yet not so minute as a contemporary writer must have made them; and lastly, the identity of Messiah here described with the Messiah of the undisputed prophecies.

It is perhaps impossible for any writer on this subject to do full justice to the adverse arguments, especially to those of a minor and auxiliary character. This is the less to be regretted, because every fresh discussion of the subject makes it more and more apparent that the question really at issue is not whether either party has established its position by direct proofs, but whether it has furnished the other with sufficient reasons for abandoning its own. If the Higher Critics can find nothing in the arguments alleged against them to make inspiration and prophetic foresight credible, they have certainly done still less to drive us from our position, that Isaiah's having written this book is unspeakably more probable than any other supposition.

Having now traced the history of the *criticism* of these prophecies, it may not be amiss to look at that of their *interpretation*, not through the medium of minute chronological or bibliographical details, but by exhibiting the several theories or schools of exegesis which, at different times or at the same time, have exerted an important influence on the interpretation of these chapters.

*One* The first of these proceeds upon the supposition that these Later Prophecies have reference throughout to the New Dispensation and the Christian Church, including its whole history, with more or less distinctness, from the advent of Christ to the end of the world. This is a favourite doctrine of the Fathers who have written on Isaiah, to wit, Cyril, Eusebius, Jerome, and of some modern writers, among whom the most distinguished is Cocceius. The difference between those who maintain it respects chiefly the degree of fulness and consistency with which they carry out their general idea, some admitting much more frequently than others the occasional occurrence of predictions which were verified before the Advent.

This system of prophetic exegesis is founded, to a great extent, on the assumption that the Book of Revelation was designed to be a key to the meaning of the ancient prophecies, and not a series of new predictions, often more enigmatical than any of the others. Because Babylon is there named as a power still existing and still threatened with destruction, it was inferred that the name must be symbolical in Isaiah likewise, or at least that it might be so explained at the interpreter's discretion. This opened an illimitable field of conjecture and invention, each interpreter pursuing his own method of determining the corresponding facts in Church History, without any settled rule to guide or to control him.

The extravagant conclusions often reached in this way, and the general uncertainty imparted to the whole work of interpretation, together with the

seeming incorrectness of the principle assumed in regard to the Apocalypse, led many, and particularly those in whom the understanding strongly predominated over the imagination, to reject this theory in favour of its opposite, viz. that the main subject of these chapters must be sought as far as possible before the Advent, and as a necessary consequence either in the period of the Babylonian Exile, or in that of the Syrian domination, with the periods of reaction which succeeded them respectively, since it was only these that furnished events of sufficient magnitude to be the subject of such grand predictions.

It is evident at once that both these theories involve some truth, and that their application must evolve the true sense of some passages. The fatal vice of both is their exclusiveness. The unbiassed reader of Isaiah can no more be persuaded that he never speaks of the New Dispensation than that he never speaks of the Old. After both systems had been pushed to an extreme, it was found necessary to devise some method of conciliating and combining them.

The first and rudest means employed for this end, even by some of the most strenuous adherents of the two extreme hypotheses, when forced at times to grant themselves a dispensation from the rigorous enforcement of their own rule, was to assume arbitrarily a change of subject when it appeared necessary, and to make the Prophet skip from Babylon to Rome, and from the Maccabees to Doomsday, as they found convenient. This arbitrary mixture of the theories is often perpetrated by Cocceius, and occasionally even by Vitringa; neither of whom seems to think it necessary to subject the application of the prophecies to any general principle, or to account for it in any other way than by alleging that it suits the text and context.

A more artificial method of combining both hypotheses is that of Grotius, whose interpretation of these prophecies appears to be governed by two maxims: first, that they all relate to subjects and events before the time of Christ; and secondly, that these are often types of something afterwards developed. What renders this kind of interpretation unsatisfactory, is the feeling which it seldom fails to generate, that the text is made to mean too much, or rather too many things; that if one of the senses really belongs to it, the other is superfluous; but above all, that the nexus of the two is insufficient; that although a gradual or even a repeated execution of a promise or a threatening is conceivable, it seems unreasonable that the interpreter should have the discretionary right of saying that the same passage means one thing in ancient times and an altogether different thing in modern times—that the same words, for example, are directly descriptive of Antiochus Epiphanes and Antichrist, of Judas Maccabaeus and Gustavus Adolphus.

A third mode of reconciling these two theories of interpretation is the one pursued by Lowth, and still more successfully by Hengstenberg. It rests upon the supposition that the nearer and the more remote realization of the same prophetic picture might be presented to the Prophet simultaneously or in immediate succession ; so that, for example, the deliverance from Babylon by Cyrus insensibly merges into a greater deliverance from sin and ruin by Christ. The principle assumed in this ingenious doctrine is as just as it is beautiful, and of the highest practical importance in interpretation. The only objection to its general application in the case before us is, that it concedes the constant reference to Babylon throughout this book, and only seeks to reconcile this fundamental fact with the wider application of the Prophecies.

It still remains to be considered, therefore, whether any general hypothesis or scheme can be constructed, which, without giving undue prominence to any of the topics introduced, without restricting general expressions to specific objects, without assuming harsh transitions, needless double senses, or imaginary typical relations, shall do justice to the unity and homogeneity of the composition, and satisfactorily reconcile the largeness and variety of its design with the particular allusions and predictions which can only be eliminated from it by a forced and artificial exegesis.

Such a hypothesis is that propounded at the beginning of this Introduction, and assumed as the basis of the following Exposition. It supposes the main subject of these Prophecies, or rather of this Prophecy, to be the Church or people of God, considered in its members and its head, in its design, its origin, its progress, its vicissitudes, its consummation, in its various relations to God and to the world, both as a field of battle and a field of labour, an enemy's country to be conquered and an inheritance to be secured.

Within the limits of this general description it is easy to distinguish, as alternate objects of prophetic vision, the two great phases of the Church on earth, its state of bondage and its state of freedom, its ceremonial and its spiritual aspect—in a word, what we usually call the Old and New Economy or Dispensation. Both are continually set before us, but with this observable distinction in the mode of presentation, that the first great period is described by individual specific strokes, the second by its outlines as a definite yet undivided whole. To the great turning-point between the two dispensations the prophetic view appears to reach with clear discrimination of the intervening objects, but beyond that to take all in at a single glance. Within the boundaries first mentioned the eye passes with a varied uniformity from one salient point to another ; but beyond them it contemplates the end and the beginning, not as distinct pictures, but as necessary elements of one. This difference might naturally be expected in a Prophecy belonging

to the Old Dispensation, while in one belonging to the New we should as naturally look for the same definiteness and minuteness as the older prophets used in their descriptions of the older times ; and this condition is completely answered by the Book of Revelation.

If this be so, it throws a new light on the more specific Prophecies of this part of Isaiah (such as those relating to the Babylonish Exile) ; which are then to be regarded, not as the main subject of the Prophecy, but only as prominent figures in the great prophetic picture, some of which were to the Prophet's eye already past, and some still future. In this respect the Prophecy is perfectly in keeping with the History of Israel, in which the Exile and the Restoration stand conspicuously forth as one of the great critical conjunctures which at distant intervals prepared the way for the removal of the ancient system, and yet secured its continued operation till the time of that removal should arrive. How far the same thing may be said of other periods which occupy a like place in the history of the Jews, such as the period of the Maccabees or Hasmonean Princes, is a question rendered doubtful by the silence of the Prophecy itself, and by the absence of any indications which are absolutely unambiguous. The specific reference of certain passages to this important epoch both by Grotius and Vitranga, has no antecedent probability against it ; but we cannot with the same unhesitating confidence assert such an allusion as we can in the case of Babylon and Cyrus, which are mentioned so expressly and repeatedly. It may be that historical discovery, the march of which has been so rapid in our own day, will enable us, or those who shall come after us, to set this question finally at rest. In the meantime it is safest to content ourselves with carefully distinguishing between the old and new economy as represented on the Prophet's canvass, without attempting to determine by conjecture what particular events are predicted even in the former, any further than we have the certain guidance of the Prophecy itself.

As to a similar attempt in reference to the New Dispensation, it is wholly inconsistent with the view which we have taken of the structure of these Prophecies, and which regards them not as particular descriptions of this or that event in later times, but as a general description of the Church in its emancipated state, or of the Reign of the Messiah, not at one time or another, but throughout its whole course, so that the faint light of the dawn is blended with the glow of sunset and the blaze of noon. The form under which the Reign of Christ is here presented to and by the Prophet is that of a glorious emancipation from the bondage and the darkness of the old economy, in representing which he naturally dwells with more minuteness upon that part of the picture which is nearest to himself, while the rest is bathed in a flood of light ; to penetrate beyond which, or to discriminate the objects hid beneath its dazzling veil, formed no part of this Prophet's

mission, but was reserved for the prophetic revelations of the New Testament.

It is not however merely to the contrast of the two dispensations that the Prophet's eye is here directed. It would indeed have been impossible to bring this contrast clearly into view without a prominent exhibition of the great event by which the transition was effected, and of the great person who effected it. That person is the Servant of Jehovah, elsewhere spoken of as his Anointed or Messiah, and both here and elsewhere represented as combining the prophetic, regal, and sacerdotal characters suggested by that title. The specific relation which he here sustains to the Israel of God, is that of the Head to a living Body; so that in many cases what is said of him appears to be true wholly or in part of them, as forming one complex person, an idea perfectly accordant with the doctrines and the images of the New Testament. It appears to have been first clearly stated in the dictum of an ancient writer quoted by Augustin: "*De Christo et Corpore ejus Ecclesia tanquam de una persona in Scriptura saepius mentionem fieri, cui quaedam tribuuntur quae tantum in Caput, quaedam quae tantum in Corpus competunt, quaedam vero in utrumque.*" There is nothing in these Prophecies more striking or peculiar than the sublime position occupied by this colossal figure, standing between the Church of the Old and that of the New Testament, as a mediator, an interpreter, a bond of union, and a common head.

If this be a correct view of the structure of these prophecies, nothing can be more erroneous or unfriendly to correct interpretation, than the idea, which appears to form the basis of some expositions, that the primary object in the Prophet's view is Israel as a race or nation, and that its spiritual or ecclesiastical relations are entirely adventitious and subordinate. The natural result of this erroneous supposition is a constant disposition to give every thing a national and local sense. This is especially the case with respect to the names so frequently occurring, Zion, Jerusalem, and Judah; all which, according to this view of the matter, must be understood, wherever it is possible, as meaning nothing more than the hill, the city, and the land, which they originally designate. This error has even been pushed by some to the irrational extreme of making Israel as a race the object of the promises, after their entire separation from the church and their reduction for the time being to the same position with the sons of Ishmael and of Esau. That this view should be taken by the modern Jews, in vindication of their own continued unbelief, is not so strange as its adoption by some Christian writers, even in direct opposition to their own interpretation of former prophecies, almost identical in form and substance. The specifications of this general charge will be fully given in the exposition.

The claim of this mode of interpretation to the praise of strictness and exactness is a false one, if the Israel of prophecy is not the nation as such merely, but the nation as the temporary frame-work of the church, and if the promises addressed to it, in forms derived from this transitory state, were nevertheless meant to be perpetual, and must be therefore independent of all temporary local restrictions. The true sense of the prophecies in this respect cannot be more strongly or explicitly set forth than in the words of the Apostle, when he says that "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew;"—"Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the election hath obtained it and the rest were blinded;" "not as though the word of God hath taken none effect, for they are not all Israel which are of Israel."

One effect of the correct view of this matter is to do away with vagueness and uncertainty or random license in the explanation of particular predictions. This requires to be more distinctly stated, as at first view the effect may seem to be directly opposite. It was a favourite maxim with an old school of interpreters, of whom Vitringa may be taken as the type and representative, that the prophecies should be explained to mean as much as possible, because the word of God must of course be more significant and pregnant than the word of man. Without disputing the correctness of the reason thus assumed, it may be granted that the rule itself is good or bad, in theory and practice, according to the sense in which it is received and applied. By the interpreters in question it was practically made to mean, that the dignity of prophecy required the utmost possible particularity of application to specific points of history, and the greatest possible number and variety of such applications. The sincerity with which the rule was recognised and acted on, in this sense, is apparent from the zeal with which Vitringa seeks minute historical allusions under the most general expressions, and the zest with which he piles up mystical senses, as he calls them, on the top of literal ones, plainly regarding the assumption of so many senses not as a necessary evil, but as a desirable advantage.

The evils of this method are, however, more apparent when the senses are less numerous, and the whole fulfilment of the prophecy is sought in some one juncture; because then all other applications are excluded, whereas the more they are diversified the more chance is allowed the reader of discovering the true generic import of the passage. For example, when Vitringa makes the Edom of these prophecies denote the Roman Empire, and also the Church of Rome, and also the unbelieving Jews, he widens the scope of his interpretation so far as unwittingly to put the reader on the true scent of a comprehensive threatening against the inveterate enemies of God and of his people, among whom those specified are only comprehended, if at all, as individual examples. But when, on the other hand, he asserts

that a particular prophecy received its whole fulfilment in the decline of Protestant theology and piety after the Reformation, he not only puts a meaning on the passage which no one else can see there without his assistance, but excludes all other applications as irrelevant. In some interpreters belonging to the same school, but inferior to Vitranga both in learning and judgment, this mode of exposition is connected with a false view of prophecy as mere prediction, and as intended solely to illustrate the divine omniscience.

Now in aiming to make every thing specific and precise, this kind of exposition renders all uncertain and indefinite, by leaving the particular events foretold to the discretion or caprice of the interpreter. Where the event is expressly described in the prophecy itself, as the conquests of Cyrus are in ch. 44 and 45, there can be no question; it is only where a strict sense is to be imposed upon indefinite expressions, that this evil fruit appears. The perfect license of conjecture thus afforded may be seen by comparing two interpreters of this class, and observing with what confidence the most incompatible opinions are maintained, neither of which would be suggested by the language of the prophecy itself to any other reader. What is thus dependent upon individual invention, taste, or fancy, must be uncertain, not only till it is discovered, but for ever; since the next interpreter may have a still more felicitous conjecture, or a still more ingenious combination, to supplant the old one. It is thus that in aiming at an unattainable precision these interpreters have brought upon themselves the very reproach which they were most solicitous to shun, that of vagueness and uncertainty.

If, instead of this, we let the Prophet say precisely what his words most naturally mean, expounded by the ordinary laws of human language and a due regard to the immediate context and to general usage, without attempting to make that specific which the author has made general, any more than to make general what he has made specific, we shall not only shun the inconveniences described, but facilitate the use and application of these prophecies by modern readers. Christian interpreters, as we have seen, have been so unwilling to renounce their interest, and that of the Church generally, in these ancient promises, encouragements, and warnings, that they have chosen rather to secure them by the cumbrous machinery of allegory, anagoge, and accommodation. But if the same end may be gained without resorting to such means,—if instead of being told to derive consolation from God's promises addressed to the Maccabees or to the Jews in exile, because he will be equally gracious to ourselves, we are permitted to regard a vast proportion of those promises as promises to the Church, and the ancient deliverances of the chosen people as mere samples or instalments of their ultimate fulfilment,—such a change in the relative position of the parties to these covenant transactions, without any change in the matter of the

covenant itself, may perhaps not unreasonably be described as recommending the method of interpretation which alone can make it possible. An exegesis marked by these results is the genuine and only realization of the old idea, in its best sense, that the word of God must mean as much as possible. All this, however, has respect to questions which can only be determined by the slow but sure test of a thorough and detailed interpretation.

Before proceeding to apply this test, it will be necessary to consider briefly the arrangement and division of these Later Prophecies. This is not a question of mere taste, or even of convenience, but one which may materially influence the exposition. Here again a brief historical statement may be useful, and not wholly without interest.

The older writers on Isaiah, being free from the influence of any artificial theory, and taking the book just as they found it, treated these chapters as a continuous discourse, with little regard to the usual divisions of the text, except as mere facilities for reference.

Vitringa's fondness for exact and even formal method, led him to attempt a systematic distribution of these chapters, similar to that which he had given of the Earlier Prophecies. He accordingly throws them into *conciones* or discourses, and divides these into *sectiones*, often coinciding with the chapters, but sometimes either longer or shorter. These subdivisions he provides with his favourite apparatus of *analysis*, *anacrisis*, etc. under which heads he appropriates distinct paragraphs to the description of the scope, design, occasion, argument, etc. of each section. The inappropriateness of this method, cumbrous at best, to these later chapters, is betrayed by the inanity of many of the prefaces, which have the look of frames or cases without any thing to fill them. This is particularly true of the paragraphs professing to exhibit the *occasion* upon which the several sections were composed. Here the author not unfrequently is under the necessity of simply referring to the preceding chapter as affording the occasion of the next,—an indirect concession that the separation of the parts, at least in that case, is gratuitous and artificial.

J. H. and J. D. Michaelis, Lowth, Gill, and other writers of the same period, while they wholly discard this embarrassing and wearisome machinery, and content themselves with the common division into chapters, are sometimes chargeable with treating these too much as an original arrangement of the author's matter by himself, and thus converting the whole into a series of detached discourses. The same thing is still more apparent in the popular and useful works of Henry, Scott, and others; where the reader is permitted, if not taught, to look upon the chapters as in some sense independent compositions, and to regard the first verse of each as introducing and the last as winding up a complete subject. This would be hurtful to



correct interpretation, even if the chapters were divided with the most consummate skill, much more when they are sometimes the result of the most superficial inspection.

The Higher Critics of the elder race, such as Eichhorn and his followers, carried out their idea of entire corruption and the consequent necessity of total revolution, not only by assuming a plurality of writers, but by taking for granted that their compositions had been put together perfectly at random, and could be reduced to order only by the constant practice of inventive ingenuity and critical conjecture. The practical effects of this hypothesis were valuable only as exhibiting its folly and producing a reaction towards more reasonable views. As a specimen of this school may be mentioned Bertholdt's distribution of the prophecies, in which certain chapters and parts of chapters are picked out and classified as having been written before the invasion of Babylonia by Cyrus, others after the invasion but before the siege of Babylon, others during the siege, others after the catastrophe.

Gesenius holds, in opposition to this theory, as we have seen, the oneness of the author and of his design. With respect to the actual arrangement of the book, he is inclined to regard it as original, but grants it to be possible that some transpositions may have taken place, and more particularly that the last chapters, as they now stand, may be older than the first.

Hitzig maintains the strict chronological arrangement of the chapters, with the exception of the forty-seventh, which he looks upon as older, but incorporated with the others by the writer himself. He also maintains, with the utmost confidence, the oneness of the composition, and rejects all suggestions of interpolation and corruption with disdain. This departure from his method in the earlier portion of the book is closely connected with his wish to bring the date of the prophecies as near as possible to that of the fulfilment. For the same reason he assumes the successive composition of the parts with considerable intervals between them, during which he supposes the events of the Persian war to have followed one another and repeatedly changed the posture of affairs. In addition to this chronological arrangement of his own, Hitzig adopts Rückert's threefold division of the book into three nearly equal parts, as indicated by the closing words of ch. 48 and 57. Ewald adopts the same view of the unity and gradual production of these prophecies, but with a different distribution of the parts. Ch. 40-48 he describes as the first attempt, exhibiting the freshest inspiration; ch. 49-60 as somewhat later, with a pause at the end of ch. 57. To these he adds two postscripts or appendixes, an earlier one ending ch. 63 : 6, and a later one extending to the close of the book.

Hendewerk divides the whole into two parallel series, the first ending with the forty-fifth chapter. He rejects Rückert's threefold division, as founded on an accidental repetition. He also rejects Hitzig's theory as to

ch. 47, but goes still further in determining the precise stages of the composition and tracing in the prophecy the principal events in the history of Cyrus. Knobel divides the whole into three parts, ch. 40-48, ch. 49-62, ch. 63-66.

A comparison of these minute arrangements shows that they are founded on imaginary allusions, or prompted by a governing desire to prove that the writer must have been contemporary with the exile, a wish which here predominates over the habitual disposition of these critics to explain away apparent references to history rather than to introduce them where they do not really exist.

Discarding these imaginary facts, Hävernick goes back to the rational hypothesis of a continuous discourse, either uninterrupted in its composition or unaffected in its structure by the interruptions which are now beyond the reach of critical discovery, and for the same reason wholly unimportant. This is substantially the ground assumed by the old interpreters, and even by Gesenius, but now confirmed by the utter failure of all efforts to establish any more artificial distribution of the text. As to arrangement, Hävernick adopts that of Rückert, which is rather poetical than critical, and founded on the similar close of ch. 48 and 57, coinciding with the usual division into chapters, so as to throw nine into each of the three portions. As an aid to the memory, and a basis of convenient distribution, this hypothesis may be adopted without injury, but not as implying that the book consists of three independent parts, or that any one of the proposed divisions can be satisfactorily interpreted apart from the others. The greater the pains taken to demonstrate such a structure, the more forced and artificial must the exposition of the book become; and it is therefore best to regard this ingenious idea of Rückert as an æsthetic decoration rather than an exegetical expedient.

After carefully comparing all the methods of division and arrangement which have come to my knowledge, I am clearly of opinion that in this part of Scripture, more perhaps than any other, the evil to be shunned is not so much defect as excess; that the book is not only a continued but a desultory composition; that although there is a sensible progression in the whole from the beginning to the end, it cannot be distinctly traced in every minor part, being often interrupted and obscured by retrocessions and resumptions, which, though governed by a natural association in each case, are not reducible to rule or system. The conventional division into chapters, viewed as a mechanical contrivance for facilitating reference, is indispensable, and cannot be materially changed with any good effect at all proportioned to the inconvenience and confusion which would necessarily attend such a departure from a usage long established and now universally familiar. The disadvantages attending it, or springing from an injudicious use of it by readers and

expounders, are the frequent separation of parts which as really cohere together as those that are combined, and the conversion of one great shifting spectacle, in which the scenes are constantly succeeding one another in a varied order, into a series of detached and unconnected pictures, throwing no light on each other even when most skilfully divided, and too often exhibiting a part of one view in absurd juxtaposition with another less akin to it than that from which it has been violently sundered.

A similar caution is required in relation to the summaries or prefatory notes with which the chapters, in conformity to usage and the prevalent opinion, are provided in the present work. In order to prevent an aggravation of the evils just described, a distinction must be clearly made between these summaries, and logical analyses so useful in the study of an argumentative context. It is there that such a method is at once most useful and most easy; because the logical nexus, where it really exists, is that which may be most successfully detected and exhibited as well as most tenaciously remembered. But in the case of an entirely different structure, and especially in one where a certain cycle of ideas is repeated often, in an order not prescribed by logic but by poetical association, there is no such facility, but on the other hand a tendency to sameness and monotony which weakens rather than excites the attention, and affords one of the strongest confirmations of the views already taken with respect to the structure of the whole book and the proper mode of treating it.

The most satisfactory and useful method of surveying the whole book with a view to the detailed interpretation of the parts is, in my opinion, to obtain a clear view of the few great themes with which the writer's mind was filled, and of the minor topics into which they readily resolve themselves, and then to mark their varied combinations as they alternately present themselves, some more fully and frequently in one part of the book, some exclusively in one part, others with greater uniformity in all. The succession of the prominent figures will be pointed out as we proceed in the interpretation of the several chapters. But in order to afford the reader every preliminary aid before attempting the detailed interpretation, I shall close this Introduction with a brief synopsis of the whole, presenting at a single glance its prominent contents and the mutual relation of its parts.

The prominent objects here presented to the Prophet's view are these five. 1. The carnal Israel, the Jewish nation, in its proud self-reliance and its gross corruption, whether idolatrous or only hypocritical and formal. 2. The spiritual Israel, the true Church, the remnant according to the election of grace, considered as the object of Jehovah's favour and protection, but at the same time as weak in faith and apprehensive of destruction. 3. The Babylonish Exile and the Restoration from it, as the most important intermediate point between the date of the prediction and the advent of Messiah,

and as an earnest or a sample of Jehovah's future dealings with his people both in wrath and mercy. 4. The Advent itself, with the person and character of Him who was to come for the deliverance of his people not only from eternal ruin but from temporal bondage, and their introduction into "glorious liberty." 5. The character of this new condition of the Church or of the Christian Dispensation, not considered in its elements but as a whole ; not in the way of chronological succession, but at one view ; not so much in itself, as in contrast with the temporary system that preceded it.

These are the subjects of the Prophet's whole discourse, and may be described as present to his mind throughout ; but the degree in which they are respectively made prominent is different in different parts. The attempts which have been made to show that they are taken up successively and treated one by one, are unsuccessful, because inconsistent with the frequent repetition and recurrence of the same theme. The order is not that of strict succession, but of alternation. It is still true, however, that the relative prominence of these great themes is far from being constant. As a general fact, it may be said that their relative positions in this respect answer to those which they hold in the enumeration above given. The character of Israel, both as a nation and a church, is chiefly prominent in the beginning, the Exile and the Advent in the middle, the contrast and the change of dispensations at the end. With this general conception of the Prophecy, the reader can have very little difficulty in perceiving the unity of the discourse, and marking its transitions for himself, even without the aid of such an abstract as the following.

The form in which the Prophecy begins has been determined by its intimate connexion with the threatening in the thirty-ninth chapter. To assure the Israel of God, or true church, that the national judgments which had been denounced should not destroy it, is the Prophet's purpose in the fortieth chapter, and is executed by exhibiting Jehovah's power, and willingness, and fixed determination to protect and save his own elect. In the forty-first, his power and omniscience are contrasted with the impotence of idols, and illustrated by an individual example. In the forty-second, the person of the great Deliverer is introduced, the nature of his influence described, the relation of his people to himself defined, and their mission or vocation as enlighteners of the world explained. The forty-third completes this exposition by exhibiting the true design of Israel's election as a people, its entire independence of all merit in themselves, and sole dependence on the sovereign will of God. In the forty-fourth the argument against idolatry is amplified and urged, and the divine sufficiency and faithfulness exemplified by a historical allusion to the exodus from Egypt, and a prophetic one to the deliverance from Babylon, in which last Cyrus is expressly named. The

last part of this chapter should have been connected with the first part of the forty-fifth, in which the name of Cyrus is repeated, and his conquests represented as an effect of God's omnipotence, and the prediction as a proof of his omniscience, both which attributes are then again contrasted with the impotence and senselessness of idols. The same comparison is still continued in the forty-sixth, with special reference to the false gods of Babylon, as utterly unable to deliver either their worshippers or themselves. In the forty-seventh the description is extended to the Babylonian government, as wholly powerless in opposition to Jehovah's interference for the emancipation of his people. The forty-eighth contains the winding up of this great argument from Cyrus and the fall of Babylon, as a conviction and rebuke to the unbelieving Jews themselves. The fact that Babylon is expressly mentioned only in these chapters is a strong confirmation of our previous conclusion that it is not the main subject of the prophecy. By a natural transition he reverts in the forty-ninth to the true Israel, and shows the groundlessness of their misgivings, by disclosing God's design respecting them, and showing the certainty of its fulfilment notwithstanding all discouraging appearances. The difference in the character and fate of the two Israels is still more exactly defined in the fiftieth chapter. In the fifty-first the true relation of the chosen people both to God and to the gentiles is illustrated by historical examples—the calling of Abram and the exodus from Egypt, and the same power pledged for the safety of Israel in time to come. In the last part of this chapter and the first of the fifty-second, which cohere in the most intimate manner, the gracious purposes of God are represented as fulfilled already, and described in the most animating terms. This view of the future condition of the church could not be separated long from that of Him by whom it was to be effected; and accordingly the last part of this chapter, forming one unbroken context with the fifty-third, exhibits him anew, no longer as a teacher, but as the great sacrifice for sin. No sooner is this great work finished than the best days of the church begin, the loss of national distinction being really a prelude to her glorious emancipation. The promise of this great change in the fifty-fourth chapter, is followed in the fifty-fifth by a gracious invitation to the whole world to partake of it. The fifty-sixth continues the same subject, by predicting the entire abrogation of all local, personal, and national distinctions. Having dwelt so long upon the prospects of the spiritual Israel or true church, the Prophet, in the last part of the fifty-sixth and the first part of the fifty-seventh, looks back at the carnal Israel, as it was in the days of its idolatrous apostacy, and closes with a threatening which insensibly melts into a promise of salvation to the true Israel. The fifty-eighth again presents the carnal Israel, not as idolaters but as hypocrites, and points out the true mean between the rejection of appointed rites and the abuse of them. The fifty-ninth explains Jehovah's

dealings with the nation of the Jews, and shows that their rejection was the fruit of their own doings, as the salvation of the saved was that of God's omnipotent compassions. In the sixtieth he turns once more to the true Israel, and begins a series of magnificent descriptions of the new dispensation as a whole, contrasted with the imperfections and restrictions of the old. The prominent figures of the picture in this chapter are immense increase by the accession of the gentiles, and internal purity and peace. The prominent figure in the sixty-first is that of the Messiah as the agent in this great work of spiritual emancipation. In the sixty-second it is that of Zion, or the Church herself, in the most intimate union with Jehovah and the full fruition of his favour. But this anticipation is inseparably blended with that of vengeance on the enemies of God, which is accordingly presented in the sublime vision of the sixty-third chapter, followed by an appeal to God's former dealings with his people, as a proof that their rejection was their own fault, and that he will still protect the true believers. These are represented in the sixty-fourth as humbly confessing their own sins and suing for the favour of Jehovah. In the sixty-fifth he solemnly announces the adoption of the gentiles and the rejection of the carnal Israel because of their iniquities, among which idolatry is once more rendered prominent. He then contrasts the doom of the apostate Israel with the glorious destiny awaiting the true Israel. And this comparison is still continued in the sixty-sixth chapter, where the Prophet, after ranging through so wide a field of vision, seems at last to fix his own eye and his reader's on the dividing line or turning point between the old and new economy, and winds up the whole drama with a vivid exhibition of the nations gathered to Jerusalem for worship, while the children of the kingdom, i. e. Israel according to the flesh, are cast forth into outer darkness, where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched. Upon this awful spectacle the curtain falls, and we are left to find relief from its impressions in the merciful disclosures of a later and more cheering revelation.

Isaiah

XL \_\_\_\_\_ LXVI

**COMMENTARY.**

**CHAPTER XL.**

A GLORIOUS change awaits the church, consisting in a new and gracious manifestation of Jehovah's presence, for which his people are exhorted to prepare, vs. 1-5. Though one generation perish after another, this promise shall eventually be fulfilled, because it rests not upon human but divine authority, vs. 6-8. Zion may even now see him approaching as the conqueror of his enemies, and at the same time as the shepherd of his people, vs. 9-11. The fulfilment of these pledges is insured by his infinite wisdom, his almighty power, and his independence both of individuals and nations, vs. 12-17. How much more is he superior to material images, by which men represent him or supply his place, vs. 18-25. The same power which sustains the heavens is pledged for the support of Israel, vs. 26-31.

The specific application of this chapter to the return from Babylon is without the least foundation in the text itself. The promise is a general one of consolation, protection, and change for the better, to be wrought by the power and wisdom of Jehovah, which are contrasted, first, with those of men, of nations, and of rulers, then with the utter impotence of idols. That the ultimate fulfilment of the promise was still distant, is implied in the exhortation to faith and patience. The reference to idolatry proves nothing with respect to the date of the prediction, although more appropriate in the writings of Isaiah than of a prophet in the Babylonish exile. It is evidently meant, however, to condemn idolatry in general, and more particularly all the idolatrous defections of the Israelites under the old economy.

V. 1. *Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.* This command is not addressed specifically to the priests or prophets, much less to the messengers from Babylon announcing the restoration of the Jews, but to any who might be supposed to hear the order, as in ch. 13 / 2, or to the people themselves, who are then required to encourage one another, as in ch. 35 / 3/4. The Vulgate even goes so far as to put *my people* in the vocative (*popule meus*). The imperative form of the expression is poetical. Instead of declaring his own purpose, God summons men to execute it.

and

Instead of saying, *I will comfort*, he says, *comfort ye*. The same idea might have been expressed by saying, in the third person, *let them comfort her*, or in the passive voice, *let her be comforted*. The possessive pronouns are emphatic, and suggest that, notwithstanding what they suffered, they were still Jehovah's people, he was still their God. There is also meaning in the repetition of the verb at the beginning. Such repetitions are not unfrequent in the earlier prophecies. (See *ch.* 24 | 16. 26 | 3. 29 | 1. 38 | 11, 17, 19.) The use of the future  $\text{יִשְׂמַח}$  for the præterite  $\text{יָשַׁח}$  (*said*) is peculiar to Isaiah. Gesenius cites as instances in other books, *Jer.* 42 | 20 | *Zech.* 13 | 9, and *Hos.* 2 | 23. But in the first and second cases, the future has its proper sense and not that of the present; while in the third, the Hebrew word is not  $\text{יִשְׂמַח}$  but  $\text{יָשַׁח}$ . At the same time, he omits the only real instance not in Isaiah, viz. *Ps.* 12 | 6. Calvin insists upon the strict translation of the future (*dicet*), as implying that the order to console the people was not to be actually given till a later period, and is only mentioned here by anticipation. But even if it be explained as a present, it is worthy of remark that this form of expression is not only peculiar to Isaiah, but common to both parts of the book. (See *ch.* 1 | 11. 18. | 33 | 10.)—The prefatory exhortation in this verse affords a key to the whole prophecy, as being consolatory in its tone and purpose. There is evident allusion to the threatening in *ch.* 39 | 7. (Compare the Earlier Prophecies, p. 652.) Having there predicted the captivity in Babylon, as one of the successive strokes, by which the fall of Israel as a nation, and the total loss of its peculiar privileges, should be brought about, the Prophet is now sent to assure the spiritual Israel, the true people of Jehovah, that although the Jewish nation should soon cease to be externally identified with the church, the church itself should not only continue to exist, but in a far more glorious state than ever. This is the “people” here meant, and this the “comfort” wherewith they were to be comforted.

2. *Speak to (or according to) the heart of Jerusalem, and cry to her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, that she hath received from the hand of Jehovah double for all her sins.* By speaking to the heart, we are to understand speaking so as to affect the heart or feelings, and also in accordance with the heart or wishes, i. e. what the person addressed desires or needs to hear. Jerusalem is here put for the church or chosen people, whose metropolis it was, and for whose sake the place itself was precious in the sight of God. Those who refer the passage to the Babylonish exile are under the necessity of assuming (with Rosenmüller) that the consolation was addressed to those left behind in Judah, or (with Gesenius) that Jerusalem means its inhabitants in exile. *Warfare* includes the two ideas of appointed time and hard service, in which sense the verb



and noun are both applied to the routine of sacerdotal functions (Num. 4 | 23. 8 | 24 | 25), but here still more expressively to the old dispensation, as a period of restriction and constraint. The next phrase strictly means *her iniquity is accepted*, i. e. an atonement for it, or the punishment already suffered is accepted as sufficient, not in strict justice, but in reference to God's gracious purpose. The same idea is supposed by some to be expressed in the last clause, where  $\text{כִּפּוּרֵי} \text{כִּפּוּרֵי}$  (*double*) is not used mathematically to denote proportion, but poetically to denote abundance, like the equivalent expression  $\text{כִּפּוּרֵי} \text{כִּפּוּרֵי}$  in ch. 61 | 7 | Job 42 | 10 | Zech. 9 | 12. The sense will then be that she has been punished abundantly, not more than she deserved, yet enough to answer the design of punishment. But as giving or receiving double, in all the other cases cited, has respect, not to punishment, but to favour after suffering, so this clause may be understood to mean, that she has now received (or is receiving) double favours notwithstanding all her sins. The  $\text{כִּפּוּרֵי}$  has then the same sense as in ch. 5 | 25. 9 | 11 | 16 | 20. 10 | 4. Either of these explanations makes it unnecessary to give *sin* the rare and doubtful sense of *punishment*. The verbs are *preterita prophetica*, but for that very reason should not be exchanged for futures, as we have no right to depart without necessity from the descriptive form in which it pleased the Holy Ghost to clothe this prophecy. The continuance of the ceremonial system and the hardships of the old dispensation are here and elsewhere represented as chastisements due to the defections of the chosen people, notwithstanding which they should continue to exist, and in a far more glorious character, not as a national church, but as a spiritual church, set free from ritual and local fetters.

V. 3. *A voice crying—in the wilderness—clear the way of Jehovah—make straight (or level) in the desert a highway for our God.* The Septuagint version, retained in the New Testament, is  $\text{φωνὴ βοῶντος}$ , which amounts to the same thing. Both in the Hebrew and the Greek, the words *in the wilderness* may be connected either with what follows or with what precedes; but the usual division is more natural, and the other has been insisted upon chiefly for the purpose of rendering the verse inapplicable to John the Baptist, who came preaching in a wilderness, and to whom the words are applied expressly in Matthew 3 | 3 | Mark 1 | 3 | Luke 3 | 4, as the herald of the new dispensation. Those who deny the inspiration of the Prophet are compelled to reject this as a mere accommodation, and apply the verse exclusively to the return from Babylon, of which there is no mention in the text or context. It is said indeed that God is here represented as marching at the head of his returning people. But in all the cases which Lowth cites as parallel, there is express allusion to the exodus from Egypt.

Here, on the contrary, the only image presented is that of God returning to Jerusalem, revisiting his people, as he did in every signal manifestation of his presence, but above all at the advent of Messiah and the opening of the new dispensation. The verb rendered *prepare* denotes a particular kind of preparation, viz. the removal of obstructions, as appears from Gen. 24 | 31 | Lev. 14 | 36, and may therefore be expressed by *clear* in English. The parallel verb means *rectify* or make straight, either in reference to obliquity of course or to unevenness of surface, most probably the latter, in which case it may be expressed by *level*. To a general term meaning *way* or *path* is added a specific one denoting an artificial causeway raised above the surface of the earth. There is no need of supposing (with Lowth) that the Prophet here alludes to any particular usage of the oriental sovereigns, or (with Grotius) that the order of the first and second verses is continued (*let there be a voice crying*). The Prophet is describing what he actually hears—a *voice crying!*—or as Ewald boldly paraphrases the expression—*hark, one cries!*

V. 4. *Every valley shall be raised and every mountain and hill brought low, and the uneven shall become level and the ridges a plain.* This may be considered as an explanation of the manner in which the way of the Lord was to be prepared. Grotius supposes the command at the beginning of the chapter to be still continued (*let every valley etc.*), and the latest German writers give the same construction of this verse, although they make a new command begin in the one preceding. The form of the following verb (הִרְבֵּה), though not incompatible with this explanation, rather favours the strict interpretation of the future, which is of course, on general principles, to be preferred. The common version (*exalted*) seems to imply that the valleys and mountains were to exchange places; but this would not facilitate the passing, which requires that both should be reduced to a common level.—The translation *crooked* is retained and defended by some modern writers, on the ground that the parallel expression requires it; but as גִּישׁוּר may denote not only lineal but superficial rectitude, so קֶבֶץ, as its opposite, may naturally signify unevenness of surface, which is more appropriate in this connexion than obliquity or irregularity of course. רַבְּסִים, according to its etymology, denotes gorges or ravines, or rather difficult passes; but in this case it seems to be the opposite of flat or level ground, and may therefore be expressed by *ridges*. The application of these several terms to different moral or spiritual objects—such as various classes in society or nations of the earth—rests upon the false assumption that the features of a portrait or the figures in a landscape are to be considered one by one, and not in their mutual relations, as composing a whole picture. (~~Compare the comment on ch. 5; 4, Earlier Prophecies, p. 66.~~) The whole impression here intended to be

See

made is that of a way opened through a wilderness by levelling the ground and the removal of obstructions, as a natural image for the removal of the hinderances to God's revisiting his people.

V. 5. *And the glory of Jehovah shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see (it) for the mouth of Jehovah speaks (or hath spoken).* The subjunctive construction of the first clause by Junius and Tremellius (*ut reveletur*) is adopted by Hitzig and Ewald, but without necessity. The idea seems to be that as soon as the way is opened, the Lord will show himself. יהוה יהוה may express either coincidence of time (*at once*) or totality (*altogether*), more probably the latter. Ewald needlessly reads יהוה יהוה, which he supposes to be implied in the Septuagint version (*τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ*), retained by Luke (3 | 6). But this only shows that *salvation* was included in the *glory* which should be revealed. Gesenius follows Luther in making the last clause express the thing to be seen (*shall see that the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken*); but this construction is precluded by the fact that this is the only case in which the sense thus put upon the formula is even possible; in all others the meaning of the clause not only may but must be, *for (because) the mouth of the Lord hath spoken*, as a reason why the declaration should be credited. (See Ex. 1 | 2; 20. 22 | 25. 58 | 14. Jer. 13 | 15. Joel 4 | 8. Ob. 1 | 18.) To this, the only tenable construction, all the later German writers have returned. To see God's glory, is a common expression for recognizing his presence and agency in any event. (See Exod. 16 | 7. Is. 35 | 2. 66 | 18.) The specific reference of this verse to the restoration of the Jews from exile is not only gratuitous, but inconsistent with the strength and comprehensiveness of its expressions. The simple meaning is, that when the way should be prepared, the glory of God would be universally displayed; a promise too extensive to be fully verified in that event or period of history.

V. 6. *A voice saying, Cry! And he said (or says), What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all its favour like a flower of the field!* Here, as in v. 3, the participle is construed in the genitive by the Septuagint (*φωνῆ λόγουτος*) and the Vulgate (*vox dicentis*); but the simplest construction makes it agree with *voice* as an adjective. That two distinct speakers are here introduced, seems to be granted by all interpreters, excepting Junius and Tremellius, who refer יהוה and יהוה to the same subject, and exclude the interrogation altogether. *A voice says, Cry, and it also says (or tells me) what I shall cry.* Cocceius supplies *is heard* at the beginning. Ewald adopts the same form of expression as in v. 3. *Hark! one says, Cry.* The force and beauty of the verse are much impaired by any version which does not represent the writer as actually hearing what he thus describes.

The Septuagint and Vulgate have *and I said*, either because they read  $\text{וַיֹּאמֶר}$  which is found in one or two manuscripts, or because they understood the form used in the common text as certainly referring to the Prophet himself. Augusti supplies, *the herald says*, which is unnecessary. There is a pleasing mystery, as Hitzig well observes, in the dialogue of these anonymous voices, which is dispelled by undertaking to determine too precisely who the speakers are. All that the words necessarily convey is, that one voice speaks and another voice answers. Interpreters are universally agreed that the last clause contains the words which the second speaker is required to utter. It is possible, however, to connect these words immediately with what precedes, and understand them as presenting an objection to the required proclamation. *What shall (or can) I cry, (since) all flesh is grass* etc. The advantages of this construction are, that it assumes no change of speaker where none is intimated in the text, and that it does away with an alleged tautology, as will be seen below. According to the usual construction we are to supply before the last clause, *and the first voice said again (or answered), Cry as follows: All flesh* etc. This last phrase is here used, not in its widest sense, as comprehending the whole animal world (Gen. 6 | 7 | 13 | 17), but in its more restricted application to mankind, of which some examples may be found in the New Testament (John 17 | 2. Rom. 3 | 20). The comparison of human frailty to grass is common in the Scriptures. (See ch. 37 | 27. 51 | 12. Ps. 103 | 15 | 16. James 1 | 10 | 11.) J. D. Michaelis supposes an allusion, in the last clause, to the sudden blasting of oriental flowers by the burning east wind. The Septuagint and Vulgate give  $\text{הִקְדָּר}$  the sense of *glory*, which is retained by Peter (1 Pet. 1 | 24, 25). From this Grotius, Houbigant, and others infer that the original reading was  $\text{הִדָּר}$ . Gesenius rejects this as altogether arbitrary, but with as little ground assumes that  $\text{הִקְדָּר}$  in this one place, is synonymous with  $\text{הָרָה}$ , when used (like the English *grace* and *favour*) in the sense of beauty. Hendewerk even goes so far as to say that  $\text{χάρις}$ , in Luke 2: 40, has an *æsthetic* sense. To assume a new sense of  $\text{הִקְדָּר}$  in this one case is a violation of the soundest principles of lexicography, and instead of letting the writer express his own ideas, forces upon him what the commentator thinks he might have said or should have said. There may be cases where a word must be supposed to have a peculiar sense in some one place; but such assumptions can be justified by nothing but ~~extreme~~ necessity; and that no such necessity exists in this case, is apparent from the fact that the usual explanation gives a perfectly good sense. The contrast is then between the shortlived and precarious favour of man and the infallible promise of God. The quotation in Peter confirms the supposition, here suggested by the context, that the words have reference to the preaching of the gospel or the introduction of the new dispensation.

V. 7. *Dried is the grass, faded the flower; for the breath of Jehovah has blown upon it. Surely the people is grass.* The present form usually given to the verbs conveys the sense correctly as a general proposition, but not in its original shape as a description of what has actually happened, and may be expected to occur again.—The translation *when* (instead of *for*), preferred by Gesenius and some older writers, is only inadmissible because it is a needless deviation from the usual meaning of the particle, which yields a perfectly good sense in this connexion.—If  $\text{וַיִּבֶן}$  does not here denote a divine agent, which is hardly consistent with the figurative form of the whole sentence, it should be taken in its primary sense of *breath*, not in the intermediate one of *wind* / although this, as Gesenius suggests, may be what the figure was intended to express, the figure itself is that of a person *breathing* on the grass and flower and causing them to wither. It is strange that Lowth should have overlooked this natural and striking image, to adopt the unpoetical and frigid notion, that “a wind of Jehovah is a Hebraism, meaning no more than a strong wind.”— $\text{וַיִּבֶן}$ , which properly means *surely, verily*, is here equivalent to an affirmative particle, *yea* or *yes*, and is so explained by Luther.—The treatment which this last clause has experienced affords an instructive illustration of the real value of the ‘higher criticism.’ Koppe, the father of this modern art or science, rejects the clause as spurious because it violates the parallelism. He is followed, with some hesitation, by Gesenius, who assigns as additional reasons, that the sense is *watery* and incoherent, and that the clause is wanting in the Septuagint, although he does not hesitate to retain the first clause, which is also omitted in that ancient version. Hitzig grants that this omission may have been a mere mistake or inadvertence, but still rejects the clause, upon the ground that it contains a false explanation of what goes before, because  $\text{וַיִּבֶן}$ , when absolutely used, *must* mean the Jews, whereas the reference in this whole context is to the gentiles; as if the latter allegation did not utterly subvert the other, by determining in what sense  $\text{וַיִּבֶן}$  must here be taken. Instead of arguing that, because the gentiles are referred to in the context, therefore they must be meant here likewise, he assumes that they are not meant here, and then pronounces the clause inconsistent with the context. The clause is retained as genuine by all the German writers since Hitzig. Another curious instance of the confidence, with which the *higher critics* can affirm contradictory propositions, is the fact that while Hitzig says that  $\text{וַיִּבֶן}$  *must* mean Israel, Gesenius quietly assumes that it *must* mean the Babylonians.

V. 8. *Dried is the grass, faded the flower, and the word of our God shall stand for ever.* The comparatively rare use of adversative particles in Hebrew is apparent from this verse, in which the relation of the clauses can

be fully expressed in English only by means of the word *but*.—Kimchi explains *word* to mean the word of prophecy, while others give it the specific sense of promise, and others understand it as denoting the gospel, on the authority of 1 Peter 1/25. All these explanations can be reconciled by suffering the Prophet to express his own ideas, without any adventitious limitation, and admitting, as the only sure conclusion, that by *word* he means neither promise, nor prophecy, nor gospel merely, but *every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God* (Deut. 8/3. Matth. 4/4). There is a tacit antithesis between the word of God and man; what man says is uncertain and precarious, what God says cannot fail. Thus understood it includes prediction, precept, promise, and the offer of salvation, and although the latter is not meant exclusively, the Apostle makes a perfectly correct and most important application of the verse when, after quoting it, he adds, *and this is the word which is preached (εὐαγγελισθῆν) unto you*, that is to say, this prophetic declaration is emphatically true of the gospel of Christ. To *stand for ever* is a common Hebrew phrase for perpetuity, security, and sure fulfilment. The expression *our God* contains, as usual, a reference to the covenant relation between God and his people. Even according to the usual arrangement and construction of these verses, the emphatic repetition in vs. 7 and 8 can only be thought *watery* by critics of extreme refinement. It is possible, however, to avoid the appearance of tautology by means of an arrangement which has been already hinted at as possible, although it does not seem to have occurred to any of the interpreters. The proposition is to give the passage a dramatic form, by making the last clause of v. 6 and the whole of v. 7 a continuation of the words of the second voice, and then regarding v. 8 as a rejoinder by the first voice. The whole may then be paraphrased as follows. A voice says, 'Cry!' And (another voice) says, 'What shall I cry' (i. e. to what purpose can I cry, or utter promises like those recorded in vs. 1-5), since all flesh is grass &c.; the grass withereth &c.; surely the people is grass (and cannot be expected to witness the fulfilment of these promises). But the first voice says again: 'The grass does wither, and the flower does fade; but these events depend not on the life of man, but on the word of God, and the word of God shall stand for ever.' There are no doubt some objections to this exegetical hypothesis, especially its somewhat artificial character; and therefore it has not been introduced into the text, but is simply thrown out here, as a possible alternative, to those who are not satisfied with the more obvious and usual construction of the passage.

V. 9. Upon a high mountain get thee up, bringer of good news, Zion! Raise with strength thy voice, bringer of good news, Jerusalem! Raise (it), fear not, say to the towns of Judah, Lo your God! The reflexive

form, *get thee up*, though not a literal translation, is an idiomatic equivalent to the Hebrew phrase (*ascend for thee or for thyself*). Some suppose an allusion to the practice of addressing large assemblies from the summit or acclivity of hills. (See Judges 9 : 7. Deut. 27 : 12. Matth. 5 : 1.) J. D. Michaelis compares the ancient practice of transmitting news by shouting from one hill-top to another, as described by Cæsar (Bell. Gall. vii. 3). *Celeriter ad omnes Gallie civitates fama perfertur; nam ubi major atque illustrior incidit res, clamore per agros regionesque significant; hunc alii deinceps excipiunt et proximis tradunt.* The essential idea is that of local elevation as extending the diffusion of the sound.—There are two constructions of צִיּוֹן וְיְרוּשָׁלַיִם and the parallel expression. The first supposes the words to be in regimen, the other in apposition. According to the former, which is given in the Septuagint, Targum, and Vulgate, and retained by Grotius, Lowth, Gesenius, and others, the person addressed is the bearer of good tidings to Zion and Jerusalem (compare ch. 52 : 7. Nah. 2 : 1). The feminine form is explained by Grotius as an enallage for the masculine, like נִבְרָךְ *Preacher*, an idiom, as Dathe thinks, peculiar to official titles. Gesenius regards it as an instance of the idiomatic use of the feminine singular as a collective, like נִבְרָכָה for נִבְרָכִים (Mic. 1 : 11, 12), and agrees with the Targum in making the prophets the object of address. But this whole theory of collective feminines is so unnatural, and so imperfectly sustained by the cases which Gesenius cites (Lehrg. p. 477. Heb. Gr. § 105. 2. c.), that if the construction now in question be adopted, it is better to revert to the hypothesis of Lowth and J. D. Michaelis, that the Prophet alludes to the practice of celebrating victories by the songs of women. (See Ex. 15 : 20, 21. Judg. 11 : 34. 1 Sam. 18 : 6, 7.) But although this explanation is decidedly more natural than that of Grotius and Gesenius, it is perhaps less so than the ancient one contained in the Peshito and the three Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, according to which Zion or Jerusalem herself is represented as the bearer of good tidings to the towns of Judah. This construction is further recommended by the beautiful personification, which it introduces, of the Holy City as the seat of the true religion and the centre of the church. The office here ascribed to it is the same that is recognised in ch. 2 : 3: *the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.* Not only in the restoration from captivity, or in the personal advent of the Saviour, but in every instance of the Lord's return to his forsaken people, it is the duty of the church to communicate as well as to receive the joyful tidings.—The explanation of Jerusalem and Zion as meaning their inhabitants among the captivity is still more arbitrary here than in v. 2, because no reason can be given why the exiles from the Holy City should be called upon to act as heralds to the others, whereas there is a beautiful poetical propriety in giving that office to the Holy City itself.—Let the reader carefully ob-

serve how many exegetical embarrassments arise from the attempt to confine the application of the passage to the period of the exile or to any other not particularly indicated. The exhortation not to fear does not imply that there was danger in making the announcement, but that there might be doubt and hesitation as to its fulfilment.—Barnes thinks it necessary to prevent abuse of this text by affirming that it ‘will not justify boisterous preaching, or a loud and unnatural tone of voice, alike offensive to good taste, injurious to health, and destructive of the life of the preacher.’ He also infers from it that ‘the glad tidings of salvation should be delivered in an animated and ardent manner; the future punishment of the wicked in a tone serious, solemn, subdued, awful.’

10. *Lo, the Lord Jehovah will come (or is coming) in (the person of) a strong one, and his arm (is) ruling for him. Lo, his hire is with him and his wages before him.* The double  $\text{הָיָה}$  represents the object as already appearing or in sight. Of the phrase  $\text{בְּיָדָאָהוּ}$  there are several interpretations. All the ancient versions make it mean *with strength*; but this abstract sense of the adjective is not sustained by usage, and the same objection lies, with still greater force, against Ewald’s version, *in victory*. Aben Ezra and Kimchi supply  $\text{בְּיָדָאָהוּ}$  (*with a strong hand*); but wherever the entire phrase occurs, the noun is construed as a feminine. Jarchi makes it mean *against the strong one*, which Vitranga adopts and applies the phrase to Satan. But usage requires that  $\text{בְּיָדָאָהוּ}$ , when it has this sense, should be construed with its object, either directly, or by means of the prepositions  $\text{בְּ}$ ,  $\text{בְּיָדָאָהוּ}$ , or  $\text{בְּ}$ . De Dieu regards the  $\text{אָהוּ}$  as pleonastic or a *beth essentialis*, corresponding to the French construction *en roi*, in (the character or person of) a king. The existence of this idiom in Hebrew is questioned by some eminent grammarians, and is at best so unusual that it should not be assumed without necessity. (See the ~~comment~~ *comment* on *ch. 26: 4* in the *Earlier Prophecies*, p. 440.) The choice, however, seems to lie between this and the construction which explains the words to mean that he will *come with a strong one*; as in *ch. 25: 2*, the Lord is said to *have a strong and mighty one*, who should cast the crown of Ephraim to the ground with his hand. What God is said to do himself in one case, he is represented in the other as accomplishing by means of a powerful instrument or agent, which, however, is defined no further. The essential meaning, common to the two constructions, is, that Jehovah was about to make a special exhibition of his power.—The participle *ruling*, in the next clause, is expressive of continuous action. The  $\text{בְּ}$  cannot refer to *arm*, which Gesenius suggests as a possible construction, because  $\text{בְּ}$ , although sometimes masculine, is here expressly construed as a feminine. The antecedent of the pronoun must be either Jehovah or the Strong One, according to the sense in which  $\text{בְּ}$  is taken, as descriptive of God himself,



or of his instrument. Those who understand that phrase to mean *against the strong one*, give the next the sense of *ruling over him*. But although ל strictly denotes relation in general (*as to, with respect to*), and admits of various equivalents in English, it is never elsewhere used in this sense after לָמַד *to rule*, which, with scarcely an exception, is followed by the preposition ל. The true sense of ל is probably the obvious one, *for him*, and the clause is a poetical description of the arm as acting independently of its possessor, and as it were in his behalf.—Here, as in Lev. 19 | 13 | Ps. 109 | 20 | Is. 49 | 4, הַיְצִיָּה *work* is put for its effect, reward, or product. There is no need of assuming, with Kimchi, an ellipsis of הַיְצִיָּה before it. The word itself, as Aben Ezra well explains it, is equivalent in meaning to הַיְצִיָּה הַיְצִיָּה.—J. D. Michaelis considers it as doubtful whether the person here referred to is described as dispensing or receiving a reward, since in either case it would be *his*. The former explanation is preferred by most interpreters, some of whom suppose a specific allusion to the customary distribution of prizes by commanders after victory. Upon this general supposition, Lowth explains the phrase *before him*, as referring to the act of stretching forth the hand, or holding out the thing to be bestowed. Those who restrict the passage to the Babylonish exiles, for the most part understand this clause as promising a recompense to such of the captives as had patiently endured God's will and believed his promises. Knobel, however, understands it as referring to the redeemed people as being themselves the recompense of their deliverer; and Henderson adopts the same construction, but applies it to the recompense earned by the Messiah. This explanation is favoured by what follows in the next verse, where Jehovah or his Strong One is described as a shepherd. The two verses may be readily connected, without any change of figure, by supposing that the lost sheep which he has recovered are the recompense referred to in the verse before us. Thus understood, the passage may have furnished the occasion and the basis of our Saviour's beautiful description of himself as the true shepherd, who lays down his life for the sheep, as well as of the figure drawn from the recovery of a lost sheep to illustrate the rejoicing in heaven over one repentant sinner. But a still more decisive argument in favour of this interpretation is the fact, that in every case without exception where הַיְצִיָּה and הַיְצִיָּה have the same sense as here, the *hire* or *wages* of a person is the hire or wages paid to him, and not that paid by him. To give it the latter meaning in this one case therefore would be to violate a usage, not merely general but uniform; and such a violation could be justified only by a kind and degree of exegetical necessity which no one can imagine to exist in this case. Upon these grounds it is probable, not only that Jehovah is here represented as receiving a reward, but that there is special reference to the recompense of the Messiah's sufferings and obedience by the redemption of his people. According to the

view which has been taken of the nexus between these two verses, *before him* may possibly contain an allusion to the shepherd's following his flock; but it admits of a more obvious and simple explanation, as denoting that his recompense is not only sure but actually realized, being already in his sight or presence, and *with him*, i. e. in immediate possession.

11. *Like a shepherd his flock will he feed, with his arm will he gather the lambs, and in his bosom carry (them); the nursing (ewes) he will (gently) lead.* Although the meaning of this verse is plain, it is not easily translated, on account of the peculiar fitness and significancy of the terms employed. The word correctly rendered *feed* denotes the whole care of a shepherd for his flock, and has therefore no exact equivalent in English. To *gather with the arm* coincides very nearly, although not precisely, with our phrase to take up in the arms. A very similar idea is expressed by *bearing in the bosom*. The last clause has been more misunderstood than any other. Most interpreters appear to have regarded צָבָה as denoting *pregnant*, whereas it is the active participle of the verb צָבָה, to suckle or give suck, and is evidently used in that sense in 1 Samuel 6 | 7 | 10. The former explanation might appear to have arisen from a misapprehension of the Vulgate version, *fatias*, which, as Bochart has shown by quotations from the classics, is sometimes applied to animals after delivery, but while still giving suck. But the erroneous explanation is much older, being unambiguously given in the Septuagint (*ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσας*). Aben Ezra also explains צָבָה as synonymous with הָיָה, whereas Solomon ben Melek gives the correct interpretation (הַנְּחִימָה הַמִּינְחָה). The essential meaning of הָיָה is admitted to be that of *leading* by all interpreters excepting Hengstenberg, who undertakes to show that it always has reference to sustenance. (Commentary on the Psalms, Vol. II. p. 64.) His strongest argument is that derived from Gen. 47 | 17; but he seems to have overlooked 2 Chron. 28 | 15; and even Ex. 15 | 13, which he owns to be against him, cannot be satisfactorily explained on his hypothesis. In that case, both the parallelism and the construction in the second clause are decidedly in favour of the old opinion, from which there seems, upon the whole, to be no sufficient reason for departing. From the primary and simple sense of leading may be readily deduced that of carefully leading or conducting, which as readily suggests the accessory idea of benignant and affectionate protection. Henderson's statement, that this verse and the one before it exhibit certain attributes of the character and work of Christ is correct, but too restricted, since the passage is descriptive of the whole relation which Jehovah sustains to his people, as their shepherd, and of which inferior but real exhibitions were afforded long before the advent of the Saviour; for example, in the restoration of the Jews from exile, which is no

more to be excluded from the scope of this prophetic picture than to be regarded as its only subject.

12. *Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended in a measure the dust of the earth, and weighed in a balance the mountains, and the hills in scales?* There are two directly opposite opinions as to the general idea here expressed. Gesenius and others understand the question as an indirect negation of the possibility of doing what is here described. The implied answer, upon this hypothesis, is, No one, and the verse is equivalent to the exclamation, How immense are the works of God! The other and more usual interpretation understands the question thus: Who (but God) has measured or can measure etc.? Thus understood, the verse, so far from affirming the immensity of God's works, represents them as little in comparison with him, who measures and distributes them with perfect ease. The first explanation derives some countenance from the analogy of the next verse, where the question certainly involves an absolute negation, and is tantamount to saying, that no one does or can do what is there described. But this consideration is not sufficient to outweigh the argument in favour of the other explanation, arising from its greater simplicity and obviousness in this connexion. It is also well observed by Hitzig, that in order to convey the idea of immensity, the largest measures, not the smallest, would have been employed. An object might be too large to be weighed in scales, or held in the hollow of a man's hand, and yet very far from being immense or even vast in its dimensions. On the other hand, the smallness of the measure is entirely appropriate as showing the immensity of God himself, who can deal with the whole universe as man deals with the most minute and trivial objects.—כַּף is properly a *handful* (1 Kings 20 } 10. Ezek. 13 } 19), but is here put for the receptacle or measure of that quantity.—By *waters* we are not to understand specifically either the ocean (Grotius) or the waters above the firmament (Rosenmüller), but water as a constituted element or portion of the globe.—The primary meaning of מִשְׁקָל is supposed by Gesenius to be that of weighing, here transferred to the measure of extension. Maurer, with more probability, regards it as a generic term for measurement, including that of weight, capacity, and extension.—The span is mentioned as a natural and universal measure of length, to which we must likewise apply Jerome's translation (*tribus digitis*), and not, as Gill imagines, to the quantity of dust which "a man can hold between his thumb and two fingers."—In every other place where כַּף occurs, it is the construct or abbreviated form of כֵּף, the nearest equivalent to our *all*, but uniformly construed as a noun, meaning properly the *whole* of any thing. The Septuagint translates it so in this case likewise (*πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*), and Gesenius, in his *Lehrgebäude* (p. 675), gives it as one

of the cases in which the governing and governed noun are separated by an intervening word. In quoting the Hebrew he inadvertently inserts a *makkeph* (אֲ-בִשְׁבַע-בְּבִשְׁבַע), thus conforming the orthography to the usual analogy. But having afterwards observed that the Hebrew text has בִּשְׁבַע with a conjunctive accent, he corrected the error in his lexicon and commentary, and referred the word to the root בִּשְׁ, which does not occur elsewhere in Kal, but the essential idea of which, as appears from the Chaldee and Arabic analogy, as well as from its own derivatives in Hebrew, is that of measuring, or rather that of holding and containing, which agrees exactly with the common English version (*comprehended*). It is a curious and characteristic circumstance, that Hitzig, in his note upon this passage, revives the explanation which Gesenius had given by mistake and afterwards abandoned, appealing to Ps. 35 | 10 as an example of the use of בִּשְׁ (*all*) with a conjunctive accent, and to Isaiah 38 | 16 as an instance of its separation from the dependent noun. To this unexpected defence of his own inadvertent error, Gesenius replies in his Thesaurus (II. 665) that clear expressions are not to be elucidated by the analogy of dark ones, and that a verb is needed here to balance the verbs *measure*, *mete*, and *weigh*, in the other clauses.—The terms used in the English Bible, *scales* and *balance*, are retained above but transposed, in order to adhere more closely to the form of the original, in which the first word is a singular (denoting properly an apparatus like the steelyard), while the other is a dual, strictly denoting a *pair* of scales. This is in fact the etymological import of *balance*, according to the usual explanation of the Latin *bilanx*, as denoting a double dish or plate; but be this as it may, the English *balance* does not at once ~~and of necessity~~ suggest the form of the instrument ~~like scales~~.—The *dust of the earth* seems to be here put for the earth itself, and is therefore not erroneously though freely rendered in the Vulgate, *molem terræ*. אֲ-בִשְׁ is properly a *third*, i. e. the third of another measure, probably the ephah, which is often rendered in the Septuagint τριῖα μέτρα, while the *seah* is translated μέτρον. The name is analogous to *quart* (meaning *fourth*), and exactly coincident with *tierce*, which Skinner defines to be “a measure so called because the third part (*triens*) of another measure called a pipe,” but which is also used in old English writers for the third part of other measures. (See Richardson’s Dictionary, p. 1910.) The ephah, according to the best computation, was equivalent to one Italian modius and a half. J. D. Michaelis is probably singular in thinking it necessary to express the value of the measure in translation, by making the Prophet ask, who measures the dust of the earth with the third part of a bushel. This is not only in bad taste, but hurtful to the sense; because the literal comprehension of the earth in this specific measure is impossible, and all that the words were intended to suggest is a comparison between the customary measurement of common things by man, and the analogous control which is

exercised by God over all his works. For this end the general sense of *measure*, which the word has in Ps. 80:6, and which is given to it here by the Targum (מִשְׁכָּל), is entirely sufficient. The exact size of the מִשְׁכָּל is of no more importance to the exposition than that of the balance or the scales.—The idea of accurate exact adjustment, which by some interpreters is thought to be included in the meaning of this verse, if expressed at all, is certainly not prominent, the main design of the description being simply to exhibit, not the power or the wisdom of God as distinguishable attributes, but rather the supreme control in which they are both exercised.—Ewald connects this verse with the argument that follows, by suggesting as the answer to the question, that certainly no man, and much less the image of a man, could do what is here described.—Umbreit connects it with what goes before by supposing the Prophet to affirm that the gracious shepherd, just before described, is at the same time all-wise and omnipotent, and therefore able to make good the promise of protection to his people.

V. 13. *Who hath measured the spirit of Jehovah, and (who, as) the man of his counsel, will teach him (or cause him to know)?* According to J. D. Michaelis, the connexion between this verse and the one before it is, that he who can do the one can do the other; if any one can weigh the hills etc., he can also measure the divine intelligence. But the natural connexion seems to be, that he who weighs the hills etc. must himself be independent, boundless, and unsearchable.—The various explanations of רָחַם as meaning known, instructed, prepared, directed, searched, etc. are mere substitutions of what ought to have been said (in the interpreter's opinion) for what is said. Although not impossible, it is highly improbable that the word should have a different meaning here from that which it evidently has in the foregoing verse, where the sense is determined by the mention of the span. What seems to be denied is the possibility of limiting or estimating the divine intelligence.—According to Calvin, we are not to understand by רָחַם here the Holy Spirit, as a person of the Godhead, but the mind or intellect of God. The Targum arbitrarily explains it as denoting *the Holy Spirit* (i. e. inspiration) *in the mouth of all the prophets*.—The last clause is not an answer to the first, but a continuation of the question. Most interpreters suppose the *who* to be repeated. Luther and Rosenmüller make it agree directly with the following phrase. (*What counsellor etc.*) The latest writers make the construction relative as well as interrogative. *Who was (or is) the counsellor that taught him?* A simpler construction is that given in our Bible, which supplies neither interrogative nor relative: *and (being) his counsellor, or (as) his counsellor, hath taught-him.* The translation of the last verb as a preterite is entirely arbitrary. Both tenses seem to have been used, as in many other cases, for the purpose of making the implied

negation more exclusive. *Who has, and who will or can?*—Ewald, rejecting the usual combination of *man* with *counsel* in the sense of *counsellor*, makes one the subject and the other the object of the verb: ‘and reveals—though a man—his counsel to him.’ The same construction seems to be at least as old as Arias Montanus, who translates the clause, *vir consilium ejus scire faciet eum*. In favour of the usual interpretation is its greater simplicity, and the occurrence of the plural form, *the men of my counsel*, in the obvious sense of counsellors, in Ps. 119: 24.—Lowth’s translation (*one of his council*) gives a sense to  $\text{וְיָגִיד}$  not sustained by usage, and Barnes’s modification of it (*one of his counsel*) introduces an idea wholly modern and irrelevant.—Calvin supposes that the Prophet, having spoken of the goodness of God in v. 11, and of his power in v. 12, here proceeds to magnify his wisdom. But both these verses are designed alike to set forth his supremacy and independence, by describing him as measuring and regulating all things, while himself incapable either of measurement or regulation.

V. 14. *Whom did he consult (or with whom took he counsel) and he made him understand, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and the way of understanding (who) will make him know?* The consecution of the tenses is the same as in the foregoing verse. The indirect construction of the second and following verbs, by Lowth and the later German writers (*that he should instruct him etc.*), is not only forced, but inconsistent with the use of the conversive future, and a gratuitous substitution of an occidental idiom for the somewhat harsh but simple Hebrew syntax, in which the object of the first verb is the subject of the second. *What man did he (the Lord) consult, and he (the man) made him (the Lord) to understand etc.* The sense is given, with but little change of form, in the English Version, by repeating the interrogative pronoun. *With whom took he counsel, and (who) instructed him or made him understand?*—The preposition before *path* is understood by Hitzig, Ewald, and Umbreit, as denoting the subject of instruction: taught him respecting or concerning (*über*) the path of judgment. Gesenius and Hendewerk regard it as a mere connective of the verb with its object: taught him the path etc. But the most satisfactory explanation is the one proposed by Knobel, who attaches to the verb the sense of guiding, and retains the proper meaning of the particle. This is confirmed by the analogy of the synonymous verb  $\text{וְיָגִיד}$ , which originally means to guide, and is also construed with the same preposition (Ps. 32: 8. Prov. 4: 11).—By *judgment* we must either understand *discretion*, in which case the whole phrase will be synonymous with *way of understanding* in the parallel clause; or *rectitude*, in which case the whole phrase will mean the *right way*, not in a moral sense, but in that of a way conducting to the end desired, the right way to attain that end. As these

are only different expressions of the same essential idea, the question is of little exegetical importance.—The plural *וְיָדְעוּ*, literally *understandings*, is not an Arabism, as Knobel elsewhere affirms of this whole class of words, but a genuine Hebrew idiom, denoting fulness or an eminent degree of the quality in question, just as *וְיָדְעָה* is used in the book of Proverbs to denote the highest wisdom, the *sapientia hypostatica*. (See Hengstenberg on the Pentateuch, vol. i. p. 258, and on the Psalms, vol. ii. p. 459.)—Jarchi, with characteristic nationality, regards this as a contrast, not between God and man, but between Israel and other nations: ‘With which of the gentiles did he take counsel as he did with the prophets, as it is said of Abraham, The Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do?’—Junius and Tremellius make the first verb reciprocal and all the rest reflexive (*Cum quo communicavit consilium, ut instruet se etc.*?), which is wholly gratuitous and forced.—The first clause of this verse is quoted in Rom. 11:34, with the following words added, *or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?* As this addition is also found in the Alexandrian text of the Septuagint, J. D. Michaelis infers that it has dropped out of the Hebrew. It is more probable, however, that the words were introduced into the Septuagint from the text in Romans, where they are really no part of the quotation from Isaiah, but the apostle’s own paraphrase of it or addition to it, the form of which may have been suggested by the first clause of Job 41:3 (in the English Bible 41:11). Such allusive imitations occur elsewhere in Paul’s writings. (See the remarks on 1 Cor. 1:20, and its connexion with Isaiah 33:18, in the *Earlier Prophecies*, p. 551.) In the present case, the addition agrees fully with the spirit of the passage quoted; since the aid in question, if it had been afforded, would be fairly entitled to a recompense.

V. 15. *Lo, nations as a drop from a bucket, and as dust on scales are reckoned; lo, islands as an atom he will take up.* He is independent, not only of nature and of individual men, but of nations. The Septuagint gives *וְיָ* the Chaldee sense of *if*, leaving the sentence incomplete, notwithstanding the attempts of the modern editors to carry the construction through several verses. By supplying *are* in the first clause, the English Version impairs the compact strength of the expression. Both members of the clause are to be construed with the verb at the end. This verb De Wette and Hendewerk explain as meaning *are to be reckoned (sind zu achten)*; but although this future sense is common in the Niphal participle, it is not to be assumed in the preterite without necessity. The sense is rather that they are already so considered. Luther gives *וְיָ בְּדָלָה* the sense of a drop remaining in a bucket when the water is poured out, correspond-

ing to the parallel expression of an atom which remains in the balance after any thing is weighed. Hitzig also translates the last word *in the bucket* (*im Eimer*). Maurer gives the strict translation *from a bucket*, and supposes *hanging* to be understood (*de situla pendens*). But as this is not an obvious ellipsis, it is better to explain the  $\text{כֶּזַי}$  as simply expressing the proportion of the drop to the contents of the bucket, a drop out of a whole bucket. Next to this, the simplest explanation is the one suggested in the English Version, which seems to take the phrase as an indirect expression for a *drop of water*. But as the mention of the bucket would in that case be superfluous, the other explanation is entitled to the preference. *Dust of the scales or balance*, i. e. dust resting on it, but without affecting its equilibrium. The Vulgate version (*momentum stateræ*) seems directly to reverse the meaning of the phrase, in which the dust is obviously spoken of as having no appreciable weight. The exegetical tradition is decisive in favour of explaining  $\text{כֶּזַי}$  to mean fine dust, while the uniform usage of the word in other cases would require the sense of *cloud*. It is possible indeed that the image which the prophet intended to suggest was that of a *cloud in the balance*, the idea of extreme levity being then conveyed by comparison with the weight of what is commonly regarded as imponderable. The weight of authority is all in favour of the other sense, which may be readily connected with the common one, by supposing  $\text{כֶּזַי}$  to mean first a cloud in general, then a cloud of dust in particular, and then dust in general, or more specifically fine minute dust.  $\text{פָּרַץ}$ , from  $\text{פָּרַץ}$  to crush or pulverize, denotes any minute portion of a solid substance, and in this connexion may be well expressed by *atom*. The Seventy seem to have mistaken it for  $\text{פָּרָה}$ , *saliva*, spittle, and translate it *σάλια*. Gesenius gives  $\text{כַּזְּיִם}$  the general sense of *lands*, and then notes this usage of the word as a sign of later date. But why may not *islands*, in the strict sense, be intended here as much as hills and mountains in v. 12? The only objection is founded on the parallelism; but this is imperfect, even if we give  $\text{כַּזְּיִם}$  its widest sense. J. D. Michaelis goes to the opposite extreme, by making it mean Europe and Asia Minor. Rabbi Jonah explains  $\text{כַּזְּיִם}$  as the Niphal of  $\text{כָּזַז}$  to throw or cast, and this explanation is retained by Knobel. In like manner, Aquila has *λεπτόν βαλλόμενον*. But most interpreters agree in making it the future Kal of  $\text{כָּזַז}$ , which in Syriac and Chaldee means to raise or lift up. On the former supposition, it must either agree irregularly with the plural *islands*, or with a relative to be supplied (like an atom which is cast away). This last construction is consistent also with the other derivation of the verb. Thus Rosenmüller has, *quem tollit tollens*; and Maurer, *which it* (the wind) *carries off*. But the simplest construction is the one which makes  $\text{כַּזְּיִם}$  the direct object of the verb, as in the English Version. Ewald gives the verb itself the sense of *poising*, weighing, which is too specific.



V. 16. *And Lebanon is not enough for burning, and its beasts are not enough for a sacrifice.* The supremacy and majesty of God are now presented in a more religious aspect, by expressions borrowed from the Mosaic ritual. He is not only independent of the power but also of the good-will of his creatures. This general allusion to oblation, as an act of homage or of friendship, suits the connexion better than a specific reference to expiation. The insufficiency of these offerings is set forth, not in a formal proposition, but by means of a striking individualization. For general terms he substitutes one striking instance, and asserts of that what might be asserted of the rest. If Lebanon could not suffice, what could? The imagery here used is justly described by Umbreit as magnificent: nature the temple; Lebanon the altar; its lordly woods the pile; its countless beasts the sacrifice. There is a strong idiomatic peculiarity of form in this verse.  $\text{לֹא־יָסַף}$  and  $\text{וְיָסַף}$  are properly both nouns in the construct state, the first meaning non-existence and the other sufficiency. The nearest approach in English to the form of the original is *nothing of sufficiency of burning*; but  $\text{יָסַף}$ , as usual, includes or indicates the verb of existence, and  $\text{יָסַף}$  is followed by a noun expressive of the end for which a thing is said to be or not to be sufficient. Clericus and Rosenmüller give  $\text{יָסַף}$  the sense of *kindling*, which it sometimes has (e. g. Ex. 35: 3. Lev. 6: 5); but as this differs from *burning* only in being limited to the inception of the process, and as it seems more natural to speak of wood enough to burn than of wood enough to kindle, there is no cause of departing from the usual interpretation. The collective  $\text{בְּהֵמָה}$  (*animal for animals*), having no equivalent in English, although common in Hebrew, can be represented only by a plural.— $\text{זֶבַח־עֹלָה}$  is the technical name appropriated in the law of Moses to the ordinary sacrifice for general expiation. It seems to denote strictly an ascension or ascent, being so called, either from the mounting of the vapour, or from the ascent of the whole victim on the altar. As the phrase by which it is commonly translated in the English Bible (*burnt-offering*) is not an exact etymological equivalent, and as no stress seems to be laid here upon the species of oblation, the general term *offering* or *sacrifice* would seem to be sufficiently specific. (Compare with this verse ch. 66: 1. 1 Kings 8: 27. 2 Chr. 6: 18. Ps. 50: 8-13.)

V. 17. *All the nations as nothing before him, less than nothing and vanity are counted to him.* The proposition of v. 15 is repeated, but in still more absolute and universal terms. Instead of *nations*, he says *all the nations*; instead of likening them to grains of sand or drops of water, he denies their very being. *Before him* does not simply mean in his view or estimation, but in comparison with him, the primary import of  $\text{כְּעִוְבָה}$  being such as to suggest the idea of two objects brought together or confronted for the purpose of comparison. So too the parallel expression  $\text{לֹא־יָסַף}$  does not mean *by*

*him* (which is seldom, if ever, so expressed in Hebrew), but *with respect to him*, or simply *to him* in the same sense as when we say that one thing or person is *nothing to* another, i. e. not to be compared with it. The same use of *to*, even without a negative, is clear from such expressions as “Hyperion to a Satyr.” That God is the arbiter who thus decides between himself and his creatures, is still implied in both the phrases, although not the sole or even prominent idea meant to be expressed by either.—The structure of the sentence is exactly like that of the first clause of v. 15, and the same remark is applicable, as to the insertion of the substantive verb in the English Version.—The particle *as* may either be a mere connective, *reckoned as nothing*, i. e. reckoned *for* or reckoned *to be* nothing, which is rather an English than a Hebrew idiom, or it may serve to soften the expression by suggesting that it is not to be literally understood, in which case it is nearly equivalent to *as it were*. So the Vulgate: *quasi non sint, sic sunt coram eo*.—The etymological distinction between אֵין and אֵינָן is that the latter means annihilation or the end of being, the former absolute nonentity. In this case, the weaker term is assimilated to the stronger by the addition of another word, denoting desolation or emptiness, and here used as a formula of intense negation.—The preposition before אֵינָן is explained by some as connective of the verb with its object, *reckoned for nothing*; which construction seems to be as old as the Septuagint (*ὡς οὐθὲρ ἐλογίσθησαν*), but is not sufficiently sustained by the usage of the Hebrew particle. Others make it an expression of resemblance, like the Vulgate (*quasi nihilum*); which seems to be a mere conjecture from the parallelism, and is equally at variance with usage. Calvin (followed by the English Version, Clericus, Vitringa, Umbreit, and Ewald in the first edition of his Grammar) makes the אֵין comparative, and understands the phrase as meaning *less than nothing*. To this it is objected by Gesenius, that it does not suit the parallelism (a virtual assertion that a climax is impossible in Hebrew composition), and that the idea is too far-fetched (*zu gesucht*); to which Hitzig adds that there is no word to mean *less*, and that if the אֵין were really comparative, the phrase would necessarily mean *more than nothing*. These objections are renewed by Knobel, without any notice of Umbreit’s answer to the last, viz. that the idea of minority is suggested by the context; that *less than nothing* could not well be otherwise expressed; and that even if it meant *more than nothing*, it would still be an equivalent expression, meaning more of nothing than nothing itself. Gesenius, in his Commentary, makes the אֵין an expletive or pleonastic particle, of common use in Arabic, so that the phrase means simply *nothing*. But in his Lexicons he agrees with Hitzig and Maurer in giving it a partitive sense, *of nothing*, i. e. a part of nothing, which, as Hitzig says, is here conceived of as a great concrete or aggregate of which the thing in question is a portion. But as the whole must be

greater than the part, this explanation is essentially identical with Calvin's (*less than nothing*), which Gesenius admits, but still objects to the latter, as being less poetical than mathematical. The reader may determine for himself whether it is any more *gesucht* than that preferred to it, or than that proposed by Hendewerk, who seems to understand the  $\text{יֵשׁ}$  as indicating the material or source, as if he had said, (*made or produced*) *out of nothing and vanity*. The common ground assumed by all these explanations is, that the verse contains the strongest possible expression of insignificance and even non-existence, as predicable even of whole nations, in comparison with God, and in his presence.

V. 18. *And (now) to whom will ye liken God, and what likeness will ye compare to him?* The inevitable logical conclusion from the previous considerations is that God is One and that there is no other. From this, the prophet now proceeds to argue, that it is folly to compare God even with the most exalted creature, how much more with lifeless matter. The logical relation of this verse to what precedes, although not indicated in the text, may be rendered clearer by the introduction of an illative particle (*then, therefore, etc.*), or more simply by inserting *now*, which is often used in such connexions. (See for example Ps. 2 : 10, and Hengstenberg's Commentary, vol. 1. p. 44.) The last clause admits of two constructions, both amounting to the same thing in the end. What *likeness* or resemblance (i. e. what similar object) will ye *compare* to him? Or, what *comparison* will ye *institute* respecting him? The last agrees best with the usage of the verb, as meaning to arrange, prepare, or set in order (*to compare*, only indirectly and by implication); while at the same time it avoids the unusual combination of *comparing a likeness* to a thing or person, instead of comparing the two objects for the purpose of discovering their likeness.—The use of the divine name  $\text{יְהוָה}$  (expressive of omnipotence) is here emphatic and significant, as a preparation for the subsequent exposure of the impotence of idols. The force of the original expression is retained in Vitringa's version (*Deum fortem*).

V. 19. *The image a carver has wrought, and a gilder with gold shall overlay it, and chains of silver (he is) casting.* The ambiguous construction of the first clause is the same in the original, where we may either supply a relative, or make it a distinct proposition. In favour of the first, which is a frequent ellipsis both in Hebrew and English, is the fact, that the verse then contains a direct answer to the question in the one before it. What have you to set over against such a God? The image which an ordinary workman manufactures. It enables us also to account for the position of *the image* at the beginning of the sentence, and for its having the definite article,

while the following nouns have none, both which forms of expression seem to be significant, *the image* which *a workman* (i. e. any workman) can produce.—The consecution of the tenses seems to show, that the writer takes his stand between the commencement and the end of the process, and describes it as actually going on. The carver has already wrought the image, and the gilder is about to overlay it.—There is a seeming incongruity between the strict etymological senses of the nouns and verb in this clause:  $\text{שֶׁנֶּהֱנֶה}$  is properly a carver, and  $\text{בְּנֶהֱנֶה}$  a carved or graven image; whereas  $\text{נֶהֱנֶה}$ , as descriptive of a process of art, can only mean to melt, cast, or found. This can only be accounted for upon the supposition, that the verb, or the nouns, or both, have acquired in usage a more extensive or indefinite meaning. In the translation above given, the discrepancy has been removed by giving to the verb the general sense of *wrought*, and to the first noun that of image, which it evidently has in other places, where a contrast is exhibited between God and idols, of course without regard to the mode of their formation. (See for example ch. 42: 8, and the note on ch. 30: 22 in the Earlier Prophecies, p. 519.)— $\text{נֶהֱנֶה}$  is properly a *melter*, and is elsewhere applied both to the smelter or finer of metals (Prov. 25: 4) and to the founder or caster of images (Judges 17: 4). The word *gilder*, although not an exact translation, has been used above, as more appropriate in this connexion than the common version, *goldsmith*.— $\text{נֶהֱנֶה}$ , which elsewhere means to beat out metal into thin plates, here denotes the application of such plates as an ornamental covering. Henderson repeats this verb, in its original sense of beating out, before *chains of silver*. Hitzig and Ewald continue the construction of the first clause through the second, and take  $\text{נֶהֱנֶה}$  as a noun, repeated for the sake of a sarcastic effect. (*And with silver chains the goldsmith.*) A similar construction had before been given by Cocceius, who supplies the substantive verb (*et sunt catenae argentae aurifabri*). But the different mode of writing the word in the two clauses ( $\text{נֶהֱנֶה}$  and  $\text{נֶהֱנֶה}$ ) seems to favour the opinion of Gesenius and most other writers, that the latter is a verbal form. Lowth reads  $\text{נֶהֱנֶה}$  in the preterite, on the authority of twenty-seven manuscripts and three editions. Maurer explains it as the Praeter Poel, of which, however, there is no example elsewhere. Gesenius regards it as a participle used for the present tense. It is really equivalent to our continuous or compound present, denoting what is actually now in progress.—The silver chains may be considered either simply ornamental, or as intended to suspend the image and prevent its falling.

V. 20. (*As for*) *the (man) impoverished (by) offering, a tree (that) will not rot he chooses, a wise carver he seeks for it, to set up an image (that) shall not be moved.* While the rich waste their gold and silver upon idols, the poor are equally extravagant in wood. None of the usual mean

ings of  $\text{בְּזָבִי}$  is here appropriate. From the noun  $\text{מִצְבָּנוֹת}$  (*treasures, stores*), Rabbi Jonah derives the sense of *rich*, while all the modern writers are agreed in giving it the opposite meaning, although doubtful and divided as to the etymology. As the form is evidently that of a participle passive, the best translation seems to be *impoverished*, and the best construction that proposed by Gesenius in his *Lehrgebäude* (p. 821), *impoverished by oblation* or religious gifts. It is true, that in his *Commentary and Lexicons* he abandons this construction, on the ground of an objection made by one of his reviewers, that it does not suit the context, and adopts the one which most succeeding writers have repeated, viz. *poor as to offering*, that is, too poor to make a costly one, or, as Cocceius slightly modifies the sense, *frugalior oblationis*. To this there is a strong philological objection, that  $\text{הִרְזִיקָהּ$ , though a very common word, is nowhere else applied to an image, and that an image could not be naturally called an offering. On the other hand, the objection from the context, so submissively allowed by Gesenius, is not only vague but founded on a superficial view of the connexion. To say that the poor man uses wood instead of gold and silver, is coherent and appropriate, but far less significant and striking than to say, that the man who has already reduced himself to want by lavish gifts to his idol, still continues his devotions, and as he no longer can afford an image of the precious metals, is resolved at least to have a durable wooden one. Thus understood, the verse adds to the general description a particular trait highly expressive of the folly of idolaters. This desertion by Gesenius of his first opinion differs from that mentioned in the exposition of v. 12 in this respect, that while he there relinquishes his former ground as having been assumed through inadvertence and mistake, he here continues to assert that what he first proposed is still the most grammatical construction (as evinced by the analogy of ch. 1 : 20. 1 Kings 22 : 10. Ex. 28 : 11, etc.), but abandons it in deference to an unmeaning and gratuitous objection. The obscurity of this phrase, even to the ancient writers, is apparent from its omission in the Septuagint and Vulgate, and from Jerome's explanation of *amsuchan* as a kind of wood.—In the next clause, the Vulgate makes  $\text{הָרִישׁ הָהֵךְ}$  the subject of the verb (*artifex sapiens quaerit quomodo* etc.); but the common construction is more natural, because it makes the conduct of the devotee still the subject of description. *Wise* is here used in what appears to be its primary meaning of artistically skilful. (See the note on ch. 3 : 3, E. P. p. 42.)  $\text{לִי}$  may either be reflexive (*for himself*), as some consider it in v. 11, and as all admit  $\text{הָיָה}$  to be in v. 9, or it may be referred to  $\text{עָנִי}$ . Having secured the stuff, he seeks *for it* a skilful workman. As  $\text{עָנִי}$  is an obvious antecedent, and as the reflexive use of the pronouns is comparatively rare, this last construction seems entitled to the preference.—Although *to prepare* is a very common meaning of  $\text{הִרְזִיקָהּ}$ , its primary sense of setting upright or

erecting is entitled to the preference, not only upon etymological grounds, but because it agrees better with the following expression,  $\text{וְיִצְבֹּב אֹלֶם}$ , which stands in antithesis, not to the preparation of the image, but to its erection or establishment, in which the previous preparation is of course implied.—As kinds of wood regarded by the ancients as peculiarly durable, Grotius enumerates the cypress, grape-vine, juniper, and mulberry; Rosenmüller the olive, cedar, fir, and oak; to which Gesenius adds the lotus and the fig-tree. There is no need, however, of supposing a specific reference to any one or more of these varieties.

V. 21. *Will you not know? will you not hear? has it not been told you from the first! have you not understood the foundations (or from the foundations) of the earth?* The tenses of the verbs in the first clause have been variously and arbitrarily explained by different interpreters. The English Version and some others exchange both the futures for praeters (*have ye not known? have ye not heard?*) without any satisfactory reason or authority. So far is such a reason from being afforded by the addition of the preterite  $\text{יָדַעְתִּי}$  in this place, or the use of the praeters  $\text{הִשְׁמַעְתִּי}$  and  $\text{הִשְׁמַעְתֶּם$  in v. 28, that it rather proves the contrary and makes it necessary to retain the strict sense of the futures. Still more capricious is the explanation of the first verb as a present and the second as a praeter, by the Vulgate and some modern writers (*do you not know? have you not heard?*). With as much or as little reason, Cocceius combines the present and the future (*do you not know? will you not hear?*). There is less objection to the rendering of both verbs in the present tense by Luther (*know you not? hear you not?*). But the most satisfactory, because the safest and most regular construction, is the strict one given in the Septuagint ( $\text{ὀν γινώσασθε; ὀν ἀκούσασθε;}$ ), revived by Lowth (*will ye not know? will ye not hear?*), and approved by Ewald (*o wollt ihr nicht erkennen? o wollt ihr nicht hören?*). The clause is then not a mere expression of surprise at their not knowing, but of concern or indignation at their being unwilling to know. There is no inconsistency between this explanation of the first two questions and the obvious meaning of the third; because the proof of their unwillingness to hear and know was the fact of their having been informed from the beginning.— $\text{שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר}$  is not a mere indefinite expression meaning *long ago, of old*, or the like; but must refer to some specific *terminus a quo*, which Aben Ezra takes to be the beginning of life. This would be more appropriate if an individual were the object of address. Others understand it to mean, from the beginning of your national existence; which supposes too exclusive a reference to the Jews in exile. Neither of these objections lies against the reference of the words to the beginning of the human race, or of the world itself, which is moreover favoured by the subsequent appeal to the creation. Kimchi explains  $\text{שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר}$

as an allusion to the *cabbalah* or Jewish tradition, and Hitzig likewise thinks there is a twofold appeal to nature and tradition, or as Calvin more scripturally states it, to the word and works of God. But although this affords a good sense, it may perhaps be too great a refinement on the plain import of the words, which would seem to refer simply to the testimony of external nature, and to mean that they who question the existence or supremacy of one God are *without excuse*, as Paul says, *because the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, to wit, his eternal power and Godhead.* (Rom. 1: 20. Compare Acts 14: 17. 17: 24.)—In the last clause Gesenius and most of the later writers connect the verb directly with the noun, as meaning, *have you not considered (or have you not understood) the foundations of the earth?* Others, adhering to the masoretic accents, which forbid the immediate grammatical conjunction of the verb and noun, prefix a preposition to the latter. *Have you not understood (from) the foundations of the earth?* The particle thus supplied may either be a particle of time, as explained by Junius and Ewald (*since the creation*), or indicate the source of knowledge (*from the creation*), as explained by Calvin. The latter is more obvious and simple in itself; but the other is favoured by the parallelism, as  $\text{שֶׁבַח}$  is universally allowed to have a temporal meaning. Lowth's emendation of the text, by the actual insertion of the preposition, is superfluous and therefore inadmissible.—By the *foundations* of the earth we are not to understand a literal description of its structure, nor an allusion to the four elements of earth, air, fire, and water, upon which Kimchi here inserts a dissertation, but a substitution of the concrete for the abstract, the foundations of the earth being put by a natural and common figure for its being founded, i. e. its creation.

V. 22. *The (one) sitting on (or over) the circle of the earth, and its inhabitants (are) as grasshoppers (or locusts); the one spreading like a veil (or awning) the heavens, and he stretches them out like the tent to dwell in.* The relative construction, *he that sitteth*, is substantially correct, but it is better to retain, as far as possible, the form of the original, as given above. The words may then be construed with the verb of existence understood, as in the English Version (*it is he that sitteth*), or with the last verb in the preceding verse (*have ye not considered the one sitting etc.?*)—The circle of the earth may either mean the earth itself, or the heavens by which it is surmounted and encompassed. (Solomon Ben Melek:  $\text{וְגִבַּל הַקּוֹנֵן הַאָרֶץ}$ .) This expression has been urged with equal propriety by Gill as a proof that the prophet was acquainted with the true shape of the earth, and by Knobel as a proof that he had a false idea of the heavens. On the absurdity of such conclusions, see E. P. p. 559. As a parallel to this may be mentioned the

remark of Hendewerk, that God is here described as bearing just the same proportion to mankind, that the latter bear to insects! The same comparison occurs in Num. 13: 33.  $\text{זָרָה}$  is now commonly explained to mean a species of *locust*, which of course has no effect upon the point of the comparison, the essential idea being that of *bestiolæ* (Calvin) or *minuta animantia* (Grotius).— $\text{פָּתַח}$  is properly a fine cloth, here applied, as Lowth supposes, to the awning spread over the open courts of oriental houses. It has been disputed whether the last words of the verse mean for himself to dwell in, or for man to dwell in. But they really form part, not of the direct description, but of the comparison, like a tent pitched for dwelling in, an idea distinctly expressed in the translation both by Henderson (*a dwelling-tent*) and Ewald (*das Wohnzelt*).—With this verse compare ch. 42: 5. 44: 24. Job 9: 8. Ps. 104: 2.

V. 23. *The (one) bringing (literally giving or putting) princes to nothing, the judges (or rulers) of the earth like emptiness (or desolation) he has made.* Not only nature but man, not only individuals but nations, not only nations but their rulers, are completely subject to the power of God. The Septuagint understands  $\text{יִשְׁלַח}$  as meaning so as to rule over nothing ( $\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$ ), implying the loss of their authority. The Vulgate strangely renders  $\text{זָרָה}$  *secretorum scrutatores*, a version probably suggested by the Chaldee  $\text{רָה}$  a secret.

V. 24. *Not even (sown) were they, not even (planted), not even rooted in the ground their stock, and he just breathed (or blew) upon them, and they withered, and a whirlwind like the chaff shall take them up (or away).* The Targum gives  $\text{בִּזְרָה}$  the sense of *though* ( $\text{בִּזְרָה}$ ), Aben Ezra and Kimchi that of *as if* ( $\text{בִּזְרָה}$ ), which last is adopted by Luther and Calvin. Gesenius and the later German writers all agree that the compound phrase has here the sense of *scarcely*.  $\text{וְזָרָה}$  by itself denotes accession, and may sometimes be expressed by *yea* or *yes*, sometimes by *also* or *even*. It is not impossible that in the present case, the  $\text{וְזָרָה}$  in one clause and the corresponding  $\text{זָרָה}$  in the other, were intended to connect the statements of this verse with the one before it. As if he had said, not only can God ultimately bring them to destruction, but *also* when they are not yet planted etc.; not only by slower and more potent means, but *also* by breathing on them. Another possible solution is that *yes* and *no* are here combined to express the idea of uncertainty, as if he had said, they are and are not sown, planted, etc. i. e. when they are scarcely sown, or when it is still doubtful whether they are sown. But perhaps the simplest and most natural construction is the one assumed above in the translation, where the phrase is taken as substantially equivalent to our *not even*, yielding the same sense in the end with



the usual modern version *scarcely*. The future form which some give to the verbs is wholly arbitrary. He is describing the destruction of the great ones of the earth as already effected; and even if the praetors be *praeterita prophetica*, there is no more need of giving them the future form in English than in Hebrew. The transition to the future in the last clause is analogous to that in v. 19, and has the same effect of showing that the point of observation is an intermediate one between the beginning and the end of the destroying process. The essential meaning of the whole verse is, that God can extirpate them, not only in the end, but in a moment; not only in the height of their prosperity, but long before they have attained it. J. D. Michaelis supposes a particular allusion to the frequency with which the highest families became extinct, so that there is not now on earth a royal house which is the lineal representative of any race that reigned in ancient times. It is possible, however, that the words may have reference to the national existence of Israel as a nation, the end of which, with the continued and more glorious existence of the church independent of all national restrictions, may be said to constitute the great theme of these prophecies.

V. 25. *And (now) to whom will ye liken me, and (to whom) shall I be equal? saith the Holy One.* He winds up his argument by coming back to the triumphant challenge of v. 18. This repetition does not seem to have struck any one as indicating a strophical arrangement, although such a conclusion would be quite as valid as in many other cases. The indirect construction of the second verb as a subjunctive (*that I may or should be equal*), although preferred by Luther, Calvin, and most modern writers, is much less simple in itself, and less consistent with the genius and usage of the language, than its strict translation as a future, continuing directly the interrogation of the other clause.—The epithet *Holy* is in this connexion well explained by J. D. Michaelis as including all that distinguishes between God and his creatures, so that the antithesis is perfect. (Compare ch. 6 : 3, and E. P. p. 89.)

V. 26. *Lift up on high your eyes and see—who hath created all these? —(and who is) the (one) bringing out by number their host?—to all of them by name will he call—from abundance of might and (because) strong in power—not one faileth (literally a man is not missed or found wanting).* The same exhortation to lift up the eyes occurs elsewhere in Isaiah (ch. 37 : 23. 49 : 18. 60 : 4).—The construction is not, *see (him) who created these*, or, *see who created these*, but, as the accents indicate, *see, behold*, the heavens and the heavenly bodies, and then as a distinct interrogation, *who created these?* There is more doubt as to the question whether the following words continue the interrogation or contain the answer to it. In the

former case, the sense is, *Who created these? (who is) the (one) bringing out etc?* In the latter case, *Who created these? The (one) bringing out etc.* This last is favoured by the analogy of ch. 41: 4, 26. 42: 21 and other places, where a similar question is immediately succeeded by the answer. But in this case such an answer would be almost unmeaning, since it would merely say that he who rules the heavenly bodies made them. It is much more natural to understand the last clause as completing the description.—To *bring out* is a military term, as appears from ch. 43: 17 and 2 Sam. 5: 2. It is applied as here to the host of heaven in Job 38: 32.—Instead of *by number*, Zwingli and Henderson understand the phrase to mean *in number*, i. e. in great numbers, just as  $\text{מְצֻדָּה}$  means *with might* or *mightily*. But the common explanation of the phrase as denoting order and arrangement is favoured, not only by the military form of the whole description, but by the parallel expression *by name*, which is not used to qualify the noun but the verb, and to show in what way the commander of this mighty host exerts his power, in what way he brings out and calls his soldiers, viz. by number and by name. The reference of these clauses to the rising of the heavenly bodies makes them too specific, and confounds direct description with comparison. The sense is that the stars are like an army which its leader brings out and enumerates, the particular points of the resemblance being left to the imagination. The explanation of  $\text{מְצֻדָּה}$  by Gesenius and others as an abstract meaning *strength* is neither justified by usage nor required by the context, since the word may be applied as a descriptive epithet to God who is the subject of the sentence. It is an old and singular opinion that the strength here spoken of is that residing in the stars themselves.  $\text{מְצֻדָּה שָׁמַיִם}$  may also be regarded as a military phrase. The feminine form of the same expression occurs in a different application ch. 34: 16. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 573.)

V. 27. *Why wilt thou say oh Jacob, and why (thus) speak oh Israel? Hidden is my way from Jehovah, and from my God my cause will pass (or is about to pass) away.* The future verbs in this verse have been rendered as variously as those in v. 21. The precise question asked by the Prophet is not *why hast thou said, why dost thou say, or why shouldst thou say*, but *why wilt thou still go on to say*, implying that it had been said, was still said, and would be said again.—The two names of the patriarch are here combined, as in many other cases, to describe his offspring.—*Hidden* may either mean *unknown*, or *neglected*, or *forgotten*, in which last sense it is used below in ch. 65: 16. The same verb is applied in Gen. 31: 49 to persons who are absent from each other and of course out of sight.—*Way* is a common figure for the course of life, experience, or what the world calls fortune, destiny, or fate.—The figure in the last clause is forensic, the idea

that of a cause or suit dismissed, lost sight of, or neglected by the judge. The expression is analogous to that in ch. 1: 23, where it is said of the unjust judges, that the cause of the widow does not come unto them or before them. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 17.) The state of mind described is a skeptical despondency as to the fulfilment of God's promises. Since this form of unbelief is more or less familiar to the personal experience of believers in all ages, and the terms of the expostulation here are not restricted to any single period in the history of Israel, the grave conclusions drawn by Gesenius and Knobel with respect to the prevalence of an epicurean skepticism at the period of the Babylonish exile, have an air of solemn trifling, and the proofs of later date which they afford are like unto them.

V. 28. *Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard? The God of eternity (or everlasting God), Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth, will not faint, and will not tire; there is no search (with respect) to his understanding.* Most of the modern writers prefer Lowth's construction, that *Jehovah (is) the everlasting God*; but this, by making several distinct propositions, impairs the simplicity of the construction. The translation of the futures in the present or potential form (*does not or cannot faint*), though not erroneous, is inadequate, since both these senses are included in the promiscuous form or future proper. That he *will* not faint or tire, implies sufficiently in this case that he neither does nor can, while it expresses his unwillingness to do so. The *ends of the earth* is a common Hebrew phrase for its limits and all that they include. The Septuagint makes the prophet say that Jehovah will not *hunger* (*ὃν πινάσει*).—This verse contains an answer to the unbelieving fears expressed in that before it, which ascribed to God an imperfection or infirmity with which he is not chargeable. The last clause may either be a general assertion that he cannot leave his people unprotected through a want of understanding and of knowledge, or, as Hitzig supposes, a suggestion that his methods of proceeding, though inscrutable, are infinitely wise, and that the seeming inconsistency between his words and deeds, far from arguing unfaithfulness or weakness upon his part, does but prove our incapacity to understand or fathom his profound designs. Even supposing that the former is the strict sense of the words, the latter is implicitly contained in them.

V. 29. *Giving to the faint (or weary) strength, and to the powerless might will he increase.* He is not only strong in himself, but the giver of strength to others, or, to state it as an argument *a fortiori*, he who is the only source of strength to others must be strong himself, and able to fulfil his promises.—The construction is similar to that in vs. 22, 23, not except-

ing the transition from the participle to the finite verb.  $\text{יָצַד}$  is not strictly a periphrasis for the present tense, as rendered in the English Version, but agrees with Jehovah as the subject of the preceding verse. The position of this word at the beginning and of the corresponding verb at the end of the verse is emphatic and climactic, the first meaning simply to *give*, the other to *give more* or abundantly.—The Septuagint has, *giving to the hungry strength, and to those that grieve not sorrow*.

V. 30. *And (yet) weary shall youths be and faint, and chosen (youths) shall be weakened, be weakened.* There is here an obvious allusion to the terms of v. 25. What is there denied of God, is here affirmed, not only of men in general, but of the stoutest and most vigorous, aptly represented by the young men chosen for military service, which appears to be a better explanation of  $\text{בְּיָמֵי הַיּוֹשֵׁבִים}$  than the one given by Gesenius, viz. choice or chosen, in reference to personal beauty. (Compare ch. 9:16, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 177.) Fürst, with still less probability, supposes the essential meaning to be that of growth or adolescence. That the prominent idea here conveyed is that of manly strength and vigour, is not questioned.—For the evidence that  $\text{בָּלַעַד}$  strictly means to grow weak or be weakened, see 1 Sam. 2:4, Zech. 12:8, and Gesenius's Thesaurus, tom. II. p. 720.—The intensive repetition of the verb may either be expressed by the addition of an adverb, as in the English Version (*utterly fall*), or retained in the translation as above.

V. 31. *And (on the other hand) those waiting for Jehovah shall gain new strength; they shall raise the pinion like the eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.* The marked antithesis between this verse and that before it, justifies the use of *but* in English, although not in the original.  $\text{יָחַד}$  is to *wait for* or *expect*, implying faith and patience. This is also the old English meaning of the phrase to *wait upon*, as applied to servants who await their master's orders; but in modern usage the idea of personal service or attendance has become predominant, so that the English phrase no longer represents the Hebrew one. *Jehovah's waiters*, which is Ewald's bold and faithful version (*Jahve's Herrer*), would convey if not a false an inadequate idea to the English reader. The class of persons meant to be described are those who show their confidence in God's ability and willingness to execute his promises, by patiently awaiting their fulfilment. The restriction of these words to the exiles in Babylon is entirely gratuitous. Although applicable, as a general proposition, to that case among others, they admit of a more direct and striking application to the case of those who under the old dispensation kept its end in view, and

still "waited for the consolation of Israel," and "looked for redemption in Jerusalem." (Luke 1 : 25, 38.)—The phrase translated *they shall gain new strength* properly means *they shall exchange strength*; but the usage of the verb determines its specific meaning to be that of changing for the better or improving. The sense is therefore correctly given in the English Version (*they shall renew their strength*).—Of the next phrase there are three distinct interpretations. 1. The English Bible follows Luther in explaining כְּנָפֵי as the future Kal, and כְּנָפֵי as a qualifying noun, equivalent to the ablative of instrument in Latin (*they shall mount up with wings*). This construction is also adopted by Junius, Cocceius, Vitringa, Augusti, Henderson, and Barnes. 2. The second opinion is expressed in Lowth's translation: *they shall put forth fresh feathers like the moulting eagle*. The reference is then to the ancient belief of the eagle's great longevity and of its frequently renewing its youth. (Psalm 103 : 5.) The rabbinical tradition, as recorded by Saadiah, is that the eagle, at the end of every tenth year, soars so near the sun as to be scorched and cast into the sea, from which it then emerges with fresh plumage, till at the end of the tenth decade or a century complete, it sinks to rise no more. This explanation of the phrase before us is given not only by the Septuagint (*πτερογενήσονται*) and the Vulgate (*assument pennas*), but by the Targum and Peshito, although more obscurely. In later times it is approved by Grotius, Clericus, J. D. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Ewald, and De Wette. The principal objections to it are, that כְּנָפֵי has no where else the sense of putting forth (although the root does sometimes mean to sprout or grow), and that כְּנָפֵי does not denote *feathers* in general, but a *wing-feather* or a *pinion* in particular. 3. A third construction, simpler than the first and more agreeable to usage than the second, gives the verb its ordinary sense of causing to ascend or raising and the noun its proper sense of pinion, and connects the two directly as a transitive verb and its object, *they shall raise the pinion (or the wing) like the eagles*. This construction is adopted by Calvin, Hensler, Gesenius, Maurer, Hitzig, Umbreit, Hendewerk, and Knobel; and, though charged by Beck with enormous flatness, is even more poetical than that which supposes an allusion not to the soaring but the moulting of the eagle. In the last clause the verbs כָּנַף and הִנִּיחַ are introduced together for the third time in a beautiful antithesis. In v. 28 they are applied to Jehovah, in v. 30 to the strongest and most vigorous of men, as they are in themselves, and here to the waiters for Jehovah, the believers in his promises, who glory in infirmity that his strength may be perfect in their weakness. (2 Cor. 12 : 9.)—Knobel's comment on this promise is characteristic of his age and school. After condescendingly showing that the thought is a correct one (*der Gedanke ist richtig*), he explains himself by saying, that trust in divine help does increase the natural powers, and that this effect is viewed by the pious writer

(i. e. Isaiah) as a direct gift of God in requital of the confidence reposed in him. All this, though absolutely true, is relatively false, so far as it implies superiority, in point of elevation and enlargement, on the part of the expounder as imagining himself to be *more than a prophet*. (Luke 11 : 9.)

## CHAPTER XLI.

UNTIL the ends of Israel's national existence are accomplished, that existence must continue, in spite of hostile nations and their gods, who shall all perish sooner than the chosen people, vs. 1-16. However feeble Israel may be in himself, Jehovah will protect him, and raise up the necessary instruments for his deliverance and triumph, vs. 17-29.

V. 1. *Be silent to me, oh islands, and the nations shall gain new strength; they shall approach, then shall they speak, together to the judgment-seat will we draw near.* Having proved the impotence of idols in a direct address to Israel, Jehovah now summons the idolaters themselves to enter into controversy with him. The restriction of *islands* here to certain parts of Europe and Asia seems preposterous. The challenge is a general one directed to the whole heathen world, and *islands* is a poetical variation for *lands* or at the most for maritime lands or sea-coasts. *Silence* in this connexion implies attention or the fact of listening, which is expressed in Job 33 : 31. The imperative form at the beginning gives an imperative sense likewise to the future, which might therefore be translated *let them approach* etc. There is an obvious allusion in the first clause to the promise in ch. 40 : 31. As if he had said: they that hope in Jehovah shall renew their strength; let those who refuse renew theirs as they can.—The particle *then* makes the passage more graphic by bringing distinctly into view the successive steps of the process. This seems to recommend the explanation of צַדִּיק as a local rather than an abstract noun. The same judicial or forensic figure is applied to contention between God and man by Job (9 : 19, 20, 32). Lowth's paraphrase of this verse is more than usually languid and diluted: e. g. *let the distant nations repair to me with new force of mind . . . . . let us enter into solemn debate.* The same writer reads הַדְּרִישִׁי on the authority of the Septuagint (ἐγκαυνοῦσθε με), and says that the same mistake occurs Zeph. 3 : 17. But the Hiphil of דָּרַשׁ does not occur elsewhere, and the common text is confirmed by Aquila (καταλύσατε) and Symmachus (συνήσατε), as well as by the other ancient versions.

V. 2. *Who hath raised up (or awakened) from the east? Righteousness shall call him to its foot; it shall give nations before him, and cause him to tread upon kings; it shall give (them) as dust to his sword, and as driven stubble to his bow.* The simplest construction of the first clause is that which assumes an abrupt transition from the form of interrogation to that of prediction. The speaker, as it were, interrupts his own question before it is complete, in order to supply what must otherwise be presupposed. Instead of going on to ask who brought the event to pass, he pauses to describe the event itself. The same sense is obtained, but with a change of form, by supplying a relative and continuing the interrogation. *Who raised up from the east (him whom) righteousness etc.* The old construction which makes *righteousness* the object of the verb and regards it as an abstract used for a concrete (*righteousness* for *righteous one*), is wholly arbitrary and at variance with the masoretic accents. Gesenius and the later German writers understand the clause to mean *whom victory meets at every step*. This new sense of  $\text{קָרָא}$  is entirely gratuitous, and violates the fundamental laws of lexicography, by multiplying senses without any necessity and confounding the definition of a term with its application. Here and elsewhere  $\text{קָרָא}$  means the righteousness of God as manifested in his providence, his dealings with his people and their enemies. (See ch. 1 : 27, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 19.) Because it suggests, in such connexions, the idea of its consequences or effects, it no more follows that this is the proper meaning of the word, than that *wrath* means *suffering*, because the wrath of God causes the sufferings of the guilty. Another objection to this version of the clause is its giving  $\text{אֶת־כָּל־שֶׁבַע}$  the less usual sense of *meet*, and  $\text{אֶת־כָּל־שֶׁבַע}$  that of *at every step*, which is certainly not justified by the obscure and dubious analogy of Gen. 30 : 30, especially when taken in connexion with the usage of the same phrase elsewhere to mean in the footsteps, train, suite, or retinue of any one. (See 1 Sam. 25 : 42. Job 18 : 11. Hab. 3 : 5.) In his lexicons, Gesenius admits the idea to be that of *following*, and actually introduces that verb into the clause, a virtual concession that his own translation of  $\text{אֶת־כָּל־שֶׁבַע}$  is at variance not only with usage but the context. To *call to one's foot* is a Hebrew idiom for calling to one's service, or summoning to take a place among one's followers. This act is here ascribed to the divine righteousness as a personified attribute. The other verbs may agree with the same subject or directly with Jehovah.—In the last clause Gesenius and the later Germans make the suffixes collective, and by *his sword, his bow*, understand the sword and bow of the nations or their kings. As the modern writers are so much accustomed to reject the old interpretations with contempt, it may not be amiss to mention here, that this construction is as old as Kimchi, and that it is set aside by Vitringa as an *expositio violenta quae nihil sani praefert*. The enallage

of number is in fact too violent to be assumed without necessity. Vitringa himself supposes the sword and bow to be those of the conqueror, and to be described as like dust or chaff in rapidity of motion. But the image, which is that of dust or chaff driven by the wind, is always used elsewhere in a passive and unfavourable sense, never as expressive of activity or energy. On the whole, there seems to be no construction more free from objection than the old one of the English Version, the Targum, and the Vulgate, which gives  $\text{כִּי־כִּדְמָה}$  the same sense, the same subject, and the same object as in the preceding clause. The difficulty which arises from supposing an ellipsis of the preposition before *sword* and *bow*, may be removed by taking these words as adverbial or qualifying nouns, a Hebrew idiom of constant occurrence. This construction becomes still more natural if we understand the clause to mean that he makes the enemy like dust or chaff *with* or *by means of* his sword and bow. In that case, the verb may be construed either with  $\text{וְהָיָה}$ ,  $\text{וְהָיָה־לְךָ}$ , or the conqueror himself. The construction may be rendered clearer by restoring the Hebrew collocation. *Kings he shall subdue (and) shall make like dust (with) his sword and like driven chaff (with) his bow.*—The explanation of the futures as preterites is wholly arbitrary, and even the descriptive present appears inadmissible when the strict sense is so perfectly appropriate.—The question, whose appearance is predicted in this verse, has been always a subject of dispute. Eusebius, Theodoret, and Procopius understand it as describing the triumphs of the true religion or the gospel, here called *righteousness*. Cyril and Jerome apply it to the Lord Jesus Christ himself as the Righteous One or the Lord our Righteousness. Cocceius stands alone in his application of the verse to the apostle Paul. The Jews make Abraham the subject of the passage, excepting Aben Ezra, who, with Vitringa and all the latest writers, understands it as a prophecy of Cyrus. The inappropriateness of the terms employed to our Saviour or the Gospel, to Abraham or Paul, is almost self-evident, and equally clear is its appropriateness to the case of Cyrus. The argument in favour of the latter application drawn from the analogy of ch. 45 : 1, 46 : 11, is less conclusive, because he is there expressly named. The truth appears to be that this is a more general intimation of a great eventful movement from the east, which is afterwards repeated with specific reference to Cyrus and his conquests. It might even be supposed without absurdity that there is here an allusion to the general progress of the human race, of conquest, civilization, and religion, from the east to the west. Umbreit supposes a specific reference to the course of the sun, from which the name of Cyrus was derived, as we shall see.

V. 3. *He shall pursue them; he shall pass (in) peace (or safety); a path with his feet he shall not go.* There is the same objection here as in



the preceding verse to the explanation of the verbs as preterites ; but most interpreters, not content with this, make the future in the last clause a pluperfect (*the way that he had not gone with his feet*). This method of translation involves the whole subject in uncertainty. If the past and the future senses may be interchanged at pleasure and without necessity, the interpreter may make the author say what he pleases. In the case before us, J. D. Michaelis adheres to the proper future sense, and explains the clause to mean that he shall not have occasion to retrace his steps. But as this, like the common explanation before mentioned, leaves the phrase *with his feet* pleonastic and unmeaning, the preference is due to Ewald's supposition that the clause describes the swiftness of his motions, as flying rather than walking on foot. This, which would be natural and striking, even in itself considered, is confirmed by the analogy of Daniel 8 : 5, where we read that *an he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground*.

V. 4. *Who hath wrought and done (it), calling the generations from the beginning? I Jehovah, the first and with the last, I (am) he.* Another construction of the verse, preferred by the latest writers, includes the last part of the first clause in the answer to the question. *Who hath wrought and done it? He that calleth the generations* etc. But besides the unequal distribution of the verse which thus arises, this construction makes the answer speak of God both in the first and second person, and gives to the indefinite אֲנִי the sense of the emphatic אֲנִי הוּא, neither of which departures from the *usus loquendi*, though admissible in case of necessity, ought to be assumed without it.—*Calling the generations* may either mean calling them into existence or proclaiming them, i. e. predicting them ; probably the latter, since the event itself, although it proved a superhuman agency, did not prove it to be that of Jehovah, which could only be established by the fulfilment of predictions uttered in his name. *With the last* does not simply mean *the last*, which is the form employed in ch. 41 : 21–25, 46 : 8–10, but co-existent with the last, a mode of expression which would seem to imply that although Jehovah existed before all other beings he will not outlast them all. אֲנִי הוּא is explained by some of the older writers as meaning *I am God* ; by the latest, *I am the same* (i. e. unchangeable) ; but the simplest construction is the common one, *I am he*, i. e. the being to whom the interrogation has respect, *I am he who has wrought and done it*.

V. 5. *The isles have seen it and are afraid, the ends of the earth tremble ; they have approached and come.* Some regard this as a description of the effect produced by the foregoing argument, but others as a part of the argument itself, drawn from the effect of the appearance of the person men-

tioned in v. 2. As an instance of the length to which specific historical interpretation can be carried by the new as well as by the old school of interpreters, it may be mentioned that Hendewerk, with the first book of Herodotus before him, explains *islands* here to mean the Greek states in the west of Asia Minor,—their approach, the message which they sent to Cyrus after the defeat of Croesus,—the mutual encouragement described in the next verse, the deliberations of the *Panionion*! All this, however, he supposes to be here described, not by a prophet in the proper sense, but by a contemporary writer.

V. 6. *A man his neighbour* (i. e. one another) <sup>he</sup> they will ~~keep~~, and to his brother (one) will say, *Be strong!* This general description is then filled up, or carried out into detail in the next verse, both containing a sarcastic description of the vain appeal of the idolaters to the protection of their tutelary deities.

V. 7. *And the carver has strengthened the gilder, the smoother with the hammer the smiter on the anvil; he says (or is saying) of the solder, It is good; and he has strengthened it with nails; it shall not be moved.* The sarcasm consists in making the idolaters dependent upon idols which are themselves dependent upon common workmen and the most trivial mechanical operations for their form and their stability. Hence the particular enumeration of the different artificers employed in the manufacture of these deities. J. D. Michaelis explains  $\text{זָּרַזְזָה}$   $\text{זָּרַזְזָה}$  to mean the treader on the bellows, i. e. the bellows-blower.—The text of the English Version has *it is ready for the soldering*; but the other construction is now universally adopted. The last clause implies that the strength of the idol is not in itself, but in the nails that keep it in its place or hold its parts together.

V. 8. *And thou Israel my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend.* The prominent idea is still that of the contrast between Israel as the people of God, and the heathen as his enemies. The insertion of the substantive verb in the first clause, *thou art Israel my servant* (Vitringa), or *thou Israel art my servant* (English Version), is unnecessary. This whole verse with the next may be understood as a description of the object of address, or of the person to whom the exhortation in v. 10 is directed. The two names of Jacob are again combined in application to his progeny. The race is described as God's *servant* and his *elect*, or, combining the two characters, his chosen servant, chosen to be his servant. Vitringa understands this last term as including the idea of a worshipper or votary; and Hitzig compares it with *Abdastartus*, a servant of Astarte, and the favourite Arabic name *Abdallah* or a worshipper of Allah.—The people

are here described not only as the sons of Jacob but of Abraham. אֲבִיבְרָאָה cannot of itself denote an object of divine love, as it is explained in the Septuagint (*ὄν ἠγάπησα*), nor can it be both active and passive, *amans* and *amatus*, as Vitringa supposes. The latter idea is implied but not expressed. The same honourable title is bestowed on Abraham in 2 Chr. 20: 7, James 2: 23, and in the common parlance of the Arabs, by whom he is usually styled *خليل الله* the Friend of God, or absolutely, *الخليل* the Friend.

V. 9. *Thou whom I have grasped from the ends of the earth, and from its joints (or sides) have called thee, and said to thee, My servant (art) thou, I have chosen thee and not rejected thee.* The description of the object of address is still continued. The essential idea here expressed is that of election and separation from the rest of men, a bringing near of those who were afar off. Interpreters have needlessly disputed whether the vocation of Israel in Abraham, or at the exodus, is here particularly meant; since both are really included in a general description of the calling and election of the people. The objection that Israel is distinguished from Abraham in v. 8, is of no weight, except against the supposition (if maintained by any) that Abraham himself is here the object of address. The application of analogous expressions to the exodus from Egypt, in Deut. 39: 10, Ezek. 20: 5, only proves that this was one of the great crises or junctures in the progress of the people, at which their election or vocation was declared, and as it were renewed. The question in what sense Egypt could be called the ends of the earth, is as trifling as the answer which some give it, that it was remote from Babylon. The phrase in question is a common idiomatic expression for remoteness, often used without reference to particular localities (see ch. 5: 26. 13: 2). The idea meant to be conveyed is identical with that expressed by Paul when he says (Eph. 2: 13), *ἡμεῖς οἱ ποτὲ ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε*. The translation *I have taken* is inadequate, the Hebrew verb meaning *to hold fast*, and the idea of removal being rather implied than expressed. The parallel expression (קָרַבְתִּי) is explained by Gesenius from the analogy of צֶדֶק *side*, by Maurer from that of צֶדֶק *a joint*, which seems to be also presupposed in the version of Symmachus (*ἀγκώρων*). The rabbinical interpretation, *chief men*, is founded on the analogy of Ex. 24: 11. Some of the Jewish writers understand וְ as meaning *in spite of*, others *in preference to*, but both without authority.—Lowth's translation of וְ as a future is entirely arbitrary, and overlooks the peculiar Hebrew idiom of saying the same thing positively and negatively. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 46.)

V. 10. *Fear thou not, for I (am) with thee; look not around, for I (am) thy God; I have strengthened thee, yea I have helped thee, yea I have*

*upheld thee with my right hand of righteousness.* This may be regarded as the conclusion of the sentence beginning in v. 8, as the address to which the two preceding verses are an introduction.—Vitringa derives עֲזָרְתִּי from עֲזָרָה. Ewald makes it an orthographical variation of עֲזָרְתִּי (Gen. 21: 21). Gesenius and most other modern writers make it the Hithpael of עֲזָרָה, and explain it to mean, do not look around fearfully as if for help. Hitzig compares it with the Homeric verb παπταίρω.—The עֲזָרָה, which might be rendered *nay more*, seems to give the last clause the form of a climax, although such a progression cannot easily be traced in the thoughts. The English Version, which adheres to the strict translation of the preterites in v. 9, here gratuitously employs the future form, which wholly changes the complexion of the sentence. It is not a simple promise, but a reference to what God had already done and might therefore be expected to do again. The present form employed by Rosenmüller (*corroboro te*) is less objectionable than the future, but in no respect preferable to the strict translation.—Equally arbitrary is the introduction by the later Germans of their favourite idea that עֲזָרָה in these prophecies means prosperity or success; whereas it does not even suggest that notion, except so far as it flows from the righteousness of God as an effect from its cause. Hitzig's translation *gracious arm* is at once a departure from the old and the new interpretation. It is not even necessary to assume with Lowth that עֲזָרָה here denotes the faithfulness of God, and to translate accordingly *my faithful right hand*. The true sense is the strict one of *righteousness* or *justice*, the appeal to which in such connexions has already been explained. (See above, on v. 2.) *The right hand of my righteousness* supposes the attribute to be personified,—a supposition which may be avoided by referring the suffix to the whole complex phrase, *my right hand of righteousness* or *just right hand*.—As specimens of ultra-specific exposition, without any foundation in the text, it may be mentioned that Knobel understands this as an exhortation to the Jewish exiles not to be afraid of Cyrus.

V. 11. *Lo, ashamed and confounded shall be all those incensed (or inflamed) against thee; they shall be as nothing (or as though they were not), and destroyed shall be thy men of strife (or they that strive with thee).* Not only shall Israel himself escape, but his enemies shall perish. To be ashamed and confounded, here as usual, includes the frustration of their plans and disappointment of their hopes. On the meaning of *as nothing*, see above, p. 20. The construction of the phrase *thy men of strife*, is the same as that of *my right hand of righteousness* in v. 10.

V. 12. *Thou shalt seek them and not find them, thy men of quarrel; they shall be as nothing and as nought, thy men of war (i. e. they who*

quarrelled and made war with thee). The first clause contains a common Hebrew figure for complete disappearance and destruction. (See Ps. 37 : 36. Jer. 50 : 20. Amos 8 : 12. Hos. 5 : 6.)  $\text{לֹא־יִשָּׁר}$  and  $\text{בִּטְּלָה}$  strictly denote non-existence and annihilation. (See above, on ch. 40 : 17.)

V. 13. *For I, Jehovah thy God, (am) holding fast thy right hand ; the (one) saying to thee, Fear not, I have helped thee, i. e. I, who command thee not to fear, have already helped thee, or secured thy safety.* J. D. Michaelis gives  $\text{יָצַקְתָּ$  the causative sense of strengthening ; but this sense is rare, except in a few of the later books, and the other is recommended here, not only by the general agreement of interpreters, but by the analogy of v. 9.

V. 14. *Fear not, thou worm Jacob and ye men of Israel ; I have helped thee, saith Jehovah, and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.* The same encouragement is here repeated, but with a direct contrast between Israel's weakness and the strength of God.—The feminine form of the verb has reference to that of the noun  $\text{יְהוָה}$ . This epithet expresses not merely the contempt of others, as in Ps. 22 : 7, much less the Babylonian oppression of the Jews, as J. H. Michaelis and others think, but the real meanness and unworthiness of man, as in Job 25 : 6. As the parallelism seems to require an analogous expression of contempt in the next clause, some either read  $\text{יְהוָה}$  (*dead men*) with Aquila ( $\text{τεθνεωτες}$ ), Theodotus ( $\text{νεκροι}$ ), and Jerome (*qui mortui estis ex Israel*), or regard  $\text{יְהוָה}$  as a modification of that word denoting *mortals*. Vitringa and Hitzig gain the same end by explaining it as an ellipsis for  $\text{יְהוָה יְהוָה}$  *men of number*, i. e. few men, used in Ps. 105 : 12. So the Septuagint has  $\text{ὀλιγοστος}$ , but omits *worm* altogether. Ewald completes the parallelism in a very summary manner, by reading  $\text{לִבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ , and translating it *gekrummtes Israel*. Maurer, on the other hand, discovers that the parallelism is not always perfect, and advises the reader to translate it boldly (*redde intrepide*) men of Israel, which seems to be the simplest and most obvious course, leaving the accessory idea of fewness or weakness to suggest itself.—The word  $\text{לִבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  *redeemer* would suggest to a Hebrew reader the ideas of a near kinsman (Lev. 25 : 24, 25) and of deliverance from bondage by the payment of a ransom. Its highest application occurs here and in Job 19 : 25. The reference to the Son of God, although it might not be perceptible of old, is now rendered necessary by the knowledge that this act, even under the old dispensation, is always referred to the same person of the Trinity. The substitution of the future for the preterite by the English and some other versions has already been seen to be gratuitous and arbitrary.

V. 15. *Behold I have placed thee for* (i. e. appointed thee to be, or changed thee into) *a threshing-sledge, sharp, new, possessed of teeth (or edges); thou shalt thresh mountains and beat (them) small, and hills like the chaff shalt thou place (or make).* The erroneous idea that he simply promises to furnish Israel with the means of threshing mountains, has arisen from the equivocal language of the English Version, *I will make thee*, which may either mean, *I will make for thee*, or *will make thee to become*, whereas the last sense only can by any possibility be put upon the Hebrew, as literally translated above. The oriental threshing machine is sometimes a sledge of thick planks armed with iron or sharp stones, sometimes a system of rough rollers joined together like a sledge or dray. Both kinds are dragged over the grain by oxen. (See Robinson's Palestine, III. p. 143.)—פֶּדַי is properly to crush, pound fine, or pulverize, פִּיּוֹת strictly denotes *mouths*; but like the primitive noun from which it is derived, it is sometimes applied to the *edge* of a sharp instrument, perhaps in allusion to the figure of devouring. Here it signifies the edges, blades, or teeth, with which the threshing-machine is armed. The reduplicated form is supposed to denote the number of such parts by Ewald (*vielspitzig*) and Knobel (*vielschneidig*). The literal sense of בָּזָא is possessor, owner. There seems to be no ground for the common assumption that *hills* and *mountains* are specific emblems here for states or governments. The image presented is the strange but strong one of a down-trodden worm reducing hills to powder, the essential idea being that of a weak and helpless object overcoming the most disproportionate obstacles, by strength derived from another.

V. 16. *Thou shalt fan (or winnow) them, and a wind shall take them up, and a whirlwind shall scatter them, and thou shalt joy in Jehovah, in the Holy One of Israel shalt thou boast (or glory).* The figure of the preceding verse is here carried out and completed. The mountains, having been completely threshed, are winnowed, in the usual oriental mode, by being thrown to the wind. Israel, on the other hand, is safe, not through his own strength but in that of his protector, *in whom*, i. e. in his relation to whom, he finds his highest happiness and honour. The writer's main design is evidently still to exhibit the contrast between God and his people on the one hand, and the idols and their people on the other.

V. 17. *The suffering and the poor (are) seeking water, and it is not (there is none); their tongue with thirst is parched. I Jehovah will hear (or answer) them, (I) the God of Israel will not forsake them.* The first clause describes the need of a divine interposition, the last the interposition itself. The images are so unlike those of the foregoing verse that they might

seem to be unconnected, but for the fact that the whole passage is entirely metaphorical. Thirst is a natural and common metaphor for suffering. Those who restrict the verse to the Babylonish exile are divided on the question whether it literally describes the hardships of the journey through the wilderness, or metaphorically those of the captivity itself. Both suppositions are entirely arbitrary, since there is nothing in the text or context to deprive the passage of its genuine and full sense as a general promise, tantamount to saying, When my people feel their need, I will be present to supply it. Such a promise those in exile could not fail to find appropriate in their case; but it is equally appropriate in others, and especially to the glorious deliverance of the church from the fetters of the old economy. שָׁמַע is not to hear in general, but to hear prayer in a favourable sense, to answer it. The conditional turn given to the sentence in our version (*when the poor and needy seek* etc.) is substantially correct, but a needless departure from the form of the original.

V. 18. *I will open upon bare hills streams, and in the midst of valleys fountains; I will place the desert for* (i. e. convert it into) *a pool of water, and a dry land for* (or into) *springs of water.* The same figure for entire and joyful change occurs in ch. 30: 25 and ch. 35: 7, and with its opposite or converse in Ps. 107: 33, 35. It is now commonly admitted that שָׁמַע includes the idea of barrenness or nakedness. (Compare שָׁמַע from the same root, ch. 13: 2.)

V. 19. *I will give in the wilderness cedar, acacia, and myrtle, and oil-tree; I will place in the desert fir, pine, and box together.* The main idea, common to all explanations of this verse, is that of trees growing where they never grew before. It is comparatively unimportant therefore to identify the species, although J. D. Michaelis supposes them to have been selected because such as do not naturally grow together. With respect to the cedar and the myrtle there is no doubt. Vitranga regards שָׁמַע (which has no *and* before it) as an epithet of אֲרֶז, and translates it *cedrus praestantissima*. Since Lowth however it has been commonly regarded as the Hebrew name of the *acacia*, a thorny tree growing in Arabia and Egypt. (See Robinson's Palestine, Vol. II. p. 349.)—By the *oil-tree* is meant the *oleaster* or wild olive, as distinguished from the זית or cultivated tree of the same species. For the different explanations of אֲרֶז, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 272. According to the latest authorities, אֲרֶז is neither the pine, the elm, nor the plane-tree, but the ilex, holm, or hard oak, so called from אֲרַז to endure or last. By the same writers אֲרֶז is understood to be a species of the cedar of Lebanon, so called from its erectness and loftiness.

V. 20. *That they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the hand of Jehovah hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it.* The verbs in the first clause may refer to men in general, or to those immediately concerned as subjects or spectators of the change described.  $\text{וַיִּשְׂבְּרוּ}$  *they may place*, seems to be an elliptical expression for  $\text{וַיִּשְׂבְּרוּ לְבָבָם}$  *may place their heart*, i. e. apply their mind, or give attention. There is no need of introducing  $\text{וַיִּשְׂבְּרוּ}$  into the text, as Lowth does, since the very same ellipsis has been pointed out by Koehler in Judges 19: 30. Still less ground is there to amend the text with Houbigant by reading  $\text{וַיִּשְׂבְּרוּ}$  (*may be astonished*).—There is a climax in the last clause: he has not only *done* it but *created* it, i. e. produced a new effect by the exertion of almighty power.

V. 21. *Present your cause (literally bring it near or cause it to approach, i. e. into the presence of the judge), saith Jehovah; bring forward your defences (or strong reasons), saith the king of Jacob.* The Septuagint changes the whole meaning of the sentence by making it a simple affirmation (*your judgment draweth near*).—Jerome applies the last clause to their idols: *accedant idola vestra quae putatis esse fortissima*. But most interpreters refer it to the arguments by which they were to maintain their cause. The metaphor is commonly supposed to be that of bulwarks or entrenchments; but this, as Knobel has observed, is hardly consistent with the call to bring them forward. It is better therefore to give the word its wider sense of strength or strong thing.

V. 22. *They shall bring forward (or let them bring forward) and show forth to us the (things) which are to happen; the former things, what they were, show forth, and we will set our heart (apply our mind, or pay attention to them), and know their issue; or (else) the coming (events) make us to hear.* The prescience of future events is here appealed to as a test of divinity. (Compare Deut. 18: 22. Jer. 28: 9, and ch. 43: 12 below.) Vitringa, Lowth, and others, understand by *former things* a proximate futurity; but the antithesis between this and *coming things* shows that the former must mean prophecies already fulfilled, or at least already published. They are required to demonstrate their foreknowledge, either by showing that they had predicted something, or by doing it now. Knobel's question whether *we* and *us* mean God alone or God and the Prophet together, is not in the best taste or particularly reasonable, since the whole idea which the text conveys is that of two contending parties at a judgment-seat. *They* means the party of the false gods and their worshippers, *we* that of Jehovah and his people.



V. 23. *Show forth the (things) to come hereafter, and we will know that ye are gods ; yes, ye shall do good or do evil, and we will look about and see together.* The subjunctive construction, *that we may know*, gives the sense of the original, but with a needless change of form. The same remark applies to the imperative translation of the futures in the next clause (*do good, do evil*). The use of the disjunctive, on the other hand, is rendered almost unavoidable by an entire difference of idiom, the Hebrews constantly employing *and* where *or* in English seems essential to the sense. The verbs in this clause are strictly and distinctly understood by Vitringa, as relating to the reward of worshippers and the punishment of enemies. Henderson explains the clause as challenging the false gods to perform a miracle. But most interpreters retain the idiomatic meaning of the same expressions elsewhere, namely, that of doing any thing whatever, good or bad. (See Jer. 10 : 5. Zeph. 1 : 12.) Lowth and Henderson understand  $\text{הִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ}$  as denoting terror, and change the pointing so as to derive the following verb from  $\text{אָרַךְ}$  to fear. Gesenius makes the former verb synonymous with  $\text{הִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ}$  (2 Kings 14 : 8), let us look one another in the face, i. e. confront one another in dispute or battle. It is much more probable, however, that the word has the same sense as in v. 10 above, where it seems to express the act of looking round or about upon those present, in that case with the secondary notion of alarm (as looking round for help), but in this case with that of inspection or consideration (we will look about us). Hitzig refers the word *together* to the two acts which the verbs express ; but it is much more natural to understand it as denoting that the two contending parties unite in the same act.

V. 24. *Lo, ye are of nothing (or less than nothing) and your work of nought (or less than nought) ; an abomination (is he that) chooseth (or will choose) you.* This is the conclusion drawn from their failure or refusal to accept the challenge and to furnish the required proof of their deity. For the meaning of  $\text{יָנֹחַ}$ , see above, on ch. 40 : 17. The parallel term  $\text{בָּחַל$  is regarded by some of the Rabbins as synonymous with  $\text{הִרְסָה}$  (*worse than a viper*) ; but the context requires an expression not of quality but of nonentity. Solomon Ben Melek makes it a synonyme of  $\text{בָּחַל}$ , Vitringa an orthographical variation of the same ; either of which is better than the supposition now most commonly adopted of an error in the text, the retention of which, even supposing its occurrence, it would not be very easy to account for. Augusti and Hitzig understand the phrase to mean *of nothing* or *belonging to nothing*, which Knobel explains as tantamount to saying that they had no work, or in other words, that they could do nothing.— $\text{הִרְסָה}$  is a strong expression often used to describe an object of religious abhorrence. On the choosing of gods, compare Judg. 5 : 8.

V. 25. *I have raised up (one) from the north, and he has come; from the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name; and he shall come upon princes as upon mortar, and as a potter treadeth clay.* This is correctly understood by Knobel as a specific application of the general conclusion in v. 24. If the gods of the heathen could do absolutely nothing, it was impossible that they should be the authors of any one remarkable event, and especially of that on which the Prophet has his eye. The expressions are remarkably similar to those in v. 2, so that the Prophet may be here said to resume the train of thought which had been interrupted at the end of v. 4. Having taken occasion to describe the effect of the event foretold upon the worshippers of idols, and from that to show the impotence of the gods themselves, he returns to the event which he had been describing, and continues his description. As before, he takes his stand at an intermediate point between the beginning and the end of the whole process, as appears from the successive introduction of the preterite and future. This peculiar feature of the passage is obscured if not effaced by rendering them all alike, or by arbitrarily distinguishing between the tense of הָיָה and יָבֹא. With the single substitution of *he has come* for *he shall come*, the common version is entirely correct. The mention of the north and east together has been variously explained. Jerome and Luther understand the clause to mean, that he was called from the north, but came from the east. Eusebius, Cyril, and Jerome refer the first clause to the nations and the last to Christ, which is entirely gratuitous. Calvin refers the first to the Chaldees and the last to Cyrus, which is better but still arbitrary. J. D. Michaelis supposes the two subjects of the clause to be Darius or Cyaxares the Mede, and Cyrus the Persian, whose respective countries lay to the north and east of Babylonia. The later writers modify this explanation by referring all to Cyrus, here considered at the same time as a Persian and a Mede. A still more satisfactory hypothesis, perhaps, is that the subject of this passage is not a determinate individual, but *the conqueror* indefinitely, who is not identified till afterwards. The use of the word מְבַרְכִים, which is the appropriate description of the Babylonian nobles, contains a covert intimation of the particular events in view. Instead of showing that the passage is of later date, as some imagine, it affords a remarkable example of prophetic foresight. The act of calling on the name of Jehovah is commonly regarded as an allusion to the profession of the true religion, or at least the recognition of Jehovah as the true God, on the part of Cyrus (Ezra 1 : 2).—Compare the figures of the last clause with ch. 10 : 6. 25 : 10.

V. 26. *Who declared from the beginning? (Say) and we will know; and beforehand, and we will say, Right (or True). Nay, there was none that told; nay, there was none that uttered; nay, there was none that heard*

*your words.* Because the adverbs of time do not necessarily express remote antiquity, Knobel infers that they here mean *since the first appearance of Cyrus*. But such an appeal to the prediction of what one man could foresee as well as another would be simply ridiculous. The sense of פִּרְוֹנִי is determined by that of פִּרְוֹנִי in ch. 43 : 9. The meaning of the whole verse is that the events in question had been foretold by Jehovah and no other.

V. 27. *First to Zion, Behold, behold them! and to Jerusalem a bringer of good news will I give.* This very peculiar idiomatic sentence may be paraphrased as follows. *I am the first to say to Zion, Behold, behold them! and to give Jerusalem a bringer of good news.* The simplest construction is to make the verb at the end govern both clauses; but in English the sense may be expressed more clearly by supplying the verb *say*. The common version of the last clause is correct, but that of the first appears to have no meaning. The sense is not *the first shall say*, but *I first*, i. e. before any other God or prophet.

V. 28. *And I will look, but there is no man; and of these, but there is no one advising (or informing); and I will ask them, and they will return a word (or answer).* He allows them as it were another opportunity of proving their divinity. In the first two clauses, the expectation and the disappointment are described together; in the third, the expectation only is expressed, the result being given in the following verse. First he looks, but finds not what he seeks. Then again, but with the same result. Once more he interrogates them and awaits an answer, but (as the next verse adds) discovers them to be impostors. There is something singularly beautiful in this peculiar structure of the sentence, which is wholly marred by the indirect constructions that are commonly adopted, *that when I asked them could answer a word*, or, *that I should question them and they return an answer*. The verse is full of laconic and elliptical expressions, which however may be easily completed, as will appear from the following brief paraphrase. *I will look* (once more to see whether any of these idols or their prophet can predict the future), *but there is no one* (who attempts it). *From among (all) these* (I seek for a response, but there is none). Yet once more *I will ask them, and* (perhaps) *they will return an answer*. The same application of the verb פִּרְוֹנִי to the prediction of the future occurs below in ch. 44 : 26. The form here used is to be strictly construed as a participle.

V. 29. *Lo, they (are) all nought, nothing their works, wind and emptiness their molten images.* This is, at once, the termination of the sentence

begun in the last clause of the verse preceding, and the summary conclusion of the whole preceding controversy as to the divinity of any gods except Jehovah. To the usual expressions of nonentity the Prophet adds two other strong descriptive terms, viz. wind and emptiness.

---

 CHAPTER XLII.

THIS chapter exhibits to our view the Servant of Jehovah, i. e. the Messiah and his people, as a complex person, and as the messenger or representative of God among the nations. His mode of operation is described as being not violent but peaceful, vs. 1-5. The effects of his influence are represented as not natural but spiritual, vs. 6-9. The power of God is pledged for his success, notwithstanding all appearances of inaction or indifference on his part, vs. 10-17. In the latter portion of the chapter, the Church or Body of Christ, as distinguished from its Head, and representing him until he came, is charged with unfaithfulness to their great trust, and this unfaithfulness declared to be the cause of what it suffered, vs. 18-25. Several important exegetical questions with respect to the Servant of Jehovah will be fully canvassed in the exposition of the chapter.

V. 1. *Behold my servant! I will hold him fast; my chosen one (in whom) my soul delights; I have given (or put) my Spirit upon him; judgment to the nations shall he cause to go forth.* There is no need of assuming (with the English Version) an ellipsis of the relative twice in the same clause. The separate construction of the first two words, as an introduction to the following description, makes them far more impressive, like the *ecce homo* (*ἰδε ὁ ἄρθροππος*) of John 19: 5.—The first verb, construed as it is here, signifies to hold fast, for the most part with the accessory idea of holding up, sustaining, or supporting. *Elect* or *chosen* does not mean choice or excellent, except by implication; directly and strictly it denotes one actually chosen, set apart, for a definite purpose.—*הִצַּדִּיק* is the verb applied in the Law of Moses to the acceptance of a sacrifice, from which some have inferred that there is here an allusion to expiatory merit; but this, although admissible, is not an obvious or necessary supposition.—By *Spirit*, as in all such cases, we are to understand, not only divine influence, but the divine person who exerts it. (See the Earlier Prophecies, pp. 59, 219).—The use of the phrase *on him*, where *in him* might have seemed more

natural, is probably intended to suggest the idea of descent, or of an influence from heaven.—The last clause is understood by Grotius as denoting that the person here described should denounce the penal judgments of Jehovah on the Medes and Babylonians. But besides the unreasonable limitation of the words to these two nations, this explanation is at variance with the usage of the singular  $\text{עַבְדֵי יְהוָה}$  and with the context, which describes the servant of Jehovah as a source of blessing to the gentiles. The same objection does not lie against an explanation of  $\text{עַבְדֵי יְהוָה}$  by Clericus as meaning justice or just government; but this is too restricted, as appears from the subsequent context. The most satisfactory interpretation is the common one, which understands this word as a description of the true religion, and the whole clause as predicting its diffusion. The office thus ascribed to the servant of Jehovah, both here and in the following context, as a teacher of the truth, makes the description wholly inappropriate to Cyrus, who is nevertheless regarded as the subject of the prophecy, not only by Saadias among the Jews, but by Hensler, Koppe, and even Ewald, though the last combines this application with another which will be explained below. <sup>2</sup>Aben Ezra, Grotius, and some later writers, understand the passage as descriptive of Isaiah himself; and this hypothesis is modified by De Wette and Gesenius in his Commentary, so as to embrace all the prophets as a class. Besides the objection to the first of these opinions, somewhat flippantly alleged by J. D. Michaelis, that if Isaiah had thus spoken of himself, he would have proved himself a madman rather than a prophet, it may be objected to the whole hypothesis, that the Prophets of the old dispensation are invariably represented as the messengers of God to the Jews and not the gentiles. And the same thing is still more emphatically true of the Levitical priesthood. Of some but much less weight is the objection to the later form of the same theory, that the collective sense which it puts upon the phrase is neither natural nor countenanced by any satisfactory analogy. There is indeed, as all admit, such a collective use of the phrase *servant of Jehovah*, in application not to any rank or office or profession, but to Israel the chosen people as such considered. Of this usage we have already had an example in ch. 41 : 8, and shall meet with many more hereafter. The distinction between this application of the title and the one which De Wette proposes is, that in the former case the national progenitor is put by a natural metonymy for his descendants, whereas there is no such individual Prophet (not even Moses) in whom the whole succession is concentrated either by natural association or by established usage. A third objection to this theory may be drawn from the analogy of other places, where the same great servant of Jehovah is described, not only as a sufferer, but as an atoning sacrifice. Even admitting the gratuitous assumption, that the Prophets, as a class, were habitually subject to malignant persecution, the repre-

sensation of these sufferings as vicarious and expiatory would be forced and arbitrary in itself, as well as contradicted by the tenor of Scripture. This last objection also lies against the exclusive application of the title to Israel as a people, or to the pious and believing portion of them, which has been maintained by various writers from Solomon Jarchi down to Knobel, who supposes that the servant of Jehovah sometimes means the whole body of the Jews in exile who externally adhered to the worship of Jehovah, sometimes the real spiritual Israel included in this number. But the representation of the Jewish nation as atoning for the sins of the gentiles, or of the pious Jews as atoning for the sins of the whole nation, is without analogy in any other part of the Old Testament. The objections which have now been stated to these various hypotheses may negatively serve to recommend the one adopted in the Targum and by Kimchi and Abarbenel, who represents the champions of the others as struck with judicial blindness. This ancient doctrine of the Jewish church, and of the great majority of Christian writers, is that the servant of the Lord is the Messiah. The lengths of paradoxical extravagance to which the unbelieving critics are prepared to go rather than admit this supposition, may be learned from Knobel's positive assertion, that the Old Testament Messiah is nowhere represented either as a teacher or a sufferer, and that the later chapters of Isaiah contain no allusion to a Messiah at all. In favour of the Messianic exposition may be urged not only the tradition of the Jewish church already cited, and the perfect facility with which this hypothesis at once accommodates itself to all the requisitions of the passages to which it is applied, but also the explicit and repeated application of these passages to Jesus Christ in the New Testament. These applications will be noticed *seriatim* as the texts successively present themselves. To this first verse there are several allusions more or less distinct and unequivocal. Besides the express citation of it, with the next three verses, in Matth. 12:19-21, there is an obvious allusion to its terms, or rather a direct application of them made by God himself, in the descent of the Holy Spirit on our Saviour at his baptism, and in the words pronounced from heaven then and at the time of his transfiguration: *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased* (Matt. 2:17. 17:5). The connecting link between the *Servant* of Isaiah and the *Son* of Matthew, is afforded by the  $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$  of the Septuagint, which includes both ideas. According to the explanation which has just been given,  $\tau\tilde{\iota}\delta\varsigma$  is neither a translation of  $\text{עֶבְדְּךָ}$ , nor a perversion of its meaning, but a clearer designation of the subject of the prophecy. That Christ was sent to the Jews and not the Gentiles, is only true of his personal ministry and not of his whole work as continued by his followers, who were expressly commissioned to go into all the world, to make disciples of all nations, the only restriction imposed being that of *beginning at*

*Jerusalem.* It only remains to be considered, whether this application of the title and the description to our Saviour is exclusive of all others, as its advocates commonly maintain. This inquiry is suggested by the fact, which all interpreters admit, that Israel, the chosen people, is not only called by this same name, but described as having some of the same attributes, not only elsewhere, but in this very context, and especially in vs. 19, 20, of this chapter, where any other explanation of the terms, as we shall see, is altogether inadmissible. Assuming, then, that the Messiah is the servant of Jehovah introduced at the beginning of the chapter, there are only two ways of accounting for the subsequent use of the same language with respect to Israel. The first way is by alleging a total difference of subject in the different places; which in fact though not in form is to decline all explanation of the fact in question, as being either needless or impossible. That such a twofold application of equivalent expressions to entirely different subjects is conceivable and must in certain cases be assumed, there is no need of denying. But unless we abandon all attempt to interpret language upon any settled principle, we cannot but admit that nothing short of exegetical necessity can justify the reference of the same descriptive terms to different subjects in one and the same context. If then there is an exegetical hypothesis by which these applications can be reconciled, without doing violence to usage or analogy, it seems to be clearly entitled to the preference. Such a hypothesis, it seems to me, is one obscurely stated by some older writers, but which may be more satisfactorily propounded thus, that by the *servant of Jehovah* in these Later Prophecies of Isaiah, we are to understand the Church with its Head, or rather the Messiah with the Church which is his body, sent by Jehovah to reclaim the world from its apostasy and ruin. This agrees exactly with the mission both of the Redeemer and his people as described in Scripture, and accounts for all the variations which embarrass the interpretation of the passages in question upon any more exclusive exegetical hypothesis. It is also favoured by the analogy of Deut. 18, where the promised Prophet, according to the best interpretation, is not Christ exclusively, but Christ as the Head of the prophetic body who possessed his spirit. Another analogy is furnished by the use of the phrase *Abraham's seed*, both individually and collectively. He whom Paul describes as the seed of Abraham, and Moses as a prophet like unto himself, in a personal but not an exclusive sense, is described by Isaiah as the servant of Jehovah, in his own person, but not to the exclusion of his people, so far as they can be considered his co-workers or his representatives. Objections founded on the want of agreement between some of these descriptions and the recorded character of Israel, are connected with a superficial view of Israel considered simply as a nation and like other nations, except so far as it was brought

into external and fortuitous connexion with the true religion. An essential feature in the theory proposed is that this race was set apart and organized for a specific purpose, and that its national character is constantly subordinate to its ecclesiastical relation. There is precisely the same variation in the language used respecting it as in the use and application of the term *ἐκκλησία* in the New Testament. Israel is sometimes described as he was meant to be, and as he should have been; sometimes as he actually was. The name is sometimes given to the whole race and sometimes to the faithful portion of it, or, which amounts to the same thing, it is sometimes used to denote the real sometimes the nominal Israel. The apparent violence of applying the same description to an individual person and a body, will be lessened by considering, that the former i. e. Christ was in the highest and the truest sense the servant of Jehovah and his messenger to man, but that his body, church, or people, was and is a sharer in the same vocation, under the gospel as an instrument or fellow-worker, under the law as a type or representative of one who had not yet become visible. Hence the same things might be predicated to a great extent of both. As the Messiah was the servant and messenger of God to the nations, so was Israel. It was his mission also to diffuse the true religion and reclaim the nations. From the very first it was intended that the law should go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. (Ch. 2 : 3.) The national restrictions of the old economy were not intended to exclude the gentiles from the church, but to preserve the church from assimilation to the gentiles. All the world might have come in if they would by complying with the terms prescribed; and nothing is more clear from the Old Testament than the fact that the privileges of the chosen people were not meant to be restricted even then to the natural descendants of Israel, for this would have excluded proselytes entirely. Multitudes did embrace the true religion before Christ came; and that more did not, was partly their own fault, partly the fault of the chosen people, who neglected or mistook their high vocation as the Messiah's representative and as Jehovah's messenger. If it be asked, how the different applications of this honourable title are to be distinguished so as to avoid confusion or capricious inconsistency, the answer is as follows. Where the terms are in their nature applicable both to Christ as the Head and to his Church as the Body, there is no need of distinguishing at all between them. Where sinful imperfection is implied in what is said, it must of course be applied to the body only. Where a freedom from such imperfection is implied, the language can have a direct and literal reference only to the Head, but may be considered as descriptive of the body, in so far as its idea or design is concerned, though not in reference to its actual condition. Lastly, when any thing is said implying deity or infinite merit, the application to the Head becomes not only predominant but exclusive.



It may further be observed that as the Church, according to this view of the matter, represents its Head, so it is represented by its leaders, whether prophets, priests, or kings; and as all these functions were to meet in Christ, so all of them may sometimes be particularly prominent in prophecy. With this explanation, the hypothesis proposed may be considered as approaching very nearly to the one maintained by Umbreit in his work upon the *Servant of God* (*Knecht Gottes*, Hamburg, 1840), as well as in his Commentary on Isaiah. A similar theory is broached by Ewald, but with this essential difference, that he excludes all reference to Christ, and identifies the Messiah of these prophecies with Cyrus. A correct view of the manifold and variable usage of the title *עַבְדֵי יְהוָה* is given by Gesenius in his Thesaurus and the later editions of his Lexicon. How far the theory here stated with respect to the *עַבְדֵי יְהוָה* is either necessary to explain the prophecies or really consistent with their terms can only be determined by a specific application of the principle to the successive parts of the description. If applied to this first verse, it would determine its interpretation, as describing Israel, the ancient church, to be in a peculiar sense the servant of Jehovah, protected and sustained by Him, enlightened by a special revelation, not for his own exclusive use but as a source of saving light to the surrounding nations. At the same time it would show him to possess this character not in his own right but in that of another, as the representative and instrument of one who, though he was with God and was God, took upon him the form of a servant and received the Spirit without measure, that he might be *a light to lighten the gentiles* as well as *the glory of his people Israel*. (Luke 2 : 32.) The reference to Christ is here so evident, however, that there is no need of supposing any distinct reference to his people at all, nor any advantage in so doing, except that of rendering the subsequent verses still more significant, as descriptive not only of his personal ministry, but of the spirit and conduct of his people, both before and after his appearance.

V. 2. *He shall not cry* (or *call aloud*), *and he shall not raise* (his voice), *and he shall not let his voice be heard in the street* (or abroad, without). The Vulgate strangely supplies *non accipiet personam*, and so obtains the customary technical expression for respect of persons or judicial partiality. This construction, which was probably suggested by the supposed analogy of ch. 11 : 3, 4, is precluded by its want of agreement with what goes before and follows. The same objection lies, though in a less degree, against Cocceius's construction of the verb as a reflexive (*se efferet*), which is moreover not grammatically tenable. It is not even necessary to assume an ellipsis of the noun *voice* in the first clause, although this may be required to make the sense clear in a version. The Hebrew construction is continued through both clauses, i. e. both verbs

govern the same noun. *He shall not raise nor suffer to be heard in the street his voice.* The simple meaning of the verse is, he shall not be noisy but quiet. Grotius supposes an allusion to the fact that angry persons often speak so loud at home as to be heard in the street. Clericus justly denies any special reference to anger, but perhaps goes too far when he translates דַּבֵּר אֶת-קוֹלֵךְ, *dabit operam ut audiatur*. The idea seems rather to be that of suffering the voice to be heard in public places. As applied both to Christ and to the Church, this verse describes a silent, unostentatious method of proceeding. The quotation in Matth. 12 : 18 is commonly explained as referring to our Saviour's mild and modest demeanour; but it rather has respect to the nature of his kingdom, and to the means by which it was to be established. His forbidding the announcement of the miracle is not recorded simply as a trait of personal character, but rather as implying that a public recognition of his claims was not included in his present purpose.

V. 3. *A bruised (or crushed) reed he will not break, and a dim wick he will not quench; by the truth will he bring forth judgment.* The verbs of the first clause have no exact equivalents in English. The first appears to mean broken but not broken off, which last is denoted by the other. Clericus supposes an allusion to the growing plant, which may be broken and yet live, but if entirely broken off must die.—The common version, *smoking flax*, is that of the Septuagint and Vulgate. The Hebrew noun really denotes flax (Ex. 9 : 31), but the adjective means faint or dim; so that in order to convey the meaning in translation, the former must be taken in the specific sense of *wick*, which it also has in ch. 43 : 17. The application of these figures to the sparing of enemies, or the indulgence of weak friends, or the sustentation of sincere but feeble faith, is too specific and exclusive. The verse continues the description of the mode in which the Messiah and his people were to *bring forth judgment to the nations*, or in other words to spread the true religion. It was not to be by clamour or by violence. The first of these ideas is expressed in the preceding verse, the last in this. That such is the true import of the words is clear from the addition of the last clause, which would be unmeaning if the verse related merely to a compassionate and sympathetic temper. That this verse is included in Matthew's quotation (ch. 12 : 19), shows that he did not quote the one before it as descriptive of a modest and retiring disposition. For although such a temper might be proved by Christ's prohibiting the publication of his miracles, this prohibition could not have been cited as an evidence of tenderness and mildness. The only way in which the whole quotation can be made appropriate to the case in hand, is by supposing that it was meant to be descriptive not of our Saviour's human virtues, but of the nature of his kingdom and of the means by which it was to be established.

That he was both lowly and compassionate is true, but it is not the truth which he established by his conduct upon this occasion, nor the truth which the evangelist intended to illustrate by the citation of these words. As well in their original connexion as in Matthew's application of them, they describe that kingdom which was not of this world; which came not with observation (Luke 17 : 20); which was neither meat nor drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 14 : 17); which was founded and promoted not by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord; and of which its founder said (John 18 : 36), *If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but now is my kingdom not from hence.* And again (John 18 : 27), when Pilate said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, *Thou sayest (rightly) that I am a king; to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth; every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.* How perfectly does this august description tally with the great prophetic picture of the Servant of Jehovah who was to bring forth judgment to the nations, and in doing so was not to cry or raise his voice or let men hear it in the streets, not by brutal force to break the crushed reed or quench the dim wick, but to conquer by healing and imparting strength. This passage also throws light on the true sense of the somewhat obscure phrase  $\text{בְּרֵצֵה אֱמֻנָה}$ , by showing that it means *with respect to the truth*, which is here equivalent to saying *by the truth*. This construction, by presenting an antithesis between the true and false way of bringing forth judgment to the gentiles, is much to be preferred to those constructions which explain the phrase as simply meaning *in truth* (i. e. truly), or *in permanence* (i. e. surely), or *unto truth* (i. e. so as to establish and secure it). All these may be suggested as accessory ideas; but the main idea seems to be the one first stated, namely, that the end in question is to be accomplished not by clamour, not by violence, but by the truth.

V. 4. *He shall not be dim, and he shall not be crushed, until he shall set judgment in the earth, and for his law the isles shall wait.* He shall neither conquer nor be conquered by violence. This verse is a new proof that the one before it does not describe mere tenderness and pity for the weak. The antithesis would then be, he shall neither be unkind to the infirm nor infirm himself. On the other hand, the sense is clear and pertinent, if v. 3 means that he shall not use violence towards those who are weaker than himself, and v. 4 that he shall not suffer it from those who are more powerful; or rather that he shall not subdue others nor himself be subdued by force. Some interpreters have been misled by not observing the exact correspondence of the verbs  $\text{בָּרַח}$  and  $\text{בָּרַחַן}$  with the adjectives  $\text{בָּרַחַן}$  and  $\text{בָּרַחַן}$ . The same oversight has led Cocceius and Vitringa to derive

רָץ from רָץ *to run*, and to understand the clause as meaning that he shall neither be remiss nor precipitate. This construction, it is true, makes the clause itself more antithetical and pointed, but only by the sacrifice of an obvious and beautiful antithesis between it and the first clause of v. 3.—*To set or place judgment in the earth* is to establish and confirm the true religion.—*By his law* we are to understand his word or revelation, considered as a rule of duty.—Here again *the islands* is a poetical expression for the nations, or more specifically for the transmarine and distant nations. The restriction of the term to Europe and Asia Minor (J. D. Michaelis) is as false in geography as it is in taste.—On the ground that the heathen could not wait or hope for that of which they were entirely ignorant, some understand the last verb as meaning *they shall trust* (i. e. after they have heard, they shall believe it). Besides the preference thus given to a secondary over a primary and proper sense, the general meaning of the clause, and its connexion with what goes before, appear to be misapprehended. The hope meant is not so much subjective as objective. The thing described is not the feeling of the gentiles towards the truth, but their dependence on it for salvation, and on Christ for the knowledge of the truth itself. *For his law the isles are waiting* (or *must wait*), and till it comes they must remain in darkness.

V. 5. *Thus saith the mighty (God), Jehovah, creating the heavens and stretching them out, spreading the earth and its issues, giving breath to the people on it, and spirit to those walking in it.* Ewald refers *thus saith* to the preceding verses, which he supposes to be here described as the words of God himself. But as the following verses also contain the words of God, there is no need of departing from the ordinary usage of the Scriptures, according to which the name of the speaker is prefixed to the report of what he says. We may indeed assume an equal connexion with what goes before and follows, as if he had said, *Thus hath Jehovah spoken and he speaks still further.*—The appeal is so directly to the power of Jehovah, that the name אֱלֹהִים, which is expressive of that attribute, ought not to be resolved into the general term *God*. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 75.)—The substitution of the preterite for the participle in the English Version (*he that created the heavens and stretched them out*) is not only a gratuitous departure from the form of the original, but hides from the English reader the allusion to the creative power of God as constantly exercised in the continued existence of his works. The same figure is exhibited more fully in ch. 40: 22, and the places there referred to. (See above, p. 25, 26.)—This clause is not a scientific but a poetical description. To the eye, the heavens have the appearance of a canopy or curtain, and the verdant surface of the earth that of a carpet. There is no need therefore of supplying a distinct verb to govern *its issues*. אֲפֵר, though originally used to signify the beating out of

metal into thin plates, has acquired in usage the more general sense of spreading or expanding, and is equally applicable to the earth as an apparently flat surface, and to its vegetation as the tapestry which covers it. The prophet's picture is completely marred by making קָרַב mean *consolidating*, which is wholly inappropriate to קָרַבְתִּי, and has no etymological foundation. Even קָרַב in the first chapter of Genesis means an *expanse*; the idea of a *firmament* comes not from the Hebrew but the ancient versions. No single English word is so appropriate as *issues* to express both the meaning and the derivation of the corresponding one in Hebrew, which denotes the things that come out of the earth, its produce, growth, or vegetation, with particular allusion here to grass.—Here, as in ch. 40 : 7, the word *people* is evidently used in application to the whole human race, a fact of some importance in the exposition of what follows. Cocceius alone supposes an antithesis between *the people* (i. e. Israel) and the rest of men. If this had been intended, the word *spirit* would no doubt have been connected with the former. By the side of this may be placed Kimchi's notion that a contrast was intended between men and brutes, on the ground that קָרַבְתִּי is limited in usage to the former. קָרַבְתִּי in the first clause of this verse is explained by some as a *pluralis majestaticus*, by others as a singular form peculiar to the קָרַב verbs and their derivatives. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 72.)—The enumeration of Jehovah's attributes in this verse is intended to accredit the assurances contained in the context.

V. 6. *I Jehovah have called thee in righteousness, and will lay hold of thee* (or hold thee fast), *and will keep thee, and will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the gentiles.*—The act of calling here implies selection, designation, and providential introduction to God's service.—*In righteousness*, i. e. in the exercise of righteousness on God's part, including the fulfilment of his promises as well as of his threatenings. *Unto righteousness*, i. e. to be righteous, is an idea foreign from the context, and one which would not have been thus expressed in Hebrew. Lowth's translation (*for a righteous purpose*), although too paraphractical, may be considered as substantially identical with that first stated. Those of Gesenius (*to salvation*) and Hitzig (*in grace*) are equally gratuitous and contrary to usage.—*I will hold thee fast*, and thereby hold thee up, sustain thee. (See above, v. 1.)—Lowth and Barnes esteem it an improvement of the common English Version to change *keep* into *preserve*.—*I will give thee for*, i. e. create, appoint, or constitute thee.—Hitzig understands by קָרַבְתִּי אֱמִתּוֹ a *covenant-people* (Bundesvolk), Ewald a mediatorial people (Mittelsvolk), both denoting a people called or sent to act as a mediator or a bond of union between God and the nations. But this, although it yields a good sense, is a German and English rather than a Hebrew construction, the instances in

which a prefixed noun qualifies the other being very rare and dubious. This objection is sufficient, without adding that the phrase as thus explained would be inapplicable to an individual, whereas the other epithets employed are equally appropriate to persons and communities. Most other writers are agreed in adhering to the obvious construction and in understanding by *a covenant of the people* a negotiator between God and the people. This use of *covenant*, although unusual, is in itself not more unnatural or forced than that of *light* in the next phrase. As *light of the nations* must mean a source or dispenser of light to them, so *covenant of people*, in the very same sentence, may naturally mean the dispenser or mediator of a covenant with them. The only reason why the one appears less natural and simple than the other, is that *light* is habitually used in various languages both for the element of light and for its source or a luminous body, whereas no such twofold usage of the other word exists, although analogies might easily be traced in the usage of such words as *justice* for judge, *counsel* for counsellor, in both which cases the functionary takes the name of that which he dispenses or administers.—But supposing this to be the true construction of the phrase, the question still arises, who are the contracting parties, or in other words, what are we to understand by *people*? The great majority of writers make it mean the *Jews*, the chosen people of Jehovah, and the *covenant* the mediator or negotiator of a new covenant between them and Jehovah, according to the representation in Jer. 31 : 31–33. To this it may be objected that  $\alpha$  has not the article as usual when employed in that sense, and that even with the article it is applied in the preceding verse to mankind in general. To this it may be added that the word *nations* in the next clause may as well be exegetical of *people* as in contrast with it. The first supposition is indeed much more natural, because the words are in such close connexion, and because there is no antithesis between the correlative expressions, *light* and *covenant*. To this it is replied, that the reference to Israel in this case is determined by the clear unambiguous analogy of ch. 49 : 8, where the phrase recurs and in a similar connexion. This conclusion not only rests upon a false assumption as to the meaning of the context there, but is directly contradicted by the language of v. 6, where it is expressly said that it was not enough for Christ to be the restorer of Israel, he must also be a *light to the gentiles*; and in direct continuation of this promise it is added in v. 8, without the show of a distinction or antithesis, that he should be a *covenant of the people* (i. e. of the nations), *to restore or re-establish the earth* (not the land, which is a perfectly gratuitous restriction), *to cause to be inherited the desolate heritages* (i. e. the ruins of an apostate world), *and to say to the prisoners, Go forth*, the arbitrary reference of which words to the Babylonish exile is in fact the only ground for the opinion now disputed. So far is this passage, then, from disproving the wide explanation

of the word עֶבֶד in the place before us, that it really affords a very strong analogical reason in its favour, and we need no longer hesitate to understand the clause as a description of the *servant of Jehovah* in the character, not only of a light (or an enlightener) to the nations, but of a mediator or negotiator between God and the people, i. e. men in general. These are epithets applying in their highest sense to Christ alone, to whom they are in fact applied by Simeon (Luke 2:32) and Paul (Acts 13:47). That neither of these quotes the phrase *a covenant of the people*, does not prove that it has no relation to the gentiles, but only that it does not relate to them exclusively, but to the whole human race; whereas the other phrase, as applying specifically to the gentiles, and as being less ambiguous, was exactly suited to Paul's purpose.—At the same time let it be observed that this description is entirely appropriate, not only to the Head but to the Body also in subordination to him. Not only the Messiah but the Israel of God was sent to be a mediator or connecting link between Jehovah and the nations. The meaning put upon עֶבֶד אֱלֹהִים by Hitzig and Ewald, although not philologically accurate, is perfectly consistent with the teachings of the Old Testament respecting the mission and vocation of Israel, the ancient church, as a covenant-race or middle-people between God and the apostate nations.

V. 7. *To open blind eyes, to bring out from prison the bondman, from the house of confinement the dwellers in darkness.* This was the end to be accomplished by the Servant of Jehovah in the character or office just ascribed to him. The spiritual evils to be remedied are represented under the figures of imprisonment and darkness, the removal of the latter having obvious allusion to the *light of the nations* in v. 6. The fashionable explanation of these words, which refers them to the restoration of the Jews from exile, is encumbered with various and complex difficulties. What is said of bondage must be either strictly understood or metaphorically. If the former be preferred, how is it that the Prophet did not use expressions more exactly descriptive of the state of Israel in Babylon? A whole nation carried captive by its enemies could hardly be described as prisoners in dark dungeons. Knobel, with readiness almost rabbinical, supplies the necessary fact by saying that a part of the Jews were imprisoned. But even granting that they were in prison, were they also blind? If it be said that this is a figurative representation of confinement in the dark, the principle of strict interpretation is abandoned, and the imprisonment itself may be a metaphor for other evils. There is then left no specific reason for applying this description to the exile any more than to a hundred other seasons of calamity. Another and more positive objection to this limitation is that it connects this verse with only part of the previous description, and that the part to which it

bears the least resemblance. Even supposing what has been disproved, that *covenant of the people* has respect to Israel alone, how is it that the other attribute, *a light to the gentiles*, must be excluded in interpreting what follows? It was surely not in this capacity that the Servant of Jehovah was to set the Jewish exiles free. If it be said that this verse has respect to only one of these two characters, this supposition is not only arbitrary, but doubly objectionable; first, because it passes over the nearest antecedent (אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) to connect the verse exclusively with one more distant (אֲנִי יְהוָה), and then, because it passes by the very one to which the figures of this verse have most analogy. The opening of the eyes and the deliverance of those that sit in darkness are correlative expressions to the *light of the gentiles*, which on this account, and as the nearest antecedent, must decide the sense of this verse, if that sense depend on either of these attributes exclusively. *I will make thee a light to the gentiles, to open the blind eyes* etc. cannot mean, I will make thee an instructor of the heathen to restore the Jews from captivity in Babylon. Whether the verse before us therefore be strictly or figuratively understood, it cannot be applied to the captivity without doing violence at once to the text and context. The very same reasoning applies to the analogous expressions used in ch. 49: 9, and thus corroborates our previous conclusion, that the context in neither of these places favours, much less requires, the restriction of אֲנִי יְהוָה to the Jews. The only natural interpretation of the verse before us is that which makes it figurative like the one preceding it, and the only natural interpretation of its figures is the one which understands them as descriptive of spiritual blindness and spiritual bondage, both which are metaphors of constant application to the natural condition of mankind in the Old as well as the New Testament. The removal of these evils is the work of Christ, as the revealer of the Father who has brought life and immortality to light: but in subordination to him, and as his representative, his church may also be correctly represented as a covenant of the people and a light of the nations; since the law, though a divine revelation, was to go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

V. 8. *I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory to another will I not give, and my praise to graven images.* The name Jehovah is here used with emphasis in reference to its etymological import as descriptive of a self-existent, independent, and eternal being. There is no sufficient ground for the opinion that the pronoun הוּא is ever used as a divine name, cognate and equivalent to *Jehovah*. In this case the obvious and usual construction is entirely satisfactory. *Graven images* are here put, as in many other cases, for idols in general, without regard to the mode of their formation. The connexion of this verse with what precedes may seem obscure, but admits



of an easy explanation. From the assertion of Jehovah's power and perfection as a ground for his people's confidence, the Prophet now proceeds, by a natural transition, to exhibit it in contrast with the impotence of those gods in whom the gentiles trusted. These are represented not only as inferior to God, but as his enemies and rivals, any act of worship paid to whom was so much taken from what he claimed as his own and as his own exclusively. The general doctrine of the verse is that true and false religion cannot coexist; because, however tolerant idolatry may be, it is essential to the worship of Jehovah to be perfectly exclusive of all other gods. This is included in the very name *Jehovah*, and accounts for its solemn proclamation here.

V. 9. *The first (or former) things—lo, they have come, and new things I (am) telling; before they spring forth (sprout or germinate) I will make (or let) you hear (them).* This is an appeal to former prophecies already verified, as grounds of confidence in those yet unfulfilled. The attempts which have been made to give specific meanings to *former things* and *new things* as denoting certain classes of prophecies, are unsuccessful because perfectly gratuitous. The most plausible hypothesis of this kind is Vitringa's, which applies the one term to the prophecies respecting Cyrus and the Babylonish exile, the other to the prophecies respecting the Messiah and the new dispensation. But the simple meaning of the words appears to be, that as former prophecies (not of Isaiah but of older prophets) had come to pass, so those now uttered should be likewise verified. The strong and beautiful expression in the last clause can only mean that the events about to be predicted were beyond the reach of human foresight, and is therefore destructive of the modern notion, that these prophecies were written after Cyrus had appeared, and at a time when the further events of his history could be foreseen by an observer of unusual sagacity. Such a prognosticator, unless he was also a deliberate deceiver, a charge which no one brings against this writer, could not have said of what he thus foresaw, that he announced it before it had begun to germinate, i. e. while the seed was in the earth, and before any outward indications of the plant could be perceived. As this embraces all the writer's prophecies, it throws the date of composition back to a period before the rise of Cyrus, and thereby helps to invalidate the arguments in favour of regarding it as contemporaneous with the Babylonish exile.

V. 10. *Sing to Jehovah a new song, his praise from the end of the earth, (ye) going down to the sea and its fulness, isles and their inhabitants!* To sing a new song, according to Old Testament usage, is to praise God for some new manifestation of his power and goodness. It implies, there-

fore, not only fresh praise, but a fresh occasion for it. Reduced to ordinary prose style, it is a prediction that changes are to take place joyfully affecting the condition of the whole world. That this is a hyperbole, relating to the restoration of the Jews from Babylon, is too gratuitous and forced a supposition to be imposed upon any reader of the prophecy against his will. Let those who can, receive and make the most of it. The great majority of readers will be apt to reject an assumption which has no foundation in the text and which reduces a sublime prediction to an extravaganza.—Gesenius, for some reason not explained, chooses to read *at* instead of *from* the end. The obvious meaning of the phrase is, that the sound of praise should be heard coming *from* the remotest quarters.—*Its fulness* may either be connected with *the sea* and both dependent on *go down* (to the sea and its fulness), or regarded as a distinct object of address. In the latter case, the marine animals would seem to be intended; in the former, the whole mass of water with its contents; the last is more poetical and natural. The antithesis is then between the sea with its frequenters on the one hand and the isles with their inhabitants on the other.

V. 11. *The desert and its towns shall raise (the voice), the enclosures (or encampments, in which) Kedar dwells; the dwellers in the Rock shall shout, from the top of mountains shall they cry aloud.* This is a direct continuation of the previous description, in which the whole world is represented as exulting in the promised change. The reference of this verse to the course of the returning exiles through the intervening desert is forbidden by the mention of the sea and its fulness, the isles and the ends of the earth, in the preceding and following verses. If these are not all parts of the same great picture, it is impossible to frame one. If they are, it is absurd to take the first and last parts in their widest sense as an extravagant hyperbole, and that which is between them in its strictest sense as a literal description. The only consistent supposition is that sea, islands, deserts, mountains, towns, and camps, are put together as poetical ingredients of the general conception, that the earth in all its parts shall have occasion to rejoice.—The mention of cities as existing in the wilderness appears less strange in the original than in a modern version, because both the leading words (רֶדֶד and צִיָּוֹן) have a greater latitude of meaning than their usual equivalents, the first denoting properly a pasture-ground, and being applicable therefore to any uncultivated region whether uninhabited or not, the other answering to *town* in its widest English sense inclusive of both villages and cities. There is no need therefore of supposing a particular allusion to *oases* in the arid desert, or of assuming, as Gesenius does in his Thesaurus, that צִיָּוֹן sometimes means nothing more than a military station, post, or watch-tower. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 8.)—The translation of צִיָּוֹן by *villages* is too restricted,

since the Hebrew word is applicable also to collections of tents or nomadic encampments, which appears to be the prominent idea here. Kedar was the second son of Ishmael. (Gen. 25:13.) Here, as in ch. 21:16, the name is put for his descendants, or by a natural metonymy for the Arabians in general. The rabbinical name for the Arabic language is *the tongue of Kedar*. The Septuagint takes it as the name of the country (*and those inhabiting Kedar*). The Vulgate makes this clause a promise (*Kedar shall dwell in houses*), and the preceding verb a passive (*let the desert and its towns be exalted*). Cocceius has the same construction, but gives both the verbs an imperative meaning, and follows the Septuagint in explaining Kedar (*efferrat se desertum et oppida ejus ; per pagos habitetur Kedarena*). Most writers, ancient and modern, have regarded a relative construction as more natural (*which Kedar doth inhabit*). The use of Kedar as a feminine is contrary to general usage, which distinguishes between the name of the country as feminine and that of the nation possessing it as masculine. The rabbins explain it by supposing an ellipsis of קִדְרָא before it. More probably, however, it is an irregularity or license of construction, such as we have seen already in ch. 21:2 and elsewhere.—Vitringa, J. D. Michaelis, and some later writers, explain קִדְרָא as the proper name of Petra ; but the whole connexion renders it more natural to take it in its general sense of *rock*, and as corresponding not so much to Kedar as to the appellatives, desert, towns, encampments, mountains.

V. 12. *They shall place (or give) to Jehovah honour, and his praise in the islands they shall show forth (or declare)*. Still another mode of saying, the whole world shall praise him. The islands are again mentioned, either as one out of several particulars before referred to, or with emphasis, as if he had said, *even in the islands*, beyond sea, and by implication in the furthest regions.—As the verb to *give*, in Hebrew usage, has the secondary sense of *placing*, so the verb to place is occasionally used as an equivalent to that of giving. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 445.)—The translation of the verbs in this verse as imperatives (*let them give glory and declare*), although substantially correct, is a needless departure from the form of the original, in which the idea of command or exhortation is sufficiently implied though not expressed.—The verbs do not agree with the series of nouns in the foregoing verse (desert, towns, etc.), for these could not celebrate Jehovah *in the islands*. The construction is indefinite, *they*, i. e. men in general, a form of speech of far more frequent occurrence in Hebrew than would be suspected by a reader of the English Bible.

V. 13. *Jehovah, like a strong one, will go forth ; like a warrior (literally a man of battle) he will rouse (his) zeal ; he will shout, yea he will*

*cry; against his foes he will make (or show) himself strong.* From the effect he now reverts to the efficient cause. The universal joy before described is to arise from Jehovah's triumph over his enemies. The martial figures of the verse are intelligible in themselves and all familiar to the usage of the Scriptures.—Lowth and Barnes amend the common version of the first clause by reading, he *shall march forth like a hero.* The modern Germans also use the word *Held* (hero). Luther and Calvin prefer *giant.* It may be doubted whether any English word is more appropriate or striking than the strict translation *strong* or *mighty.* To *go forth* is the common Hebrew phrase for going out to war or battle. (See above, on ch. 40 : 26.) Junius and Tremellius understand the plural *battles* as a superlative expression, and translate the phrase *vir bellicosissimus evigilans zelo.* The versions of Clericus (*vir militaris*) and Vitringa (*peritus bellator*) greatly weaken the expression. הַאֲזָקָה may either have its general sense of ardour, strong and violent affection of whatever kind, or its more specific sense of jealousy or sensitive regard for his own honour and for the welfare of his people. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 165.) The idea is that of an ancient warrior exciting his own courage by a shout or war-cry.—The last clause may be understood to mean, *he shall prevail over his enemies*; but although this idea is undoubtedly included, it is best to retain the reflexive form and import of the verb, as far as may be, in translation.

V. 14. *I have long been still (saying) I will hold my peace, I will restrain myself. (But now) like the travailing (woman) I will shriek, I will pant and gasp at once.* The consecution of the tenses in the first clause has occasioned the most opposite constructions. Of these the most violent and ungrammatical is that of Augusti, who translates all the verbs of the verse as preterites. With this exception, it appears to be agreed on all hands that the verbs of the last clause are either futures proper, or descriptive presents, and the only question is in reference to those of the first. According to Luther, these are all presents; while the Vulgate, followed by most modern writers, makes them all refer to past time. That such assimilations do occur, is certain; but a general maxim of interpretation makes it highly desirable to regard the distinction of the tenses, where we can, as intentional and significant. Lowth and Ewald accordingly follow the Septuagint in retaining the future form of the second and third verbs, but read them interrogatively (*I have long been silent. Shall I hold my peace and restrain myself for ever?*). This involves the necessity of reading מְהַלְלֵי (for ever?) and connecting it against the accents with what follows. It is true that interrogative sentences, without the interrogative particle expressed, are not unknown to Hebrew usage; but their occurrence is comparatively rare, and ought not to be assumed without necessity, which of course has no existence if the clause can be affirmatively

read without abandoning the strict sense of the future. This can be done, as may be seen in the translation above given, by regarding the second and third verbs as the expression of his own determination or intention while the silence lasted. The omission of the verb *to say* before such repetitions or citations is not only frequent in general usage, but the more natural in this case from the fact that this whole verse is universally regarded as the words of God himself, although he is not expressly introduced as the speaker. The necessity of supplying (at least in thought) the words *but now* before the last clause, is not peculiar to this view of the passage, but common to it with all others, except Augusti's paradoxical construction. — The word  $\text{נָפַח}$  is twice used elsewhere by Isaiah (30 : 6. 59 : 5) as a noun meaning a viper or some other venomous serpent, in which sense it is also used by Job (20 : 16). The general principles of analogical interpretation would require this sense to be retained here ; but the only writers who have ventured so to do are Junius and Tremellius who translate the clause, *ut parturientem viperam desolabo*. Even the rabbins give the word the sense of *crying*, which is plainly a conjecture from the context. Bochart attempts a compromise between the two opinions, by supposing that the word originally means *to hiss* like a serpent ; and Gesenius connects it with  $\text{נָפַח}$  *to blow*. The only objection to the common version, *shriek* or *scream*, is that it seems too strong both for the etymology and the analogy of the verbs which follow and which seem to denote a suppressed sound rather than a loud one, *I will pant and gasp at once*. There is indeed another very ancient explanation of these two verbs, given in the Vulgate and by Calvin, Grotius, Hitzig, and Henderwerk, as well as in the English Version, *I will destroy and devour at once*. This refers  $\text{נָפַח}$  to the root  $\text{נָפַח}$  *to lay waste* (and more generally *to destroy*), and gives  $\text{נָפַח}$  the sense of *swallowing* and then (like  $\text{נָפַח}$ ) that of *destroying*. But  $\text{נָפַח}$  means elsewhere *to pant* or *gasp* ; and  $\text{נָפַח}$  may be readily regarded as a synonyme, if derived from  $\text{נָפַח}$  *to breathe*, of which it would be the natural future. It is true that this verb does not occur elsewhere, but its derivative  $\text{נָפַח}$  *breath* is of perpetual occurrence ; and the very same writers who reject the derivation from  $\text{נָפַח}$  on this ground, assume that  $\text{נָפַח}$  from  $\text{נָפַח}$  not only in the absence of any other instance, but in opposition to the usage which determines it to be a noun. The authority of Gesenius may be cited upon both sides of this question, not only from his earlier and later works but from the last edition of his Lexicon, in which the two explanations of this clause are separately given as correct, the one under  $\text{נָפַח}$ , which is explained as meaning to breathe hard, to pant, to blow, “ e. g. of an angry person Is. 42 : 14,” the other under  $\text{נָפַח}$ , where the two verbs are translated, “ I will destroy and gulp down together.” The paraphrase added in the latter case, “ my wrath, long restrained, I will now let break forth,” is no doubt the true sense of the verse on either supposition.

V. 15. *I will lay waste mountains and hills, and all their herbage will I dry up; and I will turn (literally place) streams to islands, and pools (or lakes) will I dry up.* Having described the effect and the cause of the great future change, he now describes the change itself, under the common form of a complete revolution in the face of nature, sometimes with special reference to the heavens (ch. 13 : 10), sometimes (as here and in ch. 35 : 6, 7) to the earth. It is strange that, with these analogies in view and after such descriptions as those previously given, any should still suppose that by mountains and hills we are here to understand states and governments, and by their *herbs* the citizens or subjects. There is more probability in the opinion that the verse contains an allusion to the ancient cultivation of the hills of Palestine, by means of terraces, many of which are still in existence. (See the *Earlier Prophecies*, p. 134.) Houbigant and Lowth read אֲרָצוֹת (*dry deserts*), which is not only needless but contrary to usage, as אֲרָצוֹת no where signifies deserts themselves, but always their inhabitants. Gesenius and the other modern writers suppose אֲרָצוֹת to be here used in the sense of dry land as opposed to water. The necessity of this explanation may however be avoided by adopting the ingenious suggestion of Clericus, that what is here described is the actual appearance of islands in the channels of the streams on the subsiding of the water.—The drying of the bed of the Euphrates by Cyrus can at the utmost only be the subject of an indirect allusion. A literal prophecy of that event would be entirely misplaced in a series of bold metaphorical descriptions.—Rosenmüller goes to an extravagant length in attempting to connect this verse with the preceding context by explaining it to mean that the excited warrior will dry up vegetation with his burning breath.

V. 16. *And I will make the blind walk in a way they knew not, in paths they knew not I will make them tread; I will set (or turn) darkness before them to light, and obliquities to straightness. These are the words; I have made them (or done them) and have not left them.* The particle before the first verb is conversive i. e. gives a future meaning to the preterite, because preceded by the future proper. (See Nordheimer, § 219.) The ellipsis of the relative, which twice occurs in this clause, is precisely the same both in Hebrew and in English.—אֲרָצוֹת may be translated crooked or uneven places, as opposed to what is level, or to superficial rectitude. (See above, on ch. 40 : 4, p. 4.) The combination of these two antitheses (light and dark, crooked and straight) shows clearly that they are both metaphorical expressions for the same thing that is represented under other figures in the verse preceding, viz. total change; in what respect and by what means, the metaphors themselves do not determine. And yet some writers understand the first clause as specifically meaning,

that the exiles in Babylon should be delivered at a time and in a manner which they had not expected; while another class apply the words exclusively to spiritual exercise or religious experience. To both these objects the description admits of an easy application; but neither of them is to be considered its specific subject. It is impossible, without the utmost violence, to separate this one link from the chain of which it forms a part, that is to say, from the series of strong and varied metaphors, by which the Prophet is expressing the idea of abrupt and total change. The same thing that is meant by the wasting of cultivated hills, the withering of herbage, and the drying up of streams and lakes, is also meant by the leading of blind men in a new path, i. e. causing them to witness things of which they had had no previous experience.—The usual construction of the last clause supplies a relative before the leading verb and takes its suffix as a dative—‘these are the words or things which I have done for them and have not left them.’ Another construction separates the members as distinct propositions—‘these are the words (or the things which I have promised to the people); I have made them and have not forsaken them.’ The simplest and most regular construction is that given by Jerome and Cocceius, which refers the pronouns not to a noun understood but to the expressed antecedent: *These are the words* (i. e. my promises), *I have performed them and have not abandoned them*, that is to say, I have not relinquished my design until it was accomplished. (Compare the last clause of Ezekiel 17:24.) The translation of these verbs as futures has arisen merely from a feeling on the part of the interpreter that the words *ought* to contain a promise; whereas the promise is implied or rather superseded by the declaration that the work is done already, or at least that the effect is already secured. The usual construction, which makes one a preterite and one a future, is doubly arbitrary and capricious.

V. 17. *They are turned back, they shall be ashamed with shame* (i. e. utterly ashamed), *those trusting in the graven image, those saying to the molten image, Ye are our gods.* This verse describes the effect to be produced by the expected changes on the enemies of God and the worshippers of idols. *They are turned back*, utterly defeated, foiled in their malignant opposition. Nor is this all; for they are yet to be utterly ashamed, confounded, disappointed, and disgraced. In the last clause it is plain that the graven and molten image are separated only by the parallelism, because the address at the end is in the plural form, not *thou art*, but *ye are our gods*. On the usage of these two nouns, see *Earlier Prophecies*, p. 519.

V. 18. *Ye deaf, hear! and ye blind, look to see!* From the connexion, this would seem to be a call upon the worshippers of idols, to open

their eyes and ears, and become conscious of their own delusions.—The infinitive at the end of the sentence does not express the manner but the purpose of the act required. Vitringa's version therefore (*videndo intuemini*) is less correct than that of Jerome (*intuemini ad videndum*).

V. 19. *Who (is) blind but my servant, and deaf like my messenger (whom) I will send? Who (is) blind like the devoted one, and blind like the servant of Jehovah.* Why should he call the heathen blind and deaf, when Israel himself, with all his honours and advantages, refused to see or hear? The very people whose mission and vocation it was to make the gentiles see and hear, seemed to emulate their insensibility. The most difficult expression in this verse is  $\text{עֲבָדֶיךָ}$ , which the Seventy seem to have read  $\text{עֲבָדֶיךָ}$  and understood as meaning those that have dominion over them. The various explanations of the common text may all be reduced to two distinct senses of the verbal root, viz. that of being at peace and that of being perfect or complete. The latter meaning is assumed by Luther, Calvin, Cocceius, and Vitringa; while Clericus modifies it so as to mean *a man of consummate wisdom*, and Lowth one *perfectly instructed*. On the other hypothesis, Junius renders it *donatus pace*; Gesenius, *the friend of God*; Hitzig, Ewald, and Umbreit, the *devoted* or the *God-devoted*. This last is favoured by the analogy of  $\text{مسلم}$  in Arabic, the name by which the Mohammedans describe themselves, and which denotes one who gives himself to God. From the use of the Piel in the sense of completing, making good, repaying, are derived the Vulgate version (*renundatus*) and that of Rosenmüller (*redemptus*). As to the application of the term here, Clericus supposes that it means the High Priest or some eminent person of the sacerdotal order. But the great majority of writers understand it as descriptive of Israel, the chosen people. The objection arising from the use of similar expressions at the beginning of the chapter with respect to the Messiah is usually set aside by arbitrarily assuming entire diversity of subject. Henderson alone has the intrepidity to understand this verse of the Messiah likewise, accounting for the application of such epithets to such a subject by assuming that it expresses the opinion of the unbelieving Jews respecting Christ. The obvious objection to this mode of exposition is, that it opens the door to endless license of interpretation, by admitting that a passage may be referred at will to the subject which it is least adapted to describe, by simply making it express the mind not of the writer, as it seems to do, but of another party not expressly mentioned. A purely arbitrary supposition cannot be justified by the assumption of another like it. The true solution of the difficulty seems to be the one already given in explaining the first verse, viz. that the *Servant of Jehovah* is a title applying not only to the Head but to the Body also. Here, where the language implies censure and reproach, the terms



must be referred exclusively to Israel, the messenger whom God had sent to open the eyes of the other nations, but who had himself become wilfully blind. The future  $\text{הִלְכֵם}$  implies that the mission was not yet fulfilled. Jerome's construction, *unto whom I sent my messengers*, is wholly ungrammatical and a mere expedient to avoid a seeming difficulty. It is scarcely credible that Clericus seems half-inclined to take  $\text{מַלְאָכָיו}$  as the proper name of *Malachi*.

V. 20. *Thou hast seen many things, and wilt not observe. (Sent) to open ears! and he will not hear.* In the first clause he turns to Israel and addresses him directly; in the last he turns away from him again, and, as it were, expresses his surprise and indignation to the by-standers. The sense of the whole, leaving out of view this difference of form, is the same as in the foregoing verse, namely, that Israel had eyes but saw not, and instead of opening the ears of others was himself incapable of hearing. The sentence may be said to exhibit a climax. In the first clause the contrast is between the blindness of the people and the light which they enjoyed; in the last it is between their deafness and their high vocation to open the ears of others. Hence the abrupt and impassioned form of expression in the latter case. The marginal reading  $\text{וְהִלְכֵם}$ , though susceptible of explanation as an infinitive, is an unnecessary emendation of the textual  $\text{וְהִלְכֵם}$ . The infinitive  $\text{וְהִלְכֵם}$  might be considered as deriving a preterite sense from the preceding verb; but a better explanation is afforded by the analogy of v. 7, where the same infinitive describes the end for which the Servant of Jehovah was sent.

V. 21. *Jehovah (is) willing for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law and make it honourable.* The people, being thus unfaithful to their trust, had no claim to be treated any longer as an object of Jehovah's favour; and yet he continues propitious, not on their account, but out of regard to his own engagements, and for the execution of his righteous purposes. For these reasons he will still put honour on the chosen people and the system under which they lived. Gesenius and Hitzig arbitrarily construe  $\text{וְהִלְכֵם}$  with  $\text{וְהִלְכֵם}$ , *is pleased to magnify*, of which construction there is no example elsewhere, and then make this an idiom of the later Hebrew. Still less grammatical is the construction of the ancient versions, 'it pleased God to justify or sanctify him,' whether this be understood to imply the reading  $\text{וְהִלְכֵם}$ , or taken as a paraphrase of the common text. The application of the words to the righteousness of Christ is inconsistent with the terms of censure and disapprobation which precede and follow.

V. 22. *And (yet) it (is) a people spoiled and robbed, ensnared in holes*

all of them, and in houses of confinement they are hidden. They have become a spoil, and there is none delivering; a prey, and there is none saying, Restore. Here another contrast is brought into view. As the conduct of the people did not answer to their high vocation, so their treatment does not answer to the preceding declaration of God's purpose. If he still designed to honour them, though not for their own sake, how was this to be reconciled with what they suffered at the hands of their enemies? The terms are no doubt metaphorical, and therefore not exclusively descriptive of literal captivity. At the same time it may be admitted that the sufferings of Israel in exile furnished one of the most memorable instances of what is here described in general.—בְּחַיִּיבֵי is explained in the ancient versions, and by many modern writers, to mean youths or chosen men, as it does above in ch. 40 : 30. But why should this class be described as in captivity? Coecejus and Vitringa change the meaning of the clause by making בְּחַיִּיבֵי the infinitive of פִּיחַ to blow or puff, and explaining the whole phrase, 'they are all the puffing of the young men,' i. e. objects of derision and contempt. But this construction violates the parallelism for the sake of an extremely forced and far-fetched meaning. Most of the modern writers follow Luther in explaining בְּחַיִּיבֵי to mean in holes or pitfalls, corresponding to חַיִּיבֵי in the other member.

V. 23. *Who among you will give ear to this, will hearken and hear for the time to come?* By *this* we are not to understand merely the fact recorded in the foregoing verse, but the doctrine of the whole preceding context as to the vocation and mission of Israel and as to his actual condition. God had appointed him to be a source or at least a medium of light and blessing to the nations; but instead of acting up to this high character, he not only left the nations without light, but was wilfully blinded and insensible himself. Yet God would still be true to his engagements, and put honour on the special revelation which he had already given. Why, then, it might be asked, was Israel suffered to fall before his enemies? The answer to this question is introduced by an indirect caution to consider it and bear it in mind. The interrogative form implies the possibility of their neglecting or refusing to obey it.—The last phrase is explained to mean *behind* or *backwards* by Vitringa (*a tergo*) and Ewald (*zurückwärts*), who seem to understand it as denoting reflection on the past, or the act of meditating upon what they heard.—Most other writers understand it as relating either to the time of hearing (*henceforth* or *hereafter*) or the subject of the declarations to be heard (*concerning the future*).

V. 24. *Who has given Jacob for a prey, and Israel to spoilers? Has not Jehovah, against whom we have sinned, and they were not willing in*

*ms ways to walk, and did not hearken to his law?* This was what they were to bear in mind, viz. that what they suffered was ordained of God and on account of their iniquities. The errors of which this verse is the negation are those of supposing that they suffered without fault, and that they suffered, as it were, in spite of God's protection, or because he was unable to prevent it. The interrogation makes the statement more emphatic: Who else can be imagined to have done it, or for what other cause except our sins? The change of person in the last clause is a common Hebrew idiom and does not seem to be significant. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 20.) If the Prophet identifies himself with the people in the first phrase, he cannot be supposed to exclude himself in that which follows.—Hitzig's translation of the last word (*his instruction*) is too weak, as it fails to suggest the idea of obligation. It is also at variance with usage, which requires  $\text{הִרְיֶה}$  to be taken not in its etymological sense merely but in that of *law*.—This verse is strictly applicable to the sufferings of the Jews in Babylon, and it was no doubt so applied by them; but in itself it is a general declaration of a fact which has been often verified and was especially exemplified in ancient Israel, viz. that the sufferings even of God's people are the consequence of sin.

V. 25. *And he (Jehovah) poured upon him (Israel) fury (even) his wrath and the strength (or violence) of war: and it set him on fire round about, and he knew (it) not; and it burned him, and he will not lay it to heart.* This continues and concludes the description of God's judgments and of Israel's insensibility. Most writers explain  $\text{הִרְיֶה}$  as an absolute form used for the construct (*fury of his anger*). Junius and Vitranga make it an adverbial expression qualifying  $\text{אֵשׁ}$  (*excandescentiâ* or *cum excandescentiâ iram*). The simplest construction is to put the nouns in apposition, either as mere equivalents (*my anger as fury*), or as exegetical the one of the other (*fury, to wit, my anger*).—*He knew not* does not here mean *unawares*, without his knowledge, but, as the parallel clause shows, implies extreme insensibility. The translation of the last verb as a preterite is ungrammatical, and the assimilation of the two as presents an evasion. That a preterite precedes, instead of showing that the future must refer to past time, shows the contrary, by leaving us unable to account for the difference of form if none of meaning was intended. However necessary such assimilations may be elsewhere, they are inadmissible in cases like the present, where the change of tense admits of an easy explanation, to wit, that the writer intended to describe the people not only as having been insensible before but as likely to continue so in time to come.—On the usage of the phrase *to put or lay upon the heart*, see above, p. 42.

## CHAPTER XLIII.

THE main subject of this chapter is the true relation of Israel to Jehovah, and its application in the way both of warning and encouragement. The doctrine taught is that their segregation from the rest of men, as a peculiar people, was an act of sovereignty, independent of all merit in themselves, and not even intended for their benefit exclusively, but for the accomplishment of God's gracious purposes respecting men in general. The inferences drawn from this fact are, that Israel would certainly escape the dangers which environed him however imminent, and on the other hand that he must suffer for his unfaithfulness to God. In illustration of these truths, the Prophet introduces several historical allusions and specific prophecies, the most striking of the former having respect to the exodus from Egypt, and of the latter to the fall of Babylon. It is important to the just interpretation of the chapter that these parts of it should be seen in their true light and proportion, as incidental illustrations, not as the main subject of the prophecy, which, as already stated, is the general relation between God and his ancient people, and his mode of dealing with them, not at one time but at all times.

Israel is the peculiar people of Jehovah, cherished and favoured at the expense of other nations, vs. 1-4. But these are one day to become partakers of the same advantages, vs. 5-9. The proofs of the divine protection are afforded by the history of Israel, vs. 10-13. One of the most remarkable, yet future, is the downfall of Babylon and the liberation of the exiles, vs. 14, 15. An analogous example in more ancient times was the deliverance from Egypt, vs. 16, 17. But both these instances shall be forgotten in comparison with the great change which awaits the church hereafter, vs. 18-21. Of all these distinguishing favours none was owing to the merit of the people, but all to the sovereign grace of God, vs. 22-25. The people were not only destitute of merit, but deserving of punishment, which they had experienced and must experience again, vs. 26-28.

V. 1. *And now, thus saith Jehovah, thy creator, oh Jacob, and thy former, oh Israel, Fear not, for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine* (literally, *to me art thou*). The juxtaposition of this promise with the very different language at the close of the preceding chapter has led to various false assumptions as to the connexion of the

passages. Some give *and now* the sense of *yet* or *nevertheless*, while others understand it as referring to a period following that just mentioned; as if he had said, After these things have been suffered, fear no longer. But this interpretation is forbidden by the reasons here suggested for not fearing, viz. that Jehovah was already their Creator and Redeemer, and had already called them and made them his peculiar people. It will also be observed that in ch. XLII, as well as here, there is the same alternation and apparent confusion of the encouraging and minatory tone, which cannot therefore be explained by referring any one part of the context to a particular period of history. Another solution of the difficulty is that the Prophet has in view a twofold Israel, the false and true, the carnal and spiritual. This is correct so far as what he says relates to internal character; but it is evident that he has reference likewise to the outward fortunes of God's people as an organized body. The simplest and most satisfactory hypothesis is that, in this whole context, he is accounting for the sufferings of Israel and his preservation from destruction on the same ground, namely, that Jehovah had chosen them and therefore would preserve them, but that they were unfaithful and must therefore suffer. The intermingling of the promises and threatenings is not to be explained by supposing a reference to different periods or different subjects; nor is it to be set down as capricious and unmeaning, but as necessary to the Prophet's purpose. The *now* will then have a logical rather than a temporal meaning, as introductory to an explanation of the strange fact that the bush was burned but not consumed.—Create and form have reference not merely to the natural creation, nor to the spiritual renovation of individuals, but to the creation or constitution of the church. God was the maker of Israel in a peculiar sense. He existed as a nation for a special purpose.—*Fear not*, i. e. fear not that thou canst be utterly destroyed. It is not an assurance of immunity from suffering, the experience of which is implied and indeed expressly threatened in what follows.—*I have redeemed thee*. There is here an allusion to the redemption of the first-born under the Mosaic law, as appears from the metaphor of substitution used in vs. 3 and 4. Thus understood, the meaning of this clause is, thou art not like the other nations of the earth, for I have purchased or redeemed thee to myself as a peculiar people.—*To call by name* includes the ideas of specific designation, public announcement, and solemn consecration to a certain work. This and the other clauses of the verse can be applied to the election and vocation of individuals only by accommodation, and only so far as the case of the individual members is included in that of the whole body.—It is a curious idea of Menochius, that לְךָ אֶתְּךָ is the name assigned, as if he had said, *I have called thee by thy name Li-attah (Thou-art-mine)*. The true sense is, thou art mine because I have expressly called thee so to be.—Rosenmüller discovers here

another obstretical allusion in the phrase  $\overline{\text{וְיִצְרֵךְ}}$ . (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 451.)

V. 2. *When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be scorched, and the flame shall not burn thee.* Fire and water are common figures for calamity and danger. (See Ps. 66 : 12.) To explain one as meaning civil and the other religious persecutions, as Vitringa does, is wholly arbitrary, and might be reversed with just as much or rather just as little reason.—Although *when* conveys the true sense here, and is given in the lexicons as a distinct meaning of the Hebrew  $\text{כִּי}$ , the latter really retains its proper meaning, *for, because*. It is the genius of the language to delight in short independent clauses, where we use more involved and complicated periods. ‘For thou shalt pass through the waters, I will be with thee,’ is the idiomatic Hebrew mode of saying, *If or when thou passest, etc.*—The last clause might be rendered, when thou *walkest in the fire*, the preposition *through* being used even in the first clause only because the English idiom requires it after *pass*.—Hitzig gives  $\text{הִצְרִיךְ}$  a reflexive meaning (*burn thyself*), which is unnecessary, although it agrees well both with Hebrew usage and the English idiom. Augusti takes the same verb in the more specific sense of being *branded*, i. e. marked by the fire. (Compare the derivative noun  $\text{צִרְיָה}$  ch. 3 : 24.) But this does not suit the more indefinite expressions in the parallel clauses.—The common version of the last words, *shall not kindle upon thee*, is of doubtful authority, and seems to introduce a needless anticlimax, as *burning* is much more than *kindling*.—The application of this promise to individual believers is an accommodation, but one justified by the natural relation between the body and its several members.

V. 3. *For I, Jehovah, thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour, have given (as) thy ransom Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba, instead of thee.* This is an amplification of the phrase *I have redeemed thee* in v. 1. As the Israelite under the Mosaic law was obliged to redeem his first-born by the payment of a price, or by the substitution of some other object, so Jehovah secured Israel as his own by giving up the other nations, here represented by a single group, just as the forest-trees are represented in ch. 41 : 19 by a few well-known species. The group here selected is composed of three contiguous and cognate nations. *Cush*, which was placed by the older writers either wholly or partly in Arabia, is admitted by the moderns to be coincident with the Ethiopia of the Greek geographers. *Seba* is now commonly supposed, on the authority of Josephus, to be Meroe, a part of Ethiopia surrounded by the branches of the Nile, and celebrated

by the ancient writers for its wealth and commerce. The connexion of the countries was not only geographical but genealogical. According to Gen. 10 : 6, 7, Cush was the brother of Mizraim and the father of Seba. According to this exegetical hypothesis, the same essential meaning might have been conveyed by the mention of any other group of nations. At the same time it may be admitted that the mention of Egypt was probably suggested by its intimate connexion with the history of Israel, and by its actual sacrifice, in some sort, to the safety of the latter at the period of the exodus. Many interpreters go further and suppose that the words would have been applicable to no other nations than those specifically mentioned, and that the Prophet here alludes to the real or anticipated conquest of these countries by Cyrus, as a sort of compensation for the loss of Israel. But the necessity of this prosaic explanation is precluded by the prophetic usage of specifying individuals as representatives of classes, while the sense thus put upon ransom or atonement is extremely forced and far-fetched. That the terms although specific were designed to have a wider application may be safely inferred from the generic expressions substituted for them in the next verse.—The essential idea of  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , here and elsewhere, is that of vicarious compensation.—The insertion of the substantive verb in the first clause, so as to make it a distinct proposition (*I am Jehovah*), greatly weakens the whole sentence. The description of the speaker in the first clause is intended to conciliate regard to what he says in the other. It was in the character, not only of an absolute and sovereign God, but in that of Israel's God, his Holy One, his Saviour, that Jehovah had thus chosen him to the exclusion of all other nations.

V. 4. *Since thou wast precious in my eyes, thou hast been honoured, and I have loved thee, and will give man instead of thee and nations instead of thy soul (or life).* There is precisely the same ambiguity in *since* as in the Hebrew  $\text{כִּי}$ . Both expressions may be taken either in a temporal or causal sense. *Because thou wast precious, or, from the time that thou wast precious.* The former sense is really included in the latter. If Israel had been honoured ever since Jehovah called him, it is plainly implied that this vocation was the cause of his distinction.—The first clause, as the whole context clearly shows, does not refer to intrinsic qualities, but to an arbitrary sovereign choice. Since I began to treat thee as a thing of value, thou hast been distinguished among the nations. The verse, so far from ascribing any merit to the people, refers all to God. Some continue the construction through the whole verse, making the apodosis begin with the second clause, *since thou art precious in my sight, and art honoured, and I love thee, I will give etc.* This yields a good sense, but is grammatically inadmissible, because it supplies a conjunction in the first clause, and omits one in the second.

Either of these assumptions might be justified by usage and analogy ; but the coincidence appears unnatural, and makes the whole construction harsh. At the same time, this construction weakens the sentence by making it a mere repetition of what goes before, whereas it is a repetition with a pointed affirmation that the nation owed its eminence entirely to God.—The future (*I will give*) shows that the substitution mentioned in v. 3 did not relate merely to the past, but to the future also.—*Man* is here used collectively or indefinitely for *other men* or the rest of men, as in Judg. 16 : 7. Ps. 73 : 5. Job 31 : 33. Jer. 32 : 20. *Thy soul, life, or person*, seems to be an allusion to the usage of the same Hebrew word in the Law, with respect to enumeration or redemption. (See Ex. 12 : 4. Lev. 27 : 2.) The general terms of this clause make it wholly improbable that v. 3 has specific and exclusive reference to the nations named there.

V. 5. *Fear not, for I (am) with thee ; from the east will I make (or let) thy seed come, and from the west will I gather thee.* The reference of this verse to the restoration of the Jews from Babylon is not only arbitrary and without foundation, but forbidden by the mention of the west as well as the east. That it refers to any restoration is the more improbable, because the Prophet does not say *bring back* but simply *bring*.—The only interpretation which entirely suits the text and context, without supplying or assuming any thing beyond what is expressed, is that which makes the verse a promise to the church that she should be completed, that all her scattered members should be ultimately brought together. (Compare John 11 : 52. Rom. 3 : 29. 1 John 2 : 2.)—*Thy seed* has reference to Israel or Jacob as the ideal object of address.

V. 6. *I will say to the north, Give, and to the south, Withhold not. let my sons come from far, and my daughters from the end of the earth.* This is a poetical amplification of the promise in the foregoing verse. As it was there declared that God would bring and gather the whole seed of Israel, so here he represents himself as calling on the north and the south to execute his purpose. The feminine form of the verbs is explained by the rabbins on the ground that the address is to the north and south *wind*, as in Cant. 4 : 16. Gesenius makes the words themselves of common gender. Perhaps the case falls under the same general principle with names of countries, provinces, etc. which are uniformly feminine. Hitzig's suggestion that אָרְבָּנָה does not here mean *bring* but *suffer to come*, is favoured by the juxtaposition of *withhold not*.

V. 7. *Every one called by my name, and for my glory I have created him ; I have formed him, yea I have made him.* The construction is con-



tinued from the foregoing verse. My sons and my daughters, even every one called by my name. Augusti's construction, *Every one of them is called by my name*, is forbidden by the article.—The reflexive sense, *that calls himself*, implying profession rather than divine vocation, is wholly unnecessary and less agreeable to general usage.—*And I have created him* is a common Hebrew idiom equivalent to *whom I have created*.—The distinctions drawn by some between *created*, *formed*, and *made*, are more ingenious than well-founded. Thus Vitringa runs a parallel between the creation of matter out of nothing, its configuration, and the completion of its parts; the regeneration of the soul, its conformation to God's image, and its ultimate perfection. It seems to be rather an exhaustive accumulation of synonymous expressions.—*For my glory* is emphatic. God had not only made them what they were, but he had done it for his own sake, not for theirs. So likewise he now speaks of their being called by his name, as he did before of his calling them by their name, the latter denoting special designation, the former special authority and right.

V. 8. *He hath brought out the blind people, and there are eyes (to them); and the deaf, and (there are) ears to them.* The two clauses are so constructed as to supply one another's ellipsis. Most writers make הוציא imperative (*bring forth*) after the example of the Vulgate (*educ*). But as this form in thirty-five places is the praeter, and in thirty the infinitive, while the imperative without an augment always elsewhere takes the form הוצא, such an assumption is in the highest degree unsafe and precarious. Some more correctly make it the infinitive (*to bring forth*), which yields a good sense and is justified by the analogy of הוציא in 42: 20. The preterite construction, however, is not only simpler in itself, but agrees better with the וְ which follows, and which is usually found in affirmative propositions. The first verb may then be construed either with *Jehovah*, or with the subject of the preceding sentence, i. e. the chosen people or the individuals composing it, whose work or office is declared to be that of turning the heathen from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God. (Acts 26: 18.) A very different sense is put upon the verse by those interpreters who take הוציא as descriptive of the blind people (*that have eyes*), and apply it to the Jews, who in spite of their advantages were blind to spiritual objects. This agrees well with ch. 42: 19, 20, as explained above. But it then becomes difficult to understand in what sense they are said to be brought out. On this hypothesis the best explanation is that they are summoned to behold the demonstration of Jehovah's prescience, either as adverse parties or spectators. This would require the imperative construction of הוציא, the grammatical objections to which have been already stated. On the whole, the most satisfactory interpretation of the verse is that which

understands it as descriptive of the change wrought or to be wrought in the condition of mankind by Jehovah, through the agency of his people, whether the latter be expressly mentioned here or not. *He* (i. e. God, or Israel as his messenger) *hath brought out a people* (once) *blind, and (now) they have eyes, and (once) deaf, and (now) they have ears*, i. e. of course, seeing eyes and hearing ears. This agrees perfectly with all that goes before and follows with respect to the mission and vocation of God's people.

V. 9. *All the nations are gathered together, and the peoples are to be assembled. Who among them will declare this and let us hear the first things. Let them give (or produce) their witnesses and be justified; and (if they cannot do this) let them hear (my witnesses), and say, (It is) the truth.* The translation of the first verb, by Rosenmüller and others, as a future or imperative, is wholly unauthorized by usage, the cases cited to establish it being themselves of very doubtful import. At all events, it is incomparably safer and more satisfactory to retain the proper meaning when it yields a tolerable sense, than to proceed upon the strange assumption, that when a writer deliberately uses two distinct forms, he intended them to be received as one. Here the sense would seem to be, that the nations have been gathered, but that the process is not yet completed. This gathering of the nations has been commonly explained as a judicial metaphor like that in ch. 41:1. In that case the verse describes the heathen as assembled at the judgment-seat to plead their cause against Jehovah. This agrees well with the forensic terms employed in the subsequent context. It is possible, however, that this first clause may have been intended to describe not the process but the subject of adjudication. The gathering of the nations will then denote their accession to the church, as predicted in vs. 5-7; and *this*, in the next clause, will refer to the same event. Who among them (i. e. the nations) could have foretold their own change of condition? On the other supposition, *this* must either be indefinite, or mean the restoration of the Jews from exile, of which, as we have seen, there is no specific mention in the foregoing context. In either case, the usual alternative is offered, viz. that of pointing out some previous instance of foreknowledge and prediction.—The last clause admits of two constructions. It may either be read, let them be just (or candid) and hear and say it is the truth; or, let them be justified (by the witnesses whom they produce), and (if not) let them hear (my witnesses) and say, it is the truth. The latter seems more natural, because the other connects וְיִצְדְּקוּ not with its own part of the clause but with what follows. וְיִצְדְּקוּ is here equivalent to וְיִצְדְּקוּ in ch. 41:26.

V. 10. *Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, and my servant whom I have chosen, that ye may know and believe me, and may understand that I*

am He ; before me was not formed a god, and after me there shall not be. Some regard the heathen as the object of address in the first clause, and understand *my servant* as denoting Israel. But there is no consistent sense in which the former could be cited as witnesses against themselves ; and this application is besides forbidden by the obvious analogy of v. 12, where the same words are explicitly applied to Israel. Of those who correctly understand them so in this case likewise, the greater number refer *my servant* to a different subject, either Isaiah, or the Prophets as a class, or the Messiah. Ye (the Jews) are my witnesses, and (so is this) my servant. But the simplest and most natural construction of the sentence is to make *my servant* not a subject but a predicate. *Ye are my witnesses and (ye are) my servant whom I have chosen* (for this very purpose). The combination of the plural *witnesses* with the singular *servant*, although strange in itself, is in perfect agreement with the previous representations of Israel, both as a person and a body politic. On the other hypothesis, the relative clause, *that ye may know* etc., depends upon *witnesses*, and the words *whom I have chosen* form a pleonastic adjunct to the phrase *my servant*. But according to the explanation just proposed, *that ye may know* depends upon the words immediately preceding *whom I have chosen*, and the clause declares the purpose not only of the testimony here adduced, but of the election and vocation of his servant. The witness to whom God appeals is Israel, his servant, constituted such for the very end that he might know and understand and believe that of which all other nations were entirely ignorant, viz. that Jehovah was He, i. e. the being in question, *the only wise God*, the only infallible foreteller of futurity.—Various attempts have been made to explain away the singular expression, *there was no god formed before me*, as a solecism, or at least an inaccuracy of expression ; whereas nothing else could have conveyed the writer's meaning in a form at once sarcastic, argumentative, and graphic. Instead of saying, in a bald prosaic form, all other gods are the work of men's hands, but I am uncreated and exist from all eternity, he condenses all into the pregnant declaration, *there was no god manufactured before me*, i. e. all other gods were made, but none of them was made before I had a being. There is not even such an incongruity of form as some suppose,—a notion resting on the false assumption that *before me* must in this connexion mean *before I was formed*, whereas it only means *before I existed*, just as the parallel phrase *after me* does not mean *after I am formed*, but *after I shall cease to exist*. The sarcasm is rendered still more pungent by the use of the divine name  $\text{יהוה}$ , thus bringing into the most revolting contrast the pretended divinity of idols and their impotence ; as if he had said, none of these almighty gods were made before I had a being.— $\text{עֲשֵׂה}$  is properly a passive participle used as a noun, like the Latin *dictum*, and exclusively applied to divine communications.

V. 11. *I, I, Jehovah, and besides me (or apart from me) there is no Saviour.* In the first clause we may simply supply *am*, as in the English and most other versions, or *am He* from the preceding verse, and in the sense there explained. The exclusive honour here claimed is not merely that of infallible foreknowledge, but of infinite power. Jehovah was able not only to foretell the salvation of his people, but to save them. These terms are not to be restricted, if applied at all directly, to the final salvation of individual believers. There is evident allusion to the deliverance of Israel as a people from external sufferings or dangers, of which one signal instance is referred to in v. 14 and another in v. 16. At the same time, the doctrine here propounded, or the character ascribed to God, affords a sure foundation for the personal trust of all who have really a place among his people.

V. 12. *I have told and have saved and have declared (or let you hear beforehand), and there is not among you (any) stranger; and ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, and I (am) God.* Having laid claim successively to divine prescience and power, he here combines the two, and represents himself both as the foreteller and the giver of salvation. The expression of the first idea twice, before and after the expression of the other, does not seem to have any special meaning, as some interpreters imagine, except so far as it gives special prominence to the divine omniscience and the proof of it afforded in prediction, as the evidence of deity which he had particularly urged before, and which he is about to urge again.—The emphatic insertion of the pronoun *I* at the beginning of the verse can only be expressed in English by a circumlocution, *it is I that have told* etc.—Vittinga and Rosenmüller omit the substantive verb in the last member of the first clause as superfluous, and construe the words thus, *I have declared and no strange (god) among you*, i. e. no strange god declared it. But in that case, Hebrew usage would require  $\text{לֹא}$  instead of  $\text{אֵין}$ , which is not an adverb of negation, but an idiomatic equivalent to the negative verb of existence, and can only mean *there is not* or *there was not*. Most of the modern writers refer it to past time, and explain the clause as an assertion that the prophecies in question were uttered at a time when idolatry did not prevail in Israel. It is more agreeable, however, both to usage and the context, to translate it in the present, as a declaration that Jehovah was the only God whom they had reason to acknowledge, from their own experience and observation.— $\text{אֵין}$ , which is a common term for *stranger*, used in reference to men, may be here considered an ellipsis for the full phrase  $\text{אֵין לֵאלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים}$ , which is not uncommon elsewhere.

V. 13. *Also (or even) from the day I am He, and there is no one freeing from my hand; I will do, and who will undo it?* The assonance in the

last clause is not in the original, which literally means, *I will act* (or *make*), *and who will cause it to return*, i. e. reverse or nullify it? The interrogative form implies negation. A similar expression of the same idea is found in ch. 14 : 27. What is said specifically in the first clause of delivering from Jehovah's power, is extended in the last to all counteraction or reversal of his acts. The  $\text{עַל}$  at the beginning indicates a climax not only now, or on any occasion, but  $\text{עַל־עַל־עַל}$ . This last is understood by some as referring to a specific *terminus a quo*, such as the origin of Israel as a nation, the exodus, etc. Others make it indefinite, *of old* or *long since*. But the best interpreters explain it as meaning since the first day, or since time began. The words are then universal, both in the extent of power claimed, and in relation to the time of its execution. Over every object and in every age the power of Jehovah had been clearly proved to be supreme and absolute.

V. 14. *Thus saith Jehovah, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down (or made to descend) fugitives all of them; and the Chaldeans, in the ships their shout (or song).* This is a particular instance of the general protection vouchsafed by Jehovah to his people, and more especially of that providential substitution or redemption, of which we read above in vs. 3, 4. The inference before drawn from the general terms of v. 4, that the nations mentioned in v. 3 are only representatives or samples, is confirmed by this explicit mention of the fall of Babylon as an example of the same great truth.—The titles added to Jehovah's name are not mere expletives or words of course, but intimate that he would bring this great event to pass in his distinctive character as the Redeemer and the Holy One of Israel.—From the past tense of the verb (*I have sent*) some infer that this verse was written after the event, while others endeavour to avoid this conclusion by translating it as future (*I will send*). One of these inferences is just as groundless as the other. The event, although still future to the writer, is described as past, in reference not only to the purposes of God, but also the perceptions of the Prophet. As presented to his view by the prophetic inspiration, the destruction of Babylon was just as truly a historical event as that of Pharaoh and his host. This is what is meant by the *praeteritum propheticum*, to render which as future is a wanton violation of the form of the original and a gratuitous confounding of the text and comment.—The Targum strangely understands this clause as referring not to the downfall of the Babylonians but to the deportation of the Jews. *Behold, on account of your sins I sent (you) to Babylon.* But this agrees neither with the usage of  $\text{לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  nor with the meaning of the other clause. Interpreters are commonly agreed that the object of the verb is Cyrus or the Medes and Persians.—From the earliest times  $\text{בְּרִיחֵיהֶם}$  has received a twofold explanation, viz.

that of *fugitives*, as in the Septuagint, and that of *bars*, as in the Vulgate. The same question arises in the exposition of ch. 15 : 5. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 305.) But there the pointing favours the last sense, whereas here it seems to recommend the other. Of those who prefer the meaning *bars* even here, some suppose a literal allusion to the gates of Babylon, others a figurative one to its protectors. The other sense of *fugitives* is applicable either to the Babylonians themselves, or to the foreigners resident among them. (See ch. 13 : 14, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 256.)  $\text{בְּרֵשֶׁת}$  is the proper name of the foreign race by which Babylonia had been occupied before Isaiah wrote. (See ch. 23 : 13, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 411.) It is an interesting fact, that recent etymological research has identified the  $\text{בְּרֵשֶׁת}$  of the Hebrew ethnography, not only with the *Καλδαῖοι* of the Greeks, but with the *Kurds* of modern Asia. Here, however, they are mentioned simply as the inhabitants of Babylonia.—The last two words are variously construed and explained. Some connect them only with what goes before, as a description of the Chaldeans, *whose cry is in the ships*, implying their devotion to nautical pursuits; or, *whose shout* (or *song*) *was in the ships*, implying their habitual use of ships or boats for pleasure. The same idea is otherwise expressed by those who read *in the ships of their joyful cry* (i. e. their pleasure-ships). On this, which is Gesenius's interpretation, Hitzig observes, with a play upon words which cannot be retained in a translation, that the pleasure-ships are air-ships (*die Lustschiffe sind Luftschiffe*) i. e. imaginary or fictitious. The same thing has been said of the naval or maritime activity of Babylon; but Lowth has made it probable at least, that it really existed in very early times.—Another construction of these closing words connects them with  $\text{הוֹרְדָהּ}$ , 'and brought down the Chaldees into the ships of their triumph or delight.' Hitzig makes  $\text{אֲנִיחָא}$  the plural of  $\text{אֲנִיחָא}$  (ch. 29 : 2), and understands the clause to mean that God had brought down the rejoicing of the Chaldeans into lamentations. But this requires a different pointing of  $\text{אֲנִיחָא}$  from the one attested by the critical tradition of the Jews, and a very harsh construction of  $\text{בְּשִׁירִים}$ . Hitzig's construction is adopted by Ewald, who moreover changes  $\text{בְּרֵשֶׁת}$  into  $\text{בְּצִיִּיחִים}$  (their harp or music into groans), on the authority (as he affirms) of Zeph. 1 : 14 and Job 30 : 31. Either of the old interpretations, whether that which makes the clause descriptive of the Chaldees or of their destruction, yields a better sense, without the arbitrary violence of these pretended emendations.

V. 15. *I Jehovah, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King.* This verse may possibly have been intended merely to identify the subject of the one before it. *I sent to Babylon etc. even I, Jehovah, your Holy One etc.* It is simpler, however, and more in accordance with the usage

of the language to make this a distinct proposition by supplying the verb of existence. *I am Jehovah*, or, *I Jehovah am your Holy One* etc., or, *I Jehovah, your Holy One, am the Creator of Israel, your King*. Even in this case, the event predicted in v. 14 is referred to, as the proof of his being what he here asserts.

V. 16. *Thus saith Jehovah, the (one) giving in the sea a way, and in mighty waters a path*. As the participle is very commonly employed in Hebrew to denote continued and habitual action, this verse might be regarded as a general description of God's usual control of the elements and conquest of all difficulties. But the terms of the next verse, and the subsequent contrast between old and new deliverances, have led most interpreters to understand this likewise as an allusion to the passage of the Red Sea.—Some, however, follow Aben Ezra in applying the words to the passage of the Euphrates by Cyrus, a gratuitous departure from the strict and customary sense of *sea*.— $\text{יָצַד}$ , besides its etymological meaning *strong* or *mighty*, suggests the idea of impetuous, violent, and fierce.

V. 17. *The (one) bringing out chariot and horse, force and strong; together they shall lie, they shall not rise; they are extinct, like tow (or like a wick) they are quenched*.  $\text{יָצַד}$  is properly an adjective and may be understood as qualifying  $\text{הַיָּד}$ , a *force and* (i. e. even) *a strong one*. Some however regard it as indefinite or abstract (*strong for strength*) and an equivalent or parallel to  $\text{הַיָּד}$ . Some suppose a new sentence to begin with this verse, and make  $\text{הַיָּד וְהַיָּד}$  collective: those bringing out the chariot and the horse, shall lie together, they shall not rise etc. But most interpreters continue the construction from the foregoing verse, and make the first word agree directly with *Jehovah*. Of these, however, some understand the verse as having reference to a naval victory of Cyrus over the Chaldeans, others as relating to the destruction of Pharaoh and his host. It is no objection to the latter that  $\text{יָצַד}$  is future, as this verb denotes not merely the act of lying down, but the state of lying still, and is therefore a poetical equivalent and parallel to *shall not rise*. That something long past is intended, may be gathered from the exhortation of the next verse.

V. 18. *Remember not former things, and old things consider not*. As if he had said, why should I refer to ancient instances of God's almighty intervention in behalf of his people, when others equally remarkable are yet to come? Some refer this to the advent of Christ, but most to the fall of Babylon and restoration of the Jews from exile. The necessity of this specific application by no means follows from the express mention of that event in v. 14; because, as we have seen, it is there introduced as a single

illustration or example of a general truth, which had before been stated, and which may possibly be here repeated. This supposition is at least sufficient to meet all the requisitions of the text and context.

V. 19. *Behold I (am) doing (something) new, it is now (or yet) to sprout (or germinate); do you not know it? Yes, I will place in the wilderness a way, in the desert streams.* The *now* does not necessarily denote a proximate futurity, but only that the thing is yet to happen, or in other words, that it is something *new*, as distinguished from all former instances. As if he had said, it is still future. The figure of germination implies that as yet there was no appearance of the final issue. (See the same expression in ch. 42: 9.) *Do you not know it*, i. e. know what it is? Or, *will you not know it*, i. e. are you not willing to be convinced? Or, *shall you not know it*, i. e. is not the event to be attested by your own experience?—The ~~עס~~ may be regarded as equivalent to *yea, yes*, or as indicating something more than had as yet been experienced. Not content with having made a way through the sea, he would make one through the desert. Now as this is really a less extraordinary act of power than the other, it would seem to favour the opinion, that v. 16 and the one before us do not relate indefinitely to the exhibition of Jehovah's omnipotence, but specifically to the exodus from Egypt and the restoration of the Jews from exile. Even on this hypothesis, however, the terms of this verse must be understood not as a description of the literal return, but as a figurative representation of deliverance and relief, whereas v. 16 describes a literal deliverance. On the whole, therefore, it is best to take both verses as strong metaphorical descriptions of deliverance from suffering and danger by a direct divine interposition. Even supposing an allusion to the literal journey through the desert, what is said of rivers must be figurative, which makes it probable that the whole sentence is of the same description. Thus understood, the Prophet's language means that God could change the face of nature and control the angry elements in favour of his people; that he had so done in time past, and would again do so in time to come.

V. 20. *The living creature of the field shall honour me, jackals (or wolves) and ostriches; because I have given in the wilderness waters, and streams in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen.* The change is further described by representing the irrational inmates of the desert as rejoicing in its irrigation. This bold conception makes it still more evident that what precedes does not relate to the literal journey of a people through a literal desert.—As the first phrase seems to be a general one, including the two species afterwards mentioned, the translation *beast* is too restricted, and should give way to that which is etymologically most exact, viz. ζῷον.



*animal*, or living creature. The form is singular, the sense collective. The two species represent the whole class of animals inhabiting the wilderness. (Compare ch. 13: 21, 22.) The common version of the last words of this verse is the correct one. *My chosen people* would be otherwise expressed. To the simple designation of *my people*, he adds, by a kind of afterthought, *my chosen or elect*.

V. 21. *The people (or this people) I have formed for myself; my praise shall they recount (or they are to recount my praise.)* Another declaration of the end for which Israel existed as a nation. This brings us back to the main proposition of the chapter, namely, that Jehovah had not only made them what they were, but had made them for the purpose of promoting his own glory, so that any claim of merit upon their part, and any apprehension of entire destruction, must be equally unfounded.

V. 22. *And not me hast thou called, oh Jacob; for thou hast been weary of me, oh Israel.* Interpreters, almost without exception, give פָּרַעְתָּ here the sense of called upon, invoked, or worshipped. There is much, however, to be said in favour of the sense attached to it by J. H. Michaelis, namely, *thou hast not called me, I have called thee*; as our Saviour says to his disciples, *ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you.* (John 15: 16.) Having thus far represented the vocation of Israel as a sovereign act on God's part, he now presents the converse of the same proposition. This construction is further recommended by its accounting for the unusual position of the words at the beginning of the verse, without resorting to the arbitrary supposition that it is characteristic of a later age than that of Isaiah: q. d. *it is not I that have been called by you.*—According to the usual construction of the first clause, the second may be rendered either *when* or *because* thou wast weary of me. The common version of the פָּרַעְתָּ as meaning *but*, and Gesenius's unnatural construction *thou hast not called upon me so as to be troubled with me*, although very different, are equally gratuitous.—It is not easy to determine whether labour or fatigue is the primary meaning of פָּרַעְתָּ. Sometimes the one idea is more prominent, sometimes the other. In this case both would naturally be suggested, as in the following paraphrase: It is not I that have been called by thee; for so far from manifesting such a preference, thou hast been wearied and disgusted with the labour which attends my service. The indirect construction, that thou shouldst be weary of me, is only admissible in case of extreme exegetical necessity.

V. 23. *Thou hast not brought to me the sheep of thy burnt-offering, and (with) thy sacrifices thou hast not honoured me. I have not made thee serve with oblation, and I have not made thee labour (or wearied thee) with*

*incense*. The whole Mosaic ritual is here represented by an enumeration of some of the principal offerings; the *olah* or general expiation, the *zebahim* or animal sacrifices in general, the *minhah* or meal-offering, and the *lebonah* or aromatic fumigation.—כִּזְבֵּחַ includes the goat as well as the sheep, and is therefore correctly rendered in the English Version by the phrase *small cattle*.—Of the whole verse there are several distinct interpretations or rather applications. Some place the emphasis upon the pronouns. It is not to me that thou hast offered all this, but to idols. This, though a possible construction, is not the one most readily suggested by the words. Nor is it easy, upon this supposition, to account for the total want of any distinct reference to idols in the context. Another class of writers understand the passage strictly as charging the Jews with culpable neglect of the ceremonial law. But of this they were not generally guilty; and the restriction of the charge to the reign of Ahaz or to any other limited period is gratuitous, and hardly consistent with the general expressions of the context. A third hypothesis applies the passage to the unavoidable suspension of the ceremonial service during the captivity in Babylon, which it supposes to be here urged as a proof that the deliverance of Israel from exile was an act of mercy, not of righteous retribution for their national obedience and fidelity. This explanation, although much more plausible than either of the others, is open to the same charge of gratuitous restriction, without any thing to indicate it in the text or context. It may also be objected, that the error thus supposed to be refuted by the Prophet, is one which could not possibly be entertained; for how could the exiled Jews imagine that their liberty was bought by services which not only had not been but could not have been rendered? If it be said that this is merely a specific illustration of the general truth that they were not saved by any merit of their own, it still remains incredible that this truth should have been exemplified by reference not to a real case but to one wholly imaginary and impossible. How much more natural and satisfactory to give the words the general and unrestricted meaning which they naturally bear as a description of the people's conduct, not at one time or at one place, but throughout their history. The last clause is by some understood to mean, that the system imposed upon the people was not burdensome. But this is consistent neither with the circumstances of the case, nor with the statements of the New Testament respecting them (Acts 15 : 10. Gal. 5 : 1), nor with the parallel clause, in which it is simply said that Israel had not offered what was due. The most satisfactory interpretation of the verse, and that which best agrees with the whole context, is, that it has reference not merely to the outward or material act, but to its moral value and effect. You have not so performed your ceremonial duties as to lay me under any obligation to protect you. You have not really given me your cattle, you have not truly honoured me with sacri-

fices. The best explanation of the last clause is, I have not succeeded in inducing you to serve me, I have not prevailed upon you to exert yourselves, much less wearied or exhausted you in ceremonial services.

V. 24. *Thou hast not bought for me sweet cane with money, and (with) the fat of thy sacrifices thou hast not drenched me; thou hast only made me serve with thy sins, and made me toil (or wearied me) with thine iniquities.* According to Jarchi, the sweet or aromatic cane is mentioned as a common product of the Holy Land, which they were consequently not obliged to purchase in order to the preparation of the holy ointment. (Ex. 30 : 23.) But Kimchi and most other writers proceed upon the contrary assumption, that this cane was an exotic, which could only be procured with trouble and expense. This particular is mentioned, like the others with which it stands connected, as a specimen or sample of the whole congeries of ceremonial services. The antithesis between the clauses seems to show that the idea meant to be conveyed in this whole context is, that their external services were nullified by sin. So far from being satisfied or pleased with what they offered, God was only vexed with their transgressions and neglects.

V. 25. *I, I am he blotting out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and thy sins I will not remember.* This is the conclusion to which all that goes before was meant to lead, to wit, that God's goodness to his people is gratuitous. If they, instead of choosing God and his service, were averse to both,—if, instead of pleasing him by their attentions, they had grieved him by their sins,—it follows of course that he could still show them favour only by gratuitously blotting out their sins from his remembrance, or in other words, freely forgiving them.

V. 26. *Remind me; let us plead together (or judge one another); state (thy case) that thou mayest be justified.* After asserting, in the foregoing verse, the total want of merit in the people and their dependence upon God's gratuitous compassion, he now, as it were, allows them to disprove his allegation, by reminding him of some forgotten merit on their part. The badness of their case could not have been more strongly or sarcastically stated than in this ironical invitation to plead their own cause and establish their own rights if they could, with a tacit condition, not expressed but implied, that if they could not justify themselves in this way, they should submit to the righteousness of God and consent to be justified by grace.

V. 27. *Thy first father sinned, and thy interpreters rebelled against me.* Gesenius and some others give the first words a collective sense, as signifying

either the succession of priests or ancestors in general. The older writers, for the most part, give the singular its strict sense, and apply it either to Ahaz or Manasseh, as kings and therefore bound to be the fathers of their people, or to Abraham as the progenitor of Israel, or to Adam as the father of the human race. Vitringa even makes it mean Uriah, the unfaithful high priest in the reign of Ahaz. This and the first interpretation mentioned are entirely arbitrary. That which understands the phrase of Abraham is supposed by some to be at variance with the uniform mention of that patriarch in terms of commendation. But these terms are perfectly consistent with the proposition that *he was a sinner*, which may here be the exact sense of אֲשֶׁר. To the application of the phrase to Adam it has been objected, that he was not peculiarly the father of the Jews. To this it may be answered, that if the guilt of the national progenitor would prove the point in question, much more would it be established by the fact of their belonging to a guilty race. At the same time it may be considered as implied, that all their fathers who had since lived shared in the original depravity, and thus the same sense is obtained that would have been expressed by the collective explanation of *first father*, while the latter is still taken in its strict and full sense as denoting the progenitor of all mankind.—*Interpreters*, or organs of communication, is a title given elsewhere to ambassadors (2 Chr. 32 : 31) and to an interceding angel (Job 33 : 23). It here denotes all those who, under the theocracy, acted as organs of communication between God and the people, whether prophets, priests, or rulers. The idea, therefore, is the same so often expressed elsewhere, that the people, and especially their leaders, were unfaithful and rebellious.

V. 28. *And I will profane the holy chiefs, and will give up Jacob to the curse and Israel to reproaches.* The character just given of the people in all ages is urged not only as a proof that God's compassion must be perfectly gratuitous, but also as a reason for the strokes which they experienced. The *vav* before the first verb is not conversive but conjunctive, so that the reference is entirely to the future, or to the universal present, as explained by Kimchi, who observes that *vav* has *pattah* because it does not express past time; but the sense is, that in all ages God profanes the holy chiefs. This last phrase is descriptive of the same persons called *interpreters* in v. 27, namely, all the official representatives and leaders of the holy (i. e. consecrated and peculiar) people. Its specific application to the priests in 1 Chr. 24 : 5 no more proves that this is its whole meaning, than it proves that אֲשֶׁר־אֵלֹהִים always means religious officers. The name includes the priests, no doubt, but it includes much more.

## CHAPTER XLIV.

THIS chapter opens, like the fortieth and forty-third, with cheering promises to Israel, followed by reasons for confiding in them, drawn from the wisdom, power, and goodness of Jehovah.

The specific promise, which constitutes the theme or basis of the prophecy, is that of abundant spiritual influences and their fruits, not only internal prosperity, but large accessions from without, vs. 1-5.—The pledge for the fulfilment of this promise is afforded by the proofs of God's omniscience, as contrasted with all other gods, vs. 6-9.—The folly of image-worship is then established by two arguments. The first is that idols are themselves the creatures of mere men, vs. 10-14. The other is that they are not only made, and made by man, but made of the very same materials applied to the most trivial domestic uses, vs. 15-20.—From this demonstration of the power of Jehovah to perform his promise we are now brought back to the promise itself, vs. 21-24. This is again confirmed by an appeal to God's creative power, and illustrated by the raising up of Cyrus as a deliverer to Israel, vs. 25-28.

Here again it is important to the just interpretation of the passage that we keep in view the true relation which the main theme (the safety and prosperity of Israel) bears to the arguments and illustrations drawn from God's foreknowledge as established by prediction, from the impotence of idols, and the raising up of Cyrus. Through all these varied forms of promise and of reasoning there runs a thread uniting them, and this thread is the doctrine of the church, its origin, its design, and its relation to its Head and to the world around it.

V. 1. *And now hear, Jacob my servant, and Israel I have chosen him* (i. e. whom I have chosen). The transition here is the same as at the opening of the foregoing chapter, and the *now*, as there, has rather a logical than a temporal meaning. For reasons which have been already given, there is no need of supposing that a different Israel is here addressed (Cocceius), viz. the penitent believing Jews in exile (Grotius); or a different period referred to, namely, that succeeding the calamities before described; nor even that the *and* is here equivalent to *notwithstanding*, as explained by Kimchi. It is simply a resumption and continuation of the Prophet's argument, intended to exhibit the true relation between God and his people.

The election here affirmed, which Calvin understands directly of a personal election from eternity, is better explained by J. H. Michaelis as the choice and separation of the church, or God's peculiar people, from the rest of men.

V. 2. *Thus saith Jehovah, thy maker and thy former from the womb will help thee ; fear not, my servant Jacob, and Jeshurun whom I have chosen.* It has been a subject of dispute among interpreters, whether יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ought to be connected with יְהוָה יֵצֵר (as it is in the Septuagint and by the rabbins), or with יְהוָה יֵצֵר (as in the Targum and the Vulgate). The masoretic accents are in favour of the first construction ; but Gesenius rejects it as not yielding a good sense, and reads, *who helped thee from the womb.* But this translation of the future as a praeter is entirely gratuitous, and therefore ungrammatical. The simplest construction is to make the words of Jehovah begin with *thy maker*, the transition from the third to the first person being altogether natural and one of perpetual occurrence in Isaiah. *Thy maker will help thee* is equivalent to *I, who am thy maker, will help thee.* But even on the common supposition, that the words of God begin with the second clause, it is better to take *he will help thee* as a short independent clause, parenthetically thrown in to complete the description or to connect it with what follows. *Thus saith thy maker and thy former from the womb—he will help thee—Fear not* etc. As to the combination *maker from the womb*, it can seem incongruous only to a hypercritical grammarian ; so that there is no need even of adopting J. H. Michaelis's suggestion, that יְהוָה יֵצֵר means *ex quo in utero esse coepisti.* The use of these expressions in addressing Israel only shows that the conception present to the writer's mind is that of an individual man. Although the specific explanation of the figures here used has been sometimes pushed too far, there can be no doubt that the maturing of Israel as a nation in Egypt is often represented as a period of gestation, and the exodus as a birth ; but whether there is any such allusion here, may be considered doubtful.—*Jeshurun* occurs only here and in Deut. 32 : 15. 33 : 5, 26. Some of the old attempts to ascertain its etymology were ludicrous enough. Thus Vitranga quotes Forster as deriving it from אֵרֶץ *an ox*, and Cocceius from יֵצֵרֵם *they shall see*, i. e. the people who should see Christ in the flesh, *quod nemo dixerit non esse hyperbolicum et remotum* (Vitranga). Grotius's derivation of the word from יֵצֵרֵם is a philological impossibility ; but his explanation of it as a diminutive or term of endearment is now commonly adopted, but with reference to the root יָצַר *upright*, as an epithet of Israel, not “in consideration of their entire abandonment of idolatry,” as Henderson supposes, but in reference to their normal or ideal character, the end for which they were created, and the aspect which they ought to have exhibited. Hengstenberg gives the same sense to the word as a proper name, but not as a diminutive or term of endearment, which he

rejects as unsustained by etymological analogy and wholly inappropriate in the places where it is originally used. (See his *History and Prophecies of Balaam*, pp. 98–101.) The word is rendered, as a general expression of endearment, by the Septuagint (*ἡγαπημένος*), and with closer adherence to the etymology by the other Greek versions (*ἐνθὺς, ἐνθὺτατος*). The diminutive form is imitated in Latin by Gesenius (*rectulus, justulus*), and in German by Hitzig and Ewald (*Frömmchen*). Rosenmüller's version (*fortunate*) is supported only by the false analogy of פְּרָצָה as denoting good luck or prosperity.

V. 3. *For I will pour waters on the thirsty, and flowing (waters) on the dry (land); I will pour my spirit on thy seed, and my blessing on thine offspring.* This is the grand reason why God's people should not despair. The two clauses explain each other, the *water* of the first being clearly identical with the *spirit* of the second. This is a common figure for influences from above. (See ch. 32:15. Ez. 34:26. Mal. 3:10.) Knobel indeed understands the two clauses strictly and distinctly, taking the first as a promise to the land, and the second as a promise to the people. But אֲנִי most probably refers to persons, as it is not feminine like הַמַּיִם. Grotius understands this as a promise to send prophets to the Jews in exile, such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi! Gesenius also seems to think the promise here made strictly coincident with that in Joel 3:1, 2. But it is more extensive, and includes all the influences of the Holy Spirit.—The *offspring* of the people, as distinguished from itself, is supposed by Knobel to denote the individuals of whom the aggregate body was composed. Jarcli and Vitranga apply it to the strangers or proselytes who were to be added by conversion to the natural Israel. The simplest and most obvious interpretation is, that the ideal object of address is Jacob as the national progenitor, and that the Jews themselves are here described as his descendants. Even this, however, does not necessarily exclude the spiritual offspring of the patriarch, who are explicitly referred to in the context.

V. 4. *And they shall spring up in the midst of the grass, like willows on (or by) the water-courses.* This verse describes the effect of the irrigation and effusion promised in the one before it. There is no need, however, of making the construction a subjunctive one (*so that they shall spring up*), as Luther and some later writers do.—The subject of the verb is not the spirit and blessing of Jehovah, as Aben Ezra strangely imagines, but the offspring or descendants of Israel, by whom the blessing was to be experienced.—Lowth and Ewald read מִבְּרֵיחַ הַמַּיִם קָמְרוּ, *like grass amidst the water*, on the authority of the Septuagint version (*ὡς ἀραιέσσον ὑδατος ῥότος*), which seems, however,

to be simply a paraphrase or free translation. Gesenius retains the comparative form of expression (*as among*), but without a change of text, by making the participle itself comparative, an idiom of which there is no clear example elsewhere. All these expedients are intended to remove the imaginary solecism *in between*. But the true explanation has been long since given by Vittinga, namely, that  $\text{בין}$  has here its primitive and proper use, as a noun corresponding to the English *midst*. So far is the common text from being incorrect or irregular, that it is really the only form in which the idea could have been expressed, since  $\text{בין}$  as a preposition always means *between* or *among*, and is followed by a plural noun. When, on the contrary, a singular noun is to be used, as here, the Hebrew idiom prefixes not the preposition but a noun meaning *midst* ( $\text{בין}$  or  $\text{בין}$ ) with a participle before it.—The grass and the willows are separated only by the rhythmical arrangement of the sentence. The simple meaning of the whole verse is, that they shall grow as willows grow among the grass, i. e. in a moist or marshy spot. The question who are meant by the grass as distinguished from the willows, is absurd. It might as well be asked, when an object is compared to the rose of Sharon, what is meant by Sharon as distinguished from the rose. Lowth seems to look upon *aqueducts* as more poetical and better English than the common version, *water-courses*.

V. 5. *This shall say, To Jehovah I (belong); and this shall call on (or by) the name of Jacob; and this shall inscribe his hand (or with his hand), To Jehovah, and with the name of Israel shall entitle.* The repetition of the pronoun *this* implies, according to Kimchi's explanation, persons of various classes or from different quarters. It is commonly agreed that this verse predicts the accession of the gentiles, whom it represents as publicly professing their allegiance to Jehovah and attachment to his people. The act of calling one by name, and that of calling on his name (invoking him), are intimately blended in the Hebrew usage. Most interpreters understand it here as meaning to praise or celebrate. Some of the older writers follow Symmachus in giving it a passive sense (*this shall be called*), either reading  $\text{אֵלֶיךָ}$  for  $\text{אֵלֶיךָ}$ , or supplying the reflexive pronoun after it. The same diversity exists in reference to the last verb in the sentence,  $\text{יִשְׁמְעֶנּוּ}$ , which some understand to mean *he shall surname himself (or be surnamed)*, others he shall name the name of Jacob in a flattering or respectful manner.—Of the intermediate clause there are two ancient explanations, one of which makes it mean *he shall write (with) his hand*, in allusion to the signing of contracts (Jer. 32:10. Neh. 9:38); the other, *he shall write upon (inscribe) his hand*, in allusion to the ancient custom, mentioned by Procopius, of marking soldiers, slaves, and other dependents, with the name of their superior, to



which there seems to be a reference in Ex. 13:9 and Rev. 13:16. This last sense is supposed to be expressed in the Septuagint version (*ἐπιγράφει χειρὶ*).

V. 6. *Thus saith Jehovah, king of Israel, and his redeemer, Jehovah of Hosts: I (am) first, and I (am) last, and without me there is no God.* This is a description of the God whom the nations, in the preceding verse, are represented as acknowledging. The attributes ascribed to him afford, at the same time, a sufficient reason for confiding in his promises. In like manner Zeus, the supreme god of the Greeks, is described by Orpheus as being *ἀρχὴ πάντων πάντων τε τελετή*, and in another place, *Ζεὺς πρῶτος ἐγένετο Ζεὺς ἕσχατος*. Henderson points out the appropriation of the terms here used to the Lord Jesus Christ in Rev. 1:18. 2:8. 22:13.—There is no need of giving to *בְּלִבִּי*, in this and the parallel places, the restricted sense *besides*, which is really included in the usual and strict sense of *without*, i. e. without my knowledge and permission, or without subjection to my sovereign authority. The meaning is not simply, that there is no other true God in existence, but that even the *λεγόμενοι θεοὶ* (1 Cor. 8:5) exist only by his sufferance, and cannot therefore be his equals or competitors.

V. 7. *And who, like me, will call, and tell it, and state it to me, since I placed the ancient people; and coming things and things which are to come will tell to them (or for themselves)?* There is no reason why the interrogation should not be considered as extending through the verse, the rather as a different construction splits the sentence into several, and arbitrarily explains some of the futures as imperatives. Still more objectionable is the construction of *קָרָא* as a preterite, which is given by all the later writers except Ewald. The question *who has called like me* is in no respect more pertinent than the question, *who will (or can) call as I have done*, which leaves the reference to past time equally explicit, without doing any grammatical violence to the form of expression. The usual construction of the next words is, *let him tell it* etc.; but this imperative meaning is sufficiently implied in the strict translation of the words as interrogative futures, *who will tell it* etc. *קָרָא* is to call aloud or publicly announce. It differs from the next verb, if at all, by denoting an authoritative call, and suggesting the idea not only of prediction but of creation.—*יְדַבֵּר* is correctly explained by Gesenius as a forensic term meaning *to state a case*. The sense of *comparing*, preferred by Ewald, is less frequent elsewhere and less appropriate here. The words *since I placed* etc. are to be connected with *יְדַבֵּר*, *who can call, as I have done, ever since I placed* etc. To place is here to constitute, create, or give existence. Of the phrase *יְדַבֵּר* there are three interpretations. The

first is that of the rabbins, who explain it to mean *ancient people*; this is retained in the English and some other versions. The second makes it mean *eternal people*, but refers it simply to the divine purpose or decree of election. The third gives it the sense of *everlasting people*, i. e. a people who shall last for ever. In all these senses the description is appropriate to Israel, not simply as a nation but a church, the existence and prerogatives of which are still continued in the body of Christ. *Ecclesia corpus Christi est, quo nihil antiquius aut majus esse potest* (Calvin). It may be doubted, however, whether any thing more was here intended than a reference to the origin of the human race. (See above, on ch. 42: 5, 6.)—According to Kimchi, Grotius, and Vitranga, the last clause contains a distinct reference both to a proximate and remote futurity. This distinction is rejected by Gesenius, without any other reason than the groundless one that synonymes are characteristic of *this writer*, i. e. the writer of these later prophecies, as distinguished from the genuine Isaiah. But this is, to some extent, characteristic not of one but of all the Hebrew writers, and abundant illustration might be drawn from the earlier and even from the undisputed passages. The truth, however, is that the distinction made by Kimchi is so natural and simple, and agrees so well with the context and analogy, that it would be entitled to consideration, even if the two forms of expression in themselves appeared to be entirely synonymous. Much more, when such a difference is indicated by the very form. Not only are two different verbs used,—which might be otherwise explained, and by itself can have no weight,—but one is in the participial form, the clearest mode in Hebrew of expressing present action or a proximate futurity, the other in the future proper. Wherever there is a difference of form, there is presumptively a difference of meaning; and if any such difference is here intended, it can only be the difference between things actually *coming* to pass now, and those which are to come to pass hereafter.

V. 8. *Quake not and fear not; have I not since then let thee hear and told (thee), and are ye not my witnesses? Is there a God without me? And there is no rock, I know not (any).* The alternation of the singular and plural form in reference to Israel, is peculiarly appropriate to an ideal or collective person, and in strict agreement with the usage of the Pentateuch, especially with that of Deuteronomy, in which the same apparent confusion of numbers is not a mere occasional phenomenon, but one of perpetual occurrence.—The verb *תִּדְבַר*, which occurs only here, is derived by Hitzig from *דָּבַר*, by Gesenius from *דָּבַר*, and explained by Ewald as an error of the text for *תִּדְבַר*. It is more probably to be derived from the synonymous and cognate *דָּבַר*.—*בְּזָמַן* is usually taken in the vague sense of *long ago*; but

it may here be strictly understood as meaning *since that time*, which Jarch refers to the giving of the law on Sinai, Knobel to the first appearance of Cyrus, and Maurer, with more probability than either, to the event mentioned in the preceding verse, viz. the constitution of the  $\text{עֵדוּת}$ .—*And ye are my witnesses* is usually construed as an independent clause; but a possible construction is to include it in the question as above.—Viringa's explanation of  $\text{וְיִשְׁאַל}$  as an interrogative particle is any thing but justified by the analogy of 1 Sam. 22:8, to which he appeals.—Here, as in many other cases, God is called a Rock, as being the refuge of his people, and the firm foundation of their hopes.

V. 9. *The image-carvers all of them are vanity, and their desired (or beloved) ones are worthless; and their witnesses themselves will not see and will not know, that they may be ashamed.* Having fortified his promise by a solemn affirmation of his own supremacy, in contrast with the ignorance and impotence of idols, he now carries out this contrast in detail.—The literal meaning of the first phrase is *the formers of a graven image*, here put for idols in general.—*Vanity* is here to be taken as a negative expression of the strongest kind, denoting the absence of all life, intelligence, and power, and corresponding to the parallel expression *they cannot profit*, i. e. they are worthless. The *desired* or favourite things of the idolaters are the idols themselves, upon which they lavished time, expense, and misplaced confidence.—The next phrase is commonly explained to mean *their witnesses are themselves*, i. e. they are their own witnesses, which may either represent the idols as witnessing against their worshippers, or the worshippers against the idols, or either of these classes against themselves. Cocceius connects these words with the following verbs (*testes illorum ipsi non vident*), which construction is substantially renewed by Ewald and approved by Umbreit. The meaning then is, that the idolaters who bear witness to the divinity of their idols are themselves blind and ignorant.—The *puncta extraordinaria* over  $\text{וְיִשְׁאַל}$  were designed, says Henderson, to fix the attention of the reader on the dumb idols being constituted witnesses against the stupidity of their worshippers. But why in this particular case? A much more probable explanation is that the masoretic critics considered the word doubtful, perhaps because it appeared pleonastic, whereas it is in fact emphatic.—There is no need of giving *know* the vague and doubtful sense of *having knowledge*; the meaning rather is, they will not see or know it, i. e. what has just been said, as to the impotence of idols.—The last clause is explained by Gesenius as meaning that they are given up to blindness, that they may be ashamed or confounded. Umbreit, on the other hand, supposes it to mean that they have not knowledge or sense enough to be ashamed,—an aggravation of the previous description.

V. 10. *Who formed the god and cast the image to no use (or profit)?* Most interpreters regard this as an exclamation of contemptuous surprise, implying that no one in his senses would do so. (Grotius: *quis nisi demens?*) But the true sense is the one proposed by Gesenius, who explains what follows as the answer to this question. Having affirmed the worthlessness of idols in general, he now proceeds to prove it from their origin.—So far from being makers they are made themselves, and *who made them?* This is the precise force of the verse before us.—Here as elsewhere there is pungent sarcasm in the application of the name  $\text{זֶרַח}$  (*mighty God*) to idols.

V. 11. *Lo all his fellows shall be ashamed, and the workmen themselves are of men; they shall assemble all of them, they shall stand, they shall tremble, they shall be ashamed together.* Jarchi, followed by Lowth, Eichhorn, Gesenius, Maurer, and Ewald, refers the suffix in  $\text{וְעַמְּוָם}$  to the maker of the image, and understands by *his fellows* his fellow-workmen or fellow-worshippers. But why should the workman's fellows be ashamed and not himself? A much more natural construction is the one given in the Targum, and approved by Vitringa, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, and Knobel, who refer the suffix to the idol itself, and by *his fellows* understand all who have any thing to do with it, either as manufacturers or worshippers. (Compare Num. 25:3. Deut. 11:22. 30:20. Is. 56:3, 6. Hos. 4:17. 1 Cor. 10:20.)—Lowth affirms that the common text of the next clause yields no tolerable sense, and is unworthy of the Prophet; for which reason he proposes to read  $\text{וְעַמְּוָם}$  as a passive participle meaning *reddened*, and translates accordingly, *even the workmen themselves shall blush*, adding that if any one should think the singular irregular, he may read  $\text{וְעַמְּוָם}$ ,—and the one assumption is undoubtedly as reasonable as the other. It is worthy of remark not only that this emendation has commended itself to no later writer, but also that the common text is universally regarded as affording a perfectly appropriate sense, and one essential to the Prophet's argument, viz. that the makers of the idol are themselves mere men, and cannot therefore produce any thing divine. Vitringa's explanation of  $\text{וְעַמְּוָם}$  as meaning 'common people' (*plebs*) is destructive of the argument, as well as contrary to usage. The comparative sense put by some upon the phrase, as meaning that they are *less than men* (Cocceius), or that they shall be ashamed *more than other men* (Junius), is too unnatural to need refutation. The meaning of the verse is that the senseless idol and its human makers shall be witnesses against each other, and shall all be involved in the same condemnation and confusion.

V. 12. *He has carved iron (with) a graver, and has wrought (it) in the coals, and with the hammers he will shape it, and then work it with his arm of strength. Besides (or moreover), he is hungry and has no strength,*

he has not drunk water and is faint. The construction of  $\text{וַיִּזְעַק}$  as a verb, which is given in the Targum, is much the simplest and most obvious; though most interpreters regard it as the construct form of the derivative noun  $\text{זָעַק}$  a *workman* (as in Exodus 28 : 11), with  $\text{בַּיָּזְעָא}$  added to restrict its application to a *worker in iron*, i. e. a smith; as  $\text{בַּיָּזְעָא זָעַק}$  in the next verse is supposed to signify a *worker in wood*, i. e. a carpenter. (Compare the plural  $\text{בַּיָּזְעָא זָעַקִּים}$  2 Sam. 5 : 11.) Those who agree in this explanation of the first two words differ as to their construction with what follows. Apart from Lowth's gratuitous emendation of the masoretic pointing by proposing to read  $\text{וַיִּזְעַק}$  as a participle of  $\text{זָעַק}$  to cut, and the suggestion of Cappellus that it is synonymous with  $\text{זָעַק}$ ,—the English and some other versions take it in the sense of *tongs*, a mere conjecture from the context; but most of the modern writers make it mean an *axe*, as in Jer. 10 : 3, or more generically any sharp or pointed instrument. The noun thus explained is construed with what goes before in three different ways. The older writers generally understand it as a noun of instrument. Thus the English Version has *the smith with the tongs* etc. Vitringa, Gesenius, and others make the noun the object of a verb to be supplied (*the smith makes an axe*), and understand the verse as describing the formation, not of the idol itself, but of the tools to be employed in making it. Ewald and Knobel explain  $\text{וַיִּזְעַק}$  as a second term used to qualify  $\text{זָעַק}$ , or in other words as qualifying the complex phrase before it. To the whole expression Ewald gives the sense of an iron and file worker, i. e. one who works with iron and the file; Knobel that of a tool-smith or a maker of edged tools. Both make this complex name the subject of the verb  $\text{וַיִּזְעַק}$ , and the  $\text{וַיִּזְעַק}$  before it an idiomatic pleonasm. But as both these grammatical assumptions are without satisfactory authority from usage, they are only admissible in case of exegetical necessity. Hitzig likewise makes the first two words the subject of the verb, but takes the third as its object, and understands the clause to mean that the smith converts an axe into an idol, as in ch. 2 : 4 the sword becomes a ploughshare and the spear a pruning-hook. Knobel's objection that the idol would be too small is of no great moment, if it can be assumed that images were ever made of iron; but in that case the most satisfactory construction is the one first given, which makes the verse describe the proceedings not of the professional smith, but of the laborious worshipper himself. The common version, *strength of his arms*, is a needless and enfeebling transposition. The true sense of the words is *his arm of strength*. Vitringa directs attention to the beautiful parallel in Virgil (Georg. IV. 170–175), and especially to this line: *illi inter sese magna vi brachia tollunt*. The description in the last clause seems intended to convey these several ideas: that the man who undertakes to make a god is himself a mortal, subject to ordinary human infirmities; that his god is utterly unable to relieve him or supply his wants; and that

neither these considerations nor the toil which he must undergo in order to attain his end are sufficient to deter him from his self-tormenting efforts.

V. 13. *He has carved wood, he has stretched a line, he will mark it with the awl (or graver), he will form it with the chisels, and with the compass (or circle) he will mark it, and then make it (or now he has made it) like the structure (i. e. after the model) of a man, like the beauty of mankind, to dwell in a house.* In this translation חָרַט is taken as a verb and referred to the same subject as in v. 12, i. e. the idol-manufacturer, who goes through all these laborious processes himself, in order to produce a god. But the great majority of writers here assume a transition from the maker of metallic idols to the maker of wooden ones, or from the smith who makes the carpenter's tools to the carpenter himself, חָרַט עֵצִים, the worker in wood.—In this verse, as in that before it, the alternation of the preterite and future introduces us into the very midst of the process, and describes it as already begun but not yet finished. This distinctive feature of the passage is destroyed by making all the verbs indiscriminately present. The conversive future at the opening of the second clause may either denote simply that the act described is subsequent to that just mentioned, or it may represent what was just now future as already done, thereby rendering the view of a progressive operation still more vivid. The two markings or delineations mentioned are commonly supposed to have respect to the general dimensions of the figure and then to its precise form and proportions. Henderson arbitrarily translates the same verb first *he sketcheth its figure*, and then *he marketh it off*; which, even if it gave the sense, would not convey the form of the original.—According to the rabbins, אָרַד means a 'red or other coloured string' used by workmen in their measurements (Montanus: *filo tincto*). It is applied to the colouring substance by Luther (*Röthelstein*) and Lowth (*red ochre*!). Gesenius and the other modern writers draw from the Talmudical and Arabic analogy the sense of a sharp tool or graving instrument.—אָרַם and אָרַשׁ seem to have their strict sense here, as a generic and specific term, the *beauty of man*, the *structure of a man*. The Targum seems to find a reference to both sexes; in support of which some of the old Jewish writers refer to Num. 31 : 35, where אָרַם is applied to women alone. Jarchi gains the same end in a different way, by saying that the woman is the glory of her husband (הִיא הַאֲזָה עֲהִיא תְּהַאֲרַת נַעֲלָה).—Jerome and Rosenmüller seem to understand the last words of the verse as meaning that the idol has to stay at home because it cannot move. Gesenius gives בְּיָהּ the specific sense of temple. Gill supposes a particular reference to household gods. But the meaning seems to be that the idol, being like a man in form, is, like a man, to dwell in a house.

V. 14. *To hew him down cedars; and (now) he has taken a cypress and an oak—and has strengthened (i. e. raised it) for himself among the trees of the forest—he has planted a pine, and the rain shall increase (it, i. e. make it grow).* To show more clearly the absurdity of ascribing deity to material images, he here goes back, not only to their human origin and their base material, but to the very generation of the trees by which the wood is furnished. The particulars are stated in an inverse order. He begins with the felling of the trees, but interrupts himself in order to go still further back to their very cultivation. The essential idea is that man, instead of being the creature, is in some sort the creator of the wood he worships, since it does or may owe its existence to his agency. The supposition just suggested of an interruption in the syntax seems more natural than that of a grammatical ellipsis. Few interpreters, indeed, would go so far as Clericus, who introduces at the beginning of the sentence these words, *mittit ad Libanum homines*, and adds, with characteristic coolness, *haec fuerunt necessario supplenda*; although in the very next sentence he observes of the Septuagint and Vulgate versions, *constructions quam non inveniebant de suo concinnarunt*. Ewald, in his larger Grammar (p. 622) enumerates this among the examples of an infinitive denoting necessity or obligation, just as we might say familiarly in English, *he has to cut* etc. But in his exposition of the passage, he agrees with Gesenius and others in making it equivalent to a finite verb, with the additional suggestion that it may be an orthographical mistake for  $\text{הָרָרָה}$ .—The modern writers seem to be agreed that the  $\text{הָרָרָה}$  is a species of oak, so called from its hardness, like the Latin *robur*. To avoid tautology and pedantry, however, the common version *cypress* may be retained, as it yields an appropriate sense, and as botanical precision is in this case of no exegetical importance, since the meaning of the verse would be the same whatever species had been mentioned.—Most writers give  $\text{בָּרָרָה}$  the sense of choosing, designating, here and in Ps. 80 : 16, which they suppose to be easily deducible from that of strengthening, confining, fixing. Ewald even goes so far as to take  $\text{בָּרָרָה}$  in the sense of choosing, on the alleged authority of Jer. 10 : 3. This is purely arbitrary; and as  $\text{בָּרָרָה}$ , in every other case where it occurs, admits of the translation *strengthened*, it cannot be consistently abandoned here without necessity; and this necessity cannot exist, because the strict sense of *making strong* is not only relevant in this connexion, but corresponds exactly to that of *making great* expressed by  $\text{הָרָרָה}$ , both meaning here to cause to grow. Thus understood, the word helps to bring out with more strength and clearness the main idea of the verse, viz. that the idolater not only chooses suitable trees, but plants and raises them for the purpose. It is not necessary to suppose that this is a description of a usual or frequent custom. It is rather an ideal exhibition of the idol-manufacture carried out to its extreme

If so, the active subject of the whole description is the self-deluded devotee ; which furnishes another reason for believing that the smith and the carpenter are not distinctly mentioned in the two preceding verses. It also removes the seeming incongruity of making the carpenter raise his own timber, whereas the same thing, when alleged of the idolater, is perfectly in keeping with the rest of the description.—The object of the verb  $\text{רָצַח}$  may be either the trees previously mentioned, or more indefinitely trees in general. Lowth arbitrarily translates this clause, *and layeth in good store of the trees of the forest*. Clericus, still more boldly and extravagantly, makes it mean that he furnishes his workshop with the trees of the forest. Less absurd, and yet untenable, because not justified by usage, is Henderson's translation, *and what he deemeth firm among the trees of the forest*. Umbreit's suggestion, that the last clause was designed to intimate the man's dependence after all upon the rain of heaven for the very material of which he makes his god, is not entirely natural. The clause is rather added to complete the picture of the natural origin and growth of that which the idolater adores as superhuman and divine. In this as well as the foregoing verses the confusion of the tenses in most versions greatly mars the force and beauty of the Prophet's language.—What is gained by the violent and ungrammatical construction, *he has planted and the rain has nourished*, or the vague and evasive one, *he plants and the rain nourishes* ; when the exact translation, *he has planted and the rain will nourish*, is not only just as clear, coherent, and appropriate, but far more graphic and expressive, as it hurries us at once *in medias res*, and exhibits the work described as partly past and partly future ? At the same time it implies the patient perseverance of the devotee, who first does his part and then waits for natural causes to do theirs, and all for the production of an idol !

V. 15. *And it shall be to men for burning* (i. e. for fuel), *and he has taken of them and warmed himself ; yes, he will kindle and bake bread ; yes, he will form a god and fall prostrate ; he has made it a graven image and bowed down to them*. The future meaning of the first verb is determined by its intimate connexion with the last word of the foregoing verse. (See Nordheimer § 219.)  $\text{רָצַח}$  very seldom means an individual man, and seems here to be used indefinitely for man or men in general. The singular verb  $\text{רָצַח}$  does not refer to this noun, but to the worshipper or devotee who is still the subject of description. The plural form  $\text{רָצַחְתֶּם}$  is referred by Hitzig to the trees of the forest mentioned in v. 14, by Knobel to the  $\text{רָצַח}$  orsticks of wood into which the tree must be divided. The same explanation may be given of  $\text{רָצַח}$ , although Ewald and Hitzig maintain that this suffix is employed as a singular by later writers (e. g. ch. 53 : 8. Ps. 11 : 7). But even admitting the existence of this usage, which Gesenius utterly denies,



the strict and usual meaning is to be retained where possible, and therefore here, where the Prophet seems designedly to interchange the singular and plural forms, in order to identify with more effect the idol worshipped and the sticks consumed. He takes of them (the sticks), kindles a fire, warms himself, bakes bread, then makes a god, and worships, yes, bows down before them (the sticks of wood). The argument of this and the succeeding verses is intended to exhibit the absurdity of worshipping the same material that is constantly applied to the most trivial domestic uses. All the interpreters since Calvin quote the striking parallel from Horace (Sat. I. 8).

Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum;  
Quum faber, incertus scammum faceretne Priapum,  
Maluit esse Deum.

V. 16. *Half of it he hath burned in the fire, on half of it he will eat flesh, he will roast and be filled; yea, he will warm himself and say, Aha, I am warm, I have seen fire.* Both etymology and usage give חֲצִי the sense of *half*, i. e. one of two parts into which a given whole may be divided, whether equal or unequal. The indefinite translation *part*, given in all the English versions, except that of Noyes, is intended to avoid the incongruity of making two halves and a remainder. But this incongruity, although justly chargeable on Umbreit's version, which distinctly mentions *the one half, the other half, and the remainder*, has no existence in the original; because, as all the other modern writers are agreed, the first and second חֲצִי of v. 16 are one and the same half, and the other is not introduced until the next verse. Henderson indeed refers the second to the wooden dish or platter upon which the meat was literally eaten. But this disturbs the parallel between the two main uses of the wood, as fuel and a god, which is so distinctly carried out in the preceding and the following context. It is better, therefore, to explain the phrase, *on half of it he eats flesh*, as a pregnant or concise expression of the idea, that over or by means of the fire made with half of it he cooks flesh for his eating. The obscurity of this clause is immediately removed by the addition of the unambiguous words, *he roasts a roast and satisfies himself*. The force of רָאָה, both here and in the foregoing verse, appears to be equivalent to that of our expression *say more*, not only this but also, or moreover.—Gesenius and others give רָאָה in the last clause the generic sense of *perceiving* by the senses; Hitzig the more specific one of *feeling*, in support of which he quotes the observation of Schelling, that the skin is the eye for warmth, whereupon Hendewerk no less characteristically says, that the Prophet may with more probability be supposed to have ascribed these words to the idolater in the sense of an ancient fire-worshipper than in that of a modern pantheist. The truth is, that the Hebrew verb not only may but must have here its proper meaning *I have seen*; because the noun which follows does not denote the *heat* of

fire but its *light*, and there could not be a more natural expression of the feeling meant to be conveyed than by referring to the cheerful blaze of a large wood fire. To the indiscriminate translation of the verbs, both in this verse and the next, as descriptive presents, the same objections may be made as in the foregoing context.

V. 17. *And the rest of it* (i. e. the other half) *he has made into a god, into his graven image; he will bow down to it, and will worship, and will pray to it, and say, Deliver me, for thou (art) my god.* The consecution of the tenses is the same as in the preceding verse, and has the same effect of fixing the point of observation in the midst of the process. He has kindled his fire, and will use it to prepare his food. He has made his idol, and will fall down and pray to it. The pronoun at the end may be regarded as emphatic and as meaning *thou and thou alone*.

V. 18. *They have not known, and they will not understand, for he hath smeared their eyes from seeing, their hearts from doing wisely.* The combination of the preterite and future makes the description more complete and comprehensive. Some give  $\text{כִּי}$  the sense of *that*, and make it indicate the object of their ignorance and inconsideration. Junius and Tremellius, who adopt this construction, refer  $\text{כִּי}$  to the idol; they do not know that it has blinded them. The Septuagint explains the verb as a passive plural, and Gesenius has the same form in his version (*their eyes are smeared*), which he resolves however into an indefinite construction (*one has smeared their eyes*). But the analogy of ch. 6 : 10. 29 : 10. Job 17 : 4, confirms Aben Ezra's statement, that Jehovah is the agent or subject ( $\text{הַמַּעֲשֵׂה הוּא הַזֶּה}$ ). As the smearing of the eyes is merely a figure for spiritual blindness, it is here extended to the heart, of which it is not literally predicable.—On the negative or privative force of  $\text{לֹא}$ , see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 68.—As the use of the Hiphil form in any but an active sense is called in question by some eminent grammarians,  $\text{לֹא יִדְבְּרוּ}$  may here, as in some other cases, have the sense of *acting wisely*.

V. 19. *And he will not bring it home to himself* (or to his heart), *and (there is) not knowledge, and (there is) not understanding to say, Half of it I have burned in the fire, and have also baked bread on its coals, I will roast flesh and eat, and the rest of it I will make to (be) an abomination, to a log of wood* (or the trunk of a tree) *I will cast myself down.* The essential meaning is, that they have not sense enough to describe their conduct to themselves in its true colours; if they did, they would stand amazed at its impiety and folly. In the form of expression the writer passes from the plural to the singular, i. e. from idolaters in general to the individual

idolater.—The first phrase does not correspond exactly to the English *lay to heart*, but comprehends reflection and emotion. The construction of the last clause as an explanation or an interrogation has arisen from a wish to avoid the incongruity of making the man call himself a fool, or express his resolution to perform a foolish act. But this very incongruity is absolutely necessary to the writer's purpose, which is simply to tell what the infatuated devotee would say of his own conduct if he saw it in its true light. Instead of saying, I will worship my god, he would then say, I will worship a stick of wood, a part of the very log which I have just burned, upon which I have just baked my bread, and on which I am just about to cook my dinner. The more revolting and absurd this language, the more completely does it suit and carry out the writer's purpose. Hence too the use of the term *abomination*, i. e. object of abhorrence, not in the worshipper's actual belief, but as it would be if his eyes were opened.

V. 20. *Feeding on ashes, (his) heart is deceived, it has led him astray, and he cannot deliver himself (or his soul), and he will not say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?* Another statement of the reason why he cannot see his conduct in its just light or describe it in correct terms, viz. because his very mind or heart is deceived, and this because it feeds on ashes. This last expression is strangely understood by some interpreters, following the Targum, to describe the idol as a piece of half-burnt wood; and even Umbreit seems to recognise such an allusion in the sentence. But the great majority of writers, far more naturally, make it a figure for the love and prosecution of unsatisfying objects, analogous to *feeding on wind*, Hos. 12: 2. Gesenius, in his Commentary, says that the translation *feedeth on ashes* is in no case appropriate (*in keinem Falle passend*). He accordingly translates it there *sectatur cinerem*; but in his Thesaurus he abandons this gratuitous multiplication of senses, and explains it as a figurative application of the common meaning, “*pasci aliqua re, metaph. i. q. delectari re.*” The word, however, denotes something more than simply to take pleasure in an object, and suggests the idea of choosing it and resting in it as a portion.—The usual construction of the next words, *a deceived heart has seduced him*, is commonly explained by assuming an ellipsis of the relative, (*his*) *heart (which) is deceived has seduced him*. But the simplest and most natural construction is the one proposed by Knobel, who makes two short independent clauses, *the heart is deceived, it leads him astray*. The futures of the last clause have, in part if not exclusively, a potential meaning. It is best perhaps to combine the ideas of unwillingness and inability.—The concluding question is equivalent in import to the long speech put into the mouth of the idolater in v. 19. By a *lie* we are to understand that which professes to be what it is not, and thereby deceives the hopes of those who trust in it. (See

Jer. 10: 14. Ps. 33: 17.) This description some apply to the idol itself, as if he had said, Is not this, which I carry in my right hand, a deception? But as this makes a part of the interrogation literal and a part metaphorical, most writers give it uniformity by understanding all the terms as figurative: Is not this, about which I am busied, and upon which I am spending strength and labour, a deception? To any one rational enough to ask the question, the reply would be affirmative of course.

V. 21. *Remember these (things), Jacob and Israel, for thou art my servant; I have formed thee, a servant unto me art thou; Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten by me.* Having completed his detailed exposure of the folly of idolatry, or rather of the impotence of idols, as contrasted with the power of God, he now resumes the tone of promise and encouragement with which the chapter opens, and assures the chosen people, here personified as Israel or Jacob, that having been constituted such by Jehovah for a special purpose, they could not cease to be the objects of his watchful care.—*These things* may possibly refer to the immediately succeeding statements, which may then be rendered *that thou art my servant* etc. To most interpreters, however, it has seemed more natural to understand by *these things* the whole foregoing series of arguments against the divinity of idols and in favour of Jehovah's sole supremacy.—Ewald connects עָבַדְתִּי לִי with the preceding verb, so as to mean, I have formed thee as a servant for myself. The only difficulty in the way of this construction is the אָהֳבָה, which cannot be the object of the verb, but must agree with one expressed or understood. This objection might be done away by disregarding the masoretic interpunction, and transferring the disjunctive accent to the preceding word; in which case the latter member of the clause would read, *thou Israel* etc., with an emphasis upon the pronoun. This construction has the advantage of removing the apparent tautology arising from the repetition of *thou art my servant*, which is more observable in most translations than in the original, where two different forms of expression are employed.—The last word in the verse is explained in the ancient versions, and by some modern writers, as a deponent verb, *thou shalt not forget me*. But Gesenius and Ewald, with greater probability, make it a proper passive, and explain the suffix as equivalent to a dative or an ablative in Latin, *thou shalt not be forgotten (by) me*; which is much more appropriate, in this connexion, than an exhortation not to forget God. This construction is as old as Aben Ezra, who paraphrases the expression thus: לֹא תִשָּׁחַח עִמָּי וּבְרַחֵם וְאֵי אִוְרֵךְ.

V. 22. *I have blotted out, like a cloud, thy transgressions, and, like a vapour, thy sins; return to me, for I have redeemed thee.* As the previous assurances were suited to dispel any doubt or hesitation as to the power of

Jehovah, so the one in this verse meets another difficulty, namely, that arising from a sense of guilt. The assurance given is that of entire and gratuitous forgiveness. The analogy of Exodus 32:32, 33, would seem to favour an allusion to the blotting out of an inscription or an entry in a book of accounts. The cloud may then be a distinct figure to denote what is transient or evanescent. (See Hos. 6:4. 13:3. Job 7:9. 30:15.) This is Hitzig's explanation of the verse; but most interpreters suppose the blotting and the cloud to be parts of one and the same metaphor, although they differ in their method of connecting them. Junius strangely understands the clause to mean, as a cloud (when condensed into rain) purges away filth. The great majority of writers are agreed, however, that the cloud itself is here described as being blotted out. Gill supposes an allusion to the height and distance of the clouds as being far beyond man's reach, implying that forgiveness is a divine prerogative. Hendewerk sees a forced allusion to the cloud which went before the people in the wilderness. A more usual and natural interpretation is that the clouds in general are here considered as intervening between heaven and earth, as sin is expressly said, in ch. 59:2, to separate between God and his people. This explanation of the metaphor, however, does not exclude the supposition of a reference to the fleeting nature of the cloudy vapour, and the ease and suddenness with which it is dispelled by sun or wind.— $\text{??}$  and  $\text{??}$  are poetical equivalents. So far as they can be distinguished, either in etymology or usage, the correct distinction is the one expressed in the English Version (*thick cloud* and *cloud*), which Henderson reverses.—*Return unto me* is a phrase descriptive of all the restorations of God's people from their spiritual wanderings and estrangements. The restriction of this phrase and the one which follows it to the restoration of the Jews from exile, is as forced and arbitrary as the future form given to the verb in many versions.

V. 23. *Sing, oh heavens, for Jehovah hath done (it); shout, ye lower parts of the earth; break forth, ye mountains, into song, the forest and every tree in it: for Jehovah hath redeemed Jacob, and in Israel he will glorify himself.* The prediction of glorious and joyful changes, as in many other cases, is clothed in the form of an exhortation to all nature to rejoice. It is essential to the writer's purpose that the universe itself should be addressed, which precludes the explanation of the verse by Grotius, as addressed to angels, kings, and common men; or by Vitringa, as addressed to the apostles and prophets (from a misplaced comparison of Rev. 18:20). Equally inconsistent with his purpose and at variance with good taste is the explanation of mountains as meaning kingdoms, forests, cities, etc.—The thing *done* is what is mentioned in the last clause, i. e. the redemption of Israel, including the deliverance from exile in Babylon, but not confined

to it.—The arbitrary version of the two verbs in the last clause as a preterite and present or a present and a future is in no respect to be preferred to the exact translation as a preterite and a future, expressive of what God had done and would yet do for the chosen people.

V. 24. *Thus saith Jehovah thy redeemer, and thy former from the womb, I Jehovah, making all, stretching the heavens alone, spreading the earth by myself* (or, *who was with me*?). Some refer *thus saith* to the preceding promises, and take all that follows till the end of the chapter as a description of the being who uttered them. Others refer *thus saith* to what follows, supply the verb *am* before *Jehovah*, and regard the last clause of the verse as the divine declaration. A third conceivable construction would restrict it to the closing question, *who (is) with me?* i. e. who can claim equality or likeness with me?—There is no need of giving to the phrase *thy former* a moral sense as signifying the formation of character or manners, as the words *from the womb* are not necessarily exclusive of the period before birth. For the meaning of the figure itself, see above, on v. 2; for that of וְעִמִּי, on ch. 42:5.—The textual reading of the last word makes it an interrogation, וְעִמִּי אֵי, *who (is or was) with me?* implying strong negation and equivalent in meaning to the affirmation, *there was no one with me*. The marginal reading yields the same sense in another way, מִי מֵעַתָּה, *from, by, or of myself*. (Compare וְעִמִּי Hos. 8:4 and ὁὐκ ἔμμετρον John 5:30.) The objection that the textual reading interrupts the construction is valid only on the supposition that the sentence is continued through the following verses. If, as most interpreters assume, the last clause of this verse contains a proposition, interrogative or affirmative, this reading affords an appropriate conclusion to the sentence, and a striking parallel to the phrase וְעִמִּי אֵי in the other clause.

V. 25. *Breaking the signs of babblers, and diviners he will madden; turning sages back, and their knowledge he will stultify*. The whole verse is descriptive of Jehovah as convicting all prophets, except his own, of folly and imposture, by falsifying their prognostications. וְעִמִּי is commonly translated either *lies* or *liars*; but it is rather an expression of contempt, denoting praters, vain or idle talkers, and by implication utterers of falsehood. *Signs* are properly the pledges and accompaniments of predictions, but may here be regarded as equivalent to prophecy itself. These are said to be *broken* in the same sense that breaking may be predicated of a promise or a covenant. The effect of course would be to make such prophets seem like fools or madmen. (See 2 Sam. 15:31. Hos. 9:7.) The restriction of these terms to the false prophets of the Babylonish exile is not only arbitrary, but at variance with the context, which repeatedly contrasts the

omnipotence and omniscience of Jehovah with the impotence of idols and the ignorance of heathen prophets.—Because turning back and being put to shame are often joined together elsewhere, Gesenius, according to his favourite method, makes them simply synonymous; whereas the first expression strictly signifies defeat, disappointment, failure, with which shame is naturally connected but surely not identical.—The alternation of the future and participle seems to have a rhythmical design. The distinction may however be, that while the latter signifies habitual or customary action, the former expresses certain futurity and fixed determination.

V. 26. *Confirming the word of his servant, and the counsel of his messengers he will fulfil; the (one) saying to (or as to) Jerusalem, She shall be inhabited, and to (or as to) the cities of Judah, They shall be built, and her ruins I will raise.* With the frustration of the heathen prophecies is here contrasted the fulfilment of Jehovah's, who is himself represented as securing their accomplishment.  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$  has here the same sense as in Jer. 29 : 10. 33 : 14, viz. that of bringing a promise or prophecy to pass.—By *his servant* Jarchi understands Moses, Hitzig Jeremiah, Gesenius the prophets as a class, Knobel the genuine believing Israel, whose hopes were embodied in these prophecies. Simpler and more satisfactory than either of these explanations is that which supposes *his servant* to be primarily and directly the writer himself, but considered as one of a class who are then distinctly mentioned in the other member as *his messengers*. The specific application of the title of God's servant to the prophets is apparent from 2 Kings 24 : 2. Jer. 29 : 19. 35 : 15. 44 : 4.—Gill's question, why *his servant* may not denote Paul as Cocceius supposes, is unanswerable.—*Counsel*, according to Henderson, here means the counsel or purpose of God, as declared by his servants. Gesenius and most other writers make it a description of prophecy, considered as involving or suggesting counsel and advice with respect to the future. (Compare the similar application of the verb in ch. 41 : 28.)—The last clause, beginning with the word  $\text{וְהָיָה}$ , might be considered as a more specific designation or description of *his servant*, viz. *the (servant) saying* etc. But this interpretation is precluded by the double repetition of  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  in the two succeeding verses and in evident application to Jehovah himself.—The construction of  $\text{בְּיָמָיו}$  as a verb of the second person (*thou shalt be inhabited*) is forbidden by its masculine form, which could be connected with the name Jerusalem only in cases where the latter is put for its inhabitants. For the sake of uniformity the parallel expression is to be translated in like manner. Gesenius arbitrarily translates the first of these verbs as an imperative, the second as a future, and the third as a present. To raise up the ruins of a city is of course to rebuild it.

V. 27. *The (one) saying to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy floods (or streams).* The Targum, followed by Kimchi and others, explains נִזְרָה as a metaphorical description of Babylon, so called on account of its wealth, its population, or its site. Vitringa, Lowth, and some of the latest writers, understand by נִזְרָה the Euphrates, and apply the whole verse to the stratagem by which Cyrus gained access to Babylon, as related in the first book of Herodotus and the seventh of Xenophon's Cyropaedia. Henderson thinks there may be also an allusion to his division of the river Gyndes. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 236.) Ewald and others understand the verse as a description of God's power over nature and the elements, with or without an allusion to the passage of the Red Sea at the exodus. This exposition is strongly recommended by the analogy of ch. 42 : 15. 43 : 16. 50 : 2. 51 : 10. That of Jer. 50 : 33. 51 : 36 does not prove that Isaiah's description was designed to have exclusive reference to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, but only that this was included in it as a signal instance of God's power to overcome all obstacles, and that the later prophet made a specific application of the words accordingly. There is no need of giving נִזְרָה any other than its widest sense as a description of the ocean. The word *streams* or *floods* is applied in the same way to the sea by David (Ps. 24 : 2) and Jonah (2 : 4), in the last of which cases it is connected with the cognate form נִזְרָה־צָרָה. (Compare Zech. 10 : 11, and Isaiah 19 : 5.) —The strict translation of the last verb by Ewald as a future (*I will dry up*) is not only more exact but more expressive than the present form preferred by Gesenius and others.

V. 28. *The (one) saying to (or as to) Cyrus, My shepherd, and all my pleasure he will fulfil, and saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and (to) the temple, Thou shalt be founded.* It is now universally admitted that this verse has reference to Cyrus the Elder or the Great, the son of Cambyses king of Persia and the grandson of Astyages the Mede, the hero of the Cyropaedia and of the first book of Herodotus, the same who appears in sacred history (2 Chr. 36 : 23. Ezra 1 : 1) as the actual restorer of the Jews from exile. He is here called Jehovah's *shepherd*, which may either be the usual poetical designation of a king, so common in the oldest classics, or (as Umbreit suggests) a special description of his mission and vocation to gather the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It is characteristic of John David Michaelis, and of the notions prevalent in his day as to fidelity and freedom of translation, that instead of *my shepherd* he has *the king appointed by me*; for which variation he apologizes on the ground that the former title, if applied to so great a king, might sound indecorous (*unanständig klingen*), because shepherds now are low and vulgar people.—With רִבִּי we may



either supply *thou art* or *he is*, or regard it as a simple exclamation. A curious illustration of the ancient mode of writing Hebrew is afforded by Jerome's remark on this word: *Verbum Hebraicum Roi, si per res literam legamus, intelligitur pastor meus; si per dalet, sciens vel intelligens: quarum similitudo parvo apice distinguitur.*—*All my pleasure*, i. e. with respect to the deliverance of the Jews from exile.—The construction of רַוִּי is obscure and difficult. Luther refers it to an indefinite subject, so that one may say (*dass man sage*). Knobel makes it dependent on רַוִּי־אֵל in the sense of *commanding to say*. Ewald regards it as an idiomatic use of the infinitive instead of the finite verb, and refers it to Jehovah. Gesenius refers it to Cyrus, and understands it as explaining how he was to fulfil Jehovah's pleasure, namely, *by saying* etc. This, on the whole, is the most natural construction, although, like the others, it leaves unexplained the introduction of the copulative particle before the verb, which must either be rendered as in the English Version (*even saying*), or disregarded as an idiomatic pleonasm.—The same ambiguity respecting the person of the verbs exists in the last clause of this verse as in v. 26. Some take both in the second person, which requires a preposition to be introduced before רַוִּי־אֵל. Others make both in the third person, which requires רַוִּי־אֵל to be construed as a feminine in this one place exclusively. This last is the construction finally adopted by Gesenius. In his Commentary he had assumed an abrupt transition from the third to the second person.—There are two points in this verse upon which the *higher criticism* of modern times has fastened, as proofs that the passage is of later origin than that which tradition has assigned to it. The first of these is the use of רַוִּי־אֵל in the sense of business or affair, repeated instances of which are cited from the later books or what are so considered. But even in the cases thus alleged the change of usage is extremely doubtful, while in that before us it is purely imaginary or fictitious. The word has here its strict, original, and usual sense of inclination, will, or pleasure, that which one delights in, chooses, or desires; and the substitution of *affair* or *business* would be not only arbitrary but ridiculous.—The other supposititious proof of later date is the distinctness with which Cyrus is foretold by name, and which is said to be at variance with the general analogy and usage of the prophecies. Möller's attempt to set aside this difficulty by explaining רַוִּי־אֵל as a descriptive name of Israel itself, has found no adherents among later writers, and instead of mitigating aggravates the evil. Without disturbing the unanimous consent among interpreters that Cyrus is the subject of this prophecy, the objection admits of satisfactory solution. In the first place, let it be observed, that it proceeds upon a false assumption, namely that no form of expression or prediction can occur but once. Why may not this be a single exception to the general rule, analogous to that presented by the occasional introduction of precise

dates notwithstanding the usual vagueness of prediction? The want of analogy might render it a priori more improbable, and make the necessity of clear proof more imperative, but could not, in the face of such proof, make the fact itself incredible. But in the next place, the precision of this prophecy is not so totally without analogy as the objectors commonly assume. One clearly defined instance of the same kind is sufficient to relieve the case before us from the charge of being wholly unparalleled, and such an instance is afforded by the prophecy respecting Josiah in 1 Kings 13 : 2. The assertion that the name of Josiah was interpolated by a later hand, is not only perfectly gratuitous but equally available in this case, where a similar assumption would at once remove all evidence of later date. If that is an interpolation, so may this be. If that is not one, this is not without analogy. But in the third place, the alleged violation of analogy is much less real than apparent; since in both the cases there is reference to the meaning of the name as a generic or descriptive title, and not merely to its application as an individual denomination. That *Josiah* was intended to be thus significant, as well in 2 Kings 13 : 2 as in Zech. 6 : 10, has been proved by Hengstenberg in his exposition of the latter passage. (Christologie II. p. 71.) That שֶׁרָץ was likewise a descriptive title of the Persian kings, is rendered probable by several distinct considerations. The Hebrew name has been identified, by some of the most eminent comparative philologists, with a Persian word which means the *sun*. The use of such a title would agree well not only with the ancient religion of that people, but with a well known oriental usage of describing certain royal races as descendants of the sun, whether this be regarded as a superstitious myth or a poetical hyperbole. It is expressly asserted by Herodotus that Cyrus originally bore another name. This name is said by Strabo to have been *Agradates*, which Hitzig reckons as a mere mistake occasioned by confounding the river *Κῆρος* with the monarch of the same name, whereas Pott, Von Lengerke, and others, trace it to the same root with שֶׁרָץ, and the same primary sense of *sun*. To this etymology there seems to be allusion in ch. 41 : 2, 25, where Cyrus is so emphatically said to have risen in the east and pursued his course westwards. This explanation of the name is strongly favoured by the numerous analogies in this and other languages, the Egyptian Pharaohs and Ptolemies, the Philistian Abimelechs, the Amalekitish Agags, the Roman Caesars. The result of these considerations is, that the prophecy before us, although still relating to the individual Cyrus, is not so variant in form from the usual analogy of prophecy, as to afford any ground for the suspicion that the passage is on that account of later date. For the most satisfactory discussion of this point, see Hengstenberg's Christologie I. p. 192 and Hävernick's Einleitung II. p. 163.

## CHAPTER XLV.

THIS chapter contains the same essential elements with those before it, but in new combinations and a varied form. The great theme of the prophecy is still the relation of Israel to God as his chosen people, and to the nations as a source or medium of saving knowledge. This last idea is brought out with great distinctness at the close of the chapter. The proofs and illustrations of the doctrine taught are still drawn from the power of Jehovah, as displayed in the creation of the world, and as contrasted with the impotence of idols. The evidence of prescience afforded by prophecy is also here repeated and enlarged upon. As a particular prospective exhibition both of power and foreknowledge, we have still before us the conquests of Cyrus, which are specifically foretold and explicitly connected with the favour of Jehovah as their procuring cause, and with the liberation of his people and the demonstration of his deity as their designed effect.

As to the order and arrangement of the parts, the chapter opens, in direct continuation of the forty-fourth, with a further prophecy of Cyrus and of his successes, vs. 1-3. These are then referred to the power of God and his design of mercy towards his people, so that all misgivings or distrust must be irrational and impious, vs. 4-13. Then leaving Cyrus out of view, the Prophet turns his eyes to the nations, and declares that they must be subdued, but only in order to be blessed and saved, which is declared to have been the divine purpose and revealed as such from the beginning, vs. 14-25.

V. 1. *Thus saith Jehovah to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have held fast, to tread down before him nations, and the loins of kings I will loose; to open before him double doors, and gates shall not be shut.* The words of Jehovah seem to begin regularly with the next verse; but even in this, which is strictly introductory, they are mingled with the Prophet's description of Cyrus, a mode of composition very common in Hebrew, and among the oldest writers, who thought more of the idea than of the form in which it was expressed. The accumulation of descriptive epithets, which Gesenius represents as characteristic of these Later Prophecies, arises from the fact that one main object which the writer had in view was to impress upon the reader's mind the attributes of God and of his chosen instruments. —Cyrus is here called the Lord's anointed, a designation elsewhere limited,

as Calvin says, to the sacerdotal monarchy of Judah, which prefigured Christ in both his offices of priest and king.—Most writers understand it here as a synonyme of *king*, derived from Jewish usages, and not intended to indicate any thing peculiar in the royalty of Cyrus, except that he was raised up by Jehovah for a special purpose. Calvin thinks it still more pregnant and emphatic, and descriptive of Cyrus as a representative of Christ, in this one thing, that he was instrumentally the saviour or deliverer of Israel from bondage.—The treading down of nations is a trait peculiarly appropriate in this case, as the Greek historians give long catalogues of distinct nations subjugated by Cyrus, such as the Medes, Hyrcanians, Assyrians, Arabians, Cappadocians, Phrygians, Lydians, Carians, Babylonians, etc.—To loose the loins of kings is explained by Calvin as meaning to weaken them, because the strength is in the loins; and Rosenmüller cites, in illustration of this usage, the Latin verb and adjective, *delumbo* and *clumbis*. Luther, Clericus, and J. D. Michaelis suppose an allusion to the removal of the sword-belt, as the ancient method of disarming or dismissing from active service. Either of these explanations is better than Jerome's, which supposes an allusion simply to the royal cincture as a badge of office. But most of the modern writers are agreed that the words at least include a reference to the ordinary use of the girdle as a part of oriental dress, on which the activity of the wearer and his exercise of strength are in a great degree dependent, as it gathers up and tightens the flowing garments which would otherwise impede his movements.—The exclusive reference of this clause to the kings of Lydia and Babylon is arbitrary, and detracts from the greatness of the promise and description.—The dual  $\text{בָּרָזָיִם}$  is the proper Hebrew term for valves, folding-doors, or two-leaved gates. All interpreters admit that while this clause, in its most general sense, is perfectly appropriate to all the fortified places which were attacked by Cyrus, it is specifically and remarkably appropriate to the taking of Babylon. It can scarcely be considered a fortuitous coincidence, that Herodotus speaks of the gates which led to the river as having been left open on the night of the attack; and Xenophon says the doors of the palace itself having been unguardedly opened, the invaders took possession of it almost without resistance. These apparent allusions to particular circumstances and events, couched under general predictions, are far more striking and conclusive proofs of inspiration than the most explicit and detailed prediction of the particular event alone could be.

V. 2. *I will go before thee, and uneven places I will level, doors of brass I will break, and bars of iron I will cut.* The first clause describes the removal of difficulties under the figures used for the same purpose in ch. 40 : 4. The other clause would seem at first sight to contain an analo-

gous figure ; but it really includes one of those minute coincidences with history, of which we have already had an example in the preceding verse. Herodotus and Abydenus say expressly that the gates of Babylon were all of brass. (Compare Ps. 107 : 16.)

V. 3. *And I will give thee treasures of darkness and hidden riches of secret places, in order that thou mayest know that I Jehovah, the (one) calling thee by name, am the God of Israel.* It is thought by some eminent writers that no conquests have ever been attended with such acquisition of wealth as those of Cyrus. Pliny's account of what he obtained from Croesus makes it, according to Brerewood's computation, more than £26,000,000 pounds sterling. The last clause gives a reason why this circumstance is mentioned, namely, in order that Cyrus might be able to identify the being who brought it to pass with the being who foretold it. The same consideration will account for the mention of the name of Cyrus ; so that even if it were a bolder violation of analogy and usage than it is, there would still be a sufficient explanation of it furnished by the divine purpose to exert a direct influence through this prediction upon Cyrus himself. That such an influence was really exerted by the writings of Isaiah is expressly asserted by Josephus, and would seem to be implied in the monarch's solemn recognition of Jehovah as the true God and the author of his own successes. (Ezra 1 : 2.)

V. 4. *For the sake of my servant Jacob and Israel my chosen, therefore will I call thee by thy name, I will give thee a title and thou hast not known me.* Not only for God's glory in the general, but with a view to the promotion of his gracious purposes towards Israel.—The ך before םׁׁׁׁ introduces the apodosis, and may be taken as equivalent to *therefore*.—The sense of *speaking kindly*, which the modern writers give to ׁׁׁׁׁ, is here much less appropriate than that of giving a title of honour, with apparent reference to the epithets of *shepherd* and *anointed*, bestowed on Cyrus alone among the heathen princes. *Thou hast not known me* may either mean that he was not a follower of the true religion, or that the name was given long before he did or could know any thing of him who gave it. The verb expresses past time not in reference to the date of the prediction, but to that of the fulfilment.

V. 5. *I am Jehovah* (i. e. the eternal, self-existent God) *and there is no other ; except me there is no God ; I will gird thee and thou hast not known me.* What is said before of naming him is here said of girding him, i. e. investing him with royal dignity or personally strengthening him ; both may be included.

V. 6. *That they may know, from the rising of the sun to the west (or to his going down), that there is none without me; I am Jehovah, and there is no other.* What was said before of Cyrus in particular is now said of men in general, viz. that they must be convinced in this way that the God of Israel is the one true God. Some of the Jewish critics regard the final letter of  $\text{יְהוָה}$  as a suffix referring to the feminine noun  $\text{שָׁמַיִם}$ , notwithstanding the absence of mappik. The noun to which it is annexed would then have its primary sense (*occasus, setting*); otherwise it is a feminine designation of the west.

V. 7. *Forming light and creating darkness, making peace and creating evil, I (am) Jehovah doing all these (things.)* Saadias, followed by Vitringa, Lowth, J. D. Michaelis, Henderson, and Umbreit, supposes an allusion to the dualism or doctrine of two co-eternal principles as held by the ancient Persians. Gesenius objects that the terms are too indefinite, and their general sense too obvious, to admit of this specific application. But this whole passage is characterized by the recurrence of expressions, the generic sense of which seems clear, but which, at the same time, seem to bear and even to require a more specific explanation, unless we choose rather to assume an extraordinary series of fortuitous coincidences. The open doors, the gates of brass, the hidden treasures, are examples of this double sense, if such it may be called, within the compass of three verses. This analogy makes it rather probable than otherwise that in the case before us, while the Prophet's language may be naturally taken as a general description of God's universal power, an allusion was intended to the great distinctive doctrine of the faith in which Cyrus had most probably been educated. For although it cannot be distinctly proved, it can as little be disproved, and is intrinsically altogether credible, that the doctrine of the Zendavesta is as old as Cyrus.

V. 8. *Drop (or distil) ye heavens from above, and let the clouds pour out righteousness; let the earth open, and let salvation and righteousness grow, let her bring (them) forth together. I Jehovah have created it.* There is a singular *equivoque* in the common version of the first clause, *drop down ye heavens from above*, which might seem to be a call upon the skies to fall, if the sense were not determined by the parallel expression. The prediction of events in the form of a command is peculiarly frequent in Isaiah's later prophecies. The modern explanation of  $\text{פָּרַץ}$  and  $\text{הִרְבָּה}$  as meaning victory, prosperity, etc. is entirely arbitrary, as we have already seen in other cases. The manifestation of God's righteousness, including his fidelity to his engagements, is constantly recognised in Scripture as one chief end of his dispensations.— In the second clause there is a difficulty of construction, arising from the

use of the plural form  $\text{הַיָּדָיִם}$ , to explain which some make  $\text{יָדָיִם}$  a collective, others,  $\text{יָדָיִם}$ . (Compare ch. 16: 4. and Ps. 119: 103.) After all attempts, however, to resolve the syntax, the most satisfactory construction, although not the most consistent with the masoretic accents, is the one proposed by Kimchi, who connects the plural verb with the next two nouns, and repeats  $\text{יָדָיִם}$  as the subject of  $\text{הַיָּדָיִם}$ . Next to this is the one given by Luzzatto, who makes  $\text{יָדָיִם}$  mean *bring forth* (as in Deut. 29: 17) and agree with  $\text{הַיָּדָיִם}$ .—J. D. Michaelis explains this whole verse as relating to prophecy and its fulfilment.

V. 9. *Woe to (or alas for) him striving with his maker—a potsherd with potsherds of earth. Shall clay say to its former, What art thou doing? and thy work, He has no hands?* The translation of  $\text{הוּי}$  as a simple exclamation by Hitzig (*Ha!*) and Ewald (*O!*) does not meet the requisitions either of general usage or the context, which require it to be taken as an expression of displeasure, or sympathy, or both.—Striving with God is not merely active resistance, but opposition of judgment and affection.—The word  $\text{יָצַר}$ , used twice in this verse, is peculiarly expressive; because it derives from etymology the general sense of *former, fashioner*, and from usage the specific sense of *potter*, which is in strict agreement with the figurative language of both clauses.—The second member of the first clause has been very variously construed. The analogy of what precedes would seem to make it mean, *woe to the potsherd (striving) with the potsherds of the earth*. But this is universally agreed to be inadmissible, a proof that the principle of parallelism has its limitations. Mariana ingeniously but needlessly proposes to read  $\text{יָצַר}$ : let the potsherd strive with the workmen (i. e. potters) of the earth. Vitringa applies the same construction to the common text: let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth, but not with God. The Peshito renders it, *a potsherd of (or from) the potsherds of the earth*, thus making the whole phrase a description of the weakness and insignificance of man. This construction is adopted by the modern writers, almost without exception; most of whom, however, give to  $\text{אִת}$  its proper sense of *with*, which they suppose to imply likeness and relationship, like  $\text{אִת}$  in Ecc. 2: 16.—It seems to be a just observation of Hitzig, that *earth* is not mentioned as the dwelling of the potsherd, but as its material, which is indeed the predominant usage of  $\text{אֶרֶץ}$  as distinguished from  $\text{אָרֶץ}$ . The verb at the beginning of the last clause might be rendered either *does, will, can, or should say*; but all that is necessary to the writer's purpose may be considered as implied or included in the simple future. (Compare ch. 10: 15, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 195.) The same thing is substantially true of the verb  $\text{תִּשָּׁאֵר}$ ; but in this case, the exact force of the

Hebrew word may be best expressed by our compound present, *what art thou doing* or *about to do*? This is the common Hebrew formula for calling to account, or questioning the propriety of what one does. (See Job 9 : 12. Ecc. 8 : 4. Dan. 4 : 32.)—The last words of the verse have also been the subject of many discordant explanations. Some of the older writers make them a continuation of the same speech: *what art thou doing? and (as for) thy work, it has no hands*, i. e. it is unfinished. But most interpreters agree that *thy work* introduces a new speaker. *And (shall) thy work (say of thee), he has no hands!* The unexpected introduction of the second person (*thy work*) led Houbigant and Lowth to suppose a transposition of the pronouns, and to read *his work* and *thou hast no hands*, which may be safely set aside as a violent and worthless emendation. Maurer accounts for the second person by supposing it to be employed indefinitely, *thy work*, i. e. the work of any one to whom the words may be addressed. Hitzig still better makes the Prophet pass abruptly from the sign to the thing signified, from the supposed case to the real one, from the potter to Jehovah. *There are no hands to him*, i. e. he has no power. The absurdity consists in the thing made denying the existence of the hands by which it was itself produced. The essential idea is the same as in ch. 10 : 15, but the expression here much stronger, since the instrument is not merely charged with exalting itself above the efficient agent, but the creature with denying the power or skill of its creator.—The restriction of this verse, and of those which follow, to the Babylonians, or the Jews in exile, is entirely arbitrary and at variance with the context, which refers to the conquests of Cyrus and their consequences, not as the main subject of the prophecy, but as illustrations of a general truth.—The form of speech used by Paul in Rom. 9 : 20. (*why hast thou made me thus?*) is not a version but a paraphrase of למה עשיתני כה, in which however it is really included.

V. 10. *Woe to (him) saying to a father, What wilt thou beget, and to a woman, What wilt thou bring forth!* The same idea is again expressed, but in a form still more emphatic and revolting. The incongruities which have perplexed interpreters in this verse are intentional aggravations of the impious absurdity which it describes. The arbitrary change of the future to the present (*what begettest thou?*) or the past (*what hast thou brought forth?*) is not only incorrect in point of grammar, but subversive of the writer's main design, which is to represent the doubt and discontent of men in reference to God's future dealings with them as no less monstrous than the supposition of a child's objection to its own birth. Such an objection, it is true, cannot be offered in the case supposed; but in the real case it ought to be held equally impossible. This view of the Prophet's meaning,



if correct, of course precludes the explanation of the words as a complaint of weakness or deformity, or an expression of disgust with life like that in Job 3 : 20. and Jeremiah 20 : 14.

V. 11. *Thus saith Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel and his Maker, Ask me (of) the things to come, concerning my sons and concerning the work of my hands ye may command me.* The Septuagint divides the sentence differently, and reads *ὁ ποιῶν τὰ ἐπιχόμενα*. This, which seems to be a mere inadvertence or mistake, is regarded by Lowth as a sufficient reason for a change of text, and he translates accordingly *he that formeth the things which are to come*. All other writers seem to follow the masoretic inter-punctuation, which connects the participle with the second clause. Verbs of asking, as in Latin, govern two accusatives. (See Ps. 137 : 3.)—Vitringa takes  $\text{שׂאֵלֵנִי}$  as a preterite, and makes the last clause an interrogation, *They ask me, and will ye command me?* But we have then an abrupt transition, not only from affirmation to interrogation, but from the third to the second person. Hitzig removes one of these anomalies by aggravating the other, reading both the verbs interrogatively, *do they ask? and will ye command?* By far the simplest syntax is the common one, which makes the first verb an imperative, analogous in form to  $\text{שׂאֵלֵנִי}$  (Gen. 23 : 8), whereas the preterite would be  $\text{שׂאֵלְתָּ}$ , as in Ps. 137 : 3. (Compare  $\text{שׂאֵלֵנִי}$  Gen. 32 : 18.) Some who adopt this explanation of the first verb give the other an imperative form also, a needless and dubious assimilation. There is also a diversity of judgment as to the relation of these verbs, and of the sentences in which they stand, to one another. Most of the late interpreters suppose an antithetical relation, and explain the clause as meaning, you may ask me about things to come, but leave the disposal of my children to myself. This not only requires an adversative particle to be inserted, which is often the force of the Hebrew copulative, but involves a distinction without a difference; since the fortunes of God's children were themselves *things to come*, and the very things to come respecting which the people would be probably most anxious to inquire. It is better therefore to regard the parallelism as synonymous, not antithetical, and to understand both verbs as conceding an indulgence to those who are addressed. You may ask me concerning things to come, for I am able to inform you; you may trust my children to my care, for I am abundantly able to protect them.— $\text{וְעַל יְדֵי}$  is a common expression for giving one authority over any thing or person, or in other words committing it to him, and leaving it at his disposal.—For the meaning of *work of my hands* as an equivalent to *my children* or *my people*, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 367.

V. 12. *I made the earth, and man upon it I created; I, my hands,*

*spread the heavens, and all their host commanded.* This is a justification of the claim in the last clause of the foregoing verse, or a statement of the reason why he could be trusted to protect his people, namely, because he was almighty, and had proved himself to be so in creation.—The personal pronoun is emphatic in both clauses, as if he had said, *it is I who made*, or, *I (and no other) made* etc. The construction of the second of these pronouns with *my hands* has been variously explained. Some regard the latter as equivalent to an ablative of instrument in Latin: *I with my hands have spread* etc. Others consider it an instance of the idiom which adds the personal pronoun to the suffix for the sake of emphasis: *I, my hands, spread*, i. e. my own hands spread. In such constructions the personal pronoun commonly stands last. A third supposition is that the pronoun is in apposition with the noun itself, and not so much emphatic as explanatory. *I (that is to say, my hands) have spread.* (Compare Ps. 3 : 5. 17 : 13, 14. 44 : 3. 60 : 7.)—The last words of the verse admit of two explanations. We may understand the figure as a military one, and give the verb the military sense of *commanding*. Or we may take *host* as a common expression for contents or inhabitants, and understand the verb as meaning *called into existence*. (Compare Ps. 33 : 9.) In itself, the former explanation seems entitled to the preference; but it requires the verb to be construed as an indefinite praeter or a present, whereas all the other verbs, though similar in form, relate to a determinate past time, viz. the time of the creation.

V. 13. *I (and no other) raised him up in righteousness, and all his ways will I make straight (or level); (it is) he (that) shall build my city, and my captivity (or exiles) he will send (home), not for reward, and not for hire, saith Jehovah of Hosts.* From the general proof of divine power afforded by creation he descends to the particular exercise of his omnipotence and wisdom in the raising up of Cyrus, who is thus referred to without the express mention of his name, because he had been previously made the subject of a similar appeal, and the Prophet simply takes up the thread which he had dropped at the close of the fifth verse, or perhaps of the seventh. For the sense of *raising up in righteousness* see above, on ch. 41 : 2, 25. 42 : 6. In this, as well as in the other places, Vitringa supposes an allusion to the personal character of Cyrus, which he defends with great warmth against Burnet's remark in his *History of the Reformation*, that God sometimes uses bad men as his instruments, such as the cruel Cyrus. The statements of Herodotus to this effect Vitringa treats as fabulous, and claims full credit for the glowing pictures of the *Cyropaedia*. This distinction is not only strange in itself, but completely at war with the conclusions of the ablest modern critics and historians. Nor is there the

least need of insisting thus upon the moral excellence of Cyrus, who in either case was just as really a *consecrated* instrument of the divine righteousness, as the Medes and Persians generally, who are so described in ch. 13 : 3. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 246.) At the same time allowance must be made for the difference between what Cyrus was before and after he became acquainted with the true religion. (See above, on v. 3.) The figure of straight or level paths has the same sense as in ch. 40 : 3.—*My city*, i. e. the holy city, Jerusalem, of which Cyrus was indirectly the re-builder.—The form of the verb *send* here used is not unfrequently applied to the setting free of prisoners or slaves.—The last clause seems decisive of the question whether ch. 43 : 3, 4. should be understood as a general declaration of God's distinguishing affection for his people, disposing him to favour them at the expense of other nations, or as a specific promise that Cyrus should conquer Ethiopia and Egypt, as a compensation for releasing Israel, in which case he could not be said, in any appropriate sense, to have set them free without reward or hire.

V. 14. *Thus saith Jehovah, The toil of Egypt and the gain of Cush and the Sebaïm men of measure unto thee shall pass, and to thee shall they belong, after thee shall they go, in chains shall they pass over (or along); and unto thee shall they bow themselves, to thee shall they pray (saying), Only in thee (is) God, and there is none besides, no (other) God.* The first clause specifies labour and traffic as the two great sources of wealth, here put for wealth itself, or for the people who possessed it. מִסְחָרֵי אֲפִיקִים is construed by some writers as a genitive dependent on מִסְחָרֵי, *the trade of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans*; by others, as the nominative to the next verb, *the Sabeans shall pass over to thee*; a grammatical distinction not affecting the sense. For the true sense of the geographical or national names here mentioned, see above, on ch. 43 : 3. In both places they are named, as Hitzig well observes, by way of sample (*beispielsweise*) for the heathen world. To the reasons before given for this interpretation we may here add the general reference to idolaters in v. 16.—The Targum seems to explain מִסְחָרֵי here as meaning *trade* (מִסְחָרֵי); and others give it that of *tribute*, which it has in Chaldee (Ezra 4 : 20) and in Neb. 5 : 4. But the meaning *men of measure*, i. e. of extraordinary stature, is determined by the analogy of Num. 13 : 32. 1 Chr. 11 : 23. 20 : 6, and confirmed by the description of the Ethiopians in ancient history, Herodotus speaking of them as μέγιστοι ἀρθρώπων, and Solinus more specifically as *duodecim pedes longi*. According to Knobel, their stature is here mentioned, in order to show that they were able-bodied, and would be profitable servants to the Jews; but most interpreters correctly understand it as a circumstance intended to enhance the glory and importance of the conquest.—מִסְחָרֵי might be under-

stood to mean *against thee*; but this sense is precluded by the next phrase, *they shall be* (or *belong*) *to thee*, as well as by the expegetical addition, *they shall pass in chains*. Whether these are here considered as imposed by their conquerors, or by themselves in token of a voluntary submission, is a question which the words themselves leave undecided. The same thing may be said of the prostration mentioned afterwards, which in itself might be considered as denoting the customary oriental act of obeisance or civil adoration, although usually found in such connexions as require it to be taken in a religious sense, which is here further indicated by the addition of the verb to pray. The seeming incongruity of thus ascribing divine honours to a creature, may be avoided by taking  $\text{לְפָנֶיךָ}$  in a local sense, as meaning *towards thee*, but not *to thee*, as the object of the adoration. But a simpler solution of the difficulty is, that these strong expressions were employed because the explanation was to follow. Instead of saying, *they shall worship God who dwells in thee*, the Prophet makes his language more expressive by saying, *they shall worship thee*; and then immediately explains his own language by adding their acknowledgment, *only in thee is God*, or to give the Hebrew word its full force, *an almighty God*, implying that the gods of other nations were but gods in name. This exclusive recognition of the God of Israel is then repeated in a way which may to some seem tautological, but which is really emphatic in a high degree.—The application of the suffixes in this verse to Cyrus is inconsistent with the masoretic pointing, which makes them feminine. This is regarded by Vitringa and Gesenius as an oversight of Grotius, occasioned by his looking at the Latin text and not the Hebrew. But the same construction seems to be approved by Aben Ezra and Ewald, who must therefore be considered as departing from the common punctuation. The feminine pronouns of the common text may be referred either to  $\text{בְּלִיַּי}$  (*captivity*) in v. 13, or to  $\text{עִירִי}$  (*my city*) in the same verse, or to  $\text{קְהִלַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  (*the congregation of Israel*), in all which cases the real object of address is still substantially the same, viz. the ancient church or chosen people.—The question now presents itself, in what sense the subjection of the nations is here promised. That a literal conquest of Ethiopia and Egypt by the Jews themselves is here predicted, none can maintain but those who wish to fasten on Isaiah the charge of ignorance or gross imposture. An ingenious Jewish writer of our own day, Luzzatto, supposes the Prophet to foretell a literal subjection of these countries, not by Israel, but by Cyrus; and explains the whole verse as describing the conduct of the captives when they should *pass by* the land of Israel *in chains* on their way to Persia, and acknowledge the supremacy of Jehovah by worshipping towards his earthly residence. In order to sustain this ingenious and original interpretation, its author is under the necessity of taking  $\text{הַיָּבֵשׁ}$  and  $\text{בְּהַר}$  as elliptical expressions for  $\text{אֲנָשֵׁי הָאָרֶץ}$  and  $\text{אֲנָשֵׁי הַדָּרֶךְ}$ , men of labour, men of traffic, i. e. labourers and

traders. He is also forced to explain away some of the most significant expressions, such as *they shall be thine, they shall go after thee*, as merely indicating disposition or desire. The violence thus done to the obvious meaning of the Prophet's language is sufficient to condemn the exposition which involves it. The same interpretation is substantially proposed by Ewald, but more briefly and obscurely, and with his usual omission of all reference to other writers, which leaves it doubtful whether he derived it from Luzzatto, or arrived at it by an independent process. Enough has now been said to show that the most natural interpretation of the passage is the common one which makes it a prophecy of moral and spiritual conquests, to be wrought by the church over the nations, and, as one illustrious example, by the Jews' religion over the heathenism of many countries, not excepting the literal Ethiopia, as we learn from Acts 8:27.

V. 15. *Verily thou art a God hiding thyself, oh God of Israel, the Saviour!* The abrupt transition here has much perplexed interpreters. Vitringa effects nothing by his favourite and far-fetched supposition of a responsive choir or chorus. Ewald and Luzzatto suppose the words of the Egyptian captives to be still continued. It is far more natural to take the verse as an apostrophe, expressive of the Prophet's own strong feelings in contrasting what God had done and would yet do, the darkness of the present with the brightness of the future. If these things are to be hereafter, then oh thou Saviour of thy people, thou art indeed a God that hides himself, that is to say, conceals his purposes of mercy under the darkness of his present dispensations. Let it be observed, however, that the same words, which furnish a vehicle of personal emotion to the Prophet, are in fact a formula of wider import, and contain the statement of a general truth. Ewald assumes two distinct propositions, reading the last clause thus, *the God of Israel is a Saviour*; which is perfectly grammatical and agreeable to usage, but unnecessary here and undesirable, because it detracts from the simplicity and unity of the construction.

V. 16. *They are ashamed and also confounded all of them together, they are gone into confusion (or away in confusion)—the carvers of images.* Unless we assume, without necessity or warrant, an abrupt and perfectly capricious change of subject, this verse must contain the conclusion of the process described in the foregoing context. We might therefore expect to find Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba, introduced again by name; but instead of these, the sentence closes with a general expression, which has already been referred to as a proof that the war in question is a spiritual war, and that the enemies to be subdued are not certain nations, in themselves considered, but the heathen world, the vast mixed multitude who worship idols. These

are described as the carvers or artificers of images, which strengthens the conclusion before drawn, that the smith and carpenter and cook and baker and cultivator of ch. 44: 12-16. are one and the same person, viz. the idolatrous devotee himself.

V. 17. *Israel is saved in Jehovah (with) an everlasting salvation (literally, salvation of ages or eternities) ; ye shall not be ashamed, and ye shall not be confounded for ever (literally, until the ages of eternity), or as the English Version has it, world without end.* This is the counterpart and contrast to the threatening in the verse preceding, upon which it throws some light by showing that the shame and confusion which awaits the idolater is not mere wounded pride or sense of disappointment, but the loss and opposite of that salvation which is promised to God's people, or in other words, eternal perdition. Israel is saved already, i. e. his salvation is secured, not merely *through* the Lord but *in* him, i. e. by virtue of an intimate and vital union with him, as genuine and living members of his body. The general form of this solemn declaration, and the eternity again and again predicated of the salvation promised, seem to show that the Israel of this text and of others like it, is not the Jewish people, considered simply as an ancient nation, but the Jewish people considered as the church of God, a body which has never ceased and never will cease to exist and claim the promises.

V. 18. *For thus saith Jehovah, the creator of the heavens—he is God—the former of the earth and its maker—he established it—not in vain (or not to be empty) did he create it—to dwell in (or to be inhabited) he formed it—I am Jehovah, and there is none besides.* This verse assigns a reason for believing in the threatening and the promise of the two preceding verses, viz. that he who uttered them not only made the heavens and the earth, but made them for a certain purpose, which must be accomplished. The only difficulty of construction is the question where Jehovah's words begin, and this admits of several different answers. We may read, *Thus saith Jehovah, The creator of the heavens is God* ; in which case the divine address begins with a formal statement of the argument derived from the creation. Again, we may read, *Thus saith Jehovah, The creator of the heavens is the God who formed the earth.* This is Vitringa's explanation of the verse, which he regards as a denial of the doctrine that the heavens and the earth derive their origin from different creators. But most interpreters suppose the beginning of Jehovah's own words to be marked by the introduction of the pronoun of the first person, *I am Jehovah and there is no other.* All that precedes is then to be regarded as a description of the speaker, including two parenthetical propositions, each beginning with the pronoun הויה: *the creator of the heavens (he is God), the former of the earth and its*

*maker (he established it).*—Some understand מְכֻנָּה to mean *prepared (or fitted) it*, i. e. for man to dwell in. But the other sense is favoured by the predominant usage of the verb and by the analogy of Ps. 119:90. The common version of the next clause, *he created it not in vain*, is admissible, but less expressive than the more specific rendering, *he created it not (to be) a waste (or empty)*. Grotius understands by יְרֵאָה the Holy Land, and by the whole clause that God would not let it remain uninhabited. But the antithesis with *heavens* makes the wider sense more natural, in which the more restricted one, as Hitzig has suggested, may be comprehended. The earth, and the Holy Land as part of it, was made to be inhabited, not empty.—Vitringa's distinctions between making, forming, and creating, though ingenious, are no more natural or necessary here than in ch. 43:7. (See above, p. 75.) In the last clause *Jehovah* is employed as a descriptive title, and is really equivalent to יְהוָה, which the Prophet uses in a similar connexion in v. 22 below.

V. 19. *Not in secret have I spoken, in a dark place of the earth (or in a place, to wit, a land of darkness). I have not said to the seed of Jacob, In vain seek ye me. I (am) Jehovah, speaking truth, declaring rectitudes (or right things).* The doctrine of the preceding verse is no new revelation, but one long ago and universally made known. Vitringa, Lowth, Ewald, and Umbreit suppose an allusion to the mysterious and doubtful responses of the heathen oracles. The objections of Gesenius are of no more weight than in vs. 1, 2, 3, the analogy of which places makes it not improbable that such an allusion to the oracles is couched under the general terms of the verse before us.—Of the next clause there are several distinct interpretations. The oldest and most common makes it mean that God had not required the people to consult him in relation to futurity without obtaining satisfactory responses. According to Hitzig, he had not required them to seek him (i. e. serve or worship him) for nothing, or without reward. J. D. Michaelis and Luzzatto give a local sense to הַחֲרָבִים, *in the wilderness*, which Hendewerk explains as equivalent to *land of darkness*, both denoting the heathen world, in which Jehovah had not taught his people to seek him or expect responses from him.—Lowth gives מַיְאָדָּיִם the specific sense of *direct answers*, as opposed to the equivocal responses of the oracles; but this is hardly justified by usage, which requires both this word and the parallel expression to be here taken in the sense of *truth*.

V. 20. *Gather yourselves and come, draw near together ye escaped of the nations. They know not, those carrying the wood, their graven image, and praying to a God (who) cannot save.* In the first clause the idolaters are addressed directly; in the second they are spoken of again in the third

person. The challenge or summons at the beginning is precisely similar to that in ch. 41 : 21 and 43 : 9. *Escaped of the nations* has been variously explained to mean the Jews who had escaped from the oppression of the gentiles, and the gentiles who had escaped from the dominion of idolatry. But these last would scarcely have been summoned to a contest. On the whole, it seems most natural to understand the nations who survived the judgments sent by God upon them. The Hebrew phrase is in itself ambiguous, the noun added to  $\text{יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  sometimes denoting the whole body out of which a remnant has escaped, sometimes the power from which they are delivered. (Compare Judg. 12 : 4. Ez. 6 : 9. 7 : 16. Ob. 11, with Jer. 45 : 23. Ez. 6 : 8.) The predominant usage and the context here decide in favour of the first interpretation. Gesenius and Luzzatto both apply the phrase to the conquests of Cyrus, but in contrary senses. The first regards it as describing those whom he should spare, the other those whom he should conquer, and who are exhibited as fleeing with their idols on their shoulders. But the explanation which agrees best with the whole connexion is the one that supposes the idolaters still left (i. e. neither converted nor destroyed) to be the object of address. If there are any still absurd enough to carry about a wooden god and pray to one who cannot save, let them assemble and draw near.—*They do not know* is commonly explained to mean *they have no knowledge*; but it is more accordant with the usage of the language to supply a specific object. They do not know it, or, they do not know what they are doing, they are not conscious of their own impiety and folly.—The verse contains two indirect reflections on the idols, first, that they are wooden, then, that they are lifeless and dependent on their worshippers for locomotion.

V. 21. *Bring forward and bring near! Yea, let them consult together. Who has caused this to be heard of old, since then declared it? Have not I Jehovah? and there is no other God besides me; a righteous and a saving God, there is none besides me.* The object of the verbs in the first clause, according to Vitranga, is *your cause* or *your arguments*, as in ch. 41 : 21. This, which Gesenius is pleased to regard as an ignorant blunder of his great predecessor, has nevertheless commended itself to the judgment of most later writers. Gesenius himself explains the first clause as meaning *proclaim it and bring them near* (i. e. the heathen), without explaining what is to be proclaimed or by whom. According to Vitranga's exposition, the idolaters are called upon to state their case and to defend it.—The change of person in the next clause implies that they are unable or unwilling to accept the challenge, or at least in doubt and hesitation with respect to it. They are therefore invited to deliberate together, or, as some understand it, to take counsel of those wiser than themselves. Instead of waiting longer



for their plea, however, he presents his own, in the common form of an interrogation, asking who except himself had given evidence of prescience by explicitly foretelling events still far distant, and of saving power by delivering his people from calamity and bondage.—אֲנִי, although it strictly has relation to a determinate past time, seems here to be employed indefinitely as an equivalent to אֲנִי־יְהוָה.—*Have not I Jehovah, and there is no other God besides me?* is a Hebrew idiom equivalent to the English question, *Have not I, besides whom there is no other God?*

V. 22. *Turn unto me and be saved all ye ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none besides.* From the preceding declarations it might seem to follow that the gentile world had nothing to expect but the perdition threatened in v. 15. But now the Prophet brings to view a gracious alternative, inviting them to choose between destruction and submission, and showing that the drift of the foregoing argument was not to drive the heathen to despair, but to shut them up to the necessity of seeking safety in the favour of the one true God, whose exclusive deity is expressly made the ground of the exhortation.—נִסְבֵּן does not correspond exactly to the English *look*, but denotes the act of *turning round* in order to look in a different direction. The text therefore bears a strong analogy to those in which the heathen when enlightened are described as *turning* from their idols unto God. (See 1 Thess. 1 : 9. Acts 14 : 15. 15 : 19.)—*The ends of the earth* is a phrase inclusive of all nations, and is frequently employed in reference to the conversion of the gentiles. (See Ps. 22 : 28. 72 : 8. Zech. 9 : 10.) De Wette's version, *let yourselves be saved*, appears to be a needless refinement on the simple meaning of the passive.—The question whether Christ is to be regarded as the speaker in this passage, is of little exegetical importance. To us, who know that it is only through him that the Father saves, this supposition appears altogether natural ; but it does not follow that any such impression would be made or was intended to be made upon an ancient reader.

V. 23. *By myself I have sworn ; the word is gone out of a mouth of righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me shall bow every knee, shall swear every tongue.* The form of the divine oath elsewhere used is *by my life* or *as I live*. (Num. 14 : 21, 28. Deut. 32 : 40.) Hence Paul in his quotation of this text (Rom. 14 : 11) uses the formula, *Zō ēgō*, which may be regarded as an accurate paraphrase, though not as a rigorous translation.—The construction of the words אֲנִי־יְהוָה has perplexed interpreters. Jerome arbitrarily transposes them, and translates the phrase as if it were אֲנִי־יְהוָה *word of righteousness*. Rosenmüller gains the same end by supposing an unusual combination *righteousness-word*, like אֲנִי־יְהוָה in Ps. 45 : 5. Most of the modern writers make אֲנִי־יְהוָה the subject of the verb אָמַר,

notwithstanding the diversity of gender, and regard אָמַר as equivalent to אָמַר לִי. *Truth has gone out of my mouth, a word which shall not return.* The simplest construction, although none of the later writers seem to have adopted it, is that proposed by J. D. Michaelis, who regards אָמַר as the construct form of אָמַר without a suffix, and אֶמְצָא as a genitive dependent on it, *the mouth of righteousness or truth (aus dem untrüglichen Munde).*—A word, i. e. a promise or a prophecy, is said in Hebrew to *return* when it is cancelled or recalled. (See Isaiah 55 : 11.) The kneeling and swearing in the last clause are acts of homage, fealty, or allegiance, which usually went together (1 Kings 19 : 18) and involved a solemn recognition of the sovereignty of him to whom they were tendered. This verse affords a clear illustration of the difference between the act of *swearing to* and *swearing by* another. (Compare ch. 19 : 18, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 357.)—This text is twice applied by Paul to Christ (Rom. 14 : 11. Phil. 2 : 10), in proof of his regal and judicial sovereignty. It does not necessarily predict that all shall be converted to him, since the terms are such as to include both a voluntary and a compulsory submission, and in one of these ways all without exception shall yet recognise him as their rightful sovereign.

V. 24. *Only in Jehovah have I, says he, righteousness and strength; unto him shall he come, and all that were incensed (or inflamed) at him shall be ashamed.* Joseph Kimchi takes the first words as an oath, *Yes by Jehovah!* David Kimchi gives the אָמַר its proper meaning, and connects the clause with the last words of the foregoing verse.—*Every tongue shall swear (but) only by Jehovah.* Most interpreters suppose a sentence to begin with this verse, and אֶמְצָא to mean *in Jehovah*. They differ very much among themselves, however, as to the meaning of the words אֶמְצָא לִי. Vitringa, Ewald, and some others, render the phrase *said to me*, but without satisfactorily showing its relation to the context. The most usual construction is, *one says of me*, which is grammatical but seems to make the clause unmeaning or at least superfluous. Perhaps the best construction is De Dieu's, who insulates אֶמְצָא and understands it to mean *says one* or *says he*, while he connects the following words with לִי, as meaning *are to me*, the only Hebrew phrase corresponding to *I have*. In either case the general meaning evidently is that God alone can justify or give protection. Vitringa's explanation of אֶמְצָא as meaning *grace* is as groundless as the similar translation of אֶמְצָא by the modern Germans.—The masoretic interpunction refers the singular verb אֶמְצָא and the plural אֶמְצָאוּ to the same subject, namely, that which follows. But the difference of number seems designed to indicate a difference of subject, corresponding to the kinds of submission hinted at in v. 23. The singular אֶמְצָא may naturally have a common subject with the singular אֶמְצָא, viz. the 'every one' who should

eventually bow the knee and swear allegiance to Jehovah, while the plural *נְחַרְרִים* may be regularly construed with the plural *נְחַרְרִים*. Jarchi explains the whole of the last clause as describing the repentance of Jehovah's enemies; but this is really the meaning only of *נְדָרָיו יָבוֹא*, while the rest describes the final and desperate confusion of incorrigible sinners, as in v. 16. On the phrase *נְדָרָיו יָבוֹא* compare ch. 19 : 22, and on *נְחַרְרִים בּוֹ* ch. 41 : 22. and Cant. 1 : 6.

V. 25. *In Jehovah shall be justified and boast themselves (or glory) all the seed of Israel.* This closing promise is restricted by Jarchi, in the genuine spirit of rabbinism, to the literal or natural descendants of Jacob; but this is less surprising when we know that he actually violates the syntax of the preceding verse in order to bring *לִי* and *אֵלַי* together in the sense of *only to me*, the speaker being Israel! So far is this from being the correct interpretation of the verse, that it is really intended to wind up the previous addresses to the gentiles with a solemn declaration of their true relation to the chosen people, as composed of those who really believed and feared God, whether Jews or gentiles. This principle was recognised in every admission of a proselyte to the communion of the ancient church, and at the change of dispensations it is clearly and repeatedly asserted as a fundamental law of Christ's kingdom under every variety of form. (See Rom. 10 : 12. Gal. 3 : 28, 29. Col. 3 : 11.)

---

 CHAPTER XLVI.

INTERPRETERS are strangely divided in opinion as to the connexion of this chapter with the context. The arbitrary and precarious nature of their judgments may be gathered from the fact, that Ewald separates the first two verses from the body of the chapter and connects them with the one before it, while Hendewerk on the other hand commences a new "cycle" with the first verse of this chapter, and Knobel dogmatically represents it as an isolated composition, unconnected either with what goes before or follows. Even the older writers, who maintain the continuity of the discourse, appear to look upon the order of its parts as being not so much an organic articulation as a mere mechanical juxtaposition. They are therefore obliged to assume abrupt transitions, which, instead of explaining any thing else, need to be explained themselves.

All this confusion is the fruit of the erroneous exegetical hypothesis, that the main subject and occasion of these later prophecies is the Babylonish exile and the liberation from it, and that with these the other topics must be violently brought into connexion by assuming a sufficiency of types and double senses, or by charging the whole discourse with incoherence. Equally false, but far less extensive in its influence, is the assumption that the whole relates to Christ and to the new dispensation, so that even what is said of Babylon and Cyrus must be metaphorically understood. Common to both hypotheses is the arbitrary and exclusive application of the most comprehensive language to a part of what it really expresses, and a distorted view of the Prophet's themes considered in their mutual relations and connexions. The whole becomes perspicuous, continuous, and orderly, as soon as we admit what has been already proved to be the true hypothesis, viz. that the great theme of these prophecies is God's designs and dealings with the church and with the world, and that the specific predictions which are introduced are introduced as parts or as illustrations of this one great argument. By thus reversing the preposterous relation of the principal elements of the discourse, and restoring each to its legitimate position, the connexion becomes clear and the arrangement easy.

In confirmation of the general threats and promises with which ch. XLV. is wound up, the Prophet now exhibits the particular case of the Babylonian idols, as a single instance chosen from the whole range of past and future history. They are described as fallen and gone into captivity, wholly unable to protect their worshippers or save themselves, vs. 1, 2. With these he then contrasts Jehovah's constant care of Israel in time past and in time to come, vs. 3, 4. The contrast is carried out by another description of the origin and impotence of idols, vs. 5-7, and another assertion of Jehovah's sole divinity, as proved by his knowledge and control of the future, and by the raising up of Cyrus in particular, vs. 8-11. This brings him back to the same solemn warning of approaching judgments, and the same alternative of life or death, with which the foregoing chapter closes, vs. 12, 13.

V. 1. *Bel is bowed down, Nebo stooping; their images are (consigned) to the beasts and to the cattle. Your burdens are packed up (as) a load to the weary (beast).* The connexion with what goes before may be indicated thus: see for example the fate of the Babylonian idols. Of these two are mentioned, either as arbitrary samples, or as chief divinities. To these names, or rather to the subject of Babylonian mythology, Gesenius devotes an excursus or appendix of thirty pages, the results of which are given in his Thesaurus and Lexicon. He connects *Bel* etymologically with the Hebrew בִּלְזָ, and *Nebo* with נְבֻזָ (נְבֻזָּ), the two corresponding to the Zeus and Hermes of the Greek mythology, or rather to the planets Jupiter and

Mercury. The dignity of these two imaginary deities among the Babylonians may be learned from the extent to which these names enter into the composition of the names of men, both in sacred and profane history. Such are Belshazzar, Belteshazzar, Belesys, Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzaradan, Nabopolassar, Nabonned, etc. Beyond this nothing more is needed for the right interpretation of the passage, where the names are simply used to represent the Babylonian gods collectively.—The verb  $\text{סָפַד}$  occurs only here. The Septuagint renders the two, *fallen and broken*; the Vulgate gives the latter sense to both. But  $\text{סָפַד}$  is the common term for stooping, bowing, especially in death (Judges 5 : 27. 2 Kings 9 : 24. Ps. 20 : 9); and that the other is substantially synonymous, may be inferred not only from the parallelism, but from the analogy of the derivative noun  $\text{סָפֵד}$ , a hook, a tache, as being curved or bent. Although not essential to the general meaning, it is best to give the praeter and the participle their distinctive sense, as meaning strictly that the one has fallen and the other is now falling, in strict accordance with Isaiah's practice, in descriptive passages, of hurrying the reader *in medias res*, of which we have already had repeated instances.—The pronoun in *their images* might be supposed to refer to the Babylonians, though not expressly mentioned; but as these are immediately addressed in the second person, it is best to understand the pronoun as referring to Bel and Nebo, who, as heavenly bodies or imaginary deities, are then distinguished from the images which represented them in the vulgar worship. The suggestion of J. D. Michaelis, that there may be an allusion to some actual decay of the metallic idols in the shrines of Babylon is inconsistent with what follows in relation to their going into exile.—The Septuagint, the Targum, and Jerome, seem to understand the next clause as meaning that their images become beasts, which is scarcely intelligible. Most writers follow Kimchi and De Dieu in supplying  $\text{אֲבִיבִים}$  from the other clause, *they are (a burden) to the beasts* etc. But this assumes a very harsh ellipsis and is wholly unnecessary, since usage allows  $\text{לְאֲבִיבִים}$  to be taken in the sense of *they are to*, i. e. they now belong to, or are abandoned and assigned to. The common version, *on the beasts*, is too paraphractical. Kimchi supposes  $\text{חַיָּוִיִּם}$  and  $\text{חַיָּוִיִּתָּא$  to be used in their distinctive sense of wild beasts and domesticated cattle, understanding by the latter common beasts of burden, by the former camels, elephants, etc. J. D. Michaelis imagines that there may be an allusion to the mythological use of wild beasts, such as the lions of Cybele etc. Most interpreters regard the words as simple equivalents or at the most as merely distinguishing oxen, asses, mules, etc. from camels, dromedaries, and perhaps horses.— $\text{אֲבִיבִים}$  is properly a passive participle used as a noun and meaning your *carried things* (in old English, great image of Bel at Babylon was not destroyed until the time of Xerxes,

*carriages*), the things which you have been accustomed to carry in processions or from place to place, but which are now to be carried in a very different manner, on the backs of animals, as spoil or captives. מְרִיסוֹת properly means *lifted up* in order to be carried, but may here be rendered *packed* or *loaded*, though this last word is ambiguous.—אָזְרֵי does not necessarily denote a *heavy load*, but simply that they are a load, i. e. something to be carried. The idea of weight is suggested by the following word, which the Vulgate renders as an abstract meaning weariness (*usque ad lassitudinem*), but which is properly a feminine adjective agreeing with הָרָה or הָרָהָהָ understood.

V. 2. *They stoop, they bow together; they cannot save the load; themselves are gone into captivity.* The first clause may mean that they are now *both* fallen; or *together* may have reference to the other gods of Babylon, so as to mean that not only Bel and Nebo but all the rest are fallen.—The last member of the first clause has been variously explained. Gesenius is disposed to make אָזְרֵי an abstract meaning *the carrying*, a sense not worth obtaining by so harsh a supposition. The Vulgate arbitrarily reverses the meaning, and instead of the thing borne understands the bearer (*non potuerunt salvare portantem*). Of those who adhere to the strict sense, *load* or *burden*, some understand by it the Babylonian state or empire, which ought to have been borne or sustained by its tutelary gods. But the most satisfactory interpretation is the one which gives the word the same sense as in v. 1, and applies it to the images with which the beasts were charged or laden. These are then to be considered as distinguished by the writer from the gods which they represented. Bel and Nebo are unable to rescue their own images. This agrees well with the remainder of the sentence, *themselves are gone* (or literally *their self is gone*) *into captivity*. This is the only way in which the reflexive pronoun could be made emphatic here without an awkward circumlocution. There is no need, therefore, of explaining מְרִיסוֹת to mean *their soul*, i. e. the animating principle or spirit by which the image was supposed to be inhabited; much less *their desire*, i. e. the darling idols of the heathen, like הַבְּרִיָּהָהָ in ch. 44 : 9. The antithesis is really between the material images of Bel and Nebo and *themselves*, so far as they had any real existence. The whole god, soul and body, all that there was of him, was gone into captivity. The idea of the conquest and captivity of tutelary gods was common in the ancient east, and is alluded to, besides this place, in Jer. 48 : 7. 49 : 3. Hos. 10 : 5, 6. Dan. 11 : 8, to which may be added 1 Sam. 5 : 1.—Whether the Prophet here refers to an actual event or an ideal one, and how the former supposition may be reconciled with the statement of Herodotus and Diodorus, that the

are questions growing out of the erroneous supposition that the passage has exclusive reference to the conquest by Cyrus; whereas it may include the whole series of events which resulted in the final downfall of the Babylonian idol worship. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 242.)

V. 3. *Hearken unto me, oh house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, those borne from the belly, those carried from the womb.* By the remnant of the house of Israel Kimchi understands the remains of the ten tribes who were in exile; but this is a gratuitous restriction of the meaning. The participles rendered *borne* and *carried* are the masculine forms of those used in v. 1. This repetition, analogous to that in ch. 42: 2, 3, is intended to suggest a contrast between the failure of the idols to protect their worshippers and God's incessant care of his own people. The gods of the heathen had to be borne by them; but Jehovah was himself the bearer of his followers. And this was no new thing, but coeval with their national existence. The specific reference to Egypt or the exodus is no more necessary here than in ch. 44: 2, 21. 48: 8. The carrying meant is that of children by the nurse or parent. The same comparison is frequent elsewhere. (See Num. 11: 12. Deut. 1: 31. Ex. 19: 4. Is. 63: 9, and compare Deut. 32: 11, 12. Hos. 11: 3. Is. 40: 11.)—For *belly* and *womb* Noyes, by way of euphemistic variation, substitutes *birth* and *earliest breath*. —𐤁𐤏𐤍 𐤁𐤏𐤍 is identical with 𐤁𐤏𐤍 ch. 44: 24. The same form of the particle occurs in Job 20: 4. and Ps. 44: 19.

V. 4. The figure of an infant and its nurse was not sufficient to express the whole extent of God's fidelity and tenderness to Israel. The first of these relations is necessarily restricted to the earliest period of life, but God's protection is continued without limit. *And to old age I am He* (i. e. the same), *and to gray hair I will bear (you); I have done it and I will carry and I will bear and save (you).* Hitzig supposes this to mean that Israel was already old, as in ch. 47: 6; but others much more probably refer it to the future, and regard the expressions as indefinite. As I have done in time past, so I will do hereafter. The general analogy between the life of individuals and that of nations is sufficiently obvious, and is finely expressed by Florus in his division of the Roman History into the periods of childhood, youth, manhood, and old age. But Vitringa mars the beautiful analogy when he undertakes to measure off the periods in the history of Israel from his birth in Egypt, through his infancy in the desert, his youth under the Judges, his manhood until Jotham, his old age until Alexander, and his *gray hairs* or extreme old age beyond that period.—The reference of these terms to God himself as the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7: 9), is too absurd to need refutation or admit of it.

V. 5. *To whom will ye liken me and equal and compare me, that we may be (literally, and we shall be) like?* This is an indirect conclusion from the contrast in the foregoing context. If such be the power of idols, and such that of Jehovah, to whom will ye compare him? The form of expression is like that in ch. 40 : 18, 25.

V. 6. *The prodigals (or lavish ones) will weigh gold from the bag, and silver with the rod; they will hire a gilder, and he will make it a god; they will bow down, yea they will fall prostrate.* מִלֵּי is commonly explained as a participle in the sense of *pouring out* or *lavishing*; but thus understood it is of difficult construction. Vitringa resolves it into מִלֵּי הַבֶּגֶד; but this is contrary to usage. If we make it agree with the subject of the verbs in v. 5 (*ye who pour out* etc.), we must suppose an abrupt change of person in the next clause. The first construction above given is the one proposed by Schmidius, who makes מִלֵּי הַבֶּגֶד the subject of the verb יִשְׁקֹף. We may then explain מִלֵּי either as meaning taken out of the purse, or in reference to the bag of weights, in which sense it is used in Deut. 25 : 13. Mic. 6 : 11. הַבֶּגֶד is properly a reed, then any rod or bar, such as the shaft of a candlestick (Ex. 25 : 31), and here the beam of a balance or the graduated rod of a steelyard.—The verse has reference to the wealthier class of idol-worshippers.

V. 7. *They will lift him on the shoulder, they will carry him, they will set him in his place, and he will stand (there), from his place he will not move; yes, one will cry to him, and he will not answer; from his distress he will (or can) not save him.* The idol is not only the work of man's hands, but entirely dependent on him for the slightest motion. No wonder therefore that he cannot hear the prayers of his worshippers, much less grant them the deliverance and protection which they need.

V. 8. *Remember this and show yourselves men; bring it home, ye apostates, to (your) mind (or heart).*—By *this* Jarchi understands what follows; but it rather means what goes before, viz. the proof just given of the impotence of idols, the worshippers of which, whether Jews or gentiles, are addressed in this verse as apostates or rebels against God. The restriction of the term to apostate Jews is perfectly gratuitous.—The verb מִשְׁמַחֲמֵי is a ἄπαιξ λεγόμενον and admits of several different explanations. Joseph Kimchi derived it from מֵשֶׁשׁ *fire*, and explained it to mean, 'he inflamed or reddened' i. e. blush. So the Vulgate, *confundamini*. The Targum and Jarchi understand it to mean 'fortify or strengthen yourselves,' and connect it with מִשְׁמַחֲמֵי *foundations* (ch. 16 : 7). Bochart derives it from מִשְׁמַחֲמֵי *a man*, and identifies it with the ἀρδουζέσθε of 1 Cor. 16 : 13. Vitringa objects that



the apostates would not be exhorted to fortify themselves in unbelief. Hitzig replies that the clauses are addressed to different parties, which is wholly arbitrary. Gesenius removes the objection by giving to the verb the sense of acting rationally, not like children (1 Cor. 14 : 20), or as Kimchi says, like beasts which have neither judgment nor consideration. Vitringa objects moreover that the form would be  $\text{שָׁפַטְתִּי}$ ; Hitzig more plausibly, that it would be  $\text{שָׁפַטְתִּי}$  from the acknowledged root  $\text{שָׁפַט}$ ; but there is no absurdity in supposing that the verbal form was derived from the contracted  $\text{שָׁפַט}$  which is in common use.—As an exegetical monstrosity it may be stated here that Paulus explains the Hebrew word by the Arabic one  $\text{أس}$ , meaning to drive camels by the use of the syllable *is* ! *is* !

V. 9, 10. *Remember former things of old (or from eternity), for I am the Mighty and there is no other, God and there is none like me, declaring from the first the last, and from ancient time the things which are not (yet) done (or made), saying, My counsel shall stand and all my pleasure I will do.* He calls upon them to consider the proofs of his exclusive deity, afforded not only by the nullity of all conflicting claims, but by the fact of his infallible foreknowledge, as attested by the actual prediction of events long before their occurrence.—Instead of *for* some read *that*, on the ground that the thing to be believed was his divinity; the *former things* being cited merely as the proofs of it.—Declaring the last from the first, or the end from the beginning, means declaring the whole series of events included between these extremes.  $\text{אֶחָדֵם}$  does not strictly mean the end as opposed to the beginning, but the latter part of any thing as opposed to the preceding part, whatever the extent of either or their relative proportions. Hence it often means futurity, both absolute and relative, without necessarily defining the *terminus a quo* from which it is to be computed.—*My counsel shall stand*, i. e. my purpose shall be executed. (See ch. 7 : 7. 8 : 10. 14 : 24. 44 : 26.) All the modern writers seem to be agreed in giving  $\text{אֶחָדֵם}$  the sense of *my will* or *pleasure*, although not at all more natural or necessary here than in ch. 44 : 28, where it is made a proof of later date and of a diction different from that of Isaiah.—All the expressions of the ninth verse have occurred before in different combinations. (See ch. 42 : 14. 43 : 18. 45 : 21 etc.) According to Maurer, *former things* here means *former events*, as in ch. 43 : 18. 48 : 3, not *former predictions*, as in ch. 42 : 9. 43 : 9.

V. 11. *Calling from the east a bird of prey, from a land of distance the man of his counsel; I have both said and will also bring it to pass, I have formed (the plan) and will also do it.* From the general assertion of his providence and power, he now passes to that specific proof of it which has so frequently been urged before, viz. the raising up of Cyrus; but without

the mention of his name in this case, and with an indefiniteness of expression which is perfectly well suited to the general analogy of prophecy, as well as to the views already taken in the exposition of ch. 44 : 28. (See above, p. 106.)—*Calling* includes prediction and efficiency, not only announcing but calling into being. Most of the modern writers give to עֵצ here the specific sense of *eagle*, some on account of a supposed affinity between the Hebrew name and the Greek *ἀετός*, others because of the frequent similar allusions to the eagle elsewhere (see Jer. 49 : 22. Ezek. 17 : 2, 3, 12. Comp. Isaiah 40 : 31), others supposing a reference to the Persian ensign. But the very vagueness of the usual sense entitles it to the preference for reasons just suggested.—The point of comparison is not mere swiftness or rapidity of conquest (Hos. 8 : 1. Hab. 1 : 8. Jer. 48 : 40), but rapacity and fierceness. Knobel arbitrarily assumes that Media and Persia are distinctly and specifically meant by the *east* and the *far country*, whereas the language is designedly indefinite.—*Man of his counsel* does not mean his counsellor, as it does in ch. 40 : 13, but either the executor of his purpose, or the agent himself purposed i. e. foreordained by God. The marginal reading (*my counsel*) probably arose from the seeming harshness of the *enallage personae*, but this is a figure much too frequent in Isaiah to require elimination by a change of text. It is as if he had said, *I am he that calls the man of his counsel*, after which the construction is continued regularly in the first person.—עֵצ denotes accession, and is sometimes equivalent to *also*, sometimes to *nay more*. It has here the force of *not only this but also that*, or *both this and also that*.—עֵצ is not here synonymous with עֵצ as in ch. 44 : 2, but opposed to it, meaning to conceive or form the plan of any thing, as in ch. 22 : 11. 37 : 26. Jer. 18 : 11. Ps. 94 : 20. Is. 37 : 26. The antithesis expressed is that between design and execution.—The feminine suffix corresponds to our neuter pronoun *it*, referring to the feminine noun עֵצ i. e. purpose or counsel.

V. 12. *Hearken to me, ye stout of heart, those far from righteousness.* By an easy and natural association, he subjoins to these proofs of his own divinity, both past and future, a warning to those who were unwilling to receive them. Strength of heart implies, though it does not directly signify, stubbornness or obstinacy and a settled opposition to the will of God. Because עֵצ is sometimes absolutely used in the sense of a bull (Ps. 22 : 13. 50 : 13), Hitzig says that it here strictly means *bulls in intellect* (*Stiere an Vernunft*).—The same persons are described as *far from righteousness*, which some understand as meaning far from rectitude or truth, i. e. deceitful, insincere. Others explain it to mean those who regard the exhibition of God's righteousness as still far distant. But the only natural interpretation is the one which gives the words their obvious and usual sense, as signifying

those who are not righteous before God, in other words the wicked, the words *far from* expressing the degree of their depravity.

V. 13. *I have brought near my righteousness, it shall not be far off; and my salvation, it shall not tarry; and I will give (or place) in Zion my salvation, to Israel my glory.* Because righteousness and salvation frequently occur as parallel expressions, most of the modern German writers treat them as synonymous, whereas one denotes the cause and the other the effect, one relates to God and the other to man. The sense in which salvation can be referred to the righteousness of God is clear from ch. 1 : 27. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 19.) The exhibition of God's righteousness consists in the salvation of his people and the simultaneous destruction of his enemies. To these two classes it was therefore at the same time an object of desire and dread. The stout-hearted mentioned in v. 12 were not prepared for it, and, unless they were changed, must perish when God's righteousness came near.—The last words admit of two constructions, one of which repeats the verb and makes it govern the last noun (I will give my glory unto Israel); the other makes the clause a supplement to what precedes, I will give salvation in Zion unto Israel (who is) my glory. In illustration of the latter, see ch. 44 : 23. 62 : 3. Jer. 33 : 9. The other construction has more of the parallel or balanced form which is commonly considered characteristic of Hebrew composition. In sense they ultimately coincide, since Israel could become Jehovah's glory only by Jehovah's glory being bestowed upon him.

## CHAPTER XLVII.

HERE again we meet with the most discordant and unfounded assumptions, as to the connexion of this chapter with the context, and arising from the same misapprehension of the general design of the whole prophecy. Hitzig, because he cannot make it fit into an artificial system of his own, involving the hypothesis of several successive compositions, corresponding to the progress of events under Cyrus, arbitrarily describes it as an insulated prophecy, older than those which now precede it, and afterwards wrought into its present place. In support of this violent and desperate assumption he appeals to the close connexion between the last verse of ch. XLVI. and the first of ch. XLVIII; an argument which might be used, with equal plausi-

bility, to throw out any portion of the book, because throughout these later prophecies certain apostrophes and other formulas are constantly recurring at irregular intervals. Hendewerk, on the other hand, so far from seeing any want of continuity between this chapter and the two before and after it, represents the three as constituting a "cycle" or division of a cycle. But even those who hold a middle course between these violent extremes commit the usual error of inverting the legitimate relation of the topics to each other, by making the prediction of the downfall of Babylon the Prophet's main theme, and not a specific illustration of it. The difficulties which this false assumption has occasioned with respect to the arrangement of the chapter will be seen below from the interpretation of the fourth verse. Another undesirable effect of the same error is the necessity imposed upon some eminent interpreters, Vitringa for example, of superadding to their exposition of the chapter an account of what they call its mystical sense, that is to say, the application of its terms in the New Testament to Rome, both Pagan and Apostate (Rev. xviii). Such a proceeding may be looked upon as necessary on the supposition that the Babylon here threatened is the great theme of the prophecy; but if it is merely introduced as a remarkable example of God's dealings with his enemies and those of his people, it is difficult to see why its images and terms may not be used in other prophecies directed against other objects, without compelling us to comprehend those objects in the proper scope of the original prediction. Cowper has paraphrased the song of Israel over the fallen king of Babylon in ch. xiii, and put it in the mouth of the Peruvian Incas upbraiding their Spanish tyrants. If it could now be proved that Cowper was inspired when he wrote this poem, would it follow that the thirteenth chapter of Isaiah had reference either literal or mystical to Pizarro or Peru? If this would not be a legitimate conclusion in the supposed case, then all the facts of the real case may be sufficiently accounted for, by simply assuming that the costume of this prophecy was reproduced by inspiration in another, on a subject similar but not identical; that this new prophecy is not a repetition or an explanation but at most an imitation of the old one; and finally that what Vitringa calls the mystical sense of the chapter now before us is really the strict sense of another passage, and belongs therefore not to the interpretation of Isaiah but to that of the Apocalypse. The following seems to be the true analysis.

Having exemplified his general doctrine, as to God's ability and purpose to do justice both to friends and foes, by exhibiting the downfall of the Babylonian idols, he now attains the same end by predicting the downfall of Babylon itself and of the state to which it gave its name. Under the figure of a royal virgin, she is threatened with extreme degradation and exposure, vs. 1-3. Connecting this event with Israel and Israel's God, as the great themes which it was intended to illustrate, v. 4, he predicts the fall of the

empire more distinctly, v. 5, and assigns as a reason the oppression of God's people, v. 6, pride and self-confidence, vs. 7-9, especially reliance upon human wisdom and upon superstitious arts, all which would prove entirely insufficient to prevent the great catastrophe, vs. 10-15.

V. 1. *Come down!* By a beautiful apostrophe, the mighty power to be humbled is addressed directly, and the prediction of her humiliation clothed in the form of a command to exhibit the external signs of it.—*Sit on the dust!* This, which is the literal translation of the Hebrew phrase, may be conformed to our idiom either by substituting *in* for *on*, or by understanding  $\text{רָצַץ}$  to denote, as it sometimes does, the solid ground. (See ch. 2 : 19, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 35.) The act of sitting on the ground is elsewhere mentioned as a customary sign of grief. (See ch. 3 : 26. Lam. 2 : 10. Job 2 : 13.) But here it is designed, chiefly if not exclusively, to suggest the idea of dethronement which is afterwards expressed distinctly.—The next phrase is commonly explained to mean *virgin daughter of Babel* (i. e. *Babylon*), which, according to Gesenius, is a collective personification of the inhabitants. But as  $\text{בְּתוּלַת בָּבֶל}$ , notwithstanding its construct form, is really in apposition with  $\text{בָּתּוּלָה}$  (*virgin daughter*), so  $\text{בָּתּוּלָה}$  may be in apposition with  $\text{בְּתוּלַת בָּבֶל}$  (*daughter Babel*), and denote not the daughter of Babylon, but Babylon itself, personified as a virgin and a daughter, in which case the latter word may have the wide sense of the French *fille*, and be really synonymous with *virgin*. (See ch. 37 : 22, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 616.) But whatever may be the primary import of the phrase, it is admitted upon all hands to be descriptive either of the city of Babylon, or of the Babylonian state and nation. Whether that power is described as a virgin because hitherto unconquered, is much more doubtful, as this explanation seems to mar the simplicity of the description by confounding the sign with the thing signified.—*Sit to the earth!* i. e. close to it, or simply *on* it, as in Ps. 9 : 5, where the vague sense of the particle is determined by the verb and noun with which it stands connected. *To sit as to a throne* can only mean to sit upon it. *There is no throne.* Some connect this with what goes before, in this way : *sit on the earth without a throne.* But there is no need of departing from the idiomatic form of the original, in which these words are a complete proposition, which may be connected with what goes before by supplying a causal particle : 'sit on the earth, for you have now no throne.'—*Daughter of Chasdim!* This last is the common Hebrew name for the Chaldees or Chaldeans, the race introduced by the Assyrians, at an early period, into Babylonia. (See ch. 23 : 13, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 411. Compare also what is said above, on ch. 43 : 14.) If taken here in this sense, it may be understood to signify the government or the collective members of this race. Rosen-

müller applies it to the city, and supposes it to be so called because built by the Chaldeans. But this is equally at variance with history and with the analogy of other cases where a like explanation would be inadmissible. *Daughter of Chasdim* must of course be an analogous expression to the parallel phrase *daughter of Babel*, which certainly cannot mean a city built by Babylon. Besides the strict use of  $\text{כַּשְׂדִּים}$  as a plural, it is unequivocally used now and then as the name of the country, analogous to  $\text{כַּשְׂדִּי}$  which is a dual. See for example Jer. 51 : 24, 35, where we read of the *inhabitants of Chasdim*, and Ezek. 16 : 29, where it takes the local or directive  $\text{כִּי}$ . If the word be so explained in this case, it will make the correspondence of the clauses still more exact.—*For thou shalt not aild (or continue) to be called*, would be the natural and usual conclusion of the phrase; instead of which we have here *they shall not call thee*, which is common enough as an indefinite expression equivalent to a passive, and only remarkable from its combination with the preceding words, although the sense of the whole clause is quite obvious. *Thou shalt not continue to be called (or they shall no longer call thee) tender and delicate*, i. e. they shall no longer have occasion so to call thee, because thou shalt no longer be so. The same two epithets are found in combination Deut. 28 : 54, from which place it is clear that they are not so much descriptive of voluptuous and vicious habits as of a delicate and easy mode of life, such as that of a princess compared with that of a female slave. The testimonies of the ancient writers as to the prevalent iniquities of Babylon belong rather to a subsequent part of the description. All that is here meant is that the royal virgin must descend from the throne to the dust, and relinquish the luxuries and comforts of her former mode of life.

V. 2. *Take mill-stones and grind meal!* Even among the Romans this was considered one of the most servile occupations. In the east it was especially the work of female slaves. (Ex. 11 : 5. Matth. 24 : 41.)—*Uncover (i. e. lift up or remove) thy veil!* One of the Arabian poets speaks of certain ladies as appearing unveiled so that they resembled slaves, which is exactly the idea here expressed. Vitringa and others render  $\text{שֵׁשֶׁת}$  *thy hair* or *thy braided locks*, which rests on an Arabic analogy, as the sense of *veil*, now commonly adopted, does on Chaldee usage. The parallel word  $\text{שֵׁשֶׁת}$  is also understood by some as meaning *hair*, by others the *foot*, or the *sleeve*; but most interpreters are now agreed in giving it the sense of *skirt*, and to the whole phrase that of *lift up (literally strip) thy skirt (or train)*, corresponding to the lifting of the veil in the preceding clause.—*Uncover the leg, cross streams!* The only question as to this clause is whether it refers, as Gesenius and Ewald think, to the fording of rivers by female captives as they go into exile, or to the habitual exposure of the person, by which

women of the lowest class are especially distinguished in the east. The latter explanation, which is that of Vitringa, is entitled to the preference, not only because we read of no deportation of the Babylonians by Cyrus, but because the other terms of the description are confessedly intended to contrast two conditions of life or classes of society.

V. 3. The same idea of exposure is now carried out to a revolting extreme. *Let thy nakedness be uncovered, likewise let thy shame be seen.* This conveys no new idea, but is simply the climax of the previous description.—*I will take vengeance.* The metaphor is here exchanged for literal expressions by so easy a transition that it scarcely attracts notice. The destruction of Babylon is frequently set forth as a righteous retribution for the wrongs of Israel. (See Jer. 50: 15, 28.)—*I will not (or I shall not) meet a man.* Of the various and discordant explanations of this clause, it will suffice to mention one or two of the most current or most plausible. Some give פָּנֵי the sense which it has elsewhere when followed by the preposition כִּי, viz. that of interceding. Thus Jarchi understands the words to mean, I will not intercede with (or solicit) any man to avenge me, but avenge myself. Grotius gives the verb the sense of admitting intercession; and Lowth, for the same purpose, reads פָּנֵי in the Hiphil form (*neither will I suffer man to intercede with me*). Gesenius, in his Commentary, traces an affinity between פָּנֵי and פָּנֵי to visit, and explains the clause to mean *I will spare no man.* In his Thesaurus he connects it with פָּנֵי, πικρῶς, and *paciscor*, and agrees with Maurer in translating, *I will strike (or ratify) a league with no man.* But the explanation most agreeable to usage, and at the same time simplest as to syntax, is, *I shall (or will) meet no man.* This is not to be understood, however, with Vitringa, as meaning that he would find no one to avenge him, or that if he did not he would still avenge himself. The true sense is that expressed by Rosenmüller, *I shall encounter no man*, i. e. no man will be able to resist me. This simple explanation is at the same time one of the most ancient, as we find it distinctly expressed by Symmachus (ὄνκ ἀρτιστήσεται μοι ἀθροπος) and in the Vulgate (*non resistet mihi homo*).—Independently of these minuter questions, it is clear that the whole clause is a laconic explanation of the figures which precede, and which are summed up in the simple but terrific notion of resistless and inexorable vengeance.

V. 4. *Our Redeemer (or as for our Redeemer), Jehovah of Hosts (is) his name, the Holy One of Israel.* The downfall of Babylon was but a proof that the Deliverer of Israel was a sovereign and eternal being, and yet bound to his own people in the strongest and tenderest covenant relation. Thus understood, the verse does not even interrupt the sense, but makes it

clearer, by recalling to the reader's mind the great end for which the event took place and for which it is here predicted. Compare with this Lowth's pedantic supposition of a chorus, which is scarcely more natural than that of a committee or a jury, and Eichhorn's deplorable suggestion that the verse is a devout reflection of some Jewish reader, accidentally transplanted from the margin to the text. This is justly represented by Gesenius as a makeshift (*Nothbehelf*), a description equally appropriate to many of his own erasures elsewhere, if not to his extravagant assumption here, that the words *thus saith* have been left out at the beginning of the sentence. Maurer improves upon this strange exegetical device by making the verse merely introductory to that which follows, *Thus saith our Redeemer, whose name is Jehovah of Hosts, the Holy One of Israel, Sit in silence* etc. In this way every thing may easily be made to denote any thing. The only tenable conclusion is the obvious and simple one, that this is a distinct link in the chain of the prophetic argument, by which the fall of Babylon is brought into connexion and subordination to the proof of God's supremacy as shown in the protection and salvation of his people. That the Prophet speaks here in his own person, is but a single instance of a general usage, characteristic of the whole composition, in which God is spoken of, spoken to, or introduced as speaking, in constant alternation; yet without confusion or the slightest obscuration of the general meaning.

V. 5. *Sit silent (or in silence), and go into darkness (or a dark place), daughter of Chasdim!* The allusion is to natural and usual expressions of sorrow and despondency. (See Lam. 2:10. 3:2, 28.) The explanation of *darkness* as a metaphor for *prison* does not suit the context, and is no more natural or necessary here than in ch. 42:7.—*For thou shalt not continue to be called (or they shall not continue to call thee) mistress of kingdoms.* This is an allusion to the Babylonian empire, as distinguished from Babylonia proper, and including many tributary states, which Xenophon enumerates. In like manner the Assyrian king is made to ask (ch. 10:8), *Are not my princes altogether kings?*

V. 6. *I was wroth against my people; I profaned my heritage*, i. e. I suffered my chosen and consecrated people to be treated as something common and unclean. In the same sense God is said before (ch. 43:28) to have *profaned the holy princes*. Israel is called *Jehovah's heritage*, as being his perpetual possession, continued from one generation to another. This general import of the figure is obvious enough, although there is an essential difference between this case and that of literal inheritance, because in the latter the change and succession affect the proprietor, whereas in the former they affect the thing possessed, and the possessor is unchangeable.—



*And I gave them into thy hand, as my instruments of chastisement. Thou didst not show them mercy, literally place (give or appoint) it to them.* God's providential purpose was not even known to his instruments, and could not therefore be the rule of their conduct or the measure of their responsibility. Though unconsciously promoting his designs, their own ends and motives were entirely corrupt. In the precisely analogous case of the Assyrian, it is said (ch. 10 : 7), *he will not think so, and his heart not so will purpose, because to destroy (is) in his heart and to cut off nations not a few.*—The general charge is strengthened by a specific aggravation. *On the aged thou didst aggravate thy yoke (or make it heavy) exceedingly.* Koppe, Gesenius, Maurer, and Hitzig understand this of the whole people, whom they suppose to be described as *old*, i. e. as having reached the period of natural decrepitude. Umbreit agrees with Grotius and Vitranga in preferring the strict sense of the words, viz. that they were cruelly oppressive even to the aged captives, under which Vitranga is disposed to include elders in office and in rank as well as in age. This particular form of inhumanity is charged upon the Babylonians by Jeremiah twice (Lam. 4 : 16. 5 : 12), and in both cases he connects מַלְאָכִים with a parallel term denoting rank or office, viz. priests and princes. Between the two interpretations of the clause which have been stated, Knobel undertakes to steer a middle course, by explaining מַלְאָכִים to mean *aged* in the strict sense, but supposing at the same time that this single act of tyranny is put for inhumanity in general. (Compare Deut. 28 : 50.) The essential meaning of the clause, as a description of inordinate severity to those least capable of retaliation or resistance, still remains the same in either case.

V. 7. *And thou saidst, For ever I shall be a mistress, i. e. a mistress of kingdoms, the complete phrase which occurs above in v. 5.* The sense of *queen* is therefore wholly inadequate, unless we understand it to mean *queen of queens* or *queen of kings*. The ellipsis suggested may perhaps account for the use of what might seem to be a construct form, instead of the synonymous מַלְאָכִים (1 Kings 11 : 19). Hitzig, however, goes too far when he makes this a ground for disregarding the accentuation and connecting the two words מַלְאָכִים in the sense of a *mistress of eternity*, i. e. a perpetual mistress. (Compare Gen. 49 : 26. Hab. 3 : 6. Is. 9 : 5.) As examples of the segholate termination of the absolute form, Maurer cites מַלְאָכִים (Ez. 16 : 30) and מַלְאָכִים (Ez. 17 : 8). Hitzig also objects to the masoretic interpunction, that it requires מַ to be taken in the sense of *so that*, contrary to usage. But this, though assumed by Gesenius and most of the other modern writers, is entirely gratuitous. The conjunction has its proper sense of *until*, as in Job 14 : 6. 1 Sam. 20 : 41 ; and the meaning of the clause is, that she had persisted in this evil course *until* at last it had its natural effect of blind-

ing the mind and hardening the heart. *Thou saidst, For ever I shall be a mistress, till (at last) thou didst not lay these (things) to thy heart.* The idea of causal dependence (*so that*) is implied but not expressed. *Laying to heart*, including an exercise of intellect and feeling, occurs, with slight variations as to form, in ch. 42: 25. 44: 19. 46: 8.—*Thou didst not remember the end* (or *latter part*, or *issue*) *of it*, i. e. of the course pursued, the feminine pronoun being put for a neuter as in ch. 46: 11. and often elsewhere. The apparent solecism of remembering the future may be solved by observing that the thing forgotten was the knowledge of the future once possessed, just as in common parlance we use *hope* in reference to the past, because we hope to find it so, or hope that something questionable now will prove hereafter to be thus and thus.

V. 8. *And now*, a common form of logical resumption and conclusion, very nearly corresponding to our phrases, this being so, or, such being the case.—*Hear this*, i. e. what I have just said, or am just about to say, or both.—*Oh voluptuous one!* The common version, *thou that art given to pleasures*, is substantially correct, but in form too paraphrastical. The translation *delicate*, which some give, is inadequate, at least upon the common supposition that this term is not intended, like the kindred ones in v. 1, to contrast the two conditions of prosperity and downfall, but to bring against the Babylonians the specific charge of gross licentiousness, in proof and illustration of which Vitranga quotes the words of Quintus Curtius: *nihil urbis jus corruptius moribus, nec ad irritandas illicendasque immodicas voluptates instructius*, to which, after certain gross details, the historian adds, *Babylonii maxime in vinum et quae ebrietatem sequuntur effusi sunt.* This corruption of morals, as in other like cases, is supposed to have been aggravated by the wealth of Babylon, its teeming population, and the vast concourse of foreign visitors and residents. After all, however, as this charge is not repeated or insisted on, it may be doubted whether the epithet in question was intended to express more than the fact of her abundant prosperity about to be exchanged for desolation and disgrace.—*The (one) sitting in security.* The common version, *dwellst*, is as much too vague as that of Ewald, which explains it to mean *sitting on a throne*, is too specific. Sitting seems rather to be mentioned as a posture of security and ease.—*The (one) saying in her heart* (or to herself), *I (am) and none besides*, i. e. none like or equal to me. There has been much dispute respecting the precise sense of  $\text{לֹא־אִתִּי}$ ; but the question is only of grammatical importance, as all admit that the whole phrase  $\text{לֹא־אִתִּי}$  is equivalent in import to the common one  $\text{לֹא־יָיִן}$  (ch. 45: 5, 6, 18, etc.). The only doubt is whether  $\text{לֹא־אִתִּי}$  is simply negative like  $\text{לֹא־יָיִן}$ , or exceptive (*besides me*), or at the same time negative and exceptive (*none besides me*). This double explanation is

given by Noldius and Vittinga, but is justly regarded by the later writers as untenable. Cocceius makes it mean *besides me*, and assumes an interrogation, which is altogether arbitrary. De Dieu adopts the same construction, but suggests that  $\text{לְבַדִּי}$  may mean *only I*, as  $\text{לְבַדְּךָ}$  certainly means *only in* Num. 22:35. 23:13. This is adopted by Gesenius in his Commentary. Hitzig objects that  $\text{לְבַדִּי}$  is then superfluous, and that analogy would require  $\text{לְבַדְּךָ לְבַדִּי}$ . He therefore makes it simply exceptive (*besides me*), and supposes an ellipsis of the negative. Rosenmüller, Ewald, Umbreit, Knobel, and Gesenius in the notes to the second edition of his version, follow J. H. Michaelis in making it a paragogic form and simply negative (*there is no other, or none besides*). Maurer goes further, and explains  $\text{לְבַדִּי}$  as a substantive dependent on the construct form before it; literally, *nothing of more*. The sentiment expressed is that of Martial with respect to Rome, *cui par est nihil et nihil secundum*. (Compare the words of Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. 4:30.) There is even an assumption of divine supremacy in these words, when compared with the frequent use of the pronoun *I*, in the solemn declarations of Jehovah (ch. 45:6, 12. 43:11, etc.).—*I shall not sit (as) a widow*. The figure of a virgin is now exchanged for that of a wife, a strong proof that the sign was, in the writer's view, of less importance than the thing signified. It is needless to inquire, with Vittinga, whether the husband, whose loss is here implied, be the king or the chief men collectively. It is not the city or the state of which widowhood is directly predicated, but the royal personage that represents it. The same comparison is used by Jeremiah of Jerusalem (Lam. 1:1. Compare Is. 51:18–20. 54:1, 4, 5. Rev. 14:7). According to J. D. Michaelis, the state is the mother, the soldiers or citizens her sons, and the king her husband, which he illustrates by the use of the title *Dey* and other terms of relationship to designate the state, the government, etc. in Algiers and other parts of Barbary. To *sit* as a widow is considered by Gesenius as suggesting the idea of a mourner; yet in his German version he omits the word entirely, and translates, 'I shall never be a widow,' in which he is closely followed by De Wette. All the interpreters, from Grotius to Ewald, seem to understand widowhood as a specific figure for the loss of a king; but Knobel boldly questions it, and applies the whole clause to the loss of allies, or of all friendly intercourse with foreign nations.—*And I shall not know (by experience) the loss of children*. This paraphrastic expression is the nearest approach that we can make in English to the pregnant Hebrew word  $\text{אֲבִיבָה}$ . *Bereavement* and *childlessness* may seem at first sight more exact, but the first is not exclusively appropriate to the loss of children, and the last does not suggest the idea of loss at all. This last clause is paraphrased by Noyes, *nor see myself childless*; better by Henderson, *nor know what it is to be childless*.

V. 9. *And they shall come to thee.* The form of expression seems to have some reference to the phrase *I shall not know* in the preceding verse. As if he had said, they shall no longer be unknown or at a distance, they shall come near to thee.—*These two*, or *both these (things)*, from which she thought herself secure for ever.—*Suddenly.* זָזַף is a noun, and originally means the twinkling of an eye and then a moment, but is often used adverbially in the sense of *suddenly*. That it has the derivative sense here may be inferred from the addition of the words *in one day*, which would be a striking anticlimax if זָזַף strictly meant a moment or the twinkling of an eye. This objection is but partially removed by Lowth's change of the interpunction (*these two things in a moment, in one day loss of children and widowhood!*), because the first expression is still much the strongest, unless we understand *in one day* to express not mere rapidity or suddenness but the concurrence of the two privations.—*Loss of children and widowhood*, as in the verse preceding, are explained by most interpreters as figures for the loss of king and people.—*In their perfection*, literally, *according to it*, i. e. in the fullest measure possible, implying total loss and destitution.—*They have come upon thee.* The English Version makes it future like the verb in the preceding clause; but this is wholly arbitrary. There is less objection to the present form adopted by the modern German writers; but according to the principle already stated and exemplified so often, it is best to give the word its proper meaning, and to understand it not as a mere repetition of what goes before, but as an addition to it, or at least a variation in the mode of exhibition. What he at first saw coming, he now sees actually come, and describes it accordingly.—Of the ז in the next clause there are three interpretations. Ewald agrees with the English Version and the Vulgate in explaining it to mean *propter*, on account of, and supposing it to bring a new specific charge against the Babylonians, by assigning a new cause for their destruction, viz. their cultivation of the occult arts. Gesenius and the other recent writers follow Calvin and Vitranga in making it mean *notwithstanding*, as in ch. 5: 25. and Num. 14: 11. There is then no new charge or reason assigned, but a simple declaration of the insufficiency of superstitious arts to save them. But a better course than either is to give the particle its proper sense of *in* or *in the midst of*, which suggests both the other ideas, but expresses more, viz. that they should perish in the very act of using these unlawful and unprofitable means of preservation.—*In the multitude of thy enchantments, in the abundance of thy spells (or charms).* The parallel terms, though applied to the same objects, are of different origin, the first denoting primarily prayers or acts of worship, and then superstitious rites; the other specifically meaning bans or spells (from קָבַר to *bind*), with reference, as Gesenius supposes, to the outward act of tying magical knots,

but as the older writers think, to the restraining or constraining influence supposed to be exerted on the victim or even on the gods themselves.—The construction of  $\text{רָאֵץ}$  here is unusual. Gesenius regards it as immediately dependent upon  $\text{רָאֵץ}$  although separated from it by an intervening word, the *multitude of strength* i. e. the strong multitude of thy enchantments. Maurer says that  $\text{רָאֵץ}$  is construed as an adjective; while Hitzig makes it as usual an adverb, qualifying  $\text{רָאֵץ}$ , which is here equivalent to an infinitive. In either case the sense is essentially the same, viz. that of *very powerful*, or *very numerous*, or *very powerful and numerous* enchantments. The prevalence of these arts in ancient Babylon is explicitly affirmed by Diodorus Siculus, and assumed as a notorious fact by other ancient writers.

V. 10. *And (yet) thou art (or wast) secure in thy wickedness.* Vitringa and most of the later writers have *thou trustedst in thy wickedness*, but differ as to the precise sense of the last word, some referring it, with Jerome, to the occult arts of the preceding verse, others making it denote specifically tyranny or fraud, or both combined as in ch. 33: 1. But even in the places which are cited in proof of this specific explanation (such as ch. 13: 11. Nah. 3: 9, etc.), the restriction is either suggested by the context or entirely gratuitous. There is therefore no sufficient reason for departing from the wide sense of the word as descriptive of the whole congeries of crimes with which the Babylonians were chargeable. But neither in the wide nor the restricted sense could their wickedness itself be an object of trust. It is better, therefore, to give the verb the absolute meaning which it frequently has elsewhere, and to explain the whole phrase as denoting that they went on in their wickedness without a fear of change or punishment. In this way, moreover, we avoid the necessity of multiplying the specific charges against Babylon, by giving to the Prophet's words a technical and formal meaning which they will not naturally bear. Thus Vitringa introduces this verse as the statement of a fourth crime or impulsive cause of Babylon's destruction, namely, her wickedness (*malitia*); and as this of course includes all the rest, he is under the necessity of explaining it to mean specifically *cunning* and reliance on it. The construction which has been proposed above may be the one assumed in the Vulgate (*fiduciam habuisti in malitia tua*); but the only modern version where I find it expressed is that of Augusti (*du warst sicher bei deiner Bosheit*), which De Wette, in his improved version, has abandoned for the old one. The idea of *security in wickedness* agrees precisely with what follows.—*Thou hast said, there is no one seeing me*, a form of speech frequently ascribed to presumptuous sinners and unbelievers in the doctrine of providential retribution. (See Ps. 10: 11. 94: 7. Ezek. 8: 12. 9: 9. Job 22: 14.) This, on the other hand, is not a natural expression of

specific trust in any form of wickedness. He who relies upon his power or his cunning as a complete protection will be not so apt to say "None seeth me" as to feel indifferent whether he is seen or not.—*Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, it has seduced thee.* The insertion of the pronoun (סֵרַךְ) admits of a twofold explanation. It may mean *thy very wisdom*, upon which thou hast so long relied for guidance, has *itself* misled thee. But at the same time it may serve to show that wisdom and knowledge are not here to be distinguished but considered as identical. He does not say *thy wisdom and knowledge they have*, but *it has, seduced thee.* By wisdom and knowledge some understand astronomy and astrology, others political sagacity and diplomatic skill, for which it is inferred that the Babylonians were distinguished, from the places where their *wise men* are particularly mentioned. (See for example Jer. 50 : 35. 51 : 57.) But in these descriptions of the Babylonian empire, and the analogous accounts of Tyre (Ezek. 28 : 4) and Egypt (Is. 19 : 11), the reference seems not so much to any thing peculiar to the state in question, as to that peculiar political wisdom which is presupposed in the very existence, much more in the prosperity, of every great empire. Gesenius understands these expressions as ironical, an indirect denial that they were possessed of wisdom. But this is an unnecessary supposition, and not entirely consistent with the tone of the whole context. It was probably not merely the conceit of knowledge but its actual possession that had led the Babylonians astray. The verb סֵרַךְ means to turn aside (convert) from one course to another, and is used both in a good sense and a bad one. An example of the former may be found below in ch. 49 : 5, and of the latter here, where the word means not exactly to *pervert*, or as Lowth translates it, to *pervert the mind*, but rather to misguide, seduce, or lead astray, like סֵרַךְ in ch. 44 : 20. *Thy knowledge and thy wisdom, it has seduced thee.*—The remainder of the verse describes the effect of this perversion or seduction in the same terms that had been employed above in v. 8, and which occur elsewhere only in Zeph. 2 : 15, which appears to be an imitation of the place before us, and not its original as Hitzig and others arbitrarily assume.—*And thou saidst (or hast said) in thy heart.* The indirect construction, *so that thou hast said*, contains more than is expressed, but not more than is implied, in the original.—*I am and there is no other.* J. D. Michaelis understands this boast to mean, I am Babylon and there is no other. But most interpreters prefer the general meaning, I am what no one else is ; there is no one like me, much less equal to me. (See above, on v. 8.) This arrogant presumption is ascribed to their wisdom and knowledge, not as its legitimate effect, but as a necessary consequence of its perversion and abuse, as well as of men's native disposition to exaggerate the force and authority of unassisted reason. (Compare ch. 5 : 21, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 78.)

V. 11. *And (so) there cometh (or has come) upon thee evil*; with an evident allusion to the use of רָצָה in the verse preceding, so as to suggest an antithesis between natural and moral evil, sin and suffering, evil done and evil experienced. The *vav* at the beginning is not properly conversive, as it does not depend upon a foregoing future (Nordheimer § 219); so that the common version (*therefore shall evil come*) is not strictly accurate. Most of the modern writers make it present; but the strict sense of the preterite is perfectly consistent with the context and the usage of the Prophet, who continually depicts occurrences still future, first as coming, then as come, not in fact but in vision, both as certain to occur and as historically represented to his own mind. The phrase *come upon* is explained by Vitringa as implying descent from above or infliction by a higher power.—Of the next clause there are several distinct interpretations, all of which agree in making it descriptive of the *evil* threatened in the one before it. From the use of the verb יָדַע in Ps. 78: 34 and elsewhere, Lowth and others give it here the sense of intercession (*thou shalt not know how to deprecate*), which seems to be also given in the Targum and approved by Jarchi. Jerome takes יָדַע as a noun meaning *dawn*, and understands by it the origin or source of the calamity (*nescis ortum ejus*), in which he is followed by Vitringa and Rosenmüller, who appear however to apply the term, not merely to the source of the evil, but to the time of its commencement, which should be like a day without a dawn, i. e. sudden and without premonition. There is something so unnatural, however, and at variance with usage, in the representation of misfortune as a dawning day, that Gesenius, Maurer, and Umbreit, who retain the same translation of the word, reverse the sense of the whole phrase by supposing it to mean not a preceding but a following dawn; in which case the *evil* is described not as a day without a dawn before it, but as a night without a dawning after it,—a figure natural and striking in itself, and very strongly recommended by the use of יָדַע in the same sense by Isaiah elsewhere. (See ch. 8: 20, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 149.) Hitzig and Ewald still prefer, however, the hypothesis of J. D. Michaelis and others, who identify יָדַע with the Arabic *سحر*, and explain it either as a noun (*against which thou hast no charm*) or as an infinitive (*thou shalt not know how to charm or conjure it away*). This construction has the advantage of creating a more perfect correspondence between this word and the similar verbal form (יָדַעְתָּ) with which the next clause ends. Grotius and Clericus appear to regard יָדַע as a mere poetical equivalent to *day*, which is highly improbable and not at all sustained by usage.—*And there shall fall upon thee (a still stronger expression than the one before it, there shall come upon thee) ruin.* According to the modern lexicographers, the noun itself means *fall*, but in its figurative application to destruction or calamity. It occurs only here and in Ezek. 7: 26.—*Thou shalt not be able*

to avert it, or resolving the detached Hebrew clauses into one English period, *which thou shalt not be able to avert*. The exact meaning of the last word is atone for, expiate, and in this connexion, to avert by expiation, whether in the strict sense of atoning sacrifice or in the wider one of satisfaction and propitiation. If we assume a personification of the *evil*, the verb may mean to *appease*, as in Gen. 32: 21. Prov. 16: 14. In any case, the clause describes the threatened judgment as inexorable and inevitable.—*And there shall come upon thee suddenly a crash*.—or as J. D. Michaelis renders it, *a crashing fall*, a common metaphor for sudden ruin,—(*which*) *thou shalt not know*. This may either mean, of which thou shalt have no previous *experience*, or of which thou shalt have no previous *expectation*. The former meaning is the one most readily suggested by the words. The latter may be justified by the analogy of Job 9: 5, *who removeth the mountains and they know not*, which can only mean that he removes them suddenly or unawares. Because the same verb  $\text{נָדָה}$  in the first clause governs a following word (*thou shalt not know its down, or how to conjure it away*), Lowth adopts Secker's hint that a similar dependent word has here been lost, but does not venture to determine what it was, though he thinks it may have been  $\text{צָאָה בְּרִיבָה}$ , as in Jer. 11: 11.

V. 12. *Stand now!* It must be borne in mind that  $\text{עַתָּה}$  is not a particle of time but of entreaty, very often corresponding to *I pray*, or *if you please*. In this case it indicates a kind of concession to the people, if they still choose to try the virtue of their superstitious arts which he had already denounced as worthless. Some interpreters have gone too far in representing this passage as characterized by a tone of biting sarcasm.—*Stand now in thy spells* (or *charms*). Vitringa supposes an allusion to the customary standing posture of astrologers, conjurers, etc. Others understand the verb to mean *stand fast*, be firm and courageous. But the modern writers generally follow Lowth in understanding it to mean *persist* or *persevere*, which of course requires the preposition to be taken in its usual proper sense of *in*.—*Persist now in thy spells and in the abundance of thy charms*, the same nouns that are joined above in v. 9. *In which thou hast laboured*. Gesenius in his Grammar (§ 121. 2) mentions this as one of the only two cases in which the Hebrew relative is governed directly by a preposition, *in which* instead of *which in them*, the usual idiomatic combination. But Hitzig and Ewald do away with this exception, by supposing the particle to be dependent on the verb at the beginning, and the relative directly on the verb that follows: *persist in that which* (or *in that respecting which*) *thou hast laboured* (or *wearied thyself*; see above, on ch. 43: 22) *from thy youth*. This may either mean *of old*, or more specifically, since the earliest period of thy national existence. The antiquity of occult arts, and above all of astrology,



in Babylon, is attested by various profane writers. Diodorus Siculus indeed derives them from Egypt, and describes the *Chaldees* or astrologers of Babylon as Egyptian colonists. But as this last is certainly erroneous (see above on v. 1), the other assertion can have no authority. The Babylonians are reported by the same and other writers to have carried back their own antiquity, as proved by recorded scientific observations, to an extravagant and foolish length, to which some think there is allusion here in the expression *from thy youth*.—*Perhaps thou wilt be able to succeed, or keep thyself*, the verb commonly translated *profit*. (See above, ch. 44 : 10.) אִי־אֵי originally means *if not* or *whether not*, but in usage corresponds more nearly to *perhaps* than it does to the conditional compound, *if so be*, which is the common English Version here. This faint suggestion of a possibility is more expressive than a positive denial.—*Perhaps thou wilt grow strong, or prevail*, as the ancient versions render it; or *resist*, as Rosenmüller, Hitzig, and Ewald explain it from an Arabic analogy; or *terrify* (thine adversary), as Gesenius explains it from the analogy of ch. 2 : 19, 21. (Compare Ps. 10 : 18 and Job 13 : 25.) In either case the word is a specification of the more general term *succeed* or *profit*.

V. 13. *Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsel*, not merely weary of it, but exhausted by it, and in the very act of using it. אִי־אֵי seems to be a singular noun with a plural suffix, a combination which may be supposed to have arisen either from the want of any construct plural form in this case, or from a designed assimilation with the plurals in v. 12. As אֵי may denote either numerical multitude or aggregate abundance, it is often construed with a singular, for instance in Ps. 5 : 8. 52 : 9. Is. 37 : 24. By *counsel* we are not to understand the computations or conferences of the astronomers, but all the devices of the government for self-defence. The German writers have introduced an idiom of their own into the first clause wholly foreign from the usage of the Hebrew language, by making it conditional, which Noyes has copied by giving it the form of an interrogation: *art thou weary* etc.? The original form is that of a short independent proposition.—*Let now* (or *pray let*) *them stand and save thee*. We may take *stand* either in the same sense which it has above in v. 12, or in that of appearing, coming forward, presenting themselves. The use of אִי־אֵי, in the sense of rising, is erroneously alleged as a peculiar feature in the diction of these Later Prophecies.—The subject of the verbs is then defined. *The dividers of the heavens*, i. e. the astrologers, so called because they divided the heavens into houses with a view to their prognostications. Henderson's reference to the twelve signs of the Zodiac is too restricted. The chethibh or textual reading (אִי־אֵי) is regarded by some as an old form of the plural

construct, but by others as the third person plural of the preterite, agreeing with the relative pronoun understood (*who divide*). Kimchi regards division as a figure for decision or determination, which is wholly unnecessary. Some read  $\text{וְיִדְבְּרוּ}$ , and suppose an allusion to the derivative noun in v. 12; while others trace it to the Arabic root  $\text{خبر}$ , and suppose the phrase to mean those who know the heavens. All admit however that the general sense is correctly given by the Septuagint ( $\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ) and the Vulgate (*augures coeli*).—The same class of persons is then spoken of as *star-gazers*, an English phrase which well expresses the peculiar force of  $\text{וְיִדְבְּרוּ}$  followed by the preposition  $\text{עַל}$ . Some however give the former word its frequent sense of *seers* or prophets, and regard what follows as a limiting or qualifying term, the whole corresponding to the English phrase *star-prophets*, i. e. such as prophesy by means of the stars.—The next phrase does not mean *making known the new moons*, for these returned at stated intervals and needed no prognosticator to reveal them. The sense is either *at the new moons*, or *by means of the new moons*, i. e. the changes of the moons, of which the former is the simpler explanation.—Interpreters are much divided as to the way in which the remaining words of this verse are to be connected with what goes before. Aben Ezra and Vitringa make the clause dependent on the verb *save*: ‘Let them save them from (the things) which are about to come upon thee.’ The only objections to this construction are the distance of the words thus connected from each other, and the absolute sense which it puts upon  $\text{וְיִדְבְּרוּ$  by removing its object. The modern writers, with a very few exceptions, connect this participle with what follows, *making known at the new moons what shall come upon thee*. The  $\text{וְיִדְבְּרוּ}$  may then be partitive (*some of the things* etc.) or indicate the subject of the revelation (*of* i. e. *concerning what shall come* etc.). To the former Vitringa objects, that the astrologers would undertake of course to reveal not only some but all things still future. But Jarchi suggests, that the new moon could afford only partial information; and J. D. Michaelis, that this limited pretension would afford the astrologers a pretext and apology for frequent failures. But the other construction is now commonly preferred, except that Ewald gives to  $\text{וְיִדְבְּרוּ$  the meaning *whence*, i. e. from what source or quarter these things are to come upon thee.

V. 14. *Behold they are like stubble, fire has burned them* (the Babylonian astrologers). The construction given by Gesenius (*stubble which the fire consumes*) is inconsistent with the plural suffix. *Behold* brings their destruction into view as something present. It is on this account more natural, as well as more exact, to give the verbs a past or present form, as Ewald does, than to translate them in the future. He not only prophesies

that they shall be burnt, but sees them burning. The comparison with stubble seems intended to suggest that they are worthless and combustible, *whose end is to be burned*. (Heb. 6:8.) At the same time a contrast is designed, as Kimchi well observes, between the burning of stubble and the burning of wood, the former being more complete and rapid than the latter.—*They cannot deliver themselves from the hand* (i. e. the power) *of the flame*. Gesenius and most of the later writers translate  $\text{עֲצָתָם}$  *their life*; Hitzig and Ewald still more rigidly, *their soul*. But the reflexive sense *themselves* is not only favoured by the analogy of ch. 46:2, but required by the context. There is at least much less significance and point in saying that they cannot save their lives, than in saying that they cannot even save themselves, much less their votaries and dependents.—The last clause contains a negative description of the fire mentioned in the first. Of this description there are two interpretations. Grotius, Clericus, Vitringa, Lowth, Gesenius, and Maurer, understand it to mean that the destruction of the fuel will be so complete that nothing will be left at which a man can sit and warm himself. But as this gratuitously gives to  $\text{יָרָא}$  the sense *there is not left*, without the least authority from usage, Ewald and Knobel agree with J. D. Michaelis and others in explaining it to mean, (*this fire*) *is not a coal (at which) to warm one's self, a fire to sit before*, but a devouring and consuming conflagration. The only difficulty in the way of this interpretation is a slight one, namely, that it takes  $\text{רֵזְרֵזָה}$  in the sense of a coal-fire and not a single coal. With either of these expositions of the whole clause may be reconciled a different interpretation of the word  $\text{עֲצָתָם}$  proposed by Saadias and independently of him by Cocceius. These writers give the word the sense which it invariably has in every other place where it occurs, viz. *their bread*. (See Job 30:4. Prov. 30:25. Ezek. 4:13. 12:19. Hos. 9:4.) The whole expression then means that it is not a common fire for baking bread, or, on the other supposition, that there are not coals enough left for that purpose. The phrase  $\text{עֲצָתָם רֵזְרֵזָה}$  (*coal of their bread*) presents a harsh and unusual combination, rendered less so however by the use of both words in ch. 44:19. This construction is approved by Rosenmüller; but the other modern writers seem to be agreed in making  $\text{עֲצָתָם}$  the infinitive of  $\text{עֲצָתָהּ}$  (ch. 44:15, 16) with a preposition, analogous in form to  $\text{עֲצָתָהּ}$  from  $\text{עָצָה}$  (ch. 30:18). One manuscript has  $\text{עֲצָתָםִי}$ , which is nearer to the usual analogy of this class of verbs, but embarrasses the syntax with a pleonastic suffix.—The general sense of sudden, rapid, and complete destruction, is not affected by these minor questions of grammatical analysis.

V. 15. *Thus are they to thee*, i. e. such is their fate, you see what has become of them. The  $\text{אֵינִי}$  is not superfluous, as Gesenius asserts, although

foreign from our idiom. It suggests the additional idea that the person addressed was interested in them and a witness of their ruin.—*With respect to whom thou hast laboured.* This may either mean *with* whom or *for* whom; or both may be included in the general idea that these had been the object and occasion of her labours.—*Thy dealers (or traders) from thy youth.* This is commonly regarded as explanatory of the foregoing clause. Thus the English Version, *they with whom thou hast laboured, even thy merchants* etc. It then becomes a question whether these are called traders in the literal and ordinary sense, or at least in that of national allies and negociators; or whether the epithet is given in contempt to the astrologers and wise men of the foregoing context, as trafficking or dealing in imposture. J. D. Michaelis supposes them to be described as travelling dealers, i. e. pedlers and hawkers, who removed from place to place lest their frauds should be discovered. He even compares them with the gipsy fortune-tellers of our own day, but admits that the astrologers of Babylonia held a very different position in society. Against any application of the last clause to this order it may be objected that the preceding verse, of which this is a direct continuation, represents them as already utterly consumed. The true solution of the difficulty seems to be afforded by the masoretic interpunction of the sentence, which connects אֲנִי־בָּרֵךְ not with what precedes but with what follows. According to this arrangement we are not to read *and so are thy dealers*, or *even thy dealers*, but *thy dealers from thy youth* wander each his own way. We have then two classes introduced, and two distinct events predicted. As if he had said, *thy astrologers* etc. are utterly destroyed, and as for *thy dealers*, they wander home etc. widely different in fate, but both alike in this, that they leave thee defenceless in the hour of extremity. *Thy traders* may then be taken either in its strict sense as denoting foreign merchants, or in its wider sense as comprehending all, whether states or individuals, with whom she had intercourse, commercial or political. Ewald revives Houbigant's interpretation of the word as meaning *sorcerers*, in order to sustain which by the Arabic analogy, he seems inclined to read אֲנִי־בָּרֵךְ, without the least necessity or warrant.—These are described as thinking only of providing for their own security. (Compare ch. 13: 14. 43: 14.) *Each to his own quarter*, side, direction,—substantially synonymous with אֲנִי־בָּרֵךְ (Ezek. 1: 9, 12), and other phrases all meaning *straight before him*, without turning to the right hand or the left,—*they wander (or have wandered)*, a term implying not only flight but confusion. The plural form agrees with the subject understood, and not with the distributive expression אֲנִי־בָּרֵךְ by which that subject is defined and qualified.—*There is no one helping thee*, or still more strongly, *saving thee*, thou hast no saviour,—with particular reference to those just mentioned, who, instead of thinking upon

her or bringing her assistance, would be wholly engrossed by a sense of their own danger and the effort to escape it. There is no need of supposing, with Hitzig, that the image of a great conflagration is still present to the writer's mind, and that *no one helps (or saves) thee* means specifically *no one quenches thee*. The figurative dress would rather seem to have been laid aside, in order to express the naked truth more plainly.

---

 CHAPTER XLVIII.

FROM his digression with respect to the causes and effects of the catastrophe of Babylon, the Prophet now returns to his more general themes, and winds up the first great division of the Later Prophecies by a reiteration of the same truths and arguments which run through the previous portion of it, with some variations and additions which will be noticed in the proper place. The disproportionate prominence given to the Babylonish exile and the liberation from it, in most modern expositions of the passage, has produced the same confusion and the same necessity of assuming arbitrary combinations and transitions, as in other cases which have been already stated. The length to which this false hypothesis has influenced the practice of interpreters may be inferred from the fact, that one of the most recent English writers describes this chapter as "renewed assurances of restoration from Babylon." This is less surprising in the present case, however; because the Prophet, in the close as in the opening of this first book, does accommodate his language to the feelings and condition of the Jews in exile, though the truths which he inculcates are still of a general and comprehensive nature.

Although Israel is God's chosen and peculiar people, he is in himself unworthy of the honour and unfaithful to the trust, vs. 1, 2. Former predictions had been uttered expressly to prevent his ascribing the event to other gods, vs. 3-5. For the same reason new predictions will be uttered now, of events which have never been distinctly foretold, vs. 6-8. God's continued favour to his people has no reference to merit upon their part, but is the fruit of his own sovereign mercy and intended to promote his own designs, vs. 9-11. He again asserts his own exclusive deity, as proved by the creation of the world, by the prediction of events still future, and especially by the raising up of Cyrus, as a promised instrument to execute his purpose, vs. 12-16. The sufferings of Israel are the fruit of his own sin,

his prosperity and glory of God's sovereign grace, vs. 17-19. The book closes as it opened with a promise of deliverance from exile, accompanied, in this case, by a solemn limitation of the promise to its proper objects, vs. 20-22.

It is evident that these are the same elements which enter into all the Later Prophecies, so far as we have yet examined them, and that these elements are here combined in very much the usual proportions, although not in precisely the same shape and order. The most novel feature of this chapter is the fulness with which one principal design of prophecy, and the connexion between Israel's sufferings and his sins, are stated.

The confidence with which the most dissimilar hypotheses may be maintained when resting upon no determinate or valid principle, is forcibly exemplified in this case by the fact, that Vitringa and Schmidius both divide the chapter into two parts relating to two different periods of history; but the former applies vs. 1-11 to the Jews of Isaiah's time, and vs. 12-22 to those of the captivity; while the latter applies vs. 1-15 to the Jews of the captivity and vs. 16-22 to those contemporary with our Saviour. This divergency both as to the place of the dividing line, and as to the chronological relation of the parts, is a sufficient proof that the hypothesis, common to both, of a reference to two successive periods, is altogether arbitrary, and with equal reason might be varied indefinitely by supposing that the first part treats of the apostolic age and the second of the period of the reformation, or the first of the middle ages and the last of the millennium, or the first of the French Revolution and the last of the Day of Judgment. The only safe assumption is that the chapter contains general truths with special illustrations and examples.

V. 1. *Hear this*, not exclusively what follows or what goes before, but this whole series of arguments and exhortations. This is a formula by which Isaiah frequently resumes and continues his discourse. Because the verb occurs at the beginning of ch. 46 : 12, Hitzig infers that these two chapters originally came together, and that the forty-seventh was afterwards introduced between them; which seems frivolous.—*Oh house of Jacob, the (men) called by the name of Israel*, a periphrasis for Israelites or members of the ancient church.—*And from the waters of Judah they have come out*. By an easy transition, of perpetual occurrence in Isaiah, the construction is continued in the third person; as if the Prophet, after addressing them directly, had proceeded to describe them to the by-standers. The people, by a natural figure, are described as streams from the fountain of Judah. (Compare ch. 51 : 1 and Ps. 68 : 27.) Gesenius and other German writers fasten on this mention of Judah as a national progenitor, as betraying a later date of composition than the days of Isaiah. But this kind of reasoning

proceeds upon the shallow and erroneous supposition that the application of this name to the whole people was the result of accidental causes at a comparatively recent period, whereas it forms part of a change designed from the beginning, and developed by a gradual process, through the whole course of their history. Even in patriarchal times the pre-eminence of Judah was determined. From him the Messiah was expected to descend (Gen. 49:10). To him the first rank was assigned in the exodus, the journey through the desert, and the occupation of the promised land. In his line the royal power was first permanently established. To him, though deserted by five-sixths of the tribes, the honours and privileges of the theocracy were still continued; so that long before the Babylonish exile or the downfall of the kingdom of the ten tribes, the names of Israel and Judah were convertible, not as political distinctions, but as designations of the chosen people, the theocracy, the ancient church. In this sense Israelite and Jew were as really synonymous when Isaiah wrote, as they are now in common parlance.—*Those swearing by the name of Jehovah*, i. e. swearing by him as their God, and thereby not only acknowledging his deity, but solemnly avouching their relation to him. (See above, on ch. 45 : 23.)—*And of the God of Israel make mention*, not in conversation merely, but as a religious act, implying public recognition of his being and authority, in which sense the same Hebrew phrase with unimportant variations in its form is frequently used elsewhere. (For examples of the very form which here occurs, see Josh. 23 : 7. Ps. 20 : 8. 45 : 18.)—*Not in truth and not in righteousness*, uprightness, sincerity. It is not necessary to infer from these words, that the Prophet's language is addressed to a distinct class of the Jews, or to the Jews of any one exclusive period, his own, or that of the captivity, or that of Christ. The clause is an indirect reiteration of the doctrine so continually taught throughout these prophecies, and afterwards repeated in this very chapter, that God's choice of Israel and preservation of him was no proof of merit upon his part, nor even an act of mere compassion upon God's part, but the necessary means to an appointed end. The reference therefore here is not so much to individual hypocrisy or unbelief, as to the general defect of worthiness or merit in the body. Some, supposing the whole emphasis to rest upon this last clause, understand what goes before as descriptive of outward profession and pretension, and for that reason give to the passive participle קָרָאָם the reflexive sense of *calling themselves*; which is unnecessary and without analogy in the other terms of the description. They were really called by the name of Israel, and that not only by themselves and one another, but by God. Almost equally erroneous, on the other hand, is Hitzig's supposition, that this last clause is an *obiter dictum* not essential to the sense. Both parts are equally essential, the description of the Jews as the chosen people of Jehovah, and the denial of their merit;

for the error into which they were continually falling was the error of sacrificing one of these great doctrines to the other, or imagining that they were incompatible. It was necessary to the Prophet's purpose that the people should never forget either, but believe them both. From all this may be readily inferred the shallowness and blindness of the "higher criticism," which talks of the accumulation of descriptive epithets in this place as a rhetorical peculiarity and symptomatic of a later age; whereas it is a distinct enumeration of the theocratical prerogatives of Israel, and one essential to the writer's purpose.

V. 2. *For from the Holy City they are called.* The same name is given to Jerusalem below (ch. 51 : 1), and also in the later books (Dan. 9 : 24. Neh. 12 : 1) and the New Testament (Matth. 4 : 5. 27 : 53). It is so called as the seat of the true religion, the earthly residence of God, and the centre of the church. That the reference is not to mere locality is plain from the application of the name to the whole people. The ׀ at the beginning of this verse has somewhat perplexed interpreters. Cocceius makes it introduce the proof or reason of the words immediately preceding: 'not in truth and not in righteousness, because they call themselves after the Holy City,' instead of calling themselves by the name of God. This description would certainly be appropriate to ritualists and all who let the church usurp the place of its great head. But this interpretation is precluded, as Vitranga has observed, by what immediately follows, *and upon the God of Israel rely*, which certainly would not have been adduced as a proof of insincerity or even imperfection. Some connect the clauses in a different manner, by giving ׀ the sense of *although*: 'not in truth and not in righteousness, although they are called after the Holy City.' But the sense thus obtained is dearly purchased by assuming so unusual and dubious a meaning of the particle. The safest because the simplest course is to take it in its ordinary sense of *for, because*, and to regard it as continuing the previous description, or rather as resuming it after a momentary interruption, for which reason *for* is used instead of *and*. The connexion may be thus rendered clear by a paraphrase: 'I speak to those who bear the name of Israel and worship Israel's God, however insincerely and imperfectly; for they are still the chosen people, and as such entitled to rely upon Jehovah.' This last is then descriptive not of a mere professed nor of a real yet presumptuous reliance, but of the prerogative of Israel considered as the church or chosen people, a prerogative not forfeited by their unfaithfulness, so long as its continuance was necessary to the end for which it was originally granted. The false interpretations of the passage have arisen from applying it directly to the faith or unbelief of individuals, in which case there appears to be an incongruity between the parts of the description; but as



soon as we apply it to the body, this apparent incongruity is done away, it being not only consistent with Isaiah's purpose, but a necessary part of it, to hold up the prerogatives of Israel as wholly independent of all merit upon their part.—*Jehovah of Hosts (is) his name.* These words are added to identify the object of reliance more completely, as the being who was called the God of Israel and Jehovah of Hosts. At the same time they suggest the attributes implied in both parts of the name. As if he had said, they rely upon the God of Israel, whom they acknowledge as an independent and eternal Being, and the Sovereign of the universe.

V. 3. *The first (or former things) since then I have declared.* That is, I prophesied of old the events which have already taken place. For the sense of the particular expressions, see above on ch. 45: 21. 46: 10. There is no abrupt transition here, as some interpreters assume. This verse asserts God's prescience, not absolutely as in other cases, but for the purpose of explaining why he had so carefully predicted certain future events. It can be fully understood, therefore, only in connexion with what goes before and follows.—*And out of my mouth they went forth.* Some regard this as a proof that צִוְיָוִי means former prophecies and not events; but even the latter might be figuratively said to have gone out of his mouth, as having been predicted by him.—*And I cause them to be heard,* a synonymous expression.—*Suddenly I do (them) and they come to pass.* All this is introductory to what follows respecting the design of prophecy. The sense is not simply, I foretell things to come, but I foretell things to come for a particular purpose, which is now to be explained.

V. 4. *From my knowing.* This may either mean *because I knew* or *since I knew*, or the last may be included in the first, as in ch. 43: 4.—*That thou art hard.* This is commonly considered an ellipsis for צָבָר־הַעֲצֵבָה (Ezek. 3: 7) or עֲצֵב־הַעֲצֵבָה (Deut. 9: 6), hard-hearted or stiff-necked; more probably the latter, as the sense required by the context is not so much that of insensibility as that of obstinate perverseness. The same idea is expressed still more strongly by the following words, *and an iron sinew (is) thy neck.* The substitution of *bar* for *sinew*, which is elsewhere the invariable sense of צֵבֶרֶת, is not only gratuitous, but inexact and enfeebling.—*And thy forehead brass.* The hardening of the face or forehead, which is sometimes used in a good sense (e. g. ch. 50: 7), here denotes shameless persistency in opposition to the truth. The allusion is not, as Vitranga supposes, to the colour of brass, but to its hardness, with some reference, as Knobel thinks, to the habits of animals which push or butt with the forehead.

V. 5. *Therefore I told thee long ago.* This is often the force of the

conjunction *and* after a conditional clause or sentence. Because I knew thee to be such, and I told thee, i. e. therefore I told thee.—*Before it comes I have let thee hear (it), lest thou say, My idol did them*, i. e. did the things before referred to collectively in the singular. The Hebrew word for *idol*, from the double meaning of its root, suggests the two ideas of an image and a torment or vexation.—*My graven image and my molten image ordered them*, i. e. called them into being.—Gousset takes  $\text{יִצְוָה}$  in the sense of *my libation or drink-offering*.

V. 6. *Thou hast heard* (the prediction), *see all of it* (accomplished). *And ye* (idolaters or idols), *will not ye declare*, the same word used above for the prediction of events, and therefore no doubt meaning here, will not ye predict something? This is Hitzig's explanation of the words; but most interpreters suppose the sense to be, *will you not acknowledge* (or *bear witness*) that these things were predicted by Jehovah? In favour of the first is its taking  $\text{יִצְוָה}$  in the sense which it has in the preceding verse, and also the analogy of ch. 41: 22, 23, where the very same challenge is given in nearly the same form; to which may be added the sudden change to the plural form and the emphatic introduction of the pronoun, implying a new object of address, and not a mere enallage, because he immediately resumes the address to the people in the singular.—*I have made thee to hear new things*. He appeals not only to the past but to the future, and thus does what he vainly challenged them to do. There is no need of inquiring what particular predictions are referred to. All that seems to be intended is the general distinction between past and future, between earlier and later prophecies.—*From now*, henceforth, after the present time. It is a curious fact that Hitzig, who regards the old interpretation of  $\text{מִכַּתְּנָה}$  (*less than nothing*) in ch. 40: 17 as absurd, makes  $\text{מִכַּתְּנָה}$  in the case before us a comparative expression, and translates the whole phrase *never than now*, which he says is a circumlocution for the future.—*And (things) kept* (in reserve), *and thou hast not known them*, or in our idiom, *which thou hast not known*. Beck, by some unintelligible process, reaches the conclusion that this verse contains a perfectly indisputable case of *vaticinium post eventum*.

V. 7. *Now they are created* (i. e. brought into existence for the first time) *and not of old*, or never before. The literal meaning of the next words is, *and before the day and thou hast not heard them*. J. D. Michaelis and some others seem to understand this as meaning, *one day ago thou hadst not heard them*; but this is a German or a Latin idiom, wholly foreign from the Hebrew usage. Others, with more probability, explain it to mean, *before this day* (or *before to-day*) *thou hast never heard them*,  $\text{יָדָע}$  being put by poetical license for  $\text{יָדָעַתְּ$  with the article. Gesenius understands by *day*

the time of the fulfilment; which is not so obvious nor so appropriate, because the prophecy must be made known before it can be verified by the event. In all these constructions, the ך before ם is supposed to be the idiomatic sign of the apodosis, very frequent after specifications of time. (See Gen. 22: 4.) The same reason is assigned as before: *Lest thou shouldst say, Behold, I knew them.* In the last word the feminine suffix takes the place of the masculine in the verse preceding, equivalent in import to the Greek or Latin neuter.

V. 8. *Nay, thou didst not hear; nay, thou didst not know.* The idiomatic form of this sentence is not easily expressed in a translation, which, if too exact, will fail to show the true connexion. Having given the perverseness of the people as a reason why they knew so much by previous revelation, he now assigns it as a reason why they knew so little. These, although at first sight inconsistent statements, are but varied aspects of the same thing. God had told them so much beforehand, lest they should ascribe the event to other causes. He had told them no more, because he knew that they would wickedly abuse his favour. In a certain sense and to a certain extent, it was true that they had heard and known these things beforehand. In another sense, and beyond that extent, it was equally true that they had neither heard nor known them. This seems to be the true force of the ם. It was true that they had heard, but it was *also* true that they had not heard. The strict sense of the clause is, *likewise thou hadst not heard, likewise thou hadst not known*; but as this form of expression is quite foreign from our idiom, *nay* may be substituted, not as a synonyme, but an equivalent. The *yea* of the common version fails to indicate the true connexion, by suggesting the idea of a climax rather than that of an antithesis, of something more rather than of something different.—*Likewise of old* (or beforehand) *thine ear was not open*, literally, *did not open*, the Hebrew usage coinciding with the English in giving to this verb both a transitive and intransitive sense. (For another clear example of the latter, see below, ch. 60: 11.) Vitringa understands the whole of this first clause as meaning that they *would* not hear or know, but stopped their ears and minds against the revelation which was offered to them. For this supposition he assigns a reason that is really conclusive on the other side, viz. that the last clause describes them as treacherous and disloyal, which he says would be unjust if they had had no revelation to abuse. But this argument proceeds upon a false view as to the connexion of the clauses. It supposes the first to give a reason for the last, whereas the last gives a reason for the first. The sense is not, that *because* they would not hear or know what was revealed, God denounced them as traitors and apostates; but that *because* they were traitors and apostates, he would not allow them to hear

or know the things in question. This construction is required by the  $\text{כי}$  (*because*) at the beginning of the second clause ; by the words *I knew*, which, on the other supposition, are unmeaning ; and by the form  $\text{יִדְעָהְךָ}$ , which cannot, without arbitrary violence, have any other sense here but the strict one of the future, or of some tense involving the idea of futurity.—*I know thou wilt* (or *I knew thou wouldst*) *act very treacherously*. Lowth supposes the emphatic repetition of the verb to express certainty rather than intensity, and both may be included, i. e. both would perhaps be unavoidably suggested by this form of expression to a Hebrew reader. Beck's triumphant charge against the writer of the "naivest self-contradiction," proceeds upon the false assumption that the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus is the chief or rather the sole subject of the prophecy, an error which has been already more than once exposed.—*And apostate* (rebel, or deserter) *from the womb was called to thee*, i. e. this name was used in calling thee, or thou wast called. Besides the idiom in the syntax, there is here another instance of the use of the verb *call* or *name* to express the real character. They were so called, i. e. they might have been so, they deserved to be so. (See above, ch. 1 : 26, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 18.)—Here, as in ch. 42 : 2, 24, most interpreters explain *the womb* as meaning Egypt ; and Jerome carries this idea so far as to paraphrase the words thus, *quando de Ægypto liberatus, quasi meo ventre conceptus es*. In all the cases, it seems far more natural to understand this trait of the description as belonging rather to the sign than the thing signified, as representing no specific circumstance of time or place in the history of Israel, but simply the infancy or birth of the ideal person substituted for him.

V. 9. *For my name's sake*. Aben Ezra understands this to mean, for the sake of my name by which ye are called ; but most interpreters explain it as an equivalent but stronger expression than *for my own sake*, for the sake of the revelation which I have already made of my own attributes. This explanation agrees well with the language of v. 11 below.—*I will defer my anger*. Literally, *prolong* it ; but this would be equivocal in English. To avoid the équivoque, Vitranga adopts the absurd translation, *I will lengthen* (or *prolong*) *my nose*, which he explains by saying that a long face is a sign of clemency or mildness, and a short or contracted face of anger,—an opinion which appears to have as little foundation in physiognomy as in etymology. It seems most probable that  $\text{אָפְרַיִם}$  *anger* and  $\text{אֶפְרַיִם}$  *the nostrils* are at most collateral derivatives from  $\text{אָפַר}$  to breathe. The common version, *I will defer my anger*, is approved by the latest writers, and confirmed not only by our familiar use of *long* and *slow*, in certain applications, as convertible terms, but also by the unequivocal analogy of the Greek  $\muαχρὸδύμος$  and the Latin *longanimis*.—*And (for) my praise I will restrain (it) towards*

*thee*. Praise is here the parallel to name, and may be governed by  $\text{קָרַבְתָּ}$  repeated from the other clause. The more obvious construction, which would make it dependent on the following verb, is forbidden by the accents, and yields no coherent sense. Gesenius makes  $\text{בַּחֲרָתְךָ}$  reflexive, or at least supplies the reflexive pronoun after it (*I refrain myself*); but it is simpler to assume the same object (*my wrath*) in both clauses.—The last words of the verse express the effect to be produced, *so as not to cut thee off*, or destroy thee.

V. 10. *Behold I have melted thee*. This is the original meaning of the word; but it is commonly applied to the smelting of metals, and may therefore be translated *proved* or *tried thee*.—*And not with silver*. Some read  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$  (*as silver*), and others take the  $\text{ב}$  itself as a particle of comparison, or bring out substantially the same sense by rendering it *with* (i. e. in company with) *silver*, or by means of the same process. This is explained by Hitzig strictly as denoting that he had not literally melted them like silver, but only metaphorically in the furnace of affliction, an assurance no more needed here than in any other case of figurative language. Apart from these interpretations, which assume the sense *like silver*, the opinions of interpreters have been divided chiefly between two. The first of these explains the Prophet's words to mean, *not for silver* (or money), but gratuitously. This is certainly the meaning of  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$  in a number of places; but it seems to be entirely inappropriate when speaking of affliction, which is rather aggravated than relieved by the idea of its being gratuitous, i. e. for nothing. The other explanation, and the one now commonly adopted, takes the sense to be, *not with silver* (i. e. pure metal) as the result of the process. This agrees well with the context, which makes the want of merit on the part of Israel continually prominent. It also corresponds exactly to the other clause, *I have chosen thee* (not in wealth, or power, or honour, but) *in the furnace of affliction*. The explanation of  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$  as synonymous with  $\text{בְּחֵן}$  is entirely gratuitous. There is no word the sense of which is more determinately fixed by usage. The reason given by Gesenius for making *prove* or *try* the primary meaning of this verb, without a single instance to establish it, is the extraordinary one that trial must precede choice, which assumes the very question in dispute, viz. that  $\text{בְּחֵן}$  means to try at all, a fact which cannot be sustained by Aramean analogies in the teeth of an invariable Hebrew usage. But even if the method of arriving at this sense were less objectionable than it is, the sense itself would still be less appropriate and expressive than the common one. I have proved thee in the furnace of affliction, means I have afflicted thee; but this is saying even less than the first clause, whatever sense may there be put upon  $\text{כֶּסֶף}$ . It is not very likely that the Prophet simply meant to say, *I have afflicted thee in vain, I*

*have afflicted thee.* It is certainly more probable and more in keeping with the context and his whole design to understand him as saying, I have found no merit in thee, and have chosen thee in the extreme of degradation and affliction. If the furnace of affliction was designed to have a distinct historical meaning, it probably refers not to Babylon but Egypt, which is repeatedly called an iron furnace. This would agree exactly with the representations elsewhere made respecting the election of Israel in Egypt.

V. 11. *For my own sake, for my own sake, I will do what is to be done.* This is commonly restricted to the restoration of the Jews from exile; but this specific application of the promise is not made till afterwards. The terms are comprehensive and contain a statement of the general doctrine, as the sum of the whole argument, that what Jehovah does for his own people, is in truth done not for any merit upon their part, but to protect his own divine honour.—*For how will it be profaned?* This may either mean, How greatly would it be profaned! or, How can I suffer it to be profaned? Gesenius anticipates *honour* from the other clause; but most interpreters make *name* the subject of the verb, a combination which occurs in several other places. (See Lev. 18: 21. 19: 22. Ez. 36: 20.—*And my glory (or honour) to another will I not give,* as he must do if his enemies eventually triumph over his own people. The same words with the same sense occur above in ch. 42: 8.

V. 12. *Hearken unto me, oh Jacob, and Israel my called; I am He, I am the First, also I the last.* A renewed assurance of his ability and willingness to execute his promises, the latter being implied in the phrase *my called*, i. e. specially elected by me to extraordinary privileges. The threefold repetition of the pronoun *I* is supposed by some of the older writers to contain an allusion to the Trinity, of which interpretation Vitringa wisely says: *quam meditationem hoc loco non urgeo neque refello.* *I am He* is understood by the later writers to mean I am the Being in question, or, it is I that am the First and the Last. The older writers give the אֲנִי a more emphatic sense, as meaning He that really exists.—Lowth supplies *my servant* after *Jacob*, on the authority of one manuscript and two old editions. On like authority he changes אֲנִי into the simple conjunctive ו, which he says is more proper.—Compare with this verse ch. 41: 4. 43: 10. 44: 6.

V. 13. *Also my hand founded the earth, and my right hand spanned the heavens.* The force of the אֲנִי seems to be this: not only am I an Eternal Being, but the Creator of the heavens. *Hand* and *right hand* is merely a poetical or rhetorical variation.—The Septuagint renders אֲנִי יְסַדֵּתִי ἐστρεφέωσε, by assimilation to the parallel term *founded*. The Vulgate has *mensa est*,

which is approved by Kimchi. The Chaldee *suspended*, which may be taken either strictly or in the sense of *balanced, weighed*. Aben Ezra, followed by most modern writers, makes it mean *expanded*; which explanation is confirmed by the Syriac analogy, and by the parallel passage ch. 51 : 13, where the founding of the earth is connected with the spreading of the skies, and the latter expressed by the unambiguous word כִּפְּזָה. Luzzatto points out a like combination of the derivative nouns in 1 Kings 7 : 9.—Vitringa construes אֲנִי קוֹלִי like an ablative absolute in Latin (*me vocante*), and the same sense is given, with a difference of form, in the English Version (*when I call*). But in Hebrew usage, the pronoun and participle thus combined are employed to express present and continuous action, *I (am) calling*, i. e. I habitually call. The words are not therefore naturally applicable to the original creation (*I called*), as Cocceius, Gesenius, and others explain them, but must either be referred, with Kimchi, to the constant exertion of creative power in the conservation of the universe, or, with Vitringa and most later writers, to the authority of the Creator over his creatures as his instruments and servants. *I call to them* (summon them), *and they will stand up together* (i. e. all without exception). This agrees well with the usage of the phrase to *stand before*, as expressing the attendance of the servant on his master. (See for example 1 Kings 17 : 1.) The same two ideas of creation and service are connected in Ps. 119 : 90, 91. The exclusive reference of the whole verse to creation, on the other hand, is favoured by the analogy of Rom. 4 : 17 and Col. 1 : 17.—For the different expressions here used, see above, ch. 40 : 22. 42 : 5. 44 : 24. 45 : 12.

V. 14. *Assemble yourselves, all of you, and hear!* The object of address is Israel, according to the common supposition, but more probably the heathen. *Who among them*, i. e. the false gods or their prophets, *hath declared* (predicted) *these things*, the whole series of events which had been cited to demonstrate the divine foreknowledge. *Jehovah loves him*, i. e. Israel, and to show his love, *he will do his pleasure* (execute his purpose) *in Babylon, and his* (Jehovah's) *arm* (shall be upon) *the Chaldees*. This explanation, which is given by J. H. Michaelis, seems to answer all the conditions of the text and context. Most interpreters, however, make the clause refer to Cyrus, and translate it thus : 'he whom Jehovah loves shall do his pleasure in Babylon, and his arm (i. e. exercise his power or execute his vengeance) on the Chaldees.' Another construction of the last words makes them mean that 'he (Cyrus) shall be his arm (i. e. the arm of Jehovah) against the Chaldees.' But for this use of *arm* there is no satisfactory analogy. Kocher supposes it to mean that 'the Chaldees (shall be) his arm,' in allusion to the aid which Cyrus received from Gobryas and Gadates, as related in the fourth book of the Cyropaedia. Vitringa is inclined to assume an

aposiopesis and to read, 'his arm (shall conquer or destroy) the Chaldees.' Aben Ezra refers both the suffixes to Cyrus, who is then said to do his own pleasure upon Babylon.—Others refer both to God (his pleasure and his arm); but most interpreters take a middle course, referring one to each.

V. 15. *I, I, have spoken* (i. e. predicted); *I have also called him* (effectually by my providence); *I have brought him* (into existence, or into public view); *and he prospered his way*. The reference of the last verb to Jehovah as its subject involves a harsh enallage personae, which Vitringa and others avoid by making the verb neuter or intransitive, *his way prospers*. But  $\text{הִשְׁרִיחַ}$  is feminine, not only in general usage, but in combination with this very verb (Judges 18:5). The safe rule is, moreover, to give Hiphil an active sense wherever it is possible. The true solution is to make Cyrus or Israel the subject, and to understand the phrase as meaning, *he makes his own way prosperous*, i. e. he prospers in it. (Compare Ps. 1:3, and Hengstenberg's Commentary, Vol. I. p. 17.)

V. 16. *Draw near unto me!* As Jehovah is confessedly the speaker in the foregoing and the following context, and as similar language is expressly ascribed to him in ch. 45:19, Calvin and Gesenius regard it as most natural to make these his words likewise, assuming a transition in the last clause from Jehovah to the Prophet, who there describes himself as sent by Jehovah. Instead of this distinction between the clauses, Jarchi and Rosenmüller suppose the person of the Prophet and of God to be confused in both. Hitzig and Knobel follow some of the other Jewish writers in making the whole verse the words of Isaiah. Vitringa and Henderson agree with Athanasius, Augustin, and other Fathers, who reconcile the clauses by making Christ the speaker. Those who believe that he is elsewhere introduced in this same book, can have no difficulty in admitting a hypothesis, which reconciles the divine and human attributes referred to in the sentence, as belonging to one person.—*Hear this; not from the beginning in secret have I spoken*. See above, on ch. 45:19.—*From the time of its being*. Œcolampadius refers this to the eternal counsel of Jehovah; but Vitringa well observes that usage has appropriated  $\text{הִשְׁרִיחַ}$  to express the execution not the formation of the divine purpose. Brentius supposes an allusion to the exodus from Egypt and a comparison between it and the deliverance from Babylon; but this is wholly fanciful and arbitrary. The rabbins, with as little reason, make it mean, since the beginning of my ministry, since I assumed the prophetic office. But most interpreters refer the suffix (*it*) to the raising up of Cyrus and the whole series of events connected with it, which formed the subject of the prophecies in question. (See above, ch. 46:11.)—Since these events began to take place, *I was there*. Lowth



proposes to read עָצָה and to translate the phrase, *I had decreed it*. But the obvious analogy of Prov. 8 : 27 is of itself sufficient to establish the masoretic reading. Those who regard these as the words of Isaiah, understand them to mean that he had predicted them, or as Knobel expresses it, that he was present as a public speaker. Those who refer the words to the Son of God specifically, make the verse substantially identical in meaning with the one in Proverbs just referred to, which the church in every age has been very much of one mind in applying to the second person of the Godhead as the hypostatical wisdom of the Father. Those who take the words more generally as the language of Jehovah, understand him to declare that these events had not occurred without his knowledge or his agency ; that he was present, cognizant, and active, in the whole affair.—Thus far this last hypothesis must be allowed to be the simplest and most natural. The difficulties which attend it arise wholly from what follows.—*And now*. This seems to be in evident antithesis to עָצָה or to עָצָה עִיּוֹן עָצָה, the latter being the most obvious because it is the nearest antecedent.—*The Lord Jehovah hath sent me*. Those who regard Isaiah as the speaker in the whole verse understand this clause to mean, that as he had spoken before by divine authority and inspiration, he did so still. Those who refer the first clause simply to Jehovah, without reference to personal distinctions, are under the necessity of here assuming a transition to the language of the Prophet himself. The third hypothesis, which makes the Son of God the speaker, understands both clauses in their strict sense as denoting his eternity on one hand and his mission on the other. The sending of the Son by the Father is a standing form of speech in Scripture. (See Ex. 23 : 20. Is. 61 : 1. Mal. 3 : 1. John 3 : 34. 17 : 3. Heb. 3 : 1.)—*And his Spirit*. It has long been a subject of dispute whether these words belong to the subject or the object of the verb *hath sent*. The English Version removes all ambiguity by changing the collocation of the words (*the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me*). The same sense is given in the Vulgate (*et spiritus ejus*) ; while the coincidence of the nominative and accusative (τὸ πνεῦμα) makes the Septuagint no less ambiguous than the original. With the Latin and English agree Calvin, Rosenmüller, Umbreit, and Hendewerk. Vitranga, Henderson, and Knobel adopt Origen's interpretation (ἀμφοτέρω ἀπέστειλεν ὁ πατήρ, τὸν σωτήρα καὶ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα). Gesenius and the other modern Germans change the form of expression by inserting the preposition *with*, which however is intended to represent the Spirit not as the sender but as one of the things sent.—The exegetical question is not one of much importance ; because both the senses yielded are consistent with the usage of the Scriptures, and the ambiguity may be intended to let both suggest themselves. As a grammatical question, it is hard to be decided from analogy ; because, on either supposition, עָצָה cannot be considered as holding

its regular position in the sentence, but must be regarded as an afterthought. The main proposition is, *the Lord God hath sent me*. The supplementary expression *and his Spirit* may be introduced, without absurdity or any violation of the rules of syntax, either before the verb or after it. Mere usage therefore leaves the question undecided.—As little can it be determined by the context or the parallelisms. The argument, which some urge, that the Spirit is never said to send the Son, takes for granted that the latter is the speaker, an assumption which precludes any inference from the language of this clause in proof of that position. Those, on the other hand, who consider these the words of Isaiah, argue in favour of the other construction, that the Spirit is said to send the prophets.—On the whole this may be fairly represented as one of the most doubtful questions of construction in the book, and the safest course is either to admit that both ideas were meant to be suggested, although probably in different degrees, or else to fall back upon the general rule, though liable to numberless exceptions, that the preference is due to the nearest antecedent or to that construction which adheres most closely to the actual collocation of the words. The application of this principle in this case would decide the doubt in favour of the prevailing modern doctrine, that Jehovah had sent the person speaking and endued him with his Spirit, as a necessary preparation for the work to which he was appointed. Beck's ridiculous assertion, that the writer is here guilty of the folly of appealing to his present prediction of events already past as a proof of his divine legation, only shows the falsehood of the current notion that the object of address is the Jewish people at the period of the exile, and its subject the victories of Cyrus.

V. 17. *Thus saith Jehovah, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel* (see the same prefatory formulas above, ch. 41 : 14. 43 : 14), *I am Jehovah thy God* (or *I Jehovah am thy God*), *teaching thee to profit* (or *I, Jehovah, thy God, am teaching thee to profit*). Henderson's version, *I teach*, does not convey the precise force of the original, which is expressive of continued and habitual instruction, and the same remark applies to the participle in the other clause. *To profit*, i. e. to be profitable to thyself, to provide for thy own safety and prosperity, or as Cocceius phrases it, *tibi consulere*. There seems to be a reference, as Vitringa suggests, to the unprofitableness so often charged upon false gods and their worship. (See ch. 44 : 10. 45 : 19. Jer. 2 : 11.)—*Leading thee* (literally, *making thee to tread*) *in the way thou shalt go*. The ellipsis of the relative is just the same as in familiar English. The future includes the ideas of obligation and necessity, without expressing them directly; the precise sense of the words is, *the way thou wilt go if thou desirest to profit*. Augusti and Ewald make it present (*goest*); but this is at the same time less exact and less expressive.—J. H. Michaelis under-

stands these as the words of Christ, the teaching mentioned as the teaching of the gospel, the way the way of salvation etc. To all this the words are legitimately applicable, but it does not follow that they were specifically meant to convey this idea to the reader.

V. 18. J. D. Michaelis suggests the possibility of reading אִם, a form in which the negative אֵם occurs, according to the Masora, thirty-five times in the Old Testament. The first clause would then contain a direct negation, *thou hast not attended*. In his version, however, he adheres to the masoretic pointing, and translates the word as a conditional particle (*wenn du doch*), which is also recognised by Winer as the primary meaning of the word, although Gesenius and Ewald reverse the order of deduction, making *if* a secondary sense of the optative particle *oh that!* The former supposition may be illustrated by our own colloquial expression, *if it were only so and so*, implying a desire that it were so. The verb which follows is commonly taken in the wide sense of *attending*, that of *listening* being looked upon as a specific application of it. Vitringa here translates it, *animum advertisses*; J. H. Michaelis, with more regard to usage, *aures et animum*. It may be questioned, however, whether there is any clear case of its being used without explicit reference to hearing. If not, this must be regarded as the proper meaning, and the wider sense considered as implied but not expressed. Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Hendewerk, and Knobel, understand this verb as referring to the future: *Oh that thou wouldst hearken to my commandments!* But the only instance which they cite of this use of the praeter (Is. 63:19), even if it did not admit (as it evidently does) of the other explanation, could not be set off against the settled usage of the language, which refers אִם with the praeter to past time. (See Ewald's Grammar § 605, and Nordheimer § 107c.) Accordingly Maurer, De Wette, Ewald, Umbreit, and Gesenius (though less explicitly), agree with the older writers in explaining it to mean, *Oh that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments!* The objection, that this does not suit the context, is entirely unfounded. Nothing could well be more appropriate at the close of this division of the prophecies, than this affecting statement of the truth, so frequently propounded in didactic form already, that Israel, although the chosen people of Jehovah, and as such secure from total ruin, was and was to be a sufferer, not from any want of faithfulness or care on God's part, but as the necessary fruit of his own imperfections and corruptions.—The Vav conversive introduces the apodosis, and is equivalent to *then*, as used in English for a similar purpose. Those who refer the first clause to the present or the future, give the second the form of the imperfect subjunctive, *then would thy peace be like a river*; the others more correctly that of the pluperfect, *then had thy peace been* (or *then would thy peace have been*) as

*a river.* The strict sense of the Hebrew is *the river*, which Vitranga and others understand to mean the Euphrates in particular, with whose inundations, as well as with its ordinary flow, the Prophet's original readers were familiar. It seems to be more natural, however, to regard the article as pointing out a definite class of objects rather than an individual, and none the less because the parallel expression is *the sea*, which some, with wanton violence, apply to the Euphrates also.—*Peace* is here used in its wide sense of prosperity; or rather peace, in the restricted sense, is used to represent all kindred and attendant blessings. The parallel term *righteousness* adds moral good to natural, and supplies the indispensable condition without which the other cannot be enjoyed. After the various affectations of the modern German writers in distorting this and similar expressions, it is refreshing to find Ewald, and even Hendewerk, returning to the old and simple version, *Peace* and *Righteousness*. The ideas suggested by the figure of a river, are abundance, perpetuity, and freshness, to which the waves of the sea add those of vastness, depth, and continual succession.

V. 19. *Then should have been like the sand thy seed*, a common scriptural expression for great multitude, with special reference, in this case, to the promise made to Abraham and Jacob (Gen. 22: 17. 32: 12), the partial accomplishment of which (2 Sam. 17: 11) is not inconsistent with the thought here expressed, that, in the case supposed, it would have been far more ample and conspicuous. Here, as in ch. 44: 3, Knobel understands by seed or offspring the individual members of the nation as distinguished from the aggregate body. But the image is rather that of a parent (here the patriarch Jacob) and his personal descendants.—*And the issues* (or *offspring*) *of thy bowels* (an equivalent expression to *thy seed*).—Of the next word זרעו there are two interpretations. The Targum, the Vulgate, and the rabbins, give it the sense of stones, pebbles, gravel, and make it a poetical equivalent to *sand*. J. D. Michaelis and most of the later Germans make it an equivalent to זרעו with a feminine termination, because figuratively used. The antithesis is then between *thy bowels* and *its bowels*, viz. those of the sea; and the whole clause, supplying the ellipsis, will read thus, *the offspring of thy bowels like (the offspring of) its bowels*, in allusion to the vast increase of fishes, which J. D. Michaelis illustrates by saying that the whale leaves enough of its natural food, the herring, to supply all Europe with it daily. Ewald has returned to the old interpretation, which he defends from the charge of being purely conjectural, by tracing both זרעו and זרעו to the radical idea of softness, the one being applied to the soft inward parts of the body, the other to the soft fine particles of sand or gravel. We may then refer the suffix, not to the remoter antecedent זרעו, but to the nearer היל.—*His name*. We must either suppose an abrupt transition from the second

to the third person, or make *secd* the antecedent of the pronoun, which is harsh in itself, and rendered more so by the intervening plural forms. Lowth as usual restores uniformity by reading *thy name* on the authority of the Septuagint version. Vitranga supposes a particular allusion to genealogical tables and the custom of erasing names from them under certain circumstances. But all the requisitions of the text are answered by the common understanding of *name*, in such connexions, as equivalent to *memory*. The excision or destruction of the name from before God is expressive of entire extermination.—The precise sense of the futures in this clause is somewhat dubious. Most interpreters assimilate them to the futures of the foregoing clause, as in the English Version (*should not have been cut off nor destroyed*). Those who understand the first clause as expressing a wish in relation to the present or the future, make this last a promise, either absolute (*his name shall not be cut off*) or conditional (*his name should not be cut off*). Nor is this direct construction of the last clause inconsistent with the old interpretation of the first; as we may suppose that the writer, after wishing that the people had escaped the strokes provoked by their iniquities, declares that even now they shall not be entirely destroyed. This is precisely the sense given to the clause in the Septuagint (*οἰδε ῥῖν ἀπολεῖται*), and is recommended by two considerations: first, the absence of the Vav conversive, which in the other clause may indicate an indirect construction; and secondly, its perfect agreement with the whole drift of the passage, and the analogy of others like it, where the explanation of the sufferings of the people as the fruit of their own sin is combined with a promise of exemption from complete destruction.

V. 20. *Go forth from Babel!* This is a prediction of the deliverance from Babylon, clothed in the form of an exhortation to escape from it. We have no right to assume a capricious change of subject, or a want of all coherence with what goes before. The connexion may be thus stated. After the general reproof and promise of the nineteenth verse, he recurs to the great example of deliverance so often introduced before. As if he had said, Israel, notwithstanding his unworthiness, shall be preserved; even in extremity his God will not forsake him; even from Babylon he shall be delivered;—and then turning in prophetic vision to the future exiles, he invites them to come forth.—*Flee from the Chasdim* (or *Chaldees*)! Vitranga, Gesenius, and most other writers, supply  $\text{ךָּנָס}$  before  $\text{בְּאֶרְצָם}$ , or regard the latter as itself the name of the country. (See above, on ch. 47: 1.) But Maurer well says that he sees no reason why we may not here retain the proper meaning of the plural, and translate, *flee ye from the Chaldeans*, which is precisely the common English version of the clause.—*With a voice of joy*. The last word properly denotes a joyful shout, and not articulate

song. The whole phrase means, with the sound or noise of such a shout. It has been made a question whether these words are to be connected with what goes before or with what follows. Gesenius and Hendewerk prefer the former, most interpreters the latter; but Vittinga thinks the masoretic accents were intended to connect it equally with both parts of the context, as in ch. 40: 3.—*Tell this, cause it to be heard.* The Hebrew collocation (*tell, cause to be heard, this*) cannot be retained in English. *Utter it* (cause it to go forth) *even to the end of the earth.* Compare ch. 42: 10. 43: 6. *Say ye, Jehovah hath redeemed his servant Jacob.* The present form adopted by J. D. Michaelis and Augusti is not only unnecessary but injurious to the effect. These are words to be uttered after the event; and the preterite must therefore be strictly understood, as it is by most interpreters. The deliverance from Babylon is here referred to, only as one great example of the general truth that God saves his people.

V. 21. *And they thirsted not in the deserts* (through which) *he made them go.* The translation of the verbs as futures, by J. H. Michaelis and Hitzig, is entirely ungrammatical and inconsistent with the obvious intention of the writer to present these as the words of an annunciation after the event. The present form, adopted by J. D. Michaelis and the later Germans, although less erroneous, is a needless and enfeebling evasion of the true sense, which is purely descriptive.—*Water from a ~~well~~ he made to flow for them; and he clave the rock, and waters gushed out.* There is evident reference here to the miraculous supply of water in the journey through the wilderness. (Ex. 17: 6. Num. 20: 11. Ps. 78: 15.) It might even seem as if the writer meant to state these facts historically. Such at least would be the simpler exposition of his words, which would then contain a reference to the exodus from Egypt, as the great historical example of deliverance. As if he had said, Relate how God of old redeemed his servant Jacob out of Egypt, and led him through the wilderness, and slaked his thirst with water from the solid rock. Most interpreters, however, are agreed in applying the words to the deliverance from Babylon. Kimchi understands the language strictly, and expresses his surprise that no account of this great miracle was left on record by Ezra or any other inspired historian. Gesenius sneers at the rabbin's naïveté, but thinks it matched by the simplicity of some Christian writers who know not what to make of ideal anticipations which were never realized. Perhaps, however, the absurdity is not altogether on the side where he imagines it to lie. Kimchi was right in assuming, that if the flight and the march through the wilderness were literal (a supposition common to Gesenius and himself), then the accompanying circumstances must receive a literal interpretation likewise, unless there be something in the text itself to indicate the contrary. Unless we are prepared to assume

an irrational confusion of language, setting all interpretation at defiance, our only alternative is to conclude, on the one hand, that Isaiah meant to foretell a miraculous supply of water during the journey from Babylon to Jerusalem, or that the whole description is a figurative one, meaning simply that the wonders of the exodus should be renewed. Against the former is the silence of history, alleged by Kimchi; against the latter nothing but the foregone conclusion that this and other like passages must relate exclusively to Babylon and the return from exile.

V. 22. *There is no peace, saith Jehovah, to the wicked.* The meaning of this sentence, in itself considered, is too clear to be disputed. There is more doubt as to its connexion with what goes before. That it is a mere aphorism, added to this long discourse, like a moral to an ancient fable, can only satisfy the minds of those who look upon the whole book as a series of detached and incoherent sentences. Vastly more rational is the opinion, now the current one among interpreters, that this verse was intended to restrict the operation of the foregoing promises to true believers, or the genuine Israel; as if he had said, All this will God accomplish for his people, but not for the wicked among them. The grand conclusion to which all tends is, that God is all and man nothing; that even the chosen people must be sufferers, because they are sinners; that peculiar favour confers no immunity to sin or exemption from responsibility, but that even in the Israel of God and the enjoyment of the most extraordinary privileges, it still remains for ever true that "there is no peace to the wicked."

---

 CHAPTER XLIX.

THIS chapter, like the whole division which it introduces, has for its great theme the relation of the church to the world, or of Israel to the gentiles. The relation of the former to Jehovah is of course still kept in view, but with less exclusive prominence than in the First Part (ch. XL-XLVIII). The doctrine there established and illustrated, as to the mutual relation of the body and the head, is here assumed as the basis of more explicit teachings with respect to their joint relation to the world and the great design of their vocation. There is not so much a change of topics as a change in their relative position and proportions.

The chapter opens with an exhibition of the Messiah and his people, under one ideal person, as the great appointed Teacher, Apostle, and

Restorer, of the apostate nations, vs. 1-9. This is followed by a promise of divine protection and of glorious enlargement, attended by a joyous revolution in the state of the whole world, vs. 10-13. The doubts and apprehensions of the church herself are twice recited under different forms, vs. 14 and 24, and as often met and silenced, first by repeated and still stronger promises of God's unchanging love to his people and of their glorious enlargement and success, vs. 15-23; then by an awful threatening of destruction to their enemies and his, vs. 25, 26.

V. 1. *Hearken ye islands unto me, and attend ye nations from afar.* Here, as in ch. 41 : 1, he turns to the gentiles and addresses them directly. There is the same diversity in this case as to the explanation of אֲרָצֹת. Some give it the vague sense of nations, others that of distant nations, while J. D. Michaelis again goes to the opposite extreme by making it mean Europe and Asia Minor. Intermediate between these is the meaning *coasts*, approved by Ewald and others. But there seems to be no sufficient reason for departing from the sense of *islands*, which may be considered as a poetical representative of foreign and especially of distant nations, although not as directly expressing that idea.—*From afar* is not merely *at a distance* (although this explanation might, in case of necessity, be justified by usage), but suggests the idea of attention being drawn to a central point *from* other points around it.—*Jehovah from the womb hath called me, from the bowels of my mother he hath mentioned my name* (or literally, caused it to be remembered). This does not necessarily denote the literal prediction of an individual by name before his birth, although, as Hengstenberg suggests, there may be an intentional allusion to that circumstance, involved in the wider meaning of the words, viz. that of personal election and designation to office. Vitringa's explanation of אֶת־אִמִּי as meaning before birth, is not only unauthorized, but as gratuitous as Noyes's euphemistic paraphrase, *in my very childhood*. The expression *from the womb* may be either inclusive of the period before birth, or restricted to the actual vocation of the speaker to his providential work.—The speaker in this and the following verses is not Isaiah, either as an individual, or as a representative of the prophets generally, on either of which suppositions the terms used are inappropriate and extravagant. Neither the prophets as a class, nor Isaiah as a single prophet, had been intrusted with a message to the gentiles. In favour of supposing that the speaker is Israel, the chosen people, there are various considerations, but especially the aid which this hypothesis affords in the interpretation of the third verse. At the same time there are clear indications that the words are the words of the Messiah. These two most plausible interpretations may be reconciled and blended, by assuming that in this case as in ch. 42 : 1, the ideal speaker is the Messiah considered as the head of



his people and as forming with them one complex person, according to the canon of Tichonius already quoted, *de Christo et Corpore ejus Ecclesia tanquam de una persona in Scriptura saepius mentionem fieri, cui quaedam tribuuntur quae tantum in Caput, quaedam quae tantum in Corpus competunt, quaedam vero in utrumque.* The objections to this assumption here are for the most part negative and superficial. That of Hengstenberg, that if this were the true interpretation here, it would admit of being carried out elsewhere, is really a strong proof of its truth; as we have seen conclusive reasons, independently of this case, to explain the parallel passage in ch. 42 : 1 on precisely the same principle. The whole question as to the subjects and connexions of these Later Prophecies has made a very sensible advance towards satisfactory solution since the date of the Christology, as may be learned by comparing the general analysis and special expositions of the latter with the corresponding passages of Hävernick and Drechsler. If, as we have seen cause to believe, the grand theme of this whole book is the Church, in its relation to its Head and to the World, the anterior presumption is no longer against but decidedly in favour of the reference of this verse to the Head and the Body as one person, a reference confirmed, as we shall see, by clear New Testament authority.

V. 2. *And he hath placed (i. e. rendered or made) my mouth like a sharp sword.* By *mouth* we are of course to understand speech, discourse. The comparison is repeated and explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews (4 : 12): “The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” In both cases these qualities are predicated not of literal speech merely, but of the instruction of which it is the natural and common instrument. As tropical parallels, Lowth refers to Pindar’s frequent description of his verses as darts, but especially to the famous panegyric of Eupolis on Pericles, that he alone of the orators left a sting in those who heard him (*μόρος τῶν ῥητόρων τὸ κέντρον ἐγκατέλειπε τοῖς ἀκροαμένοις*).—*In the shadow of his hand he hid me.* It has been made a question whether *in the shadow of his hand* means *in his hand* or *under it*; and if the latter, whether there is reference to the usual position of the sword-belt, or to the concealment of the drawn sword or dagger under the arm or in the sleeve. Most interpreters, however, prefer the obvious sense, in the protection of his hand, or rather in its darkness, since the reference is not so much to safety as to concealment. Thus understood, the figure is appropriate not only to the personal Messiah, but to the ancient church, as his precursor and representative, in which high character it was not known for ages to the nations.—*And he placed me for (that is, rendered me, or, used me as) a polished*

*arrow.* This is the parallel expression to the first member of the other clause. What is there called a sword is here an arrow. The essential idea is of course the same, viz. that of penetrating power, but perhaps with an additional allusion to the directness of its aim and the swiftness of its flight. The common version *shaft* is not entirely accurate, the Hebrew word denoting strictly the metallic head of the arrow. The Septuagint gives ἡλεκτῆρ the sense of chosen or elect, which is retained by Vitringa; but most interpreters prefer the sense of polished, which is near akin to that of sharpened, sharp.—*In his quiver he has hid me.* This is the corresponding image to the hiding in the shadow of God's hand. It is still more obvious in this case that the main idea meant to be conveyed is not protection but concealment. The archer keeps the arrow in his quiver not merely that it may be safe, but that it may be ready for use and unobserved until it is used.

V. 3. *And he (Jehovah) said to me, Thou art my servant*, i. e. my instrument or agent constituted such for a specific and important purpose. In this same character both Israel and the Messiah have before been introduced. There is therefore the less reason for giving any other than the strict sense to the words which follow, *Israel in whom I will be glorified or glorify myself.* The version *I will glory* seems inadequate and not sufficiently sustained by usage. Gesenius, unable to reconcile this form of address with the hypothesis that the speaker is Isaiah or the Prophets as a class, proposes in his commentary what had been before proposed by J. D. Michaelis, to expunge the word כְּסֵפֶיךָ as spurious,—a desperate device which he abandons in the second edition of his version, and adopts the opinion of Umbreit, that the Israel of this passage is the chosen people as a whole or with respect to its better portion. The other devices, which have been adopted for the purpose of evading this difficulty, although not so violent, are equally unfounded. E. g. 'It is Israel in whom I will be glorified by thee.' 'Thou art an Israelite indeed, or a genuine descendant of Israel.' Another gratuitous hypothesis is that of a sudden apostrophe to Israel after addressing the Messiah or the Prophet. The only supposition which adheres to the natural and obvious meaning of the sentence, and yet agrees with the context, is the first above mentioned, viz. that of a complex subject including the Messiah and his people, or the body with its head.

V. 4. *And I said*, in opposition or reply to what Jehovah said. The pronoun in Hebrew, being not essential to the sense, is emphatic.—*In vain* (or *for a vain thing*, i. e. an unattainable object) *have I toiled.* The Hebrew word suggests the idea of exhaustion and weariness.—*For emptiness and vanity my strength have I consumed. But my right is with Jehovah and my work with my God.* כְּסֵפֶיךָ is no doubt here used in the same sense as in

ch. 40 : 10, viz. that of recompense, *work* being put for its result or its equivalent. If so, it is altogether probable that  $\text{אֲשֶׁר־לִּי}$  here means that to which I have a right or am entitled, that is to say in this connexion, my reward or recompense. This explanation of the term is certainly more natural than that which makes it mean *my cause, my suit*, as this needlessly introduces a new figure, viz. that of litigation over and above that of labour or service for hire. This clause is universally explained as an expression of strong confidence that God would make good what was wanting, by bestowing the reward which had not yet been realized. *With* therefore means in his possession, and at his disposal. The next verse shows that the failure here complained of is a failure to accomplish the great work before described, viz. that of converting the world.

V. 5. *And now, saith Jehovah, my maker (or who formed me) from the womb, for a servant to himself, i. e. to be his servant in the sense before explained. The now may be here taken either in its temporal or logical sense.—To convert (or bring back) Jacob to him.* This cannot mean to restore from exile; for how could this work be ascribed directly either to the Prophet or the Prophets, or to the Messiah, or to Israel himself? It might indeed apply to Cyrus, but the whole context is at war with such an explanation. All that is left, then, is to give the verb the sense of bringing back to a state of allegiance from one of alienation and revolt. But how could Jacob or Israel be said to bring himself back? This is the grand objection to the assumption that the servant of Jehovah was Israel himself. In order to evade it, Rosenmüller and Hitzig deny that  $\text{אֲשֶׁר־לִּי}$  is dependent on the words immediately preceding, and refer it to Jehovah himself, *that he might bring back Jacob to himself.* But this construction, not an obvious or natural one in itself, if here assumed, must be repeated again and again in the following verses, where it is still more strained and inappropriate. Nor is it necessary even here, to justify the reference of the passage to Israel, which may be effected by assuming a coincident reference to the Messiah, as the head of the body, and as such conspicuously active in restoring Israel itself to God.—This is one of the cases where the idea of the head predominates above that of the body, because they are related to each other as the subject and object of one and the same action. The vocation of Israel was to reclaim the nations; that of the Messiah was first to reclaim Israel himself and then the nations.—In the next clause there is an ancient variation of the text, preserved in the Kethib and Keri of the Masora. The marginal emendation is  $\text{אֲשֶׁר־לִּי}$  *to him*, which many modern interpreters prefer, and make it for the most part a dependent clause, *to restore Jacob to him and that Israel may be gathered to him.* In the sentence construed thus it might seem strange that different prepositions should be used in the two

parallel members, and that לִי should stand before the verb instead of closing the phrase as יִקָּח does. But these might be considered trivial points, were it not that the marginal reading is so easily accounted for, as an attempt to remove the difficulties of the older text, in which the אֵל has its natural and necessary place before the verb. Luther, adhering to the textual reading, gives the verb an unfavourable sense, *that Israel may not be snatched away or carried off*. But most of those who retain the old reading give the verb the favourable sense of gathering that which is dispersed. Some then read the clause as an interrogation, *shall not Israel be gathered?* Others as a concession, *although Israel be not gathered*. Others as a simple affirmation in the present tense, *and (yet) Israel is not gathered*. All that is needed to give this last the preference is the substitution of the future for the present, after which the whole verse may be paraphrased as follows: Thus saith Jehovah, who formed me from the womb as a servant for himself, to restore Jacob to him, and (yet) Israel will not be gathered—and (yet) I shall be honoured in the eyes of Jehovah, and my God has (already) been my strength. The first *yet* introduced to show the true connexion is equivalent to saying, though I was called and raised up for this purpose; the other is equivalent to saying, although Israel will not be gathered. This last phrase may be taken as a simple prediction that they should not be gathered, or a declaration that they would not (consent to) be gathered. This last, if not expressed, is implied.—The translation of יָצָא as meaning *my praise* is entirely gratuitous and hurtful to the sense, which is, that God had sustained him notwithstanding the apparent failure of his mission. The general meaning of the verse is that Messiah and his people should be honoured in the sight of God, although the proximate design of their mission, the salvation of the literal Israel, might seem to fail.

V. 6. *And he said*. This does not introduce a new discourse or declaration, but resumes the construction which had been interrupted by the parenthetic clauses of the foregoing verse. It is in fact a repetition of the הִיאָהְיָה אֵלֶיךָ at the beginning of that verse. *And now saith Jehovah (who formed me from the womb to be a servant to himself, to restore Jacob to him, and yet Israel will not be gathered, and yet I shall be honoured in the eyes of Jehovah, and my God has been my strength)—he said or says* as follows. *It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant*. The original form of expression is so purely idiomatic, that it cannot be retained in English. According to the usual analogy, the Hebrew words would seem to mean *it is lighter than thy being my servant*; but this can be resolved into *it is too light for thee to be my servant*, with at least as much ease as a hundred other formulas, the sense of which is obvious, however difficult it may be to account for the expression. Hitzig's assertion, therefore, that it

is at variance with the laws of thought and language, though adopted by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, is not only arbitrary but absurd, as it assumes the possibility of ascertaining and determining these laws independently of actual usage. The most that can be said with truth is that the form of expression is anomalous and rare, though not unparalleled, as may be seen by a comparison of this verse with Ezek. 8:17. The sense, if it were doubtful in itself, would be clear from the context, which requires this to be taken as a declaration that it was not enough for the Messiah (and the people as his representative) to labour for the natural descendants of Abraham, but he and they must have a wider field.—*Thy being to me a servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and the preserved of Israel to restore.* This form of expression shows very clearly that in this and the parallel passages *servant* is not used indefinitely but in the specific sense of an appointed instrument or agent to perform a certain work. That work is here the *raising up* of Jacob, a phrase which derives light from the parallel expression, to *restore* the preserved of Israel, i. e. to raise them from a state of degradation, and to restore them from a state of estrangement. A specific reference to restoration from the Babylonish exile would be gratuitous; much more the restriction of the words to that event, which is merely included as a signal instance of deliverance and restoration in the general. The textual reading  $\text{נְצִירִי}$  appears to be a verbal adjective occurring nowhere else, and therefore exchanged by the masoretic critics for the passive participle  $\text{נְצִירִי}$ . J. D. Michaelis, more ingeniously than wisely, makes  $\text{נְצִירִי}$  synonymous with  $\text{נֶצֶר}$  (ch. 11:1) a shoot or sprout, and gives to  $\text{נְצִירִי}$  the corresponding sense of a twig or branch—the shoots of Jacob and the twigs of Israel. All other writers seem to take the latter in its usual sense of tribe, and the other in that of preserved—meaning the elect or ‘such as should be saved.’—*And I have given thee for a light of the gentiles* (as in ch. 42:6), *to be my salvation even to the end of the earth.* This, according to the English idiom, would seem to mean *that thou mayest be my salvation* etc.; but Hebrew usage equally admits of the interpretation, *that my salvation may be* (i. e. extend) *to the end of the earth*, which is in fact preferred by most interpreters. The meaning of this verse is not, as some suppose, that the heathen should be given to him in exchange and compensation for the unbelieving Jews, but that his mission to the latter was, from the beginning, but a small part of his high vocation. The application of this verse by Paul and Barnabas, in their address to the Jews of Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:47) is very important, as a confirmation of the hypothesis assumed above, that the person here described is not the Messiah exclusively, but that his people are included in the subject of the description.—“It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken unto you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn

to the gentiles. FOR SO HATH THE LORD COMMANDED US (saying), I have set thee to be a light of the gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth." Although this, as Hengstenberg observes, is not irreconcilable with the exclusive Messianic explanation of the verse before us, its agreement with the wider explanation is too striking to be deemed fortuitous.

V. 7. *Thus saith Jehovah, the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, to the heartily despised, to the nation exciting abhorrence.* The two epithets in this clause are exceedingly obscure and difficult.  $\text{הִקְדָּשׁ}$  has been variously explained as an infinitive, a passive participle, and an adjective in the construct state, which last is adopted by Gesenius and most later writers— $\text{שְׂפָדָה}$  is commonly explained as meaning *men*, chiefly because the parallel expression in Ps. 22 : 7 is  $\text{שְׂפָדָה יְהוָה}$ . Another explanation takes it in its proper sense of *soul*, and understands it to qualify  $\text{הִקְדָּשׁ}$ , as meaning despised from the soul, *ex animo*. (Compare  $\text{שְׂפָדָה יְהוָה}$  (Ps. 17 : 9.) The meaning *men* belongs to the word only in certain cases, chiefly those in which we use the same expression, not a soul, forty souls, poor soul, etc. No one, from this English usage, would infer that hated by souls meant hated by persons.—The other epithet is still more difficult, as it is necessary to determine whether  $\text{שֹׂנְאָהּ$  has its usual sense, and whether  $\text{הָעַמִּים}$  is its subject or its object. *Whom the nation abhorreth, who abhorreth the nation, who excites the abhorrence of the nation, the nation which excites abhorrence*,—all these are possible translations of the Hebrew words, among which interpreters choose according to their different views respecting the whole passage. In any case it is descriptive of deep abasement and general contempt, to be exchanged hereafter for an opposite condition.—*To a servant of rulers*, one who has hitherto been subject to them but is now to receive their homage.—*Kings shall see* (not *him* or *them*, but *it*, viz. that which is to happen) and *rise up* (as a token of respect), *princes (shall see) and bow themselves*. It is an ingenious thought of Hitzig, though perhaps too refined, that kings, being usually seated in the presence of others, are described as rising from their thrones; while princes and nobles, who usually stand in the presence of their sovereigns, are described as falling prostrate.—*For the sake of Jehovah who is faithful* (to his promises), *the Holy One of Israel, and he hath chosen thee*, or in our idiom *who hath chosen thee*. 'This last clause not only ascribes the promised change to the power of God, but represents it as intended solely to promote his glory.

V. 8. *Thus saith Jehovah, In a time of favour have I heard (or answered) thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee.* The common version, *an acceptable time*, does not convey the sense of the original, which signifies a suitable or appointed time for showing grace or favour. The

object of address is still the Messiah and his people, whose great mission is again described. *And I will keep thee, and will give thee for a covenant of the people*, i. e. of men in general (see above, ch. 42 : 7), *to raise up the earth* or world from its present state of ruin, *and to cause to inherit the desolate heritages*, the moral wastes of heathenism. There is allusion to the division of the land by Joshua. Here again we have clear Apostolical authority for applying this description to the Church, or people of God, as the Body of which Christ is the Head. Paul says to the Corinthians, "We then as workers together (with him) beseech you also that ye receive not the word of God in vain. For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee." What follows is no part of the quotation but Paul's comment on it. "Behold, now is the accepted time ; behold, now is the day of salvation." (2 Cor. 6 : 2.) This, taken in connexion with the citation of v. 6 in Acts 13 : 47, precludes the supposition of an accidental or unmeaning application of this passage to the people or ministers of Christ as well as to himself.

V. 9. *To say to those bound, Come forth ; to (those) who (are) in darkness, Be revealed (or show yourselves).* אָמַרְתָּ might here be taken in its usual sense after verbs of speaking, viz. that of *saying* ; but it seems more natural to make it a correlative of the infinitives אָמַרְתָּ and אָמַרְתָּ, *to raise up—to cause to inherit—to say*. Gesenius paraphrases rather than translates אָמַרְתָּ, *come to the light* ; which is carefully copied by his later imitators as a faithful version.—*On the ways (or roads) they shall feed, and in all bare hills (shall be) their pasture.* There is here a change of figure, the delivered being represented not as prisoners or freedmen but as flocks. Some read *by the way* or *on their way* homeward ; but it is commonly agreed that the Prophet simply represents the flock as finding pasture even without going aside to seek it, and even in the most unlikely situations. The restriction of these figures to deliverance from Babylon, can seem natural only to those who have assumed the same hypothesis throughout the foregoing chapters.

V. 10. *They shall not hunger and they shall not thirst, and there shall not smite them mirage and sun ; for he that hath mercy on them shall guide them, and by springs of water shall he lead them.* The image of a flock is still continued. (Compare ch. 40 : 10, 11. 41 : 18. 43 : 19.) מַשְׁבֵּי is the same word that is now universally explained in ch. 35 : 7 to mean the *mirage*, or delusive appearance of water in the desert. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 582.) Jarchi explains it here by חֵם *heat*, which Rosenmüller supposes to be here substituted for the proper meaning. Gesenius, on the other hand, makes heat the primary, and mirage the secondary sense. The

reason for excluding the latter here is that it does not seem to suit the verb *smite*; but as this verb is used with considerable latitude, and as a *zeugma* may be easily assumed, Hitzig, Ewald, and Knobel give the noun the same sense in both places. Most of the modern writers understand the last clause to mean, *to springs of water he shall lead them*; but *along* or *by* may be considered preferable, as suggesting more directly the idea of progressive motion. As he leads them onwards, he conducts them along streams of water. This may however be supposed to give too great a latitude of meaning to the word translated *springs*.—For the true sense of the verb  $\text{הִנְחִיל}$ , see above, on ch. 40: 11.

V. 11. *And I will place all my mountains for the way, and my roads shall be high.* The image of a flock is now exchanged for that of an army on the march. Rosenmüller omits *my*, and explains  $\text{הַרְבֵּי}$  as an old plural form; to which Gesenius objects, not only as gratuitous, but also as at variance with the parallelism which requires a suffix. *My mountains* is by some understood to mean the mountains of Israel; but why these should be mentioned is not easily explained. Others with more probability explain it as an indirect assertion of God's sovereignty and absolute control, and more especially his power to remove the greatest obstacles from the way of his people. The original expression is not merely *for a way* but *for the way*, i. e. the way in which my people are to go.  $\text{הַדֶּקֶלֶת}$  is an artificial road or causeway made by throwing up the earth, which seems to be intended by the verb at the close. (Compare the use of  $\text{בָּנִי}$  ch. 57: 14. 62: 19.) The discrepancy of gender in the verb and noun is an anomaly, but one which does not in the least obscure the sense or even render the construction doubtful. Compare with this verse ch. 35: 8. 40: 4.

V. 12. *Behold, these from afar shall come, and behold these from the north and from the sea, and these from the land of Sinim.* There is not the least doubt as to the literal translation of this verse; and yet it has been a famous subject of discordant expositions, all of which turn upon the question what is meant by the *land of Sinim*. In addition to the authors usually cited, respect will here be had to an interesting monograph, by an American Missionary in China, originally published in the Chinese Repository, and republished in this country under the title of "The Land of Sinim, or an exposition of Isaiah 49: 12, together with a brief account of the Jews and Christians in China." (Philadelphia, 1845.) It is well said by this writer, that the verse before us is the central point of the prophetic discourse, of which it forms a part; inasmuch as it embodies the great promise, which in various forms is exhibited before and afterwards. This relation of the text to the context is important, because it creates a presumption in favour of the



widest meaning which can be put upon the terms of the prediction, and against a restricted local application. A preliminary question, not devoid of exegetical importance, is the question with respect to the mutual relation of the clauses, as divided in the masoretic text. The doubtful point is whether the first clause is a single item in an enumeration of particulars, or a generic statement, comprehending the specific statements of the other clause. Almost all interpreters assume the former ground and understand the verse as naming or distinguishing the four points of the compass. But the other supposition is ingeniously maintained by the Missionary in China, who makes the first clause a general prediction that converts shall come from the remotest nations, and the other an explanation of this vague expression, as including the north, the west, and the land of Sinim. Upon this construction of the sentence, which is certainly plausible and striking, it may be observed, in the first place, that it is not necessary for the end at which the author seems to aim in urging it. This end appears to be the securing of some proof that the specifications of the second clause relate to *distant* countries. But this conclusion is almost as obvious, if not entirely so, upon the other supposition; for if one of the four quarters is denoted by the phrase *from afar*, the idea necessarily suggested is that all the other points enumerated are remote likewise. The same thing would moreover be sufficiently apparent from the whole drift of the context as relating not to proximate or local changes but to vast and universal ones. Nothing is gained therefore even for the author's own opinion, by the admission of this new construction. Another observation is that the authority on which he seems to rest its claims is inconclusive, namely, that of the masoretic interpunction, as denoted by the accents. He states the testimony thus afforded much too strongly, when he speaks of "a full stop" after the clause *from afar they shall come*, and points the verse accordingly. The Athnach, as a general rule, indicates the pause not at the end but in the middle of a sentence or complete proposition. It is therefore *prima facie* proof that the sense is incomplete; and although there may be numerous exceptions, it cannot possibly demonstrate that the first clause does not form a part of the same series of particulars which is concluded in the second. That the first clause frequently contains what may be logically called an essential portion of the second, any reader may convince himself by the most cursory inspection of the book before us; and for two decisive examples in this very chapter, he has only to examine the fifth and seventh verses, where the substitution of a "full stop" for the Athnach would destroy the sense. But even if the testimony of the accents were still more explicit and decisive than it is, their comparatively recent date and their mixed relation to rhythmical or musical as well as to grammatical and logical distinctions make it always proper to subject their decisions to the requisitions of the text and context in themselves considered. Notwithstanding the great

value of the masoretic accents as an aid to interpretation, the appeal must after all be to the obvious meaning of the words, or in default of this to analogy and usage. The accents leave us therefore perfectly at liberty to look upon the mutual relation of the clauses as an open question, by inquiring whether there is any valid reason for departing from the ancient and customary supposition that the four points of the compass, or at least four quarters or directions, are distinctly mentioned. This leads me, in the third place, to observe that the objection which the Missionary makes to this hypothesis, apart from the question of accentuation, is an insufficient one. He objects to Vitringa's explanation of the phrase *from afar* as meaning *from the east* (and the same objection would by parity of reasoning apply to the explanation of it as denoting *from the south*), that *afar* does not mean the east, and is not elsewhere used to denote it. But what Vitringa means to say is not that *afar* means the *east*, but simply that it here supplies its place. If any one, in numbering the points of the compass, should, instead of a complete enumeration, say the north, south, east, and so on, his obvious meaning could not well be rendered doubtful by denying that *and so on* ever means the west. It is not the words themselves, but the place which they occupy, and their relation to the rest of the sentence, that suggests rather than expresses the idea. So here, the north, the west, the land of Sinim, and afar, may denote the four points of the compass, although not so explicitly as in the case supposed, because in that before us we have not merely one doubtful point, but two, if not three; and also because the one most dubious (*from afar*) is not at the end like *and so on*, but at the beginning. Still it seems most natural, when four distinct local designations are given, one of which is certainly, another almost certainly, and a third most probably, indicative of particular quarters or directions, to conclude that the fourth is so used likewise, however vague it may be in itself, and however situated in the sentence. The presumption thus created is confirmed by the fact that the hypothesis of only three divisions admits that the whole earth was meant to be included; and it thus becomes a question, which is most agreeable to general usage, and to that of Scripture in particular, a threefold or a fourfold distribution of the earth in such connexions? If the latter, then analogy is strongly in favour of the common supposition that the first clause is not coextensive with the other, but contains the first of four particulars enumerated. Over and above this argument derived from the usual distinction of four points or quarters, there is another furnished by the usage of the pronoun *these*, when repeated so as to express a distributive idea. In all such cases, *these* and *these* means *some* and *others*; nor is there probably a single instance in which the first *these* comprehends the whole, while the others divide it into parts. This would be just as foreign from the Hebrew idiom as it is from ours to say, 'Some live in Europe, some in France, some in

Holland,' when we mean that some live in Holland, some in France, and all in Europe. The proposed construction would be altogether natural, if  $\text{רָחֵק}$  were omitted in the first clause; but its presence cannot be accounted for, if that clause is inclusive of the other. That the distributive use of the demonstrative is not confined to two such pronouns only, may be seen from ch. 41:5, where the singular  $\text{רָחֵק}$  is twice repeated, just as the plural  $\text{רָחֵקִים}$  is here, and in a connexion which admits of no doubt as to the distributive import of all three.—From all this it seems to follow that the verse most probably contains the customary distribution of the earth or heavens into four great quarters, and that one of these is designated by the phrase *from afar*. Which one is so described can only be determined by determining the true sense of the other three. The Missionary in China is therefore perfectly correct in setting aside all arguments against his own opinion founded on the supposition that *from afar* must mean the south or the east. The expression is so vague that it must be determined by the others, and cannot therefore be employed to determine them, without reasoning in a vicious circle. This serves to show that the question after all is of no great exegetical importance, since in either case the same conclusion may be reached. It is always best, however, to adhere to the more obvious and usual construction of a passage, in the absence of decisive reasons for departing from it. Assuming then that four points are mentioned, and that the first (*from afar*) can only be determined by determining the others, let us now attempt to do so. One of these (*the north*) is undisputed; for although interpreters may differ as to its precise bounds and extent, its relative position is unquestionably fixed by the usage of the Hebrew word. Another term, which most interpreters, and among the rest the Missionary in China, seem to look upon as equally settled and beyond dispute, is more ambiguous than they imagine, and has recently received a very different explanation. This is  $\text{מָזָר}$ , which strictly means *the sea*, but is often used for *west*, because on that side Palestine is naturally bounded by the Mediterranean. Hitzig, however, very confidently says that here and in Ps. 103:7, where it is put in opposition to the *north*,  $\text{מָזָר}$  means the south sea, and as a term of geography the *south*. This is not mentioned as having any probability, of which it is entirely destitute, because the geographical import of the term is not to be decided by the parallelism or the context in any given case, but by the predominant usage, which determines it to mean the west, and so it is explained both by the oldest and the latest writers. Having two points thus determined, we are sure that the two which remain must be the east and south; and as we have already seen that *from afar* from its vagueness must receive but cannot give light, we have now to ascertain, if possible, in which of these directions lay the *land of Sinim*. The discrepancy of the versions as to these concluding words is remarkable, and shows the doubt in

which the subject was involved at a very early period. The Missionary in China makes an observation on this difference which is less just than ingenious, viz. that no one of the authors of these versions seems to have regarded his own country as the Land of Sinim; "for it can scarcely be supposed," says he, "that the authors of a version living in the very country referred to, should so utterly fail of perceiving it as to give the preference to other lands." It is not easy to perceive, however, why the same causes that have made the prophecy obscure to others, should not make it equally obscure to the people of the country meant, especially if the name used was intended to be enigmatical, as some interpreters suppose. Indeed, by parity of reasoning it would seem to follow that if the author of the Septuagint Version had supposed it to be Egypt, this would have decided the question. But although this observation does not seem entitled to any influence upon the exegesis, the difference between the ancient versions, as well as the commentators of all ages, is still very remarkable. Without attempting to enumerate all the explanations, it will not be amiss to give some samples of the different classes. Some would seem to be mere conjectural inferences from the context. Thus the Targum and Vulgate make it mean the land of the south or southern land, assuming no doubt that *from afar* must mean the east, and that the south alone remained to be supplied. Proceeding on the contrary hypothesis, that *from afar* must mean the south, the Septuagint puts the Land of Sinim in the east, but gives it the specific sense of *Persia*, which appears to be entirely arbitrary. The same thing may be said of Matthew Henry's notion that the Land of Sinim was a Babylonian province. As a specimen of fanciful interpretation, may be given Adam Clarke's suggestion that אֲרָבָה means a bush, אֲרָבֵי אֲרָבָה may mean bushes, woods, or a woody country, and be here used to denote the region occupied by the descendants of the ten tribes, perhaps in West Africa or North America! Dismissing these gratuitous conjectures, we may now confine ourselves to those interpretations which have some foundation or appearance of it either in philology or history. Among these may be mentioned, first, the supposition that the *land of Sinim* is the country of the *Sinites* spoken of in Gen. 10: 17 and 1 Chron. 1: 15. But why should a Canaanitish tribe of no importance, and which no where reappears in history, be here made to represent one of the four quarters of the globe? This question becomes still more difficult to answer when it is added that the *Sinites* must have been immediately adjacent to the land of Israel, and on the north side which is separately mentioned. Grotius indeed transfers them to the south side, but by sheer mistake, and for the purpose of connecting them with the wilderness of *Sin* and Mount *Sinai*, which are wholly distinct from it. Jerome and Jarchi also understand the Land of Sinim to be the wilderness of *Sin* or the peninsula of *Sinai*, but without identifying

these with the country of the Canaanitish Sinites, as Grotius does. To their opinion the decisive objection is not the one which the Missionary in China draws from the difference of name and from the plural form *Sinim*. That "there were not two deserts of Sin," proves no more in this case than the assertion that there were not two Hermons proves against the application of the plural *Hermonim* to that mountain in Ps. 42: 7. If a mountain might be so called, why not a desert? And if Hermonim means Hermonites, why may not Sinim mean Sinites? This question is especially appropriate, because the author gives no explanation of the plural form, upon his own hypothesis. But although this objection is invalid, the other which the author urges is conclusive, namely, that Sinai and the wilderness of Sin were too near and too limited to be employed in this connexion. Another explanation founded on analogy of names is that of Aben Ezra, Kimchi, Bochart, Vitringa, J. D. Michaelis, and Ewald, that the *land of Sinim* is the land of Egypt, so called from *Syene*, as Michaelis supposes, or from *Sin*, i. e. Pelusium, mentioned under that name by Ezekiel (30: 15, 16) as maintained by Bochart, Vitringa, and Ewald. Here again it seems unfair to argue, with the Missionary in China, from the plural form of the Hebrew name; for if, as he observes, it is merely fanciful to refer it to the old geographical distinction of Upper and Lower Egypt, is it not more than fanciful to refer it to China where there is no such distinction to account for it at all! If it be said, that *Sinim* means the Chinese, it may just as easily be said that it means the Egyptians. There is no force therefore in the argument from this peculiarity in form, any more than in the argument which the Missionary in China himself admits to be here inapplicable, that Egypt was not sufficiently important to be made the representative of one great quarter. As little weight attaches to his argument that this interpretation of the name would make the distribution too unequal; for as he adjusts the limits of the north and even of the land of Sinim at discretion, there is no sufficient reason why the same thing might not be done with Sinim if it did mean Egypt. The really decisive ground, assumed by the same writer, is that Egypt, notwithstanding its extent and historical importance, was too near at hand to suit the context, which requires a remote land to be here meant, whether *from afar* be taken as a general description or as a distinct specification. Another strong objection is that no cause can be shown, from analogy or otherwise, for the designation of this well known country, in this one place only, by a name derived from one of its cities, and that not of the first rank. The only remaining explanation, which will be referred to, is that the land of Sinim is China, as maintained by Manasseh Ben Israel, Montanus, Calmet, Gesenius, Winer, Maurer, Hitzig, Henderson, Umbreit, Hendewerk, Knobel, and Beck. An objection to this interpretation is suggested to some minds by its resemblance

to an etymological conceit founded merely on an assonance of names. It was probably this prejudice which caused it to be spoken of with such contempt by Grotius, Clericus, and Vitringa. But in modern times, the current has completely changed, and this despised notion has been warmly espoused not only by the most distinguished writers on Isaiah (Rosenmüller and Ewald being almost the only exceptions in the German school), but by the most eminent comparative philologists, such as Langlès, Lassen, and others, who have investigated the question as one of historical and literary interest. The only plausible objections which are still urged against it may be reduced to two. The first is that China was unknown to the Jews at the date of the prophecy. To this it may be answered, first, that no one who believes in the inspiration of the prophets, can refuse to admit the possibility of such a prediction, even if the fact were so; and secondly, that in all probability China was known to the Jews at a very early period. The rashness of asserting a negative in such cases has been clearly proved by the modern discovery of porcelain vessels with Chinese inscriptions in the monuments of Thebes. But it is still objected, that the name *Sinim* is not that used by the Chinese themselves, nor by other nations until long after the date of this prophecy, it having been derived from a family which did not ascend the throne until about 246 years before the birth of Christ. It is remarkable how readily this date in Chinese history is taken for granted as undoubtedly correct by those who wish to use it for an argument, although it rests upon a dark and dubious tradition of a distant unknown country; although the very text before us makes it doubtful; although the universal prevalence of the name Sin, Chin, or Jin, throughout western and southern Asia from time immemorial presupposes an antiquity still more remote; and although Chinese historians themselves record that the family from which the name derives its origin, for ages before it ruled the empire ruled a province or kingdom on the western frontier, whence the name might easily have been extended to the western nations. There are in fact few cases of a name being more extensively or longer prevalent than that of *China*, the very form which it exhibits in the Sanscrit, the mother language of southern Asia. That the Chinese themselves have never used it, although acquainted with it, is nothing to the purpose. A Hebrew writer would of course use the name familiar in the west of Asia. This universal name is allowed to be essentially identical with  $\text{יִצְחָק}$  by the highest philological authorities. There is therefore no conclusive force in either of the arguments advanced against this explanation of the name. As positive reasons on the other side, besides the main one drawn from the coincidence of name, may be mentioned the agreement of so many different and independent writers, and the appropriateness of the explanation to the context. Under the first head may be classed precisely those philologists whose peculiar studies best entitle

them to speak with authority on such a point, and those German commentators on Isaiah, who are most accustomed to differ among themselves and with the older writers, especially where any thing is likely to be added by a proposed interpretation to the strength of revelation or rather to the clearness of its evidences. Prejudice and interest would certainly have led this class of writers to oppose rather than favour a hypothesis which tends to identify the subject of this prophecy with China, the great object of missionary effort at the present day.—The other confirmation is afforded by the suitability of the sense thus evolved to the connexion. If the land of Sinim meant the wilderness of Sin or even Egypt, it would be difficult if not impossible to give a satisfactory solution of its singular position here as one of the great quarters or divisions of the world. But if it mean China, that extreme limit of the eastern world, that hive of nations, supposed to comprehend a third part of the human race, the enigma explains itself. Even to us there would be nothing unintelligible or absurd, however strange or novel, in the combination, north, west, south, and China. On the whole, then, a hypothesis which solves all difficulties, satisfies the claims of philology and history, unites the suffrages of the most independent schools and parties, fully meets the requisitions of the text and context, and opens a glorious field of expectation and of effort to the church, may be safely regarded as the true one. For an interesting view of the extent to which the promise has already been fulfilled, and of the encouragements to hope and pray for its entire consummation, the reader is referred to the little book, of which we have so frequently made mention, although our citations have been necessarily confined to the first or expository chapter, the remaining four being occupied with the fulfilment of the prophecy.

V. 13. *Shout, oh heavens, and rejoice, oh earth, let the mountains burst into a shout; because Jehovah has comforted his people, and on his sufferers he will have mercy.* This is a very common method with Isaiah of foretelling any joyful change by summoning all nature to exult in it as already realized. See especially ch. 44 : 23, where instead of the future יִשְׂמְחוּ we have the imperative יִשְׂמְחוּ, in imitation of which the Keri here reads יִשְׂמְחוּ, and Lowth simply יִשְׂמְחוּ on the authority of two or three manuscripts and the ancient versions. There is of course no sufficient reason for departing from the ancient reading still preserved in the text.—Jehovah's consolation of his people, as Gesenius observes, is administered by deed as well as by word. (Compare ch. 51 : 3, 12. 52 : 9. 66 : 13. Luke 2 : 25, 38.) The consolation here meant is the joyful assemblage of his people from all parts of the earth, predicted in the foregoing verse.—The modern writers render both the preterite and future in the last clause by the present (comforts, has mercy); which is not only arbitrary but injurious to the force of the expres-

sion, which describes the consolation as both past and future, that is to say as already begun and still to be continued; unless the change of tense be designed to intimate that what is vividly described in the preceding words as past is really still future.—װ, which is commonly translated in the English Bible *poor*, is here rendered more correctly *afflicted*. The expression *his afflicted* intimates at once their previous condition and their intimate relation to the Lord as their protector.

V. 14. *And (yet) Zion said, Jehovah hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me.* So far was this glorious change from having been procured by confidence in God, that Zion thought herself forsaken and forgotten. Those who restrict these prophecies to the Babylonish exile are compelled to understand this either of the captive inhabitants of Zion, as distinguished from the other exiles, or of Jerusalem itself, complaining of its desolation. But the former distinction is as arbitrary here as in ch. 40 : 9, and the long argumentative expostulation which ensues would be absurd if addressed to the bare walls of an empty town. The only satisfactory conclusion is, that Zion or Jerusalem is mentioned as the capital of Israel, the centre of the true religion, the earthly residence of God himself, and therefore an appropriate and natural emblem of his chosen people or the ancient church, just as we speak of the corruptions or spiritual tyranny of Rome, meaning not the city but the great ecclesiastical society or corporation which it represents and of which it is the centre.—The translation *Zion says*, although not ungrammatical, is less appropriate here, because it represents the church as still complaining; whereas the original describes her previous unbelief, before the event, or before the truth of the promise had been guaranteed. It is worthy of remark that the same translators who make the first verb present give the other two their proper past sense, a diversity admissible in case of necessity, but not without it.

V. 15. *Will a woman forget her suckling, from having mercy (i. e. so as not to have mercy) on the son of her womb? Also (or even) these will forget, and I will not forget thee.* The constancy of God's affection for his people is expressed by the strongest possible comparison derived from human instincts. There is a climax in the thought, if not in the expression. What is indirectly mentioned as impossible in one clause, is declared to be real in the other. He first declares that he can no more forget them than a woman can forget her child, he then rises higher and declares that he is still more mindful of them than a mother. The future verb at the beginning implies without expressing a potential sense. If she will, she can; if she cannot, then of course she will not. For the negative use of the preposition װ, see above, on ch. 44 : 18.—װװ might seem to have the general sense of *body*,



as we find it applied to males in Job 19:17. Mic. 6:7.—The precise force of the  $\text{וְאִם}$  is this: not only strangers but *also* mothers; it may therefore be correctly expressed by *even*. Most interpreters make the first part of the last clause conditional, and Gesenius even understands  $\text{וְאִם}$  as an ellipsis for  $\text{וְאִם אֲשֶׁר}$  *although*. (See ch. 1:15.) But this is not so much a version as a paraphrase, a substitution of equivalent expressions. There is no need of departing from the obvious meaning of the prophet's language, which is not hypothetical but categorical. He does not say that if or though a woman could forget her child he would not follow her example, but asserts directly that she can and will, and puts this fact in contrast with his own unwavering constancy. The plural in the last clause, like the singular in the first, denotes the whole class. He does not say that all mothers thus forget their children, nor that mothers generally do so, but that such oblivion is not unknown to the experience of mothers as a class, or of woman as an ideal individual. The primitive simplicity with which the Hebrew idiom employs the simple copulative *and*, where we feel the strongest adversative expression to be necessary, really adds to the force of the expression, when it is once understood and familiar. The *and* may be retained, and yet the antithesis expressed in English by supplying *yet*: and (yet) I will not forget thee.

V. 16. *Behold, on (my) palms I have graven thee; thy walls (are) before me continually.* Paulus understands the first clause as meaning, *upon (thy) hands I have graven* (i. e. branded, marked) *thee*, as belonging to me. Gesenius seems to object to this construction of the suffix with the verb, although precisely similar to that of  $\text{וְאִם אֲשֶׁר}$  in v. 44:5, as explained by himself. His other objection is a better one, viz. that such an explanation of the first clause makes the second almost unmeaning. Döderlein explains it to mean, *with (my) hands I have sketched* (or *drawn*) *thee*, in allusion to a builder's draught or plan before he enters on the work of construction. (Compare Ex. 25:40. 1 Chron. 23:11, 19.) But this use of the preposition  $\text{בְּ}$  has no authority in usage, and the palms of the hands would not be mentioned as the instruments in such a process. Vitranga avoids both these objections by supposing the plan or picture to be drawn upon Jehovah's hands, because there would be something incongruous in representing him as using paper or a table. The Dutch taste of this excellent interpreter lets him go the length of adding that the divine hands are to be conceived of as large and allowing ample room for such a delineation as the one supposed. The true sense of the Prophet's figure seems to be the one expressed by Gesenius and other modern writers, who suppose him to allude not to a picture or a plan of Zion but her name imprinted on his hands for a memorial, as the ancient slave and soldier wore his master's name but for a different purpose. (See above, on ch. 44:5.) The use of the word *palms* implies a

double inscription and in an unusual position, chosen with a view to its being constantly in sight. The idea of a picture was suggested by the other clause, considered as a parallel expression of the same thing as the first. *Thy walls*, i. e. the image of thy walls upon my hands. But this is not necessarily or certainly the true relation of the clauses, which may be considered not as parts of the same image but as two distinct images of one and the same thing. The essential idea, I will not forget thee, may be first expressed by saying, I will write thy name upon my hands, and then by saying, I will keep thy walls constantly before me, i. e. in my sight and memory. (See Ps. 16 : 8. Is. 38 : 13, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 639.)—The mention of the *walls* is no proof that Zion is mentioned merely as a city, since the image of a city is the proximate object here presented, even if the object which it symbolizes be the church or chosen people.

V. 17. *Thy sons hasten (to thee) ; thy destroyers and thy wasters shall go out from thee.* This is the proof that God had not forsaken her. Rosenmüller follows the older writers in translating the first verb as a future, which is wholly arbitrary. Gesenius and others render both the first and last verb in the present tense. The true construction, as in many other cases, seems to be that which represents the process as begun but not complete. Already had her sons begun to hasten to her, and ere long her enemies should be entirely departed. The Septuagint, Targum, and Vulgate, seem to read, instead of *thy sons* (אֲנָשֵׁי), *thy builders* (בְּנֵי), which differs from it only in a single vowel, and agrees well with the parallel expression, *destroyers*, literally, *pullers down*. Lowth amends the text accordingly ; but Vitringa, Gesenius, and the later writers, adhere to the masoretic pointing, on account of its agreement with the thoughts and words of vs. 20–22. —By wasters and destroyers Vitringa understands internal enemies, Gesenius foreign oppressors, Knobel the strangers who had taken possession of Jerusalem and the rest of the country, which, as he acknowledges, it here represents. The natural interpretation of the words is that which understands them as containing simply an emphatic contrast between friends and foes, the latter taking their departure, and the former coming into possession.

V. 18. *Lift up thine eyes round about and see, all of them are gathered together, they are come to thee. (As) I live, saith Jehovah, (I swear) that all of them as an ornament thou shalt put on, and bind (or gird) them like the bride.* The sons, described in v. 17 as rapidly approaching, are now in sight, and their mother is invited to survey them, by lifting up her eyes *round about*, i. e. in all directions, with allusion to their coming from the four points of the compass, as predicted in v. 12. The common version of אֵלֵיהֶם, *all these*, seems to introduce a new subject. The strict translation, *all*

of *them*, refers to what precedes, and means all the sons who are described in the first clause of v. 17 as hastening to her. They are now already gathered, i. e. met together at the point to which they tended from so many distinct quarters. *They come to thee* is an inadequate translation. The true sense is that they are actually come, i. e. arrived.—In the second clause, the ׀ may correspond to the Greek *ὄτι* after verbs of speaking, or retain its ordinary sense with an ellipsis of *I swear* before it. The formula of swearing here used strictly means, *I (am) alive (or living)*, and is itself equivalent to *I swear* in English.—The sons are then compared to ornaments of dress, which the mother girds or binds upon her person. At the end Lowth inserts ׀׀׀ in the text from ch. 61: 10. But this is wholly unnecessary, as the same idea is suggested by the more concise expressions of the common text, which Lowth is utterly mistaken in supposing to describe the bride as binding children round her; for, as Döderlein correctly says, the point of comparison between the type and antitype is not children but decoration. As a bride puts on her ornaments, so thou shalt be adorned with thy children.

V. 19. *For thy ruins, and thy wastes, and thy land of desolation* (i. e. thy desolated land)—*for now thou shalt be too narrow for the inhabitant, and far off shall be thy devourers* (those who swallow thee up). The general meaning of this verse is evident, although the construction is obscure. Most writers take the nouns at the beginning as absolute nominatives, i. e. agreeing with no verb expressed. *As for thy wastes etc. thou shalt be too narrow.* But this still leaves the double ׀ to be accounted for, which Rosenmüller supposes to depend upon the verb *I swear*, as in v. 18, and to signify *that*. Maurer regards the second as a pleonastic or emphatic repetition not belonging to the regular construction. Others give it the supposititious sense of *certainly or surely*. Beck makes the first clause mean, ‘thy ruins and thy wastes and thy desolations shall exist no longer;’ but this requires another verb to be supplied or understood. Perhaps the best solution is the one proposed by Hitzig, who supposes the construction to be interrupted and resumed: *For thy wastes, and thy ruins, and thy land of desolation—(then beginning anew, without completing the first sentence)—for thou shalt be too narrow etc.* This mode of composition, not unlike what appears in the first draft of any piece of writing till obliterated by correction, is comparatively frequent in the ancient writers, not excepting some of the highest classical models, though proscribed as inelegant and incorrect by the fastidious rules of modern rhetoric. This explanation of the double ׀ makes it unnecessary to assume an absolute nominative in the first clause. Knobel carries Hitzig’s hypothesis too far when he assumes an actual ellipsis of the same verb in the first clause—׀׀׀ (derived by Ewald from ׀׀׀, by Gesenius from the cognate and synonymous ׀׀׀) can

only be the second person feminine. The common version, therefore, which refers it to the land, although it gives substantially the true sense, is grammatically incorrect.—*For the inhabitant* is literally *from the inhabitant*, the Hebrew preposition being here used as in 1 Kings 19:7.—Knobel supposes the connexion of the clauses to be this, that there would not be room even for the rightful possessors, much less for strangers and enemies. For the application of the verb  $\text{בָּנִי}$  to enemies, see Lam. 2:2, 5.—The *devourers* of this verse are of course the *destroyers* of v. 17.

V. 20. *Again (or still) shall they say in thine ears, the sons of thy childlessness, (Too) narrow for me is the place; come near for me, and I will dwell (or that I may dwell).* The  $\text{וְעַתָּה}$  may simply indicate that something more is to be said than had been said before, in which case it is nearly equivalent to *over and above this* or *moreover*. Or it may have its true sense as a particle of time, and intimate that these words shall be uttered more than once, again and again, or still, i. e. continually, as the necessity becomes more urgent. The relative position of the verb and its subject is retained in the translation, as it causes no obscurity, and exhibits more exactly the characteristic form of the original. Jarchi explains *the sons of thy childlessness* to mean the sons of whom thou wast bereaved, referring to the exiled Jews. The later writers more correctly make it mean *the sons of thee a childless one*, or, *thy sons oh childless one*. The apparent contradiction is intentional, as appears from what follows. She who was deemed by others, and who deemed herself, a childless mother, hears the voices of her children, complaining that they have not a sufficient space to dwell in.—*In thy ears* means *in thy hearing*, although not addressed to thee. (Compare 2 Sam. 18:12.) Even in ch. 5:9 the idea seems to be not merely that of hearing, but of overhearing. That the same thing is intended in the case before us, may be gathered from the masculine  $\text{בָּנִי}$ , which shows that *they shall say* does not mean they shall say to thee, but they shall say to one another. Rosenmüller explains  $\text{בָּנִי}$  as an adjective; but usage and authority determine it to be a verb, the contracted form of  $\text{בָּנִי}$ , here used in precisely the same sense as the future of the same verb or a cognate root in the preceding verse. The idea of excess (*nimis, too*) is not expressed as in that case, but implied, the strict translation being simply this, *the place is narrow for me*.—All interpreters agree that  $\text{בָּנִי}$  means *make room for me*, as rendered in the Septuagint (*ποιήσόν μοι τόπον*) and the Vulgate (*fac mihi spatium*); but they differ in explaining how this sense may be extracted from the Hebrew words. Gesenius, as in many other cases, resorts to the easy supposition of a word inaccurately used to express directly opposite ideas, and explains the verb, both here and in Gen. 19:9, as meaning to *recede* or *move away* from any one. But even if the general

usage, which he alleges to exist with respect to verbs of motion, were more certain than it is, a serious difficulty in the way of its assumption here would be presented by the fact that in every other case excepting these two (which may be regarded as identical), the verb means *to come near* or approach. Rosenmüller adheres to the only sense authorized by usage, and explains the phrase to mean, *Come near to me*, that there may be more room. Maurer defends this explanation of the word (both here and in Gen. 19: 9) against the objections of Gesenius, but without replying to the main one, namely, that the sense thus given to the words is inappropriate, because the person speaking demands room not for others but for himself, which he could not possibly secure by calling on his neighbour to come close to him. The whole difficulty seems to have arisen from assuming that  $\text{לִּי}$  means *to me*, and denotes the direction of the motion, in opposition to the fact that  $\text{לִּי}$  is never so used after  $\text{בָּרָח}$ , but always indicates the purpose or design, not only when prefixed to the infinitive (as in Lev. 21: 21. 2 Kings 4: 27), but also when prefixed to  $\text{הִלָּחֵם}$ , the only noun with which it is connected after this verb, and with which it signifies not *to the battle* but *for battle*, or *to fight*, being equivalent to an infinitive construction. The only cases, therefore, where the  $\text{לִּי}$  is thus used (Judges 20: 23. 2 Sam. 10: 13. 1 Chron. 19: 14. Jer. 46: 3), are not even exceptions to the rule, but strong corroborations of the statement, that this particle when added to the verb denotes the object *for which*, not the place *to which*, one approaches. This induction fully justifies the explanation of the phrase before us given by Jarchi, 'approach to one side for me or on my account' ( $\text{הִתְקַרְבְּ לִי לְצַדִּי}$ ), leaving the precise direction of the motion undetermined, to express which the dominant usage of the language would require the preposition  $\text{לְפָנַי}$ . The sense just given to  $\text{לִּי}$  (*for me*) is the more probable, because it is precisely that which it has in the first clause of this verse and the first clause of the next.—J. D. Michaelis and Ewald take  $\text{הִתְקַרְבְּ}$  in its primitive sense of *sitting*, rather than its secondary one of *dwelling*, which is preferred by most interpreters. The former version makes the passage still more graphic by presenting the image of children contending for a seat, and calling on each other, in the presence of their mother, to make room. But even if we grant that there is nothing unworthy or incongruous in this conception, the hypothesis that it was here intended is precluded by the use of the participle  $\text{בָּרָח}$  in the verse preceding, where the sense of *inhabitant* is rendered necessary by its close connexion with the nouns *land*, *wastes*, and *ruins*.

V. 21. *And thou shalt say in thine heart*, i. e. to thyself, in strict agreement with the preceding verse, as a dialogue not between the mother and her children, but between the children in their mother's hearing. This is consequently not an answer to what goes before, but an observation uttered,

as it were, *aside* by an eye and ear witness of the struggle and the clamour for more room. With them the question is, where they shall dwell; with her it is, whence they came.—*Who hath produced these for me?* Interpreters have vexed themselves with the inquiry whether וְזֵרָה here means to bear or to beget, or in other words whether she is asking for the father or the mother of the children whom she sees around her. Vitringa, Lowth, Gesenius, Ewald, and Umbreit, who prefer the former sense, suppose an allusion to the conjugal relation of Jehovah to his people, and to the repudiation spoken of below in ch. 50:1. But such allusion seems, in this connexion, far-fetched and unnatural. Rosenmüller, Hitzig, and Knobel, choose the other sense, which is really the strict and common one, and here recommended by the fact that the combination הָיָרָה is often applied elsewhere to the mother, but never to the father. This might be esteemed conclusive, but for two material points of difference between the cases cited and the one before us. The first is that in these cases הָ is followed by the name of the father, whereas here the speaker is supposed to be a woman. The other is that in all those cases the verb itself is feminine, whereas here it is masculine. But these diversities, although they leave some room for doubt and difference of opinion, do not necessarily preclude the explanation of the phrase as referring to the mother. The masculine form of the verb in this case is easily accounted for; because its nominative is not, as in all the other cases, a female name or other feminine noun, but the interrogative pronoun, which is invariable and naturally followed by the verb in its original or simplest form, not because that form includes both genders, but because both verb and pronoun are used vaguely, without any distinct reference to sex at all. So too the use of הָיָרָה by a female speaker, although a violation of analogy, is one very easily explained, because intentional and even necessary in the extraordinary case supposed. As in other cases the mother is said to bear a child *to* the father, so in this case one mother may without absurdity be said to bear a child *to* another, because in either case the essential idea is that of one person being provided with a child by another, whether it be a husband by his wife, or a childless woman by a woman who has children.—The truth is, however, that the force and beauty of the passage are exceedingly impaired by cutting its bold figures to the quick, and insisting on a rigorous conformity to artificial rules, instead of resting in the general conception, so clearly and affectingly presented, of a childless mother finding herself suddenly surrounded by the clamour of a multitude of children, and asking in amazement whence they came and who they are. The distinction between father and mother is one which would never occur to the speaker in such a case, and may therefore be safely overlooked by the interpreter.—The cause of her astonishment is then assigned. *And I was bereaved and barren.* These almost incompatible expressions for a *childless* one are joined

for the purpose of expressing that idea in the strongest manner, and with more regard to the idea itself than to the rules of rhetorical propriety.—*An exile and a banished one.* The last word strictly means *removed*, i. e. from home and from society.—*And these who brought up?* literally made great, as in ch. 1 : 2. The general sense put upon גָּדַלְתִּי is confirmed by the analogy of this phrase, which has no specific reference to either parent, and is masculine in form simply because there was no reason why it should be feminine.—*Behold, I was left alone (or by myself) ; these, where were they?* The pronoun at the end is emphatic : where were *they*? She asks how it is that she was so long desolate and childless, when she sees so many children round her now. Rosenmüller changes the whole figure by supposing that long absent children are described as returning to their mother with a numerous offspring. It is essential to the writer's purpose that the children should be all regarded as the speaker's own ; for this alone could afford any adequate ground for the astonishment expressed.—Some of the modern writers find it very hard to reconcile the language of this verse with their hypothesis that the Zion of this passage is the forsaken city of Jerusalem as such considered. The inconveniences of such a supposition may be gathered from the fact that Knobel represents the Prophet as departing from his own chosen image in the words *an exile and a banished one*, which are of course inapplicable to the town itself, and then returning to it in the words *I was left alone*, which readily admit of such an application. If such abrupt transitions may be assumed at pleasure, how can any thing be proved to be the sense intended by the author? The very fact that they are necessary on a given supposition, is a strong proof that it is a false one, and ought to be exchanged for one which is equally consistent with all the parts of the description. Such is the hypothesis assumed as the basis of our exposition, viz. that the Zion of this context is the ancient church or chosen people, represented both in fiction and in fact by the Sanctuary and the Holy City, as its local centre and appointed symbol. Of this ideal subject, desolation, childlessness, captivity, exile, and the other varying conditions here described, may all be predicated with the same propriety. If this, however, be the true exegetical hypothesis, and no other seems to answer all the requisitions of the case, then the Babylonish exile, and the state of the church at that period of her history, has no claim to be recognised as any thing more than a particular exemplification of the general promise, that the church, after passing through extreme depression and attenuation, should be raised up and replenished like a childless mother who suddenly finds herself surrounded by a large and joyous family of children.

V. 22. *Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Behold, I will lift up to the nations my hand, and I will set up to the peoples my standard (or signal) ;*

and they will bring thy sons in the bosom (or arms), and thy daughters on the shoulders shall be carried. The idea expressed by the figures of the first clause is that of summoning the nations to perform their part in this great work. The figures themselves are the same as in ch. 13 : 2, viz. the shaking or waving of the hand and the erection of a banner, pole, or other signal, with distinct reference perhaps to persons at a distance and at hand. The figurative promise would be verified by any divine influence securing the co-operation of the heathen in accomplishing Jehovah's purpose, whatever might be the external circumstances either of the call or their compliance with it. The effect of that compliance is described in the last clause, as the bringing home of Zion's sons and daughters, with all the tender care which is wont to be lavished upon infants by their parents or their nurses. The same image is again presented in ch. 60 : 4. 66 : 12. Peculiar to this case is the use of the word יָצֵרָה, which seems most probably to signify either the bosom or the arm, when spoken of in reference to carrying and especially the carrying of children. Strictly perhaps the word expresses an idea intermediate between arm and bosom, or including both, viz. the space enclosed by them in the act of grasping or embracing. This likewise seems to be the sense of the cognate יָצֵרָה which occurs in Ps. 129 : 7. The only other instance of the form יָצֵרָה is Neh. 5 : 13, where it is rendered *lap*, and evidently signifies some part of the dress, perhaps the wide sleeve of an oriental garment, which would connect it with the meaning *arm*, but more probably the bosom of the same. According to Rosenmüller it denotes any curvature or fold of the body or the dress, like the Latin *sinus*. That the sense of bosom is at least included here, may be inferred from the analogy of Num. 11 : 12 and Ruth 4 : 16, where the same act is described by the use of the unambiguous term יָצֵרָה. Gesenius's translation, *arm*, is therefore too restricted. It is somewhat curious that Hitzig, while he renders this word *bosom*, uses *erm* as an equivalent to יָצֵרָה, which is an arbitrary explanation of the common word for *shoulder*, and one so often mentioned in connexion with the act of bearing burdens. (See above, ch. 30 : 6. 46 : 7. Ezek. 12 : 6. Num. 7 : 9.) *Arm*, however, is a favourite word with Hitzig, who substitutes it frequently for *hand*, without the least necessity or reason. Those who restrict the promise to the exiled Jews in Babylon are under the necessity of making this a restoration, which is not only perfectly gratuitous but inconsistent with the verse preceding, where these same children are described as appearing for the first time and thereby exciting the surprise of the forsaken mother.

V. 23. *And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers; face to the ground shall they bow to thee, and the dust of thy feet shall they lick; and thou shalt know that I am Jehovah, whose waiters (or hoppers, i. e. those who trust in him) shall not be ashamed (or disappointed).*



The same promise is repeated in substance with a change of form. Instead of the nations, we have now their kings and queens; and instead of Zion's sons and daughters, Zion herself. This last variation, while it either perplexes or annoys the rhetorical precisian, aids the rational interpreter by showing that the figures of the preceding verse, however natural and just, are not to be rigidly explained. In other words, it shows that between the Zion of this passage and her children there is no essential difference, and that what is promised to the one is promised to the other. This identity is clear from the apparent solecism of representing the bereaved and childless mother as herself an infant in the arms and at the breast, because really as much in need of sustenance and care as those before called her sons and daughters, or rather because she is but another figure for the same thing. This confusion of imagery all tends to confirm the supposition that the Zion of these prophecies is not a city, which could scarcely be thus confounded with its citizens, but a society or corporation, between which as an ideal person and its individual members or any given portion of them, there is no such well defined and palpable distinction.— $\text{זָרָא}$ , to which the English Version and some others give the sense of *nourishers*, is now explained to mean a *carrier* or *bearer*, which last name is applied by the English in Hindostan to the male nurses of their children. Some regard it as equivalent to *παιδαγωγός* (Gal. 3: 24), and as referring to a later period of childhood than  $\text{זָרָא}$  which is properly a suckler or wet-nurse. But as there is nothing in the text to suggest the idea of succession in time, they may be regarded as poetical equivalents. Hitzig's notion that the kings and queens are merely represented as the servile attendants of Zion is forbidden by the specific offices ascribed to them. As little can it be supposed with Knobel, that she is here to be conceived of as a queen upon her throne, who could scarcely be supposed to need the tender attentions of a bearer and a wet-nurse. The image is still that of a tender infant, with an almost imperceptible substitution of the mother for her children.— $\text{זָרָא} \text{ מִזָּרָא}$  is a kind of compound adverb like our English phrases *sword-in-hand*, *arm-in-arm*, but still more concise. The addition of these words determines the meaning of the preceding verb as denoting actual prostration, which is also clear from the next clause, where the licking of the dust cannot be naturally understood as a strong expression for the kissing of the feet or of the earth in token of homage, but is rather like the biting of the dust in Homer, a poetical description of complete and compulsory prostration, not merely that of subjects to their sovereign, but of vanquished enemies before their conquerors. (Compare Mic. 7: 17. Ps. 72: 9.) In the last clause  $\text{וְזָרָא}$  is not a conjunction, meaning *that* or *for*, but as usual a relative, to be connected with  $\text{וְזָרָא}$  in construction, *who my hoppers*, i. e. whose hoppers, those who hope in me.

V. 24. *Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, and shall the captivity of the righteous be delivered?* This verse suggests a difficulty in the way of the fulfilment of the promise.  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$  and  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$  are combined likewise elsewhere to describe whatever can be taken in war, including prisoners and booty. (Num. 31: 11, 12, 27, 32.)  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$ , though properly an abstract, is continually used as a collective term for *captives*. Its combination here with  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$  has perplexed interpreters. Houbigant, Lowth, Ewald, and Knobel read  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם קִדְמוֹתָם}$ , as in the next verse, which is a mere subterfuge. Rosenmüller follows Albert Schultens in giving to  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$  the sense of rigid, stern, severe; which is not in the least justified by Hebrew usage. Beck follows J. D. Michaelis in explaining it to mean *victorious* according to the sense of *victory* now commonly put upon  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$ , notwithstanding the objection of Gesenius that there is no authority in usage for the application of this term to the successes of the wicked, without regard to its original import. Symmachus, Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Hitzig, understand the phrase to mean the *righteous captives*, i. e. the exiled Jews. Gesenius, Maurer, and Umbreit, the prey or plunder of the righteous, i. e. taken from the righteous. But this explanation of  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$  is harsh, and the parallelism, as well as the analogy of v. 25, requires that  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$  should be referred to the subject not the object of the action. The English Version makes it agree directly with  $\text{קִדְמוֹתָם}$ , in the sense of *lawful captive*, i. e. one who has been lawfully enslaved, or one who deserves to be a captive. The simplest and most obvious construction of the words is that which makes them mean the captives of a righteous conqueror. The argument may then be stated thus: Shall the captives even of a righteous conqueror be freed in such a case? How much more the captives of an unjust oppressor!

V. 25. *For thus saith Jehovah, also (or even) the captivity (or captives) of the mighty shall be taken, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered, and with thy strivers will I strive, and thy sons will I save.* There is no need of giving to the  $\text{כִּי}$  at the beginning the factitious sense of yes, no, nay, more, verily, or the like. Its proper meaning may be retained by supplying in thought an affirmative answer to the foregoing question. Shall the captives of the righteous be delivered? Yes, and more; for thus saith Jehovah, not only this but also the captives of the tyrant or oppressor. There is a very material difference between supplying what is not expressed and changing the meaning of what is. The latter expedient is never admissible; the former is often necessary. The logical connexion between this verse and the one before it has been already stated. Its general sense is clear, as a solemn declaration that the power of the captor can oppose no real obstacle to the fulfilment of the promise of deliverance. The same idea is expressed in the last clause in more general and literal terms.

V. 26. *And I will make thy oppressors eat their (own) flesh, and as with new wine, with their blood shall they be drunken; and all flesh shall know, that I, Jehovah, am thy Saviour, and (that) thy Redeemer is the Mighty One of Jacob.* The first clause is commonly explained as a strong metaphorical description of intestine wars and mutual destruction, similar to that in Zech. 11 : 9. In this case, however, as in ch. 9 : 19, the image is perhaps rather that of a person devouring his own flesh in impotent and desperate rage. The Targum gratuitously changes the sense by interpreting the first clause to mean, 'I will give their flesh for food to the birds of heaven,' or, as Jarchi has it, 'to the beasts of the field.' The last clause winds up this part of the prophecy by the usual return to the great theme of the whole book, the relation of Jehovah to his people, as their Saviour, Redeemer, and Protector, self-existent, eternal, and almighty in himself, yet condescending to be called the Mighty One of Jacob. The last words may be construed as a single proposition, 'that I am Jehovah thy Saviour and thy Redeemer the Mighty One of Jacob.' This will be found upon comparison, however, to express much less than the construction above given, which asserts not only that the speaker is Jehovah etc. but that the Being who possesses these attributes is the peculiar covenanted God of Israel or Jacob. For the different epithets of this clause, see above, ch. 1 : 24, 41 : 14, 43 : 3. For a similar statement of the purpose of God's providential dealings with his people, see ch. 45 : 3, and v. 23 of this same chapter.

---

 CHAPTER L.

THIS chapter contains no entirely new element, but a fresh view of several which have already been repeatedly exhibited. The first of these is the great truth, that the sufferings of God's people are the necessary fruit of their own sins, vs. 1. The second is the power of Jehovah to accomplish their deliverance, vs. 2, 3. The third is the Servant of Jehovah, his mission, his qualifications for it, his endurance of reproach and opposition on account of it, vs. 4-9. The fourth is the way of salvation and the certain doom of those who neglect it, vs. 10, 11.

This perpetual recurrence of the same great themes in various combinations makes the mere division of the chapters a comparatively unimportant matter, although some writers seem to attach great importance to the

separation of the first three verses from what follows, and their intimate connexion with what goes before. It should be ever borne in mind that these divisions are conventional and modern, and that in this part of Isaiah more especially they might have been omitted altogether without any serious inconvenience to the reader or interpreter. A much greater evil than the want of these divisions is the habit of ascribing to them undue authority and suffering the exposition to be governed by them, as if each were a separate prediction or discourse, instead of being arbitrary though convenient breaks in a continued composition, not materially differing from the paragraphs now used in every modern book. The re-arrangement of the chapters in the present case would answer no good purpose, since the first three verses are not more closely connected with the end of the preceding chapter than what follows is with its beginning. The true course is to make use of the common divisions as convenient pauses, but to read and expound the text as one continuous discourse.

V. 1. *Thus saith Jehovah.* This prefatory formula has no doubt had some influence on the division of the chapters. It does not, however, always indicate the introduction of a new subject, as may be seen by a comparison of ch. 48 : 17 with ch. 49 : 1.—*Where is* or *what is?* ךָּ by itself is the interrogative adverb *where?* When joined with ךָּ, it seems to be equivalent to our interrogative *what* or *which*, but always with reference to place, and for the most part with a noun of place following. The most frequent combination is, *which way?* This leaves it doubtful whether it is used in the general sense of *what*, as explained by Ewald, or in the more specific one of *what place* i. e. *where*, preferred by Gesenius and most other writers. This is a question of but little moment as to the general meaning of the sentence; since the question ‘where is it?’ as we shall see below, is here substantially equivalent to ‘what is it?’—*The bill of divorcement*, literally, writing of excision or repudiation, translated in the Septuagint *βιβλίον τοῦ ἀποσσεσίον*, which form is retained in the New Testament (Matth. 19 : 7. Mark 10 : 4) though sometimes abridged (Matth. 5 : 31). The Hebrew phrase denotes the legal instrument by which the Mosaic law allowed a husband to repudiate his wife (Deut. 24 : 1–3).—*Of your mother.* The persons addressed are the individual members of the church or nation; their mother is the church or nation itself. These are of course distinguished from each other only by a poetical figure.—*Whom I have sent (or put) away.* These words admit of a twofold construction. According to the common Hebrew idiom, the relative pronoun, when the object of a verb, is followed by the personal pronoun which it represents. According to this idiom, *whom I have sent her* means nothing more than *whom I have sent*, except that it more distinctly indicates the gender of the object. This con-

struction is recommended here, not only by its strict conformity to general usage, but by its recurrence in the very next clause, where *אֲשֶׁר קָדַמְתִּי אֲתֵכֶם לָךְ* is agreed on all hands to mean *to whom I sold you*. But as the verb *to send* governs two accusatives in Hebrew, the relative may take the place of one of them, denoting the end for which or the means by which, as it actually does in ch. 55 : 11. 2 Sam. 11 : 22. 1 Kings 14 : 6, and in the case before us, according to the judgment of most modern writers, who explain the words to mean *wherewith I have sent her away*.—The use of the disjunctive *or* in Hebrew is comparatively rare, and consequently more significant when it does occur, as in this case, where it seems designed to intimate that the two figures of the clause are to be taken separately, not together, that is to say that the punishment of the people is not compared to the repudiation of a wife and the sale of her children in the same ideal case, but represented by the two distinct emblems of a wife divorced and children sold. *Or which of my creditors (is it) to whom I have sold you?* We have here an allusion to another provision of the Mosaic law, which allows debtors to be sold in payment of their debts (Matt. 18 : 25), and even children by their parents (Exod. 21 : 7).—The answer follows in the other clause. *Behold, for your iniquities ye have been sold*. The reflexive meaning, *ye have sold yourselves*, is frequently expressed by this form of the verb, but not invariably nor even commonly; it is not, therefore, necessary here, nor even favoured by the parallelism, as the corresponding term is a simple passive of a different form, and one which cannot, from the nature of the case, denote a reflexive or reciprocal action.—*And for your transgressions*. Vitringa's suggestion, that one of the parallel terms may signify civil and the other religious offences, is entirely gratuitous. *Your mother has been sent (or put) away*. The repetition of *your*, where *her transgressions* might have been expected, only serves to show more clearly the real identity of those who are formally distinguished as the mother and the children.—The interrogation in the first clause of this verse has been variously understood. Jerome and the Rabbins explain it as an indirect but absolute negation, implying that she had not been divorced at all, but had wilfully forsaken her husband, and, as Abarbenel says, gone out from his house of herself or of her own accord (*היא עזבה יאסה מן בנין*). This, though a good sense in itself, is not an obvious one, or that which the words would readily suggest. If this had been the writer's meaning, and he had chosen to express it in the form of an interrogation, he would more probably have said, Have I given your mother a bill of divorcement? Have I sold you to my creditors? Besides, the explanation of this clause as an absolute negation is at variance with the positive statement in the last clause that she had been put away, as well as with the parallel assertion that they had been sold, which last indeed may be explained away by adopting the reflexive sense, but no such explanation

is admissible in the other case. In order to avoid this objection, some explain the clause not as an absolute negation but a qualified one. Thus Vitringa understands it to mean that she had been put away and they sold, not by him, i. e. not by the husband and the father, but by judicial process, which he undertakes to reconcile with ancient Jewish usage by the authority of Buxtorf and Selden. It is evident, however, that the qualification, which is needed to reconcile the clauses, is, in this interpretation, wholly supplied by the imagination of the reader or interpreter, without the least foundation in the text or context. The same remark applies, though in a less degree, to the modification of this negative hypothesis by Grotius, who supposes it to be denied that she had been divorced without sufficient reason, and by Gesenius, who explains it as denying that she had received a bill or writing of the ordinary kind. The difficulty common to all these hypotheses is that the qualification assumed is altogether arbitrary and dependent on the fancy or discretion of the reader.—This is equally true of some interpretations which assume that she had been put away, for example that of Hitzig, who ingeniously supposes that the bill of divorcement is called for that it may be cancelled, and the creditor that he may be paid. The most emphatic and significant portion of the sentence is in this case not expressed at all, and never would occur to any reader but the one whose ingenuity invented it.—The simplest and most obvious interpretation of the first clause is the one suggested by the second, which evidently stands related to it as an answer to the question which occasions it. In the present case, the answer is wholly unambiguous, viz. that they were sold for their sins, and that she was put away for their transgressions. The question naturally corresponding to this answer is the question, why the mother was divorced, and why the sons were sold. Supposing this to be the substance of the first clause, its form is very easily accounted for. *Where is your mother's bill of divorcement?* produce it that we may see the cause of her repudiation. *Where is the creditor to whom I sold you?* let him appear and tell us what was the occasion of your being sold. Gesenius's objection, that the Jewish bills of divorcement did not state the cause, is trivial, even if the fact alleged be admitted to be true, for which there is no sufficient reason. The objection that God could not have a creditor, from which some have argued that the first clause must be negatively understood, has no more force than the objection that he could not be a husband or a writer, both involving an egregious misconception or an utter disregard of the figurative nature of the passage. If Jehovah's casting off his people might be likened to a Jewish husband's repudiation of his wife, then the same thing might be likened to a Jewish debtor's sale of himself or his children to his creditors, without any greater incongruity or contradiction in the one case than the other. The general idea of rejection is twice clothed in a figurative dress,

first by emblems borrowed from the law and custom of divorce, and then by emblems borrowed from the law and custom of imprisonment for debt.—The restriction of this passage to the Babylonish exile is entirely arbitrary. If it admits of any special application, it is rather to the repudiation of the Jewish people at the advent.

V. 2. *Why did I come, and there was no man? (why) did I call, and there was no one answering?* The idiom of occidental languages would here admit, if not require, a more involved and hypothetical construction. ‘Why, when I came, was there no one (to receive me), and, when I called, no one to answer me?’ (See above, ch. 5:4, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 66.) The Targum explains this of God’s coming and calling by the Prophets, and the modern Germans adopt the same interpretation. Vitringa and many other writers understand it of Christ’s coming in the flesh. Both explanations are erroneous if exclusive, both correct as specific applications of a general expression. In themselves, the words imply nothing more than that God had come near to the people, by his word and providence, but without any suitable response on their part. The clause is explanatory of their being *sold* and *put away*, as represented in the foregoing verse. The general truth which it teaches is, that God has never and will never put away his people even for a time without preceding disobedience and alienation upon their part. Particular examples of this general truth are furnished by the Babylonish exile and by every season of distress and persecution.—The other clause precludes the vindication of their unbelief and disobedience on the ground that they had not sufficient reason to obey his commands and rely upon his promises. Such doubts are rendered impious and foolish by the proofs of his almighty power. This power is first asserted indirectly by a question implying the strongest negation: *Is my hand shortened, shortened, from redemption? and is there with me no power* (i. e. have I no power) *to deliver?* Shortness of hand or arm is a common oriental figure for defect of power, especially in reference to some particular effect, which is thus represented as beyond the reach. (See ch. 59:1. Num. 11:23. cf. ch. 37:17.) According to Gesenius, Artaxerxes Longimanus was so called, not in reference to any corporeal peculiarity, but as being possessed of extraordinary power. The emphatic repetition of the Hebrew verb may, as usual, be variously expressed in translation by the introduction of intensive phrases, such as *altogether* or *at all*, or by a simple repetition of the verb in English. *From redemption*, i. e. so as not to redeem or deliver from distress. (See above, on ch. 49:15.)—*Behold, by my rebuke* (a term often used to express God’s control over the elements) *I will dry up the sea.* I can make a complete change in the face of nature. Most of the modern writers use the present form, *I dry up the sea.* But this, as expressing an

habitual act, fails to give the sense of the original, which is not a description of what he usually does, but a declaration of what he can do and what he will do in the present instance if it should be necessary. Hence the best translation of the verb is the exact one which adheres to the strict sense of the future. As in many other cases, this general expression may involve a particular allusion, namely, to the crossing of the Red Sea at the exodus from Egypt. But to make this the direct and main sense of the words, is equally at variance with good taste and the context. It is only upon this erroneous supposition that Vitringa could imagine himself bound to apply what follows (*I will make streams a wilderness*) to the passage of the Jordan, and to justify the plural designation of that river by appealing to its magnitude, historical importance, etc. It is really a poetical reiteration of what goes before, extending what was there said of the *sea* to *streams* and other waters. The remaining words of this verse are intended merely to complete the picture, by subjoining to the cause its natural effect.—*Let their fish stink for want of water and die of thirst.* The abbreviated form רָבָה seems to show that the writer here passes from the tone of prediction or general description to that of actual command. It may however be a poetic variation of the ordinary future form, in which case the sense will be, *their fish shall die* etc.; or the abbreviated form may indicate an indirect or oblique construction, *so that their fish shall stink* etc., which last explanation is the one preferred by the latest writers. The pronoun *their* refers to *sea* and *rivers*, or to the last alone, which is masculine, though feminine in form.—For רָבָה Lowth reads רָבָה (*their fish is dried up*), on the authority of one manuscript confirmed by the Septuagint version (ξηραθίςσorra). The collective use of the word *fish* is the same in Hebrew and in English. For the true sense of רָבָה, see above, ch. 5:9, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 70.

V. 3. The description of Jehovah's power, as displayed in his control of the elements, is still continued. *I will clothe the heavens in blackness.* The Hebrew noun, according to its etymology, denotes not merely a black colour, but such a colour used as a sign of mourning. Thus understood, it corresponds exactly to the following words, where the customary mourning dress of ancient times is mentioned. *And sackcloth I will place (or make) their covering.* The reference of this verse to the plague of darkness in the land of Egypt is admissible only in the sense explained above with respect to the passage of the Red Sea, namely, as a particular allusion comprehended in a general description. J. D. Michaelis and some later writers understand it as referring to the usual phenomena of storms, or even to the obscuration of the sky by clouds; but it is inconceivable that such an every-day occurrence should be coupled with the drying up of seas and



rivers, as a proof of God's power over nature and the elements. The sense required by the connexion is that of an extraordinary darkness (such as that of an eclipse), or even an extinction of the heavenly bodies, as in ch. 13: 10. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 253.)

V. 4. *The Lord Jehovah hath given to me.* As Jehovah is the speaker in the foregoing verse, Cocceius, Vitringa, and many others, regard this clause as a proof that these are the words of the Messiah, who, in virtue of his twofold nature, might speak in the person of Jehovah, and yet say, *Jehovah hath given to me.* The rabbins and the Germans explain them as the words of Isaiah himself, speaking either in his own name or in that of the prophets as a class. But some of the things which follow are inapplicable to such a subject, an objection not relieved by assuming with Grotius that Isaiah is here a type of Christ. The true hypothesis is still the same which we have found ourselves constrained to assume in all like cases throughout the foregoing chapters, namely, that the *servant of Jehovah*, as he calls himself in v. 10 below, is the Messiah and his People, as a complex person, or the Church in indissoluble union with its Head, asserting his divine commission and authority to act as the great teacher and enlightener of the world. For this end God had given him a ready tongue or speech. Most interpreters adopt a different version of לְיִרְיָהּ in the first and last clause, giving it at first the sense of *learned*, and afterwards that of *learners*. These two ideas, it is true, are near akin, and may be blended in the Hebrew word as they are in the English *scholar*, which is used both for a learner and a learned person. It is best, however, for that very reason, to retain the same word in translation, as is done by Hitzig, who translates it *disciples*, Ewald *apostles*, and Henderson *those who are taught*. Grotius agrees with the Septuagint in making לְיִרְיָהּ an abstract noun meaning *instructive*—*γλῶσσαι παιδείας*, an instructive tongue. Gesenius considers it equivalent to *taught* or *practised tongue*. In every other case the word is a concrete, meaning persons taught, disciples. (See above, ch. 8: 16, and below, ch. 54: 13.) From this expression Hitzig and Knobel strangely infer that Isaiah was an uneducated prophet like Amos (7: 14), which would be a very forced conclusion, even if Isaiah were the subject of the passage. As applied to Christ, it is descriptive of that power of conviction and persuasion which is frequently ascribed in the New Testament to his oral teachings. As his representative and instrument, the Church has always had a measure of the same gift enabling her to execute her high vocation.—*To know* (that I might know) *to help or succour the weary (with) a word.* This explanation of the verb יָרָה, which occurs only here, is that given by Aquila (*ὑποστηρίσαι*), Jerome (*sustentare*), Gesenius (*stärken*),

and several of the later writers. Near akin to this, and founded on another Arabic analogy, is the sense of *refreshing*, which is expressed by Rückert, Ewald, and Umbreit. J. D. Michaelis explains it to mean *change*, and applies it to the endless variety of our Saviour's instructions. Paulus and Hitzig make the ה radical, and identify the word with the Arabic **لغى** *to speak*; but this, according to Knobel, would be applicable only to frivolous, unmeaning speech. Most of the older writers understand כִּנְנֵה as a denominative verb from כִּנְנֵה *time*, meaning to speak seasonably. This explanation seems to be implied in the Septuagint paraphrase (**τοῦ γινώριαι ἡμίμου δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον**). But according to the probable etymology of כִּנְנֵה, the verb derived from it would assume another form, and the construction with two objects, as Gesenius observes, would be harsh; whereas it is not uncommon with verbs of supporting or sustaining. (See Gen. 47:13. 1 Kings 18:4.) The Chaldee paraphrase, 'that I might know how to teach wisdom to the righteous panting for the words of the law,' or, as Jarchi and Kimchi have it, 'thirsting for the words of God,' appears to be conjectural.—*He will waken, in the morning, in the morning, he will waken for me the ear*, i. e. he will waken my ear, rouse my attention, and open my mind to the reception of the truth. (See ch. 48:8. 1 Sam. 9:15. 20:2. Ps. 41:7.) The present tense (*he wakeneth*) asserts a claim to constant inspiration; the future expresses a confident belief that God will assist and inspire him.—The accents require *in the morning in the morning* to be read together, as in ch. 28:19, where it is an intensive repetition meaning *every morning*. It might otherwise be thought more natural to read the sentence thus, *he will waken in the morning, in the morning he will waken*, a twofold expression of the same idea, viz. that he will do so early. In either case the object of both verbs is the same; the introduction of the pronoun *me* after the first in the English Version being needless and hurtful to the sentence.—The last words of the verse declare the end or purpose of this wakening, *to hear* (i. e. that I may hear) *like the disciples or the taught*, i. e. that I may give attention as a learner listens to his teacher. Luzzatto understands this verse as an assertion of the pious and believing Jews, that God enables them to hear and speak as if they were all prophets, which, if correctly understood and duly limited, appears to be the true sense as explained above.

V. 5. *The Lord Jehovah opened for me the ear, and I resisted not.* The common version, *I was not rebellious*, seems to convert the description of an act into that of a habit.—*I did not draw back*, or refuse the office, on account of the hardships by which I foresaw that it would be accompanied. There may be an allusion to the conduct of Moses (4:13) in declining the

dangerous but honourable work to which the Lord had called him. (Compare Jer. 1 : 6. 17 : 16.) Henderson's reflection on this sentence is, "How different the conduct of the Messiah from that of Jonah !"

V. 6. *My back I gave to (those) smiting.* We may understand by *gave* either *yielded* unresistingly or *offered* voluntarily. (Compare Matth. 5 : 39.) The punishment of scourging was a common one, and is particularly mentioned in the history of our Lord's maltreatment.—*And my cheeks to (those) plucking* (the beard or hair). It is well observed by Hitzig that the context here requires something more than the playful or even the contemptuous pulling of the beard, the *vellere barbam* of Horace and Persius, to which preceding writers had referred. A better parallel is Neh. 13 : 25, where the Tirshatha is said to have contended with the Jews, and cursed them, and smote them, and *plucked off their hair*. (Compare Ezra 9 : 3.) This particular species of abuse is not recorded in the history of our Saviour's sufferings, but some suppose it to be comprehended in the general term *buffeting*.—*My face I did not hide from shame and spitting.* The plural form פְּלִיטָה may be either an intensive or emphatic expression for extreme shame or abundant shame, or a term comprehending various shameful acts, such as smiting on the face, spitting in it, and the like. In the phrase *I did not hide my face* there may be an allusion to the common figure of confusion covering the face (Jer. 51 : 51), in reference no doubt to the natural expression of this feeling by a blush, or in extreme cases by a livid paleness overspreading the features. Some have imagined that by *spitting* nothing more is meant than spitting on the ground in one's presence, which, according to the oriental usages and feelings, is a strong expression of abhorrence and contempt. But, as Lowth well says, if spitting in a person's presence was such an indignity, how much more spitting in his face ; and the whole connexion shows that the reference is not to any mitigated form of insult but to its extreme. That this part of the description was fulfilled in the experience of our Saviour, is expressly recorded, Matth. 26 : 67. 27 : 30. That it was literally verified in that of Isaiah, is not only without proof but in the last degree improbable, much more the supposition that it was a common or habitual treatment of the prophets as a class. As to Isaiah himself, it is worthy of remark that a learned and ingenious rabbin of our own day (Samuel Luzzatto) argues against this application of the prophet's language, first, because he was not a prophet of evil, and could not therefore be an object of the popular hatred ; secondly, because his predictions were not addressed to his contemporaries but to future ages ; thirdly, because even on the supposition that he lived at the time of the Babylonish exile, he must have written in the name and person of an older prophet, and could not therefore have exposed himself to any public insult. From this

impossibility of proving any literal coincidence between the prophetic description and the personal experience of the prophet himself, when taken in connexion with the palpable coincidences which have been already pointed out in the experience of Jesus Christ, many interpreters infer that it was meant to be a literal prediction of his sufferings. But even Vitranga has observed that if it were so, its fulfilment, or the record of it, would be imperfect, since the points of agreement are not fully commensurate with those of the description. (See for example what has been already said with respect to the plucking of the beard or hair.) The most satisfactory solution of the difficulty is the one suggested by Vitranga himself, who regards the prophecy as metaphorical, and as denoting cruel and contemptuous treatment in general, and supposes the literal coincidences, as in many other cases, to have been providentially secured, not merely to convict the Jews as Grotius says, but also to identify to others the great subject of the prophecy. But if the prophecy itself be metaphorical, it may apply to other subjects, less completely and remarkably but no less really, not to Isaiah, it is true, from whom its terms, even figuratively understood, are foreign, but to the church or people of God, the body of Christ, which like its head has ever been an object of contempt with those who did not understand its character or recognise its claims. What is literally true of the Head is metaphorically true of the Body. 'I gave my back to the smiters and my cheeks to the pluckers, my face I did not hide from shame and spitting.'

V. 7. *And the Lord Jehovah will help me, or afford help to me.* The adversative particle, which most translators have found necessary here to show the true connexion, is not required by the Hebrew idiom. (See above, on ch. 40: 8.)—*Therefore I am not confounded* by the persecution and contempt described in the foregoing verses. The common version, *I shall not be confounded*, is not only arbitrary but injurious to the sense, which is not that God's protection will save him from future shame, but that the hope of it saves him even now. The words strictly mean *I have not been confounded*, which implies of course that he is not so now.—*Therefore I have set my face as a flint.* This is a common description of firmness and determination, as expressed in the countenance. It is equally applicable to a wicked impudence (Jer. 5: 3. Zech. 7: 12) and a holy resolution (Ezek. 3: 8, 9). The same thing is expressed by Jeremiah under different but kindred figures. (Jer. 1: 17, 18. 15: 20.) It is probable, as J. H. Michaelis suggests, that Luke alludes to these passages, when he says that our Lord *steadfastly set his face* (τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήριξε) *to go to Jerusalem.* (Luke 9: 51.) The strong and expressive English phrase *set my face* is in all respects better than those which later versions have substituted for it, such as *place* (Barnes), *present* (Noyes), etc.—*And*

*I know that I shall not be ashamed.* The substitution of *because* for *and* is an unnecessary deviation from the Hebrew idiom.

V. 8. *Near (is) my justifier* (or the one justifying me). קִרְבָּנִי is strictly a forensic term meaning to acquit or pronounce innocent, in case of accusation, and to right or do justice to, in case of civil controversy. The use of this word and of several correlative expressions, may be clearly learned from Deut. 25 : 1. The justifier is of course Jehovah. His being *near* is not intended to denote the proximity of an event still future, but to describe his intervention as constantly within reach and available. It is not the justification which is said to be near to the time of speaking, but the justifier who is said to be near the speaker himself. The justification of his servant is the full vindication of his claims to divine authority and inspiration. At the same time there is a designed coincidence between the terms of the prediction and the issue of our Saviour's trial ; but the prophecy is not to be restricted to this object. The general meaning of the words is, all this reproach is undeserved, as will be seen hereafter. Since God himself has undertaken his defence, the accuser's case is hopeless. He therefore asks triumphantly, *Who will contend with me?* The Hebrew verb denotes specifically litigation, or forensic strife. Rom. 8 : 33, 34, is an obvious imitation of this passage as to form. But even Vitringa, and the warmest advocates for letting the New Testament explain the Old, are forced to acknowledge that in this case Paul merely borrows his expressions from the Prophet, and applies them to a different object. In any other case this class of writers would no doubt have insisted that the justifier must be Christ and the justified his people ; but from this they are precluded by their own assumption, that the Messiah is the speaker. Both hypotheses, so far as they have any just foundation, may be reconciled by the supposition that the ideal speaker is the Body and the Head in union. In the sense here intended, Christ is justified by the Father, and at the same time justifies his people.—*We will stand (or let us stand) together*, at the bar, before the judgment-seat, a frequent application of the Hebrew verb. (See Num. 27 : 2. Deut. 19 : 17. 1 Kings 3 : 16.) This is an indirect defiance or ironical challenge ; as if he had said, If any will still venture to accuse me, *let us stand up together*.—The same thing is then expressed in other words, the form of interrogation and proposal being still retained. *Who is my adversary?* This is more literally rendered in the margin of the English Bible, *who is the master of my cause?* But even this fails to convey the precise sense of the original, and may be even said to reverse it, for the *master of my cause* seems to imply ascendancy or better right, and is not therefore applicable to a vanquished adversary whose case was just before described as hopeless. The truth is that the pronoun *my* belongs not to

the last word merely but to the whole complex phrase, and לַעֲבָד simply means 'possessor,' i. e. one to whom a given thing belongs. Thus a *cause-master* (elsewhere called עַבְדֵי הַלֵּוִי לַעֲבָד, Exod. 24 : 14) means one who has a cause or lawsuit, a party litigant, and *my cause-master* means one who has a controversy with me, my opponent or adversary ; so that the common version really conveys the meaning better than what seems to be the more exact translation of the margin. In sense, the question is precisely parallel and tantamount to the one before it, *who will contend with me!*—*Let him draw near to me*, confront me, or engage in conflict with me.—The forensic figures of this verse and some of its expressions, have repeatedly occurred in the course of the preceding chapters. (See ch. 41 : 1, 21. 43 : 9, 26. 45 : 20. 48 : 14, 16.)

V. 9. *Behold, the Lord Jehovah will help me ; who (is) he (that) will condemn me?* The help specifically meant is that afforded by an advocate or judge to an injured party. עֲשֵׂה לִי is the technical antithesis to פָּקֵד לִי used in v. 8. Both verbs with their cognate adjectives occur in Dent. 25 : 1.—The potential meaning (*can condemn*) is included in the future (*will condemn*), though not directly much less exclusively expressed by it.—The last clause adds to the assurance of his own safety that of the destruction of his enemies. *All they* (or *all of them*, his adversaries, not expressly mentioned but referred to in the questions which precede) *like the garment shall grow old* (or *be worn out*), i. e. like the garment which is worn out or decays.—*The moth shall devour them*. Gesenius condemns the relative construction *which the moth devours* (referring to הַבְּזָרָה as a collective), because inadmissible in the parallel passage, ch. 51 : 8. He nevertheless adopts it in his own German version (*wie ein Gewand das die Motte verzehret*). The real objection to it is, that it is needless and rests upon a frivolous rhetorical punctilio. By a perfectly natural and common transition, the writer passes from comparison to metaphor, and having first transformed them into garments, says directly that *the moth shall devour them*, not as men, in which light he no longer views them, but as old clothes. This is a favourite comparison in Scripture to express a gradual but sure decay. (Compare ch. 51 : 8 and Hos. 5 : 12.) In Job 13 : 28. Ps. 39 : 12, it seems to denote the effect of pining sickness. Not contented with this obvious and natural interpretation of the figure, Vitringa supposes an allusion to the official dresses of their chief men, which is not a whit more reasonable than the notion of Cocceius, which he sets aside as far-fetched, that the prophets, priests, and rulers of the old economy were but a garment, under which the Messiah was concealed until his advent, and of which he stripped himself (ἀπεκδυσάμενος, Col. 2 : 15) at death. The necessity of thus explaining why the enemies of Christ and his people are compared to gar-

ments is precluded by the obvious consideration, that the main point of the simile is the slow consuming process of the moth, and that the clothes are added simply as the substances in which it is most frequently observed.

V. 10. *Who among you is a fearer of Jehovah, hearkening to the voice of his servant, who walketh in darkness and there is no light to him? Let him trust in the name of Jehovah, and lean upon his God.* The same sense may be attained by closing the interrogation at *his servant*, and reading the remainder of the sentence thus: *whoso walketh in darkness and hath no light, let him trust etc.* This construction, which is given by De Wette, has the advantage of adhering more closely to the masoretic interpunction. A different turn is given to the sentence by J. D. Michaelis, who terminates the question at *Jehovah*, and makes all the rest an answer to it. ‘Who among you is a fearer of Jehovah? He that hearkeneth to the voice of his servant, that walketh in darkness where he has no dawn, yet trusts in Jehovah and relies upon his God.’ To this ingenious and original construction it may be objected, first, that it divides the sentence into two very unequal parts, directly contrary to Hebrew usage; and in the next place, that it makes the participle, present, and future, all precisely synonymous and equally descriptive of the pious man’s habitual conduct. All the constructions which have now been mentioned give the  $\text{מִי}$  its usual and proper sense, as an interrogative pronoun corresponding to the English *who?* But Vitringa, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and Maurer, choose to give it an indefinite sense, *whoso* or *whoever*, and exclude the interrogation altogether,—the same superficial lexicography which confounds  $\text{מִי}$  with  $\text{מִי־כֵן}$ , because the Hebrew employed one form of expression where we should more naturally use the other. Because *whoever* might be used, and would be used more readily by us in such a case than *who*, it does not follow that the former is the true sense of the Hebrew word in that case. All the instances alleged by Gesenius in his Lexicon as proofs that  $\text{מִי}$  is sometimes an indefinite, admit, with one exception, of the usual interrogative translation, not only without damage to the sense, but with a more exact adherence to the genius of the language, which delights in short detached propositions, where an occidental writer would prefer a series of dependent members forming one complex period. Thus in Judg. 7:3 the occidental idiom would be, *Whosoever is fearful and afraid let him return*; but the genuine Hebrew form is, *Who is fearful and afraid? let him return.* The same thing is true of Exod. 24:14. Prov. 9:4. Eccl. 5:9. Is. 54:15, in all which cases there is nothing whatever to forbid the application of the general rule, that the usual and proper sense must be retained unless there be some reason for departing from it; and such a reason cannot be afforded by the bare possibility of a different construction. The single exception above mentioned,

and the only case of the indefinite use of אֲנִי alleged by Ewald in his Grammar, is 2 Sam. 18: 12, which is too anomalous and doubtful to prove any thing, and which may be as properly alleged on one side as the other. The occasional combination of אֲנִי with אֲנִי־אֲנִי, instead of favouring the views here combated, affords an argument against them, as the obvious meaning of the words, both in Exod. 32: 33 and 2 Sam. 20: 11, is, *who (is he) that?* All that need be added upon this point is, that the latest German writers have returned to the old and true translation, *who?*—Obedience to the word is implied in hearing it, but not expressed. Lowth, on the authority of two ancient versions, reads אֲנִי־אֲנִי for אֲנִי־אֲנִי, *let him hearken*, which is copied by Gesenius, perhaps through inadvertence, as he says nothing of a change of text, and no such sense can possibly be put upon the participle. This mistake or oversight, if such it be, although corrected by the later Germans, has been carefully retained by Noyes (*let him hearken to the voice of his servant*). Henderson, on the other hand, retains the common interrogative translation, but explains the אֲנִי, in his note, as “a substitute for the relative אֲנִי־אֲנִי, *he who,*” which is scarcely intelligible.—Darkness is here used as a natural and common figure for distress. (See above, ch. 3: 20. 9: 1.) J. D. Michaelis gives to אֲנִי the specific sense of dawn, break of day, or morning light, like אֲנִי in ch. 8: 20 and 47: 11. Vitringa understands it to mean *splendor* or a great degree of light, and thus avoids the absolute negation of all spiritual light, which would not suit his exegetical hypothesis. The great majority of writers, late and early, are agreed in making it a poetical equivalent or synonyme of אֲנִי.—The futures in the last clause may, with equal propriety, if not still greater, be translated, *he will trust and lean*; the exhortation being then implied but not expressed.—The preterite אֲנִי־אֲנִי may be intended to suggest that the darkness spoken of is not a transient state, but one which has already long continued. Trusting in the *name* of Jehovah is not simply trusting in himself, or in the independent self-existence which that name implies, but in his manifested attributes, attested by experience, which seems to be the full sense of the word *name*, as applied to God in the Old Testament.—Two exegetical questions, in relation to this verse, have much divided and perplexed interpreters. The first has respect to the person speaking and the objects of address; the other to the servant of Jehovah. These questions, from their close connexion and their mutual dependence, may be most conveniently discussed together. There would be no absurdity, nor even inconsistency, in supposing that *his servant* means the prophet or the prophets indefinitely, as the organs of the divine communications. This may be granted even by those who give the title a very different meaning elsewhere, as it cannot reasonably be supposed that so indefinite a name, and one of such perpetual occurrence, is invariably used in its most pregnant and emphatic sense. It



is certain, on the contrary, that it is frequently applied to the prophets and to other public functionaries of the old economy. There is therefore no absurdity in Calvin's explanation of the phrase as here descriptive of God's ministers or messengers in general, to whom those who fear him are required to submit. The verse may then be connected immediately with what precedes, as the words of the same speaker. But while all this is unquestionably true, it cannot be denied that the frequency and prominence with which the Servant of Jehovah is exhibited in these Later Prophecies, as one distinguished from the ordinary ministry, makes it more natural to make that application of the words in this case, if it be admissible. The only difficulty lies in the mention of the Servant of Jehovah in the third person, while the preceding context is to be considered as his own words. (See above, on ch. 49: 1.) This objection may be easily removed, if we assume, as Ewald does, that the words of the Servant of Jehovah are concluded in the preceding verse, and that in the one before us the Prophet goes on to speak in his own person. This assumption, although not demonstrably correct, agrees well with the dramatic form of the context, both before and after, and the frequent changes of person, without any explicit intimation, which even the most rigorous interpreters are under the necessity of granting. On this hypothesis, which seems to be approved by the latest as well as by the older writers, the Servant of Jehovah here referred to is the same ideal person who appears at the beginning of the forty-ninth and forty-second chapters, namely, the Messiah and his People as his type and representative, to whose instructions in the name of God the world must hearken if it would be saved. The question, which part of the complex person here predominates, must be determined by observing what is said of him. If the exhortation of the verse were naturally applicable to the world at large, as distinguished from the chosen people, then the latter might be readily supposed to be included under the description of the Servant of Jehovah. But as the terms employed appear to be descriptive of the people of Jehovah, or of some considerable class among them, the most probable conclusion seems to be, that by the Servant of Jehovah we are here to understand the Head as distinguished from the Body, with a secondary reference, perhaps, to his official representatives, so far as he employs them in communicating even with the Body itself. There is no need of pointing out the arbitrary nature of Vitringa's theory, that this verse relates to a period extending from the advent to the reign of Trajan or Hadrian,—a chronological hypothesis in which the *terminus a quo* is only less gratuitous and groundless than the *terminus ad quem*.

V. 11. *Lo, all of you kindling fire, girding sparks (or fiery darts), go in the light of your fire, and in the sparks ye have kindled. From my hand*

is this to you ; in pain (or at the place of torment) shall ye lie down. The construction of the first clause is ambiguous, as *kindling* and *girding*, with their adjuncts, may be either the predicates or subjects of the proposition. J. D. Michaelis, Hitzig, and Hendewerk, prefer the latter supposition, and explain the clause to mean, *all of you are kindling fire* etc. This being inconsistent with the character described in the preceding verse, Hitzig supposes that the speaker here acknowledges his error, or admits that the *fearers of Jehovah*, whose existence he had hypothetically stated, were in fact not to be found. As if he had said, 'But you are not such, all of you are kindling,' etc. The harshness of this interpretation, or perhaps other reasons, have induced the great majority of writers to adopt the other syntax, and explain the participles as the subject of the proposition, or a description of the object of address, *all of you kindling*, i. e. all of you who kindle. Thus understood, the clause implies that the speaker is here turning from one class of hearers to another, from the gentiles to the Jews, or from the unbelieving portion of the latter to the pious, or still more generally from the corresponding classes of mankind at large, without either national or local limitation. The wider sense agrees best with the comprehensive terms of the passage, whatever specific applications may be virtually comprehended in it or legitimately inferable from it. This is of course too vague an hypothesis to satisfy the judgment or the feelings of the excellent Vitranga, by whom it is repeatedly affirmed that all who admit the application of the prophecy to Christ, must grant that this verse is addressed to the Pharisaic party of the Jews,—a consequence the logical necessity of which is very far from being evident.—There is also a difference of opinion with respect to the import of the figures. That of *kindling fire* is explained by Junius and Tremellius as denoting the invention of doctrines not revealed in Scripture, while the *sparks* represent the Pharisaical traditions. The rabbinical interpreters suppose the fire to denote the wrath of God, in proof of which they are able to allege not only the general usage of the emblem in that sense, but the specific combination of this very noun and verb in Deut. 32:22. Jer. 15:14. 17:4. In all these cases the meaning of the figure is determined by the addition of the words *in my anger*, or as some absurdly choose to render it, *in my nose*. (See above, on ch. 48:9.) This is certainly a strong analogical argument in favour of the rabbinical interpretation, and Vitranga's method of evading it is not a little curious. He rests his proof on the omission of this very phrase (עָרָה), in default of which, he says, *nemo hic necessario cogitat de ira Dei*. The same rule, if applied with equal rigour to his own interpretations, would exclude a very large proportion of his favourite conclusions. Even in this case, he has no διακρίτωρ, as he calls it, to compel the adoption of his own idea, that the fire kindled is the fire of sedition and intestine strife, still less to prove that

the particular sedition and intestine conflict meant is that which raged among the Jews before the final downfall of Jerusalem. Lowth seems unwilling to reject this explanation, though his better taste inclines him to prefer the wider sense of human devices and worldly policy, exclusive of faith and trust in God. This is substantially the explanation of the words now commonly adopted, though particular interpreters diverge from one another in details, according to the sense which they attach to the parallel metaphor,  $\text{הֲרִיבֵי יִרְקִיָּה}$ . The rabbinical tradition gives the noun the sense of *sparks*, which is retained in many versions. But others follow Albert Schultens in explaining it to mean small bundles of combustibles, employed like matches or as missiles in ancient warfare. This is generalized by Lowth into *fuel*, while Gesenius makes it signify specifically burning arrows, fiery darts, the  $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\ \pi\epsilon\pi\rho\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$  of Eph. 6:16. J. D. Michaelis adopts the kindred sense of *torches*. No less doubtful is the meaning of the verb in this connexion. Lowth translates the whole phrase, *who heap the fuel round about*, and Vitringa, *qui circumponitis malleolos*. Gesenius retains the usual sense of girding, and supposes them to be described as wearing the  $\text{הֲרִיבֵי}$  at the girdle. Most interpreters incline to the generic sense *surrounding*, as equally compatible with several different interpretations of the following noun. Any of these interpretations is better than the desperate device of emendation, which is here resorted to by Cappellus and Secker, the last of whom suggests  $\text{הֲרִיבֵי}$ ; Hitzig proposes  $\text{הֲרִיבֵי}$ , which seems to be approved by Ewald.—Common to all the explanations is the radical idea of a fire kindled by themselves to their own eventual destruction. This result is predicted, as in many other cases, under the form of a command or exhortation to persist in the course which must finally destroy them. *Go* (i. e. go on) *in the light of your fire*. This seems to favour the opinion that the fire is supposed to have been kindled for the sake of its light, which is implied indeed in Lowth's interpretation. Hitzig, however, understands the fire to be kindled for the purpose of destroying the righteous, instead of which result those who kindle it are called upon to enter into it and be consumed. For this is their appointed doom.—*From my hand is this to you*, i. e. my power has decreed and will accomplish what is now about to be declared, viz. that you shall lie down in sorrow, or a place of sorrow, if with Ewald we give the noun the local sense usual in words of this formation. The expression is a general one, denoting final ruin, and of course includes, although it may not specifically signify, a future state of misery.—It may here be mentioned, as a specimen of misplaced ingenuity, that J. D. Michaelis understands the scene depicted to be that of travellers in the dark who strike a light, and when it is extinguished find it darker than before, in consequence of which they fall among the rocks and hurt themselves severely, which is meant by lying down in pain. It is characteristic

of this writer and his age, that although rather supercilious and reserved in allowing the aesthetic merits of Isaiah, he describes this passage, thus distorted by himself, as a specimen of oriental imagery which 'really deserves to be introduced even into our poetry;' while many of the Prophet's loftiest flights elsewhere, if not entirely overlooked, are noticed in a kind of apologetic tone, as if the critic were ashamed of his subject. The spirit of such criticism is not yet extinct, although its grosser forms are superseded by a purer taste, even in Germany.

## CHAPTER LI.

INTERPRETERS are much divided with respect to the particular period which constitutes the subject of this prophecy. The modern Jews regard it as a promise of deliverance from their present exile and dispersion by the Messiah, whom they still expect. The Christian Fathers refer it to the time of the first advent. Modern writers are divided between this hypothesis and that which confines it to the Babylonish exile. The truth appears to be, that this chapter is a direct continuation of the preceding declarations with respect to the vocation of the Church and the divine administration towards her. The possibility of her increase, as previously promised, is evinced by the example of Abraham, from whom all Israel descended, vs. 1-3. In like manner many shall be added from the gentiles, vs. 4-6. Their enemies shall not only fail to destroy them, but shall be themselves destroyed, vs. 7, 8. This is confirmed by another historical example, that of Egypt, vs. 9, 10. The same assurances are then repeated, with a clearer promise of the new dispensation, vs. 11-16. The chapter closes with a direct address to Zion, who, though helpless in herself and destitute of human aid, is sure of God's protection and of the destruction of her enemies and his, vs. 17-23.

V. 1. *Hearken unto me!* A common formula, when the writer or speaker turns away from one object of address to another. It is here used because he is about to address himself to the faithful servants of Jehovah, the true Israel, who are described as *seeking after righteousness*, i. e. making it the end of all their efforts to be righteous, or conformed to the will of God. The sense of justifying righteousness or justification is as much out of place here as that of truth, which is given by the Targum;

except so far as all these terms are employed, in Scripture usage, to express the general idea of moral goodness, piety, a character acceptable in God's sight. The original application of the phrase here used is by Moses (Deut. 16: 20) ; from whom it is copied twice by Solomon (Prov. 15: 9. 21: 21), and twice by Paul (1 Tim. 6: 11. 2 Tim. 2: 22). The same apostle uses, in the same sense, the more general expression, *follow after good* (1 Thess. 5: 15); which is also used by David (Ps. 38: 21, comp. Ps. 34: 15). The same class of persons is then described as *seeking* (or *seekers of*) *Jehovah*, i. e. seeking his presence, praying to him, worshipping him, consulting him. The first description is more abstract, the second expresses a personal relation to Jehovah; both together are descriptive of the righteous as distinguished from the wicked. Now as these have ever been comparatively few, not only in relation to the heathen world, but in relation to the spurious members of the church itself, a promise of vast increase (like that in ch. 49: 18-21) might well appear incredible. In order to remove this doubt, the Prophet here appeals, not, as in many other cases, to the mere omnipotence of God, but to a historical example of precisely the same kind, viz. that of Abraham, from whom the race of Israel had already sprung, in strict fulfilment of a divine promise.—*Look unto the rock ye have been hewn.* The earlier grammarians assume an ellipsis of the relative and preposition, *the rock from which ye have been hewn*; the later, and particularly Ewald, reject this as an occidental idiom, and suppose the Hebrew phrase to be complete, but give the same sense as the others. The same remark applies to the parallel clause, *and to the hole of the pit (from which) ye have been digged.* The reference of these figures to our Lord Jesus Christ, as the rock of ages and the source of spiritual life, is held by some of the Fathers, one of whom (Eusebius) supposes a collateral allusion to the rock in which our Saviour was entombed; but this interpretation is too mystical even for Vitringa, who admits that the figures of this verse are explained in the next by the Prophet himself. His Dutch taste again gets the better of his judgment and his reverent regard for the word of God, and allows him to put a revolting sense upon the figures here employed, in which Knobel follows him with still greater coarseness. The truth, as recognised by almost all interpreters, is that the rock and pit (or quarry) are two kindred metaphors for one and the same thing, both expressing the general idea of extraction or descent (compare ch. 48: 2) without particular reference to the individual parents, although both are mentioned in the next verse, for the sake of a parallel construction, upon which it is almost puerile to found such a conclusion as the one in question. In the same category may be safely placed the old dispute, whether Abraham is called a rock because he was *strong in faith* (Rom. 4: 20), or because he was *as good as dead* (Heb. 11: 12) when he received the promise. He is

no more represented as a rock than as a pit or quarry, neither of which figures is applied to him distinctively, but both together signify extraction or origin in a genealogical sense.

V. 2. *Look unto Abraham your father and unto Sarah (that) bare you.* That Sarah is mentioned chiefly for rhythmical effect, may be inferred from the writer's now confining what he says to Abraham alone.—Instead of speaking further of both parents, he now says, *For I have called him one*; which does not mean, I have declared him to be such or so described him, but, I have called (i. e. chosen, designated) him, when he was only one, i. e. a solitary individual, although the destined father of a great nation (Gen. 12: 2.) This sense of the word *one* is clear from Ezek. 33: 24, where, with obvious allusion to this verse, it is put in opposition to *many*: *Abraham was one, and he inherited the land; and we are many, (much more then) is the land given to us for an inheritance.* The same antithesis is far more obvious and appropriate in this place, than that between Abraham, as sole heir of the promise, and the rest of men, who were excluded from it. The design of the Prophet is not so much to magnify the honour put upon Abraham by choosing him out of the whole race to be the father of the faithful, as it is to show the power and faithfulness of God in making this *one man* a nation like the stars of heaven for multitude, according to the promise (Gen. 15: 5). Noyes's version, *a single man*, is rendered by the modern usage of that phrase almost ludicrously equivocal, and necessarily suggests an idea directly at variance with the facts of the case; unless he really infers from the exclusive mention of Abraham in this clause, that he was called before his marriage, which can hardly be reconciled with the sacred narrative (compare Gen. 11: 29 and 12: 1, 5), and, even if it were true, would scarcely have been solemnly affirmed in this connexion, since the promise, whatever its precise date, presupposed his marriage as the necessary means of its fulfilment.—Interpreters, with almost perfect unanimity, explain the two verbs at the end of this verse as expressing past time (*and I blessed him and caused him to increase*), although the *rar* prefixed to neither has the pointing of the *rar conversive*, in default of which the preterite translation is entirely gratuitous and therefore ungrammatical. The masoretic pointing, it is true, is not of absolute authority, but it is of the highest value as the record of an ancient critical tradition; and the very fact that it departs in this case from the sense which all interpreters have felt to be most obvious and natural, creates a strong presumption that it rests upon some high authority or some profound view of the Prophet's meaning. And we find accordingly that by adhering to the strict sense of the future, we not only act in accordance with a most important general principle of exegesis, but obtain a sense which, though less obvious than the common one, is

really better in itself and better suited to the context. According to the usual interpretation, this verse simply asserts the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham, leaving the reader to connect it with what follows as he can. But by a strict translation of the futures, they are made to furnish an easy and natural transition from the one case to the other, from the great historical example cited to the subject which it was intended to illustrate. The concise phrase, *one I called him*, really includes a citation of the promise made to Abraham, and suggests the fact of its fulfilment, so far as this had yet taken place. The Prophet, speaking in Jehovah's name, then adds a declaration that the promise should be still more gloriously verified. As if he had said, I promised to bless him and increase him, and I did so, *and I will bless him and increase him* (still). But how? By showing mercy to his seed, as I have determined and begun to do. This last idea is expressed in the first clause of the next verse, which is then no longer incoherent or abrupt, but in the closest and most natural connexion with what goes before. This consideration might have less force if the illustration had been drawn from the experience of another race,—for instance from the history of Egypt or Assyria, or even from the increase of the sons of Lot or Ishmael; but when the promise which he wished to render credible is really a repetition or continuation of the one which he cites as an illustrative example, the intimate connexion thus established or revealed between them is a strong proof that the explanation which involves it is the true one.

V. 3. *For Jehovah hath comforted Zion.* The arbitrary character of the usual construction of these sentences may be learned from the fact that Rosenmüller and Gesenius, not content with making both the futures at the close of the second verse preterites, explain both the preterites in this clause as futures,—a double violation of analogy and usage, which seems to leave the meaning of the writer wholly at the mercy of the reader or expounder. From the same erroneous understanding of the closing words of v. 2 springs the forced interpretation of the ׀ at the beginning of this, as meaning *so* (Gesenius), *thus therefore* (Lowth), and the still more unnatural construction of the whole clause by Hitzig, as the apodosis of a comparative sentence beginning in the first verse: 'As I called him alone, and blessed him, and increased him, so does Jehovah pity Zion,' etc. As soon as the strict sense of the futures in v. 2 has been reinstated, the connexion becomes obvious and ׀ retains its usual and proper sense. 'I have blessed and increased him, and I will bless and increase him; *for* Jehovah has begun to comfort Zion.' The strong assurance thus afforded by the strict translation of the preterite ׀׀׀ conspires with analogy and usage to give it the preference over the vague evasive present form, employed by Hitzig, Ewald, and De Wette. This view of the connexion also supersedes the necessity

of laying an unusual stress on the name Jehovah, as J. H. Michaelis does, as if he had said, it is God not man that comforts Zion.—Gesenius translates  $\text{רַחֵם}$ , in this case, ‘will have mercy or compassion’ (*wird sich erbarmen*), in which he is followed by De Wette and Henderson. But even his own Lexicon gives no such definition of the Piel, and the Niphal, though coincident in this tense as to form, would, according to usage, take a preposition after it. Besides, the proper sense of *comforting*, retained by Ewald and the other Germans, is more appropriate, because it expresses not mere feeling but its active exhibition, and because the same verb is employed at the very outset of these prophecies (ch. 40 : 1) in the same application, but in a connexion where the sense of pitying or having mercy is wholly inadequate if not inadmissible. The comparison of that place also shows what we are here to understand by Zion, viz. Jehovah’s people, of which it was the capital, the sanctuary, and the symbol. What is there commanded is here, in a certain sort, performed, or its performance more distinctly and positively promised.—*He hath comforted all her wastes* (or ruins), i. e. restored cheerfulness to what was wholly desolate. This phrase proves nothing as to the Prophet’s viewing Zion merely as a ruinous city, since in any case this is the substratum of his metaphor. The question is not whether he has reference to Zion or Jerusalem as a town, but whether this town is considered merely as a town, and mentioned for its own sake, or in the sense before explained, as the established representative and emblem of the church or chosen people. (See above, on ch. 49 : 21.)—*And hath placed or made her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord.* This beautiful comparison is the strongest possible expression of a joyful change from total barrenness and desolation to the highest pitch of fertility and beauty. It is closely copied in Ezekiel 31 : 9 ; but the same comparison, in more concise terms, is employed by Moses (Gen. 13 : 10). Even there, notwithstanding what is added about Egypt, but still more unequivocally here, the reference is not to a garden or to pleasure-grounds in general, as Luther and several of the later Germans have assumed, with no small damage to the force and beauty of their versions, but Eden as a proper name, *the garden of Jehovah*, the *Paradise*, as the Septuagint renders it, both here and in Gen. 2 : 8, the grand historical and yet ideal designation of the most consummate terrene excellence, analogous, if not still more nearly related, to the Grecian pictures of Arcadia and of Tempe.—*Joy and gladness shall be found in her*, i. e. in Zion, thus transformed into a paradise. The plural form, *in them*, employed by Barnes, is not only inexact but hurtful to the sense, by withdrawing the attention from the central figure of this glowing landscape. *Shall be found* does not simply mean *shall be*, as J. D. Michaelis paraphrases it, but also that they shall be there accessible, not only present in their abstract essence, as it were,



but in the actual experience of those who dwell there.—*Thanksgiving and the voice of melody.* The music of the common version of this last clause is at once too familiar and too sacred to be superseded, simply for the purpose of expressing more distinctly the exact sense of the last word, which originally signifies the sound of an instrument or instrumental music, but is afterwards used to denote song in general, or rather as a vehicle of praise to God.

V. 4. *Attend (or hearken) unto me, my people; and my nation, unto me give ear.* This may seem to be a violation of the usage which has been already stated as employing this form of speech to indicate a change in the object of address. But such a change, although a slight one, takes place even here; for he seems no longer to address those seeking righteousness exclusively, but the whole body of the people as such. Some interpreters suppose a change still greater, namely a transition from the Jews to the Gentiles. In order to admit of this, the text must be amended or its obvious sense explained away. Lowth, of course, prefers the former method, and reads  $\text{עֲנֵנִי}$  on the authority of two manuscripts, and  $\text{עֲנֵנוּ}$  on the authority of nine. Gesenius gains the same end by explaining  $\text{עֲנֵנִי}$  and  $\text{עֲנֵנוּ}$  as unusual plural forms, the first of which he also finds in three other places (2 Sam. 22:41. Ps. 144:2. Lam. 3:14). Ewald denies the existence of such a termination, against which he argues with much force that in these four places, however inappropriate the sense *my people* may appear to the interpreter, no one pretends to say that it is absurd or impossible, while in every other case the very meaning of the noun is so obscure that it can throw no light upon the question of form. The discussion of the question by these eminent grammarians (in the *Lehrgebäude* § 121 and the *Kritische Grammatik* § 164) has left the existence of the plural form in question at the least very doubtful (see Nordheimer § 553); and even if it be conceded, it is confessedly so rare that it is not to be assumed without necessity in such a case as this, simply because it may conceivably be true, when the sense which the word has in nearly two hundred places is perfectly appropriate here. The only argument in favour of it, drawn from the connexion, is without force, because the dependence of the gentiles upon Israel for saving knowledge might be just as well asserted in addressing the latter as the former, as appears from the analogy of ch. 2:3. The same reasons which have now been stated will suffice to set aside Maurer's gratuitous interpretation of the words as singular collectives, which might be assumed in a case of extreme exegetical necessity, but in no other.—The next clause explains what it is that they are thus called upon to hear, viz. *that law from me shall go forth*, i. e. revelation or the true religion, as an

expression of God's will, and consequently man's rule of duty. In like manner Paul describes the gospel as the *law of faith* (Rom. 3 : 27), not binding upon one race or nation merely, but *by the commandment of the everlasting God made known to all nations for the obedience of faith* (Rom. 16 : 26). J. D. Michaelis, followed by Rosenmüller and De Wette, dilutes it into a *doctrine* (*eine Lehre*), which, although correct in point of etymology, is justified neither by the context nor by usage. Ewald gives the same translation of the word, but makes it less indefinite by adding the possessive pronoun (*meinē Lehre*). The meaning of the clause is that the nations can expect illumination only from one quarter.—The same thing is then said in another form. *And my judgment* (נִיְוִן אֲנִי equivalent to הוֹרָה and combined with it like *lex* and *jus* in Latin) *for a light of the nations* (as in ch. 42 : 6. 49 : 6) *will I cause to rest*, i. e. fix, establish. Jarchi explains it by the synonyme הוֹרָה, which is frequently employed in this sense (e. g. ch. 46 : 7. 2 Kings 17 : 29). The meanings given to the word by Calvin (*patefaciam*), Cocceius (*promovebo*), Lowth (*cause to break forth*), and others, are either wholly conjectural or founded on a false etymology. Aben Ezra speaks of some as having made it a denominative from נִיְוִן, meaning 'I will do it in a moment.' Kimchi strangely says that נִיְוִן אֲנִי may mean *in the presence of the gentiles*,—a suggestion which savours of rabbinical reluctance to believe in the conversion of the world to God. As specimens of exegesis on the most contracted scale, it may be mentioned, that Piscator understands by *law*, in this verse, Cyrus's decree for the restoration of the Jewish exiles, and by *light* the knowledge of this great event among the nations; whereas Grotius explains *judgment* to mean penal inflictions on the Babylonians, and *light* the evidence thereby afforded that Jehovah was the true God. The groundless and injurious protrusion of the Babylonish exile as the great theme of the prophecy is here abandoned even by Kimchi and Abarbenel, although they refer the promise to the advent of Messiah as still future. The simple proposition that the world can be converted only by a revelation admits no more of being thus restricted than any of the spiritual promises and prophecies contained in the New Testament.

V. 5. *Near (is) my righteousness*, i. e. the exhibition of it in the changes previously promised and threatened. *Near*, as often elsewhere in the prophecies, is an indefinite expression which describes it simply as approaching, and as actually near to the perceptions of the Prophet or to any one who occupies the same point of vision.—*Gone forth is my salvation*. Not only is the purpose formed, and the decree gone forth, but the event itself, in the sense just explained, may be described

as past or actually passing. Hitzig, however, understands  $\text{שׁוֹרֵךְ}$  to mean 'it goes forth from my mouth,' as in ch. 48: 3. 55: 11. Umbreit agrees with Vitranga in supposing an allusion to the rising of the sun (Ps. 19: 6, 7), or, as Gesenius suggests, to the dawning of the day (ch. 47: 11); while Ewald and Knobel understand it as referring to the springing or incipient germination of plants, which is properly expressed by  $\text{נִצְּחַר}$  (ch. 42: 9), the two verbs being elsewhere used as parallels in this sense (Job 5: 6). But none of these ingenious explanations is so natural as that which gives  $\text{שׁוֹרֵךְ}$  the same sense as in the preceding verse, viz. that of issuing or going forth from God (conceived as resident in heaven or in Zion) to the heathen world.—*And my arms shall judge the nations.* As the foregoing clause contains a promise, some interpreters suppose it to be necessary to give *judge* the favourable sense of vindicating, righting (as in ch. 1: 17, 23), or at least the generic one of ruling (as in 1 Sam. 8: 5). But nothing can be more in keeping with the usage of the Scriptures, and of this book in particular, than the simultaneous exhibition of God's justice in his treatment both of friends and foes. (Compare ch. 1: 27.) There is no objection, therefore, to Jarchi's explanation of the verb as meaning here to punish; this at least may be included as a part of the idea which it was intended to express.—J. D. Michaelis, supposing the construction of  $\text{שׁוֹרֵךְ}$  (which is feminine) with a masculine verb to be ungrammatical, proposes, by a change of punctuation, to connect the one with what precedes, and then to read, *the nations shall be judged.* This hypercriticism provokes Gesenius to convict its author of deficiency in Hebrew grammar, which he does by showing that in Gen. 49: 24 and Dan. 11: 31 this form of the plural is construed as a masculine, to which he adds a like use of the singular itself in Is. 17: 5.—*For me shall the islands wait*, i. e. for me they must wait, until I reveal myself they must remain in darkness. (See above, on ch. 42: 4.) Here again, as in ch. 41: 1. 42: 4. etc.,  $\text{אֲרָצוֹת}$  is explained to mean lands, distant lands, coasts, distant coasts, western lands, Europe, Northern Asia, and Asia Minor. As in all the former instances, however, the usual sense of *islands* is entirely appropriate, as a poetical or representative expression for countries in general, with more particular reference to those across the sea.—*And in my arm they shall hope*, i. e. in the exercise of my almighty power. As in ch. 42: 6, the sense is not so much that they shall exercise a feeling of trust, but that this will be their only hope or dependence. To be enlightened, they must wait for my revelation; to be saved, for the exertion of my power. It is not descriptive, therefore, of the feelings of the nations after the way of salvation is made known to them, but of their helpless and desperate condition until they hear it. True to their favourite hypotheses, Piscator understands by *islands* the Israelites

captives in Assyria, Grotius the Persians residing on the sea-coast, who were not idolaters! Knobel, with equal confidence and equal reason, makes the verse refer to the downfall of Croesus and the conquests of Cyrus.

V. 6. *Raise to the heavens your eyes, and look unto the earth beneath.* A similar form of address occurs above, in ch. 40 : 26. (Compare Gen. 15 : 5.) Heaven and earth are here put, as in many other places, for the whole frame of nature. The next clause explains why they are called upon to look. *For the heavens like smoke are dissolved or driven away.* The verb in this form occurs no where else, and the interpreters have tried in vain to derive its meaning here from other cognate forms of the same root, which all have reference to salting (from the primitive noun מֶלַח *salt*). So Symmachus in this place, ἀλίωσι. But this, according to analogy, would rather imply perpetuity than its opposite. The link between them may consist in the idea of reducing to powder or minute dust by trituration, which is equally appropriate to salt and to the dissolution of any solid substance. Most writers give this verb a future sense (or a present one as an evasive substitute), because the real future follows; but for this very reason it may be presumed that the writer used distinct forms to express distinct ideas, and that he first gives a vivid description of the dissolution as already past, and then foretells its consummation as still future.—*And the earth like the garment (which grows old) shall grow old (or wear out).* The same comparison occurs above in ch. 50 : 9, and serves to identify the passages as parts of one continued composition. *And their inhabitants shall die,* מֵתֵיהֶם. This is a difficult expression. Cocceius alone proposes three distinct interpretations, all peculiar to himself. In his version he translates the phrase *ut quivis*, which appears to mean ‘like any body else.’ But in his commentary he suggests that it may possibly mean *quemadmodum probus*, making מֵתֵיהֶם an adjective, and supposing an allusion to the death of the righteous as described in ch. 57 : 1, 2. His third supposition is that this is a case of aposiopesis or interrupted construction, and that the writer first says *they shall die like*—but before the comparison is finished ends by saying *so*—as if he pointed to the spectacle before him. Samuel Luzzatto makes the phrase mean *in an instant*, strictly in the time required to say מֵתֵיהֶם, which he compares to the German phrase, *in cinem Nu*. Apart from these ingenious notions, there are only two interpretations of the phrase which are entitled to notice. The first takes both words in their ordinary sense, and understands the whole as an intensive expression *just so* or *exactly so*. This seems to be the sense intended by the Septuagint (ὡσπερ ταῦτα) and Vulgate (*sicut haec*), although they adhere less closely to the form of the original than Schmidius (*sicut sic*) and Rückert (*so wie so*). The only other recent versions which retain this sense are those of Barnes and Henderson. Noyes

and the modern Germans all adopt the opinion of De Dieu, Gússetus, and Vitringa, that  $\eta\bar{\alpha}$  is the singular of  $\eta\bar{\alpha}\eta\bar{\alpha}$ , the word translated *lice* in the history of the plagues of Egypt (Ex. 8 : 12, 13), but explained by the later lexicographers to mean a kind of stinging gnat. Supposing the essential idea to be that of a contemptible animalcule, Vitringa renders it *instar vermiculí*, Lowth still more freely *like the vilest insect*. Noyes simply says *like flies*, which scarcely expresses the comparison supposed by these writers to have been intended. It is not impossible that this ingenious but fanciful translation will yet be abandoned in its turn by most interpreters for that recommended by analogy and usage as well as by the testimony of the ancient versions. *The inhabitants shall die like a gnat*, is a meaning which, in order to be purchased at so dear a rate, ought to possess some marked superiority above the old one, *they shall likewise perish*, to which there may possibly be an allusion in our Saviour's words recorded in Luke 13 : 3, 5.—The contrast to this general destruction is contained in the last clause. *And my salvation to eternity shall be, and my righteousness shall not be broken*, i. e. shall not cease from being what it is, in which sense the same verb is evidently used by Isaiah elsewhere (ch. 7 : 8). In this as in many other cases, *salvation and righteousness* are not synonymous but merely correlative as cause and effect. (See above, on ch. 42 : 6.) The only question as to this clause is whether it is a hypothetical or absolute proposition. If the former, then the sense is that until (or even if) the frame of nature be dissolved, the justice and salvation of Jehovah shall remain unshaken. This explanation is preferred by Joseph Kimchi, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and Maurer. The other interpretation understands the first clause as a positive and independent declaration that the heavens and earth shall be dissolved, which Vitringa understands to mean that the old economy shall cease, while others give these words their literal meaning. All these hypotheses are reconcilable by making the first clause mean, as similar expressions do mean elsewhere, that the most extraordinary changes shall be witnessed, moral and physical; but that amidst them all this one thing shall remain unchangeable, the righteousness of God as displayed in the salvation of his people. (See ch. 40 : 8. 65 : 17. Matt. 5 : 18. 1 John 2 : 17.) Knobel thinks that the ancient prophets actually looked for a complete revolution in the face of nature, coetaneous and coincident with the moral and spiritual changes which they foretold.

V. 7. *Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, people (with) my law in their heart; fear not the reproach of men, and by their scoffs be not broken* (in spirit, i. e. terrified). The distinction here implied is still that between the righteous and the wicked as the two great classes of mankind.

Those who are described in v. 1 as *seeking after righteousness* are here said to *know it*, i. e. know it by experience. Vitringa and Gesenius explain the Hebrew verb as meaning *love*; but this is an arbitrary substitution of what may be considered as implied for what is really expressed. The presence of the law in the heart denotes not mere affection for it but a correct apprehension of it, as the heart in Hebrew is put for the whole mind or soul; it is therefore a just parallel to *knowing* in the other member of the clause.—The opposite class, or those who know not what is right, and who have not God's law in their heart, are comprehended under the generic title *man*, with particular reference to the derivation of the Hebrew word from a root meaning to be weak or sickly, so that its application here suggests the idea of their frailty and mortality, as a sufficient reason why God's people should not be afraid of them.

V. 8. *For like the (moth-eaten) garment shall the moth devour them, and like the (worm-eaten) wool shall the worm devour them; and my righteousness to eternity shall be, and my salvation to an age of ages.* The same contrast between God's immutability and the brief duration of his enemies, is presented in ch. 50: 9 and in v. 6 above.

V. 9. *Awake, awake, put on strength, arm of Jehovah, awake, as (in the) days of old, the ages of eternities; art not thou the same that hewed Rahab in pieces, that wounded the serpent or dragon?* The Septuagint makes Jerusalem the object of address, in which it is followed by some modern writers, who suppose the *arm of Jehovah* to be mentioned as a synonyme or figurative paraphrase of the *strength* with which she is exhorted to invest herself. This addition would however be at once so harsh and so gratuitous, that most interpreters appear to acquiesce in the more obvious explanation of the words as addressed directly to the *arm of Jehovah* as the symbol of his power. Gesenius's idea, that Jehovah thus calls upon his own arm to awake, is as unnatural as Vitringa's supposition of a chorus of saints or doctors. The only probable hypothesis is that which puts the words into the mouth of the people or of the Prophet as their representative. The verse is then a highly figurative but by no means an obscure appeal to the former exertion of that power, as a reason for its renewed exertion in the present case. The particular example cited seems to be the overthrow of Egypt, here described by the enigmatical name *Rahab*, for the origin and sense of which see the ~~Earlier Prophecies~~, p. 510. The same thing is probably intended by the parallel term  $\text{יָרִיב}$ , whether this be understood to mean an aquatic monster in the general, or more specifically the crocodile, the natural and immemorial emblem of Egypt.

V. 10. *Art not thou the same that dried the sea, the waters of the great deep, that placed the depths of the sea (as) a way for the passage of redeemed ones?* The allusion to the overthrow of Egypt is carried out and completed by a distinct mention of the miraculous passage of the Red Sea. The interrogative form of the sentence is equivalent to a direct affirmation that it is the same arm, or in other words, that the same power which destroyed the Egyptians for the sake of Israel still exists, and may again be exerted for a similar purpose. The confidence that this will be done is expressed somewhat abruptly in the next verse.

V. 11. *And the ransomed of Jehovah shall return and come to Zion with shouting, and everlasting joy upon their head; gladness and joy shall overtake (them), sorrow and sighing have fled away.* The same words occur in ch. 35 : 10, except that *וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ* is there written in its usual form, without the final *ו*, and that *וַיִּסְּחוּ* is preceded by the *Vav conversive*. Some manuscripts exhibit the same reading here, and the difference might be considered accidental, but for the fact that such variations are often made intentionally. See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 587.

V. 12. *I, I, am he that comforteth you; who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of man (who) is to die, and of the son of man who (as) grass is to be given?* The important truth is here reiterated, that Jehovah is not only the deliverer but the sole deliverer of his people, and as the necessary consequence, that they have not only no need but no right to be afraid, which seems to be the force of the interrogation, *Who art thou that thou shouldst be afraid*, or still more literally, *who art thou and thou hast been afraid?* i. e. consider who is thy protector, and then recollect that thou hast been afraid. The etymological import of *אֵינְךָ* is rendered still more prominent in this case by the addition of the word *אֵינְךָ*, before which a relative may be supplied in order to conform it to our idiom, although the original construction is rather that of a complete but parenthetical proposition. 'Afraid of man (he shall die), and of the son of man (as grass he shall be given).' This last verb is commonly explained as if simply equivalent to *he shall be* or *shall become*, which is hardly consistent with its usage elsewhere. Some adhere more closely to the strict sense by supposing it to mean *he shall be given up*, abandoned to destruction. There is no need of supposing a grammatical ellipsis of the preposition *בְּ*, since the relation of resemblance is in many cases suggested by a simple apposition, as in the English phrase, *he reigns a sovereign*. On the comparison itself, see above, ch. 40 : 6.

V. 13. *And hast forgotten Jehovah thy Maker, spreading the heavens*

and founding the earth, and hast trembled continually all the day, from before the wrath of the oppressor as he made ready to destroy? And where is (now) the wrath of the oppressor? The form of expression in the first clause makes it still more clear that the statement in v. 12 is not merely hypothetical but historical, implying that they had actually feared man and forgotten God. The epithets added to God's name are not merely ornamental, much less superfluous, but strictly appropriate, because suggestive of almighty power, which ensured the performance of his promise and the effectual protection of his people.—*Continually all the day* is an emphatic pleonasm, such as are occasionally used in every language.—*From before* is a common Hebrew idiom for *because of, on account of*, but may here be taken in its strict sense as expressive of alarm and flight before an enemy. (See ch. 2 : 19.)—Some render  $\text{וְיָרֵא}^{\text{ו}}$  as *if*, to which there are two objections: first, the want of any satisfactory authority from usage; and secondly, the fact that the words then imply that no such attempt has really been made. *As if he could destroy* would be appropriate enough, because it is merely an indirect denial of his power to do so; but it cannot be intended to deny that he had aimed at it.— $\text{וְיָרֵא}^{\text{ו}}$  is particularly used in reference to the preparation of the bow for shooting by the adjustment of the arrow on the string; some suppose that it specifically signifies the act of taking aim. (Ps. 7 : 13. 11 : 2. 21 : 13.)—The question at the close implies that the wrath is at an end, and the oppressor himself vanished. We have no authority for limiting this reference to any particular historical event. It is as if he had said, How often have you trembled when your oppressors threatened to destroy you, and where are they now? Beck absurdly imagines that the writer here betrays himself as writing after the event which he affects to foretell.—Ewald seems to make  $\text{וְיָרֵא}^{\text{ו}}$  a denominative from  $\text{וְיָרֵא}^{\text{ו}}$  meaning to send to hell (*in die Hölle zu senden*); but this, although it strengthens the expression, seems to do it at the cost of philological exactness.

V. 14. *He hastens bowing to be loosed, and he shall not die in the pit, and his bread shall not fail.* The essential idea is that of liberation, but with some obscurity in the expression. Some give to  $\text{וְיָרֵא}^{\text{ו}}$  here and in ch. 63 : 1 the sense of marching, which would here be appropriate, but could not be so easily reconciled with the other cases where the word occurs. The modern lexicographers appear to be agreed that the radical meaning of the verb is that of bending, either backward (as in ch. 63 : 1) or downward (as in Jer. 48 : 12 and here). The latest versions accordingly explain it as a poetical description of the prisoner bowed down under chains. With still more exactness it may be translated as a participle qualifying the indefinite subject of the verb at the beginning. There is however no objection



to the usual construction of the word as a noun ; the sense remains the same in either case.—The next clause is sometimes taken as an indirect subjunctive proposition, *that he should not die* ; but it is best to make it a direct affirmation that *he shall not*. Ewald gives  $\text{רָחֵם}$  a sense corresponding to that of the verb in the preceding verse, and renders the entire phrase *for hell*, i. e. so as to descend into it. If the noun be taken in this sense, or in the kindred one of *grave*, the preposition cannot mean *in*, a sense moreover not agreeable to usage. Those who give it that sense here are under the necessity of making  $\text{רָחֵם}$  mean the dungeon, which is a frequent sense of the analogous term  $\text{בַּיִת}$ . But whether the phrase in question mean *for hell*, or *for the grave*, or *in the pit*, or *to destruction*, the general sense is still that the captive shall not perish in captivity. This general promise is then rendered more specific by the assurance that he shall not starve to death, which seems to be the only sense that can be put upon the last clause.

V. 15. *And I (am) Jehovah thy God, rousing the sea and then its waves roar ; Jehovah of Hosts (is) his name.* Another appeal to the power of God as a pledge for the performance of his promise.  $\text{רָחַם}$  has been understood in two directly opposite senses, that of *stilling* and that of *agitating*. The first is strongly recommended by the not unfrequent use of the derivative conjugations in the sense of quieting or being quiet. The other rests upon an Arabic analogy, confirmed however by the context, as  $\text{רָחַם}$  must indicate a consequence (*and then* or *so that*), and not an antecedent (*when they roar*) as explained by the writers who take  $\text{רָחַם}$  in the sense of *stilling*, and even by Gesenius, who gives that verb the sense of frightening. Some of the older writers seem to have regarded  $\text{רָחַם}$  as a transposition for  $\text{רָחַם}$  rebuking, a word often used to express the divine control over nature, and especially the sea. (See above, ch. 17 : 13.)

V. 16. *And I have put my words in thy mouth, and in the shadow of my hand I have hid thee, to plant the heavens, and to found the earth, and to say to Zion, Thou art my people.* That these words are not addressed to Zion or the Church is evident ; because in the last clause she is spoken of in the third person, and addressed in the next verse with a sudden change to the feminine form from the masculine which is here used. That it is not the Prophet may be readily inferred from the nature of the work described in the second clause. The only remaining supposition is that the Messiah is the object of address, and that his work or mission is here described, viz. to plant the heavens, i. e. to establish them, perhaps with allusion to the erection of a tent by the insertion of its stakes in the ground. There is no need of reading  $\text{רָחַם}$ , as Lowth does ; since the usage of the Scriptures is

rather in favour of variation than of scrupulous transcription. The whole clause is equivalent to *creating a new world*, which must here be taken in a figurative sense; because the literal creation, as a thing already past, would here be inappropriate, especially when followed by the words, *to say to Zion, thou art my people*. Nothing is gained by referring the infinitives to God himself, as Rosenmüller does; because the person here addressed is still described as the instrument if not as the efficient agent. The new creation thus announced can only mean the reproduction of the church in a new form, by what we usually call the change of dispensations. The outward economy should all be new, and yet the identity of the chosen people should remain unbroken. For he whom God had called to plant new heavens and to found a new earth was likewise commissioned to say to Zion, Thou art still my people.

V. 17. This may be considered a continuation of the address begun at the end of the preceding verse. The same voice which there said, *Thou art my people*, may be here supposed to say, *Rouse thyself! rouse thyself! Arise Jerusalem! (thou) who hast drunk at the hand of Jehovah the cup of his wrath; the bowl of the cup of reeling thou hast drunk, thou hast wrung (or sucked) out*, i. e. drunk its very dregs. Some of the rabbins give the sense of dregs to  $\text{רַעְרַעַר}$  itself. The ancient versions either overlook it or explain it to mean a certain kind of cup. The modern writers are disposed to regard it as a pleonastic expression similar to *goblet-cup*. According to its probable etymology, as traceable in Hebrew and Arabic, the word denotes the convex surface of a cup or bowl, while  $\text{בַּיִת}$  is properly the area or space within. The cup is of course put for its contents, a natural figure for any thing administered or proffered by a higher power. (Compare Jer. 25 : 15, 16. 49 : 12. 51 : 7. Lam. 4 : 21. Ob. 16. Ezek. 23 : 34. Rev. 14 : 10.)

V. 18. *There is no guide to her (or no one leading her) of all the sons she has brought forth, and no one grasping her hand of all the sons she has brought up*. From addressing Zion in the second person, he now proceeds to speak of her in the third. This verse is not so much descriptive of unnatural abandonment as it is of weakness. The sense is not that no one will, but that no one can protect or guide her. Some interpreters suppose the figure of a drunken person to be still continued. J. D. Michaelis even goes so far as to translate the first words of the verse, *No one brings her a drink of water*. This is no doubt founded on the usual application of this verb to the watering of flocks, from which is deduced the secondary sense of guidance in general. Hengstenberg gives to it, wherever

it occurs, the sense of fostering or nourishing. (See above, on ch. 40: 11.) The mother and the sons, i. e. the people collectively and individually, are distinguished only by a figure of speech.

V. 19. *Both those things are befalling (or about to befall) thee; who will mourn for thee? Wasting and ruin, famine and sword; who (but) I will comfort thee?* A difficulty here is the mention of *two things* in the first clause, followed by an enumeration of *four* in the second. Some suppose the two things to refer to what precedes, others to wasting and ruin only. Grotius thinks that wasting and famine, ruin and sword, are to be combined as synonymes. The modern writers understand the second phrase as an explanation or specification of the first. As if he had said, *wasting and ruin* (such as are produced by) *famine and the sword*. The last words of the verse, strictly translated, mean, *who I will comfort thee*. The Targum limits the interrogation to the first word, and supposes the others to contain the answer. The same construction is given by Henderson—*Who? I myself will comfort thee*. A much greater number of interpreters include the whole in the interrogation, and either give the verb a subjunctive form, *who am I that I should comfort thee?* or take יי as an adverb, *how shall I comfort thee?* Hitzig: *by whom* (i. e. by what example of similar or greater suffering) *shall I comfort thee?* Still a different construction, although yielding substantially the same sense, is adopted above, in the translation of the verse. The general meaning evidently is that her grief was beyond the reach of any human comforter.

V. 20. *Thy sons were faint (or helpless)*. This explains why they did not come to her assistance.—*They lie at the head of all the streets*. A conspicuous place is evidently meant, but whether the corners or the higher part of an uneven street, is a question of small moment.—*Like a wild bull in a net*, i. e. utterly unable to exert their strength. The Hebrew word אַיִל is no doubt identical with the אַיִל of Deut. 14: 5, and therefore must denote an animal. The ancient versions favour its identity with the *oryx*, a species of antelope or wild goat. Gesenius gives this explanation in his *Lexicon*, but here translates it *stag* (Hirsch). The common version (*wild bull*) is derived from the Targum, and is sufficient to convey the writer's meaning by suggesting the idea of a wild animal rendered entirely powerless. The extraordinary version given in the Septuagint, *σειτλιον ημίερον*, a *half-cooked beet*, owes its origin, no doubt, to some coincidence of form or sound between the obscure Hebrew word and an Egyptian one, with which the translator was familiar. The cognate form in Deuteronomy is rendered, in the same version, but no doubt by a different hand, ὄρνυα. The precise sense of the

Hebrew phrase appears to be, *like an oryx of net*, or *a net-oryx*, i. e. an ensnared one; but the sense may be best expressed in English by supplying the local preposition (*in a net*). Knobel supposes a particular allusion to the faintness produced by hunger, and refers to several passages in Jeremiah, especially to Lam. 2: 19, which is no doubt imitated from the one before us.—The true cause of their lying thus is given in the last clause. *Filled* (i. e. drunk, as Ewald explains it) *with the wrath of Jehovah, the rebuke of thy God*. In Hebrew usage  $\text{הִרְבֵּה}$  approaches to the strong sense *curse*, and is so translated by Gesenius. The expression *thy God* is emphatic, and suggests that her sufferings proceeded from the alienation of her own divine protector. This verse is incorrectly applied by Vitringa to the siege of the ancient Jerusalem, whereas it is a figurative representation of the helplessness of Zion or the Church when partially forsaken for a time by her offended Head.

V. 21. *Therefore pray hear this, thou suffering one and drunken but not with wine*. The antithesis in the last clause is to be completed from the context. Not with wine, but with the wrath of God, which had already been described as a *cup of reeling* or intoxication. The same negative expression is employed in ch. 29: 9. The Targum supplies *from distress*. Kimchi inserts *the wrath of God*. Jarchi supposes an ellipsis of something else ( $\text{דבר אחר}$ ), and thus accounts for the construct form of the participle. But the Michlal Jophi explains it more correctly as an instance of the idiomatic use of the construct for the absolute in cases where a very intimate relation is to be expressed. Vitringa carries out his favourite method of interpretation, by explaining this verse as addressed specifically to the ancient church, when recovering from the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes,—a limitation which might just as well be made in reference to any of the general encouragements of true believers which the word of God contains.

V. 22. *Thus saith thy Lord, Jehovah, and thy God—he will defend (or avenge) his people—Behold, I have taken from thy hand the cup of reeling (or intoxication), the bowl of the cup of my fury; thou shalt not add (continue or repeat) to drink it any more (or again)*. Even Knobel is compelled to admit that the writer has reference less to the place than to the people of Jerusalem, and even to this only as the representative of the entire nation; a concession which goes far to confirm the explanation of the “Zion” of these prophecies which has been already given.—It is usual to explain  $\text{וְרִיבֵי עַמּוֹ}$  as a relative clause (*who pleads the cause of his people*); but it is simpler, and at the same time more in accordance with the genius of the language, to regard it as a brief but complete parenthetical proposi-

tion. The same character is often ascribed elsewhere to Jehovah. (See ch. 1:17. 34:8. 41:11. 49:25.)—As the cup was the cup of God's wrath, not of man's, so God himself is represented as withdrawing it from the sufferer's lips, when its purpose is accomplished.

V. 23. *And put it into the hand of those that afflicted thee, that said to thy soul, Bow down and we will (or that we may) pass over; and thou didst lay thy back as the ground and as the street for the passengers.* Ewald and Umbreit agree with Secker and Lowth in reading *אֲרִיבֶיךָ* thy oppressors, as in ch. 49:26, on the alleged authority of the ancient versions, which would be wholly insufficient if the fact were so, and Kocher has clearly shown that it is not. The common reading is confirmed, moreover, by the use of *אֲרִיבֶיךָ* in Lam. 1:12.—*To thy soul* is explained by Gesenius and others as a mere periphrasis for *to thee*. Vitringa supposes the expression to be used because the body could not be bowed down in the manner here described without a previous bowing of the mind. But the true explanation is no doubt that given by Hengstenberg in his exposition of Ps. 3:3 (Commentary, I. p. 59), viz. that this form of speech always implies a strong and commonly a painful affection of the mind in the object of address. *Who said to thy soul* is then equivalent to saying, *who distressed thy soul by saying*. The last clause is commonly explained as a proverbial or at least a metaphorical description of extreme humiliation, although history affords instances of literal humiliation in this form. Such is the treatment of Valerian by Sapor, as described by Lactantius and Aurelius Victor; with which may be compared the conduct of Sesostris to his royal captives, as described by Diodorus, and that of Pope Alexander III. to the Emperor Frederic, as recorded by the Italian historians. For scriptural parallels see Josh. 10:24 and Judg. 1:7.—If we had any right or reason to restrict this prediction to a single period or event, the most obvious would be the humiliation of the Chaldees, who are threatened with the cup of God's wrath in Jer. 25:26. Yet Vitringa sets this application aside, upon the ground that Israel drank of the same cup afterwards, and understands the verse of the deliverance of the Jews from their Macedonian oppressors by the valour of the Maccabees. To the obvious objection that even this was not a final deliverance, he ingeniously replies that all the promises to Israel extend only to the end of the old dispensation,—an assumption which confounds the Jewish nation with the Israel of God, the Church, or chosen people, which continued to exist under every change of dispensation and economy, and, notwithstanding all its fluctuations and vicissitudes, shall ultimately be for ever rescued by the same hand which destroys its enemies. This is the simple substance of the promise in the verse before us, which includes without specifically signifying all that has been thus represented as its meaning.

## CHAPTER LII.

HOWEVER low the natural Israel may sink, the true Church shall become more glorious than ever, being freed from the impurities connected with her former state, v. 1. This is described as a captivity, from which she is exhorted to escape, v. 2. Her emancipation is the fruit of God's gratuitous compassion, v. 3. As a nation she has suffered long enough, vs. 4, 5. The day is coming when the Israel of God shall know in whom they have believed, v. 6. The herald of the new dispensation is described as already visible upon the mountains, v. 7. The watchmen of Zion hail their coming Lord, v. 8. The very ruins of Jerusalem are summoned to rejoice, v. 9. The glorious change is witnessed by the whole world, v. 10. The true Church or Israel of God is exhorted to come out of Jewry, v. 11. This exodus is likened to the one from Egypt, but described as even more auspicious, v. 12. Its great leader, the Messiah, as the Servant of Jehovah, must be and is to be exalted, v. 13. And this exaltation shall bear due proportion to the humiliation which preceded it, vs. 14, 15.

V. 1. *Awake, awake, put on thy strength, oh Zion! Put on thy garments of beauty, oh Jerusalem, the Holy City! For no more shall there add (or continue) to come into thee an uncircumcised and unclean (person).* The encouraging assurances of the foregoing context are now followed by a summons similar to that in ch. 51 : 17, but in form approaching nearer to the apostrophe in ch. 51 : 9.—Vitringa objects to the version *awake*, on the ground that it was not a state of sleep from which she was to rouse herself. This is true so far as literal slumber is concerned; but sleep is one of the most natural and common figures for a despondent lethargy. The essential idea is, no doubt, that of rousing or arising, which Gesenius and the later Germans express by an interjection meaning *up (auf! auf!)*. The same writers give to *וַיִּבֶן*, in this as in many other cases, the factitious sense of beauty, glory, simply on account of the parallelism. This is a gratuitous weakening of the sense; for *beauty and beauty* is certainly much less than *beauty and strength*. To put on strength is a perfectly intelligible figure for resuming strength or taking courage, and is therefore entirely appropriate in this connexion; while the other meaning is not only less agreeable to usage, but excluded by the clear analogy of ch. 51 : 9, where the sense of

*strength* is universally admitted. It might be objected that the sense is there determined by the use of the word *arm*, if the meaning *strength* were a rare and doubtful one; but since it is confessedly the usual and proper one, the case referred to merely confirms the strict interpretation, which is here retained by Ewald (*Macht*).—That the city is here addressed only as a symbol of the nation, is certain from the next verse; so that Hitzig is compelled to assume two different objects of address, in utter violation of analogy and taste.—*Beautiful garments* is by most interpreters regarded as a general expression meaning fine clothes or holiday dresses; but some suppose a special allusion to a widow's weeds (2 Sam. 14: 2) or to prison-garments (2 Kings 25: 29). It is a bold but not unnatural idea of Knobel, that the Prophet here resumes the metaphor of ch. 49: 18, where Zion's children are compared to bridal ornaments.—*The Holy City*, literally, *city of holiness*, an epithet before applied to Zion (ch. 48: 2), and denoting her peculiar consecration, and that of her people, to the service of Jehovah. (Compare Dan. 8: 24.) Henceforth the name is to be more appropriate than ever, for the reason given in the last clause. The meaning of *הַקֹּדֶשׁ*, when followed by the future, is precisely equivalent to the more usual construction with the infinitive, of which we have an instance in ch. 51: 22.—*Uncircumcised* is an expression borrowed from the ritual law and signifying unclean. That it is not here used in its strict sense, is intimated by the addition of the general term *אֲרָמִים*. The restriction of these epithets to the Babylonians is purely arbitrary, and intended to meet the objection that Jerusalem was not free from heathen intrusion after the exile. The same motive leads Vittinga to explain the promise as addressed to the Jewish church after its deliverance from the insults and oppressions of Antiochus Epiphanes. The Jews refer it to a future period, and the Germans easily dispose of it as a visionary expectation which was never realized. Thus Beck explains it as a prophecy that all mankind should be converted to Judaism, which is a virtual concession of the truth of the interpretation above given. The question is not materially varied by substituting *come against* for *come into*. The true solution is the one above suggested, namely, that the words contain a general promise of exemption from the contaminating presence of the impure and unworthy, as a part of the blessedness and glory promised to God's people, as the end and solace of their various trials.

V. 2. *Shake thyself from the dust, arise, sit, oh Jerusalem! loose the bands of thy neck, oh captive daughter Zion (or of Zion)! The dust, from which she is to free herself by shaking it off, is either that in which she had been sitting as a mourner (ch. 3: 26. 47: 1. Job 2: 13), or that which, in token of her grief, she had sprinkled on her head (Job 2: 12).—*

Koppe and Hitzig make  $\text{קִיָּצִי}$  a noun, meaning *captivity* or *captives* collectively, like the corresponding feminine  $\text{קִיָּצִיָּה$  in the other clause. Rosenmüller's objection, that  $\text{קִיָּצִי}$  would in that case have a conjunctive accent, is declared by Hitzig to be groundless, and is certainly inconclusive. A more serious objection is the one made by Gesenius, that  $\text{קִיָּצִי}$  is always masculine, and would not therefore agree with the feminine verb  $\text{קִיָּצִי}$ . Hitzig's reply, that  $\text{קִיָּצִי}$ , as a collective, may be here used as a feminine, is not only wholly gratuitous but utterly precluded by the existence of a distinct feminine form and its occurrence in this very sentence. Because feminines have sometimes a collective sense, it does not follow that a masculine, when used collectively, becomes a feminine, least of all when a feminine form exists already. Among the writers who explain it as a verb, there is a difference of judgment with respect to the meaning of the exhortation, *sit!* The common English version, *sit down*, till explained, suggests an idea directly opposite to that intended. Gesenius, on the contrary, makes it mean *sit up*, in opposition to a previous recumbent posture. To this it may be objected, that the verb is elsewhere absolutely used in the sense of *sitting down*, especially in reference to sitting on the ground as a sign of grief; and also, that the other verb does not merely qualify this, but expresses a distinct idea, not merely that of rising but that of standing up, which is inconsistent with an exhortation to sit up, immediately ensuing. Ewald, Umbreit, and Knobel, therefore, agree with Vitranga and Lowth in adopting the interpretation of the Targum, *sit upon thy throne*, from which she is supposed to have been previously cast down.—The textual reading  $\text{קִיָּצִיָּה$  may be either a preterite or an imperative. In the former case, the Hithpael must have a passive sense, *the bands of thy neck are loosed*, or *have loosed themselves*. In the other case, the words may be considered as addressed to the bands themselves (*be loosed*), which is hardly compatible, however, with the use of the second person in *thy neck*; or the object of address may be the captives, which is equally at variance with the following singular, *captive daughter of Zion*. The marginal reading  $\text{קִיָּצִיָּה$  preserves both the parallelism and the syntax, and is therefore regarded as the true text by Ewald and Knobel with the older writers. The latter, followed by Rosenmüller, suppose an ellipsis of the preposition *from*. Thus the English Version: *loose thyself from the bands of thy neck*. Gesenius and Ewald make *bands* the object of the verb, which they explain, not as a strict reflexive, but a modification of it, corresponding to the middle voice in Greek. *Loose for thyself the bands of thy neck*.—On the different constructions of the phrase  $\text{קִיָּצִיָּה$ , see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 8.—As a whole, the verse is a poetical description of the liberation of a female captive from degrading servitude, designed to represent the complete emancipation of the Church from tyranny and persecution.



V. 3. *For thus saith Jehovah, Ye were sold for nought, and not for money shall ye be redeemed.* These words are apparently designed to remove two difficulties in the way of Israel's deliverance, a physical and a moral one. The essential meaning is, that it might be effected rightly and easily. As Jehovah had received no price for them, he was under no obligations to renounce his right to them; and as nothing had been gained by their rejection, so nothing would be lost by their recovery. The only obscurity arises from the singular nature of the figure under which the truth is here presented, by the transfer of expressions borrowed from the commercial intercourse of men to the free action of the divine sovereignty. The verse, as explained above, agrees exactly with the terms of Ps. 44:13, notwithstanding Hengstenberg's denial (Commentary, II. p. 391). The reference to the blood of Christ as infinitely more precious than silver and gold, would here be wholly out of place, where the thing asserted is that they shall be redeemed as they were sold, viz. without any price at all, not merely without silver and gold. This misconception has arisen from the use of analogous expressions in the New Testament in application to a far more important subject, the redemption of mankind from everlasting ruin. The reflexive meaning given to  $\text{בְּמַחְרָתְכֶם}$  in the English Version (*ye have sold yourselves*), is not sustained by usage nor required by the context, either here or in Lev. 25:39, 47, where Gesenius admits it. (See above, on ch. 50:1.)

V. 4. *For thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Into Egypt went down my people at the first to sojourn there, and Assyria oppressed them for nothing.* The interpretation of this verse and the next has been not a little influenced by the assumption of one or more strongly marked antitheses. Thus some writers take it for granted that the Prophet here intended to contrast the Egyptian and Assyrian bondage. They accordingly explain the verse as meaning that the first introduction of Israel into Egypt was without any evil design upon the part of the Egyptians, who did not begin to oppress them until there arose a king who knew not Joseph (Ex. 1:8), whereas the Assyrian deportation of Israel was from the beginning a high-handed act of tyranny. Another antithesis, maintained by some in connexion with the one already mentioned, and by others in the place of it, is that between  $\text{בְּרֵאשִׁית}$  at the first, and  $\text{בְּאַחֵרִית}$  at the last. A third hypothesis supposes Egypt and Assyria together to be here contrasted with the Babylonian tyranny described in the next verse. But even here there is a question, whether the comparison has reference merely to time, and the Prophet means to say that what Jehovah had done he would do again—or whether there is also a designed antithesis between the former oppressions as less aggravated and the present one as more so. Knobel appears to exclude the supposition of a

contrast altogether, and to understand the passage as a chronological enumeration of events, designed to show how much had been endured already as a reason why they should endure no more. (Compare ch. 40: 2.) In ancient times they were oppressed by the Egyptians, at a later period by Assyria, and later still by Babylonia, whose oppressions are supposed to be described in v. 5, either as already suffered, or as an object of prophetic foresight. This is the simplest and most natural interpretation, and is very strongly recommended by the difficulty of defining the antithesis intended on the other supposition.—Of the phrase  $\text{בְּאַיִן}$  there are three interpretations. Saadias, Lowth, and Henderson explain it as a particle of time, the opposite of  $\text{בְּאַיִן}$ . The objection to this is the want of any other case in which the noun is thus applied to time, together with its frequent use to describe nonentity or nothing. It is no doubt true, as Hävernäck alleges, that the word may as well denote extremity of time as of place; but even the latter application is confined to the plural in the frequent formula  $\text{אַשְׁמֵי אַרְיָן}$ . The argument derived from the parallelism is of no avail; because, as we have seen, one of the points at issue is the question whether  $\text{בְּרֵאשִׁיטָה}$  stands opposed to  $\text{בְּאַשְׁמֵי}$  or to  $\text{נְהַה}$  in the next verse. Most writers therefore understand it as meaning *for nothing* or without cause, i. e. unjustly, or as Kimchi expresses it,  $\text{כִּלְאֵי עֲשָׂה}$ . Knobel, however, makes it strictly synonymous with  $\text{בְּהֵיטָה}$  in v. 3, and understands the clause to mean that the Assyrians had enslaved Israel gratuitously, i. e. without paying any price for him, and therefore had no right to him, when God chose to reclaim him,—which is precisely the idea expressed in the foregoing verse.—The explanation of Assyria as meaning or including Babylonia, though not without authority from usage, is as unnecessary here as in various other places where it has been proposed. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 125).—The unsatisfactory nature of exegetical conclusions drawn from doubtful premises is strongly illustrated by the fact, that while Gesenius argues from this verse that the writer must have lived long after the Assyrian bondage, since he couples it with that of Egypt as a thing of ancient date, Hävernäck (Einleitung II. 2, p. 187) insists that it must have been written in the days of Isaiah, because it contrasts the Egyptian and Assyrian bondage as the first and the last which Israel as a nation had experienced. The chief use of such reasonings is to cancel one another. Though we may not venture to rest the genuineness of these prophecies on such a basis, we may cheerfully accept the assurance thus afforded that the arguments against it are of no validity.

V. 5. *And now what is there to me here (what have I here), saith Jehovah, that my people is taken away for nothing, its rulers howl, saith Jehovah, and continually, all the day, my name is blasphemed? Some understand now strictly as meaning at the present time, in opposition to the*

ancient times when Israel suffered at the hands of Egypt and Assyria. The same antithesis may be obtained by giving *now* a modified sense so as to mean *in the present case*, as distinguished from the two already mentioned. It would even be admissible to give the *now* its logical sense as substantially meaning *since these things are so*, although such a departure from the proper import of the word is by no means necessary.—The other adverb, *here*, admits of no less various explanations. Hitzig and some older writers understand it to mean *heaven* as the customary residence of God. (1 Kings 8 : 30.) Some suppose it to mean *Babylon*, while others, with a bolder departure from the strict sense, understand it as equivalent to *in the present case*, viz. that of the Babylonian exile; which, however, even if correct in substance, is rather a paraphrase than a translation.—With the meaning put upon this adverb varies the interpretation of the whole phrase, *what have I here?* If *here* mean *in Babylon*, the sense would seem to be, what else have I to do here but to free my people? If it mean *in heaven*, then the question is, what is there to detain me here from going to the rescue of my people? If it mean *in the present case*, whether this be referred to the Babylonish exile or more generally understood, the best explanation of the question is the one proposed by Knobel, what have I gained in this case, any more than in the others, since my people are still taken from me without any compensation? But Beck supposes it to mean, how much more cause have I to interfere in this case than in any of the others. The conclusion implied, though not expressed, is that in this, as in the other instances referred to, a regard to his own honour, metaphorically represented as his interest, requires that he should interpose for the deliverance of his people.—The next clause likewise has been very variously explained. The most extraordinary exposition is the one preferred by Aben Ezra, which gives וְלִשְׁמֵרָה the same sense as in Num. 21 : 27, and explains the whole clause thus: *their poets howl*, i. e. their songs, instead of being joyous, have become mere lamentations. This ingenious notion is revived by Luzzatto, who refers in illustration to the prophecy of Amos (8 : 3), that the songs of the temple shall in that day howl, or, as the English Version phrases it, be howlings. Among the vast majority of writers who retain the common meaning of the word as a derivative from לָשַׁר to rule, the question chiefly in dispute is whether it denotes the native rulers of the Jews themselves, as in ch. 28 : 14, or their foreign oppressors, as in ch. 49 : 7. Vitringa and Hitzig, who prefer the former supposition, understand the clause as meaning that the chiefs, who represent the people, howl or wail in their distress. (Compare Exod. 5 : 15, 21.) Knobel objects to this interpretation, that the context requires a description not of their distress but of its cause, and also that the Jews had no chiefs but the Babylonians while in exile; which is at once historically false, because the internal organization of the people seems to



and superfluous, that he expunged it from the text on the authority of several ancient versions, which were much more likely to omit it inadvertently than all the manuscripts to introduce it without reason or authority. It is also commonly agreed that  $\text{וְיָדָע}$  means *that*, and that the verb *shall know* must be repeated with a different object. It might, however, be considered simpler and more natural to repeat the object with the verb, and let the last clause give a reason for the first: 'therefore in that day shall they know it (i. e. know my name), because I am he that said, Behold me (or, Lo here I am)!' The English Version differs from all the constructions which have now been stated, in explaining  $\text{וְיָדָע}$  as a mere reiteration of what goes before: 'they shall know in that day that I am he that doth speak; behold it is I.' But according to usage,  $\text{וְיָדָע}$ , especially when standing at the end of a clause or sentence, does not merely reiterate the subject of a foregoing verb, but constitutes a new proposition; it does not mean *lo I*, or *lo I am*, but *lo I am here*, and is therefore the common idiomatic Hebrew answer to a call by name

V. 7. *How timely on the mountains are the feet of one bringing glad tidings, publishing peace, bringing glad tidings of good, publishing salvation, saying to Zion, Thy God reigneth.* The verb  $\text{וְיָדָע}$  means to be suitable, becoming, opportune, and though not applied to time in either of the two cases where it occurs elsewhere, evidently admits of such an application, especially when there is no general usage to forbid it. It is here recommended by the context; which is much more coherent if we understand this verse as intimating that the help appears at the very juncture when it is most needed, than if we take it as a mere expression of delight. It is also favoured by the analogy of Nah. 2: 1, where a similar connexion is expressed by the word  $\text{וְיָדָע}$ . It is favoured lastly by the use of the Greek word  $\omega\rho\alpha\iota\omicron\tau$  in Paul's translation of the verse (Rom. 10: 15), of which  $\omega\rho\alpha$  in our copies of the Septuagint is probably a corruption. This Greek word, both from etymology and usage, most explicitly means *timely* or *seasonable*, although sometimes employed in the secondary sense of *beautiful* (Matt. 23: 27. Acts 3: 2), like the Hebrew  $\text{וְיָדָע}$  (Cant. 1: 10), *decorus* in Latin, and *becoming* in English. The mountains meant may be the mountains round Jerusalem, or the word may be more indefinitely understood as adding a trait to the prophetic picture.—Hitzig gratuitously changes the form of the expression, by substituting foot and messengers for feet and messenger. The word  $\text{וְיָדָע}$  has no equivalent in English, and must therefore be expressed by a periphrasis, in order to include the two ideas of annunciation and the joyful character of that which is announced. The sense is perfectly expressed by the Greek  $\epsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ : but our derivatives, *evangelizing* and *evangelist*, are technical not popular expressions, and would not convey the

meaning to an ordinary reader. The joyous nature of the tidings brought is still more definitely intimated in the next clause by the addition of the word *good*, which is not explanatory but intensive. The peculiar form of the original is marred in some translations, by rendering the first  $\text{וַיִּשְׂמְעוּ}$  as a noun and the second as a verb; whereas in Hebrew there are two participles, both repeated. The explanation of  $\text{וַיִּשְׂמְעוּ}$  as a collective referring to the prophets, or the messengers from Babylonia to Jerusalem, is perfectly gratuitous. The primary application of the term is to the Messiah, but in itself it is indefinite; and Paul is therefore chargeable with no misapplication of the words when he applies them to the preachers of the gospel. The contents of the message are the manifestation of the reign of God, the very news which Christ and his forerunner published when they cried saying, The kingdom of God is at hand.

V. 8. *The voice of thy watchmen! They raise the voice, together will they shout; for eye to eye shall they see in Jehovah's returning to Zion.* Lowth complains that none of the ancient versions or modern interpreters have cleared up the construction of the first clause to his satisfaction, or supplied the ellipsis in any way that seems to him easy and natural. He therefore proposes to read  $\text{כֹּל}$  for  $\text{כִּי־לֵב}$  (*all thy watchmen lift up their voice*), which he says perfectly rectifies the sense and the construction. It is hard to reconcile with Lowth's reputation for refined taste the preference of this prosaic reading (the only external evidence for which is that  $\text{פ}$  stands on a rasure in one manuscript) to the obvious assumption of a poetical apostrophe or exclamation, which has commended itself to all later writers, and had been before proposed by Vitranga. There is no need even of supplying *is heard* with Knobel, *sounds* with Gesenius in his Commentary, or *hark* with the same writer in his German version. The exact translation is not only admissible, but more expressive than any other. Gesenius and De Wette, by connecting  $\text{וַיִּשְׂמְעוּ}$  with the word before it (*erheben die Stimme allzumal*), not only violate the accents, but are under the necessity of supplying *and* before the next verb.—This is one of the cases where it seems most allowable to look upon the preterite and future as equivalent to our present; but according to the general rule hitherto adopted, it is best to retain the original difference of form, whenever, as in this case, we can do so without injuring the sense. Thus understood, the clause would seem to intimate that they should have still further cause to shout hereafter; they have already raised the voice, and ere long they shall all shout together. Because the prophets are elsewhere represented as *watchmen* on the walls of Zion (ch. 56: 10. Jer. 6: 17. Ez. 3: 17. 33: 2, 7), most interpreters attach that meaning to the figure here; but the restriction is unnecessary, since the application of a metaphor to one object does not preclude its application to another, and

objectionable, as it mars the unity and beauty of the scene presented, which is simply that of a messenger of good news drawing near to a walled town, whose watchmen take up and repeat his tidings to the people within.—Ewald strangely takes the last clause as the words to be uttered by the watchmen, and explains them to mean, ‘How will they see eye to eye!’ etc. This is far less natural than the usual construction, which regards the last clause as the Prophet’s explanation of the joy described in the first.—The phrase *eye to eye*, or, as Hitzig and De Wette have it, *eye in eye*, occurs only here and in Num. 14:14. The sense put upon it in the Targum and adopted by Gesenius (*with their eyes*), though not erroneous, is inadequate. According to Vitranga, it denotes *with both eyes*, i. e. not imperfectly or dimly, but distinctly; and the same idea is expressed by Symmachus (*ὁφθαλμοφαρῶς*). The same essential meaning is attached to the expression by Ewald, but with a distinct intimation of local proximity, the phrase being properly descriptive of two persons so near as to look into each other’s eyes. The phrases *face to face* (Ex. 33:11) and *mouth to mouth* (Num. 12:8) are kindred and analogous, but not identical with that before us.—The verb רָאָה may be construed either with רָאָהוּ or with an indefinite subject, *they* (i. e. the people of Jerusalem or men in general) *shall see*.—Rosenmüller explains וְ before רָאָה as the connective which the verb רָאָה takes after it when it means to see with pleasure or to gaze at with delight. The same construction seems to be implied in Ewald’s paraphrase of רָאָה (*sich weiden*); but it seems much simpler to construe the verb absolutely or without an object expressed (they shall see, i. e. look), and to make the וְ a particle of time, as it usually is when prefixed to the infinitive.—The transitive meaning ascribed to רָאָה in this and many other places has been clearly shown by Hengstenberg (Pentateuch, I, pp. 104–106) to have no foundation either in etymology or usage, and to be wholly inadmissible even in the frequent combination וְרָאָהוּ, much more in cases like the present, where the proper sense is not only appropriate but required by the context and the analogy of other places in which the reconciliation between God and his people is represented as a return after a long absence. (See above, on ch. 40:11.)—The direct construction of the verb of motion with the noun of place is a Hebrew idiom of constant occurrence; so that it is not necessary even to suppose an ellipsis of the preposition.

V. 9. *Burst forth, shout together, ruins of Jerusalem! For Jehovah hath comforted his people, hath redeemed Jerusalem.* The phrase רָצַח רָצָה, to burst forth into shouting, is a favourite expression with Isaiah (see above, ch. 14:7. 44:23. 49:13, and below, ch. 54:1. 55:12); but in this case the qualifying noun is exchanged for its verbal root,—a combination which occurs elsewhere only in Ps. 98:4. As רָצַח is never used in any

other connexion, and therefore denotes only this one kind of bursting, it may be considered as involving the idea of the whole phrase, and is so translated in the English Version (*break forth into joy*), while Gesenius gives the same sense to the two words, and translates the phrase exactly like the usual one,  $\text{הִצִּיגוּ יַחְדָּם}$ .—*Together* may either mean *all of you*, or *at the same time* with the watchmen mentioned in v. 8. Hitzig even goes so far as to say that the ruins are here called upon to imitate the watchmen. Knobel adds that the ruins had particular occasion to rejoice, because they were to be transformed into a splendid city (ch. 44 : 26). Such appeals to inanimate objects are of frequent occurrence in Isaiah. (See above, ch. 44 : 23. 49 : 13, and below, ch. 55 : 12.)—The translation of the verbs in the last clause as presents is unnecessary and enfeebling, as it takes away the strong assurance always conveyed by the *praeteritum propheticum*. See above, on ch. 49 : 13.

V. 10. *Jehovah hath bared his holy arm to the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God.* The allusion in the first clause is to the ancient military practice of going into battle with the right arm and shoulder bare. Thus Porus is described by Arrian as  $\delta\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\omicron\nu\sigma\ \delta\acute{\omega}\mu\omicron\nu\sigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\ \gamma\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu\delta\omicron\nu\sigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\chi\eta$ ; Diana by Silius Italicus, *excitatos avide pugnae nudata lacertos*; Tydeus by Statius, *excitare humeros nudamque lacessere pugnam*. The same Hebrew verb is used in the same application by Ezekiel (4 : 7). The baring of the arm may either be mentioned as a preparation for the conflict, or the act of stretching it forth may be included, as Rosenmüller and Gesenius suppose. The bare arm is here in contrast either with the long sleeves of the female dress, or with the indolent insertion of the hand in the bosom. (Ps. 74 : 11.) The exertion of God's power is elsewhere expressed by the kindred figure of a great hand (Ex. 14 : 30), a strong hand (Ez. 20 : 34), or a hand stretched out (Is. 9 : 11). The act here described is the same that is described in ch. 51 : 9. The comparison of Jehovah to a warrior occurs above in ch. 42 : 13. Jehovah's arm is here described as *holy*, because, as Knobel thinks, his holiness or justice is exercised in punishing the wicked; but the word is rather to be taken in its wide sense, as denoting the divine perfection, or whatever distinguishes between God and man, perhaps with special reference to his power, as that by which his deity is most frequently and clearly manifested to his creatures. The sense of sanctifying, i. e. glorifying arm, which Rosenmüller suggests as possible, is much less natural and scarcely reconcilable with the expression. In this clause Ewald has retained the strict translation of the preterite instead of the enfeebling present form preferred by most of the late writers. In the last clause he adopts the subjunctive form, *so that all nations see*, which is substantially correct, as



וַיֵּצֵא introduces the effect or consequence of the action described in the foregoing clause. Compare this clause with ch. 18 : 3. 33 : 13. and Ps. 98 : 3, where it is repeated word for word. Another coincidence between this passage of Isaiah and that Psalm has been already pointed out in expounding the foregoing verse.

V. 11. *Away! away! go out from thence! the unclean touch not! come out from the midst of her! be clean (or cleanse yourselves) ye armour-bearers of Jehovah!* The first word in Hebrew is a verb, and literally means *depart*; but there is something peculiarly expressive in Gesenius's translation of it by an adverb. The analogy of ch. 48 : 20 seems to show that the Prophet had the departure from Babylon in view; but the omission of the name here, and of any allusion to that subject in the context, forbids the restriction of the words any further than the author has himself restricted them. The idea that this high-wrought and impassioned composition has reference merely to the literal migration of the captive Jews, says but little for the taste of those who entertain it. The whole analogy of language and especially of poetical composition shows that Babylon is no more the exclusive object of the writer's contemplation than the local Zion and the literal Jerusalem in many of the places where those names are mentioned. Like other great historical events, particularly such as may be looked upon as critical conjunctures, the deliverance becomes a type, not only to the prophet, but to the poet and historian, not by any arbitrary process, but by a spontaneous association of ideas. As some names, even in our own day, have acquired a generic meaning and become descriptive of a whole class of events, so in the earliest authentic history, the Flood, the Fall of Sodom and Gomorrah, the Exodus, the Babylonish Exile, are continually used as symbols of divine interposition both in wrath and mercy. There is no inconsistency whatever, therefore, in admitting that the Prophet has the exodus from Babylon in view, and yet maintaining that his language has a far more extensive scope. The error of those Christian writers who adopt this confined hypothesis is not so obvious in their own interpretations as it is in those which have been raised upon the same base by the German neologists, who, not content with this limitation of the meaning, sneer at the contracted Jewish spirit which the writer here betrays, by insisting on the old Levitical distinctions and denouncing all communion with the gentiles as pollution. In order to maintain this unworthy view of the writer's meaning, they explain the exhortation in the last clause as requiring ceremonial ablutions, and adopt Jarchi's groundless and absurd interpretation of וַיֵּצֵא as referring exclusively to persons, with allusion to the וַיֵּצֵא אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן-הַבְּיַרְדֵּן of Ezra 6 : 21. This restriction of the terms is so unreasonable and unfair, that Ewald and Knobel, though belonging to the same school, both explain

אֲנִי as a neuter (*Unreines*), that which is unclean. It would indeed be impossible to frame a more general dehortation or dissuasion from religious and moral impurity, and thousands of intelligent readers have so understood the words, without detecting in them those “ängstliche pedantische Grundsätze” since brought to light by a mode of criticism which, even in a mere aesthetic point of view, deserves to be characterized as eminently *ängstlich* and *pedantisch*. The same spirit shows itself in the exposition of the closing words of this verse by the same class of writers. Not content with identifying the אֲנִי אֲנִי with the אֲנִי אֲנִי of Num. 4 : 15. 1 Chron. 9 : 29, an assumption not entirely devoid of probability, they make this an address to the Priests and Levites, the official bearers of these vessels, and explain it as implying a hope that the sacred utensils taken by Nebuchadnezzar from the temple (2 Kings 25 : 14, 15. Dan. 5 : 1) would be restored by Cyrus, as they afterwards were. (Ezra 1 : 7–11.) And this anticipated restitution is the great theme of the grand yet brilliant passage now before us, in the eyes of those very critics who have gone to an extreme in holding up Isaiah’s baldest prose as unmingled poetry ! They reject of course the sense which Rosenmüller, following some older writers, puts upon the closing words as meaning the armour-bearers of Jehovah. This would not be Jewish and Levitical enough to serve their purpose of really degrading what they affect to magnify ‘with faint praise.’ Yet this sense is not only in the highest degree suitable to the idea of a solemn march, but strongly recommended by the fact that אֲנִי אֲנִי in historical prose is the appropriated title of an armour-bearer. (See 1 Sam. 14 : 1, 6, 7. 16 : 21.) At the same time the mention of the sacred vessels would scarcely be omitted in the description of this new exodus. Both explanations may be blended without any violation of usage, and with great advantage to the beauty of the passage, by supposing an allusion to the mixture of the martial and the sacerdotal in the whole organization of the host of Israel during the journey through the wilderness. Not even in the crusades were the priest and the soldier brought so near together, and so mingled, not to say identified, as in the long march of the chosen people from the Red Sea to the Jordan. By applying this key to the case before us, we obtain the grand though blended image of a march and a procession, an army and a church, a ‘sacramental host’ bearing the sacred vessels not as Priests and Levites merely, but as the *armour-bearers of Jehovah*, the weapons of whose warfare, though not carnal, are mighty to the pulling down of strong holds. (2 Cor. 10 : 4.) With this comprehensive exposition of the clause agrees the clear and settled usage of the word אֲנִי אֲנִי in the wide sense of *implements*, including weapons on the one hand and vessels on the other. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 249.)—The application of the terms of this verse by John to the spiritual Babylon (Rev. 18 : 4), so far from standing in the way of the enlarged

interpretation above given, really confirms it by showing that the language of the prophecy is suited to express far more than the literal exodus of Israel from Babylon.

V. 12. *For not in haste shall ye go out, and in flight ye shall not depart; for going before you (is) Jehovah, and bringing up your rear the God of Israel.* This verse is crowded with allusions to the earlier history of Israel, some of which consist in the adaptation of expressions with which the Hebrew reader was familiar, but which must of course be lost in a translation. Thus the hasty departure out of Egypt is not only recorded as a fact in the Mosaic history (Ex. 11 : 1. 12 : 33, 39), but designated by the very term here used וַיִּפְחֹץ (Ex. 12 : 11. Deut. 16 : 3), meaning terrified and sudden flight. So also וַיִּפְחֹץ and וַיִּפְחֹץ are military terms familiar to the readers of the ancient books. (See Num. 10 : 25. Josh. 6 : 9, 13.) There is likewise an obvious allusion to the cloudy pillar going sometimes before and sometimes behind the host (Ex. 14 : 19, 20), and possibly to Moses' poetical description of Jehovah as encompassing Israel with his protection (Deut. 32 : 10). These minute resemblances are rendered still more striking by the distinction which the Prophet makes between the two events. The former exodus was hurried and disorderly; the one here promised shall be solemn and deliberate. How far the exquisite poetical beauty of the passage is appreciated by some modern critics, may be gathered from the fact that Rosenmüller quotes without dissent the ridiculous remark of Schuster, that the verse has reference to the dangers of the desert between Babylonia and Judea (Ezra 8 : 22, 31), and the still more curious fact that Knobel understands it as assigning a reason why they need not neglect their Levitical ablutions before setting out; while Hitzig infers from this last verse that the purification enjoined in the one before it was "*etwas Zeit-raubendes,*" or something that required time for its performance. Such *aesthetics*, if applied to any of the master-works of classical genius, would be laughed to scorn; but even the transcendent merit of the passage now before us, simply considered as a piece of composition, cannot wash out the offensive stain of *Judaismus*, or enable certain critics to forget or even to forgive its being Scripture. The true connexion of the verse with that before it must be obvious to every unsophisticated reader. The *for*, as in many other cases, has relation to an intermediate thought which may be easily supplied though not expressed. Or rather, it has reference to the promise, implied in the preceding exhortation, of protection and security. To many thousands both of learned and unlearned readers, this connexion has been obvious for ages; whereas not more than two or three, we may venture to believe, ever dreamed that this magnificent description of Jehovah's presence with his people was intended to assure the Jewish exiles that

before leaving Babylon they would have time enough to wash themselves at leisure!—From this verse, taken in connexion with the one before it, we may derive a confirmation of our previous conclusions, first that the image there presented is a military no less than a priestly one; and secondly that this whole passage has a wider scope and higher theme than the deliverance from Babylon, because the latter is no more vividly exhibited to view than the deliverance from Egypt; and if this is a mere emblem, so may that be, nay it must be, when we add to the consideration just presented, the result of the inductive process hitherto pursued in the interpretation of these prophecies, viz. that the deliverance of Israel from exile does not constitute the theme of the predictions, but is simply one remarkable historico-prophetical example which the Prophet cites in illustration of his general teachings as to the principle and mode of the divine administration, and his special predictions of a great and glorious change to be connected with the abrogation of the old economy.

V. 13. *Behold, my servant shall do wisely, (and as a necessary consequence) shall rise and be exalted and high exceedingly.* The parenthesis introduced to show the true relation of the clauses serves at the same time to preclude the necessity of giving לַחֵכְלִי the doubtful and secondary sense of *prospering*, as most modern writers do. The objection to this interpretation is the same as in the case of קָצָץ and הִקְדָּץ, which it is the fashion now to render *victory, salvation*, or the like. The parallel expressions in the present case are not synonymous but simply correlative, the mutual relation being that of cause and effect. He shall be exalted because he shall act wisely, in the highest sense, i. e. shall use the best means for the attainment of the highest end. This kind of wisdom involves prosperity, not merely as a possible result, but as a necessary consequence. We have no right, however, to substitute the one for the other, or to merge the primary idea in its derivative. Hengstenberg undertakes to blend both senses by translating the verb *he shall rule well*, i. e. both wisely and successfully. But to this there are two objections: first, that it introduces an idea (that of ruling) which is not expressed at all in the original; and then, that it confounds two things which in the original are kept distinct, the antecedent and the consequent, wisdom and prosperity. The latter has the less claim to be forced into the first clause, because in the last it is so fully and strongly expressed, by combining, as Hengstenberg himself well says, all the Hebrew verbs that denote exaltation and then adding the intensive adverb. The version of the Septuagint (*συνήσσει*) and the Vulgate (*intelliget*) is only defective because it makes the verb denote the possession of intelligence, and not its active exercise, which is required by the Hiphil form and by the connexion, as well here as in the parallel passage, Jer. 23 : 5. (Compare

1 Kings 2 : 3.)—Connected with this verse there are two exegetical questions which are famous as the subject of dispute among interpreters. The first and least important has respect to the division and arrangement of the text, viz. whether this verse is to be connected with what goes before, or separated from it and regarded as the introduction of a new subject. The former method is adopted in the older versions and in the masoretic Hebrew text. The latter, according to Procopius and others, was pursued in the ancient distribution of the book, with which the Fathers were familiar, and has been adopted in our own day by most writers on Isaiah. A particular exegetical motive may be easily detected in some cases for preferring the one or the other of these methods. Thus Abarbenel is naturally led to sever these three verses (13–15) from what follows, by a wish to establish his peculiar hypothesis that the Messiah is the subject of these verses, but not of the next chapter. On the other hand, those writers who restrict the foregoing context to the restoration of the Jews from exile have a strong inducement to make this the beginning of a new discourse upon another subject, as the best means of disguising the unnatural and violent transition which their hypothesis compels them to assume. But to this statement there are certainly exceptions. Thus the usual division is retained by Hitzig notwithstanding his adherence to the Babylonian theory, while Ewald, who adopts the other method, admits that the fifty-third chapter begins in an entirely new tone. The ease with which arbitrary arrangements of the text may be multiplied derives some illustration from Hendewerk's assertion that ch. 52 : 7 to 54 : 17 is a distinct prophecy, consisting of three parallel parts, ch. 52 : 7–15, ch. 53 : 1–12, ch. 54 : 1–17, so that the favourite modern separation of ch. 52 : 13 to 53 : 12 from the context as a separate discourse is not only arbitrary but a 'mutilation of the oracle.' Common to all these arrangements is the radical error of supposing that the book is susceptible of distribution into detached and independent parts,—a notion which, as we have seen already, is not only theoretically groundless, but practically hurtful in a high degree to the sound interpretation of these prophecies. What seems to be gained, in such cases, by combining things which ought to go together, is more than outweighed by the disadvantage of separating others which are no less closely connected. The only satisfactory method, as we have already seen, is to regard the whole as a continuous composition, and to recognise the usual division into chapters, simply because it is familiar and on the whole convenient, although sometimes very injudicious and erroneous. According to this view of the matter, the precise distribution of the chapters is of no more importance than that of the paragraphs in any modern book, which may sometimes facilitate and sometimes hinder its convenient perusal, but can never be regarded as authoritative in determining the sense. In the case immediately before us, it is proper to

resist the violent division of the chapter; because when read in its natural connexion, it shows how easy the transition was from the foregoing promise of deliverance to the description of the Servant of Jehovah as the leader of the grand march just described, and confirms our previous conclusions as to the exalted meaning of the promises in question, and against a forced restriction of them to the Babylonish exile. At the same time it is equally important that the intimate connexion of these verses with the following chapter should be fully recognised, in order that the Servant of the Lord, whose humiliation and exaltation are here mentioned, may be identified with that mysterious person whose expiatory sufferings and spiritual triumphs form the great theme of the subsequent context. To the general agreement among Jews and Christians as to this identity, the forced hypothesis already quoted from Abarbenel may be regarded as the sole exception. It follows, therefore, that the meaning of the whole passage, to the end of the fifty-third chapter, turns upon the question, Who is meant by עַבְדִּי (*my servant*) in the verse before us? An individual or a collective body? If the latter, is it Israel as a whole, or its better portion, or the Prophets, or the Priesthood? If the former, is it Moses, Abraham, Uzziab, Josiah, Jeremiah, Cyrus, an anonymous prophet, the author himself, or the Messiah? This is the other exegetical question which has been referred to, as connected with this verse and materially affecting the interpretation of the whole passage. The answer to this question, which at once suggests itself as the result of all our previous inquiries, is that the Servant of Jehovah here, as in ch. 42 : 1-6 and ch. 49 : 1-9, is the Messiah, but presented rather in his own personality than in conjunction with his people. According to the rule already stated (see above, p. 50), the idea of the Body here recedes, and that of the Head becomes exclusively conspicuous; because, as we shall see below, the Servant of Jehovah is exhibited, not merely as a teacher or a ruler, but as an expiatory sacrifice. That this application of the verse and the whole passage to the Messiah was held by the oldest school of Jewish interpreters, appears from the Targum of Jonathan, who here has *my Servant the Messiah*, and is admitted by Aben Ezra, Jarchi, Abarbenel, and other Jews, who have themselves abandoned this opinion because it would constrain them to acknowledge Christ as the Messiah of their Scriptures. Detailed proofs from the ancient Jewish books themselves are given by Hengstenberg in his *Christology* (Vol. I. pp. 292-294). Gesenius, too, explicitly admits that the later Jews were no doubt led to give up the old interpretation of the passage by polemic opposition to the Christians. (Commentary II. p. 161.) The same interpretation was maintained, almost without exception, in the Christian church, till near the end of the eighteenth century, when it was abandoned by the German theologians along with the doctrines of atonement and prophetic inspiration. Even in Germany, however, it has always had

its zealous adherents, and in our own day some of its most able, learned, and successful advocates. In its favour may be urged, besides the tradition of the synagogue and church, the analogy of the other places where the Servant of Jehovah is mentioned, the wonderful agreement of the terms of the prediction with the character and history of Jesus Christ, and the express application of the passage to him by himself and his inspired apostles, who appear to have assumed it as the basis of their doctrine with respect to the atonement, and to have quoted it comparatively seldom only because they had it constantly in view, as appears from their numerous allusions to it, and the perfect agreement of their teachings with it; so that even Gesenius, while in one place he argues from their silence that they did not find the doctrine of atonement in the passage, says expressly in another, with a strange but gratifying inconsistency, that most Hebrew readers, being already familiar with the notions of sacrifice and substitution, must of necessity have so explained the place, and that undoubtedly the apostolic doctrine as to Christ's expiatory death rests in a great measure upon this foundation. (Comm. II. p. 191.) The detailed proofs of the Messianic exposition will be given in the course of the interpretation and compared with the other hypotheses maintained by Jews and Christians, which will therefore only be enumerated here in order that the reader may recall them for the purpose of comparison. The individual subjects which have been assumed besides the Messiah, are Josiah by Abarbenel, Jeremiah by Grotius, Uzziah by Augusti, Hezekiah by Bahrdr, Isaiah by Stäudlin, and (according to some) Moses and the Rabbi Akiba by a tradition quoted in the Talmud, although Hengstenberg supposes that these are mentioned only as examples or representatives of a whole class. An anonymous German writer understands by the Servant of this verse an unknown prophet who suffered martyrdom during the exile! Another anonymous writer of the same country applies the name as a collective to the Maccabees; another to the nobles carried off by Nebuchadnezzar, or to their descendants who returned; Bolten applies it in like manner to the house or family of David. Another nameless German understands by the Servant of Jehovah the priesthood as a class or body. This is near akin to Rosenmüller's early doctrine that it means the prophets, which was afterwards abandoned by its author, but renewed by Gesenius in his Commentary, and by De Wette and Winer, while Umbreit attempts to blend it with the Messianic exposition by supposing the Messiah to be set forth as the greatest of the prophets or as their ideal. Instead of this hypothesis, Rosenmüller afterwards adopted that of the rabbins who reject the Messianic doctrine (such as Jarchi, Kimchi, and Aben Ezra), viz. that the Servant of Jehovah is the Jewish people; and the same opinion is maintained by Eichhorn and Hitzig, but with this important difference between the soi-disant Christian and the Jewish writers, that the latter apply the passage to the

present dispersion of their people, and the former to the Babylonish exile. As modifications of this general hypothesis may be mentioned Eckermann's extravagant idea, that the people as such or considered in the abstract is here distinguished from its individual members, whose words he supposes to be given in the following chapter. Another modification of the same opinion is the ground assumed by Paulus, Maurer, Gesenius in his *Lexicon*, and in a still more qualified manner by Ewald and Knobel, viz. that the Servant of Jehovah is the spiritual Israel, the better portion of the Jewish people, as distinguished either from their ungodly brethren, or from the heathen, or from both. Some of these explanations are so perfectly groundless and extravagant that they can no more be refuted than established. This is especially the case with those which make the Servant of Jehovah any individual except the Messiah, of which it has been well said that they might be multiplied *ad libitum*, there being no more show of reason for the names suggested than for a multitude of others which have never been proposed. This remark may be extended to the theories which identify the Servant of Jehovah with the Maccabees, the House of David, the Noble Exiles, and the Priesthood, leaving as the only plausible hypotheses besides the Messianic one, those which severally understand the title as denoting the order of Prophets or the Jewish people, either as a whole or in relation to its better part. To these the attention of the reader will be therefore directed in comparison with that which is assumed as the basis of the exposition, leaving the others to refute themselves. Of those which have been mentioned as entitled to comparative consideration, that which approaches nearest to the truth is the hypothesis of Beck and Ewald, that by the Servant of Jehovah we are to understand the ideal Israel, or rather it denotes the Israel of God, not considered as a nation or a race, but as the church or chosen people, who in some sense represented the Messiah till he came, and is therefore often blended with him in the prophetic picture as a complex person, sometimes more and sometimes less conspicuous, but here, as we have seen already, totally eclipsed by the image of the Head himself. And yet even in this case there are visible such striking points of similarity between the Body and the Head, that although this passage can directly refer only to the latter, it confirms the previous conclusion that in other cases the reverse is true. The general views which have been now expressed on this and other points will be reduced to a more specific form in the progress of the exposition, during the course of which respect will be had, not only to the commentaries usually quoted in this work, but to one or two important monographs or special expositions of this passage, the most important of which are Martini's *Commentatio Philologico-critica* (Rostock, 1791), to which most later writers have been largely indebted, and Hengstenberg's excellent interpretation contained in the second part of his *Christologie*, the valuable substance of



which it is proposed to reproduce in the ensuing pages, with some changes both of form and substance, and many additions from more recent sources.—In the verse immediately before us all that need be added is, that the extraordinary exaltation promised in the last clause is such as could never have been looked for by the Prophet, for himself or for his order, especially upon the modern supposition, that he lived in the time of the exile, when the grounds for such an expectation were far less than at any former period. It may also be observed that the personification of the prophets as an ideal individual is foreign from the usage of the Scriptures; the parallelism of *servant* and *messengers*, in the first clause of ch. 44 : 26, no more proves the first to be collective, than the like relation of *Jerusalem* and *cities of Judah* in the last clause proves the same thing of Jerusalem. The objection, that the title *servant* is not applied elsewhere to Messiah, would have little force if true, because the title in itself is a general one and may be applied to any chosen instrument; it is not true, however, as the single case of Zech. 3 : 8 will suffice to show, without appealing to the fact that the same application of the title, either partial or exclusive, has been found admissible above in ch. 42 : 1. 49 : 3, and 50 : 10.

Vs. 14, 15. *As many were shocked at thee—so marred from man his look, and his form from the sons of man—so shall he sprinkle many nations; concerning him shall kings stop their mouth, because what was not recounted to them they have seen, and what they had not heard they have perceived.* His exaltation shall bear due proportion to his humiliation; the contempt of men shall be exchanged for wonder and respect. According to the common agreement of interpreters, v. 14 is the protasis and v. 15 the apodosis of the same sentence, the correlative clauses being introduced, as usual in cases of comparison, by  $\text{כִּי} \text{וְכִי}$  and  $\text{כִּי}$ . The construction is somewhat embarrassed by the intervening  $\text{כִּי}$  at the beginning of the last clause of v. 14, which most interpreters however treat as a parenthesis explanatory of the first clause: ‘as many were shocked at thee (because his countenance was so marred etc.), so shall he sprinkle many nations,’ etc. A simpler construction, though it does not yield so clear a sense, would be to assume a double apodosis: ‘as many were shocked at thee, so was his countenance marred etc., so also shall he sprinkle,’ etc. As thus explained the sense would be, their abhorrence of him was not without reason and it shall not be without requital.  $\text{וְכִי}$  expresses a mixture of surprise, contempt, and aversion; it is frequently applied to extraordinary instances of suffering when viewed as divine judgments. (Lev. 26 : 32. Ezek. 27 : 35. Jer. 18 : 16. 19 : 8.) It is followed by the preposition  $\text{עַל}$  as usual when employed in this sense.—*Many* does not mean *all*, nor is *nations* to be anticipated from the other clause; there seems to be rather an antithesis between many individuals and many

nations. As a single people had despised him, so the whole world should admire him.  $\text{רָחַץ$  is a verbal noun, equivalent in this connexion to an infinitive or passive participle. It strictly means *corruption*, but is here put for disfiguration or deformity. De Dieu's derivation of this word from  $\text{רָחַץ}$  'to anoint,' has found no adherents among later writers. Henderson construes it with  $\text{רָחַץ$  (*the disfiguration of his appearance*), notwithstanding the interposition of  $\text{רָחַץ$ . The other recent writers make it the predicate and  $\text{רָחַץ$  the subject of the same proposition. By *look* and *form* we are neither to understand a mean condition nor the personal appearance, but, as an intermediate idea, the visible effects of suffering. The preposition *from*, *away from*, may be taken simply as expressive of comparison (*more than*), or more emphatically of negation (*so as not to be human*), which are only different gradations of the same essential meaning. Jahn supposes a climax in the use of  $\text{רָחַץ}$  and  $\text{רָחַץ}$ —his appearance should be far below that even of the lowest men; but this is looked upon by Hengstenberg as weakening the expression, and is certainly unnecessary, as well as founded on a dubious usage.— $\text{רָחַץ$  is the technical term of the Mosaic law for *sprinkling* water, oil, or blood, as a purifying rite. Jerome supposes a specific reference to the blood of Christ and the water of baptism. Hengstenberg gives the verb the secondary sense of cleansing, but still with reference to the effects of the atonement. The explanation of this word by the majority of modern writers as denoting that he shall cause them to leap for joy (Paulus, Winer, Gesenius in Comm.), or rise from their seats with reverence (Ewald, Gesenius in Thes.), or start with astonishment (Eichhorn, Hitzig), or be struck with cordial admiration (Clericus, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Umbreit, Knobel), is in direct opposition to a perfectly uniform Hebrew usage, and without any real ground even in Arabic analogy. The ostensible reasons for this gross violation of the clearest principles of lexicography are: first, the chimera of a perfect parallelism, which is never urged except in case of great necessity; and secondly, the fact that in every other case the verb is followed by the substance sprinkled, and connected with the object, upon which it is sprinkled, by a preposition. But since both the constructions of the verb 'to sprinkle' are employed in other languages—as we may either speak of sprinkling a person or of sprinkling water on him—the transition must be natural, and no one can pretend to say that two or more examples of it in a book of this size are required to demonstrate its existence. The real motive of the strange unanimity with which the true sense has been set aside, is the desire to obliterate this clear description, at the very outset, of the Servant of Jehovah as an expiatory purifier, one who must be innocent himself in order to cleanse others, an office and a character alike inapplicable either to the prophets as a class, or to Israel as a nation, or even to the better class of Jews, much more to any single individual except the One who claimed to

be the Purifier of the guilty, and to whom many nations do at this day ascribe whatever purity of heart or life they either have or hope for. Another objection to the modern explanation of the word is, that it then anticipates the declaration of the next clause, instead of forming a connecting link between it and the first. This clause is understood by some to mean that they shall be reverently silent *before him*, by others that they shall be dumb with wonder *on account of him*, by others that they shall be silent *respecting him*, i. e. no longer utter expressions of aversion or contempt. Gesenius asks whether kings ever personally bowed to Christ, as intimated here and in ch. 49 : 7 ; to which Hengstenberg replies, that the only word which creates the difficulty (*personally*) is supplied by the objector,—that multitudes of kings have bowed to Christ in one sense, whereas none, in any sense, have ever thus acknowledged their subjection to the prophets, or to Israel, or even to the pious Jews, or could have been expected so to do.—The reason of this voluntary humiliation is expressed in the last clause, viz. because they see things of which they had never had experience or even knowledge by report. This expression shows that *many nations* must be taken in its natural and proper sense, as denoting the gentiles. It is accordingly applied by Paul (Rom. 15 : 21) to the preaching of the gospel among those who had never before heard it. Interpreters have needlessly refined in interpreting the verb *see* as signifying mental no less than bodily perception. The truth is that the language is not scientific but poetical ; the writer does not put sight for experience, but on the contrary describes experience as simple vision.—For the stopping of the mouth, as an expression of astonishment or reverence, see Job 29 : 9. 40 : 4. Ps. 107 : 42. Ezek. 16 : 63. Mic. 7 : 16.

---

 CHAPTER LIII.

NOTWITHSTANDING these and other prophecies of the Messiah, he is not recognised when he appears, v. 1. He is not the object of desire and trust for whom the great mass of the people have been waiting, v. 2. Nay, his low condition, and especially his sufferings, make him rather an object of contempt, v. 3. But this humiliation and these sufferings are vicarious, not accidental or incurred by his own fault, vs. 4–6. Hence, though personally innocent, he is perfectly unresisting, v. 7. Even they for whom he suffers may mistake his person and his office, v. 8. His case presents the two

extremes of righteous punishment and perfect innocence, v. 9. But the glorious fruit of these very sufferings will correct all errors, v. 10. He becomes a Saviour only by becoming a substitute, v. 11. Even after the work of expiation is completed and his glorious reward secured, the work of intercession will be still continued, v. 12.

V. 1. *Who hath believed our report? and the arm of Jehovah, to whom (or upon whom) has it been revealed?* While most modern writers, as we have already seen, detach the three preceding verses and prefix them to this chapter, Hitzig goes to the opposite extreme of saying that the writer here begins afresh, without any visible connexion with the previous context. Ewald more reasonably makes this a direct continuation, but observes a change of tone, from that of joyous confidence to that of penitent confession, on the part of the believing Jews, in reference to their former incredulity. Martini, Jahn, and Rosenmüller put these words into the mouth of the heathen, acknowledging their error with respect to the sufferings of Israel. But this hypothesis, besides being arbitrary in itself, and unsustained by any parallel case in which the heathen are thus introduced as speaking, requires a forced interpretation to be put upon the language of the verse. Thus Rosenmüller understands the first clause as meaning, 'who of us would have believed this, had we merely heard instead of seeing it?' And the last clause in like manner, 'unto whom has the arm of Jehovah been revealed as unto us?' Gesenius and the later writers much more naturally understand the Prophet as speaking in his own name or in that of the prophets generally, not his predecessors or contemporaries merely, as Jerome and Van Der Palm assume without necessity. They also for the most part retain the strict sense of the preterite, which Hengstenberg and Hendewerk exchange for the present form, *believes* and *is revealed*.—שמעו is properly the passive participle of the verb to hear, the feminine being used like the neuter to denote what is heard, and may therefore be applied to rumour, to instruction, or to speech in general. (See ch. 28: 9, 19. Jer. 49: 14, and compare the Greek *ἀκοί*, Rom. 10: 16. Gal. 3: 2. 1 Thess. 2: 13.) Hitzig supposes that the word was here suggested by the שמעו of the preceding verse. The restricted applications of the term, by Gesenius and Maurer to the news of the deliverance from Babylon, and by Hendewerk to the preceding strophe (ch. 52: 7-15), are alike gratuitous. Martini, Jahn, and Rosenmüller, in accordance with their notion that the heathen are here speaking, understand the whole phrase passively, as meaning 'that which we have heard;' and the same sense, on a wholly different hypothesis, is also given by Umbreit and Knobel, the last of whom applies the term to that which the Prophet is described as having heard in ch. 50: 4, 5. Gesenius, Hengstenberg, and others understand it actively, as meaning that which we have published in the hearing of

others; which agrees well with the context and with Paul's quotation (Rom. 10:16), and is perfectly consistent with the strict sense of the Hebrew words, though not sustained by any definite usage, as Henderson alleges. That the words might have either of these senses in different connexions, may be gathered from the fact, that in 2 Sam. 4:4, the qualifying noun denotes neither the author nor the recipient of the declaration, but its subject, so that in itself the phrase is quite indefinite. Some understand the interrogation in this clause as implying an absolute negation, which, according to Hendewerk, includes the very Servant of Jehovah himself, who is described as blind and deaf in ch. 42:19. But there, as we have seen, the prominent idea in the Servant of Jehovah is the Body, whereas here it is the Head. According to Hengstenberg the implied negation is not absolute, but simply expressive of wonder at the paucity of true believers in the world at large, but more especially among the Jews, to whom, with Van Der Palm, he understands the passage as specifically referring, because it had already been predicted, in the foregoing verse, that the heathen would believe. There is no inconsistency, however, even if we take the words before us in their widest sense; because, as Calvin has observed, the Prophet interrupts his prediction of success and triumph to bewail the discouragements and disappointments which should intervene. The same thing had already been predicted indirectly in ch. 42:24, and similar objections to his own assurances occur in ch. 49:14, 24. The last clause is understood by Knobel as assigning a reason for the unbelief described in the first: they did not believe what they heard, because they did not see the arm of Jehovah visibly revealed. But most interpreters regard the two as parallel expressions of the same idea,—to believe what God said, and to see his arm revealed, being really identical. The advent of Christ, his miracles, his resurrection, his ascension, are among the clearest proofs of the divine omnipotence and of its real exercise, a skeptical misgiving as to which is involved in a refusal to believe. The *arm* as the seat of active strength is often put for strength itself (2 Chr. 32:8. Job 22:8. Jer. 17:5), and especially for the power of Jehovah (ch. 59:16. Deut. 4:34. 5:15. 26:8). In this sense it is commonly regarded as convertible with *hand*; but Hendewerk maintains that the latter only is applied to a gracious exercise of power (ch. 41:20. 45:11, 12. 48:13. 49:2, 22. 59:1), while the former always has respect to war (ch. 40:10. 52:10. 63:5. 59:16). He therefore gives the clause exclusive reference to what God had already done for Cyrus and designed to do for Israel, by making them victorious over all their enemies. But this distinction, though ingenious, is fallacious; because it confounds the usual application of a figure with its essential meaning, and entirely overlooks the many cases in which *hand* has reference to the divine vengeance (e. g. ch. 9:11, 20. 10:4. 19:16. 25:10).

51 : 17), while in some of the cases where the arm is mentioned (ch. 40 : 12 and 51 : 5) it is hard to discover any reference to war. But the true solution of the difficulty is, that the manifestation of God's justice is commonly described by Isaiah as including at the same time the deliverance of his friends and the destruction of his enemies. (See above, ch. 51 : 5).—The use of  $\text{זֶרַע}$  in the last clause is explained by some as a mere variation of the usual construction with  $\text{זֶרַע}$  or  $\text{זֶרַע}$ ; but Hengstenberg regards it as implying that the revelation comes from above, and Hitzig supposes an allusion to the elevation of the arm itself.

V. 2. *And he came up like the tender plant before him, and like the root from a dry ground; he had no form nor comeliness, and we shall see him, and no sight that we should desire it.* There is something almost ludicrous to modern readers in Vitringa's pedantic notion that the Prophet puts these words into the mouth of a chorus of converted Jews. There is also something too artificial in Van Der Palm's dramatic distribution of the passage, according to which the Prophet's censure of the unbelief of the Jews (v. 1) is followed by their justification of it (vs. 2, 3), while the first clause of the fourth verse contains the Prophet's answer and the last the rejoinder of the Jews, after which the Prophet speaks again without any further interruption. Most of the modern writers agree with Gesenius in making all that follows the first verse the language of the people acknowledging their own incredulity with respect to the Messiah, and assigning as its cause their carnal expectations of a temporal prince, and their ignorance of the very end for which he came. The hypothesis of Rosenmüller and others who regard this as the language of the heathen, acknowledging their error with respect to Israel, has been already mentioned. (See above, on ch. 52 : 13.) A novel and ingenious but untenable hypothesis has been more recently proposed by Hendewerk, viz. that the speakers are the elder race of exiles in Babylon, by whose transgressions that infliction was occasioned, and that the sufferer here described is the younger race, for whose sake it was terminated, just as in the case of the fathers and children who came out of Egypt.—The  $\text{ו}$  at the beginning of this verse is not causative but narrative, determining the past sense of the future form and connecting the sentence, either with ch. 52 : 14 or 15, or, which is the simplest and most natural construction, with the verse immediately preceding, which, although interrogative in form, involves an affirmation, namely, that the people were incredulous, which general statement is here amplified.—The common version of  $\text{וַיִּצְמַח}$  as a future proper (*he shall grow up*) is utterly precluded by the Vav conversive, and gratuitously violates the uniformity of the description, which presents the humiliation of Messiah as already past.— $\text{וַיִּצְמַח}$  is properly a *suckling*, but is here used precisely like the cognate

English word *sucker*, by which Lowth translates it. On the meaning of שֶׁרֶשׁ, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 228.—*Out of a dry ground* implies a feeble, sickly growth, and as its consequence a mean appearance. The dry ground, according to Alexander Morus, is Bethlehem, which he describes, on the authority of Strabo, as a barren spot. Along with this may be recorded the opinion of Eusebius and other Fathers, that the dry ground was the Virgin Mary; of which Calvin might well say, *extra rem loquuntur*. *Out of a dry ground* and the parallel expression (*before him*) may be considered as qualifying both the nouns, and separated only for the sake of the rhythmical arrangement of the sentence. *Before him* is translated by Henderson *before them*, and by Lowth *in their sight*, in accordance with the explanation of J. H. Michaelis, who regards it as descriptive of the popular misapprehension and contempt of Christ. Most writers take it strictly as a singular, referring to *Jehovah*, and analogous in meaning to those words of Peter, *disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious* (1 Pet. 2: 4). It is well observed by Henderson, however, that it was not in the sight of God that the Messiah was a root out of a dry ground, but in that of the people.—*He had not*, literally, there was not to him, the only form in which that idea can be expressed in Hebrew.—*Form* is here put for beautiful or handsome form; as in 1 Sam. 16: 18, David is called a *man of form*, i. e. a comely person. The two nouns here used are combined in literal description elsewhere (e. g. Gen. 29: 17. 1 Sam. 25: 31), and in this very passage (see above, ch. 52: 13). They denote in this case, not mere personal appearance, but the whole state of humiliation, and as Calvin says are to be understood *de toto regno cujus nulla in oculis hominum forma, nullus decor, nulla magnificentia fuit*.—The modern writers generally disregard the masoretic interpunction of this sentence, and connect אֵינֶנּוּ with the first clause, as a parallel to אֵינֶנּוּ. The meaning then is, no form or beauty that we should look at him, no appearance that we should desire him. This is precisely the construction adopted by Symmachus, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν, ἵνα ἐπιθυμῶμεν. But as this relation of the clauses is too obvious to have escaped the masoretic critics, it is reasonable to conclude that they were influenced in setting it aside by high traditional authority. There is besides a difficulty, if it be retained, in explaining the use of the verb אָרָא, which means to view with pleasure only when followed by the preposition בְּ, and the sense *that we should look at him* does not seem entirely adequate. If we adhere to the masoretic interpunction, there is no need of paraphrasing אֵינֶנּוּ with the English Version (*when we shall see him*); it is better to give it its direct and proper sense (*and we shall see him*). But as both these versions suppose a transition from the form of narrative to that of prophecy, there is the same objection to them as to the common version of אֵינֶנּוּ. On the whole, therefore, leaving out of view the authority of the

Masorah, the usual construction is the most satisfactory.—In what sense the prophets thus grew up like suckers from a dry soil, or the Jewish nation while in exile, or the pious portion of them, or the younger race, it is as difficult to understand, or even to conceive, as it is easy to recognise this trait of the prophetic picture in the humiliation of our Saviour, and the general contempt to which it exposed him.

V. 3. *Despised and forsaken of men* (or *ceasing from among men*), *a man of sorrows and acquainted with sickness, and like one hiding the face from him* (or *us*), *despised, and we esteemed him not*. From the general description of his humiliation, the Prophet now passes to a more particular account of his sufferings.— $\text{לְרֵיבֹהֶן}$ , from  $\text{לְרֵיבֹהֶן}$  to cease, is by some taken in a passive and by others in an active sense. On the former supposition, the whole phrase may mean *rejected of men* (English Version), *forsaken by men*, i. e. by his friends, as in Job 19 : 14 (Gesenius), or *avoided by men*, as an object of abhorrence (Hitzig, Ewald, Hendewerk). On the other supposition, it is explained by Hengstenberg as meaning one who ceases from among men, i. e. ceases to be a man or to be so considered. This is probably the sense intended by the Septuagint version, and is certainly the one expressed by Aben Ezra ( $\text{לְרֵיבֹהֶן עִם אֲנָשִׁים}$ ). The version of Symmachus ( $\text{\textit{\epsilon}\textit{\lambda}\textit{\lambda}\textit{\iota}\textit{\chi}\textit{\iota}\textit{\sigma}\textit{\tau}\textit{o}\textit{s}} \textit{\textit{\alpha}}\textit{\rho}\textit{\theta}\textit{\epsilon}\textit{\omega}\textit{s}}$ ), with which the Vulgate and Peshito substantially agree, seems to rest upon the same construction of  $\text{לְרֵיבֹהֶן}$  that is proposed by Martini, who regards both this word and  $\text{לְרֵיבֹהֶן}$  as adjectives deriving a superlative import from the plural following, the most despised and forsaken of men. (Compare Ps. 22 : 7. Prov. 15 : 20.) But for this sense there is no authority in usage.—The phrase *man of sorrows* seems to mean one whose afflictions are his chief characteristic, perhaps with an allusion to their number in the plural form. (Compare Prov. 29 : 1.) Symmachus translates the phrase  $\text{\textit{\gamma}\textit{\rho}\textit{o}\textit{s}\textit{\tau}\textit{o}\textit{s}} \textit{\textit{\rho}\textit{o}\textit{s}\textit{\tau}\textit{o}\textit{s}}$ , which is generally understood to mean, known or distinguished by disease; and this sense is retained by J. D. Michaelis, Paulus, Jahn, Rosenmüller, Gesenius in his Commentary, Maurer, and Umbreit. The Septuagint, Vulgate, and Peshito, give the first word the sense of *knowing* ( $\text{\textit{\epsilon}\textit{\iota}\textit{\delta}\textit{o}\textit{s}}$ , *sciens*), from which Lowth infers that they read  $\text{יָדַעַתְּ$ . But Hengstenberg and others have shown that the passive participle is itself employed like *acquainted* in English, so that there is no need of supposing any difference of text, or even that the passive form was used in an active sense. (Compare Song Sol. 3 : 8. Ps. 112 : 7. 103 : 14.) Gesenius in his Commentary characterizes this interpretation of the word as “false,” but quietly adopts it in the second edition of his German Version.—In the next phrase  $\text{לְרֵיבֹהֶן}$  is by some regarded as a participle and by others as a noun. On the former supposition, the entire phrase is explained by the Septuagint, Vulgate, Targum, Aquila, Jarchi, Lowth,



Koppe, De Wette, and others, as meaning, *he was like one hiding his face from us*, with allusion to the veiling of the face by lepers (Lev. 13 : 45) or by mourners (2 Sam. 15 : 30. Ez. 14 : 17), or as an expression of shame (Micah 3 : 7). To this Gesenius objects in his Commentary, that the whole description has respect not to the conduct of the sufferer but to his appearance in the sight of others. In the Thesaurus, he adopts this very explanation, without noticing his own objection, though he still avows a preference for his former construction, notwithstanding the harshness with which it may be charged, viz. like one from whom one hides the face. J. H. Michaelis and Rosenmüller give the Hiphil, as usual, a causative sense, like one making (others) hide the face from him. But in every other case  $\text{הִתְחַיֵּי}$  simply means to hide, and occurs repeatedly in that sense with this very noun  $\text{פָּנָי}$ . It may also be objected to the explanation of the word as a participle, that analogy and usage would require the form  $\text{מְתַחַיֵּי}$ , which is actually found in four manuscripts, but no doubt as a conjectural emendation. Kimchi, Martini, and Hengstenberg, take  $\text{הִתְחַיֵּי}$  as an abstract noun, meaning properly *concealment*, and explain the whole phrase, like concealment of the face from it, i. e. like that which causes men to hide the face from it. But although the hiding of the face is elsewhere mentioned as a natural expression of displeasure, shame, and sorrow, it does not occur as an expression of contemptuous astonishment, and seems to be a forced and exaggerated method of expressing such a feeling. It may therefore be better on the whole to combine the explanation of  $\text{הִתְחַיֵּי}$  as a noun with that of  $\text{פָּנָי}$  as a pronoun of the first person, and to understand the whole phrase as meaning, like a hiding of the face from us, i. e. as if he hid his face from us in shame and sorrow; notwithstanding the objection of Gesenius, that the subject of description is not the demeanour of the sufferer, which has not only been abandoned by himself (although renewed by Hengstenberg), but is in itself unreasonable, since the writer's purpose was not to observe the unities of rhetoric, but to make a strong impression of the voluntary humiliation of the Messiah, which could not be more effectively secured by any single stroke than by the one before us, thus explained.—Gesenius, Hengstenberg, and Umbreit follow the Peshito in making  $\text{הִתְחַיֵּי}$  the first person plural (*we despised him*); and Martini supplies the want of a suffix by reading  $\text{נִבְזֵי לָא}$  instead of  $\text{נִבְזֵי וְלָא}$ . But the anomalous use of the future creates a difficulty not to be gratuitously introduced; and the analogy of  $\text{הִתְחַיֵּי}$  in the first clause makes it much more natural to take this as a participle likewise, with the other ancient versions, and with Maurer, Hitzig, Ewald, and Knobel.—Here again the reader is invited to compare the forced application of this verse to the Prophets, to all Israel, to the pious Jews, or to the younger race of exiles, with the old interpretation of it as a prophecy of Christ's humiliation.

V. 4. *Surely our sicknesses he bore, and our griefs he carried; and we thought him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.* וְנָס is determined, both by its etymology and usage, to be a participle of affirmation. The sense of *but*, assumed by most interpreters, is rather what they think the writer should have said than what he has said. The comparatively rare use of adversative particles in Hebrew has already been mentioned as a striking idiomatic peculiarity. The metaphor is that of a burden, and the meaning of the whole verse, that they had misunderstood the very end for which Messiah was to come. *Sickness*, as in the verse preceding, is a representative expression for all suffering. *Our griefs*, those which we must otherwise have suffered, and that justly. The plural חֲלָוֵינוּ is defectively written for חֲלָוֵינוּ, which last appears, however, in eleven manuscripts and eighteen editions; while on the other hand twenty manuscripts and two editions have the defective form חֲלָוֵנוּ, which cannot be singular, because the pronoun which refers to it is plural. Henderson makes his English version more expressive of the writer's main drift by employing the idiomatic form, *it was our griefs he bore, it was our sorrows he carried.*—The explanation of נָס as meaning merely *took away*, is contradicted by the context and especially by the parallel phrase בָּרָאָהוּ, which can only mean *he bore or carried them*. It is alleged indeed that one is never said to bear the sins of another, and some go so far as to explain these words as meaning that he bore with them patiently, while others understand the sense to be that he shared in the sufferings of others. But the terms are evidently drawn from the Mosaic law of sacrifice, a prominent feature in which is the substitution of the victim for the actual offender, so that the former *bears* the sins of the latter, and the latter, in default of such an expiation, is said to bear his own sin. (See Lev. 5:1, 17. 17:16. 24:15. Num. 9:13. 14:33. Ex. 23:38. Lev. 10:17. 16:22.) For the use of בָּרָאָהוּ in the same vicarious sense, see Lam. 5:7. (Compare Ez. 18:19.) The Septuagint in the case before us has *ἠένεκεν*, Symmachus *ἀνέλαβε*. The application of these words by Matthew (8:17) to the removal of bodily diseases cannot involve a denial of the doctrine of vicarious atonement, which is clearly recognised in Matt. 20:28; nor is it an exposition of the passage quoted in its full sense, but, as Calvin well explains it, an intimation that the prediction had begun to be fulfilled, because already its effects were visible, the Scriptures always representing sorrow as the fruit of sin.—*Stricken*, as in some other cases, has the pregnant sense of *stricken from above*, as Noyes expresses it, or *smitten of God*, as it is fully expressed in the next clause. (See Gen. 12:17. 2 Kings 15:5. 1 Sam. 6:9.) There is no need, therefore, of supposing an ellipsis. The other verb חָרַב was particularly applied to the infliction of disease (Num. 14:12. Deut. 28:22), especially the leprosy; which led Jerome to give חָרַב the specific sense *leprous*. Hence the old

Jewish notion that the Messiah was to be a leper. Theodoret more correctly uses the generic term *μεμιαστωμένος*, equivalent to the *πληγὴς θεοῦ μάστιγι* of Æschylus.—Instead of the construct form *הַמָּצִיץ*, some manuscripts exhibit the absolute *הַמָּצִץ*; which is preferred by Bellarmine and some others, who explain the whole phrase as meaning *a stricken God*, and use it as a proof of the divinity of Christ.—By stricken, smitten, and afflicted, we are of course not to understand stricken, smitten, and afflicted for his own sins, or merely stricken, smitten, and afflicted, without any deeper cause or higher purpose than in other cases of severe suffering. It is scarcely necessary to suppose a reference to the notion that great suffering was a proof of great iniquity. (Compare Luke 13 : 1. John 9 : 2.)—In order to reconcile this verse with their hypotheses, Knobel and Hendewerk are under the necessity of proving that the pious Jews or younger race of exiles suffered more in the captivity than any others, which they do with great ease by applying thus all the descriptions of maltreatment which occur throughout the Later Prophecies.

V. 5. *And he was pierced (or wounded) for our transgressions, bruised (or crushed) for our iniquities; the chastisement (or punishment) of our peace (was) upon him, and by his stripes we were healed.* The translation of the participle at the beginning by *whereas, yea*, or the like, is a departure from the Hebrew idiom wholly unnecessary to the clearness of the passage, which is continued in the simple narrative or descriptive form. Aben Ezra's application of the verse to the sufferings of the Jews in their present exile and dispersion, is worthy of a place by the side of Hendewerk's assertion that the Prophet here speaks as one of the older race of captives in Babylon, acknowledging the error of himself and his contemporaries with respect to the younger and better generation.—*לְפָנָיו* is derived by Cocceius from *לָפַי* to writhe with pain, and translated *exercuciatus est*; but the true derivation is no doubt the common one from *לָפַי* to perforate, transfix, or pierce with special reference to mortal wounds,—so that the derivative *לְפָנָיו*, though strictly meaning pierced or wounded, is constantly applied to persons slain by violence, and especially in battle. Hence the Peshito version of *לְפָנָיו* (*killed*), although apparently inaccurate, is really in strict accordance with the Hebrew usage. Vitringa and Henderson suppose a particular allusion to the crucifixion. Hengstenberg explains the word more generally as a metaphorical expression for extreme suffering. This agrees well with the parallel expression, *crushed or bruised*, to which there is nothing literally corresponding in our Saviour's passion; and if this must be taken as a figure for distress of mind or suffering in general, the other can be naturally understood only in the same way. It is very possible, however, that there may be a secondary and implicit reference to the crucifixion, such as we have met with repeatedly before in cases where the direct and proper meaning of

the words was more extensive.—As  $\text{רָפָא}$  is often applied elsewhere to correction by words, some explain it to mean here *instruction*, as to the means of obtaining peace with God. But the stronger sense of *chastisement* or punishment not only suits the context better, but is really the most consistent with the usage of the verbal root, and of the noun itself, in such cases as Job 5 : 17. Prov. 22 : 15. 23 : 13, as well as with the subsequent expression *on him*, which is hardly reconcilable with the supposition of mere precept or example. Whether the word was intended at the same time, as Hengstenberg supposes, to suggest the idea of a warning to others, may be made a question. The chastisement of peace is not only that which tends to peace, but that by which peace is procured directly. It is not, to use the words of an extreme and zealous rationalist, a chastisement morally salutary for us, nor one which merely contributes to our safety, but, according to the parallelism, one which has accomplished our salvation, and in this way, that it was inflicted not on us but on him, so that we came off safe and uninjured. (Hitzig.) The application of the phrase to Christ, without express quotation, is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament. (See Eph. 2 : 14–17. Col. 1 : 20, 21. Heb. 13 : 20, and compare Isaiah 9 : 6. Mic. 6 : 5. Zech. 1 : 13.)— $\text{הַרְפָּיָהוּ}$  is properly a singular, denoting the tumour raised by scourging, here put collectively for stripes, and that for suffering in general, but probably with secondary reference to the literal infliction of this punishment upon the Saviour.— $\text{רָפָא}$  is not a noun, as Henderson explains it, but a passive verb, here used impersonally, *it was healed to us*, the  $\text{לָנוּ}$  limiting the action to a specific object. *It was healed* is a general proposition; *with respect to us* is the specific limitation. The use of the  $\text{לָנוּ}$  may be otherwise explained by supposing that the verb has here the modified sense of *healing was imparted*, as in v. 11  $\text{לְהַרְפִּיאוֹתַי}$  means to impart righteousness or justification. Healing is a natural and common figure for relief from suffering considered as a wound or malady. (Compare ch. 6 : 10. 19 : 22. 30 : 26. Jer. 8 : 22. 50 : 17. 2 Chron. 7 : 14.) The preterite is not used merely to signify the certainty of the event, but because this effect is considered as inseparable from the procuring cause which had been just before described in the historical or narrative form as an event already past: when he was smitten we were thereby healed. It is therefore injurious to the strength as well as to the beauty of the sentence, to translate with Henderson, *that by his stripes we might be healed*. The mere contingency thus stated is immeasurably less than the positive assertion that *by his stripes we were healed*. The same objection, in a less degree, applies to the common version, *we are healed*, which makes the statement too indefinite, and robs it of its peculiar historical form.—Above thirty manuscripts and as many editions have  $\text{רָפָאוּ}$  in the plural, a form which does not occur elsewhere.—The hypothesis that this passage has

exclusive reference to the Babylonish exile, becomes absolutely ludicrous when it requires us to understand the Prophet as here saying that the people were healed (i. e. restored to their own land) by the stripes of the prophets, or by those of the true believers, or that the old and wicked race were healed by the stripes of their more devout successors. This last hypothesis of Hendewerk's, besides the weak points which it has in common with the others, involves two very improbable assumptions: first, that the distinction of good and bad was coincident with that of young and old among the exiles; and secondly, that this younger race was not only better than the older, but endured more suffering.

V. 6. *All we like sheep had gone astray, each to his own way we had turned, and Jehovah laid on him the iniquity of us all.* This verse describes the occasion or rather the necessity of the sufferings mentioned in those before it. It was because men were wholly estranged from God, and an atonement was required for their reconciliation. *All we* does not mean all the Jews or all the heathen, but all men without exception. The common version, *have gone astray, have turned*, does not express the historical form of the original sufficiently, but rather means we have done so up to the present time, whereas the prominent idea in the Prophet's mind is that we had done so before Messiah suffered. Noyes's version *we were going astray* is ambiguous, because it may imply nothing more than an incipient estrangement.—The figure of wandering or lost sheep is common in Scripture to denote alienation from God and the misery which is its necessary consequence. (See Ezek. 34: 5. Matth. 9: 36.) The entire comparison is probably that of sheep without a shepherd (1 Kings 22: 17. Zech. 10: 2). The second clause is understood by Augusti as denoting selfishness and a defect of public spirit or benevolence; and this interpretation is admitted by Hengstenberg as correct if "taken in a deeper sense," viz. that union among men can only spring from their common union with God. But this idea, however just it may be in itself, is wholly out of place in a comparison with scattered sheep, whose running off in different directions does not spring from selfishness but from confusion, ignorance, and incapacity to choose the right path. A much better exposition of the figure, although still too limited, is that of Theodoret, who understands it to denote the vast variety of false religions, as exemplified by the different idols worshipped in Egypt, Phenicia, Scythia, and Greece, alike in nothing but the common error of departure from the true God. *Εἰ καὶ διάφοροι τῆς πλάνης οἱ τρόποι, πάντες ὁμοίως τὸν ὄντα θεὸν καταλείπότες.*—The original expression is like *the sheep* (or collectively the flock) i. e. not sheep in general but the sheep that wander or that have no shepherd.—The idea of a shepherd, although not expressed,

appears to have been present to the writer's mind, not only in the first clause but the last, where the image meant to be presented is no doubt that of a shepherd laying down his life for the sheep. This may be fairly inferred not merely from the want of connexion which would otherwise exist between the clauses, and which can only be supplied in this way, nor even from the striking analogy of Zech. 13 : 7 where the figure is again used, but chiefly from the application of the metaphor, with obvious though tacit reference to this part of Isaiah, in the New Testament to Christ's laying down his life for his people. (See John 10 : 11-13 and 1 Peter 2 : 24, 25.)—The reading of one manuscript,  $\text{זָּרַח}$  for  $\text{זָּרַחַת}$ , is probably an accidental variation. The meaning given to this verb in the margin of the English Bible (*made to meet*) is not sustained by etymology or usage, as the primitive verb  $\text{זָּרַח}$  does not mean simply to come together, but always denotes some degree of violent collision, either physical as when one body lights or strikes upon another, or moral, as when one person falls upon i. e. attacks another. The secondary senses of the verb are doubtful and of rare occurrence. (See above, on ch. 47 : 3, and below, on ch. 64 : 4.) Kimchi supposes the punishment of sin to be here represented as an enemy whom God permitted or impelled to fall upon, assail, the sufferer. Vitringa and Henderson, with much more questionable taste, suppose the image to be that of a wild beast by which the flock is threatened, and from which it is delivered only by the interposition and vicarious exposure of the shepherd to its fury. Most interpreters appear to be agreed in giving it a more generic sense. The common version (*laid upon him*) is objectionable only because it is too weak, and suggests the idea of a mild and inoffensive gesture, whereas that conveyed by the Hebrew word is necessarily a violent one, viz. that of causing to strike or fall, which is faithfully expressed by Umbreit (*liess fallen*), still more closely by Ewald and De Wette (*liess treffen*), and correctly but less definitely by Gesenius, Hengstenberg, and others (*warf*). Among the ancient versions Symmachus has *zaratrisai epoihsen*, and Jerome *posuit in eo*, which last, although it scarcely gives the full sense of the verb, retains that of the preposition, as denoting strictly *in him*, i. e. not merely on his head or on his body, but in his soul, or rather in his person, as expressive of the whole man. The word  $\text{זָּרַח}$  does not of itself mean punishment, but sin; which, however, is said to have been laid upon the Messiah, only in reference to its effects. If vicarious suffering can be described in words, it is so described in these two verses; so that the attempts to explain them as denoting mere forbearance or participation in the punishment of others, may be fairly regarded as desperate expedients to make the passage applicable to the imaginary persecutions of the prophets, or the pious Jews, or the younger race during the Babylonish exile. The amount of ingenuity

expended on these sophisms only shows how artificial and devoid of solid basis the hypotheses must be which require to be thus supported.—With this and the foregoing verse compare Rom. 4 : 25. 2 Cor. 5 : 21. 1 Pet. 2 : 22-25.

V. 7. *He was oppressed and he humbled himself, and he will not open his mouth—as a lamb to the slaughter is brought, and as a sheep before its shearers is dumb—and he will not open his mouth.* Having explained the occasion of Messiah's sufferings, the Prophet now describes his patient endurance of them. As  $\text{שָׁרַף}$  is sometimes applied to the rigorous exaction of debts, De Dieu translates it here *exactus est*, Tremellius *exigebatur poena*. Lowth has the same sense, but makes the verb impersonal, *it was exacted and he was made answerable*; but  $\text{שָׁרַף}$  is not used like the Latin *respondeo* as a technical forensic term. Van Der Palm explains the first verb, *he was demanded*, i. e. by the people, to be crucified; but  $\text{שָׁרַף}$  does not mean to demand in general, its primary meaning is to urge or press. (See ch. 3 : 5, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 43.) The general voice of the interpreters is strongly in favour of the old translation, *he was oppressed or persecuted*.—The next phrase has been usually understood as a simple repetition of the same idea in other words. Thus the English Version renders it, *he was oppressed and he was afflicted*. Besides the tautology of this translation (which would prove nothing by itself), it fails to represent the form of the original, in which the pronoun  $\text{וְהוּא}$  is introduced before the second verb, and according to usage must be regarded as emphatic. Martini's proposition to transpose the particle, so as to read  $\text{וְהוּא שָׁרַף וְשָׁרַף}$ , is merely an ingenious expedient to evade a difficulty of construction. Gesenius gives  $\text{וְהוּא}$  the sense of *although*, and explains the whole as meaning that he was oppressed although before afflicted, and the same interpretation is adopted by Umbreit, Hendewerk, and Knobel. There does not seem to be much force in Hengstenberg's objection, that  $\text{וְהוּא}$  as well as  $\text{שָׁרַף}$  is applied to severe suffering. Gesenius's interpretation would be no less admissible on the supposition that the verbs are perfectly synonymous, the distinction lying not in the verbs themselves, but in the *ohnehin* which he supplies. The true objection is that he does supply it, arbitrarily referring the two verbs to different points of time, and also that the meaning which he gives  $\text{וְהוּא}$  is forced and foreign from Hebrew usage. The same objection lies against Hitzig's construction of the clause, *he was oppressed, and although persecuted opened not his mouth*, which moreover omits in translation not only the first *Vav* but the second. Ewald explains it thus: *he was persecuted although he humbled himself*. The same reflexive meaning had been given to  $\text{וְהוּא}$  by Koppe, Jahn, and others, and appears to be implied in the paraphrastic versions of Symmachus (*καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπήκουσε*) and Jerome (*quia ipse voluit*). Supposing

this sense of the verb to be admissible, by far the simplest and most natural construction is to give  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה}$  its ordinary sense as a conjunction and emphatic pronoun, *he was oppressed and he himself submitted to affliction*, or allowed himself to be afflicted. There is then no tautology nor any arbitrary difference of tense assumed between the two verbs, while the whole sense is good in itself and in perfect agreement with the context. The same sense, substantially, is put upon the clause by Beek's explanation of  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה}$  as the first person plural (*wir erwiesen uns tyrannisch*); which is favoured by the obvious opposition of the first and third person in the preceding verse, and by the use of  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה}$  in this. All other writers seem agreed, however, that  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה}$  is the third person singular of Niphal. All interpreters, perhaps without exception, render  $\text{וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה}$  as a praeter or a present, which is no doubt substantially correct, as the whole passage is descriptive. It seems desirable, however, to retain, as far as possible, the characteristic form of the original, especially as it is very hard to account for the repeated use of the future here, if nothing more was intended than might have been expressed by the praeter. At all events, the strict sense of the form should be retained, if it can be done without injury to the sense, which is certainly the case here, as we have only to suppose that the writer suddenly but naturally changes his position from that of historical retrospection to that of actual participation in the passing scene, and, as if he saw the victim led to the slaughter, says, 'he will not open his mouth.' There is no need, therefore, of supposing with Hitzig that the  $\text{ו}$ , though separated from the verb, exerts a conversive influence upon it. The repetition of the same words at the end, so far from being even a rhetorical defect, is highly graphic and impressive. In the intermediate clause, we may either suppose an ellipsis of the relative, equally common in Hebrew and in English (like a lamb *which* is led), or suppose the preposition to be used as a conjunction (*as a lamb is led*), without effect upon the meaning of the sentence. The  $\text{ו}$  before the last clause is not the sign of the apodosis, nor need it be translated *so*, the form adopted in the Septuagint version (*οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα*), for the purpose of showing that the words refer to the subject of the first clause, and not to the sheep or lamb, as Luther and Gesenius assume, in violation of the syntax ( $\text{לְבָרָה}$  being feminine) and the poetical structure of the sentence, which depends materially on the repetition of the same words in the same sense and application as before. Besides those places where Christ is called the Lamb of God (e. g. John 1 : 29. 1 Peter 1 : 18, 19. Acts 8 : 32, 35), there seems to be reference to this description of his meek endurance in 1 Peter 2 : 23.—It might seem almost incredible, if it were not merely one out of a thousand such examples, that Vitringa formally propounds the question, *quando tonsus sit Christus Dominus?* and gravely answers, when he was shorn of his prerogatives and rights by the Jewish Sanhedrim. As if there were no



difference, or as if such a man as Vitranga could not see it, between saying he was silent and submissive like a sheep before its shearers, and saying he was silent and submissive before his shearers like a sheep.

V. 8. *From distress and from judgment he was taken; and in his generation who will think, that he was cut off from the land of the living, for the transgression of my people, (as) a curse for them?* Every clause of this verse has been made the subject of dispute among interpreters. The first question is, whether the particle at the beginning denotes the occasion or the cause, as all agree that it does before  $\text{עָצָר}$  in the last clause, or whether it is to be taken in its ordinary sense of *from*. This is connected with another question, viz. whether *taken* means delivered, or taken up, or taken away to execution, or taken out of life. It is also disputed whether  $\text{עָצָר}$  means imprisonment or oppression and distress in general, and also whether  $\text{עָצָר}$  means judicial process, sentence, or punishment. From the combination of these various explanations have resulted several distinct interpretations of the whole clause. Thus the text of the English Version has, he was taken from prison and from judgment; the margin of the same, he was taken away by distress and judgment; Hengstenberg and others, he was taken (to execution) by an oppressive judgment. Most of the older writers understand these words as descriptive of his exaltation—from distress and judgment he was freed or taken up to heaven. So Jerome and J. H. Michaelis. Gesenius, Rückert, and Umbreit also understand it to mean that he was freed from his sufferings by death. To this interpretation Hengstenberg objects, that the account of the Messiah's exaltation begins in v. 10, while the intervening verse still relates to the circumstances of his death; and also that the reference of  $\text{עָצָר}$  to a violent death is here determined by the parallel expression, 'he was cut off from the land of the living.' He might have added that even in Gen. 5:24 and 2 Kings 2:9, 10, the word is used in reference to a singular departure from the ordinary course of nature. Luzzatto and Henderson give  $\text{עָצָר}$  the privative sense of *without*, and understand the clause to mean that he was taken off without restraint or authority. The same construction seems to have been anticipated by Zwingli, who paraphrases the expression thus, *indictâ causâ citraque judicium*.—In the next clause, the interpretation turns upon the question whether  $\text{עָצָר}$  means life, dwelling, posterity, or contemporaries, and the verb to think or speak. Luther, Calvin, and Vitranga understand the clause to mean, who can declare the length of his life hereafter? Kimchi and Hengstenberg explain it to mean, who can declare his posterity or spiritual seed? To this it is objected that the verb requires a connective particle before its object, and that Christ is not called the father but the brother of his people, and that  $\text{עָצָר}$  has this sense

only in the plural. Clericus supposes it to mean, who can worthily describe his course of life? But this sense of  $\text{לִי־דֹר}$  is not sustained by usage. Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and others follow Storr in making  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$  an absolute nominative—as to his generation (i. e. his contemporaries), who considered it, or cared for it? To this construction Hengstenberg objects that  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$  seldom if ever denotes the subject of the verb, and also that  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$  is then left without an object. Neither of these objections lies against Ewald's modification of this same exposition, which makes  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$  a preposition, and continues the interrogation through the sentence—in (or among) his generation (i. e. his contemporaries), who considered that he was cut off from the land of the living, etc.? Hofmann's extravagant interpretation of the clause as meaning, who cares for his dwelling, i. e. where he is? deserves no refutation.— $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$ ; according to some writers, is employed in Ps. 88: 6 and Lam. 3: 54, in reference to a natural and quiet death; but Hengstenberg maintains that even there a violent departure is implied.—Paulus infers from the singular form  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$ , that Jehovah here begins to speak again; but Hengstenberg explains it as equivalent to *us*, and a similar use of the singular form by a plurality of speakers is exemplified in 1 Sam. 5: 10. Zech. 8: 21.—Of the last words  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$  there are several interpretations. Aben Ezra and Abarbenel, followed by Rosenmüller and Gesenius, apply them to the sufferer here described, as meaning, he was smitten, and infer from the use of the plural suffix that the subject of the chapter is collective. Others adopt the same sense and application of the words, but deny the inference, upon the ground that  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$ , though properly a plural suffix, is not unfrequently used for a singular, as the very same form is in Ethiopic. This ground is also maintained by Ewald in his Grammar. Hengstenberg admits that the pronoun is here plural, but refers it to the people, and supplies a relative—for the transgression of my people who were smitten, literally to whom there was a stroke or punishment, i. e. due or appointed. Ewald, without supposing an ellipsis, renders it, a stroke for them, i. e. smitten in their place and for their benefit. Cocceius gives the same sense to the words, but applies them very differently as a description of the people, *plaga ipsis adhaeret*, i. e. *impuri sunt*. (See the use of  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$  in Ex. 11: 1.)—According to Hendewerk, *the land of the living* is the Holy Land, and the verse is descriptive of the Babylonish exile. 'By a divine judgment was the people taken away, and yet who can declare its future increase? It was cut off from its own land, for the transgression of the fathers were the children smitten.' It is not surprising that the writer who invented this interpretation should sneer at the Messianic exposition as extravagant and groundless. The reading  $\text{לִי־דֹרֹתֶיךָ}$ , which appears to be implied in the Septuagint Version and is adopted by Houbigant and Lowth, is wholly without critical authority or intrinsic worth to recommend it.

V. 9. *And he gave with wicked (men) his grave, and with a rich (man) in his death; because (or although) he had done no violence, and no deceit (was) in his mouth.* The second member of the first clause is thus translated by Martini: *tumulum sepulchralem cum violentis*; which supposes  $\text{בְּזִנְיָתָם}$  to be the plural of  $\text{זִנְיָה}$ , a height or high place, here put for a monumental mound or hillock. The same interpretation is approved by Kennicott and Jubb. But as the plural  $\text{בְּזִנְיָתָם}$  retains its first vowel when followed by a suffix or another noun (Deut. 32: 29. Mic. 3: 12), Ewald adopts the pointing  $\text{בְּזִנְיָתָם}$ , which is found in three manuscripts; but it still remains impossible to prove from usage any such meaning of  $\text{זִנְיָה}$ . Thenius goes further and reads  $\text{בְּזִנְיָתָם}$ . And all this for the sake of a more perfect parallelism, although the common text affords a perfectly good sense, viz. in his death, i. e. after it, as in Lev. 11: 31. 1 Kings 12: 31. Esther 2: 7, and the only difficulty is the one presented by the plural form, which is surely not so serious as to require its removal by an arbitrary change of text. It is not even necessary to explain it with Jarchi as denoting all kinds of death, or with Abarbenel as implying a collective not an individual subject. It is much more natural to assume with Hitzig that the suffix is assimilated to the apparent plural termination  $\text{ִים}$ , or that it is simply a case of poetic variation, as in Ezek. 28: 8, 10.—Rosenmüller's version is, he gave himself up to the wicked to be buried, or he left his burial to the wicked. But besides the forced construction here assumed, this explanation leaves  $\text{בְּזִנְיָתָם}$  unexplained, and does not agree with what is afterwards asserted, that he did no wrong etc.—Rabbi Jonah, as quoted in the Michlal Jophi, explains  $\text{זִנְיָה}$  to mean a wicked man; and this explanation is adopted by Luther, Calvin, and Gesenius, who regard the word as suggesting the accessory idea of one who sets his heart upon his wealth, or puts his trust in it, or makes an unlawful use of it. This is so arbitrary, that Martini and some later writers abandon the Hebrew usage altogether, and derive the sense of wicked from the Arabic root  $\text{عثر}$ . But this is doubly untenable, first, because the Hebrew usage cannot be postponed to the Arabic analogy without extreme necessity, which does not here exist; and secondly, because the best authorities exhibit no such meaning of the Arabic word itself. Ewald, aware of this, and yet determined to obtain the same sense, effects his purpose with his usual boldness, by changing  $\text{זִנְיָה}$  into  $\text{זִנְיָה}$ —a convenient word invented for the purpose. Beck, with scarcely less violence, explains it as an orthographical variation of  $\text{זִנְיָה}$  (ch. 49: 25). It may appear surprising that this forced imposition of a new and foreign meaning on a word so familiar should be thus insisted on. Luther and Calvin no doubt simply followed the rabbinical tradition; but the later writers have a deeper motive for pursuing a course which in other circumstances they

would boldly charge upon the great Reformers' ignorance of Hebrew. That motive is the wish to do away with the remarkable coincidence between the circumstances of our Saviour's burial and the language of this verse, as it has commonly been understood since Cappellus. This interpretation, as expressed by Hengstenberg, makes the verse mean, that they appointed him his grave with the wicked, but that in his death he really reposed with a rich man, viz. Joseph of Arimathea, who is expressly so called, Matt. 27 : 57. The indefinite construction of the verb, and the sense thus put upon it, are in perfect accordance with usage. (See e. g. Ps. 72 : 15. Eccl. 2 : 21. Gen. 15 : 18. Is. 55 : 4. Jer. 1 : 4.) Even Aben Ezra explains *gare* by adding, i. e. in intention. It is also possible to make  $\text{וְעִם הַרְשָׁעִים}$  the subject of the verb, but wholly unnecessary. Some refer it to Jehovah, and suppose the sense to be that he appeared to assign him his grave with the wicked. Malefactors were either left unburied or disgraced by a promiscuous interment in an unclean place,—a usage explicitly asserted by Josephus and Maimonides. As the Messiah was to die like a criminal, he might have expected to be buried like one ; and his exemption from this posthumous dishonour was occasioned by a special providential interference. To the different interpretations which have now been given of this first clause, may be added two as curiosities. The first is that of Jerome, who makes  $\text{אִתָּם}$  the sign of the accusative, and thus translates the whole, *dabit impios pro sepultura et divitem pro morte suo*. The other that of Hofmann, *they (my people) treated him (my servant) like a wealthy tyrant*. — $\text{לְכִי}$  (for  $\text{לְכִי אִתָּם}$ ) is properly a causative particle equivalent to *for that* or *because* ; but most interpreters regard it as equivalent to *although*, which is more agreeable to our idiom in this connexion.—Knobel observes, with great naïveté, that the reference of this verse to the burial of Christ has found its way into the exposition of the passage in connexion with its general application to that subject ; to which we may add, that it can only find its way out in connexion with a wish to get rid of that unwelcome application. At the same time it must be observed that even if  $\text{עִם הַרְשָׁעִים}$  be taken in the sense of wicked, although we lose the striking allusion to the burial of Christ in the sepulchre of Joseph, the verse is still applicable to his burial, as the last clause then means, like the first, that they appointed him his grave with malefactors. Clericus and Kennicott propose to transpose  $\text{קָבְרוּ}$  and  $\text{בְּיַד הַרְשָׁעִים}$ , because there seems to be an incongruity in saying that he made his grave with the wicked and was with the rich in his death, when according to the history he died with the wicked and was buried with the rich. But this apparent difficulty rests upon a false interpretation both of  $\text{יָהִי}$  and  $\text{בְּיַד הַרְשָׁעִים}$ . There is no need of following in detail the laborious attempt to reconcile this verse, even after some of its expressions have been wrested

for the purpose, with the supposition that the subject of the prophecy is Israel in exile, and that the burial here spoken of is merely political and civil, as in ch. 25 : 8. 26 : 19.

V. 10. *And Jehovah was pleased to crush (or bruise) him, he put him to grief (or made him sick); if (or when) his soul shall make an offering for sin, he shall see (his) seed, he shall prolong (his) days, and the pleasure of Jehovah in his hand shall prosper.* Here begins the account of the Messiah's exaltation. All the previous sufferings were to have an end in the erection of God's kingdom upon earth. As the first clause is in contrast with the last of v. 9, it may be read, *and (yet) Jehovah was pleased*, i. e. notwithstanding the Messiah's perfect innocence. The sense is not, as Barnes expresses it, that *Jehovah was pleased with his being crushed*, which might imply that he was crushed by another, but that Jehovah was pleased himself to crush or bruise him, since the verb is not a passive but an active one. Luzzatto makes  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$  an adjective used as a noun, his crushed or afflicted one, *contritus suus*. Hitzig makes  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$  a noun with the article, *it pleased Jehovah that disease should crush him*. But most interpreters appear to be agreed that the first is the Piel infinitive of  $\text{כָּרַס}$ , and the last the Hiphil preterite of  $\text{כָּרַס}$ , strictly meaning *he made sick*, but here used, like the cognate noun in vs. 3, 4, to denote distress or suffering in general. Martini and Gesenius make  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$  the object of  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$ , *it pleased Jehovah to make his wound sick*, i. e. to aggravate his wounds or wound him sorely. This construction, although somewhat favoured by the analogy of Micah 6 : 13 (compare Nah. 3 : 19), does violence to both words and is inconsistent with their collocation in the sentence. Jahn accounts for the future form of  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$  by supplying  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$ , and regarding what follows as the words of Jehovah, who is afterwards spoken of, however, in the third person. But this is not unusual even in cases where Jehovah is undoubtedly the speaker. Hitzig and Hendewerk agree with De Dieu and other early writers in explaining  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$  as the second person, which is also given in the text of the English Version (*when thou shalt make etc.*); but as Jehovah is no where else directly addressed in this whole context, the construction in the margin (*when his soul shall make*) is the one now commonly adopted. Hengstenberg in his Christology explains  $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$  as a mere periphrasis for  $\text{כָּרַס}$ ; but he may be considered as retracting this opinion in his Commentary on Ps. 3 : 3, where he denies that the expression is ever so employed. Vitranga understands it here to signify that the oblation was a voluntary one. It seems more natural however to explain it as referring the oblation to the life itself, which was really the thing offered; just as the blood of Christ is said to cleanse from all sin (1 John 1 : 7), meaning that Christ cleanses by his blood i. e. his expiatory death.— $\text{כָּרַסְתִּי}$  primarily signifies a trespass or offence,

and secondarily a trespass-offering. In the law of Moses it is technically used to designate a certain kind of sacrifice, nearly allied to the  $\text{זָבַח}$  or sin-offering, and yet very carefully distinguished from it, although archaeologists have never yet been able to determine the precise distinction, and a learned modern rabbi, Samuel Luzzatto, expresses his conviction that they differed only in the mode of offering the blood. The word is here used not with specific reference to this kind of oblation, but as a generic term for expiatory sacrifice. The use of analogous expressions in the New Testament will be clear from a comparison of Rom. 3: 25. 8: 3. 2 Cor. 5: 21. 1 John 2: 2. 4: 10. Heb. 9: 14. In the case last quoted, as in that before us, Christ is represented as offering himself to God.—As the terms used to describe the atonement are borrowed from the ceremonial institutions of the old economy, so those employed in describing the reward of the Messiah's sufferings are also drawn from theocratical associations. Hence the promise of long life and a numerous offspring, which of course are applicable only in a figurative spiritual sense. The Septuagint and Vulgate, followed by Lowth, connect the two successive members of the clause as forming only one promise (*he shall see a seed which shall prolong their days*). The separate construction is not only simpler but requisite in order to express the full sense of the promise, which was literally given and fulfilled to Job in both its parts (Job 42: 16), and in its spiritual sense is frequently applied to Christ (e. g. Heb. 7: 16, 25. Rev. 1: 18). The seed here mentioned is correctly identified by Hengstenberg and others with the mighty, whom he is described as sprinkling in ch. 52: 15, and as spoiling in v. 13 below, whom he is represented in v. 11 as justifying, in v. 5 as representing, in v. 12 as interceding for. They are called his seed, as they are elsewhere called the sons of God (Gen. 6: 2), as the disciples of the prophets were called their sons (1 Kings 2: 25), and as Christians are to this day in the east called the offspring or family of the Messiah.— $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  does not refer to past time, as Martini explains it (*jelicissime exsecutus est*), but to the future, into which the glorious reward of the Messiah is and must be considered as extending.

V. 11. *From the labour of his soul (or life) he shall see, he shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my servant (as) a righteous one give righteousness to many, and their iniquities he will bear.* In this verse Jehovah is again directly introduced as speaking. The  $\text{וְ$  at the beginning is explained by Gesenius, Hitzig, and Maurer as a particle of time, *after the labour of his soul*, like the Latin *ab itinere*. Others explain it *from*, implying freedom or deliverance. Knobel makes it mean *without*, which yields the same sense. Most interpreters follow the Vulgate in making it denote the efficient or procuring cause: *Pro eo quod laboravit anima ejus.*

The English Version makes it partitive; but this detracts from the force of the expression, and implies that he should only see a portion of the fruit of his labours. The allusion to the pains of parturition, which some English writers find here, has no foundation in the Hebrew text, but only in the ambiguity of the common version, which here employs the old word *travail* not in its specific but its general sense of toil or labour. The Hebrew word includes the ideas of exertion and of suffering as its consequence. J. D. Michaelis understands the clause as meaning, 'from his labour he shall joyfully look up;' but there is no sufficient authority for this interpretation of the verb, which simply means *to see*, and must be construed with an object either expressed or understood. This object is supposed by Kimchi to be *good* in general (יראה טוב ויטובת בו); by Jerome *seed*, as in the foregoing verse; by Hengstenberg the whole blessing there promised. Abarbenel supposes the two parts of that promise to be specially referred to, 'he shall see his seed, he shall be satisfied with days,' a common scriptural expression. (Gen. 25 : 8. 35 : 29.)—יִרְאֶה means to be satisfied, not in the sense of being contented, but in that of being filled or abundantly supplied. It is applied to spiritual no less than to temporal enjoyments. (Ps. 17 : 15. 123 : 3. Jer. 31 : 14.) Clericus and Hengstenberg suppose an allusion to the processes of agriculture and the abundant produce of the earth. Some interpreters regard this as a case of hendiadys, in which the one word simply qualifies the other: he shall see he shall be satisfied, i. e. he shall abundantly see or see to his heart's content. Maurer adopts this construction, and moreover connects יִרְאֶה with what goes before, and gives יִרְאֶה the sense of seeing with delight: *mirifice lactabitur sapientiâ suâ*. Martini has the same construction, but explains יִרְאֶה to mean the knowledge of God, i. e. piety or true religion. But as Jehovah is himself the speaker, Jahn refers the suffix to Messiah and gives the phrase a passive sense, 'he shall be satiated with the knowledge of himself,' i. e. abundantly enjoy the happiness of being recognised by others as their highest benefactor. But this is neither a natural construction nor consistent with the accents. The explanation of יִרְאֶה as meaning *doctrine* is entirely without foundation in usage. The only satisfactory construction is the passive one which makes the phrase mean *by the knowledge of him* upon the part of others; and this is determined by the whole connexion to mean practical experimental knowledge, involving faith and a self-appropriation of the Messiah's righteousness, the effect of which is then expressed in the following words.—Gesenius gives יִרְאֶה the sense of converting to the true religion, or *turning to righteousness*, as in Dan. 12 : 3. But that justification in the strict forensic sense is meant, may be argued from the entire context, in which the Messiah appears not as a Prophet or a Teacher, but a Priest and a Sacrifice, and also from the parallel expression in this very verse, *and their iniquities*

*he will bear.* The construction with  $\text{ב}$  Cocceius, Hengstenberg, and Maurer explain, by giving to the verb the sense of bestowing or imparting righteousness, in which way other active verbs are construed elsewhere. (See for example ch. 14 : 3. Gen. 45 : 7. 2 Sam. 3 : 30.) Another solution of the syntax is afforded by taking  $\text{ב}$  in its strict sense as denoting general relation, and the verb as meaning to perform the act of justification, not in the general, but in reference to certain objects—he shall be a justifier with respect to many. In the next clause Lowth omits  $\text{פָּרְיָם}$  because it stands before the substantive, which he pronounces an absurd solecism. Gesenius supposes the adjective to be prefixed because it is peculiarly emphatic. Hengstenberg goes further and supposes it to be used as a noun, *the righteous one, my servant*. But as this would seem to require the article, it is perhaps better to explain  $\text{פָּרְיָם}$  with Ewald, *as a righteous person (als Gerechter)*, which idea Maurer thus expresses paraphrastically, *for my servant is righteous*. Martini's explanation of the clause as meaning, *the Saviour my servant shall save many*, has met with little favour, even among those who adopt an analogous explanation of  $\text{פָּרְיָם}$  and  $\text{הִרְיָם}$  elsewhere. According to Beck the sense of the whole clause is, 'by his knowledge of God he shall justify himself or show himself righteous; righteous is my servant for many, i. e. for their benefit.'—All mistake and doubt as to the nature of the justification here intended, or of the healing mentioned in v. 6, or of the cleansing mentioned in ch. 52 : 15, is precluded by the addition of the words, *and he shall bear their iniquities*. The introduction of the pronoun makes a virtual antithesis, suggesting the idea of exchange or mutual substitution. *They* shall receive his righteousness, and *he* shall bear their burdens. One part of the doctrine taught is well expressed by Jerome: *et iniquitates eorum ipse portabit, quas illi portare non poterant, et quorum pondere opprimebantur*. The whole is admirably paraphrased by Calvin: *Christus justificat homines dando ipsis justitiam suam, et vicissim in se suscipit peccata ipsorum, ut ea expiet*.—The preterite sense given to  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$  by Martini and others is entirely arbitrary and rejected by the later Germans as forbidden by the futures which precede and follow, all referring to the state of exaltation. Gesenius, however, though he makes the expression future, extenuates it by explaining it to mean that he shall make their burden lighter by his doctrine and by promoting their moral improvement. But this is at once inconsistent with the context and with his own interpretation of the fourth verse, where he understands the similar expressions as referring to vicarious atonement, while Hitzig is guilty of the same inconsistency, but in a reversed order, making this verse teach the doctrine and the other not.—In order to do justice to the theories which represent this passage as a prophecy of the return from exile, it should here be mentioned that Maurer understands this verse as meaning that the pious



Jews should not refuse to share the punishment incurred by their ungodly brethren, and Luzzatto that they should endure with patience the maltreatment and misconduct of the world around them. As for Hendewerk, he boldly denies that  $\text{פָּרַחְתָּ}$  is used in a forensic sense, or that  $\text{בְּיָדָם}$  means *to bear* in any other sense than that of the Latin phrase *tollere morbum* or *dolores*. Knobel sums up his exposition of the verse by saying that the *many* are without doubt the heathen who should be converted, and to whom the Jews sustained the same relation as a prophet or a priest to laymen.

V. 12. *Therefore will I divide him among the many, and with the strong shall he divide the spoil, in lieu of this that he bared unto death his soul, and with the transgressors was numbered, and he (himself) bare the sin of many, and for the transgressors he shall make intercession.* The Septuagint and Vulgate make the *many* and the *strong* the very spoil to be divided ( $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\sigma\alpha\iota\ \mu\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ , *dispertiam ei plurimos*). The same construction is retained by Lowth, Martini, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, and others. It would scarcely be natural, however, even if both adjectives were preceded by the ambiguous particle  $\text{וְ}$ , much less when the first has  $\text{וְ}$  before it, which occurs no where else as a connective of this verb with its object. It is better therefore to adopt the usual construction, sanctioned by Calvin, Gesenius, and Ewald, which supposes him to be described as equal to the greatest conquerors. If this is not enough, or if the sense is frigid, as Martini alleges, it is not the fault of the interpreter, who has no right to strengthen the expressions of his author by means of forced constructions. The simple meaning of the first clause is that he shall be triumphant, not that others shall be sharers in his victory, but that he shall be as gloriously successful in his enterprise as other victors ever were in theirs. Indeed the same sense may be thus obtained, for which the writers above mentioned have departed from the obvious construction, if, instead of making  $\text{וְ}$  and  $\text{וְ}$  denote comparison, we understand them to denote locality, and to describe him as obtaining spoil not *with* but *among* the many and the strong, and thus securing as the fruits of victory not only their possessions but themselves.—Hengstenberg gives  $\text{וְיָדָם}$  the sense of *mighty*, simply because that idea is expressed by the parallel term; which rather proves the contrary, as a synonymous parallelism would in this case be enfeebling, and the very same word is admitted to mean *many* by Hengstenberg himself in the last clause.—Abarbenel's objection, that Christ never waged war or divided spoil, has been eagerly caught up and repeated by the rationalistic school of critics. But Hengstenberg has clearly shown that spiritual triumphs must be here intended, because no others could be represented as the fruit of voluntary humiliation and vicarious suffering, and because the same thing is described in the context as a sprinkling of the nations, as a bearing of their guilt, as

their justification. The *many* and the *strong* of this verse are the nations and the kings of ch. 52 : 15, the spiritual seed of v. 8 and 10 above. (Compare ch. 11 : 10 and Ps. 2 : 8.)—The last clause recapitulates the claims of the Messiah to this glorious reward.  $\text{הִשָּׁקַף}$  is commonly explained to mean *poured out*, with an allusion to the shedding of blood considered as the vehicle of life. (Gen. 9 : 4. Lev. 17 : 11.) Beck even goes so far as to say that the writer looks upon the soul itself as a material fluid running in the blood. Not only is this inference a forced one, but the premises from which it is deduced are doubtful ; for it seems more accordant with the usage of the verb, and at the same time to afford a better sense, if we explain it to mean *made bare* or *exposed to death*. The assertion that  $\text{לְיָמָיו}$  would then be superfluous is refuted by the analogy of Judg. 5 : 18.—The reflexive sense which Hengstenberg and others give to  $\text{הִשָּׁקַף$  (numbered himself or suffered himself to be numbered), though not absolutely necessary, is strongly recommended by the context, and the obvious consideration that his being numbered passively among them was not such a claim to subsequent reward as a voluntary acquiescence in their estimation.—The application of this clause to our Saviour's crucifixion between thieves (Mark 15 : 28) is justly said by Hengstenberg not to exhaust the whole sense of the prophecy. It rather points out one of those remarkable coincidences which were brought about by Providence between the prophecies and the circumstances of our Saviour's passion.— $\text{וְיָצַד$  does not mean *he fell among sinners*, i. e. he was reckoned one of them (Maurer), but, as in Jer. 36 : 25, denotes intercession, not in the restricted sense of prayer for others, but in the wider one of meritorious and prevailing intervention, which is ascribed to Christ in the New Testament, not as a work already finished, like that of atonement, but as one still going on (Rom. 8 : 34. Heb. 9 : 24. 1 John 2 : 1), for which cause the Prophet here employs the future form. There is no ground, therefore, for explaining it as a descriptive present, or perverting it into a preterite, nor even for transforming  $\text{וְיָצַד}$  to a future likewise for the sake of uniformity. Because the Prophet speaks of the atonement as already past, and of the work of intercession as still future, it follows, not as some imagine that he meant to represent both as past or both as future, but on the contrary that he has said precisely what he meant to say, provided that we give his words their simple, obvious, and unforced meaning. The  $\text{וְיָצַד$  does not mean *and yet, whereas, or although*, but is either designed to make the pronoun emphatic (*he himself* or he on his part), or, as Hengstenberg suggests, to show that the last two members of the clause are not dependent on the  $\text{וְיָצַד$ . This last phrase does not simply mean *because*, but expresses more distinctly the idea of reward or compensation. The most specious objection to the old interpretation of this verse, as teaching the doctrine of vicarious atonement, is the one made by Luzzatto, who asserts that  $\text{וְיָצַד}$ ,

when directly followed by a noun denoting sin, invariably means to *forgive* or pardon it, except in Lev. 10 : 17, where it means to atone for it, but never to bear the sins of others, which can only be expressed by  $\text{קָם־עָלָי}$ , as in Ezek. 18 : 19, 20. In proof of his general assertion, he appeals to Gen. 50 : 17. Ex. 10 : 17. 32 : 32. 34 : 7. Ps. 32 : 5. 85 : 3. Job 7 : 21, in all which cases it must be admitted that the sense which he alleges is the true one. It is no sufficient answer to this argument to say that the parallel expression ( $\text{קָם־עָלָי בְּחַטָּאתִי}$ ) determines the meaning of the phrase in question ; since all parallelisms are not synonymous, and no parallelism can prove any thing in opposition to a settled usage. But although the parallel phrase cannot change or even ascertain the sense of this, it does itself undoubtedly express the idea which the objector seeks to banish from the text ; since no one can pretend to say that  $\text{בָּרַח}$  means to pardon, and it matters not on which side of the parallel the disputed doctrine is expressed, if it only be expressed at all. Little or nothing would be therefore gained by proving that  $\text{נָסַח הַטָּא נִסַּח}$  only means to pardon. But this is very far from being proved by the induction which Luzzatto has exhibited, and by which he has unintentionally put a weapon into the hands of his opponents while attempting to disarm them. How can this learned and ingenious Jew account for the fact, which he himself asserts, that the idea of forgiveness is expressed in Hebrew by the verb  $\text{נָסַח}$ ? The most plausible account which he could probably give is that  $\text{נָסַח}$  means to take away, and that to pardon is to take away sin. But let it be observed, in the first place, that the two ideas are by no means identical, and that to many, perhaps most minds, the phrase *to take away sin* suggests the idea, not of pardon properly so called, but of something preparatory to it ; and what is this something but atonement? In the next place, the primary and proper meaning of  $\text{נָסַח}$  is not to *take away*, but to *take up*, or to take upon one's self ; its most frequent secondary meaning is to *take about* or carry, and even in the cases where it means to *take away*, it means to take away by taking up and bearing : so that even if  $\text{נָסַח הַטָּא}$  means to take away sin, it would necessarily suggest the idea of its being, in some sense, taken up and borne, as the means of its removal. In the third place, the only satisfactory solution of the question above stated is, that the usage, to which it relates, presupposes the doctrine, that the only way in which a holy God can take away sin is by bearing it ; in other words he can forgive it only by providing an atonement for it. This alone enables him to be supremely just and yet a justifier, not of the innocent, but of the guilty. Thus the usage, which Luzzatto so triumphantly adduces to disprove the doctrine of atonement, is found, on deeper and more thorough scrutiny, itself to presuppose that very doctrine. But lastly, let it be observed that Luzzatto is compelled to grant that  $\text{נָסַח}$  may mean to bear the guilt of others as a substitute, but modestly asks us to believe that it

has this sense only in one place (Ezek. 18 : 20), and even there only because followed by a  $\pi$ ; as if that construction, which is perpetually interchanged with the direct one, could have more effect in that case, than the context and parallelism in the one before us. The only other aberration which it will be necessary here to notice, is the strange opinion, broached by Ewald, with his characteristic confidence and abstinence from proof, that this whole passage, from the thirteenth verse of the preceding chapter, is the work of an older writer than the Great Unknown to whom he ascribes the other chapters, and whom he supposes to have thrust it into the midst of his own composition, without any reason why it should stand any where, and still less why it should stand just in this place; since, according to Ewald's own account, it has no direct connexion either with what goes before or follows. The arguments by which he undertakes to justify this wild hypothesis are such as we have long since learned to rate at their true value, such as the use and repetition of expressions and ideas which occur no where else, together with the vague metaphorical assertion, that the atmosphere of this piece is entirely different from that of the other chapters, always excepting ch. 56 : 9 to 57 : 11, which (we may almost say, of course) is likewise an interpolation. It is strange that such an intellect as Ewald's should have failed to perceive that all this is an ill-disguised confession of his own incapacity to trace the true connexion in a difficult portion of an ancient writing, and proceeds upon the principle, which even he would hardly venture to propound in terms, that it is better to expunge a passage from the text than to acknowledge its obscurity or leave it unexplained. If it be true, as he asserts, that this is the only way in which the existing controversy as to the fifty-third chapter can be settled, it had better not be settled at all. It is worthy of remark that neither Ewald's reasoning nor his authority appear to have made any converts to this neoteric doctrine. With respect to the frequent repetitions which he charges on the passage, it may be added in conclusion, that so far from being rhetorical defects or indications of another author, they are used with an obvious design, viz. that of making it impossible for any ingenuity or learning to eliminate the doctrine of vicarious atonement from this passage, by presenting it so often and in forms so varied and yet still the same, that he who succeeds in expelling it from one place is compelled to meet it in another, as we have already seen to be the case in the comparison of vs. 4 and 11, as interpreted by Hitzig and Gesenius. Whether the dreaded inconvenience is more bravely met or more effectually remedied by making this incorrigible prophecy still older than the rest with which it stands connected, is a question which we leave to the decision of the reader.

## CHAPTER LIV.

INSTEAD of suffering from the loss of her national prerogatives, the church shall be more glorious and productive than before, v. 1. Instead of being limited to a single nation, she shall be so extended as to take in all the nations of the earth, vs. 2, 3. What seemed at first to be her forlorn and desolate condition, shall be followed by a glorious change, v. 4. He who seemed once to be the God of the Jews only, shall now be seen to be the God of the Gentiles also, v. 5. The abrogation of the old economy was like the repudiation of a wife, but its effects will show it to be rather a renewal of the conjugal relation, v. 6. The momentary rejection shall be followed by an everlasting reconciliation, vs. 7, 8. The old economy, like Noah's flood, can never be repeated or renewed, v. 9. That was a temporary institution; this shall outlast the earth itself, v. 10. The old Jerusalem shall be forgotten in the splendour of the new, vs. 11, 12. But this shall be a spiritual splendour springing from a constant divine influence, v. 13. Hence it shall also be a holy and a safe state, v. 14. All the enemies of the Church shall either be destroyed or received into her bosom, v. 15. The warrior and his weapons are alike God's creatures and at his disposal, v. 16. In every contest, both of hand and tongue, the Church shall be triumphant, not in her own right or her own strength, but in that of Him who justifies, protects, and saves her, v. 17.

V. 1. *Shout oh barren, that did not bear, break forth into a shout and cry aloud, she that did not writhe (in childbirth); for more (are) the children of the desolate than the children of the married (woman), saith Jehovah.* According to Grotius and some later writers, the object of address is the city of Jerusalem, in which no citizens were born during the exile, but which was afterwards to be more populous than the other cities of Judah which had not been reduced to such a state of desolation. Besides other difficulties which attend this explanation, it will be sufficient to observe that those who apply the first verse to the city of Jerusalem are under the necessity of afterwards assuming that this object is exchanged for another, viz. the people,—a conclusive reason for regarding this as the original object of address, especially as we have had abundant proof already that the Zion or Jerusalem of these Later Prophecies is the city only as a symbol of the church or nation.—Our idiom in the first clause would require *didst not bear* and

*didst not writhe* ; but Hebrew usage admits of the third person. Another Hebrew idiom is the expression of the same idea first in a positive and then in a negative form, *barren that did not bear*. This very combination occurs more than once elsewhere. (Judges 13 : 2. Job 24 : 21.)—For the sense of  $\text{הָרָה וְלֹא יָלְדָה}$ , see above, on ch. 52 : 9 ; and for that of  $\text{הָרָה וְלֹא יָלְדָה}$  as opposed to  $\text{הָרָה וְיָלְדָה}$ , compare 2 Sam. 13 : 20. The same antithesis here used occurs in 1 Sam. 2 : 5.

V. 2. *Widen the place of thy tent, and the curtains of thy dwellings let them stretch out ; spare not (or hinder it not) ; lengthen thy cords and strengthen (or make fast) thy stakes.* As in the parallel passage (ch. 49 : 20, 21), the promise of increase is now expressed by the figure of enlarged accommodations. The *place* may either be the area within the tent or the spot on which it is erected. The curtains are the tent-cloths stretched upon the poles to form the dwelling.  $\text{הָרָה וְלֹא יָלְדָה}$ , though strictly a generic term, is often used in reference to tents, and particularly to the tabernacle. Some take  $\text{הָרָה}$  as a neuter or reflexive verb, let them stretch out or extend themselves ; but Kimchi construes it with *those who stretch*, and Ewald with an indefinite subject, *let them stretch*. That this verb was habitually used in this connexion, may be learned from 2 Sam. 16 : 22. The *stakes* are the tent-pins, to which the tent-cloths are attached by cords. The last verb may either mean take stronger pins, or fix them more firmly in the ground,—both implying an enlargement of the tent and a consequently greater stress upon the cords and stakes.

V. 3. *For right and left shalt thou break forth (or spread), and thy seed shall possess (or dispossess or inherit) nations, and repopulate ruined (or forsaken) cities.* Kimchi understands *right* and *left* as geographical terms equivalent to north and south, the east and west being represented by *nations* and *cities*. Knobel gives the same explanation of the first two, but accounts for the omission of the other two by saying that the sea was on the west and on the east a wilderness. A far more natural interpretation of the words is that which takes *right* and *left* as indefinite expressions meaning on both sides or in all directions. The verb  $\text{הָרָה וְלֹא יָלְדָה}$  was peculiarly appropriate because associated with the promise in Gen. 28 : 14, in which case all the cardinal points of the compass are distinctly mentioned.  $\text{הָרָה וְלֹא יָלְדָה}$  is not simply to possess but to inherit, i. e. to possess by succession, which in this case implies the dispossession of the previous inhabitants, so that the version *drive out*, given by Gesenius and others, although not a literal translation, really expresses no idea not expressed in the original. The figurative meaning of the terms, as in many other cases, is evinced by an immediate change of figure, without any regard to mere rhetorical consistency. The same thing

which is first represented as the violent expulsion of an enemy from his dominions, is immediately afterwards described as the restoration of deserted places, unless יָצַח־בְּיָמָיו be supposed to mean *forsaken* by those just before expelled, which is hardly consistent with its usage as applied to desolations of long standing.—The whole verse is a beautiful description of the wonderful extension of the church, and her spiritual conquest of the nations.

V. 4. *Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed, and be not abashed, for thou shalt not blush; for the shame of thy youth thou shalt forget, and the reproach of thy widowhood thou shalt not remember any more.* Here, as in many other cases, shame includes the disappointment of the hopes, but with specific reference to previous misconduct. (See Job 6 : 20.) The first clause declares that she has no cause for despondency, the second disposes of the causes which might seem to be suggested by her history. The essential meaning is, thy former experience of my displeasure. The figurative form of the expression is accommodated to the chosen metaphor of a wife forsaken and restored to her husband. The specific reference of *youth* to the Egyptian bondage, and of *widowhood* to the Babylonian exile, is extremely artificial, and forbidden by the context.

V. 5. *For thy husband (is) thy Maker, Jehovah of Hosts (is) his name; and thy Redeemer (is) the Holy One of Israel, the God of all the earth shall he be called.* This verse is marked by a peculiar regularity of structure, the two members of the first clause corresponding exactly to the similar members of the other. In each clause the first member points out the relation of Jehovah to his people, while the second proclaims one of his descriptive names. He is related to the church as her *Husband* and *Redeemer*; he is known or shall be known to all mankind as the *Lord of Hosts* and as the *God of the whole earth*, which are not to be regarded as equivalent expressions. As the *Goel* of the Jewish institutions, the redeemer of a forfeited inheritance, was necessarily the next of kin, it is appropriately placed in opposition to the endearing name of husband; and as the title *Lord of Hosts* imports a universal sovereignty, it is no less exactly matched with the *God of the whole earth*. But this last phrase expresses the idea of universal recognition.—There is no grammatical objection to the usual interpretation of the last word in the verse as meaning *he is called*, corresponding to *his name is* in the other clause, and signifying, in the Hebrew idiom, *he is*, with emphasis. But since no reason can in that case be assigned for the use of אֱלֹהֵי־כָל־הָאָרֶץ instead of אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל, and since the strict translation of the future strengthens the expression by transforming a description into a prophecy, it seems best to retain the English Version, *the God of the whole earth shall he be called*, i. e. he shall be recognised hereafter in the character

which even now belongs to him. (Compare ch. 45 : 23 and Rom. 14 : 11.) The Targum and the Vulgate, Aben Ezra and Kimchi, take  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִם}$  in its primitive sense of *thy lords or rulers*; but this, though etymologically right, is less agreeable to usage, to the parallelism, the immediate context, and the analogy of other places where the conjugal relation is undoubtedly referred to. (See especially ch. 62 : 4, 5.) The form of this word and  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִךְ}$  is regarded by Gesenius as an instance of the *pluralis majesticus*, while Maurer makes the last a singular form peculiar to the  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִם}$  derivatives, and supposes the other to be merely assimilated to it by a species of paronomasia.

V. 6. *For as a wife forsaken and grieved in spirit has Jehovah called thee, and (as) a wife of youth, for she shall be rejected, said thy God.* Reduced to a prosaic form and order, this verse seems to mean, that Jehovah had espoused her in her youth, then cast her off for her iniquities, and now at last recalled her from her solitude and grief to be his wife again. (Compare Hosea 2 : 4, 7, 14, 16, 19.)—*A wife of youth*, not merely a young wife, but one married early. (See Proverbs 5 : 18 and Malachi 2 : 14.) As this description belongs not to the main subject but to the thing with which it is compared, there is no propriety in making *youth* mean a specific period in the history of Israel. The sense is not that she had been wedded to Jehovah in her youth and now recalled, but that he now recalled her as a husband might recall the long rejected wife of his youth.—The common version of the last clause, *when thou wast refused*, is ungrammatical, unless we take  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִךְ}$  as a license for  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִךְ}$  like  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִךְ}$  in ch. 57 : 8, and such anomalies are not to be assumed much less to be multiplied without necessity. Most of the modern writers make it the third person, but retain the same construction: *who has been* (or *when she has been*) *rejected*. But this, besides being forced, would seem to require the praeter not the future, which Hitzig sets down as an inaccuracy of the writer. Still more unnatural and arbitrary is Luzzatto's interrogative construction: '*Can the wife of one's youth be thus abhorred? Surely not.*' Ewald gains the same sense by making it an ironical exclamation: *and the wife of one's youth*—(as if it were possible) *that she could be treated with contempt!* All these expedients are precluded by the fact that we obtain a good sense by adhering to the proper meaning of the  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִךְ}$  and of the future, simply making these the words of Jehovah at the time of her rejection, and referring  $\text{אֲדֹנָיִךְ}$  to the same time and to this clause alone, instead of making it include the whole verse, which is the less natural because the first clause speaks of Jehovah in the first person. Thus understood, the last clause is an explanation of the first, in which she is said to have been recalled as a forsaken wife, and that a wife of youth, because her God had said to her at that time, thou shalt be rejected. This explanation, while it simplifies the syntax, leaves the mean-



ing of the verse unaltered.—Henderson calls upon the reader to “mark the paronomasia in *קָצַרְתָּ וְקָצַרְתָּ* and *קָצַרְתָּ וְקָצַרְתָּ*.” Gesenius goes further and attempts to copy it (*ein vertriebnes Weib betrübten Herzens*); while Hitzig, it may be for that very reason, doubts whether any paronomasia was designed at all.

V. 7. *In a little moment I forsook thee, and in great mercies I will gather thee.* The metaphor is here carried out in the form of an affectionate assurance that the love now restored shall experience no further interruption. The use of the preterite and future implies an intermediate point of view between the opposite treatments here described. I did forsake thee, and now I am about to gather thee. Hitzig explains this last expression by the analogy of Judges 19 : 15, where a cognate verb means to receive into one's house. So Lowth translates it, *I will receive thee again*, and Ewald in like manner. Umbreit still more expressively, *I draw thee to myself*. Knobel applies the term directly to the people, whose scattered members were to be collected. (See ch. 27 : 12. 43 : 5.) According to Umbreit, the time of anger is called *little* in comparison with the provocation offered; according to Knobel, in comparison with the favour that should follow, which agrees far better with the parallelism and the context. Hitzig, however, says that it is not the period of alienation which is here described as short; but the anger which occasioned it. A similar antithesis is used by David, Ps. 30 : 6. (Compare Isaiah 26 : 20.) Instead of *great mercies*, Henderson has *with the greatest tenderness*.—If any specific application of the words be made, it must be to the momentary casting off of Israel which seemed to accompany the change of dispensations. The confusion of the metaphors in this whole passage springs from the complexity of the relations which they represent. As a nation, Israel was in fact cast off; but as a church, it never could be.

V. 8. *In a gush of wrath I hid my face a moment from thee, and in everlasting kindness I have had mercy on thee, saith thy Redeemer, Jehovah.* The idea of the preceding verse is again expressed more fully. The word *קָצַרְתָּ* occurs only here. The older writers conjectured from the context that it signified a short time or a little quantity. Rabbi Menahem is quoted by Jarchi as explaining it to mean heat or fury, which is no doubt also merely conjectural. Schultens explains it from an Arabic analogy as meaning hardness or severity. Rosenmüller and Gesenius identify it with *קָצַרְתָּ* a flood or inundation, which is elsewhere used in reference to anger (Prov. 7 : 24). So in ch. 42 : 25, the wrath of God is said to have been *poured out* upon Israel. According to Gesenius, it is here written *קָצַרְתָּ* only for the sake of the resemblance to *קָצַרְתָּ*. This paronomasia is copied by Gesenius (*in der Fluth der Zorngluth*), by Hitzig (*in derber Herbe*), and by Ewald

(*als der Groll war voll*). We do not find that any of these writers make the rapid recurrence of this figure in so short a space an argument to prove that the passage was written by a different author. Ewald gives  $\text{אהבהך}$  the sense which it has in Kal, and renders it, *I love thee*. This is undoubtedly implied, but the sense of *showing mercy* is required not only by usage but by the context, which describes the relenting of one previously offended.— This verse, like the one before it, is a general description of the everlasting favour which shall drown the very memory of former alienations between God and his people. The modern German school of course restrict it to the Babylonish exile. Cocceius extends it to the whole of the Old Testament economy, which although long to man was but a day in the divine sight. (Ps. 90 : 4.) Vitringa, not content with these gratuitous appropriations of a general promise, or with this prosaic disfiguration of an exquisite poetical conception, undertakes to give a different application to the two verses, applying the little moment of v. 7 to the Babylonish exile, and the angry moment of v. 8 to the Syrian persecution. With equal reason they might be pronounced descriptive of the Egyptian and Assyrian bondage, or of the Assyrian and the Babylonian, or of the Syrian and the Roman. If, because it is appropriate to one of these events, it has no reference to any other, then they all may be successively excluded, and with equal ease all proved to be the subject of the prophecy. The only specific application which is equally consistent with the form of the expression and the context is the one suggested in the note upon the foregoing verse.

V. 9. *For the waters of Noah is this to me ; what I swear from the waters of Noah passing again over the earth* (i. e. against their passing, or, that they should not pass), *so I have sworn from being angry* (that I will not be angry) *against thee, and from rebuking* (that I will not rebuke) *thee*. The assurance of the preceding verse is now repeated in another form. There can no more be another such effusion of my wrath than there can be another deluge, here called the *waters of Noah*, just as we familiarly say “Noah’s flood.” The security in this case, as in that, is a divine oath or solemn covenant, like that recorded Gen. 8 : 21 and 9 : 11. Vitringa, as usual, converts a simile into a symbol, and endeavours to enumerate the points of similarity between the world and the deluge, the church and the ark. It is only upon this erroneous supposition that such passages as Ps. 124 : 4, 5, can be regarded as illustrative parallels. Such minute coincidences any reader is at liberty to search out for himself ; but the text mentions only one point of comparison between the two events, namely, that neither can occur again. The Prophet does not say that God’s displeasure with the church is a flood which shall never be repeated, but that it shall never be repeated any more than the flood. When our Lord says it is easier

for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than a rich man into heaven, no one thinks of running a comparison between the rich man and the camel, or inquiring what the hump or the double stomach signifies; because the text suggests not a general analogy between the rich man and the camel, but a specific one confined to one particular. In the case before us, that particular, as we have seen already, is the certainty that neither of the things compared can ever be repeated. This certainty does not arise, as Ewald seems to think, from any natural necessity, or universal law forbidding such expurgatory revolutions to occur more than once, but, as the text expressly tells us, from the oath and covenant of God.—Instead of יָמֵי נֹחַ one or two manuscripts have יָמֵי־נֹחַ, all in one word, meaning *as the days of Noah*, and Kimchi speaks of this division as existing in some ancient codices of his day. This reading likewise appears in all the ancient versions but the Septuagint, and is preferred by Lowth (*as in the days of Noah*). It is also a remarkable coincidence that this expression occurs twice in the New Testament (Matt. 24 : 37. 1 Pet. 3 : 20), but not in reference to this place or to the comparison here instituted. All the latest writers seem to be in favour of adhering to the common text, which is probably the only safe conclusion, although some of the reasons which have been assigned are not of much weight. Henderson, for instance, says that “the conjunction וְ could not have been omitted,” yet supposes two ellipses of the preposition וְ in this one sentence, and in this one clause of it. Another argument which some urge, namely, that the words וְיָמֵי־נֹחַ are repeated afterwards, may be employed as well on one side as the other. For it might be said, with some plausibility at least, that such a repetition, not for the sake of parallelism, but in the same part of the sentence, is unusual, and also that the presence of these two words afterwards may easily have led to an error of transcription. The true ground for adhering to the common text is the traditional authority of almost every codex in existence, confirmed by that of the oldest version, and by its yielding a perfectly good sense.—There is no need of supplying any preposition before *waters*, as Gesenius does (*wie bey den Wassern Noah's*); since the meaning is that this is the same thing as the flood, or just such another case, in what respect is afterwards explained. The closest copy of the original is Ewald's, *Noah's Wasser ist mir dies*. The plural *waters* is connected with the pronoun in the singular, simply because it is used only in the plural. The pronoun *this* is explained by Jarchi to mean *this oath*, by Kimchi *this captivity*, by Knobel *this effusion of my wrath*, etc. The best construction is to take it in the widest sense, as meaning *this case, this affair*, or the like. Hendewerk appears to be alone in supplying the future tense of the verb (*this shall be*) instead of the present (*this is*). On the privative use of the preposition לֹא, see ch. 5 : 6, 8 : 11, where it has respect to negative commands or prohibitions. *To me* does

not simply mean in my view or opinion, but expresses similarity of obligation; the oath was as binding in the one case as the other.—Vitringa and Lowth make וְעַתָּה a particle of time, *when I swear*. Gesenius and the other modern writers take it as a particle of comparison, corresponding to וְ just as the full expression וְעַתָּה does in ch. 14 : 24, and as וְעַתָּה itself does in Jer. 33 : 22. Hendewerk understands it strictly as a relative, *of which I swear*; in which וְ is not a parallel expression, but simply continues the discourse. The same construction of וְעַתָּה might be retained without entirely destroying the antithesis, by rendering the former *what*. As if he had said, ‘*what I swear then, that I swear now,*’ but impaired the exact correspondence of the terms by changing *that* to *so*. It is a matter of indifference whether the second verb be rendered *I have sworn* or *I swear*; since even in the former case it means *I have now sworn*, as distinguished from the former swearing which he had just mentioned.—*Rebuke* must here be taken in the strong and pregnant sense which it has in ch. 17 : 13. 50 : 2. 51 : 20, and very generally throughout the Old Testament, as signifying not a merely verbal but a practical rebuke. There is no need, however, of departing from the literal translation with Gesenius, who translates it *curse*, and Hitzig, who translates it *punish*. Umbreit has *threaten*, which is nearer to the strict sense, but excludes the actual infliction, which is a necessary part of the idea.—That this is not a general promise of security, is plain from the fact that the church has always been subjected to vicissitudes and fluctuations. Nor is there any period in her history to which it can be properly applied in a specific sense, except the change of dispensations, which was made once for all and can never be repeated. That the church shall never be again brought under the restrictive institutions of the ceremonial law, is neither a matter of course nor a matter of indifference, but a glorious promise altogether worthy of the solemn oath by which it is attested here.

V. 10. *For the mountains shall move and the hills shall shake; but my favour from thee shall not move, and my covenant of peace shall not shake, saith thy pitier Jehovah.* Vitringa’s observation, that the futures in the first clause must not be so translated, because this would imply that hills and mountains might be moved, whereas they are here represented as immovable, affords a curious illustration of the tendency among interpreters to substitute what they would have said for what the writer has said. If the first clause does not literally mean that the mountains and the hills shall move, that idea cannot be expressed in Hebrew. This is indeed the customary method of expressing such comparisons. (See above, on ch. 40 : 8 and 49 : 15.) The meaning is not that God’s promise is as stable as the mountains, but that it is more so; they shall be removed, but it shall stand for

ever. There is no need, therefore, of translating the verb *let them shake* or *they may shake*, as some of the latest writers do. Still more gratuitous is the present form given to the verbs by Gesenius, as if they expressed a thing of constant occurrence. Even Vitranga is compelled to admit that the mountains and hills in this place are not symbols of states and empires, but natural emblems of stability. (See Deut. 33 : 15. Ps. 65 : 7. 125 : 1, 2.)—Gesenius supposes an allusion in *covenant of peace* to the covenant with Noah (Gen. 9 : 8, 11). The phrase denotes a covenant, i. e. a divine promise or engagement, securing the enjoyment of peace, both in the strict sense and in the wide one of prosperity or happiness. (Compare v. 13. ch. 53 : 5. Ezek. 34 : 25. 37 : 26.) The suffix, as in many other cases, qualifies the whole phrase, not the last word merely. *The covenant of my peace* does not give the sense so fully as *my covenant of peace*, i. e. my peace-giving covenant, or as Rosenmüller phrases it, *meum pacificum foedus*.—The participle in יְרַחֵם יְהוָה is construed as a noun, and the whole phrase means *thy pitier*. The force of the expression is impaired by the circumlocution of the common version, *the Lord that hath mercy on thee*, still more by Lowth's diluted paraphrase, *Jehovah who beareth toward thee the most tender affection*.

V. 11. *Wretched, storm-tossed, comfortless! Behold I am laying (or about to lay) thy stones in antimony, and I will found thee upon sapphires.* The past afflictions of God's people are contrasted with the glory which awaits them, and which is here represented by the image of a city built of precious stones, and cemented with the substance used by oriental women in the staining of their eyelids. (2 Kings 9 : 30. Jer. 4 : 30.) This eye-paint, made of stibium or antimony, may be joined with sapphires as a costly substance, commonly applied to a more delicate use; or there may be allusion, as Hitzig thinks, to the likeness between stones thus set and painted eyes: either of which suppositions is more probable than that of Henderson, viz. that the idea meant to be conveyed is simply that of beauty in general, for which a thousand more appropriate expressions might have been employed. The stones meant are not corner or foundation-stones, but all those used in building. There is something singular, though not perhaps significant, in the application to these stones of a verb elsewhere used only in reference to animals. Knobel gravely observes that this verse can hardly be considered as expressing a real expectation of the Prophet; as if it were a literal description of a city built with gems instead of hewn stones, and stibium instead of mortar. Kimchi indeed thinks it possible that all this may be verified hereafter in the literal Jerusalem. Abarbenel more reasonably looks for its fulfilment in a figurative or spiritual sense. Those writers who insist upon applying the first verse of this chapter to the city as a city, although not particularly named there, are compelled to understand

the one before us of the people, notwithstanding the minuteness and precision of the references to a city. If the city as such is not meant when stones and cement, gates and walls, are mentioned, how much less when none of these particulars appear, but every thing suggests a different subject.— $\text{אֲבָנֵי יָדָה}$  is rendered by Jerome *per ordinem*, and in the Septuagint *ἀρθρακα*, as if it were a kind of precious stone, as it appears to be in 1 Chr. 29:2. But the modern lexicographers identify it with the Greek *q̄v̄os* and the Latin *fuscus*, i. e. face or eye-paint; and even in Chronicles it may mean nothing more than ornamental stones. Ludolf supposes the clause to mean that the stones should be powdered with antimony. Luzzatto likewise assumes a hypallage, and explains ‘I will lay thy stones in stibium’ to mean I will lay it on them. Henderson’s version of  $\text{תִּטְּסֵנִי}$  (*tossed*) is insufficient, as both etymology and usage require a reference to storm or tempest. Kimchi and Saadias apply it specifically to the exile, Jarchi to the storms of sorrow in general. Rosenmüller explains it as a passive participle put for  $\text{תִּטְּסֵנִי}$ , Gesenius as the usual Kal participle of  $\text{טָסַן}$ . It is agreed that  $\text{תִּטְּסֵנִי}$  is the contracted Pual participle for  $\text{תִּטְּסֵנִי}$ , like  $\text{תִּרְחֵן}$  in Hos. 1:6, 8.—Maurer notes this as an example of the peculiar sense in which this writer used the verb  $\text{טָסַן}$ . (Compare ch. 49:13. 51:3, 12. 52:9.) Knobel restricts the first clause to the siege of Jerusalem, especially by Nebuchadnezzar! Ewald, very unnecessarily, proposes to amend the text by reading in the last clause  $\text{תִּבְנֵנִי}$  *thy foundations*. If this be the specific sense intended, which is doubtful, it is sufficiently conveyed already by the common reading.

V. 12. *And I will make thy battlements (or pinnacles) ruby, and thy gates to (be) sparkling gems, and all thy border to (be) stones of pleasure (or delight).* The splendid image of the preceding verse is here continued and completed. The precise kinds of gems here meant are not of much importance. The essential idea, as appears from the etymology of the names, is that of sparkling brilliancy. The exact meaning of  $\text{אֲבָנֵי יָדָה}$  was unknown even in Jerome’s time. Aquila and Theodotion retain the Hebrew word, in which they are followed by Cocceius.  $\text{אֲבָנֵי יָדָה}$  is explained by Aben Ezra and Kimchi to mean windows or other apertures admitting the light of the sun. But the modern writers generally make it a poetical description of the battlements and spires of a city.—The Septuagint and Vulgate explain  $\text{אֲבָנֵי יָדָה}$  as denoting carved or sculptured stones; but its obvious connexion with the verb  $\text{תִּרְחֵן}$  favours the modern explanation, sparkling gems.—The last phrase is a more generic term, including all the others, and equivalent to our expression, precious stones. So too  $\text{אֲבָנֵי יָדָה}$  may be collective, and denote the whole congeries of buildings or their parts; although interpreters are more inclined to make it mean the outer wall of a fortified

city, which is described as built of the same costly materials. But Gesenius thinks it possible that there may be allusion to 1 Kings 10 : 27, and that the clause may represent the ground within the limits of the city as strewn with precious stones instead of pebbles.—The same interpreter regards the  $\frac{1}{2}$  in the last clause as a sign of the accusative, but Kimchi explains  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\text{אֶת־הַבָּנִים}$  as meaning ‘I will change into or render.’ Hitzig thinks it would have been “*bequemere*,” and Knobel “*passender*,” if the writer, instead of saying that their gates should be *turned into* precious stones, had said they should be *made of* them.—Vitranga of course puts a specific sense on every part of the description, understanding by the  $\text{שַׁרְיָם}$  of the preceding verse the doctrine of Christ’s blood, by the gates the synods of the church, by the battlements its advocates and champions, etc. Lowth, with better taste and judgment, says that “these seem to be general images to express beauty, magnificence, purity, strength, and solidity, agreeably to the ideas of the eastern nations, and to have never been intended to be strictly scrutinized, or minutely and particularly explained, as if they had each of them some precise moral or spiritual meaning.”

V. 13. *And all thy children disciples of Jehovah, and great (or plentiful) the peace of thy children.* Ewald makes the sentence simply descriptive, by supplying *are* in the present tense. Most other writers supply *shall be*, and thus make it a prediction or a promise.  $\text{בָּנִים}$ , when used as a distinctive term, means *sons*; but it is constantly employed where we say *children*.—The common version, *taught of God*, which Lowth changes into *taught by God*, though not erroneous, is inadequate; since  $\text{לְמַדְרֵי}$  is not a participle but a noun, used elsewhere to denote a pupil, follower, or disciple. (See ch. 8 : 16.) The promise is not one of occasional instruction, but of permanent connexion with Jehovah, as his followers and partakers of his constant teaching. That the words are applicable to the highest teaching of which any rational being is susceptible, to wit, that of the Holy Spirit making known the Father and the Son, we have our Saviour’s own authority for stating. (See John 6 : 44, and compare Matt. 23 : 8. Heb. 8 : 11. 1 John 2 : 27.) Paul too describes believers as *θεοδιδάκτοι* in relation to the duties of their calling. (1 Thess. 4 : 9.) Similar promises under the Old Testament are given in Jer. 31 : 34 and elsewhere. Gesenius restricts the words to the promise of prophetic inspiration, the want of which is lamented in Lam. 2 : 9. Ps. 74 : 9, and the renewal of it promised in Joel 3 : 1. But this restriction is regarded as unauthorized even by Maurer. As in ch. 43 : 9, all the gifts of the Spirit are included. The consequence of this blessed privilege is peace, no doubt in the widest sense of spiritual welfare and prosperity. (John 14 : 27. Phil. 4 : 7.) Knobel restricts the promise to the people of Jerusalem, and Hendewerk declares that it was

broken in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. To prevent the tautological recurrence of אָרְזֶנָּה, Koppe reads אָרְזֶנָּה in the first clause and Döderlein in the second, while J. D. Michaelis, for a different reason, makes the change in both. Kocher and Rosenmüller cite examples of such repetition from ch. 16 : 7. 55 : 4, and 55 : 10, together with Virgil's famous line, *Ambo florentes aetatibus Arcades ambo*. Such precedents were surely not required to justify a bold but beautiful expression from the charges brought against it by pedantic rhetoricians.—Umbreit supposes that this verse contains an explanation of the striking figures in the one before it. Hitzig compares the first clause with the corresponding part of ch. 60 : 21, *and thy people all of them are righteous*, which idea is expressed here in the next verse.

V. 14. *In righteousness shalt thou be established: be far from oppression, for thou shalt not fear, and from destruction, for it shall not come near to thee.* An additional promise of complete security, made more emphatic by its repetition in a variety of forms. By *righteousness* J. H. Michaelis understands the righteousness or faithfulness of God, securing the performance of his promises; Vitranga, the justice of the government itself; Rosenmüller and the other modern writers, the practice of righteousness among the people. The first, however, comprehends the others as its necessary consequences, public and private virtue being always represented in Scripture as the fruit of divine influence. (Compare ch. 1 : 27. 9 : 6. 11 : 5. 16 : 5.)—The modern grammarians acquiesce in Aben Ezra's explanation of אָרְזֶנָּה as a Hithpael form like אָרְזֶנָּה, ch. 52 : 5.—Of the next clause there are several interpretations. The Septuagint, Peshito, and Vulgate, understand it as a warning or dissuasion from the practice of oppression. But this does not agree with the context, which is evidently meant to be consolatory and encouraging. Still more unnatural is the opinion of Cocceius, that אָרְזֶנָּה here means spiritual robbery, such as robbing God of his glory, the soul of its salvation, etc. etc. Jerome arbitrarily renders it *calumniam*. The explanation which has been most generally acquiesced in, is the one proposed by Kimchi, who takes אָרְזֶנָּה in a passive sense, i. e. as meaning the experience of oppression, and supposes the imperative to represent the future, or a promise to be clothed in the form of a command: 'Be far from oppression, i. e. thou shalt be far from it.' Examples of this idiom are supposed to occur in Gen. 42 : 18. Deut. 32 : 50. Prov. 20 : 13. But as this makes it necessary to give אָרְזֶנָּה the sense of *ya* with Lowth, or of *therefore* with Vitranga, Gesenius and the later writers choose to adhere to the strict sense of the imperative, and give אָרְזֶנָּה in this one place the meaning of anxiety, distress, which they suppose to be the sense of אָרְזֶנָּה in ch. 38 : 14. The ground of this gratuitous assumption is the parallel expression אָרְזֶנָּה consternation, fear, which seems to require in this place an analogous



affection of the mind. It will be found, however, on investigation, that there are several instances in which  $\text{יִרְאָה}$  cannot possibly mean *fear* (e. g. Ps. 89 : 41. Prov. 10 : 14. 13 : 3. 18 : 7); while in every place where it occurs, perhaps excepting Jer. 48 : 39, the other sense *destruction* is entirely appropriate. On the soundest principles of lexicography, this meaning is entitled to the preference, and, if adopted here, forms an accurate parallelism to  $\text{רָצַח}$  in the sense which it uniformly has elsewhere (e. g. in ch. 30 : 12 and 59 : 13), viz. oppression or violent injustice. That the other term is stronger, only adds to the expression the advantage of a climax. There is no need, however, of explaining the imperative as a future, like the older writers, or of taking  $\text{אַל}$  in any but its usual and proper sense. *Be far from oppression* is not a promise of exemption from it, for that follows in the next clause, which the modern interpreters correctly understand as meaning, thou hast no cause to fear. The other words are well explained by Knobel as relating to the feelings of the person here addressed. *Be far from oppression*, i. e. far from apprehending it. The whole may then be paraphrased as follows: 'When once established by the exercise of righteousness on my part and your own, you may put far off all dread of oppression, for you have no cause to fear it, and of destruction, for it shall not come nigh you.'—With the promise of this clause, compare ch. 32 : 16 and 62 : 12.—Knobel and Hendewerk are actually able to persuade themselves that this verse contains a specific promise that Jerusalem should never be successfully besieged again. The truth of the promise, in its true sense, is vindicated by the fact that it relates to the course of the new dispensation as a whole, with special reference to its final consummation.

V. 15. *Lo, they shall gather, they shall gather, not at my sign (or signal). Who has gathered against thee? He shall fall away to thee.* The promise of the preceding verse is here so modified as to provide for every possible contingency. If enemies should be assembled, it will not be by divine command (compare ch. 10 : 5. 47 : 6), and they shall end by coming over to the side of those whom they assail. This, on the whole, appears to be the meaning, although every expression has received a different explanation. Gesenius gives  $\text{אִם}$  the sense of *if*, as in Chaldee, and notes it as a proof of later date: to which it may be answered, first, that his own examples include some in the oldest books, e. g. Ex. 8 : 22; then, that the assumption of this meaning in the present case is wholly gratuitous; and lastly, that it is a dubious question whether any such usage of the word exists at all. Cocceius follows Jarchi in giving  $\text{יִרְאָה}$  the sense of *fear*, which it sometimes has, e. g. in Deut. 1 : 17 and Psalm 22 : 24. The Septuagint and Targum give it the still more frequent sense of 'sojourning, dwelling

as a stranger,' and apply the clause to proselytes. In like manner Gousset, followed by Rosenmüller, understands the words to mean, that no one who sojourns with Israel shall remain a stranger to the true religion. Tremellius makes it mean 'contend,' and Ewald, 'stir up bitterness,' both apparently resorting to the cognate  $\text{רָצַף}$  as a source of illustration. Most interpreters agree with Kimchi in giving  $\text{רָצַף}$  the same sense here as in Ps. 56 : 7. 59 : 4, on which places see Hengstenberg's Commentary.—There is also a difference as to the construction. Luther makes the whole verse one interrogation. Gesenius, as we have already seen, makes the first clause conditional. Others translate it as a concession, 'let them gather.' But the simplest and most natural construction is to translate  $\text{רָצַף}$  as a future proper. They shall indeed (or no doubt) gather. The promise is not that they should never be assailed, but that they should never be conquered.—The Targum explains  $\text{רָצַף}$  to mean *in the end*; but most writers understand it as a simple negative. (See above, on ch. 52 : 4.)  $\text{רָצַף}$  is regarded by Gesenius as another proof of later date, the preposition  $\text{רָצַף}$  being confounded with the objective participle. But here again examples of the same analogy are found as early as Lev. 15 : 18, 24, and Josh. 23 : 15. It is not the occasional occurrence of this form but its habitual use that marks the later writers, as is well observed by Hävernick, who explains the case before us as an effect of the pause accent, while in the one below (ch. 59 : 21) he maintains that  $\text{רָצַף}$  is the noun meaning *sign* (Einleitung I. pp. 198, 222); which last explanation is still more applicable here, *not by my sign or signal* being not only perfectly in keeping with the usage of the same figure elsewhere, but yielding substantially the same sense which the word has according to the common explanation, namely, *not by my authority or not at my command*. (Compare  $\text{רָצַף}$  Hos. 7 : 14.) Hitzig throws these words ( $\text{רָצַף}$   $\text{רָצַף}$ ) into a parenthesis—'which is not from me,' and Ewald gives them the force of a proviso—'only not from me,' i. e. no attack shall be successful, provided it is made without my authority. The same writer takes  $\text{רָצַף}$  in its usual sense as an interrogative pronoun, while Gesenius and others make it mean *whoever*. (See above, on ch. 50 : 10.) Vitranga and the English Version separate  $\text{רָצַף}$  from the following verb, and take the latter absolutely, 'he shall fall,' i. e. perish. Knobel obtains the same sense without a violation of the accents, by supposing  $\text{רָצַף}$   $\text{רָצַף}$  to be synonymous with  $\text{רָצַף}$   $\text{רָצַף}$ , 'he shall fall before thee.' But the former phrase is determined by a settled usage to denote the act of falling away or deserting to an enemy. (See 1 Chron. 12 : 19, 20. 2 Chron. 15 : 9. Jer. 21 : 9.) In one case (1 Sam. 29 : 3) the same idea seems to be expressed by the verb when absolutely used. This explanation of the last words is as old as the Septuagint ( $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \sigma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\zeta\omicron\rho\tau\alpha\iota$ ) and Vulgate (*adjugetur tibi*).

V. 16. *Lo, I have created the smith, blowing into the fire of coal, and bringing out a weapon for his work; and I have created the waster to destroy.* The general meaning evidently is that God can certainly redeem his pledge, because all instruments and agents are alike at his disposal and under his control. He is not only the maker of the weapons of war, but the maker of their maker, as well as of the warrior who wields them.—The pronoun in both clauses is emphatic. It is I (and not another) who created them.—The common version of the second member, *that bloweth the coals in the fire*, is inconsistent with the masoretic pointing and accentuation, which require נִפְּחֵהוּ בְּאֵשׁ to be construed *in regimine*, as meaning *a coal fire* in opposition to an ordinary fire of wood. The same preposition is elsewhere used as a connective between this verb and the object blown upon or at (Ezek. 37 : 9), and in one other place at least in reference to the same act of blowing into fire (Ezek. 22 : 21), an exact description of the process even at the present day. A similar glimpse into the ancient forge or smithy has already been afforded in the scornful attack upon the worshippers of idols, ch. 41 : 6.—*Bringing out* does not mean bringing out of his workshop or his hands, as Knobel explains it, but bringing into shape or into being, precisely as we say bringing forth, producing, although commonly in reference to animal or vegetable life. Perhaps, however, it would be still better to explain it as meaning out of the fire, in which case there would be a fine antithesis between blowing into it and bringing the wrought iron out of it.—וְיָצֵא may denote any instrument, but here derives from the connexion the specific sense of *weapon*. (See above, on ch. 52 : 11.) The next phrase has been variously understood. Interpreters are much divided as to the antecedent of the suffix pronoun. Some of the older writers understand it as applying to the instrument itself, *bringing forth a weapon for its work*, i. e. fitted for the work of destruction. Others suppose it to refer by prolepsis to the warrior or destroyer who is mentioned in the last clause, *bringing forth a weapon for his work* or use. A still greater number understand it as referring to the smith or armourer himself. Besides the modern English versions, which are either unmeaning or inaccurate,—*according to his work* (Lowth), *by his labour* (Noyes), *as the result of his work* (Barnes),—this class includes the ingenious construction of the words by Ewald, *bringing forth a weapon as his own work, whereas I made the deadly weapon for destruction*. According to this interpretation, וְיָצֵא הַמְּדַבֵּר *the destroyer* is a poetical description of the weapon before mentioned; whereas most interpreters apply it to the warrior who wields it, as if he had said, I make the weapon of destruction and I also make the waster to destroy with it. Both these hypotheses agree in making the destruction mentioned to be that of enemies in battle, one ascribing it directly to the weapon and the other to the combatant. But Gesenius follows Jarchi and Kimchi in supposing the

destruction here meant to be that of the instruments themselves, as if he had said, I create the weapons of war and I also create the destroyer to destroy them. Gesenius seems to think that this construction is required by the repetition of  $\text{אֲנִי}$ , as clearly indicating an antithesis; but this is equally secured by Ewald's version, and even in the common and more natural construction, the repeated pronoun has its proper emphasis. 'It is I that create the smith who makes the instruments, and it is also I that create the destroyer who employs them.'

V. 17. *Every weapon (that) shall be formed against thee shall not prosper, and every tongue (that) shall rise with thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of Jehovah, and their righteousness from me, saith Jehovah.* The common version of the first clause expresses the same thought in the English idiom, *no weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper*, a form of speech which does not exist in Hebrew, and can only be supplied by combining negative and universal terms. The expression, though ambiguous, is determined by the context. It cannot mean that only some of the weapons formed should take effect—which might be the meaning of the phrase in English—because in the affirmative clause which follows, and which must be co-extensive in its meaning, there is no such ambiguity, it being said expressly that every tongue shall be condemned. Another difference of idiom here exemplified has reference to the ellipsis of the relative pronoun, which in English is familiarly omitted when the object of the verb, but never when its subject. *Every weapon they form* would be perfectly intelligible; but *every weapon is formed* (for which *is formed*) would convey a wrong idea.—*Shall not prosper*, i. e. shall not take effect or accomplish its design. Vitringa needlessly supposes a litotes or meiosis, as if the words meant that the weapon should itself be destroyed; but this is not expressed, even if it is implied, which may be questioned.—To rise or stand in judgment, literally *for or with respect to judgment*, is to appear before a judgment-seat, to invoke the decision of a judge. *With thee* may either denote simply simultaneous action, that of standing up together, or it may have the stronger sense *against thee*, as it seems to have above in v. 15, and as it has in our expressions to *fight with* or to *go to law with*. The tongue is here personified, or used to represent the party litigant whose only weapon is his speech. Lowth translates  $\text{אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ$  *thou shalt obtain thy cause*, which is the true sense, but requires the insertion of *against* before *every tongue*, which in Hebrew is governed directly by the verb. For the judicial or forensic usage of this verb, see above, on ch. 50: 9.—Hitzig explains what is here said of litigation as a mere figure for war, which is literally described in the foregoing clause; and Knobel cites a case (1 Sam. 14: 47) in which the verb  $\text{אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ}$  is applied to conquest. It

is also easy to deduce the one sense from the other, by assuming as the intermediate link the idea—not confined to ancient nations—that success in arms is a criterion of right and wrong, the very principle on which the wager of battle and the ordeal of the duel rested. But in this case it is far more satisfactory and natural, instead of making one clause figurative and the other literal, to understand both either literally or figuratively as a comprehensive description of all controversy or contention. Kimchi supposes these two clauses to reduce all opposition and hostility to that of word and that of deed; but there may also be allusion to the obvious distinction between warfare in its military and its civil forms, or between what is properly called war and litigation. In all these varied forms of strife it is predicted that the church shall be victorious. (Compare Rom. 8 : 37 and 2 Cor. 2 : 14.) And this security is represented as her heritage or lawful possession and as her right, i. e. what is due to her from God, as the judge of the whole earth, who must do right. Lowth and Ewald understand it to mean *justification*: ‘this security shall prove that God acquits or justifies me from the charges brought against me by my enemies.’ Vitringa gives the Hebrew word the simple sense *jus*, or that to which the party is entitled. The diluted sense of *blessing* or *prosperity*, which some of the later writers prefer even here, no longer needs a refutation. The English Version makes this last an independent clause, *their righteousness is of me*; which is wholly unnecessary, and affords a less appropriate sense than the construction above given, which is the one now commonly adopted.—According to Ewald this verse is an explanation of the promise at the close of ch. 53. Hendewerk goes further and identifies the heritage of this verse with the division of the spoil in that, and the collective *servants* here named with the individual *servant* mentioned there. Knobel is still more explicit, and asserts that the Prophet, having been disappointed in his hope that all Israel would return from exile, now discards the use of the word *servant* and confines himself to that of the plural. The only colour for this singular assertion is the fact, no doubt remarkable, that we read no more of the ‘Servant of Jehovah’ who has been so often introduced before, but often of his ‘servants.’ It may no doubt be said in explanation of this fact, that the Prophet has completed his description of that august person under his various characters and aspects, but has still much to say of his followers or servants. But a full explanation is afforded only by the hypothesis assumed throughout this exposition, that the Servant of Jehovah is a name applied both to the Body and the Head, sometimes to both in union, sometimes, as in ch. 53, to one exclusively; from which it naturally follows that as soon as he has reached the final exaltation of Messiah, and withdrawn him from our view, the Prophet thenceforth ceases to personify his members, and applies to them the ordinary plural designation of ‘Jehovah’s servants.’

## CHAPTER LV.

By the removal of the old restrictions, the church is, for the first time, open to the whole world, as a source or medium of the richest spiritual blessings, v. 1. It is only here that real nourishment can be obtained, v. 2. Life is made sure by an oath and covenant, v. 3. The Messiah is a witness of the truth and a commander of the nations, v. 4. As such he will be recognised by many nations who before knew nothing of the true religion, v. 5. These are now addressed directly, and exhorted to embrace the offered opportunity, v. 6. To this there is every encouragement afforded in the divine mercy, v. 7. The infinite disparity between God and man should have the same effect, instead of hindering it, vs. 8, 9. The commands and promises of God must be fulfilled, vs. 10, 11. Nothing therefore can prevent a glorious change in the condition of the world under the dispensation of the Spirit, v. 12. This blessed renovation, being directly promotive of God's glory, shall endure for ever, v. 13.

V. 1. *Ho every thirsty one, come ye to the waters ; and he to whom there is no money, come ye, buy (food) and eat ; and come, buy, without money and without price, wine and milk.* The promises contained in the preceding chapters to the church, are now followed by a general invitation to partake of the blessings thus secured. Water, milk, and wine, are here combined to express the ideas of refreshment, nourishment, and exhilaration. Under these figures are included, as Calvin well observes, all things essential to the spiritual life. The Targum restricts the terms to intellectual supplies : ' whoever will learn let him come and learn.' The same application is made by Aben Ezra and Kimchi, and Vitringa admits that the language is highly appropriate to the Gentiles who were seeking after wisdom. (1 Cor. 1 : 22.) But the benefits here offered must of course bear some proportion to the means by which they were secured, viz. the atoning death of the Messiah and the influences of his Spirit. Among the earlier writers Grotius alone restricts the passage to the period of the Babylonish exile. Even the Rabbins understand it as relating to their present dispersion. Grotius's further limitation of the passage to the teachings of Jeremiah, as a rich supply offered to the heathen, is of course rejected by the modern Germans, not so much because of its absurdity as on account of its recognis-

ing Isaiah as the author. They adhere, however, to his Babylonian theory, and task their powers of invention to explain the general terms of this gracious invitation in accordance with it. Thus Hendewerk regards the chapter as an intimation to the exiles that they should be freed as soon as they were brought into a proper state of mind, together with a promise that when once restored they should obtain for nothing in their own land what they could not even buy for money in the land of their oppressors. In like manner Knobel understands the Prophet as declaring the conditions upon which the exile was to cease, and promising to those who should return the enjoyment of unparalleled abundance in the Holy Land. It is easy to perceive that this specific explanation of a passage in itself unlimited is far more easy than the unauthorized extension of one really specific, because in the former case there is nothing in the passage itself which can be urged against a limitation which is only false because it is gratuitous. The best refutation is afforded by the ease with which a thousand other limitations, once assumed, might be brought into seeming agreement with the terms of the prediction. If, for example, some new critic, still more intrepid than his predecessors, should maintain that this book is of later date than the Babylonian exile, having been written at the period of the Maccabees, or even in the days of Josephus, whatever difficulties might arise from definite allusions to anterior events in other places, it would require but little ingenuity to reconcile the foregone conclusion with the general terms of such a prophecy as that before us. The hypothesis once granted, the details would all seem to follow of course. The impartial interpreter is therefore bound to resist all such unauthorized restrictions and to give the Prophet's words their full scope, as relating to the benefits which God proposed from the beginning to bestow upon the nations through the medium of his church. The mixed or half-way theory of Henderson that this passage relates to the Babylonish exile and also to the reign of the Messiah, has all the inconveniences of both the others without the advantages of either.—Most of the modern writers follow Jarchi in explaining וְיָחַד as a mere participle of invitation, which is variously expressed by Luther (*wohlan!*), Gesenius (*auf!*), De Wette (*ha!*), etc. Maurer insists, however, on the usual and strict sense of the participle as expressing pity for the exiles (*heu, alas!*), not only here but in Zech. 2 : 10, 11.—שָׂאֵף is not properly a participle (*thirsting*), but a verbal adjective (*athirst* or *thirsty*). Vitranga strangely makes it neuter (*omne sitiens*), although the very nature of the invitation points out persons as the object of address, and although this is the only form in which an address to persons could have been expressed; whereas if a distinction were designed, the neuter would, according to the Hebrew idiom, be represented by the feminine. The combination of the singular (*every one*) with the plural verb (*come ye*) may be either an idiomatic license or intended to

extend the call to every individual.—The reference to the water of baptism, which some of the Fathers found in this verse, is excluded by the fact that the water here meant is not water for washing but water to be drunk.—*And he*, after the universal expression *every one*, does not add a new idea, but explains the one expressed already, and is therefore equivalent to *even he* in English. The same remark applies to the *and* before the second *come*, which is not incorrectly rendered *yea come* in the common version.—*To whom there is not money* is the only equivalent in Hebrew to our phrase *who has no money*. Instead of this generic term Lowth retains the original meaning of the Hebrew word, *silver*, in which he is followed by Ewald and Umbreit.— $\text{קָנָה}$  is not to buy in general, but to buy food, or still more specifically to buy grain or breadstuffs. It is here absolutely used, as in Gen. 41 : 57. 42 : 2, 5. Henderson's paraphrase (*procure*) is too indefinite, and not at all needed to remove the seeming incongruity of buying without money or any other price. This apparent contradiction was intended by the writer to express in the strongest manner the gratuitous nature of the purchase. *Wine* and *milk* are combined, either as necessities or luxuries, by Jacob in Gen. 49 : 12.—The images of this verse are essentially the same with those in ch. 12 : 3. 25 : 6. 62 : 8, 9. 65 : 13. John 4 : 14. 7 : 37. Rev. 22 : 17.—Sanctius, in order to connect this chapter with the one before it, supposes the idea to be that of a feast provided in the habitation which is there described as having been enlarged. Vitringa thinks it better to call up the image of a market and a public fountain. Neither of these conceptions would spontaneously occur to any ordinary reader.

V. 2. *Why will ye weigh money for (that which is) not bread, and your labour for (that which is) not to satiety? Hearken, hearken unto me, and eat (that which is) good, and your soul shall enjoy itself in fatness.* The gratuitous blessings offered by Messiah are contrasted with the costly and unprofitable labours of mankind to gain the same end in another way. It was not that they refused food, nor even that they were unwilling to buy it; but they mistook for it that which was not nourishing. In the first clause there is reference to the primitive custom of weighing instead of counting money, from which have arisen several of the most familiar denominations, such as the Hebrew *shekel*, the Greek *talent*, the French *livre*, and the English *pound*. The essential idea here is that of paying. Bread, as the staff of life, is here and in many other cases put for food in general.—*Labour*, as in ch. 45 : 14, means the product or result of labour. It is well expressed by Umbreit (*euer Ermühetes*). Ewald's translation (*euer Erspartes*) rather suggests the idea of that which is saved or hoarded, whereas the writer seems to have in view the immediate expenditure of what is earned.—The emphatic repetition of the verb *to hear* may be variously



expressed in English as denoting to hear diligently, attentively, by all means, or to purpose; but the best translation, because it may be considered as including all the rest, is that which copies most exactly the peculiar form of the original. The old mode of doing this by joining the participle with the finite verb (*hearkening ye shall hearken*) is at once less exact and less expressive than the simple repetition used by Ewald elsewhere, although here he introduces the word *rather* (*vielmehr hört*).—The mention of the soul admits of two explanations. We may give the Hebrew word its frequent sense of *appetite*, exactly as the appetite is said in common parlance to be gratified, indulged, pampered, mortified, etc. This is a good sense in itself, but less in keeping with the rest of the description than another which may be obtained by supposing that the soul is mentioned for the purpose of showing that the hunger and the food referred to are not bodily but spiritual. Most of the modern writers explain  $\text{אֲכַלְתֶּם}$  as an imperative used for the future according to a common Hebrew idiom. (See ch. 45 : 22 and Gen. 42 : 18.) But there is no need of departing from the strict construction which makes  $\text{אֲכַלְתֶּם}$  a command. The promise is not that if they hearkened they should eat, but that if they hearkened and ate they should be happy.—*Good* is emphatic, meaning that which is truly good, in opposition to the *no-bread* of the first clause, which Vitringa and the later writers take as a peculiar compound phrase like  $\text{לֶחֶם-אֵי$  (ch. 10 : 15),  $\text{לֶחֶם-אֵלֹהִים}$  and  $\text{לֶחֶם-חַיִּים}$  (ch. 31 : 3). *Fat*, by a figure common in all languages, is put for *richness* both of food and soil. (See ch. 5 : 1. Ps. 36 : 9. 63 : 6. Job 36 : 16.) There is something almost laughable in Rosenmüller's saying that the orientals are extremely fond of gross food, when the fact is notoriously otherwise, and such a charge has often been alleged against the Germans either truly or falsely. Luther degrades the text itself by rendering it *shall grow fat*. As a sample of the opposite extreme of false refinement, we may give Lowth's paraphrase, *your soul shall feast itself with the richest delicacies*.—The application of the figures is self-evident upon the general hypothesis before assumed. Aben Ezra and Kimchi, who suppose the blessing offered to be purely intellectual, apply the first clause to foreign or exotic wisdom ( $\text{חַכְמַת זְרָמִית}$ ). But the hardest task devolves on those who understand the passage as relating exclusively to the deliverance of Israel from Babylon. In what sense could the exiles there be said to spend their money for what was not bread, and their labour for what did not satisfy? Koppe was brave enough to make it refer literally to the bad bread which the Jews were compelled to eat in Babylonia. Hitzig only ventures to make this a part of the calamity described, which he explains, with Gesenius, as consisting in the slavery to which they were subjected, not as tributaries merely, but as labourers without reward. (Compare Josh. 9 : 27. 1 Kings 9 : 21.) Maurer refers the clause to the expensive worship of idols, from whom no favours

were obtained in recompense. (See ch. 46 : 6, 7.) Knobel sees merely a strong contrast between Babylon, where the Jews spent much without enjoyment or advantage, and the Holy Land, where they should enjoy much and spend nothing. The last he might consistently regard as a mere visionary expectation ; but the only proof which he adduces of the fact first mentioned is the reference to Israel's oppression in ch. 14 : 3. 47 : 6. 51 : 14. A comparison of these interpretations with the true one will show how much is gained by the assumption of the Babylonian theory, and how strong the motive must be which induces men of ingenuity and learning to adopt it in spite of the embarrassments with which it is encumbered.

V. 3. *Incline your ear and come unto me, hear and your soul shall live (or let it live), and I will make with you an everlasting covenant, the sure mercies of David.* This is obviously a repetition of the same offer in another form ; which shows that the two preceding verses cannot have respect to literal food or bodily subsistence. Here again the use of the word *soul* necessarily suggests the thought of spiritual life, and this sense is admitted here by Kimchi and Abarbenel. Neither of the animal life nor of the appetite could it be said that it should live. The abbreviated form הִתְהַיְתָה may either give the future an imperative sense or be taken as a poetical substitute for the full form of the future proper. The regular construction of בְּרַחֲמֵי is with עָשָׂה. That with יְהִי, according to Vitranga, simply means a promise ; according to Gesenius, an engagement on the part of a superior. (See ch. 61 : 8. Josh. 9 : 15. 24 : 25.) There is no need of assuming a zeugma in the last clause, with Gesenius, or supposing בְּרַחֲמֵי to include the idea of bestowing, with Knobel ; since the *mercies of David* are not directly governed by that verb, but simply added as an explanation of the *everlasting covenant*. As if he had said, I will make with you an everlasting covenant which shall be the same with the mercies of David. Of this phrase, which is also used by Solomon (2 Chr. 6 : 42), there are three interpretations. The rabbins and Grotius understand it to mean favours, like those which were enjoyed by David. Cocceius regards David as a name of the Messiah, as in Ezek. 34 : 23, 24, to which he adds Hos. 3 : 5 ; but this may be understood, with Hitzig, as merely meaning David's house or family. The third explanation, and the one most commonly adopted, is, that the *mercies of David* means the mercies promised to him, with particular reference to 2 Sam. 7 : 8-16. (Compare 1 Chr. 17 : 11, 12 and Psalm 89 : 3, 4.) As the main theme of this promise was a perpetual succession on the throne of David, it was fulfilled in Christ, to whom it is applied in Acts 13 : 34. (Compare Is. 9 : 6 and Luke 1 : 32, 33.) The Greek word *ῥομα* there used is borrowed from the Septuagint Version, and is so far correct as it conveys the idea of a sacred and inviolable engagement. That the promise

to David was distinct from that respecting Solomon (1 Chr. 22 : 8-13), and had not reference to any immediate descendant, Henderson has shown from 1 Chr. 17 : 12-14. Thus understood, the text contains a solemn assurance that the promise made to David should be faithfully performed in its original import and intent. Hence the mercies of David are called *sure*, i. e. sure to be accomplished ; or it might be rendered faithful, credible, or trusted, without any material effect upon the meaning. With this interpretation of the verse may be compared that of Knobel, who explains it as a promise that the theocratic covenant should be restored (as if it had been abrogated), or of Rosenmüller, who supposes it to have been given to console the exiles under the despondency arising from the ruin of the House of David during the captivity, and the apparent violation of the promise which had long before been given to himself. So far as there is any truth in this interpretation, it is but a small part of the full sense of the passage as relating to the everlasting reign of the Messiah.

V. 4. *Lo, (as) a witness of nations I have given him, a chief and commander of nations.* The emphasis appears to be on *nations*, which is therefore repeated without change of form. The essential meaning is the same as that of ch. 49 : 6, viz. that the Messiah was sent to be the Saviour not of the Jews only but also of the Gentiles. His relation to the latter is expressed by three terms. First he is a witness, i. e. a witness to the truth (John 18 : 37) and a witness against sinners (Mal. 3 : 5). The same office is ascribed to Christ in Rev. 1 : 5. 3 : 14. (Compare 1 Tim. 6 : 13.) The application of this verse to the Messiah, therefore, is entirely natural if taken by itself. But an objection is presented by the fact that the Messiah is not named in the foregoing context. It is hardly an adequate solution to affirm with Vitranga that the verse must be connected with the fifty-third chapter, and the fifty-fourth considered parenthetical. Cocceius refers the suffixes to David in v. 3, which he explains there as a name of the Messiah. The same resort is not accessible to Henderson, who arbitrarily makes David in the third verse mean the ancient king and in the fourth the Messiah,—an expedient which may be employed to conquer any difficulty. All the modern Germans except Umbreit understand the verse before us as describing the honours actually put upon king David. *Lo, I gave him as a witness of the nations, a leader and commander of the nations.* This is certainly the simplest and most natural construction of the sentence, but one not without its difficulties. According to general analogy, the interjection לו has reference not to a past event, but to one either present or future. This argument from usage is confirmed by the fact that לו at the beginning of the next verse does undoubtedly relate to the future, and that the connexion of the verses is obscure and abrupt if that before us be referred to David.

Another difficulty is, that David could not with truth be so emphatically styled the chief or leader of the nations. For although he did subdue some foreign tribes, they did not constitute the main part of his kingdom, and the character in which the Scriptures always represent him is that of a theocratic king of Israel. Another difficulty in relation to the use of the term *witness* is evaded by supposing עֵד, in this one place, to mean a ruler (Gesenius) or a legislator (Maurer). Ewald's translation of the word by *law* seems to be an inadvertence. This violation of a perfectly defined and settled usage would be treated by these writers in an adversary as a proof of ignorance or *mala fides*. The only shadow of evidence which they adduce from usage or analogy, is the assertion, equally unfounded, that the verbal root sometimes means to enjoin, and the collateral derivatives עֲדָה and עֲדָה laws or precepts. The utmost that can be established by a philological induction is, that in some cases the alleged sense would be relevant, whereas the proper one of testimony is in every case admissible. If in the face of these facts we may still invent a new sense for a word which has enough already to account for every instance in the Hebrew Bible, there is no such thing as principles or laws of lexicography, and every critic has a full discretion to confound the application of a term with its essential meaning when he pleases. As to its being here combined with other words expressive of authority, let it be noted, that words thus connected cannot always be synonymous, and in the next place that the usual meaning of the term, as applied to the Messiah or to God, implies as much authority as either of the others, for it means an authoritative witness of the truth, and this is substantially equivalent to Prophet or Divine Teacher,—an office with which David never was invested in relation to the gentiles. The more restricted sense of *monitor* (מוֹדֵר) which Kimchi puts upon the word is no less arbitrary than the vague one (עֵד) given in the Targum.—עֵד is properly the one in front, the foremost, and is therefore naturally used to signify a chief or leader. This title is expressly applied to the Messiah by Daniel (9: 25), and the corresponding titles ἀρχων and ἀρχηγός to Christ in the New Testament (Acts 3: 15. Heb. 2: 10. Rev. 4: 5), considered both as an example and a leader.—The third name (עֲדָר), being properly the participle of a verb which means to command, might be considered as equivalent either to *preceptor* or *commander*, both derivatives from verbs of the same meaning. Now as one of these definitions agrees well with the explanation which has been adopted of the first title (*witness*), and the other with the obvious meaning of the second (*leader*), and as the offices of preceptor and commander are by no means incompatible and actually meet in Christ, there seems to be no sufficient reason for excluding either in the case before us. At the same time, let it be observed that as עֲדָר sometimes means to command in a military sense, but never perhaps to teach or give

instruction, the idea of commander must predominate in any case, and is entitled to the preference, if either must be chosen to the entire exclusion of the other.—Of the objections which the modern writers urge against the application of this verse to the Messiah, that which they appear to consider the most cogent and conclusive is precisely that which we have seen, from the beginning of the book, to be the weakest and most groundless, namely, that these Later Prophecies know nothing of a personal Messiah; which is established in the usual manner by denying all the cases *seriatim*, and refusing to let one of them be cited in defence or illustration of another. It is proper to observe in this connexion, that both Umbreit and Hendewerk retain the usual sense of מָלֵךְ, and that the latter understands the verse as a description of the office which the Jewish people should discharge in reference to the other nations after their return from exile. This is a near approach to the correct interpretation, and may be blended with it by recurring to the exegetical hypothesis, of which we have so often spoken, that the Body and the Head are often introduced as one ideal person. This, though at variance with Knobel's notion that the Prophet has now ceased to speak of Israel as one individual servant of Jehovah (see above, on ch. 54: 17), is in perfect accordance with the general tenor of the Scriptures as to the vocation and the mission both of Christ and of the Church.

V. 5. *Lo, a nation (that) thou knowest not thou shalt call, and a nation (that) have not known thee shall run unto thee, for the sake of Jehovah thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel, for he hath glorified thee.* The question which has chiefly divided interpreters, in reference to this verse, is, whether the object of address is the Messiah or the Church. The former opinion is maintained by Calvin, Sanctius, and others; the latter by Grotius and Vitranga. The masculine forms prove nothing either way; because the Church is sometimes presented in the person of Israel, and sometimes personified as a woman. The most natural supposition is, that after speaking of the Messiah, he now turns to him and addresses him directly. If this be so, the verse affords an argument against the application of v. 4 to David, who could not be the subject of such a promise ages after his decease. At the same time, the facility with which the words can be applied to either subject, may be considered as confirming the hypothesis that although the Messiah is the main subject of the verse, the Church is not entirely excluded.—The construction of the second מֵאֵלֶיךָ with two plural verbs shows it to be collective. Lowth's version, *the nation*, is unnecessary here, although the article is frequently omitted both in poetry and elevated prose.—Their running indicates the eagerness with which they shall attach themselves to him and engage in his service. According to Jarchi, *thou shalt call* means thou

shalt call into thy service. (See Job 19 : 16.)—*For he hath glorified thee.* This expression is repeatedly used in the New Testament with reference to Christ. (See John 17 : 1, 5. Acts 3 : 13.) Henderson gives  $\text{וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה}$  what is supposed by some to be its primary sense, viz. that of a relative pronoun (*who hath glorified thee*); which is wholly unnecessary here, and rests upon a very dubious etymological assumption.—The form of expression in a part of this verse seems to be borrowed from 2 Sam. 22 : 44; but the resemblance neither proves that the Messiah is the subject of that passage nor that David is the subject of this.—The *nation* means of course the gentiles. What is said of the Messiah's not knowing them is thus explained by Schmi dius. "Messias non noverat gentiles ut ecclesiae suae membra actu, et gentiles ipsum non noverant, saltem fide, plerique etiam de ipso quicquam non audiverant."

V. 6. *Seek ye Jchovah while he may be found; call ye upon him while he is near.* The  $\text{וְ}$ , as usual when joined with the infinitive, is a particle of time. The literal translation would be, *in his being found, in his being near.* By a sudden apostrophe he turns from the Messiah to those whom he had come to save, and exhorts them to embrace this great salvation, to be reconciled with God. A similar exhortation, implying like the present that the day of grace is limited, occurs in Zeph. 2 : 2. There are two limitations of the text before us, which have no foundation but the will of the interpreters. The first restricts it to the Jews in general, either making it a general advice to them to seize the opportunity of restoration (Rosenmüller), or a special warning to those hardened sinners who refused to do so (Knobel), and particularly such as were addicted to idolatry. These expositions are doubly arbitrary, first in restricting the passage to that period of Jewish history, and then in assuming the imaginary fact that a portion of the exiles were unwilling to return; the passages appealed to in support of which are wholly inconclusive. An equally unfounded but less violent assumption is, that this passage has respect to the Jews not at that time merely, but in general, as distinguished from the gentiles. Like many other similar hypotheses, when this is once assumed, it is easy to accommodate the general expressions of the passage to it; but it would be difficult to find in the whole chapter any adequate reason for applying its commands and exhortations either to gentiles or to Jews exclusively. In either case there were peculiar reasons for obeying the injunction, but it seems to be addressed to both alike. The Jew had great cause to beware lest the gentile should outstrip him, and the gentile might be reasonably urged to partake of those advantages which hitherto had been restricted to the Jew; but both are called to the same duty, namely, that of seeking and calling upon God,—

expressions elsewhere used both severally and together to express the whole work of repentance, faith, and new obedience.—Lowth seems to find the common version of the last word (*near*) too simple, and enlarges it accordingly to *near at hand*.

V. 7. *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the man of iniquity his thoughts, and let him return unto Jehovah, and he will have mercy on him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon* (literally, *multiply to pardon*). This is a continuation of the foregoing call, and at the same time an explanation of the way in which it was to be obeyed. We are here taught that the seeking of Jehovah, and the calling upon him just enjoined, involve an abandonment of sin and a return to righteousness of life. The imperative version of the futures is warranted, if not required, by the abbreviated form  $\text{פָּרַח}$ . Even the future form, however, would convey the same essential meaning both in Hebrew and in English. *The wicked shall forsake* etc. is in fact the strongest form of a command. *Way* is a common figure for the course of life. What is here meant is the *evil way*, as Jeremiah calls it (56: 1), i. e. a habitually sinful course.— $\text{לֹא־יִהְיֶה}$  is a negative expression, strictly meaning non-existence or non-entity, and then, in a secondary moral sense, the destitution of all goodness, which is put, by a common Hebrew idiom, for the existence of the very opposite. The common version (*the unrighteous man*) gives the sense but not the whole force of the original construction, which is here retained by Hendewerk (*der Mann der Missethat*). The same writer speaks of these two verses as an interruption, by the Prophet, of the divine discourse. This criticism is founded on the mention of Jehovah in the third person, which is a form of speech constantly occurring, even where he is himself the speaker, not to mention the futility of the assumption that the passage is dramatic or a formal dialogue. It mattered little to the writer's purpose whether he seemed to be himself the speaker or a mere reporter of the words of God, to whom in either case they must be finally ascribed. Hence the constant alternation of the first, second, and third persons, in a style which sets all rules of unity and rigid laws of composition at defiance.—The word translated *thoughts* is commonly employed not to denote opinions but designs or purposes, in which sense it is joined with *way*, in order to express the whole drift of the character and life. To return to God in both these respects is a complete description of repentance, implying an entire change of heart as well as life.—The indirect construction of  $\text{וַיִּרְחַמֵּנוּ$ , which is given in most modern versions (*that he may have mercy on him*), is not only a gratuitous intrusion of the occidental idiom, but injurious to the sense by making that contingent which is positively promised. The encouragement to seek God is not merely that he *may*, but that he *will* have mercy. Lowth's decoction of the same words (*will*

*receive him with compassion*) is enfeebling in another way, and inexact; because the act of receiving is implied, not expressed, and the verb denotes not mere compassion but gratuitous and sovereign mercy.—There is further encouragement contained in the expression *our God*. To the Jew it would suggest motives drawn from the covenant relation of Jehovah to his people, while the gentile would regard it as an indirect assurance that even he was not excluded from God's mercy.—Another weakening of this sentence is effected by the modern version of the last clause as a mere description (Lowth: *for he aboundeth in forgiveness*), and not as an explicit promise that he will abundantly forgive, which is not only the natural and obvious import of the terms, but imperatively required by the favourite law of parallelism.

V. 8. *For my thoughts (are) not your thoughts, nor your ways my ways, saith Jehovah.* Clear and simple as these words are in themselves, they have occasioned much dispute among interpreters, in reference to their nexus with what goes before. The earliest commentators, Jews and Christians, seem to have understood them as intended to meet an objection to the promise arising from its vastness and its freeness, by assuring us that such forgiveness, however foreign from the feelings and the practices of men, is not beyond the reach of the divine compassion. As if he had said, 'to you such forgiveness may appear impossible; but my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither your ways my ways.' This is the sense put upon the words by Cyril, Aben Ezra, Kimchi, Oecolampadius, Piscator, Henderson. Thus understood, the text may be compared with Matt. 19: 26. Another explanation, that of Vitranga, rests upon the false assumption that the words have reference to the Jews, and were intended to correct their prejudice against the calling of the gentiles as at variance with the promises of God to themselves. As if he had said, 'you may think the extension of my grace to them a departure from my settled ways and purposes; but my thoughts are not your thoughts, nor your ways my ways.' This specific application of the words could scarcely be suggested to any ordinary reader, either by the text or context, and at most can only be considered as included in its general import. Jerome and Rosenmüller, while they seem to acquiesce in the principle of the interpretation first proposed, so far modify it as to make the faithfulness and truth of the divine assurances a prominent idea. This sense is also put upon the words by Gesenius and several of the later writers, who suppose the meaning of this verse to be determined by the analogy of vs. 10, 11, and accordingly explain it as denoting the irrevocable nature of God's purposes and promises. In this sense, it may be considered parallel to Num. 23: 19 and 1 Sam. 15: 29. Is. 31: 2. 45: 23. But this is neither the natural meaning of the words, nor one which stands in any obvious rela-



tion to what goes before; in consequence of which some who hold it are under the necessity of denying that the  $\text{׃}$  at the beginning of the verse has its proper causal meaning. It is indeed hard to see any coherence in this sequence of ideas, 'let the wicked man repent, for my promise is irrevocable.' This objection does not lie against another very ancient explanation of the passage, that proposed by Jarchi, but maintained by scarcely any later writer except Sanctius. This hypothesis is founded on the obvious correspondence of the terms employed in this verse and in that before it, and especially the parallel expressions *ways* and *thoughts*, there applied to man and here to God. According to this last interpretation, we have here a reason given why the sinner must forsake his ways and thoughts, viz. because they are incurably at variance with those of God himself: 'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; for my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither your ways my ways.' Vitringa's objection to this exposition, that the fact asserted is too obvious and familiar to be emphatically stated, is an arbitrary allegation, as to which the tastes of different men may naturally differ. There is more weight in the objection that the moral dissimilitude between God and man would hardly be expressed by a reference to the height of the heavens above the earth. But the difference in question is in fact a difference of elevation, on the most important scale, that of morals, and might therefore be naturally so expressed. At all events, this interpretation has so greatly the advantage of the others, in facility and beauty of connexion with what goes before, that it must be considered as at least affording the formal basis of the true interpretation, but without excluding wholly the ideas which according to the other theories these words express. They may all be reconciled indeed by making the disparity asserted have respect not merely to moral purity, but also to constancy, benevolence, and wisdom. As if he had said, 'you must forsake your evil ways and thoughts, and by so doing, you infallibly secure my favour; for as high as the heavens are above the earth, so far am I superior to you in mercy, not only in the rigour and extent of my requirements, but also in compassion for the guilty, in benevolent consideration even for the gentiles, and in the constancy and firmness of my purposes when formed.'—In his comment upon this verse, Vitringa gives his definition of the ways of God, which has so frequently been cited or repeated without citation: "Via Dei sunt vel quibus ipse incedit, vel quibus homines incedere vult." For the meaning of *his thoughts*, see Ps. 33: 11 and Jer. 51: 29. If the sense which has been put upon the sentence be correct, it means far more than that which Hitzig quotes from Homer ( $\alpha\lambda\lambda' \alpha\iota\epsilon\iota \tau\epsilon \Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \kappa\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\omega\nu \nu\omicron\omicron\varsigma \eta\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega\nu$ .) Knobel can of course see nothing here but an allusion to Cyrus and Croesus.

V. 9. *For (as) the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.* This is an illustration by comparison of the negative assertion in the verse preceding. The *as* in the protasis of the comparison is left out, as in Hos. 11 : 2. Ps. 48 : 6. Job 7 : 9. Jer. 3 : 20. There can be no ground therefore for supposing, with Secker, Houbigant, and Lowth, that it has dropped out of the text in this place. The full expression may be seen in ch. 10 : 11.—The  $\text{מִן}$  might here be taken in its proper sense of *from, away from*, as the reference is in fact to an interval of space ; but our idiom would hardly bear the strict translation, and comparison is certainly implied, if not expressed. The same comparison and in a similar application occurs Ps. 103 : 11.

V. 10, 11. *For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and thither returneth not, but when it has watered the earth and made it bear and put forth and has given seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be, which goeth out of my mouth ; it shall not return unto me void (or without effect), but when it has done that which I desired, and successfully done that for which I sent it.* This is a new comparison, suggested by the mention of the heavens and the earth in the preceding verse. The tenth and eleventh form a single sentence of unusual length in Hebrew composition. The one contains the comparison properly so-called, the other makes the application. The futures  $\text{יָרֵד}$  and  $\text{יָשׁוּב}$  strictly mean will come down, will return, implying that the same series of events might be expected to recur ; but as a still more general recurrence is implied, the true sense is conveyed by the English present.—The construction of  $\text{אֲשֶׁר} \text{לֹא}$  is precisely the same as in Gen. 32 : 27. Lev. 22 : 6. Ruth 2 : 16. 3 : 18. Amos 3 : 7, in all which cases it indicates the *sine qua non*, the condition without which the event expressed by the future cannot take place. Hitzig asserts however that the Hebrews knew nothing of the rain going back to heaven by evaporation, and on this ground will not let the words have their obvious and necessary meaning. The impossibility of proving any thing from such expressions, either as to the ignorance or knowledge of the laws of nature which the ancients possessed, has been repeatedly pointed out. But it is certainly too much to violate analogy and syntax for the purpose of involving the writer in a real or apparent blunder.—The *word* of v. 11 is not merely prophecy or promise, much less the command of God to Cyrus respecting Israel (Henderson), least of all the Prophet himself as an incarnation of Jehovah's word (Hendewerk), but every thing that God utters either in the way of prediction or command.—The construction of  $\text{אֲשֶׁר} \text{שָׁלַחְתִּי}$  is essentially the same as in 2 Sam. 11 : 22. That  $\text{שָׁלַח}$  governs two accusatives is evident from such places as 1 Kings 14 : 6.—The English Version refers

נִהְיֶה to the earth; but this construction is precluded by the difference of gender. The effect is metaphorically represented as produced directly by the rain and snow.—הִצְלִיחַ does not mean *prosper in*, but make to prosper or do prosperously, the active sense being inseparable from the Hiphil form. The general design of these two verses is to generate and foster confidence in what Jehovah has engaged to do.

V. 12. *For with joy shall ye go forth, and in peace shall ye be led; the mountains and the hills shall break out before you into a shout, and all the trees of the field shall clap the hand.* Here as in many other places the idea of joyful change is expressed by representing all nature as rejoicing. (See ch. 35 : 1, 2. 44 : 23. 49 : 13. 52 : 9. Ps. 98 : 8.) The expression *go forth* is eagerly seized upon by some interpreters as justifying the restriction of the passage to the restoration from the Babylonish exile. But the real allusion in such cases is to the deliverance from Egypt, which is constantly referred to as a type of deliverance in general, so that every signal restoration or deliverance is represented as a spiritual exodus. Vitringa, with much more probability, applies the words to the joy of the first heathen converts when they heard the gospel (Acts 13 : 48. 1 Thess. 1 : 6). The rabbins upon their part understand the passage as a prophecy of Israel's deliverance from the present exile and dispersion. All the interpreters since Lowth repeat his fine quotation from Virgil, *ipsi lætitia montes* etc.

V. 13. *Instead of the thorn shall come up the cypress, and instead of the nettle, the myrtle, and it shall be to Jehovah for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.* The same change which had just been represented by the shouting of the hills and the applause of the forests is now described as the substitution of the noblest trees for the most unprofitable and offensive plants. (Compare ch. 41 : 19.) An analogous but different figure for the same thing is the opening of rivers in the desert. (See above, ch. 35 : 6, 7. 43 : 19, 20.) For the meaning of נִצְעִיר and בְּרוֹשׁ, see the Earlier Prophecies, pp. 129, 272. The name בְּרוֹשׁ occurs only here. Simonis and Ewald understand it as denoting a species of mustard plant. Jerome describes it as a worthless and offensive weed. The Seventy have *xórvia*. The modern writers are disposed to acquiesce in the Vulgate Version, *urtica* or nettle. All that is essential to the writer's purpose is, that it be understood to signify a mean and useless plant, and thus to form a contrast with the myrtle as the thorn does with the cypress.—Instead of *it shall be*, the modern Germans as usual prefer the indirect construction, *that it may be*, which is neither so exact nor so expressive as the strict translation. Knobel makes the trees the subject of this last clause also; but it seems more natural to understand it as refer-

ring to the change itself, described in this and the preceding verse. Dropping the metaphor, the Prophet then says, in direct terms, that the glorious change predicted shall redound to the glory of its author. *It shall be for a name*, i. e. it shall serve as a memorial, which is then described in other words as a *sign of perpetuity* or everlasting token, with allusion, as Vitringa thinks, to those commemorative obelisks or pillars mentioned elsewhere (e. g. ch. 19 : 19). This memorial is called perpetual because it *shall not be cut off*, pass away, or be abolished.—It will here be sufficient simply to state the fact that Knobel understands this as a promise that the homeward journey of the exiles should be comfortable and pleasant (*bequem und angenehm*).

---

## CHAPTER LVI.

WHILE the church, with its essential institutions, is to continue unimpaired, the old distinctions, national and personal, are to be done away, and the Jewish people robbed of that pre-eminence of which its rulers proved themselves unworthy.

The day is coming when the righteousness of God is to be fully revealed, without the veils and shackles which had hitherto confined it, v. 1. For this great change the best preparation is fidelity to the spirit of the old economy, v. 2. No personal or national distinctions will be any longer recognised, v. 3. Connexion with the church will no longer be a matter of hereditary right, vs. 4, 5. The church shall be henceforth co-extensive with the world, vs. 6–8. But first, the carnal Israel must be abandoned to its enemies, v. 9. Its rulers are neither able nor worthy to deliver the people or themselves, vs. 10–12.

V. 1. *Thus saith Jehovah, Keep ye judgment (or justice) and do righteousness; for near (is) my salvation to come, and my righteousness to be revealed.* The Jews refer this passage to their present dispersion, and understand it as declaring the conditions of their restoration. Vitringa applies it to the beginning of the new dispensation; Piscator to the new dispensation generally; the modern Germans to the end of the Babylonish exile. These different classes of interpreters of course expound particulars in accordance with their general hypothesis, but none of them without undue restriction of that which in itself requires or at least admits a wider

application. On the principle heretofore assumed as the basis of our exposition, we can only regard it as a statement of the general laws which govern the divine dispensations towards the chosen people and the world at large. The reference is not merely to the ancient Israel, much less to the Jews of the captivity, still less to the Christian church distinctively considered, least of all to the Christian church of any one period. The doctrine of the passage is simply this, that they who enjoy extraordinary privileges, or expect extraordinary favours, are under corresponding obligations to do the will of God; and moreover that the nearer the manifestation of God's mercy, whether in time or in eternity, the louder the call to righteousness of life. These truths are of no restricted application, but may be applied wherever the relation of a church or chosen people can be recognised. Without attempting to refute the various opinions founded on the false hypothesis of a local or temporal limitation, it will be sufficient to point out the absurdities attending that which in our day has the greatest vogue, viz. the notion that the passage relates merely to the Babylonish exile. Thus Maurer understands the Prophet as advising his contemporaries to act in a manner worthy of their approaching liberation, and Gesenius supposes him to take this opportunity of combating the Jewish prejudice against the calling of the gentiles. Why this error needed to be controverted at this precise juncture, he omits to explain. But this is not the worst thing in Gesenius's interpretation of the place before us. After saying that a proselyting spirit is inseparable from the belief in one exclusive way of salvation, and particularly pardonable in the Jewish exiles, surrounded as they were by idolaters, he goes on to represent the liberal spirit of this passage as directly at variance with the law of Moses, particularly as contained in Deut. 23 : 2-8, which he says is virtually here repealed. This shallow and erroneous view of the relation which subsists between the Law and the Prophets will correct itself as we proceed with the detailed interpretation. עבדך seems here to be equivalent to היה, with which it is connected as a parallel in ch. 42 : 4. 51 : 4.

V. 2. *Happy the man (that) shall do this, and the son of man that shall hold it fast, keeping the Sabbath from profaning it, and keeping his hand from doing all evil.* The pronoun *this* seems to refer to what follows, as in Ps. 7 : 4 and Deut. 32 : 29. *Son of man* is simply an equivalent expression to the *man* of the other clause. The last clause is remarkable, and has occasioned much dispute among interpreters, on account of its combining a positive and negative description of the character required, the last of which is very general, and the first no less specific. A great variety of reasons have been given for the special mention of the Sabbath here. It has especially perplexed those writers who regard the Sabbath as

a temporary ceremonial institution. Some of these endeavour to evade the difficulty, by supposing that the Sabbath here meant is a mystical or spiritual Sabbatism, a repose from suffering, sin, or ceremonial impositions. But how could such a Sabbath be *observed*, or how could they be called upon to *keep* it, as a condition of the divine favour? Some suppose the Sabbath to be here put for the whole Mosaic system of religious services, as being the most ancient, and, in some sort, the foundation of the rest. According to Gesenius, it is specified because it was the only part of the Mosaic institutions which could be perpetuated through the exile, that which was merely ceremonial and restricted to the temple being necessarily suspended. Rosenmüller thinks that it is here referred to, as a public national profession of the worship of one God. The true explanation is afforded by a reference to the primary and secondary ends of the Sabbatical institution, and the belief involved in its observance. In the first place, it implied a recognition of Jehovah as the omnipotent creator of the universe (Ex. 20 : 11. 31 : 17) : in the next place, as the sanctifier of his people, not in the technical or theological sense, but as denoting him by whom they had been set apart as a peculiar people (Ex. 31 : 13. Ez. 20 : 12) ; in the next place, as the Saviour of this chosen people from the bondage of Egypt (Deut. 5 : 15). Of these great truths the Sabbath was a weekly remembrancer, and its observance by the people a perpetual recognition and profession, besides the practical advantages accruing to the maintenance of a religious spirit by the weekly recurrence of a day of rest—advantages which no one more distinctly acknowledges, or states more strongly, than Gesenius. *Holding fast*, is a common idiomatic expression for consistent perseverance in a certain course. It occurs not unfrequently in the New Testament. (Heb. 4 : 4. 6 : 18. Rev. 2 : 25. 3 : 11.) The suffix in מִצְדָּקָה refers to צִדְקָה, and like it has respect to the whole course of conduct afterwards described. Gesenius refers to ch. 1 : 13 as a rejection of the Sabbath, and in this detects a want of agreement between the genuine and spurious Isaiah,—a conclusion resting wholly on a false view of that passage, for the true sense of which see the Earlier Prophecies, pp. 9–12.

V. 3. *And let not the foreigner say, who has joined himself unto Jehovah, saying, Jehovah will separate me wholly from his people ; and let not the eunuch say, Lo, I am a dry tree.* The essential meaning of this verse is, that all external disabilities shall be abolished, whether personal or national. To express the latter he makes use of the phrase בְּנֵי אֲרָצוֹת אֲחֵרוֹת, which strictly means not *the son of the stranger*, as the common version has it, but the son of strangeness, or of a strange country ; אֲרָצוֹת corresponding to the German *Fremde*, which has no equivalent in English. The whole class of personal disqualifications is represented by the case of the eunuch,

in reference to Deut. 23 : 1, and as Calvin thinks to the promise in Gen. 15 : 5. and 22 : 17, from which that class of persons was excluded. Hensler's idea that עָרִיס here means an officer or courtier, is precluded by the addition of the words, *I am a dry tree*, a proverbial description of childlessness said to be still current in the east. It is possible, however, that the eunuch may be mentioned, simply because it stands at the beginning of the list of prohibitions in the law. In either case, the expression is generic or representative of more particulars than it expresses. Knobel's restriction of the first clause to the Canaanites, who mingled with the Jews in their captivity, or occupied their places in their absence, is entirely gratuitous. The meaning is, that all restrictions, even such as still affected proselytes, should be abolished.

V. 4, 5. *For thus saith Jehovah to (or, as to) the eunuchs who shall keep my Sabbaths, and shall choose what I delight in, and take fast hold of my covenant, I will give to them in my house and within my walls a place and name better than sons and than daughters; an everlasting name will I give to him, which shall not be cut off.* According to Joseph Kimchi, the plural *Sabbaths* is intended to include the Sabbatical year and that of jubilee. If any distinction was intended, it was probably that between the wider and narrower meaning of the term *Sabbaths*, i. e. the Sabbath properly so called, and the other institutions of religion with which it is connected.—What it is that God delights in, may be learned from ch. 66 : 4. Jer. 9 : 24. Hos. 6 : 6. By holding fast my covenant is meant adhering to his compact with me, which includes obedience to the precepts and faith in the promises. The ׀ at the beginning of v. 5 introduces the apodosis, and gives the verb a future meaning.—By *my walls* we are not to understand, with Jerome, those of Jerusalem, nor, with the modern writers, those of the temple, but in a more ideal sense, the walls of God's house or dwelling, which had just been mentioned. The promise is not merely one of free access to the material sanctuary, but of a home in the household or family of God, an image of perpetual occurrence in the Psalms of David. (See especially Psalms 15, 23 and 24, as expounded by Hengstenberg.)—The use of the word יָד in this connexion is obscure, although the essential meaning is determined by the context. Umbreit follows Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, in adhering to the usual sense *hand*, which he seems to think is mentioned as the natural instrument of seizure, and metaphorically applicable to the thing seized, for example, to a share or portion. Gesenius recognises this use of the plural in a few places, but appears to derive it from the primary idea of a handful. In the case before us he explains the word as meaning a memorial or monument, which sense it seems to have in 2 Sam. 18 : 18, perhaps with reference, as Gesenius supposes, to the uplifted hand and arm found on

many ancient *cippi* or sepulchral columns. But as the antiquity and universality of this practice are uncertain, and as the meaning *place* is admissible in 2 Sam. 18 : 18, as in many other cases, it appears to be entitled to the preference.—*Better than sons and daughters* may either mean better than the comfort immediately derived from children (as in Ruth 4 : 15), or better than the perpetuation of the name by hereditary succession. Most interpreters prefer the latter sense, but both may be included. A beautiful coincidence and partial fulfilment of the promise is pointed out by J. D. Michaelis, in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch whose conversion is recorded in the eighth of Acts, and whose memory is far more honoured in the church than it could have been by a long line of illustrious descendants.

V. 6, 7. *And (as to) the foreigners joining themselves to Jehovah to serve him and to love the name of Jehovah, to be to him for servants, every one keeping the Sabbath from profaning it, and holding fast my covenant, I will bring them to my mount of holiness, and make them joyful in my house of prayer, their offerings and their sacrifices (shall be) to acceptance on my altar; for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations.* Aben Ezra points out as a rhetorical peculiarity in the structure of this passage, that the writer, after mentioning the foreigners and eunuchs in v. 3, afterwards recurs to them in an inverted order. As an analogous example, he refers to Josh. 24 : 31.—The verb *יָצַד*, although strictly a generic term, is specially appropriated to the official service of the priests and Levites. Some interpreters accordingly suppose it to be here said that the heathen shall partake of the sacerdotal honours elsewhere promised to the church. (See ch. 61 : 6. Ex. 19 : 6. 1 Pet. 2 : 5, 9. Rev. 1 : 6.)—To love the name of Jehovah, is to love his attributes as manifested in his word and works. (Compare ch. 60 : 9. 66 : 5.)—*בַּיְתִי בְּמִצְרָיִם* does not mean *the house of my prayer*, i. e. the house where prayer is made to me, but my house of prayer, as *הַר הַקְּדוֹשׁ* means my hill of holiness, or holy hill. Knobel supposes an allusion to the residence of the Nethinim on Ophel. (Neh. 3 : 26. 11 : 21.)—*Shall be called*, as in many other cases, implies that it shall be so. Our Saviour quotes a part of the last clause, not in reference to its main sense, but to what is incidentally mentioned, viz. its being called a house of prayer. This part of the sentence was applicable to the material temple while it lasted; but the whole prediction could be verified only after its destruction, when the house of God even upon earth ceased to be a limited locality, and became co-extensive with the church in its enlargement and diffusion. The form of expression is derived, however, from the ceremonies of the old economy, and worship is described by names familiar to the writer and his original readers. (Compare Hos. 14 : 3. Heb. 13 : 13. John 4 : 21–23.) The general promise is the same as that in Mal. 1 : 11,



and is so far from being inconsistent with the principles on which the old economy was founded, that it simply carries out its original design as settled and announced from the beginning.

V. 8. *Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, the gatherer of the outcasts of Israel, Still (more) will I gather upon him (in addition) to his gathered.* This may either mean, I will go on to gather still more of his outcasts, or, besides his outcasts I will gather others. There is less difference between the two interpretations than at first sight there might seem to be. In either case, the words are applicable to the calling of the gentiles. On the second supposition, which is commonly adopted, even by the Jewish writers, this is the direct and proper meaning of the words. But even on the other, they amount to the same thing, if we only give to Israel its true sense, as denoting not the Jewish nation as such, but the chosen people or the church of God, to which the elect heathen as really belong as the elect Jews, and are therefore just as much entitled to be called *outcasts of Israel*. It is true that our Saviour uses a similar expression (lost sheep of the House of Israel) in a restricted application to the Israelites properly so called; but it is in a connexion which brings the Jews and gentiles into evident antithesis, and therefore leaves no doubt as to the sense in which the name Israel is to be understood.—וְאֵלֶיךָ may either mean simply *to him* or *upon him*, implying vast accumulation.

V. 9. *All ye beasts of the field, come to devour, all ye beasts in the forest!* The structure of this verse is somewhat unusual, consisting of two parallel members, with a third, equally related to both, interposed between them. It is an invitation to the enemies of Israel to destroy it. The people being represented, in the following verses, as a flock, their destroyers are naturally represented here as wild beasts. Hitzig and Knobel understand the invitation as ironical, or as a mere poetical description of the defenceless state in which Israel was left through the neglect of its natural protectors. It is more natural, however, to explain it as an indirect prediction of an actual event, clothed in Isaiah's favourite form of an apostrophe. Vitringa's limitation of the prophecy to the subversion of the Roman empire by the barbarians, is as arbitrary as its application, in the Targum and by Kimchi, to Gog and Magog. We have here simply one of those alternations and transitions which are not only frequent in this book, but one of its characteristics, and indeed essential to the writer's purpose of exhibiting God's dealing with his church both in wrath and mercy. From the foregoing promises of growth, he now reverts to intervening judgments and their causes. There is no ground, therefore, for Luzzatto's assertion, that the next seventeen verses are entirely unconnected with what goes before, and

must therefore be considered an interpolation. Ewald, on the other hand, alleges that from this verse to the middle of ch. 57 : 11 is an extract from an older writer, inserted here in order to have something against idolatry, and because the author of the book could not hope to produce any thing better ! As a further illustration of the value of such critical decisions, I may add that Hendewerk separates chs. 55, 56, and 57 from the foregoing and following context as a distinct prophecy ! Besides the usual and natural interpretation of the verse before us as a threatening, may be mentioned that of Cyril and Jerome, who regard it as an invitation to all sorts of men to partake of the Lord's supper ; while Clericus explains it as a like invitation to the gentiles to frequent the temple and partake of the sacrificial feasts. The same sense was put upon the words by Rosenmüller in his first edition ; but he afterwards adopted a different grammatical construction of the sentence, being the one proposed by Aben Ezra, who explains the *beasts of the forest* as the object of the verb *devour*, and understands the sentence as an invitation to the heathen to destroy the wicked Jews. The same construction is adopted by Jarchi and Abarbenel, but with a very different result, as they suppose the invitation to be given to the proselytes to destroy the enemies of Israel. On the same grammatical foundation Cocceius erects his explanation of the verse as a call to the barbarians to destroy the corrupt Christians, while Schmidius regards it as an exhortation to the church to swallow up the gentiles by receiving them into her bosom ! All the modern writers seem to be agreed that the last clause as well as the first is a description of the object of address, and that the thing to be devoured must be supplied from the following verses. With the metaphors of this verse compare Ex. 23 : 29. Ez. 34 : 5-8. Jer. 12 : 9. 7 : 33. 50 : 17. Beasts of the field and of the forest are parallel expressions. Some interpreters make one a stronger expression than the other ; but in deciding which it is, they directly contradict each other. Vitringa's notion that the one may mean the Saracens, the other the Huns, Turks, and Tartars, is, to use his own words with respect to Cyril's exposition of the verse, "non commendabilis hac aetate ecclesiae."

V. 10. *His watchmen (are) blind all of them, they have not known (or do not know), all of them (are) dumb dogs, they cannot bark, dreaming, lying down, loving to slumber.* The pronoun *his* refers to *Israel*, as in v. 8, and thus proves clearly that no new discourse begins either with v. 9 or with that before us, where the large  $\aleph$  of the masoretic text, and the space before the verse in most manuscripts, seem to indicate a change of subject. But, as Gesenius correctly says, the writer merely pauses to take breath, and then resumes the thread of his discourse. Many give *do not know* the absolute sense of knowing nothing, being without knowledge ; but in all

such cases it seems better to connect it with an object understood. We may here supply their duty, or the state of the flock, or the danger to which it is exposed. The difference between the past and present form is immaterial here; because both are really included, the condition described being one of ancient date, but still continued. The dogs particularly meant are shepherds' dogs (Job 30 : 1), whose task it was to watch the flock, and by their barking give notice of approaching danger. But these are dumb dogs which cannot even bark, and therefore wholly useless. They are also negligent and lazy. Far from averting peril or announcing it, they do not see it. What is before expressed by the figure of a blind watchman, is here expressed by that of a shepherd's dog asleep. וְהוֹרֵה is confounded by the Vulgate, Symmachus, and Saadiah, with וְהוֹרֵה, which might either be a participle (*seeing*) or a noun (*seers*), corresponding to *watchmen* in the first clause. The common text is now very generally regarded as correct, and explained by the Arabic analogy to signify *dreaming*, or talking in sleep, or raving either from disease or sleep. Some suppose a particular allusion to the murmuring and growling of a dog in its dreams. Some writers make the watchmen of this verse denote the prophets, as in ch. 52 : 8. Jer. 6 : 17. Ez. 3 : 17. 33 : 7. But Gesenius more correctly understands it as a figure for the rulers of the people generally, not excluding even the false prophets. The figurative title is expressive of that watchfulness so frequently described in the New Testament as an essential attribute of spiritual guides. (Compare also Matth. 15 : 4.)

V. 11. *And the dogs are greedy, they know not satiety, and they, the shepherds (or the shepherds themselves), know not how to distinguish (or act wisely); all of them to their own way are turned, (every) man to his own gain from his own quarter (or without exception).* A new turn is now given to the figures of the preceding verse. The dogs, though indolent are greedy. Several of the ancient versions confound וְהוֹרֵה with וְהוֹרֵה *hard-faced*, and translate it *impudent*. The true sense of the former phrase is *strong of appetite*, i. e. voracious.—The pronoun וְהוֹרֵה is emphatic, and may either mean that these same dogs are at the same time shepherds, thus affording a transition to a different though kindred image, or it may be intended to distinguish between two kinds of rulers; as if he had said, while the dogs are thus indolent and greedy, they (the shepherds) are incompetent; or, while the shepherds' dogs are such, the shepherds themselves know not how to distinguish. The latter is probably the true construction; for although the same class of persons may be successively compared to shepherds' dogs and shepherds, it cannot even by a figure of speech be naturally said that the dogs themselves are shepherds. There is no need, however, of distinguishing between the dogs and shepherds as denoting civil

and religious rulers, since both comparisons are equally appropriate to rulers in general. Etymologically,  $\text{יָדָע}$  may be understood to signify the act of discernment or discrimination. Usage would seem to require that of being wise or prudent; but its Hiphil form, and its being preceded by the verb *to know*, are in favour of explaining it to mean wise conduct, with particular reference in this case to official obligation. Their being all turned to their own way is expressive of diversity, and also of selfishness in each individual. The latter sense is then expressed more fully by the addition of  $\text{לְעַצְמוֹתָם}$ , to or for his own gain or profit. That voluptuous as well as avaricious indulgences are here referred to, is apparent from what follows in the next verse.—The last word literally means *from his end* or *his extremity*, to which the older writers gave the sense of his quarter or direction, corresponding to *his own way*; and Henderson says that it expresses the extreme lengths to which they went in their efforts to accumulate gain. Most of the modern writers have adopted the opinion of De Dieu, that  $\text{מֵעַד אֶחָד}$  means *ad unum omnes*, all without exception, i. e. all within a given space or number, from its very end or remotest limit. (Compare Gen. 19 : 4. Jer. 51 : 31. Ez. 25 : 9.)

V. 12. *Come ye, I will fetch wine, and we will intoxicate ourselves with strong drink, and like to-day (shall be) to-morrow, great, abundantly, exceedingly.* The description of the revellers is verified by quoting their own words, as in ch. 22 : 13. The language is that of one inviting others to join in a debauch; hence the alternation of the singular and plural.  $\text{סָבְרוּ}$  is not merely to drink, nor even to be filled, but to be drunk. The futures might be rendered *let me fetch* and *let us drink*, without either injuring or bettering the sense.—The last clause professes or expresses a determination to prolong the revel till the morrow. The accents connect  $\text{וַיֹּדֵעַ}$  with  $\text{וַיִּשְׂכְּרוּ}$  in the sense of *dies crastinus*. Another possible construction is, to make the pronoun  $\text{וַיִּשְׂכְּרוּ}$  agree with  $\text{וַיֹּדֵעַ}$  although preceding it,—a combination less incredible in this case, because  $\text{וַיִּשְׂכְּרוּ}$  in the following member is supposed by some to agree with  $\text{וַיִּשְׂכְּרוּ}$  as a noun, in which case the whole phrase would mean *exceeding great abundance*. Most interpreters, however, make  $\text{וַיִּשְׂכְּרוּ}$  and  $\text{וַיִּשְׂכְּרוּ}$  both adverbs, although both originally nouns, and construe *great* with *day*, a *great day* being naturally applicable to a day remarkable for any thing, as in the case before us for its revelry; just as we say in colloquial English, a high time, or a rare time, for a time of great enjoyment.

## CHAPTER LVII.

THE righteous who died during the old economy were taken away from the evil to come, vs. 1, 2. The wicked who despised them were themselves proper objects of contempt, vs. 3, 4. Their idolatry is first described in literal terms, vs. 5, 6. It is then represented as a spiritual adultery, vs. 7-9. Their obstinate persistency in sin is represented as the cause of their hopeless and remediless destruction, vs. 10-13. A way is prepared for spiritual Israel to come out from among them, v. 14. The hopes of true believers shall not be deferred for ever, vs. 15, 16. Even these must be chastened for their sins, v. 17. But there is favour in reserve for all true penitents, without regard to national distinctions, vs. 18, 19. To the incorrigible sinner, on the other hand, peace is impossible, vs. 20, 21.

V. 1. *The righteous perisheth, and there is no man laying (it) to heart, and men of mercy are taken away, with none considering (or perceiving) that from the presence of evil the righteous is taken away.* Henderson says that whether Hezekiah or Josiah be meant by *the righteous*, cannot be determined, nor indeed whether any particular individual be intended. This doubt may not appear so utterly insoluble when we consider that there is no further reference to either of the persons mentioned, nor any thing like an individual description in the text or context; that  $\text{קִדְּמָה}$  is used generically for a whole class elsewhere (e. g. Eccl. 3 : 17. Ez. 18 : 20. Ps. 37 : 12); and that the parallel expression here is plural. This last consideration, it is true, would have no weight against Tertullian and Cyprian, who explain *the righteous* to be Christ and *men of mercy* his apostles; but even Vitringa speaks of this hypothesis as *nulla specie probabilem*, and therefore needing no refutation. The terms of this verse are specifically applicable neither to violent nor natural death as such considered, but are appropriate to either. Even Kimchi points out that the righteous is not here said to perish, either in the sense of ceasing to exist or in that of ceasing to be happy, but in that of being lost to the world and to society. *Laying to heart* is not merely feeling or appreciating, but observing and perceiving.—*Men of mercy* is another description of the righteous, so called as the objects of God's mercy and as being merciful themselves. (See Matth. 5 : 7.)—The verb  $\text{קָדַח}$  is doubly appropriate, first in its general though secondary sense of taking away, and then in its primary specific sense of gathering,

i. e. gathering to one's fathers or one's people,—an expression frequently applied in the Old Testament to death, and especially to that of godly men. (See Gen. 49 : 29. Judges 2 : 10.) The verb is used absolutely in this sense by Moses (Num. 20 : 26).— $\text{וְאֵלֶיךָ}$  means strictly *in default* or *in the absence of* (Prov. 8 : 24. 26 : 20).—Most interpreters give  $\text{וְאֵלֶיךָ}$  the sense of *that*, and understand the last clause as stating what it is that no one lays to heart or understands, viz. the fact that the righteous is taken away, etc. Some, however, translate  $\text{וְאֵלֶיךָ}$  *for*, and make the last clause a mere reiteration of the fact twice stated in the first. Upon this point Hitzig's version and his comment are directly contradictory, the former having *for* (*denn*) and the latter saying expressly, “ $\text{וְאֵלֶיךָ}$  here means not *for* (*denn*), but *that* (*dass*); their death is observed, but not its cause.” There is also a difference of opinion as to  $\text{וְאֵלֶיךָ}$ , which some suppose to mean *because of*, others *before* (in reference to time), and others *from the face or presence of*. So too *the evil* is by some understood in a physical sense, viz. that of misery or suffering, by others in a moral sense, viz. that of guilt or sin. Those who adopt the latter understand the clause to mean that the death of the righteous is occasioned by the sins of the people. But why may not this be asserted of the death of the sinner likewise? On the other hypothesis, the sense is either that the righteous is destroyed by his calamities, or that he is removed before they come upon the people. To the latter it is objected by Maurer, that the subsequent context represents great prosperity as in reserve for the people. But this objection presupposes an erroneous limitation of the passage to the period of the exile.

V. 2. *He shall go in peace (or enter into peace); they shall rest upon their beds—walking straight before him.* The alternation of the singular and plural shows that the subject of the sentence is a collective person. Kimchi makes  $\text{וְאֵלֶיךָ}$  the subject of the first and last members, and regards the intermediate one as a parenthesis: Peace shall go walking straight before him or straight forwards, i. e. shall conduct him or escort him out of this life to a place of rest. Aben Ezra refers the pronoun in  $\text{וְאֵלֶיךָ}$  to Jehovah, *walking before him*, i. e. in his presence. (Compare Judges 18 : 6.) But the explanation commonly approved is that of Jarchi, who makes this phrase an additional description of the righteous, as one walking in his uprightness, or, as Cocceius expresses it, *straight before him (qui recta ante se incedit)*. It seems to be added as a kind of afterthought, to limit what immediately precedes, and preclude its application to all the dead without distinction. The peace and rest here meant are those of the body in the grave and of the soul in heaven; the former being frequently referred to as a kind of pledge and adumbration of the latter. Vitringa understands this verse as stating the alleviations which attend the lamentable loss of

good men. Ewald regards it as a kind of pious wish analogous to *requiescat in pace!* Gesenius supposes an antithesis between this and the next verse: 'The righteous is at rest (or let him rest), but as for you,' etc. This suggestion is of value so far as it removes the appearance of abrupt transition, and shows the continuity of the discourse.

V. 3. *And ye (or as for you), draw near hither, ye sons of the witch, seed of the adulterer and the harlot.* According to Jarchi, these words are addressed to the survivors of the judgments by which the righteous are described as having been removed. They are summoned, according to the same rabbin, to receive their punishment, but as Kimchi thinks, simply to appear before the judgment-seat. (Compare ch. 41: 1.) The description which follows was of course designed to be extremely opprobrious; but interpreters differ as to the precise sense of the terms employed. Gesenius supposes that instead of simply charging them with certain crimes, he brings the charge against their parents,—a species of reproach peculiarly offensive to the orientals. Hendewerk supposes this form of contumely to have been selected for the purpose of identifying those who were immediately addressed with their progenitors. In this way he ingeniously accounts for the subsequent description of idolatry, which Ewald and many others look upon as applicable only to the times of Isaiah himself. Vitranga and the older writers generally give a more specific meaning to the Prophet's metaphors. understanding by the adulterer the idol, by the harlot the apostate church, and by the children the corrupted offspring of this shameful apostasy.—Instead of sorceress or witch, the Septuagint and Targum have iniquity. Grotius supposes that they read *עֲוֹנוֹתָם*, Rosenmüller *עֲוֹנוֹתָם*. The Peshito seems to make it a participle of *עָנָה* (*afflicted*). Jerome quotes Theodotion as retaining the original word *onena*, which is the common text. For the meaning of the word, see the ~~Earlier Prophecies~~, p. 28. The occult arts are mentioned as inseparable adjuncts of idolatry.—A grammatical difficulty is presented by the verb *עָנָה*, where the noun *עָנָה* might have been expected. None of the modern writers seem to have assumed a noun of that form, although not without analogy. The current explanation is the one adopted by Gesenius, which supposes an ellipsis of the relative (she who committed whoredom), and a change of construction from the participle to the finite verb. Luzzatto objects that in all such cases the participle and the finite verb have one and the same subject. He accordingly agrees with Abarbenel and Gousset in explaining *עָנָה* as the second person, the seed of an adulterer, and (therefore) thou hast thyself committed whoredom. Essentially the same interpretation is proposed by Piscator and Cocceius.—Whoredom and sorcery are again combined in Mal. 3: 5 and elsewhere.

V. 4. *At whom do you amuse yourselves? At whom do you enlarge the mouth, prolong the tongue? Are you not children of rebellion (or apostasy), a seed of falsehood?* This retorts the impious contempt of the apostates on themselves. There is no need, however, of supposing that they had cast these very same reproaches on the godly. The meaning is not necessarily that they were what they falsely charged their brethren with being. All that is certainly implied is, that they were unworthy to treat them with contempt. Jarchi gives לֵב מְפֹרָשׁ the sense of delighting in, which it has in ch. 58 : 11. Job 22 : 26. 27 : 10. Ps. 37 : 4; but most interpreters suppose the next clause to determine that the words express derision. The opening or stretching of the mouth in mockery is mentioned Ps. 22 : 8, 14. 35 : 21. Lam. 2 : 16, and in chap. 58 : 9 below. The lolling of the tongue as a derisive gesture is referred to by Persius in poetry and Livy in prose. According to Hitzig there are not two different gestures here described but one, the mouth being opened for the purpose of exhibiting the tongue. The form of expostulation is similar to that in ch. 37 : 23.—Jarchi supposes the prophets to be specially intended as the objects of this wicked mockery. (See 2 Chron. 36 : 16.)—Here, as in the preceding verse, some regard *seed* and *children* as mere idiomatic pleonasm, or at most, as rhetorical embellishments. Of those who understand them strictly, some suppose the qualities of falsehood and apostasy to be predicated of the parents, others of the children. Both are probably included; they were worthy of their parentage, and diligently filled up the measure of their fathers' iniquity. (See ch. 1 : 4.) By 'a seed of falsehood' we may understand a spurious brood, and at the same time one itself perfidious and addicted to a false religion.

V. 5. *Inflamed (or inflaming yourselves) among the oaks (or terebinths), under every green tree, slaughtering the children in the valleys, under the clefts of the rocks.* Their idolatrous practices are now described in detail. The first word of this verse properly denotes libidinous excitement, and is here used with reference to the previous representation of idolatry as spiritual whoredom or adultery. The reflexive version of the Niphal strengthens the expression, but is not required by usage or the context.—מִן־עֲצֵי אֲשֵׁרִים is commonly translated *with idols*, in accordance with the ancient versions. The objections are that מִן is not a natural connective of the foregoing verb with its object, and that אֲשֵׁרִים is constantly employed by this writer with direct allusion to its proper sense (*almighty*), and in reference to false gods only where they are sarcastically placed in opposition to the true. Maurer, Ewald, and Knobel, have revived the old interpretation given by Jarchi and Kimchi, which gives מִן־עֲצֵי אֲשֵׁרִים the sense of oaks (or terebinths), as in ch. 1 : 29. The objection usually made, viz. that the next words are descriptive of the place,



only shows how easily the parallelism may be made to sustain either side of any question. The interpreter has only to allege that the words in question must or must not mean the same thing with the next words, as the case may be, and his purpose is accomplished. This objection is, moreover, inconclusive, because it proves too much; for it equally applies to the consecutive expressions in the last clause, both of which are universally regarded as descriptive of localities. Hitzig renders the objection somewhat more plausible, by saying that the terebinth is necessarily included under *every green tree*; but if the genius of the language would admit of two consecutive expressions being perfectly synonymous, how much more of such as really involve a climax—‘among the terebinths, and not only so but under every green tree.’ Sacrificial infanticide is often mentioned in the Scriptures as a rite of heathen worship, and especially of that paid to Moloch, in which it seems to have been usual to burn the children; but we find the word slaughter frequently applied to it (see Ez. 16 : 21. 23 : 39), either in the wide sense of slaying (Gesenius), or because the children were first slaughtered and then burnt (Hitzig), or because both modes of sacrifice were practised. Hitzig adds very coolly to his observations on this subject, “compare Gen. 22,” a reference which obviously implies much more than the opinion entertained by some older writers, that human sacrifices owed their origin to a misapprehension of the history of Isaac. The Hebrew *בְּנֵי* is applied both to a valley and a stream flowing through it. Jerome has here *torrentibus*, by which he may have meant their beds or channels. According to Vitranga, there is special reference to the great valley of Lebanon, between the chains of Libanus and Antilibanus, a region infamous for its idolatry. A much more natural interpretation is the one which supposes an allusion to the valleys round Jerusalem, in one of which, the valley of the son of Hinnom, we know that Moloch was adored with human victims. The clefts of the rocks, or cliffs projecting in consequence of excavations, is a circumstance perfectly in keeping with the topography of that spot. The minute description of idolatry given in this passage is exceedingly perplexing to those writers who fix the date of composition at the period of the exile. Hendewerk, as we have seen, intrepidly maintains that the children are here charged with the sins of their fathers; but along with this extravagant assertion he makes one concession really valuable, namely, that the efforts of Gesenius and Hitzig to reconcile the terms of the description with the state of things during the captivity are wholly abortive. A perfect solution of the difficulty is afforded by our own hypothesis, that the Prophet, from the whole field of vision spread before him, singles out the most revolting traits and images by which he could present in its true aspect the guilt and madness of apostasy from God.

V. 6. *Among the smooth (stones) of the valley (or the brook) is thy portion; they, they, are thy lot; also to them hast thou poured out a drink-offering, thou hast brought up a meal-offering. Shall I for these things be consoled (i. e. satisfied without revenge)? Thy portion, i. e. the objects of thy choice and thy affection (Jer. 10 : 16). The word stones is correctly supplied in the English Version. (See 1 Sam. 17 : 40.) Others supply places, and suppose the phrase to mean open cleared spots in the midst of wooded valleys, places cleared for the performance of religious rites. In favour of this meaning, is the not unfrequent use of the Hebrew word to signify not hairy, and in figurative application to the earth, not wooded, free from trees. According to this interpretation, which is that of Paulus, De Wette, Hitzig, Rückert, and Umbreit, the first clause merely describes the place where the idols were worshipped. According to the other, which is given in the Targum, and approved by Aben Ezra, Kimchi, Grotius, Clericus, Lowth, Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Knobel, it is a description of the idols themselves. Smooth stones may mean either polished or anointed stones, such as were set up by the patriarchs as memorials (Gen. 28 : 18. 35 : 12), and by the heathen as objects of worship. Thus Arnobius says, that before his conversion to Christianity he never saw an oiled stone (*lubricatum lapidem et ex olivi unguine sordidatum*) without addressing it and praying to it. This explanation of the first clause agrees best with what follows and with the emphatic repetition, *they, they, are thy portion*, which is more natural in reference to the objects than to the mere place of worship. Most writers find here a play upon the double sense of פֶּזֶז (*smooth and portion*); but Ewald gives to both the sense of stone (*an des Thales Steinchen ist dein Stein*), and makes them the plural of פֶּזֶז a synonyme of פֶּזֶז (1 Sam. 17 : 40). Beck, on the other hand, makes both mean part or portion. Libations and vegetable offerings are here put for offerings in general, as being the simplest kinds of sacrifice. There seems to be another *lusus verborum* in the use of the word עָנִי, which may either mean to remain satisfied without vengeance, or to satisfy one's self by taking it. (See ch. 1 : 24.)*

V. 7. *On a high and elevated mountain thou hast placed thy bed; also there (or even thither) hast thou gone up to offer sacrifice. The figure of adulterous attachment is resumed. (Compare Ez. 16 : 24. 25 : 31.) That the mountain is not used as a mere figure for an elevated spot is clear from the obvious antithesis between it and the valleys before mentioned. Still less ground is there for supposing any reference to the worship of mountains themselves. By the bed here, Spencer understands the couch on which the ancients reclined at their sacrificial feasts. All other writers seem to give it*

the same sense as in Prov. 7 : 17 and Ezek. 23 : 17. In the last clause the figure is resolved and making the bed explained to mean offering sacrifice. Knobel supposes a particular allusion to the labour of ascending mountains as a proof of self-denying zeal in the worshipper.

V. 8. *And behind the door and the door-post thou hast placed thy memorial, for away from me thou hast uncovered (thyself or thy bed), and hast gone up, thou hast enlarged thy bed and hast covenanted from them, thou hast loved their bed, thou hast provided room.* Interpreters are much divided as to the particular expressions of this very obscure verse, although agreed in understanding it as a description of the grossest idolatry. Gesenius and Maurer explain זכרון as meaning *memory*, by which the former understands posthumous fame or notoriety, the latter something cherished or remembered with affection, meaning here the idol as a beloved object. The same sense is obtained in another way by those who make the word mean a memorial, or that which brings to mind an absent object. In this sense the image of a false god may be reckoned its memorial. Grotius and Hitzig suppose an allusion to Deut. 6 ; 9, the former supposing that the idolaters are here described as doing just the opposite of what is there required, the latter that the Prophet represents them as putting the required memorial of Jehovah's sole divinity out of sight, by going to an inner apartment. A still more natural application of the same sense would be to suppose that they are here described as thrusting the memorial of Jehovah into a corner to make room for that of the beloved idol. Some suppose a special reference to the worship of Penates, Lares, or household gods. The rest of the verse describes idolatry as adulterous intercourse. חבבתי חמיהם has been variously explained to mean, thou hast covenanted with them—thou hast bargained for a reward from them—thou hast made a covenant with some of them. The masculine form חבבתי is used for the feminine as in ch. 15 : 5. Hitzig supposes this to have been usual for Vav conversive. (Compare Ewald's H. G. p. 643. S. G. § 234.) The most probable interpretation of the last words in the verse is that which gives to נָקַד the same sense as in ch. 56 : 5. This is strongly favoured by the parallel expression חבבתי משכנתי. Others understand it to mean, wherever thou hast seen (their) memorial or monument ; others, wherever thou seest a hand (beckoning or inviting thee). The sense gratuitously put upon the phrase by Döderlein, and the praises given him for the discovery, are characteristic of neological aesthetics.

V. 9. *And thou hast gone to the king in oil and hast multiplied thine unguents, and hast sent thine ambassadors even to a far-off (land), and hast gone (or sent) down even to hell.* The first verb has been variously

explained as meaning to see, to look around, to appear, to be adorned, to sing, to carry gifts, which last is founded on the analogy of the noun  $\text{הַגִּיֹּף}$  a gift or present (1 Sam. 9 : 7). Gesenius derives the noun from this verb in the sense of *going with* or carrying, and the modern writers generally acquiesce in this interpretation founded on an Arabic analogy. By *the king* some understand the king of Babylon or Egypt, and refer the clause to the eagerness with which the Prophet's contemporaries sought out foreign alliances. Most writers understand it as a name for idols generally, or for Moloch in particular.  $\text{בְּשֵׁן}$  is commonly explained to mean *with oil* or ointment (as a gift); but Hitzig understands it to mean *in oil*, i. e. anointed, beautified, adorned. Upon the explanation of this phrase of course depends that of the next, where the unguents are said to be multiplied, either in the way of gifts to others or as means of self-adornment. Gesenius and the later writers make  $\text{בְּשֵׁן}$  qualify  $\text{הַגִּיֹּף}$  understood as a kind of auxiliary, *thou hast sent down deep to hell*, i. e. to the lower world, as opposed to heaven, of which Moloch was esteemed the king. (See the same construction of the verb in Jer. 13 : 18.) It is much more natural, however, to give it an independent meaning as expressive of extreme indignation and abhorrence. There is no need of ascribing a reflexive meaning to the Hiphil, as the same end may be gained by supplying *way* or some other noun denoting conduct. Maurer wonders that any interpreter should fail to see that the simplest explanation of this clause is that which makes it signify extreme remoteness. But nothing could in fact be more unusual or unnatural than the expression of this idea by the phrase, *humbling even to Sheol*.

V. 10. *In the greatness of thy way* (or the abundance of thy travel) *thou hast laboured; (but) thou hast not said, There is no hope. Thou hast found the life of thy hand; therefore thou art not weak.* Whether *way* be understood as a figure for the whole course of life, or as involving a specific allusion to the journeys mentioned in v. 9, the general sense is still the same, viz. that no exertion in the service of her false gods could weary or discourage her. This is so obviously the meaning of the whole, that the common version of  $\text{הָיִיתָ עָרֵב}$  (*thou art wearied*) seems to be precluded, the rather as the verb may be used to denote the cause as well as the effect, i. e. exertion no less than fatigue. Lowth reverses the declaration of the text by omitting the negative (*thou hast said*) on the authority of a single manuscript, in which the text, as Kocher well observes, was no doubt conjecturally changed in order to conform it to Jer. 2 : 25. 18 : 12. In both these places the verb  $\text{עָרֵב}$  is employed as it is here impersonally, *desperatum est*, a form of speech to which we have no exact equivalent in English.—Saadias and Koppe give  $\text{הָיִיתָ עָרֵב}$  the sense of animal or beast, in reference to idols of that form. All other writers seem agreed that the essential idea

which the whole phrase conveys is that of *strength*. Some accordingly attach this specific sense to  $\text{חַיָּה}$ , others to  $\text{יָד}$ ; but it rather belongs to the two in combination. In translation this essential sense may be conveyed under several different forms: 'Thou hast found thy hand still alive, or still able to sustain life, etc.  $\text{לֹא־חַיָּה}$  does not merely mean to be sick or to be grieved, but to be weak or weakened, as in Judg. 16 : 7. 11 : 17.—According to Luzzatto, *way* means specifically wicked way, as in Prov. 31 : 3.

V. 11. *And whom hast thou feared and been afraid of, that thou shouldst lie? and me thou hast not remembered, thou hast not called to mind (or laid to heart). Is it not (because) I hold my peace, and that of old, that thou wilt not fear me?* De Dieu, Cocceius, and Vitranga, understand this as ironical, and as meaning that the fear which they affected as a ground for their forsaking God had no foundation. Gesenius and others understand it as a serious and consolatory declaration that they had no cause to fear. Hitzig supposes an allusion to the mixture of idolatrous worship with the forms of the true religion in the exile. With the exception of the last gratuitous restriction, this agrees well with the form of expression, and may be applied to all hypocritical professors of the truth. They have no real fear of God; why then should they affect to serve him? His forbearance only served to harden and embolden them. 'Have I not long kept silence? It cannot be that you fear me.' There is no need, therefore, of making the last clause interrogative, as Ewald does, *wilt thou not fear me?* Still more gratuitous and violent is De Wette's construction, 'thou needest not have feared me.' This is certainly no better than Luther's interrogative construction of the last clause, 'do you think that I will always hold my peace?' Luzzatto renders  $\text{אִם־יִפְּשָׁה־יָדִי}$  *that thou mightest fail*, and refers to ch. 58 : 11. But waters are there said to *deceive* the expectation by their failure, an expression which is utterly inapplicable to the failure of the strength. Instead of  $\text{אִם־יִפְּשָׁה־יָדִי}$  Lowth reads  $\text{וַיִּסְתֵּר־עֵינָיו}$  *and hide (my eyes)*, with the noun omitted as in Ps. 10 : 1. Henderson also thinks the common reading justly suspected, because the Complutensian and other editions, with a number of manuscripts, read  $\text{וַיִּסְתֵּר}$ . But this is merely the defective orthography of the common text, and precisely the kind of variation which most frequently occurs in Hebrew manuscripts. Kocher, moreover, has shown to the satisfaction of most later writers, that the  $\text{ו}$  before  $\text{נִסְתֵּר}$  is equivalent to *et quidem* in Latin or *and that too* in English.—The use of  $\text{וַיִּשָׁחֵט}$  is the same as in ch. 64 : 11. 65 : 6.—The image is identical with that presented in ch. 42 . 14. Knobel contrives to limit the passage to the Babylonish exile, by explaining this verse as a declaration that the Jews had no need of the Babylonian idols to protect them, and alleging that a portion of the captives had renounced the worship of Jehovah because they thought

his power insufficient to deliver them. In the same taste and spirit he explains  $\text{הַיְהוָה}$  to mean since the beginning of the exile.—Compare with this verse ch. 40 : 27 and 51 : 12, 13.

V. 12. *I will declare thy righteousness and thy works, and they shall not profit (or avail) thee.* Lowth reads *my righteousness*, on the authority of the Peshito and a few manuscripts. Hendewerk understands  $\text{הַיְהוָה}$  to mean *thy desert*, thy righteous doom; Ewald, thy justification; Umbreit, thy righteousness, which I will give thee notwithstanding thy unworthiness. Gesenius and Knobel still adhere to their imaginary sense of happiness, salvation, which is not only arbitrary in itself but incoherent with the next clause, which they are obliged to understand as meaning, as for thy own works they can profit thee nothing. Knobel, however, follows Hitzig in making *thy works* mean *thy idols*, elsewhere called the work of men's fingers. De Dieu makes the last clause an answer to the first. Shall I declare thy righteousness and works? They will profit thee nothing. But this, in the absence of the form of interrogation, is entirely arbitrary. The earlier writers who retain the sense of  $\text{הַיְהוָה}$  for the most part follow Jerome and Zwingle in making the first clause ironical. But this is unnecessary, as the simplest and most obvious construction is in all respects the most satisfactory. *I will declare thy righteousness*, i. e. I will show clearly whether thou art righteous, *and* in order to do this I must declare *thy works*; and if this is done, *they cannot profit thee*, because instead of justifying they will condemn thee. There is no need, therefore, of supposing  $\text{ו}$  at the beginning of the last clause to mean *which, for, that*, or any thing but *and*. One of the latest writers on the passage, Thenius, agrees with one of the oldest, Jarchi, in explaining the first clause to mean, I will show how you may be or ought to be righteous; but this is sufficiently refuted by a simple statement of the true sense, which has been already given.

V. 13. *In thy crying* (i. e. when thou criest for help), *let thy gatherings save thee!* *And (yet) all of them the wind shall take up and a breath shall take away, and the (one) trusting in me shall inherit the land and possess my holy mountain.* This is merely a strong contrast between the impotence of idols and the power of Jehovah to protect their followers respectively. Hitzig, without a change of sense, makes  $\text{הַיְהוָה}$  an ironical exclamation, *they shall save thee!* This is much better than De Wette's interrogative construction, *will they save thee?* which is altogether arbitrary. Most of the modern writers follow Jarchi in explaining  $\text{הַיְהוָה}$  to mean thy gatherings of gods, thy whole pantheon, as Gesenius expresses it, so called, as Maurer thinks, because collected from all nations. (Compare Jer. 2 : 28.) Knobel denies that there was any such collection, or that gods could be

described as blown away, and therefore goes back to Vitringa's explanation of the word as meaning armies, i. e. as he thinks those of Babylon, in which the idolatrous Jews trusted to deliver them from Cyrus, and which might therefore be correctly called their gatherings! It may be questioned whether any of these explanations is entitled to the preference above that of Aben Ezra, who appears to understand the word generically, as denoting all that they could scrape together for their own security, including idols, armies, and all other objects of reliance. This exposition is the more entitled to regard, because the limitation of the passage to the exile is entirely gratuitous, and it is evidently levelled against all unbelieving dependence upon any thing but God.—In the consecution of *וְהָיָה רִיחַ* and *וְהָיָה* there is a climax: even a wind is not required for the purpose; a mere breath would be sufficient. This fine stroke is effaced by J. D. Michaelis's interpretation of the second word as meaning vapour, and the whole clause as descriptive of evaporation. The promise of the last clause is identical with that in ch. 49: 8, 60: 21. 65: 9. Ps. 37: 11. 69: 37, 38. Matt. 5: 5. Rev. 5: 10.—Those who restrict the passage to the Babylonish exile must of course explain the promise as relating merely to the restoration; but the context and the usage of the Scriptures is in favour of a wider explanation, in which the possession of the land is an appointed symbol of the highest blessings which are in reserve for true believers here and hereafter.

V. 14. *And he shall say, Cast up, cast up, clear the way, take up the stumbling-block from the way of my people!* Lowth and J. D. Michaelis read *וְאָמַר* (*then will I say*), the correctness of which change Lowth alleges to be plain from the pronoun *my* in the last clause, a demonstration which appears to have had small effect upon succeeding writers.—Gesenius and Ewald make *וְאָמַר* impersonal, *they say, one says, or it is said*. Vitringa in like manner long before had paraphrased it thus, *exit vox*; and Aben Ezra earlier still had proposed substantially the same thing, by supplying *הַיְהוָה* as the subject of *וְאָמַר*. Maurer agrees with the English Version in connecting this verb with the foregoing sentence and making it agree with *הַיְהוָה* *the one trusting*. The sense will then be that the man whose faith is thus rewarded will express his joy when he beholds the promise verified. Hitzig thinks it equally evident, however, that Jehovah is the speaker; and Umbreit further recommends this hypothesis by ingeniously combining it with what is said of the divine forbearance in v. 11. He who had long been silent speaks at last, and that to announce the restoration of his people. The image here presented, and the form of the expression, are the same as in ch. 35: 8. 40: 3. 49: 11. 62: 10. Knobel is not ashamed to make the verse mean that the way of the returning captives home from Babylon shall be convenient and agreeable. There is certainly not much to choose, in

point of taste and exegetical discretion between this hypothesis and that of Vitringa, who labours to find references to the reformation and the subsequent efforts made by ministers and magistrates to take away all scandals both of doctrine and discipline, with special allusion, as he seems to think, to the hundred grievances presented to Pope Adrian by the German princes in 1523. Such interpreters have no right to despise each other; for the only error with which either can be charged is that of fixing upon one specific instance of the thing foretold and making that the whole theme and the sole theme of a prophecy, which in design as well as fact is perfectly unlimited to any one event or period, yet perfectly defined as a description of God's mode of dealing with his church and with those who although in it are not of it.

V. 15. *For thus saith the High and Exalted One, inhabiting eternity, and Holy is his name: On high and holy will I dwell, and with the broken and humble of spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the broken (or contrite ones).* This verse assigns a reason why the foregoing promise might be trusted, notwithstanding the infinite disparity between the giver and the objects of his favour. Notwithstanding the intimate connexion of the verses, there is no need of referring *thus saith* to what goes before, as if he had said, these assurances are uttered by the High and Exalted One. Analogy and usage necessarily connect them with what follows, the relation of the verse to that before it being clearly indicated by the *for* at the beginning. You need not hesitate to trust the promise which is involved in this command, for the High and Holy One has made the following solemn declaration.—The only reason for translating  $\text{עָלֵי}$  *exalted* rather than *lofty*, is that the former retains the participial form of the original. The same two epithets are joined in ch. 6: 1, which is regarded by the modern critics as the oldest extant composition of the genuine Isaiah. J. D. Michaelis disregards the masoretic accents, and explains the next words as meaning that his name is the inhabitant of eternity and the sanctuary, which last he regards as a hendiadys for the everlasting sanctuary i. e. heaven as distinguished from material and temporary structures. Luzzatto gives the same construction of the clause, but supposes the noun  $\text{עָלֵי}$  (like the cognate preposition) to be applicable to space as well as time, and in this case to denote infinite height, which sense he likewise attaches to  $\text{עָלֵי הַרְיָוִת}$  when predicated of the hills etc. All other modern writers follow the accentuation, making *holy* the predicate and *name* the subject of a distinct proposition. On this hypothesis,  $\text{עָלֵי הַרְיָוִת}$  may either be an adjective qualifying  $\text{עָלֵי}$ , *his name is holy*, i. e. divine or infinitely above every other name; or it may be absolutely used and qualify Jehovah understood, his name is Holy or the Holy One. The ambiguity in English is exactly copied from



the Hebrew.—As *קָרוֹם* is not an adjective but a substantive denoting a high place, the following *קָרוֹם* must either be referred to *קָרוֹם* understood or construed with *קָרוֹם* itself, *a height, and that a holy one, will I inhabit*.—Ewald takes *וְאָרַח* at the beginning of the last clause as a sign of the nominative absolute, and the infinitives as expressive of necessity or obligation: *And as for the broken and contrite of spirit, (it is necessary) to revive etc.* Henderson and Knobel regard *וְאָרַח* as the objective particle showing what follows to be governed directly by the verb *וְאָרַחְתִּי*: ‘I inhabit (or dwell in) the broken and humble of spirit.’ This would be more natural if the other objects of the same verb were preceded by the particle; but as this is not the case, the most satisfactory construction is the common one, which takes *וְאָרַח* as a preposition meaning *with*.—The future meaning given to *וְאָרַחְתִּי* by Lowth is strictly accurate and more expressive than the present, as it intimates that notwithstanding God’s condescension he will still maintain his dignity. The idea of habitual or perpetual residence is still implied.—The reviving of the spirit and the heart is a common Hebrew phrase for consolation and encouragement.—Hitzig denies that contrition and humility are here propounded as conditions or prerequisites, and understands the clause as a description of the actual distress and degradation of the exiles.—Vitringa finds here a specific reference to the early sufferers in the cause of reformation, such as the Waldenses and Bohemian Brethren.—Compare with this verse ch. 33 : 5. 63 : 15. 66 : 1, 2. Ps. 22 : 4. 113 : 5, 6. 138 : 6.

V. 16. *For not to eternity will I contend, and not to perpetuity will I be wroth; for the spirit from before me will faint, and the souls (which) I have made.* A reason for exercising mercy is here drawn from the frailty of the creature. (Compare ch. 42 : 3. Ps. 78 : 38, 39. 103 : 9, 14.) Suffering being always represented in Scripture as the consequence of sin, its infliction is often metaphorically spoken of as a divine quarrel or controversy with the sufferer. (See above, ch. 27 : 8, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 464.)—The verb *וַיִּפֹּן* has been very variously explained, as meaning *to go forth* (Septuagint and Vulgate), *return* (De Dieu), *have mercy* (Cappellus), etc.; but the only sense sustained by etymology and usage is that of covering. The Targum seems to make the clause descriptive of a resurrection similar to that in Ezekiel’s vision, the life-giving Spirit *covering* the bones with flesh and breathing into the nostrils the breath of life. Cocceius understands it of the *Spirit* by his influences *covering* the earth as the waters cover the sea (ch. 11 : 9). Clericus makes it descriptive of the origin of man, in which the spirit covers or clothes itself with matter. The modern writers are agreed in making it intransitive and elliptical, the full expression being that of covering with darkness, metaphorically applied to extreme depression, faintness, and stupor. Maurer translates it even here, *caligine*

*obvolvitur.* The figurative use is clear from the analogy of Ps. 61: 3. 102: 1, compared with that of the reflexive form in Ps. 107: 5. 143: 4. Jon. 2: 8. Rosenmüller follows Jarchi in giving רָח the sense of *when*, and takes the last clause as a promise: when the spirit from before me faints, I grant a breathing time (*respirationes concedo*). The credit of this last interpretation is perhaps due to Grotius, who translates the clause, *et ventulum faciam*. But רָחֵרָח is evidently used as an equivalent to שָׁחַח in Prov. 20: 27, and is here the parallel expression to רָחַרַח. Lowth's translation *living souls* multiplies words without expressing the exact sense of the Hebrew, which is *breaths*. The ellipsis of the relative is the one so often mentioned heretofore as common both in Hebrew and English. *From before me* is connected by the accents with the verb *to faint*, and indicates God's presence as the cause of the depression. A more perfect parallelism would, however, be obtained by understanding *from before me* as referring to the origin of human life and as corresponding to the words *which I have made* in the other member. Umbreit's explanation of the verse, as meaning that God cannot be for ever at enmity with any of his creatures, is as old as Kimchi, but without foundation in the text and inconsistent with the uniform teaching of the Scriptures.

V. 17. *For his covetous iniquity I am wroth and will smite him, (I will) hide me and will be wroth; for he has gone on turning away (i. e. persevering in apostasy) in the way of his heart (or of his own inclination).* The futures in the first clause show that both the punishment and mercy are still future. The interpreters have generally overlooked the fact that the ו before these futures is not Vav conversive, and there is nothing in the text or context to require or justify either an arbitrary change of pointing or an arbitrary disregard of the difference between the tenses.—The first phrase in the verse (רָחֵרָח יָצַח) has been very variously understood. Lowth says the usual meaning of the second noun would here be “quite beside the purpose,” and accordingly omits the suffix and takes רָחֵרָח as an adverb meaning *for a short time*; of which it can only be said that the criticism and lexicography are worthy of each other. Koppe adopts another desperate expedient by calling in the Arabic analogy to prove that the true sense of רָחֵרָח is *scortatio*. J. D. Michaelis and Henderson make one noun simply qualify the other and explain the whole as meaning his accumulated guilt or his exorbitant iniquity. Vitringa and Gesenius suppose covetousness to be here used in a wide sense for all selfish desires or undue attachment to the things of time and sense, a usage which they think may be distinctly traced both in the Old and New Testament. (See Ps. 119: 36. Ez. 33: 31. 1 Tim. 6: 10. Eph. 5: 5.) Perhaps the safest and most satisfactory hypothesis is that of Maurer, who adheres to the strict sense of the word, but supposes

covetousness to be here considered as a temptation and incentive to other forms of sin.—The singular pronouns *his* and *him* refer to the collective noun *people*, or rather to *Israel* as an ideal person.—וְיָחִי is an adverbial, rendered equivalent in this case by its collocation to the futures which precede and follow. In the last clause the writer suddenly reverts from the future to the past, in order to assign the cause of the infliction threatened in the first. This connexion can be rendered clear in English only by the use of the word *for*, although the literal translation would be *and he went*. Jarchi's assumption of a transposition is entirely unnecessary. Hendewerk's translation, *but he went on*, rests upon the false assumption that the first clause is historical. Luther seems to understand the last clause as describing the effect of the divine stroke (*da gingen sie hin und her*). With the closing words of this clause compare ch. 42 : 24. 53 : 6. 56 : 11. 65 : 12.—The best refutation of Vitringa's notion, that this verse has special reference to the period from the death of Charles the Bald to the beginning of the Reformation, is suggested by his own apology for not going into the details of the fulfilment : "Narrandi nullus hic finis est si inceperis."

V. 18. *His ways I have seen, and I will heal him, and will guide him, and restore comforts unto him and to his mourners.* The healing here meant is forgiveness and conversion, as correctly explained by Kimchi, with a reference to ch. 6 : 10 and Ps. 41 : 5. This obvious meaning of the figure creates a difficulty in explaining the foregoing words so as to make the connexion appear natural. Gesenius supposes an antithesis, and makes the particle adversative. 'I have seen his (evil) ways, but I will (nevertheless) heal him.' There is then a promise of gratuitous forgiveness similar to that in ch. 43 : 25 and 48 : 9. The Targum puts a favourable sense on *ways*, as meaning his repentance and conversion. So Jarchi, I have seen his humiliation; and Ewald, I have seen his patient endurance of trial. Hitzig strangely understands the words to mean that God saw punishment to be without effect and therefore pardoned him, and cites in illustration Gen. 8 : 21, where the incorrigible wickedness of men is assigned as a reason for not again destroying them. But even if this sense were correct and natural considered in itself, it could hardly be extracted from the words here used.—Knobel supposes *ways* to mean neither good nor evil works but sufferings, the length of which, without regard to guilt or innocence, induced Jehovah to deliver them.—*I will guide him* is supposed by Hitzig to mean I will guide him as a shepherd guides his flock through the wilderness. (See ch. 48 : 21. 49 : 10.) But as this does not agree with the mention of consolation and of mourners in the other clause, it is better to rest in the general sense of gracious and providential guidance. (Compare Ps. 73 : 24.) Clericus

renders it *feci quiescere*, in reference to the rest of the exiles in their own land. This interpretation, which is mentioned although not approved by Jarchi, supposes an arbitrary change at least of vowels so as to derive the word from  $\text{קָנַח}$ .—The promise to *restore* consolation implies not only that it had been once enjoyed but also that it should *compensate* for the intervening sorrows, as the Hebrew word means properly to make good or indemnify.—The addition of the words *and to his mourners* has led to a dispute among interpreters, whether the writer had in mind two distinct classes of sufferers or only one. Cocceius adopts the former supposition and assumes a distinction in the church itself. Others understand by *his mourners* those who mourned for him, and Henderson applies it specifically to the heathen proselytes who sympathized with Israel in exile. Hitzig and Knobel understand the  $\text{וְאֵלֵינוּ}$  as meaning *and especially*, because those who suffered most were most in need of consolation. Perhaps it would be still more satisfactory to make these words explanatory of the  $\text{לְבָנָיו}$ , to him i. e. to his mourners. Whether these were but a part or coextensive with the whole, the form of expression then leaves undecided. Luzzatto gets rid of the difficulty by connecting these words with the next verse, ‘and for his mourners I create’ etc. Koppe throws not only this verse and the next but the one following all into one sentence, making this the expression of a wish and the next a continuation of it. ‘I saw his ways and would have healed him, guided him, consoled him and his mourners, creating etc.—but the wicked are like the troubled sea,’ etc. This is ingenious, but too artificial and refined to be good Hebrew. Vitringa sees a special connexion between this verse and the supplication of the Austrian nobles to the Emperor Ferdinand in 1541.

V. 19. *Creating the fruit of the lips, Peace, peace to the far off and to the near, saith Jehovah, and I heal him.* Luzzatto adds to this verse the concluding words of v. 18, ‘and for his mourners I create’ etc. This, besides the arbitrary change in the traditional arrangement of the text, requires the participle  $\text{סֹרֵסֵר}$  to be taken as an independent verb, which although a possible construction, is not to be assumed without necessity. The usual construction connects  $\text{סֹרֵסֵר}$  with Jehovah as the subject of the foregoing verse.—The fruit or product of the lips is speech, and creating as usual implies almighty power and a new effect. Rosenmüller understands the clause to mean that nothing shall be uttered but the following proclamation, ‘Peace, peace’ etc. Gesenius understands by the fruit of the lips praise or thanksgiving, as in Heb. 13 : 15 and Hos. 14 : 3. Hitzig supposes it to mean the promise which Jehovah had given and would certainly fulfil.—By the *far* and *near* Henderson understands the Jews and Gentiles. (Compare Acts 10 : 36. Eph. 2 : 17.) Jarchi and Knobel explain it to mean all the

Jews wherever scattered (ch. 43: 5-7. 49: 12). The Targum makes the distinction an internal one,—the just who have kept the law, and sinners who have returned to it by sincere repentance. Kimchi in like manner understands the words as abolishing all difference between the earlier and later converts, an idea similar to that embodied in our Saviour's parable of the labourers in the vineyard. Hitzig directs attention to the way in which the writer here comes back to the beginning of v. 18, as an observable rhetorical beauty.—The present form is used above in the translation of the last verb, because it is doubtful whether the Vav has a conversive influence when separated so far from the futures of the foregoing verse.

V. 20. *And the wicked (are) like the troubled sea, for rest it cannot, and its waters cast up mire and dirt.* Koppe's unnatural construction of this verse as the apodosis of a sentence beginning in v. 18 has already been refuted. Interpreters are commonly agreed in making it a necessary limitation of the foregoing promise to its proper objects. Hitzig regards it as a mere introduction to the next verse. There is a force in the original which cannot be retained in a translation, arising from the etymological affinity between the words translated *wicked, troubled, and cast up*. Among the various epithets applied to sinners, the one here used is that which originally signifies their turbulence or restlessness. (See Hengstenberg on Ps. 2: 1.) Henderson's strange version of the first clause (*as for the wicked they are each tossed about like the sea which cannot rest*) seems to be founded upon some mistaken view of the construction, and is certainly not worth purchasing by a violation of the accents.—Hendewerk's version of the clause is peculiar only in the use of the indefinite expression *a sea*. Gesenius in his Lexicon makes this one of the cases in which ׀ retains its original meaning as a relative pronoun, *like the troubled sea which cannot rest*. The English Version and some others take it as a particle of time (*when it cannot rest*). All the latest German writers follow Lowth in giving it its usual sense of *for, because*. The only objection to this version, that it appears to make the sea itself the subject of comparison, Knobel ingeniously removes by adding, 'any more than you can.' The future form ׀׀׀ implies that such will be the case hereafter as it has been heretofore, which is sufficiently expressed by the reference to futurity in our verb *can*. The Vav conversive prefixed to the last verb merely shows its dependence on the one before it, as an effect upon its cause, or a consequent upon its antecedent. Its waters cannot rest, and (so or therefore) they cast up mire and mud. Lowth's version of this last clause is more than usually plain and vigorous: *its waters work up mire and filth*. The verb means strictly to expel or drive out, and is therefore happily descriptive of the natural process here referred to. There seems to

be allusion to this verse in the *κείμενα ἄγρια θαλάσσης* of Jude v. 13. Most of the later writers have repeated the fine parallel which Clericus quotes from Ovid :

Cumque sit hibernis agitatum fluctibus aequor,  
Pectora sunt ipso turbidiora mari.

V. 21. *There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.* Gesenius has *for the wicked*, i. e. in reserve for them. Ewald follows Luther in exchanging the oriental for an occidental idiom, *the wicked have no peace*, which although perfectly correct in sense, is an enfeebling deviation from the Hebrew collocation and construction. That *peace* is here to be taken in its strict sense, and not in that of welfare or prosperity, is clear from the comparison in the preceding verse. Twenty-two manuscripts assimilate this verse to ch. 48 : 22 by reading  $\text{וְלֹא שָׁלוֹם}$  for  $\text{וְלֹא שָׁלוֹם}$ . The Alexandrian text of the Septuagint combines both readings, *κείτος ὁ θεός*. So too Jerome has *Dominus Deus*, which Grotius thinks ought to be read *Dominus meus*, not observing that the form of expression would still be different from that of the original. It is somewhat surprising that the "higher criticism" has not detected in this repetition a marginal gloss or the assimilating hand of some redactor. But even Hitzig zealously contends, without an adversary, that the verse is genuine both here and in ch. 48 : 22, and that its studied repetition proves the unity and chronological arrangement of the whole book. The only wonder is that in a hundred cases more or less analogous the same kind of reasoning is rejected as beneath refutation. This verse, according to the theory of Rückert, Hitzig, and Hävernick, closes the second great division of the Later Prophecies. For the true sense of the words themselves, see above, on ch. 48 : 22.

## CHAPTER LVIII.

THE rejection of Israel as a nation is the just reward of their unfaithfulness, v. 1. Their religious services are hypocritical, v. 2. Their mortifications and austerities are nullified by accompanying wickedness, vs. 3-5. They should have been connected with the opposite virtues, vs. 6-7. In that case they would have continued to enjoy the divine favour, vs. 8-9. They are still invited to make trial of this course, with an ample promise of prosperity and blessing to encourage them, vs. 10-14.

V. 1. *Cry with the throat, spare not, like the trumpet raise thy voice, and tell to my people their transgression and to the house of Jacob their sins.* Although this may be conveniently assigned as the beginning of the third part, according to the theory propounded in the Introduction, it is really, as Knobel well observes, a direct continuation of the previous discourse. Ewald's suggestion that the latter may have produced some effect upon the people before this was uttered, rests on a supposition which has probably no foundation in fact. The utmost that can be conceded is that the Prophet, after a brief pause, recommences his discourse precisely at the point where he suspended it.—The object of address is the Prophet himself, as expressed in the Targuin, and by Saadias (he said to me). That he is here viewed as the representative of prophets or ministers in general, is not a natural or necessary inference. Crying with the throat or from the lungs is here opposed to a simple motion of the lips and tongue. (See 1 Sam. 1 : 13.) The common version (*cry aloud*) is therefore substantially correct, though somewhat vague. The Septuagint in like manner paraphrases it *ἐν ἰσχυρί*. The Vulgate omits it altogether. J. D. Michaelis reads, *as loud as thou canst*. The positive command is enforced by the negative one, *spare not*, as in ch. 54 : 2. The comparison with a trumpet is of frequent occurrence in the Book of Revelations. (See e. g. 1 : 10. 4 : 1.) The loudness of the call is intended to suggest the importance of the subject, and perhaps the insensibility of those to be convinced. The Prophet here seems to turn away from avowed apostates to hypocritical professors of the truth. The restriction of the verse to Isaiah's contemporaries by the rabbins, Grotius, and Piscator—and to the Jews of the Babylonish exile by Sanctius and the modern writers—is as perfectly gratuitous as its restriction by Eusebius and Jerome to the Pharisees of Christ's time, and by Vitranga to the Protestant churches at the decline of the Reformation. The points of similarity with all or any of these periods arise from its being a description of what often has occurred and will occur again. It was important that a phase of human history so real and important should form a part of this prophetic picture, and accordingly it has not been forgotten.

V. 2. *And me day (by) day they will seek, and the knowledge of my ways they will delight in (or desire), like a nation which has done right and the judgment of its God has not forsaken; they will ask of me righteous judgments, the approach to God (or of God) they will delight in (or desire).* The older writers understand this as a description of hypocrisy, as practised in a formal seeking (i. e. worshipping) of God and a professed desire to know his ways (i. e. the doctrines and duties of the true religion), the external appearance of a just and godly people, who delight in nothing

more than in drawing near to God (i. e. in worship and communion with him). Cocceius and Vitranga, while they differ on some minor questions, e. g. whether seeking denotes consultation or worship, or includes them both, agree as to the main points of the exposition which has just been given. But Gesenius and all the later German writers put a very different sense upon the passage. They apply it not to hypocritical formality, but to a discontented and incredulous impatience of delay in the fulfilment of God's promises. According to this view of the matter, seeking God daily, means importunate solicitation; delight in the knowledge of his ways, is eager curiosity to know his providential plans and purposes; the judgments of righteousness which they demand are either saving judgments for themselves or destroying judgments for their enemies; the approach which they desire is not their own approach to God, but his approach to them for their deliverance; and the words *like a nation* etc. are descriptive not of a simulated piety, but of a self-righteous belief that by their outward services they had acquired a meritorious claim to the divine interposition in their favour. It is somewhat remarkable that a sentence of such length should without violence admit of two interpretations so entirely different, and the wonder is enhanced by the fact that both the senses may be reconciled with the ensuing context. The only arguments which seem to be decisive in favour of the first, are its superior simplicity and the greater readiness with which it is suggested to most readers by the language of the text itself, together with the fact that it precludes the necessity of limiting the words to the Babylonish exile, for which limitation there is no ground either in the text or context. The objection to the modern explanation, founded on the sense which it attaches to the verb  $\text{יָרַד}$ , is met by the analogous use of the verb *love* in Ps. 40 : 17. 70 : 5. 2 Tim. 4 : 8.—Luther understands the last clause as accusing them of wishing to contend with God, and venturing to charge him with injustice.

V. 3. *Why have we fasted and thou hast not seen (it), afflicted our soul (or ourselves) and thou wilt not know (it)? Behold, in the day of your fast ye will find pleasure, and all your labours ye will exact.* The two interpretations which have been propounded of the foregoing verse agree in making this a particular exemplification of the people's self-righteous confidence in the meritorious efficacy of their outward services. The first clause contains their complaint, and the last the prophet's answer. This relation of the clauses Saadias points out by prefixing to one the words "they say," and to the other "Prophet, answer them." Cocceius and Vitranga suppose fasting to be here used in a wide sense for the whole routine of ceremonial services. The same end is attained by adhering to the strict sense, but supposing what is said of this one instance to be appli-



cable to the others. The structure of the first clause is like that in ch. 5 : 4. 50 : 2. In our idiom the idea would be naturally thus expressed, Why dost thou not see when we fast, or recognise our merit when we mortify ourselves before thee? The word  $\text{עָבַד}$  here may either mean the appetite, or the soul as distinguished from the body, or it may supply the place of the reflexive pronoun *self*, which is entitled to the preference, because the context shows that their mortifications were not of a spiritual but of a corporeal nature. The combination of the preterite (*hast not seen*) and the future (*will not know*) includes all time. The clause describes Jehovah as indifferent and inattentive to their laboured austerities. The reason given is analogous to that for the rejection of their sacrifices in ch. 1 : 11–13, viz. the combination of their formal service with unhallowed practice. The precise nature of the alleged abuse depends upon the sense of the word  $\text{עָבַד}$ . Gesenius and most later writers understand it to mean business, as in ch. 44 : 23. 53 : 10, and explain the whole clause as a declaration that on days set apart for fasting they were accustomed to pursue their usual employments, or as Henderson expresses it, to “attend to business.” But this explanation of the word, as we have seen before, is perfectly gratuitous. If we take it in its usual and proper sense, the meaning of the clause is that they made their pretended self-denial a means or an occasion of sinful gratification. J. D. Michaelis supposes the specific pleasure meant to be that afforded by the admiration of their superior goodness by the people. But this is a needless limitation of the language, which may naturally be applied to all kinds of enjoyment inconsistent with the mortifying humiliation which is inseparable from right fasting.—The remaining member of the sentence has been still more variously explained. According to the Septuagint and Vulgate, it charges them with specially oppressing their dependents (*ὑποκειμένους* and *subjectos*) at such times. Luther agrees with Symmachus in supposing a particular allusion to the treatment of debtors. Gesenius in his Commentary, Umbreit, and De Wette, prefer the specific sense of labourers or workmen forced to toil on fast-days as at other times. Maurer, Hitzig, and Gesenius in his Thesaurus, coincide with the English Version in the sense, *ye exact all your labours*, i. e. all the labour due to you from your dependents. As these substitute labours for labourers so the Rabbins debts for debtors. Aben Ezra uses the expression *mammon*, which may mean your gains or profits; but  $\text{עָבַד}$ , as Maurer well observes, does not signify emolument in general, but hard-earned wages, as appears both from etymology and usage. (See Prov. 5 : 10. 10 : 22. Ps. 127 : 2.) J. D. Michaelis ingeniously explains the clause as meaning that they demanded of God himself a reward for their meritorious services.—On the stated fasts of the Old Testament, see Jer. 36 : 9. Zech. 7 : 3. 8 : 19.—According to Luzzatto,  $\text{עָבַד}$  originally signifies the convocation of the people

for prayer and preaching; so that when Jezebel required a fast to be proclaimed, Naboth was set on high among the people, i. e. preached against idolatry, on which pretext he was afterwards accused of having blasphemed God and the king. (1 Kings 21 : 9-13.)

V. 4. *Behold, for strife and contention ye will fast, and to smite with the fist of wickedness; ye shall not (or ye will not) fast to-day (so as) to make your voice heard on high.* Some understand this as a further reason why their fasts were not acceptable to God; others suppose the same to be continued, and refer what is here said to the maltreatment of the labourers or debtors mentioned in the verse preceding. Gesenius understands the  $\text{ב}$  in the first clause as expressive merely of an accompanying circumstance, ye fast *with* strife and quarrel. But Maurer and the later writers, more consistently with usage, understand it as denoting the effect, either simply so considered, or as the end deliberately aimed at. J. D. Michaelis tells a story of a lady who was never known to scold her servants so severely as on fast days, which he says agrees well with physiological principles and facts. Vitringa applies this clause to the doctrinal divisions among Protestants, and more particularly to the controversies in the church of Holland on the subject of grace and predestination. To smite with the fist of wickedness is a periphrasis for fighting, no doubt borrowed from the provision of the law in Ex. 21 : 18.—Luther and other early writers understand the last clause as a prohibition of noisy quarrels, to make the voice heard on high being taken as equivalent to letting it be heard in the street (ch. 42 : 3). Vitringa and the later writers give it a meaning altogether different, by taking  $\text{קרוֹן}$  in the sense of heaven (ch. 57 : 15), and the whole clause as a declaration that such fasting would not have the desired effect of gaining audience and acceptance for their prayers. (See Joel 1 : 14. 2 : 12.) All the modern writers make  $\text{כִּי־יִיָּמֵם}$  synonymous with  $\text{כִּי־יִיָּמֵם}$  *to-day*, as in 1 Kings 1 : 31. Jarchi's explanation, *as the day* (ought to be kept) involves a harsh ellipsis and is contrary to usage.—Instead of  $\text{רַשָׁע לֹא}$ , Lowth reads  $\text{לִי רַשָׁע עַל זֶה לִי}$ , and translates 'to smite with the fist the poor; wherefore fast ye unto me in this manner?' The only authority for this pretended emendation is the  $\text{\tau\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\iota\ \iota\upsilon\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \mu\omicron\iota}$  of the Septuagint version, and the strange idea that it "gives a much better sense than the present reading of the Hebrew."

V. 5. *Shall it be like this, the fast that I will choose, the day of man's humbling himself? Is it to hang his head like a bulrush and make sackcloth and ashes his bed? Wilt thou call this a fast, and a day of acceptance (an acceptable day) to Jehovah?* The general meaning of this verse is clear, although its structure and particular expressions are marked with a strong idiomatic peculiarity which makes exact translation very difficult.

The interrogative form, as in many other cases, implies strong negation mingled with surprise. Nothing is gained but something lost by dropping the future forms of the first clause. The preterite translation of *אֶבְחַר* (*I have chosen*) is in fact quite ungrammatical. No less gratuitous is the explanation of this verb as meaning *love* by Gesenius, and *approve* by Henderson; neither of which ideas is expressed, although both are really implied in the exact translation, *choose*. The second member of the first clause is not part of the contemptuous description of a mere external fast, but belongs to the definition of a true one, as a time for men to practise self-humiliation. He does not ask whether the fast which he chooses is a day for a man to afflict himself, implying that it is not, which would be destructive of the very essence of a fast; but he asks whether the fast which he has chosen as a time for men to humble and afflict themselves is such as this, i. e. a mere external self-abasement.—*וַיִּפְּצֵהוּ* means to spread any thing under one for him to lie upon. (See above, ch. 14 : 11.) The effect of fasting as an outward means and token of sincere humiliation, may be learned from the case of Ahab (1 Kings 21 : 27–29) and the Ninevites (Jonah 3 : 5–9). The use of sackcloth and ashes in connexion with fasting is recorded in Esther 9 : 3. Even Gesenius regards this general description as particularly applicable to the abuse of fasting in the Romish and the Oriental churches. The sense attached to *יָד* by Luther (*des Tages*) and Lowth (*for a day*) changes the meaning of the clause by an arbitrary violation of the syntax.

V. 6. *Is not this the fast that I will choose, to loosen bands of wickedness, to undo the fastenings of the yoke, and to send away the crushed (or broken) free, and every yoke ye shall break? Most interpreters suppose a particular allusion to the detention of Hebrew servants after the seventh year, contrary to the express provisions of the law (Ex. 21 : 2. Lev. 25 : 39. Deut. 15 : 12). Grotius applies the terms in a figurative sense to judicial oppression; Cocceius to impositions on the conscience (Matt. 23 : 4. Acts 15 : 28. Gal. 5 : 1); Vitringa, still more generally, to human domination in the church (1 Cor. 7 : 23), with special reference to the arbitrary imposition of formulas and creeds. It is evident, however, that the terms were so selected as to be descriptive of oppression universally; to make which still more evident, the Prophet adds a general command or exhortation, Ye shall break every yoke. The Targum explains *בִּזְכָּה* to mean unjust decrees (*בְּהַבְרֵי רִיזָה בְּמִסְתֵּי*), and the Septuagint applies it to fraudulent contracts, an idea which Gesenius thinks was probably suggested to the translator by his knowledge of the habits of the Alexandrian Jews. Hitzig agrees with Jarchi in deriving the first *בִּזְכָּה* from *נָזָה* and making it synonymous with *מָזָה* (Ez. 9 : 9), the perversion of justice. (For this application of*

the verb, see above, ch. 29: 21. 30: 11). But although this affords a more perfect parallelism with  $\text{שָׁפַט}$ , it is dearly purchased by assuming that the same form  $\text{הִצִּיחַ}$  is here used in two entirely different senses. For the use of  $\text{הִצִּיחַ}$  in reference to oppression see 1 Sam. 12: 3, 4, and compare Isaiah 42: 3. Gesenius here repeats his unwarrantable mistranslation of  $\text{הִצִּיחַ}$  as synonymous with  $\text{הִצִּיחַ}$ . In this he is followed by Hitzig; but the later writers have the good taste to prefer the strict translation. The change of construction in the last clause from the infinitive to the future, is so common as to be entitled to consideration, not as a solecism but a Hebrew idiom. There is no need therefore of adopting the indirect and foreign construction, *that ye break every yoke*.—In reply to the question, how the acts here mentioned could be described as fasting, J. D. Michaelis says that they are all to be considered as involving acts of conscientious self-denial, which he illustrates by the case of an American slaveholder brought by stress of conscience to emancipate his slaves. The principle is stated still more clearly and more generally by Augustine, in a passage which Gesenius quotes in illustration of the verse before us. (*Jejunium magnum et generale est abstinere ab iniquitatibus et illicitis voluptatibus seculi, quod est perfectum jejunium.*) Hendewerk understands this passage of Isaiah as expressly condemning and prohibiting all fasts, but the other Germans still maintain the old opinion that it merely shows the spirit which is necessary to a true fast.

V. 7. *Is it not to break unto the hungry thy bread, and the afflicted, the homeless, thou shalt bring home; for thou shalt see one naked and shalt clothe him, and from thine own flesh thou shalt not hide thyself.* The change of construction to the future in the first clause is precisely the same as in the preceding verse.—Grotius explains the phrase *to break bread* (meaning to distribute) from the oriental practice of baking bread in thin flat cakes.—Lowth's version of the next phrase (*the wandering poor*) is now commonly regarded as substantially correct. (Compare Job 15: 23.)  $\text{בְּרִדְדִים}$  is properly an abstract, meaning *wandering* (from  $\text{רָדַד}$ ), here used for the concrete expression *wanderers*. There is no need of explaining it with Henderson as an ellipsis for  $\text{אֲנָשֵׁי בְּרִדְדִים}$  men of wanderings. The essential idea is expressed in the Septuagint version (*ἀστέγους*) which Ewald copies (*Dachlose*), and still more exactly in the Vulgate (*vagos*). Jarchi explains it to mean *mourning*, by metathesis for  $\text{בְּרִדְדִים}$  a passive participle from  $\text{רָדַד}$ . Hitzig derives it from  $\text{קָרַד}$  to rebel, but gives it the specific sense of fugitive rebels. *Thou shalt bring home*, i. e. as Knobel understands it, for the purpose of feeding them; but this is a gratuitous restriction.—The construction of the second clause is similar to that in v. 2. It is best to retain the form of the original, not only upon general grounds, but because *thou shalt see the naked* seems to be a substantive command corresponding

to thou shalt not hide thyself.—For the use of *flesh* to signify near kindred, see Gen. 29 : 14. 37 : 27. 2 Sam. 5 : 1. The Septuagint paraphrase is, ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου.—With the general precepts of the verse compare ch. 32 : 6. Job 31 : 16–22. Ez. 18 : 7. Prov. 22 : 9. Ps. 112 : 9. Matt. 25 : 36. Rom. 12 : 11. Heb. 13 : 2. James 2 : 15, 16; and with the last clause, Matth. 15 : 5, 6.

V. 8. *Then shall break forth as the dawn thy light, and thy healing speedily shall spring up; then shall go before thee thy righteousness, and the glory of Jehovah shall be thy reward (or bring up thy rear).* Kinchi connects this with the foregoing context by supplying as an intermediate thought, thou shalt no longer need to fast or lie in sackcloth and ashes. It is evident, however, that the writer has entirely lost sight of the particular example upon which he had been dwelling so minutely, and is now entirely occupied with the effects which would arise from a conformity to God's will, not in reference to fasting merely, but to every other part of duty. *Then*, i. e. when this cordial compliance shall have taken place. The future form is preferable here to the conditional (*would break forth*), not only as more obvious and exact, but as implying that it will be so in point of fact, that the effect will certainly take place, because the previous condition will be certainly complied with. The verb to break forth (literally, *to be cleft*), elsewhere applied to the hatching of eggs (ch. 59 : 5) and the gushing of water (ch. 35 : 6), is here used in reference to the dawn or break of day, a common figure for relief succeeding deep affliction. (See ch. 8 : 22. 47 : 11. 60 : 1.)—פָּצַח is properly a bandage, but has here the sense of healing, as in Jer. 8 : 22. 30 : 17. 33 : 6. By a mixture of metaphors, which does not in the least obscure the sense, this healing is here said to sprout or germinate, a figure employed elsewhere to denote the sudden, rapid, and spontaneous growth or rise of any thing. (See above, on ch. 42 : 9 and 43 : 19.) In the last clause a third distinct figure is employed to express the same idea, viz. that of a march like the journey through the wilderness, with the pillar of cloud, as the symbol of God's presence, going before and after. (See above, on ch. 52 : 12; and compare Ex. 13 : 21. 14 : 19.)—*Thy righteousness shall go before thee* cannot mean that righteousness shall be exacted as a previous condition, which is wholly out of keeping with the figurative character of the description. Luther has also marred it by translating the last verb, *shall take thee to himself*, overlooking its peculiar military sense, for which see above on ch. 52 : 12. Knobel improves upon Gesenius's gratuitous assumption that פָּצַח means salvation, by explaining it in this case as an abstract used for the concrete, and accordingly translating it *thy Saviour*. All the advantages of this interpretation are secured

without the slightest violence to usage, by supposing that Jehovah here assumes the conduct of his people, as their righteousness or justifier. (See Jer. 23 : 6. 33 : 16 ; and compare Isaiah 54 : 17.) The parallel term *glory* may then be understood as denoting the manifested glory of Jehovah, or Jehovah himself in glorious epiphany ; just as his presence with his people in the wilderness was manifested by the pillar of cloud and of fire, which sometimes went before them and at other times brought up their rear. (See above, on ch. 52 : 12.) This grand reiteration of a glorious promise is gratuitously weakened and belittled by restricting it to the return of the exiled Jews from Babylon ; which, although one remarkable example of the thing described, has no more claim to be regarded as the whole of it, than the deliverance of Paul or Peter from imprisonment exhausted Christ's engagement to be with his servants always even to the end of the world.

V. 9. *Then shalt thou call and Jehovah will answer, thou shalt cry and he will say, Behold me* (here I am), *if thou wilt put away from the midst of thee the yoke, the pointing of the finger, and the speaking of vanity.* The  $\text{נָּ}$  may either be connected with what goes before or correspond to  $\text{נָּ}$  in the other clause, like *then, when*, in English. That  $\text{נָּ}$  may thus be used as a particle of time, will be seen by comparing ch. 4 : 4. 24 : 13. The conditional form of the promise implies that it was not so with them now, of which indeed they are themselves represented as complaining in v. 3. The idea of this verse might be expressed in the occidental idiom by saying, *when thou callest, Jehovah will answer ; when thou criest, he will say, Behold me.* (See above, on ch. 50 : 2.)—The yoke is again mentioned as the symbol of oppression. (See v. 6.) De Wette needlessly resolves it into subjugation (*Unterjochung*), Hendewerk still more boldly into *slavery*.—The pointing of the finger is a gesture of derision. Hence the middle finger is called by Persius *digitus infamis* ; Martial says, *rideto multum*, and in the same connexion, *digitum porrigito medium* ; Plautus, in reference to an object of derision, *intende digitum in hunc*. The Arabs have a verb derived from *finger* and denoting scornful ridicule. The object of contempt in this case is supposed by Grotius to be the pious ; by Hitzig, the Prophet or Jehovah himself ; by Knobel, the unfortunate, who are afterwards described as objects of sympathy.—Words of vanity in Zech. 10 : 2 mean falsehood, which is here retained by J. D. Michaelis, while Dathe gives it the specific sense of slander, and Paulus that of secret and malignant machination. Vitranga understands it as relating to censorious and unnecessary fault-finding ; Kimchi, Ewald, and Gesenius, to strife and bickerings. All these may be included in the general sense of evil speech or wicked words. The Targum has, *words of oppression*, or as Gesenius explains it, *violence*.

V. 10. *And (if) thou wilt let out thy soul to the hungry, and the afflicted soul wilt satisfy, then shall thy light arise in the darkness, and thy gloom as the (double light or) noon.* For לַחֲמֵהֶם Lowth reads לַחֲמֵהֶם *thy bread*, in which he is supported by eight manuscripts. The Septuagint version he considers as combining the two readings. But Vitrिंगa understands ἐκ ψυχῆς as denoting the cordiality of a cheerful giver (2 Cor. 9 : 7. Rom. 12 : 8). Luzzatto, by means of a curious etymological analogy, makes פָּנֶיךָ synonymous with the פָּנֶיךָ of Lev. 9 : 12, 13, 18, and translates the whole phrase, 'if thou wilt present thy person.' Gesenius takes פָּנֶיךָ in the sense of *appetite* or *hunger*, here put for the thing desired or enjoyed (*deinen Bissen*). Hitzig and Ewald, with the same view of the writer's meaning, retain the more exact sense of *desire* in their translations. Hendewerk's explanation, 'if thou wilt turn thy heart to the hungry,' is near akin to Luther's, 'if thou let the hungry find thy heart,' which seems to rest upon the same interpretation of the verb that has been quoted from Luzzatto. By a distressed soul Hitzig here understands one suffering from want and craving sustenance. (See ch. 29 : 8.) The figure in the last clause is a common one for happiness succeeding sorrow. (See Judg. 5 : 31. Ps. 112 : 4. Job 11 : 17.) Vitrिंगa asserts roundly (*àio rotunde*) that this prophecy was not fulfilled until after the Reformation, when so many German, French, Italian, and Hungarian Protestants were forced to seek refuge in other countries. The true sense of the passage he has given without knowing it, in these words: "Post tot beneficia et stricturas lucis ecclesie inductas, restat merities quem expectat."

V. 11. *And Jehovah will guide thee ever, and satisfy thy soul in drought, and thy bones shall he invigorate, and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water whose waters shall not fail.* The promise of guidance had already been given in ch. 57 : 18. (Compare Ps. 73 : 24, 78 : 14.) Jerome's translation (*requiem tibi dabit*) derives the verb from נָחַם, not נָחַם. Driessen and some others make נָחַם mean with clear or bright waters; but the sense of glistening, dazzling, which belongs to the Arabic root, is equally applicable to the burning sands of a desert. Ewald translates it fever-heat. The common version, *drought*, which Lowth changes to *severest drought*, in order to express the intensive meaning of the plural form, agrees well with the verb to *satisfy*, referring to thirst, as v. 10 does to hunger. The common version of the next clause (*and make fat thy bones*) is sanctioned by the Septuagint and Kimchi, who appeals to the analogy of Prov. 15 : 30. The Vulgate version (*ossa liberabit*) seems both arbitrary and unmeaning. The Peshito and Saadias translate the verb *will strengthen*, which is adopted by most modern writers. Secker's emendation (וְיָחַם לְךָ נְחָם), which Lowth adopts (*renew*

*thy strength*), derives some countenance not only from the Targum, but from the analogy of ch. 40 : 31 and 41 : 1, and is only inadmissible because it is gratuitous. Similar allusions to the bones as the seat of strength, occur in Ps. 51 : 10 and Job 21 : 24. The figure in the last clause is the converse of that in ch. 1 : 30. There is here a climax. Not content with the image of a well-watered garden, he substitutes that of the stream, or rather of the spring itself. The general idea is a favourite with Isaiah. (See above, ch. 30 : 25. 33 : 21. 35 : 5, 7. 41 : 17. 43 : 20. 44 : 4. 48 : 21. 49 : 10.) On the deceiving of the waters, see Jer. 15 : 18, and compare the analogous expressions of Hosea with respect to wine, and of Habakkuk with respect to oil. (Hos. 5 : 2. Hab. 3 : 17.) Hitzig and Knobel understand what is here said of heat and drought in literal application to the journey of the exiles through the wilderness, while all the analogous expressions in the context are regarded as strong figures. The truth is, that the exodus from Egypt had already made these images familiar and appropriate to any great deliverance.

V. 12. *And they shall build from thee the ruins of antiquity (or perpetuity), foundations of age and age (i. e. of ages) shalt thou raise up; and it shall be called to thee (or thou shalt be called) Repairer of the breach, Restorer of paths for dwelling.* Ewald reads בָּנֵי, they shall be built by thee; but this passive form does not occur elsewhere, and is here sustained by no external evidence. Kimchi understands בָּנֵי as referring not to persons, but effects (*opera*), which is very unnatural. Hitzig retains the old interpretation of the clause as referring to children or descendants; and the latter writer gives it a specific application to the younger race of exiles, whom he supposes to be the Servant of Jehovah in these Later Prophecies. Gesenius denies the reference to children, and explains בָּנֵי as meaning those belonging to thee, or, as he paraphrases it, *thy people*. The simplest supposition is that of some rabbinical writers, who supply as the subject of the verb its correlative noun, builders. But as בָּנֵי properly means *from thee*, it denotes something more than mere connexion, and, unless forbidden by something in the context, must be taken to signify a going forth from Israel into other lands. Thus understood, the clause agrees exactly with the work assigned to Israel in ch. 42 : 14 and 57 : 11, viz. that of reclaiming the apostate nations, and building the wastes of a desolated world. As יָמֵי obviously refers to past time, this is the only natural interpretation of the corresponding phrase, הַיָּדֵי יָרֵד; although Luther and others understand the latter as referring to foundations which shall last for ever. Gesenius understands by foundations, buildings razed to their foundations (Ps. 137 : 7); and Hitzig supposes it to have the secondary sense of *ruins*, like אֲשֵׁרִישִׁים, in ch. 16 : 7. The sense will then be, if referred to past



time, foundations which have lain bare, or buildings whose foundations have lain bare, for ages. For the metaphor, compare Am. 9 : 11 ; for that of a highway, ch. 19 : 23. 35 : 8 ; and for that of the breach, Ez. 13 : 5. 22 : 30. The addition of the last phrase, לְצַדִּיק, has perplexed interpreters. Cocceius understands it to mean that the paths themselves shall be inhabited. Gesenius arbitrarily translates it, *in the inhabited land*. Knobel no less gratuitously gives to *paths* the sense of beaten or frequented regions. Jerome and Grotius make the word a derivative from צָדִיק, and translate it *in quietem*, or *ad quiescendum*. The most satisfactory hypotheses are those of Hitzig and Maurer, the former of whom makes the phrase mean *ad habitandum sc. terram*, that the land may be inhabited. The latter understands the paths to be described as leading not to ruins and to deserts as before, but to inhabited regions. Of these the former seems entitled to the preference. It will be sufficient to record the fact, that Vitringa finds in this verse an allusion to fundamental doctrines, canons, formulas, etc. etc.

V. 13. *If thou wilt turn away thy foot from the Sabbath to do thy pleasure on my holy day, and wilt call the Sabbath a delight, (and) the holy (day) of Jehovah honourable, and wilt honour it by not doing thy own ways, by not finding thy pleasure and talking talk.* The version of Henderson and others, turn away thy foot *on* the Sabbath, is inconsistent with the form of the original, as well as with the figure, which is that of something trodden down and trampled, or at least encroached upon. Most interpreters agree with Kimchi in supplying כִּן before יִשְׂתַּחֲוֶה, a combination which is actually found in one manuscript. Hitzig supposes that the grammatical effect of the first כִּן extends to this infinitive. Maurer supplies nothing, and translates *ut agas*. The modern version of חֵזְקֶךָ (*business*) is much less natural, even in this connexion, than the old one, *thy pleasure*, especially as paraphrased by Luther, *what thou wilt (was dir gefällt)*. Hitzig observes a climax in the requisitions of this clause, not unlike that in Prov. 2 : 2-4. The mere outward observance was of no avail, unless the institution were regarded with reverence, as of God ; nay more, with complacency, as in itself delightful. To call it a delight, is to acknowledge it as such. The ל before קָדוֹשׁ appears to interrupt the construction, which has led some interpreters to disregard it altogether, and others to take קָדוֹשׁ as a verb, or an adjective agreeing with Jehovah—honoured in order to sanctify (or glorify) Jehovah—honoured by the sanctification of Jehovah—honoured for the sake of the Holy One, Jehovah. But the simplest explanation is the one proposed by De Dieu and adopted by Vitringa, which treats the ל before שָׁבַת, and that before קָדוֹשׁ, as correlatives, alike connecting the verb קָרָא with its object. As the construction of this verb is foreign from our idiom, it may be best explained by a paraphrase : ‘ If thou wilt give to the Sab-

bath (לִשְׂשׂוֹן) the name of a delight, and to the holy (לְיְהוָה) day or ordinance of Jehovah that of honourable.' But mere acknowledgment is not enough—it must not only be admitted to deserve honour, but in fact receive it. Hence he adds, and if thou wilt honour it thyself, *by not doing*, literally, away from doing, so as not to do. (On this use of נָעַד, see ch. 5 : 6. 49 : 15.) Here again, to find one's *pleasure* on the Sabbath is more natural than to find one's *business*. Doing thy own ways, although not a usual combination, is rendered intelligible by the constant use of *way* in Hebrew to denote a course of conduct. Speaking speech or talking talk is by some regarded as equivalent to speaking vanity, in v. 9. The Septuagint adds *ἐν ὀργῇ*. The modern writers, for the most part, are in favour of the explanation, speaking mere words, idle talk. (Compare Matt. 12 : 36.) The classical parallels adduced by Clericus, Gesenius, and others, are very little to the purpose. As to the importance here attached to the Sabbath, see above, on ch. 56 : 2.

V. 14. *Then shalt thou be happy in Jehovah, and I will make thee ride upon the heights of the earth, and I will make thee eat the heritage of Jacob thy father, for Jehovah's mouth hath spoken it.* The verb יהרהב is combined with the divine name elsewhere to express both a duty and a privilege. (Compare Psalm 37 : 4 with Job 22 : 26. 27 : 10.—יהרהב does not mean I will raise thee above (Jerome), or I will cause thee to sit (Cocceius), but I will cause thee to ride. The whole phrase is descriptive not of a mere return to Palestine the highest of all lands (Kinichi), nor of mere security from enemies by being placed beyond their reach (Vitranga), but of conquest and triumphant possession, as in Deut. 32 : 13, from which the expression is derived by all the later writers who employ it. There is no sufficient ground for Knobel's supposition that יהרהב in this phrase means the fortresses erected upon hills and mountains.—To eat the heritage is to enjoy it and derive subsistence from it. Kinichi correctly says that it is called the heritage of Jacob as distinct from that of Ishmael and Esau, although equally descended from the Father of the Faithful.—The last clause is added to ensure the certainty of the event, as resting not on human but divine authority. See ch. 1 : 2.

## CHAPTER LIX.

THE fault of Israel's rejection is not in the Lord but in themselves, vs. 1, 2. They are charged with sins of violence and injustice, vs. 3, 4. The ruinous effects of these corruptions are described, vs. 5, 6. Their violence and injustice are as fatal to themselves as to others, vs. 7, 8. The moral condition of the people is described as one of darkness and hopeless degradation, vs. 9-15. In this extremity Jehovah interposes to deliver the true Israel, vs. 16, 17. This can only be effected by the destruction of the carnal Israel, v. 18. The divine presence shall no longer be subjected to local restrictions, v. 19. A Redeemer shall appear in Zion to save the true Israel, v. 20. The old temporary dispensation shall give place to the dispensation of the Word and Spirit, which shall last for ever, v. 21.

V. 1. *Behold, not shortened is Jehovah's hand from saving, and not benumbed is his ear from hearing*, i. e. so as not to save, and not to hear, or too short to save, too dull to hear. On this use of the preposition, see above on ch. 58 : 13, and the references there made. The Prophet merely pauses, as it were, for a moment, to exonerate his master from all blame, before continuing his accusation of the people. The beginning of a chapter here is simply a matter of convenience, as the following context has precisely the same character with that before it; unless we assume with Lowth that the Prophet now ascends from particulars to generals, or with J. D. Michaelis, that he here descends to a lower depth of wickedness. The only explanation of the passage which allows it to speak for itself, without gratuitous additions or embellishments, is that which likens it to ch. 42 : 18-25. 43 : 22-28, and 50 : 1, 2, as a solemn exhibition of the truth that the rejection of God's ancient people was the fruit of their own sin, and not to be imputed either to unfaithfulness on his part, or to want of strength or wisdom to protect them. For the true sense of the metaphor here used, see above, on ch. 50 : 2. Hendewerk is under the necessity of granting that the Israel of this passage is a moral i. e. an ideal person, corresponding not to any definite portion of the people at any one time, but to such of them at various times as possessed a certain character. Whatever may be thought of the necessity or grounds of this assumption in the case before us,

he has no right to deny the possibility of others like it, even where he does not think them requisite himself. *Hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.*

V. 2. *But your iniquities have been separating between you and your God, and your sins have hid (his) face from you, so as not to hear.* בִּי אֵם is the usual adversative after a negation, corresponding to the German *sondern*, which has no distinct equivalent in English. Ewald's version, *rather* (*vielmehr*), seems to weaken the expression; and Umbreit's combination of the two (*sondern vielmehr*) is entirely gratuitous.—The present form given to the verb (*they separate*) by Luther and retained even by De Wette, is entirely inadequate. The original expression is intended to convey, in the strongest manner, the idea both of past time and of continuance or custom. Ewald expresses this by introducing the word *bislang*, but Umbreit better by retaining the exact form of the original (*waren scheidend*). Hitzig points out an allusion to the הָיָה בְּהַרְיֵל of Gen. 1 : 6, which is the more remarkable because it may be likewise traced in the construction of the preposition בֵּין, both the modes of employing it which there occur being here combined.—The general idea of this verse is otherwise expressed in Jer. 5 : 25, while in Lam. 3 : 44 the same prophet reproduces both the thought and the expression, with a distinct mention of the intervening object as a cloud, which may possibly have been suggested by the language of Isaiah himself in ch. 44 : 22.—Henderson adopts the explanation of הִקְהִירָה by Kimchi and Aben Ezra as a causative (*have made him hide*); but this is contrary to usage.—Secker proposes to read פָּנַי (my face), and Lowth פָּנָיו (his face), for which he cites the authority of the ancient versions; but in these, as in the modern ones, the pronoun is supplied by the translator, in order to remove an ellipsis which is certainly unusual, though not without example, as appears from Job 34 : 29, where the noun without a suffix is combined with this very verb. For an instance of the same kind, though not perfectly identical, see above, ch. 53 : 3. The omission of the pronoun is so far from being wholly anomalous that Luther simply has *the face*, in which he is followed both by Ewald and Umbreit.—The force of the particle before the last verb is the same as in ch. 44 : 18 and 49 : 15. It does not mean specifically *that he will not*, much less *that he cannot hear*, but, as Lowth translates it, *that he doth not hear*. It is still better, however, to retain the infinitive form of the original by rendering it, *so as not to hear*.

V. 3. *For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken falsehood, your tongue will utter wickedness.* The Prophet now, according to a common usage of the Scriptures,

classifies the prevalent iniquities as sins of the hands, the mouth, the feet, as if to intimate that every member of the social body was affected. On the staining of the hands with blood, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 12. Here again we have a marked and apparently unstudied similarity of thought and language to the genuine Isaiah. The form  $\text{בְּחַיְתָּ}$ , which occurs only here and in Lam. 4 : 14, is explained by Kimchi as a mixture of the Niphal and Pual, by Gesenius as a kind of double passive. The use of this form, instead of the Pual, which is found only in the latest books, is rather symptomatic of an earlier writer. The sense here put upon  $\text{בְּחַיְתָּ}$ , and in a few other places, seems so wholly unconnected with its usual and proper meaning, as to give some countenance to Henderson's idea, which might otherwise seem fanciful, that it is a denominative from  $\text{בְּחַי}$  the avenger of blood.—Vitringa infers from v. 7, that the blood here meant is specifically that of the innocent or those unjustly put to death.—According to Grotius, the iniquity which stained their fingers was that of robbery and theft. It is far more natural, however, to consider hands and fingers as equivalent expressions, or at the utmost as expressing different degrees of the same thing. Thus Umbreit represents it as characteristic of the Old Testament severity in reprehending sin, that the Prophet, not content with staining the hands, extends his description to the very fingers. This is certainly ingenious, but perhaps too artificial to have been intended by the writer.—The restriction of the falsehood here charged to judicial fraud or misrepresentation, is unnecessary.—The preterite and future forms describe the evil as habitual, and ought to be retained in the translation, were it only for the purpose of exhibiting the characteristic form of the original.—The last verb is explained by Vitringa as expressive of deliberate promulgation (*meditate profert*), and by Luther of invention (*dichtet*). J. D. Michaelis attenuates its sense to that of simple speech, while Hitzig coincides with the English Version (muttered). As the word, though applied to vocal utterance, is not confined to articulate speech, the nearest equivalent perhaps is *utter*, as conveying neither more nor less than the original.—Vitringa applies this verse likewise to the scandals of the reformed church, and especially to those arising from its coalescence with the state, observing that the interpreter is not bound to verify the truth of the description, as we know not what is yet to happen. This would be rational enough where the prophecy itself contained explicit indications of a specific subject; but where this is to be made out by comparison with history, a reference to future possibilities is laughable.—The wider meaning of the whole description is evident from Paul's combining parts of it with phrases drawn from several Psalms remarkably resembling it, in proof of the depravity of human nature. (Rom. 3 : 15–17.)

V. 4. *There is none calling with justice, and there is none contending with truth; they trust in vanity and speak falsehood, conceive mischief and bring forth iniquity.* The phrase פְּרָצִים אֵין has been variously understood. The Septuagint makes it mean simply speaking just things (οὐδεὶς λαλεῖ δίκαια) which would hardly have been so expressed in Hebrew. The Chaldee paraphrase, *praying in truth* (i. e. sincerely), seems to be founded on the frequent description of worship, as calling on the name of God. Jerome's version, *qui invocet justitiam*, is followed in the English Bible, *calleth for justice*, i. e. as Clericus explains it, there is no one who is willing to commit his cause to such unrighteous judges. Hensler and Döderlein apply it to judicial decrees and decisions, which is wholly at variance with the usage of the verb. Kimchi understands it of one person calling to another for the purpose of reproving him; but then the essential idea is the very one which happens not to be expressed. Gesenius and Maurer follow Rosenmüller in attaching to אֵין the forensic sense of καλέω εἰς δίκην and *voco in jus*: 'No one summons another, i. e. sues him, justly.' In proof of such a Hebrew usage Knobel cites Job 5 : 1. 13 : 22; which are at best very doubtful. The same sense seems to be designed by Lowth (*preferreth his suit*). It would be still more difficult to justify the sense of *speaking for* or *advocating*, here assumed by J. D. Michaelis and Henderson. In this uncertainty, some of the latest writers have gone back to Luther's sense of *preaching*, which is easily deducible from that of calling publicly, proclaiming. According to Hitzig this is the proper Hebrew term for public speaking, such as that in the synagogues, which was free to all. (See Luke 4 : 16. Acts 13 : 15.) Luther makes righteousness the subject of the preaching, Ewald and Umbreit a description of its quality (*aright or justly*). The only argument against this explanation, and in favour of a more forensic or judicial one, is that afforded by the parallel expression, אֵין מִשְׁפָּטִים מִשְׁפָּטִים. Kimchi makes the verb a simple passive, meaning to be tried or judged—'no one is fairly tried.' Luther and J. D. Michaelis reverse this explanation and apply the clause to unjust judges. Most writers make the verb reciprocal (as in ch. 43 : 26. Prov. 29 : 9. Ez. 17 : 20), and apply it either to forensic litigation, or to controversy and contention for the truth. In either case אֵין must mean *bona fides*, and not truth as the subject or occasion of dispute, which is not the meaning of the Hebrew word. (See Hengstenberg on Ps. 33 : 4.) The infinitive construction of the next clause cannot be retained in English. The nearest equivalent is that adopted in the common version. Lowth's substitution of the participle (*trusting, speaking, etc.*) is no better as to form, and really obscures the sense or at least the true grammatical relation of the clauses. The construction is the same as in ch. 5 : 5. 21 : 9. Vitranga supposes an ellipsis of the preterite, which

is inadmissible, for reasons given in the Earlier Prophecies, p. 67.—הוהו is vigorously rendered by J. D. Michaelis *nothing* (auf ein Nichts). The falsehood mentioned in this clause is understood by some in the specific sense of false or unfair reasoning.—With the figure of the last clause compare Job 15 : 35 and Psalm 7 : 15. It might here be understood to denote mere disappointment or failure, as in v. 13 below ; but the analogy of ch. 33 : 11 seems to show that the prominent idea is that of mischievous and spiteful machination. With the first of these interpretations seems to be connected the sense which J. D. Michaelis here attaches to הוהו, namely, that of pain or suffering.

V. 5. *Eggs of the basilisk they have hatched, and webs of the spider they will spin (or weave) ; the (one) eating of their eggs shall die, and the crushed (egg) shall hatch out a viper.* The figure of the serpent is substantially the same as in ch. 14 : 29. (Compare Deut. 32 : 33.) The precise varieties intended are of little exegetical importance. The modern writers generally follow Bochart in explaining הוהו to mean the basilisk, a serpent small in size but of a deadly venom. For the use of the verb in such connexions, see above, ch. 34 : 15. The figure of the spider's web is added to express the idea both of hurtfulness and futility. (See Job. 8 : 14.) —הוהו for הוהו (like הוהו for הוהו Zech. 5 : 4) is the passive participle of הוהו to press, applied in ch. 1 : 4 to the curative compression of a wound. That it does not here denote incubation, as explained by Aquila (*θαλαθέρν*), Jerome (*confotum*), and Jarchi, may be inferred from Job 39 : 15, where the same verb is applied to the crushing of the eggs of the ostrich by the foot.—Luther, Lowth, J. D. Michaelis, and Gesenius make הוהו הוהו a nominative absolute, 'if one is crushed there creeps out a viper.' Maurer and the later writers construe it directly with the verb, as in the English Bible.—To the objection that the viper is viviparous, Vitringa answers, that the Prophet intentionally uses a mixed metaphor ; Gesenius, that we cannot look for accurate details of natural history in such a writer. Neither seems to have observed that the exact correspondence of the Hebrew word to *viper* is extremely problematical, although Gesenius himself defines it in his Lexicon, "a viper, adder, *any poisonous serpent*," and J. D. Michaelis accordingly translates it by the general term *schlange*. The same writer looks upon the whole verse as peculiarly appropriate to the character and condition of the Jews immediately before their destruction by the Romans.

V. 6. *Their webs shall not become (or be for) clothing, and they shall not cover themselves with their works ; their works are works of mischief (or iniquity), and the doing of violence is in their hands.* The first clause

does not seem to form a part of what the writer meant at first to say, but is a kind of afterthought, by which he gives a new turn to the sentence, and expresses an additional idea without a change of metaphor. Having introduced the spider's web, in connexion with the serpent's egg, as an emblem of malignant and treacherous designs, he here repeats the first but for another purpose, namely, to suggest the idea of futility and worthlessness. This application may have been suggested by the frequent reference to webs and weaving as conducive to the comfort and emolument of men; but spiders' webs can answer no such purpose. The idea that it is not fit or cannot be applied to this end, although not exclusively expressed, is really included in the general declaration that they *shall not* be so used.—Gesenius and Ewald make the second verb indefinite, *they shall not* (i. e. no one shall) employ them for this purpose. But the sentence is more pointed if we understand it as including a specific menace that the authors of these devices shall derive no advantage from them. *Works* in the first clause simply means *what they have made*; but in the second, where the metaphor is dropped, this version would be inadmissible. The common version of *לַעֲשׂוֹת* (*act*) and Lowth's emendation of it (*deed*), are both defective in not suggesting the idea of continued and habitual practice.

V. 7. *Their feet to evil will run, and they will hasten to shed innocent blood; their thoughts are thoughts of mischief (or iniquity); wasting and ruin are in their paths.* The first clause expresses not a mere disposition, but an eager proclivity to wrong. The word translated *thoughts* has here and elsewhere the specific sense of purposes, contrivances, devices, which last Lowth employs as an equivalent. Luther gives *ἔργα* here as well as in the foregoing verse the sense of trouble (*Mühe*), in reference no doubt to the oppressors themselves. In like manner J. D. Michaelis explains *ruin in their paths* as meaning that it awaits themselves; but most interpreters take both expressions in an active sense, as meaning what they do to others, not what they experience themselves. *Their paths* are then the paths in which their feet run to evil and make haste to shed innocent blood.—The two nouns combined in the last clause strictly denote desolation and crushing, i. e. utter ruin. *Destruction and calamity* (Lowth) are as much too vague as *destruction and wounds* (J. D. Michaelis) or *force and ruins* (Ewald) are too specific. Knobel supposes the idea to be that of a country wasted by invading enemies. (See ch. 1: 4.)—With this verse compare Prov. 1: 16, and the evil way of ch. 55: 7 above. Knobel of course applies it to the quarrelsome exiles, and gravely adds that nothing more can be determined with respect to them than this that they sometimes did not hesitate to rob and murder! The references which he adds to this extraordinary statement are ch. 57: 20. 50: 11, and vs. 3 and 15 of this chapter.



V. 8. *The way of peace they have not known, and there is no justice in their paths; their courses they have rendered crooked for them; every one walking in them knows not peace.* J. D. Michaelis and Umbreit go to opposite extremes in their interpretation of the first clause. The former makes the way of peace denote the way to happiness; the latter understands the clause to mean that they refuse all overtures of reconciliation. The obvious and simple meaning is, that their lives are not pacific but contentious. In order to vary the expression, Lowth translates  $\text{בְּדַרְכֵיהֶם}$  in *their tracks*, which is retained by Henderson. With still more exact adherence to the primary meaning of the verb, they might have written *in their ruts*.  $\text{שָׁפָט}$  is twice used in the book of Proverbs as the opposite of upright or sincere. (Prov. 10 : 9. 28 : 18.) Hitzig gives the verb the specific sense of *choosing* crooked paths, which is not so simple or exact as the common English version (*they have made them crooked paths*).  $\text{נָא}$  is a neuter or indefinite expression. There is no need therefore of reading either  $\text{נִרְבְּבוּ-בָהֶם}$  with a single manuscript, or  $\text{נָא}$  with the ancient versions, between which emendations Lowth appears to hesitate. Knobel's inference from this verse that some of the less corrupted Jews were led astray by wicked leaders, is as groundless as Vitranga's specific application of the passage to the excesses of victorious parties in religious controversy, not without evident allusion to the ecclesiastical disputes of the Reformed Dutch Church, to which he very naturally, but by no means very reasonably, yields an extravagantly disproportioned space, in determining the scope of this prophetic vision. The erroneous principle involved in both interpretations is refuted by the comprehensive sense which the apostle puts upon the words in the passage which has been already cited. (Rom. 3 : 15-17.)

V. 9. *Therefore is judgment far from us, and righteousness will not overtake us; we wait for light and behold darkness; for splendours, (and) in obscurities we walk.* The future form of all the verbs in this verse intimates that they expect this state of things to continue. Knobel explains *judgment* as meaning the practical decision between them and their enemies, which God would make when he delivered them. Why then may not the parallel expression, *righteousness*, be applied in the same way, without losing its original and proper sense in that of *salvation*? According to Hendewerk, it here denotes the righteous compensation which the Jews were to receive for their excessive sufferings. (See above, on ch. 40 : 2.) J. D. Michaelis explains the expression *overtake* strictly, as denoting that they fled from it. (Compare ch. 35 : 10. and 51 : 11.) Vitranga applies this verse to the threatened extinction of religion in his own day; Knobel, to the delay in the deliverance from Babylon, occasioned by Cyrus's attack on Croesus!

V. 10. *We grope like the blind for the wall, like the eyeless we grope ; we stumble at noonday as in twilight, in thick darkness like the dead.* Lowth is so offended with the "poverty and inelegance" of repeating נַחֲשָׁה, which he thinks "extremely unworthy of the Prophet, and unlike his manner," that he reads in the second place with Houbigant, נַחֲנַח we wander, candidly adding that the mistake, although very easy and obvious, "is of long standing, being prior to all the ancient versions." Whatever else may be said of "this ingenious correction," it cannot be described as of long standing ; for no writer since Lowth appears to have adopted it. To an unsophisticated taste the repetition is a beauty, when used sparingly and in the proper place. The phrase נַחֲשָׁה has been variously rendered. Jerome, Luther, J. D. Michaelis, and Rückert, make the noun mean darkness or dark places (*in caliginosis*) ; the Targum, Saadiah, Kimchi, and Grotius, *in the tomb* ; which sense the elder Kimchi derives from נַחֲשָׁה to be desolate. Lowth, Koppe, Döderlein, and Bauer, in the midst of fatness, abundance, or fertility ; Gesenius, Hitzig, Maurer, and Hendewerk, in fat or fertile fields ; Aben Ezra, Rosenmüller, Ewald, and Umbreit, in the midst of the fat or healthy, with or without allusion to the prosperous heathen among whom they were scattered, or by whom they were oppressed. Knobel has gone back to the meaning *darkness*, as best suited to the context, and easily deducible from the sense of fatness, just as we speak of gross or thick darkness. Vitringa dissents from the application of this verse by Cocceius to the deposition of Ferdinand king of Bohemia, and the election of Frederick the Count Palatine. With this verse compare Deut. 28 : 29 and Zeph. 1 : 17.

V. 11. *We growl like the bears, all of us, and like the doves we moan (we) moan ; we wait for justice and there is none, for salvation (and) it is far from us.* The Latin poets also speak of the voice of bears and doves as a *gemitus* or groaning. (See above, ch. 38 : 14, and Ezek. 7 : 16.) Umbreit supposes the two here to represent the extremes of violent and gentle grief. The same effect which is produced in the first clause, by the use of the phrase *all of us*, is produced in the other by the idiomatic repetition of the verb. Here, as in v. 9, we may understand by judgment or justice that which God does by his providential dispensations both to his people and his enemies.

V. 12. *For our transgressions are multiplied before thee, and our sins testify against us ; for our transgressions are with us, and our iniquities—we know them.* The Prophet here begins a general confession in the name of God's people. For the form of expression, compare Ps. 51 : 5. The construction of the verb נִקְּרָה with a plural noun is explained by Tremel-

lius and Vitranga as implying an ellipsis (*quodque*). Cocceius in like manner supplies *id ipsum*. The modern grammarians, who in general are averse to the gratuitous assumption of ellipses, seem disposed to regard it as an idiomatic license of construction. Lowth translates  $\text{ויצאנו}$ , *cleave fast unto us*; but interpreters generally prefer the sense expressed in the English Version—they are with us, i. e. in our sight or present to our memory.

V. 13. *To transgress and lie against Jehovah, and to turn back from behind our God, to speak oppression and departure, to conceive and utter from the heart words of falsehood.* The specifications of the general charge are now expressed by an unusual succession of infinitives, not as Hitzig says because the persons were already known—which would require the adoption of the same form in a multitude of places where it is not found at present—but because the writer wished to concentrate and condense his accusation. This rhetorical effect is materially injured by the substitution of the finite verb. Although by no means equal in conciseness to the Hebrew, our infinitive may be employed as the most exact translation. Gesenius makes  $\text{ויצאנו}$  a future form, but Maurer an infinitive from  $\text{יצא}$ . *Departure* means departure from the right course or the law (Deut. 19 : 16), i. e. transgression or iniquity. Knobel applies the term specifically to idolatry, and understands  $\text{ויצאנו}$  as implying that the exiles in Babylon oppressed each other!

V. 14. *And judgment is thrust (or driven) back, and righteousness afar off stands; for truth has fallen in the street, and uprightness cannot enter.* The description is now continued in the ordinary form by the finite verb.—The word translated *street* properly means an open place or square, especially the space about the gate of an oriental town where courts were held and other public business transacted. (See Job 29 : 7. Neh. 8 : 1.) The present form which seems to be required by our idiom is much less expressive than the preterite and futures of the original. Those interpreters who commonly apply whatever is said of tyranny to the oppression of the Jews in exile are compelled in this case, where the sin is charged upon the Jews themselves, to resort to the imaginary fact of gross misgovernment among the exiles, for the purpose of avoiding the conclusion that the passage has respect to a condition of society like that described in the first chapter.

V. 15. *Then truth was missed (i. e. found wanting), and whoso departed from evil made himself a prey (or was plundered). Then Jehovah saw and it was evil in his eyes that there was no judgment (or practical justice).* The Vav conversive in both clauses indicates a sequence of events, and may

be best expressed by *then* in English. The passive participle is here used with the substantive verb, as the active is in v. 2, to denote anterior habitual action. Hitzig understands the first clause to mean that honesty (i. e. the honest people) was betrayed, in direct opposition to the usage both of the noun and verb in Hebrew. For the sense of נִבְרַר, see above, on ch. 34 : 16. 40 : 26. Lowth's version, *utterly lost*, is substantially correct, though perhaps too strong. Jarchi, Cocceius, and J. D. Michaelis understand נִבְרַר as meaning, *was accounted mad*, which is also given in the margin of the English Bible, but has no foundation either in etymology or usage. It is now commonly agreed that this verbal form is near akin to the noun נִבְרַר spoil or plunder, and has here the same sense as in Ps. 76 : 6. This explanation is sustained by the authority of the Targum and Jerome. Kimchi understands it to describe the godly man as snatched away, perhaps in allusion to ch. 57 : 1. Ewald derives from what he thinks the true sense of the root the meaning, he became rare (*wurde selten*).

V. 16. *And he saw that there was no man, and he stood aghast that there was no one interposing ; and his own arm saved for him, and his own righteousness, it upheld him.* The repetition of the words *and he saw* connects this verse in the closest manner with the one before it. Rosenmüller, Umbreit, and others, follow Jarchi in supposing נִבְרַר to be emphatic and to signify a man of the right sort, a man equal to the occasion. This explanation derives some colour from the analogy of Jer. 5 : 1 ; but even there, and still more here, the strength of the expression is increased rather than diminished by taking this phrase in the simple sense of *nobody*. What was wanting was not merely a qualified man, but any man whatever, to maintain the cause of Israel and Jehovah. A like absolute expression is employed in 2 Kings 14 : 26, where it is said that Jehovah saw the affliction of Israel, that it was very bitter, and that there was *no helper for Israel*, not merely no sufficient one, but none at all. The desperate nature of the case is then described in terms still stronger and only applicable to Jehovah by the boldest figure. The common version (*wondered*), though substantially correct, is too weak to express the full force of the Hebrew word, which strictly means to be desolate, and is used in reference to persons for the purpose of expressing an extreme degree of horror and astonishment. (See Ps. 143 : 4, and compare the colloquial use of *désolé* in French.) As applied to God, the term may be considered simply anthropopathic, or as intended to imply a certain sympathetic union with humanity, arising from the mode in which this great intervention was to be accomplished.—נִבְרַר strictly denotes causing to meet or come together, bringing into contact. Hence it is applied to intercessory prayer, and this sense is expressed here by the Chaldee paraphrase. But the context, etymology, and usage, all combine to recommend

the wider sense of intervention, interposition, both in word and deed. (See above, on ch. 53 : 12.) This sense is well expressed by Lowth (*there was none to interpose*), except that he gratuitously substitutes the infinitive for the active participle, which is more expressive as suggesting that the danger was imminent and unavoidable without the aid of some one actually interposing to avert it. The full force of the last clause can be given in English only by the use of the emphatic form *his own*, which is implied but cannot be distinctly expressed in the original except by a periphrasis. To do any thing with one's own hand or arm, is an expression frequently used elsewhere to denote entire independence of all foreign aid. (See Judges 7 : 2. 1 Sam. 4 : 9. 25 : 26. Ps. 44 : 4. 98 : 1.)—The meaning of this clause has been much obscured by making  $\text{ב}$  the object of the verb. The obvious incongruity of representing God as saving or delivering himself has led to different evasions. Some interpreters attenuate the meaning of the verb from *save* to *help*, which is the favourite expedient of the modern writers; while the older ones content themselves with making it intransitive and absolute, *brought salvation* (English Version), *wrought salvation* (Lowth). The only simple and exact translation is, *his arm saved for him*, leaving the object to be gathered from the context, namely, Israel or his people. The  $\text{ב}$  means nothing more than that his own arm did it *for him*, without reliance upon any other. This same idea is expressed in the last words of the verse, where *his righteousness sustained him* means that he relied or depended upon it exclusively. By righteousness in this case we are not to understand a simple consciousness of doing right, nor the possession of a righteous cause, nor a right to do what he did, all which are modifications of the same essential meaning, nor a zealous love of justice, which Vitringa deduces from the use of the word *fury* (i. e. ardent zeal) in the parallel passage ch. 63 : 5. It is far more satisfactory to give the word its strict and proper sense as denoting an attribute of God, here joined with his power, to show that what are commonly distinguished as his moral and his natural perfections are alike pledged to this great work, and constitute his only reliance for its execution.—The extraordinary character of this description, and the very violence which it seems to offer to our ordinary notions of the divine nature, unavoidably prepare the mind for something higher than the restoration of the Jews from exile, or the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The embarrassment occasioned by this passage to the champions of the Babylonian theory may be inferred from their complex and unnatural hypothesis, that because the magistrates and elders of the captivity did not repress and punish the offences just described, God would himself do it, not by continuing the exile as a punishment, but by destroying Babylon, and with it the ungodly Jews, while the better portion should escape and be restored to their own country! It is a strange and peculiar idea of Ewald's, that

the Prophet here reproaches Israel that no Messiah had arisen from among themselves according to the ancient promise, so that God had as it were been under the necessity of raising up a foreign instrument for their deliverance, namely Cyrus. If all things else were as much in favour of this wild invention as they are against it, a sufficient refutation would be still afforded by the obvious unsuitableness of the language to express the alleged meaning. A reluctant use of foreign agents by Jehovah might be described as any thing rather than his own arm doing the work for him. If arm means power, it was no more exerted in the one case than it would have been exerted in the other; if it means instrumentality, the one employed was not so truly or emphatically his own arm as it would have been if raised up from among his own people.

V. 17. *And he clothed himself with righteousness as a coat of mail, and a helmet of salvation on his head, and he clothed himself with garments of vengeance (for) clothing, and put on, as the cloak (or tunic), jealousy.* Here again the verse is closely connected with the one before it by the repetition of צָדִיקָהּ. Its relation to the other verse is not, however, that of an explanation, as implied in Hendewerk's translation of the particle by *for*. The writer simply carries out in detail his general declaration that Jehovah undertook the cause of Israel himself, under figures borrowed from the usages of war. The older writers have in vain perplexed themselves with efforts to determine why righteousness is called a breastplate or salvation a helmet, and to reconcile the variations in Paul's copies of this picture (Eph. 6 : 4-17, 1 Thess. 5 : 8) with the original. The true principle of exegesis in such cases is the one laid down by Clericus, who may speak with authority whenever the question in dispute is a question not of doctrine or experience but of taste. Justice, says this accomplished rhetorician, might just as well have been a sword, salvation a shield, vengeance a javelin or spear, and zeal or jealousy a torch with which to fire the hostile camp. *Ratio habenda est scopi, non singularum vocum.* The correctness of this principle is clear from the general analogy of figurative language and from the endless license of invention which would follow from the adoption of the other method, so that in aiming at precision and fulness we should unavoidably involve the sense of Scripture in incurable uncertainty. That the figures in this case were intended to convey the general idea of martial equipment, may be gathered from a fact which even Vitringa has observed, that there is no reference whatever to offensive weapons, an omission wholly unaccountable upon his own hypothesis. There is no ground for Rosenmüller's explanation of צָדִיקָהּ as denoting the desire of vengeance, unless this be a periphrasis for retributive or vindicatory justice. Equally groundless is the explanation of הַשָּׂדֶה by Gesenius and the later writers in the sense of vic-

tory. However appropriate and striking this idea may be in so martial a description, it is not the one expressed by the writer, who looks far beyond mere victory to the salvation of God's people as the great end to be answered by it. There is much more plausibility in Knobel's suggestion, that the first two nouns have reference to Israel, and the last two to his enemies; the same catastrophe which was to secure justice and salvation to the former would bring the zeal and vengeance of Jehovah on the latter. This distinction is no doubt correct so far as the terms vengeance and salvation are concerned; but it cannot be so well sustained as to the others, since  $\text{קִדְמוֹתַי}$  signifies the righteousness of God, as the cause of the catastrophe in question, and  $\text{קִדְמוֹתַי}$  not merely his zeal against his enemies, but his jealous regard for his own honour and the welfare of his people. (See the usage of this word fully stated in ~~the Earlier Prophecies~~, p. 165.) The particular expressions of the verse need little explanation. The first piece of armour specified is not the breast-plate, as the older writers generally render it, perhaps in reference to Eph. 6: 14, but the habergeon or coat of mail. The first and third terms denote parts of armour properly so called, the second and fourth the dress as distinguished from the armour. The  $\text{קִדְמוֹתַי}$  is either the tunic or the military cloak, often mentioned in the classics as being of a purple colour. The same noun is construed with the same verb in 1 Sam. 28: 14. The meaning of the whole verse is, that God equipped himself for battle, and arrayed his power, justice, and distinguishing attachment to his people, against their persecutors and oppressors.—Jubb proposes to omit  $\text{קִדְמוֹתַי}$  as superfluous, inelegant, and probably a gloss from the margin. But even Lowth, although he quotes the proposition, leaves the text unchanged, and Henderson is betrayed into the opposite extreme of pronouncing the word "singularly beautiful."

V. 18. *According to (their) deeds, accordingly will he repay, wrath to his enemies, (their) desert to his foes, to the isles (their) desert will he repay.* The essential meaning of this verse is evident and undisputed; but the form of expression in the first clause is singular, if not anomalous. Some of the latest writers, such as Maurer, Henderson, and Umbreit, get rid of the difficulty simply by denying its existence, which is easy enough after every method of solution has been suggested by preceding writers. That there is a grammatical difficulty in the clause is evident not only from the paraphrastic forms adopted by the ancient versions, but also from the attention given to the question by such scholars as De Dieu, Cocceius, and Gesenius. Ewald, it is true, passes it by in silence, as he usually does when he has nothing to suggest but what has been already said by his predecessors. Another proof of the existence of a difficulty is, that even those who deny it paraphrase the text instead of rigidly translating it, and thus go

safely round the hard place rather than triumphantly through it. The difficulty is not exegetical, but purely grammatical, arising from the unexampled use of the preposition לְ without an object: *According to their deeds—according to—will he repay.* Cocceius and Vitranga give to לְ its original value as a noun, which very rarely occurs elsewhere (Hos. 11 : 7. 7 : 16), and understand it here to mean the height or highest degree: ‘According to the height of their deserts, according to the height, will I repay.’ Lowth after quoting Vitranga’s opinion, that Cocceius and himself had together made out the true sense, adds with some humour, “I do not expect that any third person will ever be of that opinion.” He little imagined that his own would never even be seconded. His proposition is to read לְלֵךְ for לְלֵךְ in either case, on the authority of the Chaldee paraphrase of this place compared with that of ch. 35 : 4 and Prov. 22 : 24, in all which cases the Chaldee has רַרְר corresponding to the Hebrew לְלֵךְ, lord or master. The text thus amended Lowth translates, *He is mighty to recompense, he that is mighty to recompense will requite*, of which Henderson observes that it is drawling and paraphrastical at best, and incorrectly rendered; as it ought to have been, *He is the Retributor, the Retributor will requite.* But even granting Lowth the right to fix the meaning of a text manufactured by himself, it is evident that such an emendation must be critically worthless. De Dieu and Rosenmüller explain לְ when used in the sense of *propter* as equivalent to a noun meaning cause or reason; as if he had said, ‘on account of their deeds on (that) account, will I repay.’ But besides the artificial character of this solution, it overlooks the fact that although לְ by itself might simply indicate the cause or ground, the לְ prefixed denotes proportion, as in other cases where it follows verbs of recompense. (E. g. Ps. 18 : 21. 62 : 13. Jer. 50 : 39.) The latest writers seem to have come back to the simple and obvious supposition of the oldest writers, such as Jerome and the rabbins, that it is a case of anomalous ellipsis, the object of the preposition being not expressed, but mentally repeated from the foregoing clause: *According to their deeds, according to (them), he will repay.* In the mere repetition there is nothing singular, but rather something characteristic of the Prophet. (See above, ch. 52 : 6.) Maurer and several later writers choose, however, to regard it not as a mere repetition of the same words in the same sense, but as an instance of the idiomatic use of לְ—כֵן, as equivalent to our *as—so*. The sense will then be, ‘as according to their deeds, so according to (their deeds) will he repay.’ But this construction would create a difficulty, even if these writers were correct in denying its existence there already. All that need be added is, that the English Version happily approaches to a perfect reproduction of the Hebrew expression by employing the cognate terms *according* and *accordingly*, which has the advantage of retaining essentially the same term, and



yet varying it so as to avoid a grammatical anomaly by which it might have been rendered unintelligible.—*לְרַגְלֵךָ*, according to the modern lexicographers, is not directly *recompense*, but *conduct* either good or bad, and as such worthy of reward or punishment. For Hengstenberg's peculiar explanation of the verb and its derivatives, see his Commentary on the Psalms, I. p. 147, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 46. The feminine plural here used in the first clause, corresponds to the singular in 2 Sam. 19:37. —The last clause, relating to the islands, J. D. Michaelis in his usual ostentatious manner, declares himself incompetent to understand, and, as he says himself of Kennicott elsewhere, seems disposed to wonder that any body else should be so bold as to understand it better than himself. On the whole he is inclined to regard it as a promise that the true religion should be spread throughout Europe. The modern writers who restrict the passage to the Babylonian exile, are again embarrassed by the writer's losing sight of the wicked Jews whom he had been describing, and, as J. D. Michaelis says, threatening to visit their offences on the Gentiles. Knobel easily gets over this obstruction by observing that, although the wicked Jews were to be implicated in the ruin of the Babylonians, yet as these were the direct object of attack to Cyrus, they alone are mentioned. How far this will make it appear natural to say, 'because ye are wicked, I will punish the Gentiles,' let the reader judge. There is also something very artificial in Henderson's distinction between the *enemies* and *adversaries* of this verse, as meaning the wicked Jews destroyed or scattered by the Romans, and the *isles*, as meaning the Romans themselves, who were to be overthrown by the barbarians. The objection to such exegetical refinements is not that they are in themselves absurd or incredible, but simply that a thousand others might be invented not an atom more so. The only satisfactory solution is the one afforded by the hypothesis that the salvation here intended is salvation in the highest sense from sin and all its consequences, and that by Israel and the isles (or Gentiles) we are to understand the church or people of God, and the world considered as its enemies and his.

V. 19. *And they shall fear from the west the name of Jehovah, and from the rising of the sun his glory; for it shall come like a straitened stream, the spirit of Jehovah raising a banner in it.* Luther and Ewald mark the dependence of this verse upon the one before it by translating the *וְכִי* so that; but there seems to be no sufficient reason for departing from the simplicity of the original construction. The name and glory of Jehovah are here not only parallels but synonymes, as we learn from other places where the two terms are jointly or severally used to signify the manifested excellence or glorious presence of Jehovah. (See above, ch. 30:27. 35:2. 40:5. 42:11.) As in these and other places (e. g. ch. 8:9. 18:3.

33 : 13), the remotest nations or ends of the earth, here represented by the east and west (ch. 43 : 5. 45 : 6), are said to see this name or glory, Knobel accordingly translates the first verb *they shall see*. But although this affords a good sense and is justified by usage, it effects no such improvement in the meaning of the passage as would compensate for the violation of the masoretic pointing, confirmed by the authority of all the ancient versions. Let it also be observed that the seeing is implied or presupposed in the fearing, and that the mention of this last effect agrees best with the meaning of the last clause, which on any exegetical hypothesis suggests the thought of conflict and coercion.—Gesenius gratuitously changes *from* to *in*, as if the apparent necessity of that sense in a few doubtful cases could justify its substitution for the proper one in cases like the present, where it not only yields an intelligible sense but suggests an idea which must otherwise be lost, viz. that of convergence from these distant points as to a common centre. There is the same objection to the sense which Lowth and Henderson attach to  $\text{מִן}$ , viz. that of *belonging to* (*they from the west, those of the west*), besides the dubious grammatical correctness of regarding as the subject of the verb what appears to be dependent on it as a qualifying phrase. There is something pleasing, if no more, in the suggestion of Vitranga, that the usual order of the east and west (ch. 43 : 5. Mal. 1 : 11) is here reversed, as if to intimate that the diffusion of the truth shall one day take a new direction, an idea which Henderson applies specifically to the Christian missions of Great Britain and America, not only to new countries but to Asia, the cradle of the gospel, of the law, and of the human race.—The last clause of this verse has been a famous subject of dispute among interpreters, who differ more or less in reference to every word, as well as to the general meaning of the whole. The least important question has respect to the  $\text{כִּי}$  at the beginning of the clause; for whether this be rendered *when* or *for*, the sense remains essentially the same, because the one implies the other. The only weighty reasons for preferring the latter, are first its natural priority as being the usual and proper sense, and then the simplicity of structure which results from it as being more accordant with the genius and usage of the language. As to the next word ( $\text{שֵׁם}$ ) the only question is in relation to its subject or nominative, some connecting it with *name* or *glory* in the other clause, some with *Jehovah*, some with  $\text{עָצָר}$  considered as a noun. Of those who thus explain  $\text{עָצָר}$ , some suppose it to mean anguish or distress as in ch. 63 : 8, others an enemy as in v. 18 above. Of those who consider it an adjective, one understands it to mean hostile, but the great majority narrow or compressed. The questions as to  $\text{רוּחַ}$  are whether it means breath or spirit, and whether it is a poetical description of the wind, or a personal designation of the Holy Ghost. The only doubt in reference to  $\text{יְהוָה}$  is whether it is idiomatically used to qualify the word

before it (as a strong wind), or employed more strictly as a divine name. But the great theme of controversy is the next word  $\text{נִסְפָּח}$ , which some derive from  $\text{נִס}$ , and some from  $\text{סִפָּח}$ ; some regard as a participle, others as a preterite; some understand as meaning to set up a banner, others to put to flight, to drive along, or scatter. Lastly  $\text{בּוֹ}$  is by some construed directly with the verb as its object (drive it, scatter it, etc.), while by others it is separately understood as meaning either *in it* or *against it*. From the combination of these various senses have resulted several distinct interpretations of the whole clause, two of which deserve to be particularly mentioned, as the two between which most writers have been and are still divided. The first of these is the interpretation found, as to its essence, in several of the ancient versions, and especially the Vulgate, *cum venerit quasi fluvius violentus quem Spiritus Domini cogit*. This is substantially retained by Luther and by Lowth (when he shall come like a river straitened in his course, which a strong wind driveth along). It is also given by most of the recent German writers, with trivial variations,—Gesenius reading *when*, Ewald *for*, and the like. According to this view of the matter,  $\text{רוּחַ יְהוָה בּוֹ}$  is either a Hebrew idiom for a strong wind, or a poetical description of the wind in general as the breath of God. The former explanation, although Lowth prefers it, is aesthetically far below the other, which the later writers commonly adopt. It will also be observed that this interpretation makes  $\text{נִסְפָּח}$  the causative of  $\text{נִס}$  to *fly*, and takes  $\text{צָר}$  as an adjective, and in its primary etymological sense of narrow or compressed (Num. 22 : 26), the idea being that of a stream confined in a narrow channel and flowing violently through it. The other principal interpretation of the clause gives  $\text{בּוֹ}$  the sense of *when*,  $\text{צָר}$  that of *enemy*, construes the latter with the verb to *come*, derives  $\text{נִסְפָּח}$  from  $\text{נִס}$  a banner, and explains the whole to mean that *when the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him*. This is the version of the English and Dutch Bibles, of Vitringa, Alting, Henderson, and others. Between these two main interpretations there are others too numerous to be recited, which agree essentially with one but in some minor points coincide with the other or dissent from both. Thus Jarchi gives to  $\text{נִסְפָּח}$  the sense of consuming, which he thinks it has in ch. 10 : 18, and J. D. Michaelis that of drying up, which he founds upon an Arabic analogy. Aben Ezra and Hitzig, though they construe  $\text{צָר}$  with the preceding verb, make it a substantive signifying pressure or distress. Maurer agrees with the second exposition of the clause in all points, except that he explains  $\text{נִסְפָּח}$  in the sense of dispelling, and applies it to the stream itself. The objections to the first (and now prevailing) exposition, as stated by Rosenmüller and Maurer, are, its needless violation of the masoretic accents, which forbid the intimate conjunction of  $\text{נִסְפָּח}$  and  $\text{צָר}$

as noun and adjective; the incongruity of likening Jehovah to a river which his own breath drives along; and the improbability that  $\text{רָפַד}$  is here used in a different sense from that which all attach to the plural in v. 18. To this may be added the unnatural image of a stream rendered rapid by the wind, and (against Maurer's own interpretation) the gratuitous assumption that the Polel of  $\text{רָפַד}$  is used in this one place and as a causative, when that idea is expressed so often elsewhere by the Hiphil of the same verb. On the other hand, Gesenius himself derives  $\text{רָפַד}$  from a root  $\text{רָפַד}$  to raise, which might therefore be poetically used without the noun to express the whole idea; or the form before us might without absurdity be looked upon as an amalgam of the words  $\text{רָפַד}$   $\text{רָפַד}$ , which are combined in ch. 5: 26. 13: 2. etc. (Compare the compound forms  $\text{הִלְבִּיחַ}$  and  $\text{הִלְבִּיחַ$ , as explained by Hengstenberg in his Commentary on the Psalms, Vol. I. p. 218.) The common version of this vexed clause, therefore, is entirely defensible, and clearly preferable to the one which has so nearly superseded it. Considering, however, the objections to which both are open, it may be possible to come still nearer to the true sense by combining what is least objectionable in the other expositions; and in this view, no interpreter perhaps has been more successful than Cocceius, who translates the clause, *quia veniet tanquam fluvius hostis in quo Spiritus Domini signum praeferet*. Besides giving every word its strictest or most probable interpretation, this ingenious version, as if by anticipation, shuns the last objection to Vitranga's, namely that of Knobel, that the context does not lead us to expect an allusion to the coming of God's enemies against him, but rather to his coming against them, as the preceding clause declares that all the ends of the earth shall fear his name and his glory. The objection of Vitranga, that the instruments of the divine purpose would not here be called an enemy, is without weight; since enemy is a relative expression, and Jehovah is continually represented as sustaining this relation to the wicked world. Another merit of Cocceius's interpretation is that instead of giving  $\text{בִּי}$  the rare and doubtful sense of *against him*, or the still more doubtful office of a mere connective of the verb and object, he explains it strictly as denoting *in it*, and at the same time introduces a new and striking image, that of the triumphant flag or signal erected in the stream itself and floating on its waves as it approaches.—On the whole, then, the meaning of the verse appears to be, that the ends of the earth shall see and fear the name and glory of Jehovah; because when he approaches as their enemy, it will be like an overflowing stream (ch. 8: 7, 8. 28: 15), in which his spirit bears aloft the banner or the signal of victory.—The specific explanation of  $\text{רָפַד}$  in the Targum as denoting the Euphrates is a very insufficient ground for Vitranga's application of the passage to the Saracens and Tartars.

V. 20. *Then shall come for Zion a Redeemer, and for the converts of apostasy in Jacob, saith Jehovah.* The English *then* is here used to convey the full force of the Vav conversive, which cannot be expressed in our idiom by the simple copulative *and*. The original construction necessarily suggests the idea of succession and dependence.  $\text{ב}$  is not the proper particle of motion or direction, though it often supplies its place as well as that of other prepositions. This arises from the fact repeatedly stated heretofore, that  $\text{ב}$  properly denotes relation in the widest sense, and is most commonly equivalent to *as to, with respect to*, the precise relation being left to be determined by the context. So in this place  $\text{בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  strictly means nothing more than that the advent of the great deliverer promised has respect to Zion or the chosen people, without deciding what particular respect, whether local, temporal, or of another nature altogether. Hence the Septuagint version,  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota\tau\ \Sigma\iota\omicron\nu\upsilon\tau$ , though it may be too specific, is not contradictory to the original; and even Paul's translation,  $\epsilon\kappa\ \Sigma\iota\omicron\nu\upsilon\tau$ , although it seems completely to reverse the sense, is not so wholly inconsistent with it as has sometimes been pretended. For although the Hebrew words do not mean *from Zion*, they mean that which may include *from Zion* in its scope; because it might be by going out of Zion that he was to act as her deliverer, and the Apostle might intend by his translation to suggest the idea that Zion's redeemer was to be also the redeemer of the Gentiles. In no case, therefore, is there any ground for charging the Apostle with perversion, or the Hebrew text with corruption, as Lowth and J. D. Michaelis do by their assimilation of it to the words of Paul. It seems to me, however, that the variation in the latter not only from the Hebrew but the Septuagint, together with the use which the Apostle makes of this citation, warrant the conclusion that he is not there interpreting Isaiah, but employing the familiar language of an ancient prophecy as the vehicle of a new one. Other examples of this practice have occurred before, nor is there any thing unworthy or unreasonable in it, when the context in both cases clearly shows the author's drift, as in the case before us, where it seems no less clear that Paul employs the language to predict the future restoration of the Jews, than that Isaiah uses it to foretell the deliverance of God's people from their enemies in case of their repentance, without any reference to local, temporal, or national distinctions. This hypothesis in reference to Paul's quotation has the advantage of accounting for his change of the original expression, which may then be regarded as a kind of caution against that very error into which interpreters have generally fallen. As to Knobel's figment of Zion representing the captivity in Babylon, it seems to call for no additional discussion. (See above, on ch. 40: 2.)—The expression *converts of transgression* or *apostasy* is perfectly intelligible, though unusual and perhaps without exam-

ple; since according to analogy the phrase would seem to mean those relapsing into apostasy, the impossibility of which sense conspires with the context to determine as the true sense that which every reader spontaneously attaches to it.

V. 21. *And I (or as for me)—this (is) my covenant with them, saith Jehovah. My Spirit which is on thee, and my words which I have placed in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith Jehovah, from henceforth and for ever (or from now and to eternity).* The absolute pronoun at the beginning is not merely emphatic, but intended to intimate a change of person, God himself reappearing as the speaker. There may also be allusion to the use of the pronoun in the promise to Noah (Gen. 9 : 9), which was ever present to the mind of Jewish readers as the great standing type and model of God's covenants and promises. קָרַיִי denotes the stipulation which Jehovah condescends to make in return for the repentance and conversion implicitly required in the verse preceding. This view of the connexion may serve still further to explain the introduction of the pronoun, as denoting *upon my part*, and referring to the previous requisition of something upon theirs. The only natural antecedent of the pronoun *them* is the *converts of apostasy in Jacob*, to whom the promise in v. 20 is limited. These are then suddenly addressed, or rather the discourse is turned to Israel himself as the progenitor or as the ideal representative of his descendants, not considered merely as a nation but as a church, and therefore including proselytes as well as natives, Gentiles as well as Jews, nay believing Gentiles to the exclusion of the unbelieving Jews. This idea of the Israel of God and of the Prophecies is too clearly stated in the Epistle to the Romans to be misapprehended or denied by any who admit the authority of the Apostle. This interpretation is moreover not a mere incidental application of Old Testament expressions to another subject, but a protracted and repeated exposition of the mutual relations of the old and new economy and of the natural and spiritual Israel. To this great body, considered as the Israel of God, the promise now before us is addressed, a promise of continued spiritual influence exerted through the word and giving it effect. The phrase, *upon thee*, here as elsewhere implies influence from above and has respect to the figure of the Spirit's descending and abiding on the object. The particular mention of the mouth cannot be explained as having reference merely to the reception of the word, in which case the ear would have been more appropriate. The true explanation seems to be that Israel is here, as in many other parts of this great prophecy, regarded not merely as a receiver but as a dispenser of the truth,—an office with which as we have seen the Body is

invested in connexion with the Head, and in perpetual subordination to him. Israel, as well as the Messiah, and in due dependence on him, was to be the light of the gentiles, the reclamer of apostate nations; and in this high mission and vocation was to be sustained and prospered by the never-failing presence of the Holy Spirit, as the author and the finisher of all revelation. (See above, ch. 42 : 1-7. 44 : 3. 49 : 1-9. 51 : 16. 54 : 3. 56 : 6-8. 58 : 12. And compare Jer. 31 : 31. Joel 2 : 28. Ezek. 36 : 27. 39 : 29.)

## CHAPTER LX.

HAVING repeatedly and fully shown that the national pre-eminence of Israel was not to be perpetual, that the loss of it was the natural consequence and righteous retribution of iniquity, and that their loss did not involve the destruction of the true church or spiritual Israel, the Prophet now proceeds to show that to the latter the approaching change would be a glorious and blessed one. He accordingly describes it as a new and divine light rising upon Zion, v. 1. He contrasts it with the darkness of surrounding nations, v. 2. Yet these are not excluded from participation in the light, v. 3. The elect in every nation are the children of the church, and shall be gathered to her, vs. 4, 5. On one side he sees the oriental caravans and flocks approaching, vs. 6, 7. On the other, the commercial fleets of western nations, vs. 8, 9. What seemed to be rejection is in fact the highest favour, v. 10. The glory of the true church is her freedom from local and national restrictions, v. 11. None are excluded from her pale but those who exclude themselves and thereby perish, v. 12. External nature shall contribute to her splendour, v. 13. Her very enemies shall do her homage, v. 14. Instead of being cast off, she is glorified for ever, v. 15. Instead of being identified with one nation, she shall derive support from all, v. 16. All that is changed in her condition shall be changed for the better, v. 17. The evils of her former state are done away, v. 18. Even some of its advantages are now superfluous, v. 19. What remains shall no longer be precarious, v. 20. The splendour of this new dispensation is a moral and a spiritual splendour, but attended by external safety and protection, vs. 21, 22. All this shall certainly and promptly come to pass at the appointed time, v. 22.

Here as elsewhere the new dispensation is contrasted, as a whole, with that before it. We are not therefore to seek the fulfilment of the prophecy in any one period of history exclusively, nor to consider actual corruptions and afflictions as inconsistent with the splendid vision of the New Jerusalem presented to the Prophet, not in its successive stages, but at one grand panoramic view.

V. 1. *Arise, be light; for thy light is come, and the glory of Jehovah has risen upon thee.* These are the words, not of a prophetic chorus, as Vitringa imagines, but of Isaiah, speaking in the name of God to Zion or Jerusalem, not merely as a city, nor even as a capital, but as the centre, representative, and symbol of the church or chosen people. A precisely analogous example is afforded by the use of the name Rome in modern religious controversy, not to denote the city or the civil government as such, but the Roman Catholic Church, with all its parts, dependencies, and interests. The one usage is as natural and intelligible as the other; and if no one hesitates to say that Newman has apostatized to Rome, or that his influence has added greatly to the strength of Rome in England, no one can justly treat it as a wresting of the Prophet's language to explain it in precisely the same manner. And the arguments employed to prove that the Israel and Jerusalem of these predictions are the natural Israel and the literal Jerusalem, would equally avail to prove, in future ages, that the hopes and fears expressed at this day in relation to the growing or decreasing power of Rome have reference to the increase of the city, or the fall of the temporal monarchy established there.—The object of address is here so plain that several of the ancient versions actually introduce the name Jerusalem. The Septuagint renders both the verbs at the beginning by *ἠορίζου*, which is probably to be regarded not as a difference of text but as a mere inadvertence. The common version *shine* is defective only in not showing the affinity between the verb and noun which is so marked in the original. The English *risen* is also less expressive, because more ambiguous and vague, than the Hebrew *הִרְאָה*, which means not to rise in general, but to rise above the horizon, to appear. The *glory of Jehovah* is his manifested presence, with allusion to the cloudy pillar and the Shechinah. *Upon thee* represents Jerusalem as exposed and subjected to the full blaze of this rising light. Rosenmüller's notion that *be light*, means *be cheerful*, as the eyes are elsewhere said to be enlightened (1 Sam. 14 : 27, 29), is inconsistent with the figure of a rising sun. The explanation of the words by others as an exhortation to come to the light, supposes the object of address to be a person, which is not the case. Light, and especially the light imparted by the divine presence, is a common figure for prosperity, both temporal and spiritual. Hitzig gravely represents it as certain from this verse, taken in connexion with ch. 62 : 11,



that between the completion of the foregoing chapter and the beginning of this, Cyrus issued his decree for the return of the captivity to Palestine. To an unbiassed reader it must be evident that this is a direct continuation of the foregoing context, and that what follows is distinguished from what goes before only by the increasing prominence with which the normal and ideal perfection of the church is set forth, as the prophecy draws near to a conclusion.

V. 2. *For behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and a gloom the nations, and upon thee shall Jehovah rise, and his glory upon thee shall be seen.* The general description in the first verse is now amplified and carried out into detail. Of this specification the verse before us contains only the beginning. To regard it as the whole would be to make the Prophet say the very opposite of what he does say. The perfection of the glory promised to the church is not to arise from its contrast with the darkness of the world around it, but from the diffusion of its light until that darkness disappears. The Prophet here reverts for a moment to the previous condition of the world, in order to describe with more effect the glorious change to be produced. He is not therefore to be understood as saying that Zion shall be glorious because while the nations are in darkness she is to enjoy exclusive light, but because the light imparted to her first shall draw the nations to her.— $\text{בְּעָנָן}$  is essentially equivalent to  $\text{אֲנֹכְחָה$ , but stronger and more poetical. Lowth translates it *vapour*, which would be an anti-climax, and has no etymological exactness to recommend it. Gesenius translates it *night*, but in his lexicon explains it as a compound or mixed form, meaning a dark cloud. *Jehovah* and his *glory*, which are jointly said to rise in the preceding verse, are here divided between two parallel members, and the rising predicated of the first alone. Lowth's version of the last word, *shall be conspicuous*, is vastly inferior both in vigour and exactness to the common version. Instead of *upon thee* Noyes has *over thee*, which gives a good sense in itself, but not an adequate one, besides gratuitously varying the translation of the particle in one short sentence.

V. 3. *And nations shall walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness of thy rising, i. e. thy rising brightness, or the bright light which shall rise upon thee.* The common version, *to thy light*, may seem at first sight more exact than the one here given, but is really less so. The Hebrew preposition  $\text{ב}$  does not correspond to our *to* as a particle of motion or direction, but expresses relation in the widest and most general manner. It is often therefore interchanged with other particles, and *to*, among the rest, but is not to be so translated here or in any other case without necessity. In this case it seems to mean that they shall walk with reference to the light

in question, which in English may be best expressed by *in*, but not as a literal translation. The sense thus yielded is in some respects better than the other, as suggesting the idea not of mere attraction but of general diffusion. By light we are then to understand the radiation from the luminous centre and not merely the centre itself. This explanation of the verse is given by the best of the modern interpreters. Some of these, however, arbitrarily apply it to the restoration of the Jews from exile, who were to be accompanied by heathen kings as their guides and protectors. As a prophecy this never was fulfilled. As a visionary anticipation it could never have been entertained by a contemporary writer, such as these interpreters suppose the author of the book to be. Those who with J. D. Michaelis and Henderson apply this passage exclusively to the future restoration of the Jews, are of course cut off from all historical illustration of its meaning, which the first of these writers therefore properly dispenses with. The allegation of the other that his own position is the only one "that can be maintained consistently with a strict adherence to definite principles of interpretation," may be denied as boldly as it is affirmed. His charge of "a perpetual vacillancy between the literal and the spiritual, the Jews and the Gentiles, the past and the future," lies only against those interpretations which regard the book as a succession of specific and detached predictions. If our hypothesis be true, that it is one indivisible exhibition of the Church, under its two successive phases, and in its essential relations to its Head and to the world, the objection is not only inconclusive but absurd. How far it can be alleged with truth, and without bringing the Old and New Testament into collision, that the future glory of the Jewish people as a people is the great theme of these prophecies, and that the Gentiles are brought forward chiefly for the purpose of "gracing the triumphs" of the Jews, will be seen hereafter, if not evident already. In the meantime, nothing has been yet alleged to justify the arbitrary supposition of a sudden leap from one subject to another, scarcely more "satisfactory" than a "perpetual vacillancy" between the two.

V. 4. *Lift up thine eyes round about* (i. e. in all directions) *and see; all of them are gathered, they come to thee, thy sons from afar shall come, and thy daughters at the side shall be borne.* See ch. 43: 5-7 and 49: 18-23. The English Version seems to suppose an antithesis between נִרְחַקִּים and זְלַצְרָא, which last it accordingly translates *at thy side*, i. e. near thee. Lowth and Henderson suppose an allusion to the oriental practice, described by Chardin, of carrying young children astride upon the hip. The latest writers simply give to צַר the sense of arm, because the arm is at the side! The primary sense of נִרְחַקִּים seems to be that of carrying, with special reference to children. Jerome understands it to mean nursing, in the sense of

giving suck, and translates the phrase before us *lac sugent*, which has been corrupted in the Vulgate text to *ex latere surgent*. Grotius needlessly infers that Jerome read שָׁד instead of צָד. Those who confine these prophecies to the Babylonish exile, understand this as describing the agency of heathen states and sovereigns in the restoration. But in this, as in the parallel passages, there is, by a strange coincidence, no word or phrase implying restoration or return, but the image evidently is that of enlargement and accession; the children thus brought to Zion being not those whom she had lost, but such as she had never before known, as is evident from ch. 49: 21. The event predicted is therefore neither the former restoration of the Jews, as Henderson alleges in the other cases, nor their future restoration, as he no less confidently alleges here. The two interpretations are both groundless and destructive of each other. This perpetual insertion of ideas not expressed in the original, is quite as unreasonable as Vitringa's being always haunted by his phantom of a chorus, which he here sees taking Zion by the hand, consoling her, etc. He is also of opinion that by daughters we are here to understand weak Christians who require peculiar tenderness from ministers. There is more probability in Knobel's suggestion, that the Prophet made his picture true to nature by describing the sons as walking, and the daughters as being carried.

V. 5. *Then shalt thou see (or fear) and brighten up (or overflow), and thy heart shall throb and swell; because (or when) the abundance of the sea shall be turned upon thee, the strength of nations shall come unto thee.* This translation exhibits the points of agreement as well as of difference among interpreters in reference to this verse. All agree that it describes a great and joyful change to be produced by the accession of the gentiles to the church or chosen people, and the effect of this enlargement on the latter. Aben Ezra, Lowth, Vitringa, J. D. Michaelis, Döderlein, Justi, Gesenius, and Umbreit, derive תִּירָא from יָרָא to fear, and apply it to the painful sensation which often attends sudden joy, and which is certainly described in the next clause. Nearly all the later writers repeat Lowth's fine parallel quotation from Lucretius:

His tibi me rebus quaedam divina voluptas  
Percipit atque horror—

Above sixty manuscripts and one of the oldest editions (Bib. Soncin.) require this explanation, by reading either תִּירָא, תִּירָא, or תִּירָא, none of which can regularly come from רָאָה to see. Yet the latter derivation is not only sanctioned by all the ancient versions, and preferred by Kimchi, but approved by Luther, Clericus, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hitzig, Henderson, Ewald, and Knobel. It is curious to see how the parallelism is urged on either side of this dispute, and that with equal plausibility. Thus Vitringa

thinks that *thou shalt see* would be a vain repetition of the *lift up thine eyes and see* in v. 4, while Knobel describes the double reference to fear in this verse as a "lästige Tautologie." As to  $\text{וַיִּרְא}$  the difficulty is in choosing between its two admitted senses of flowing (ch. 2 : 2) and of shining (Ps. 34 : 6). The former is preferred by Jerome, who translates it *affluc* ; by Junius and Tremellius, who have *confluc* ; and by the English and Dutch Versions, the latter of which refers it to the confluence of crowds produced by any strange occurrence. Vitringa makes it mean to *flow out*, and Lowth to *overflow* with joy. But all the latest writers of authority give the word the same sense as in Ps. 34 : 6, which is well expressed by Henderson in strong though homely English, *thou shalt look and brighten up*. His version of the next clause, *thy heart shall throb and dilute*, may be improved by changing the last word, which he took from Lowth, to the equivalent but plainer *swell*.— $\text{וַיִּרְד}$ , which Lowth renders *ruffled*, is admitted by most writers to be here used in its primary sense of trembling, which in reference to the heart may be best expressed by beating or throbbing. But the usual though secondary sense of fearing is retained by Luzzatto, who regards it as descriptive of her terror at the sight of supposed enemies approaching ; and by Hendewerk, who applies it to her apprehension that she would not have sufficient room for the accommodation of the strangers. The usual and proper sense of  $\text{כִּי}$  (for, because) is perfectly appropriate ; the only reason for preferring that of *when*, as Vitringa, Gesenius, and others do, is its apparent relation to the  $\text{וַיִּרְא}$  at the beginning of the sentence, as if he had said, *when* the abundance of the sea, etc. *then* shalt thou see, etc. According to the other explanation of this particle, the  $\text{וַיִּרְא}$  refers to the foregoing context. Another doubt arises from the ambiguity of the nouns  $\text{וַיִּרְא}$  and  $\text{וַיִּרְא}$ , both of which may be applied either to things or persons,—the first denoting sometimes a multitude (ch. 17 : 12), sometimes abundance (Ps. 37 : 16) ; the other signifying sometimes a military force (Ex. 14 : 28), sometimes wealth (Gen. 31 : 29.) As in either case the different meanings are only modifications of one radical idea—a multitude of persons and a multitude of things, a military force and pecuniary force,—as both the meanings of each word are here appropriate,—and as interpreters, whichever meaning they prefer, contrive to join the other with it,—we may safely infer that it was also the intention of the writer to convey the whole idea, that the gentiles should devote themselves and their possessions to the service of Jehovah. (Compare Zech. 14 : 14.)—For *of the sea* J. D. Michaelis has *from the west* ; and other writers who retain the strict translation, suppose a designed antithesis between the west in this verse and the eastern nations mentioned in the next. The conversion here predicted has the same sense as in English, viz. the conversion of the property of one to the use of another. *Upon* can hardly be a simple substitute for *to*, but is rather intended to

suggest the same idea as when we speak of gifts or favours being showered or lavished *on* a person. This force of the particle is well expressed in Lowth's translation, *when the riches of the sea shall be poured in upon thee*, but with too little regard to the proper meaning of the Hebrew verb. The next clause is a repetition of the same thought, but without a figure. If this had reference to the restoration of the Jews from Babylon, it was an extravagant anticipation utterly falsified by the event. But this, although it may commend the hypothesis to those who deny the inspiration of the prophet, is itself a refutation of it to the minds of those who occupy a contrary position. The most natural interpretation of the verse is that which makes it a promise of indefinite enlargement, comprehending both the persons and the riches of the nations. There is something amusing at the present day in Vitringa's suggesting as a difficulty to be cleared away from the interpretation of the passage, that as Christianity is a spiritual religion it can have no great occasion for gold or silver. Even literally understood, the promise is intelligible and most welcome to the philanthropic Christian, as affording means for the diffusion of the truth and the conversion of the world.

V. 6. *A stream of camels shall cover thee, young camels (or dromedaries) of Midian and Ephah, all of them from Sheba shall come, gold and incense shall they bear, and the praises of Jehovah as good news.* This last form of expression is adopted in order to convey the full force of the Hebrew verb, which does not mean simply to announce or even to announce with joy, but to announce glad tidings. (See above, on ch. 40 : 9.) Retaining this sense here, the word would seem to signify not the direct praise of God, but the announcement of the fact that others praised him, and the messengers would be described as bringing to Jerusalem the news of the conversion of their people. It is possible, however, that the primary meaning of בִּשְׂרָה may be simply to announce, as in ch. 52 : 7. 1 Kings 1 : 42. 1 Sam. 4 : 17. 2 Sam. 18 : 20, 26, and that the derivation given by Gesenius is fictitious. But in no case is it necessary, with Vitringa, to exchange the settled meaning of הִלְלָהּ for the doubtful one of praiseworthy acts.—Ewald has greatly improved upon the usual translation of הַרְבֵּה by exchanging *multitude* for *stream* or *flood*, the version given by Jerome (*inundatio*), and not only more expressive than the other, but in perfect accordance with the etymology, and with the usage of the noun itself in Job. 22 : 11. 38 : 34. When applied in prose to a drove of horses (Ez. 20 : 10) or a troop of horsemen (2 Kings 9 : 17), it requires of course a different version. This explanation of הַרְבֵּה throws light upon the phrase *shall cover thee*, a term elsewhere applied to water (e. g. ch. 11 : 9). and suggesting here the poetical idea of a city not merely thronged but flooded with Arabian caravans.

This is at least more natural than Vitringa's notion that the camels are said to cover that which they approach, because they are so tall that they overtop and overshadow it. The camel has been always so peculiarly associated with the Arabs that they are described by Strabo as *σκηρίται καμηλοβοσκοί*. They are here, according to Isaiah's practice, represented by a group of ancestral names. Ephah was the eldest son of Midian (Gen. 25 : 4), who was himself the son of Abraham by Keturah (Gen. 25 : 2) and the brother of Jokshan the father of Sheba. (Gen. 25 : 1-4.) The first two represent northern and central Arabia, the third Arabia Felix, so called by the old geographers because of the rich products which it furnished to the northern traders, either from its own resources or as an entrepôt of Indian commerce. The queen of this country, by whom Solomon was visited, brought with her gold, gems, and spices in abundance (1 Kings 10 : 2), and we read elsewhere of its frankincense (Jer. 6 : 20), its Phœnician commerce (Ezek. 27 : 29), and its caravans (Job 6 : 19), while those of Midian are mentioned even in the patriarchal history (Gen. 37 : 28). Bochart supposes the Midian of this passage to be the Madiene of Josephus and the Modion of Ptolemy, and identifies Ephah with the *Ἰπτός* of the Greek geographers. It is more accordant with usage, however, to explain them as the names of the national progenitors, representing their descendants.—It matters little whether *dromedaries* or *young camels* be the true translation. (For the arguments on both sides see Bochart's *Hierozoicon*, Vol. I. p. 15, with Rosenmüller's Note.) The former is preferable only because it gives us a distinct name, as in the original, which is perhaps the reason that Gesenius retains it in his Version but rejects it in his Commentary. Aben Ezra and Saadiah make  $\text{עִפְיָה}$  a preposition and  $\text{עִפְיָהוּ}$  the plural of  $\text{עִפְיָה}$ , which in Gen. 31 : 34 denotes a litter or woman's saddle used in riding upon camels.—The verb  $\text{עִפְיָהוּ}$  does not agree with the preceding nouns, as the camels of Midian and Ephah could not come from Sheba, but with *all of them*, which may either be indefinite, 'they (i. e. men) shall come all of them,' or more specifically signify the merchants of Sheba. Most interpreters agree with the Targum in referring the last verb ( $\text{עִפְיָהוּ}$ ) to the men who come with the camels and the gifts; but as  $\text{עִפְיָהוּ}$  properly denotes the act of the animals themselves, it is not without a show of reason that Vitringa construes the other verb in the same manner, and supposes the camels by their very burdens to praise God or rather to announce the disposition of these tribes to praise him. This is rendered still more probable by the analogy of the next verse, where kindred acts appear to be ascribed to other animals.—It is a common opinion of interpreters that this verse represents the east as joining in the acts of homage and of tribute which the one before it had ascribed to the west; but it may well be doubted whether this distinctive meaning can be put

upon the terms *sea* and *nations* there employed, and the antithesis would hardly be in keeping with another which appears to be designed between these two verses and the eighth, as will be explained below.

V. 7. *All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered for thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister to thee, they shall ascend with good-will (or acceptably) my altar, and my house of beauty I will beautify.* To the traders of Arabia with their caravans and precious wares he now adds her shepherds with their countless flocks. While Kimchi explains *all* as meaning *many*, and Knobel *all kinds*, Vitringa insists upon the strict sense as an essential feature of the prophecy. Kedar, the second son of Ishmael (Gen. 25 : 13), who represents Arabia in ch. 21 : 16 and 42 : 11, is here joined for the same purpose with his elder brother *Nebaioth*, obviously identical with the *Nabataei*, the name given to the people of Arabia Petraea by Strabo and Diodorus Siculus, who represent them as possessed of no wealth except flocks and herds, in which they were extremely rich. Ezekiel also speaks of Tyre as trading with *Arabia and all the chiefs of Kedar in lambs and rams and goats.* (Ezek. 27 : 21.) These are here described as gathered in one vast flock to Jerusalem, or rather *for her*, i. e. for her use or service, which agrees best with what follows, and with the usage of the Hebrew preposition. They are then, by a bold and striking figure, represented as offering themselves, which is first expressed by the general term *serve* or *minister*, and then more unequivocally by declaring that they shall themselves ascend the altar. Kimchi endeavours to get rid of this bold metaphor by introducing *with* before the *rams of Nebaioth* and referring both verbs to the people themselves: (*With*) *the rams of Nebaioth shall they serve thee, and cause (then) to ascend,* etc. But the common judgment of interpreters is in favour of explaining the words strictly, and retaining the unusual figure unimpaired. They are not disposed however to go all lengths with Vitringa, who supposes the rams to be personified as priests offering themselves upon the altar.—The ascent of the victim on the altar is repeatedly connected elsewhere with the phrase לָרִצּוֹן, to acceptance or acceptably. (See above, ch. 56 : 7 and Jer. 6 : 20.) But in this one place we have the phrase עֲלֵי-רִצּוֹן, as if the last noun had usurped the place of *altar*, which immediately follows. Of this unusual construction there are several distinct explanations. Kimchi regards it as a case of סִבּוּךְ or metathesis, which may be thus resolved: יִרְעוּ לִרְצוֹן עַל מִזְבְּחִי. Gesenius obtains precisely the same meaning by explaining מִזְבְּחִי as an accusative after a verb of motion, and making עֲלֵי-רִצּוֹן a simple variation of the common phrase לָרִצּוֹן. Hitzig and Henderson adopt the same construction, but suppose the two phrases to be different in sense as well as form, לָרִצּוֹן meaning *to (divine) acceptance*, עֲלֵי-רִצּוֹן *with good will or complacency.* The phrase then only serves to

strengthen the description of the victims as spontaneously offering themselves, an idea which Lowth finely, but perhaps too artificially, illustrates by citations from Suetonius and Tacitus, showing that the ancients viewed reluctance in the victims as an evil omen, and by parity of reasoning the appearance of spontaneous self-devotion as a good one.—In the last clause the meaning of the phrase  $\text{בְּבֵיתֵנוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  is determined by the parallel expressions in ch. 64 : 10, where the suffix necessarily belongs to the governing word, or rather to the whole complex phrase, and the whole means, not *the house of our holiness and our beauty*, but *our house of holiness and beauty*, or resolved into the occidental idiom, *our holy and our beautiful house*, which is the common English version. The LXX have here *my house of prayer*, as in ch. 56 : 7 ; and Hitzig regards this as the genuine reading, though he does not adopt it in his German version. His reason for this critical decision is a very insufficient one, viz. that God is nowhere else said to glory in the temple, which is not the meaning of the common text,  $\text{בְּבֵיתֵנוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  being here used in its primary and ordinary sense of *beauty*, as appears from its conjunction with the verb  $\text{יִצְבֹּר}$ , which, in this connexion, even upon Hitzig's own hypothesis, must mean to beautify.—Grotius supposes this prediction to have been literally verified in Herod's temple. Gesenius and the other Germans easily dispose of it as a fanatical anticipation. It is much more embarrassing to those who make the passage a prediction of the future restoration of the Jews and the future splendour of the literal Jerusalem. Some of the most intrepid writers of this class consistently apply their fundamental principle of literal interpretation, and believe that the Mosaic ritual or something like it is to be restored. But such interpreters as J. D. Michaelis and Henderson, who cannot go to this length, are obliged to own that spiritual services are here represented under forms and titles borrowed from the old dispensation. "Whatever the descendants of those oriental tribes may possess shall be cheerfully placed at the disposal of the restored Jews. . . . There shall be no want of any thing that is required for the full restoration of divine worship, when the mosque of Omar shall give place to a new temple to be erected for the celebration of the services of that ministration which exceedeth in glory. 2 Cor. 3 : 8-11." This is the 'literal interpretation' of a school which will not allow Israel to mean the church or chosen people as such considered, but insists upon its meaning the nation of the Jews! The picture which this interpretation makes the Prophet draw may well be called a mixed one, consisting of a literal Jerusalem, literal caravans and camels, but a figurative altar, figurative victims, and a material temple to be built upon the site of the old one for a spiritual worship exclusive of the very rites which it is here predicted shall be solemnly performed there. Of such a figment upon such a subject we may say, with more than ordinary emphasis, and even with a double sense, *Credat Judæus apetta!* On



the other hand, the prophecy explains itself to those who believe that the ancient Israel is still in existence and that the Jews as a nation form no part of it. The charge of mystical or allegorical interpretation does not lie against this view of the matter, but against Vitranga's needless and fantastic addition to his real exegesis of a set of riddles or enigmas, in which he puzzles both his readers and himself by attempting to determine whether camels mean laborious and patient Christians, rams strong ones, sheep those fattened by the word and clothed in the white wool of holiness, etc. To any but Vitranga himself it must be difficult to see in what respect all this is any better than the notion for which he reproves Eusebius, Jerome, and Procopius, that camels here mean rich men, as in Matth. 19:24. And yet after saying in regard to these erring Fathers, *vitanda utique sunt in applicationibus mysticis ἀλλογενῶν*, he adds with great complacency, *nostrae rationes hic sunt liquidæ!* If any proof were needed of the risk attending the admission of a false exegetical principle, however harmless in appearance, it would be afforded by these melancholy triflings on the part of one of the most able, learned, orthodox, devout, accomplished, and with this exception sensible interpreters of Scripture, that the world has ever seen or can expect to see again.

V. 8. *Who are these that fly as a cloud and as doves to their windows?* It is a fine conception of Vitranga, that the ships expressly mentioned in the next verse are here described in their first appearance at a distance resembling with their outspread sails and rapid course a fleecy cloud driven by the wind, and a flight of doves returning to their young. Both comparisons are elsewhere used as here to indicate rapidity of motion. (Job 30:15. Ps. 55:7. Hos. 11:11. Jer. 4:13.) Much less felicitous is Vitranga's idea that the image here presented is that of a prophetic chorus standing with the church on the roof of the city, and asked by her, or asking, what it is they see approaching. Houbigant's emendation of the text by reading אברהיהם, though approved by Lowth and even improved by the change of אָ to יָ on the authority of more than forty manuscripts, so as to admit of the translation *like doves upon the wing*, is justly characterized by Gesenius as an "elende Conjectur." The common text means *lattices* or *latticed windows*, either of which is better than Henderson's translation *holes*, though even this is preferable to the vague and weak term *habitations* used by Noyes.

V. 9. *Because for me the isles are waiting (or must wait), and the ships of Tarshish in the first place, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, for the name of Jehovah thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel, because he has glorified thee.* This verse contains a

virtual though not a formal answer to the question in the one before it. As if he had said, Wonder not that these are seen approaching, for the whole world is only awaiting my command to bring thy sons, etc. This view of the connexion makes it wholly unnecessary to give  $\text{בְּ}^{\text{א}}$  the sense of *surely, yes*, or any other than its usual and proper one of *for, because*. For the true sense of  $\text{בְּ}^{\text{א}}$ , see above on ch. 42: 4, and for ships of Tarshish, the Earlier Prophecies, p. 405. Luzzatto here gratuitously reads  $\text{בְּ}^{\text{א}}$  *let them be gathered*, which is applied to a confluence of nations in Jer. 3: 17. The Septuagint, which elsewhere explains Tarshish to mean the sea, here retains the name; but the Vulgate even here has *naves maris*.<sup>3</sup> J. D. Michaelis, *the ships of Spain*. Jarēhi and Kimchi supply  $\text{בְּ}^{\text{א}}$  before  $\text{בְּ}^{\text{א}}$ , and explain it to mean *as at first*, or *as of old*, referring to the days of Solomon and Hiram. This reading is actually found in twenty-five manuscripts, and sanctioned by the Peshito; but even Lowth retains the common text. The Hebrew phrase is generally understood to mean in the first rank either as to time or place. (Compare Num. 10: 13, 14.) Both may be included, as they really imply one another. The pronoun *their* may have for its antecedent either *sons* or *islands*; but the former, as the nearer, is more natural. The last clause is repeated from ch. 55: 5, where  $\text{בְּ}^{\text{א}}$  takes the place of the first  $\text{בְּ}^{\text{א}}$  and determines it to mean not *to* but *for*. There is no need therefore of explaining *name* to mean the place where the divine name was recorded. J. D. Michaelis still declines to say in what precise form this prediction is to be fulfilled; but Henderson, less cautious or more confident, affirms that the property of the Jews as well as themselves shall be conveyed free of charge to Palestine, adding that many of them resident in distant parts can only conveniently return by sea. The principle involved in this interpretation is, that we have no right to make the Zion here addressed any other than the literal Jerusalem, or the ships, the silver, and the gold, any other than literal silver, gold, and ships. This rule to be of any practical avail must apply to all parts of the passage, and especially to all parts of the verse alike, without which uniformity interpretation becomes wholly arbitrary or mere guess-work. It is an interesting question, therefore, what we are to understand in this connexion by the *ships of Tarshish*, to which such extraordinary prominence is given in the work of restoration. As to this point, Henderson refers us to his note on ch. 23: 10, where we read as follows: "By *Tarshish* there can no longer be any reasonable doubt we are to understand *Tartessus*, the ancient and celebrated emporium of the Phœnicians, situated between the two mouths of the river Bactis (now Guadalquivir) on the south-western coast of Spain." Are we to understand then that the vessels of this part of Spain are to be foremost in the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, just as the descendants of the ancient Kedar, Ephah, and Sheba, are to place their possessions at

the disposal of the restored Jews? If so, this meaning should have been distinctly stated, as it partly is by Michaelis in translating Tarshish *Spain*. If not, and if as we suspect the ships of Tarshish are secretly identified with the commercial navy of Great Britain and perhaps America, we then have another medley like that in v. 7, but in this case consisting of a literal return to the literal Jerusalem in literal ships but belonging to a figurative Tarshish. In these repeated instances of mixed interpretation there is something like a vacillancy between the literal and the spiritual, which is any thing but satisfactory. To the assumption that commercial intercourse and navigation are here represented under forms and names derived from the Old Testament history, I am so far from objecting, that I wish to apply it to the whole prediction, and to use precisely the same liberty in understanding what is said of Zion and her sons, as in understanding what is said of Tarshish and her ships. Let it also be added to the cumulative proofs already urged in favour of our own hypothesis, that here, as in so many former instances, the writer does not even accidentally use any term explicitly denoting restoration or return, but only such as are appropriate to mere accession and increase *ab extra*. It cannot therefore be absurd, even if it is erroneous, to apply what is here said, with Vitringa, to the growth of the true Israel or chosen people by the calling of the gentiles, with particular allusion to the wealth of the commercial nations, from among whom the elect of God, the sons of Zion, when they come to the embraces of their unknown mother, shall come bringing their silver and gold with them.

V. 10. *And strangers shall build thy walls, and their kings shall serve thee; for in my wrath I smote thee, and in my favour I have had mercy on thee.* For the true sense of the phrase  $\text{וְיִבְנֶינָהּ זָרִים}$ , see above, on ch. 56 : 3; and with the last clause compare ch. 54 : 7, 8. The  $\text{וְ}$  relates to the whole of that clause taken together, not to the first member by itself. It was not because God had been angry, but because he had been angry and relented, that they were to be thus favoured. (See ~~the Earlier Prophecies~~, p. 238.) *Vol. I. p.* There is no need, however, of substituting an involved occidental syntax for the simple Hebrew construction, as Vitringa and Rosenmüller do, by reading, ‘for although in my wrath I may have smitten thee, etc.’ The English version of the last verb in the sentence is correct. Lowth’s emendation of it, in which he is followed by Henderson and Noyes, is wholly ungrammatical, since the preceding verb is not a future but a preterite. The change is also needless, since the mercy is described as past, not in reference to the date of the prediction, but of its fulfilment. There is something at once inexact and mawkish in Lowth’s paraphrase of this verb, *I will embrace thee with the most tender affection*. If any departure from the usual translation were required or admissible, the preference would be due to Ewald’s

version (*lieb ich dich wieder*).—Eichhorn supposed the expectation here expressed to have been excited by the benefactions of the Persian kings to the restored Jews (Ezra 1 : 8. 6 : 8, 9); but even Gesenius regards the date thus assigned to the prediction as too late. Knobel applies the text to the neighbouring heathen, called  $\text{גֵּרֵי אֲרָם}$  by Nehemiah (ch. 9 : 2. comp. Ps. 13 : 45. 141 : 7, 11), who were to be driven from the lands upon which they had intruded during the captivity, and reduced to bondage by the restored Jews. Henderson's explanation of the verse as meaning that foreigners shall count it an honour to be employed in rebuilding Jerusalem and "in any way contributing to the recovery of the lost happiness of Israel, and that even monarchs shall regard it as a privilege to aid in the work by employing whatever legitimate influence they may possess in advancing it," is hardly a fair specimen of strictly literal interpretation, but rather an insensible approximation to the old opinion, as expressed by Vitringa, that the Prophet here foretells the agency of strangers or new converts in promoting the safety and prosperity of Israel, under figures borrowed from the old economy, and implying a vicissitude or alternation of distress and joy, such as Isaiah frequently exhibits. The building of the walls here mentioned is the same as that in Ps. 51 : 20 and 147 : 2, where it is no more to be literally understood than the captivity of Zion in Ps. 14 : 7 or that of Job in ch. 42 : 10. (See Hengstenberg on the Psalms, Vol. I. p. 291.)

V. 11. *And thy gates shall be open continually, day and night they shall not be shut, to bring into thee the strength of nations and their kings led (captive or in triumph).* According to Hitzig there is here a resumption of the figures in v. 6. and the gates are represented as kept open day and night by the perpetual influx of Arabian caravans. But without going back to the peculiar imagery of that verse, we may understand the one before us as relating to the influx of strangers and new converts generally. The two ideas expressed are those of unobstructed access and undisturbed tranquillity. The use of  $\text{תָּפֹחַ}$  is the same as in ch. 48 : 8, nearly but not entirely coincident with that of the corresponding verb in English, when we speak of a door's opening instead of being opened. The difference is simply that between the description of a momentary act and of a permanent condition. The intransitive construction is in either case the same. Upon this verse, perhaps combined with Zech. 14 : 7, is founded that beautiful and grand description, *the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day, for there shall be no night there* (Rev. 21 : 25), of which Vitringa speaks as an inspired exposition of the verse before us, while Henderson says more correctly that the Apostle "borrows the language in his description of the New Jerusalem."— $\text{תָּפֹחַ}$  has the same ambiguity or latitude of meaning as

in v. 5, above. The sense of wealth or treasure is preferred by most of the late writers, but Rosenmüller has *exercitus*. Better than either, because comprehending both, is Vitringa's version *copia*, to which we have no exact equivalent in English.—Vitringa and Rosenmüller follow Kimchi in explaining מְהִימָהּ to mean escorted, led in procession, or, as Lowth has it, *pompously attended*, which they take to be the meaning of the verb in Nah. 2 : 8. But as that place is itself obscure and doubtful, and as the verb is clearly employed elsewhere to express the act of leading captive (ch. 20 : 4. 1 Sam. 30 : 2), several of the later writers have reverted to this explanation, which is also given in the Targum (מְהִימָהּ) and by Aben Ezra, and agrees well with ch. 45 : 14 (compare Ps. 149 : 8). Gesenius in his Commentary charges Köppe with omitting to observe that this sense is at variance with the idea of voluntary adhesion expressed throughout the context; but in his Thesaurus he adopts this very explanation, without attempting to refute his own objection. Hitzig's solution of it is that the nations are described as coming to Jerusalem *en masse*, and bringing their reluctant kings in chains along with them. Knobel proposes an entirely new explanation, in which מְהִימָהּ is to have an active meaning (like מְהִימָהּ and מְהִימָהּ), and to be translated *leaders*; but if ever the invention of a new sense was without the faintest colour of necessity, it is so here. The general meaning no doubt is that earthly sovereigns must unite in this adhesion to the true religion, either willingly or by compulsion. The different impressions made by such a passage on intelligent interpreters, according to their several hypotheses or previous conclusions, may be shown by comparing the remarks of Henderson and Umbreit upon this verse. While the latter confidently asks who can here fail to read the daily progress of God's kingdom by accretion from the gentiles, in which sense the doors of Zion are still open, kings and nations streaming in by day and night, the other gravely observes that "modern travellers greatly complain of the inconvenience to which they are put, when they do not reach Jerusalem before the gates are closed." This is either nothing to the purpose or implies that the blessing promised in the text is a more convenient regulation of the gate-police after the restoration of the Jews.

V. 12. *For the nation and the kingdom which will not serve thee shall perish, and the nations shall be desolated, desolated.* Similar threatenings are found in Zechariah 10 : 1, 12 : 1, and 14 : 17, in the last of which places there is a specific threat of drought, as the appointed punishment. This has led Hitzig and some later writers to explain the last verb here as meaning to be utterly dried up or parched. But in ch. 37 : 18, above, it is applied to nations in the general sense of desolation. The *for* at the beginning of the verse is commonly explained as introducing a reason for

the confluence of strangers just before predicted, namely, the desire of escaping this destruction; but it may as well be understood to give a reason for the promise of increase in general. The gates of Zion shall be crowded, because all shall enter into them but those who are to perish. *The nations* in the last clause may mean the nations just described, or, as the common version expresses it, *those nations*. But it may also mean, perhaps more naturally, those who still continue to be gentiles, heathen, by refusing to unite themselves with Israel.—The threatening in this verse is a very serious one, however understood; but it is also very strange and unaccountable if understood as meaning that all nations shall be utterly destroyed which will not serve the Jews when restored to their own country. Even if we give to *serve* the mitigated sense of showing favour and assisting, there is still something almost revolting in the penalty annexed to the omission; how much more if we understand it as denoting actual subjection and hard bondage. It is no wonder that a writer so acute as Henderson is forced by the pressure of this difficulty on his theory to seek for a “meiosis” in the sentence, and to understand the threatening as directed only against those who are chargeable with “positive hostility,” a forced assumption not to be supported by a reference to Judges 5 : 23. The whole is rendered clear by the assumption, not got up for the occasion, but resulting from an extensive exegetical induction, that the threatening was intended to apply, in its most obvious and strongest sense, to all those nations which refuse to be connected with the church or Israel of God.

V. 13. *The glory of Lebanon to thee shall come, cypress, plane, and box together, to adorn the place of my sanctuary, and the place of my feet I will honour.* The glory of Lebanon is its cedars. For the other trees here mentioned, see above, on ch. 41 : 19, where, as here, they are merely representatives of ornamental forest-trees in general. *The place of my sanctuary* has been generally understood to mean the sanctuary itself; but several of the latest writers understand by it Jerusalem, as being the place where the temple was erected. The same sense is put by Maurer and others on *the place of my feet*, that is, the place where I habitually stand or walk. (Ezek. 43 : 7.) Vitringa and the older writers generally seem to understand by it the ark of the covenant, considered as the footstool of Jehovah (1 Chron. 28 : 2. Ps. 99 : 5. 132 : 7) when enthroned between the cherubim (ch. 37 : 16. Ps. 80 : 2). In favour of the wider sense is the analogy of ch. 66 : 2, where the same description is applied to the whole earth, but in reference to heaven as the throne of God.—Another topic upon which interpreters have been divided, is the question whether the adorning mentioned here is that of cultivated grounds by living trees, or that of buildings by the use of the choicest kinds of timber. The latter

opinion has most commonly prevailed; but Hitzig, Ewald, and Knobel, are decidedly in favour of the other, which is far more pleasing in itself and more in keeping with the poetical tone of the whole context. In either case the meaning of the figure is that the earthly residence of God shall be invested with the most attractive forms of beauty. Even Grotius, as Vitringa has observed, was ashamed to rest in the material sense of this description, and has made it so far tropical as to denote the conquest of many parts of Syria by the Jews. But Henderson goes back to ground which even Grotius could not occupy, and understands the verse not only of material trees but of material timber. "A literal temple or house of worship being intended, *the language MUST BE literally understood.*" But why are literal trees more indispensable in this case than literal sheep and rams and a literal altar in v. 7, or than literal ships of Tarshish in v. 9? This perpetual vacillancy between the literal and the spiritual is any thing but satisfactory. "From all that appears to be the state of Palestine in regard to wood, supplies from Lebanon will be as necessary as they were when the ancient temple was constructed." With this may be worthily compared the use of the same text to justify the 'dressing of churches' at the festival of Christmas.

V. 14. *Then shall come to thee bending the sons of thy oppressors, then shall bow down to the soles of thy feet all thy despisers, and shall call thee the City of Jehovah, Zion the holy place of Israel (or the Zion of the Holy One of Israel).* For the same ideas and expressions, see above, ch. 45: 14 and 49: 23. The  $\text{בָּל}$  before  $\text{בְּפָנָי}$  is not simply equivalent to *at*, but expresses downward motion, and may be translated *down to*. The act described is the oriental prostration as a sign of the profoundest reverence. The Vulgate makes the sense still stronger, and indeed too strong, by attaching to the verb a religious meaning, and regarding  $\text{בְּפָנָי}$  as its object (*adorabunt vestigia pedum tuorum*). The sons are mentioned either for the purpose of contrasting the successive generations more emphatically, or as a mere oriental idiom without distinctive meaning. In favour of the latter supposition is the circumstance that it is wanting in the other clause, where the despisers are themselves represented as doing the same thing with the sons of the oppressors.  $\text{נִזְקֶנָה}$  means not only to despise in heart but to treat with contempt. These humbled enemies are represented as acknowledging the claim of Zion to be recognised as the holy place and dwelling of Jehovah. The old construction of the last words, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel, supposes Zion as a proper name to govern the next word, contrary to the general rule, but after the analogy of such combinations as *Bethlehem of Judah* and *Jehovah of Hosts*. Hitzig prefers to make  $\text{צִיּוֹן}$  an appellative synonymous with  $\text{צִיּוֹן}$ , *the pillar of the Holy One of Israel*. Maurer more plausibly suggests that  $\text{קָרִיִּשׁ}$  here means not a holy person but

a holy or consecrated place, as in ch. 57 : 15. Ps. 46 : 5. 65 : 5. On any of these suppositions, the sense of the acknowledgment remains the same. That sense is determined by the parallel passage ch. 45 : 14, where a part of the confession is in these words, *only in thee is God.* (See above, p. 118.) The same sense must here be attached to the acknowledgment of Zion as the City of Jehovah, in order to explain or justify the strength of the expressions put into the mouth of her repentant enemies. The old Jerusalem was not merely *a* holy place, *a* city of Jehovah, but *the* holy place, *the* city of Jehovah. Its exclusive possession of this character was perfectly essential, and is always so described in Scripture. Are we to understand, then, that Jerusalem, when rebuilt and enlarged hereafter, is again to be invested with its old monopoly of spiritual privileges? If it is, how can such a restoration of the old economy be reconciled with the New Testament doctrines? If it is not, why are these repentant enemies described as rendering precisely the same homage to the New Jerusalem, which properly belonged to the old? If this is a mere figure for deep reverence and so forth, what becomes of the principle of literal interpretation? Whether these questions are of any exegetical importance, and if so, whether they are satisfactorily solved by Henderson's interpretation of the verse as meaning that "the descendants of her oppressors will acknowledge the wrongs that have been done to her, and humbly crave a share in her privileges," is left to the decision of the reader. On the supposition hitherto assumed as the basis of the exposition, this verse simply means that the enemies of the Church shall recognise her in her true relation to her divine Head.

V. 15. *Instead of thy being forsaken and hated and with none passing (through thee), and I will place thee for a boast of perpetuity, a joy of age and age.* The  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  may express either simply a change of condition (whereas), or the reason of the change (because), or the further idea of equitable compensation. Hitzig supposes an allusion in  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  to the use of the same word in the law with respect to a less beloved wife (Gen. 29 : 31. Deut. 21 : 15). But in the phrase  $\text{וְהָיָה לְךָ$  the personification seems entirely merged in the idea of a city. The  $\text{ו}$  at the beginning of the second clause is commonly regarded as the sign of the apodosis, and as such cannot be expressed in English. It may however have its usual copulative meaning if the first clause be connected with the foregoing verse as a part of the same sentence. In either case the  $\text{ו}$  must at the same time be converse and connect the verb with those of the preceding verse, or else it must be taken as a praeter like  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  in v. 10. In order probably to make the application of the verse to the material Jerusalem more natural, Henderson observes that  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  is here used, as in many other places, for a period of long



and unknown duration. As this is certainly the primitive meaning of the word, it is often so applied, and yet it may be noted that according to the true interpretation of the prophecy, this expression may be taken in its utmost strength and latitude of meaning.

V. 16. *And thou shalt suck the milk of nations, and the breast of kings shalt thou suck, and thou shalt know that I, Jehovah, am thy saviour, and (that) thy redeemer (is) the Mighty One of Jacob.* All interpreters agree with the Targum in applying this verse to the influx of wealth and power and whatever else the kings and nations of the earth can contribute to the progress of the true religion. The figure is derived from Deut. 33 : 19, *they shall suck the abundance of the seas.* מִנְּי cannot here mean desolation, as above in ch. 59 : 7 and below in v. 18, but must be a variation of the usual form מִנְּי as in Job 24 : 9. The catachresis in the second clause is not a mere rhetorical blunder, but as Hitzig well says, an example of the sense overmastering the style, a license the occasional use of which is characteristic of a bold and energetic writer. It also serves the useful purpose of showing how purely tropical the language is. Lowth and Noyes gratuitously try to mitigate the harshness of the metaphor by changing the second *suck* into *fostered at* and *nursed from* the breast of kings. Vitringa speaks of some as attempting to remove the solecism altogether by making *kings* mean *queens* or the *daughters of kings*, or by appealing to extraordinary cases in which males have given suck ! The construction of the last clause is the one expressed by Noyes. Each member of that clause contains a subject and a predicate, and therefore a complete proposition. The sense is not merely that Jehovah is the Mighty One of Jacob, but that the Mighty God of Jacob is Israel's redeemer, and the self-existent everlasting God his saviour. Here, as in ch. 1 : 24, Henderson translates מִנְּי *protector* ; but see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 18.

V. 17. *Instead of brass (or copper) I will bring gold, and instead of iron I will bring silver, and instead of wood brass, and instead of stones iron, and I will place (or make) thy government peace and thy rulers righteousness.* Grotius follows the Targum in explaining the first clause as a promise of ample compensation for preceding losses. As if he had said, 'for the brass which thy enemies have taken from thee I will bring thee gold,' etc. Knobel, on the contrary, understands the clause as meaning that the value of the precious metals shall be lowered by their great abundance. Henderson likewise understands it as a promise that "the temporal prosperity of the restored Israelites shall resemble that of their ancestors in the days of Solomon." (See 1 Kings 10 : 27. 2 Chr. 9 : 20, 27.) But the thought which is naturally suggested by the words is that expressed by Vitringa,

namely, that all things shall be changed for the better. The change described is not a change in kind, i. e. from bad to good, but in degree, i. e. from good to better; because the same things which appear to be rejected in the first clause are expressly promised in the second. The arrangement of the items Vitranga endeavours to explain as having reference to the outward appearance of the substances, those being put together which are most alike. See a similar gradation in ch. 30 : 26. Zech. 14 : 20. 1 Cor. 3 : 12. 15 : 41.—The last clause resolves the figures into literal expressions, and thus shows that the promise has respect not to money but to moral advantages. רָבִיבָה properly means office, magistracy, government, here put for those who exercise it, like nobility, ministry, and other terms in English. (Compare Ezek. 9 : 1. 2 Kings 11 : 18.) רָבִיבָה, which has commonly a bad sense, is here used for magistrates or rulers in general, for the purpose of suggesting that instead of tyrants or exactors they should now be under equitable government. The two parallel expressions Henderson decides to signify the temporal and spiritual chiefs of the restored Jewish community, without assigning any ground for the alleged distinction. There is much more force in his remark that the similarity of structure between this verse and ch. 3 : 24 corroborates the genuineness of these later prophecies. Koppe's explanation of the last clause as meaning, 'I will change thy punishment into peace and thy afflictions into blessing,' is justly represented by Gesenius as arbitrary.

V. 18. *There shall no more be heard violence in thy land, desolation and ruin in thy borders (or within thy bounds); and thou shalt call salvation thy walls, and thy gates praise.* According to Vitranga עָרָה was the cry for help usually uttered in case of personal violence. (See Job 19 : 7. Jer. 20 : 8.) But there is no need of departing from the strict sense of violence itself, which shall never more be heard of. He also distinguishes עָרָה and עָרָה as relating severally to lands and houses. The most natural explanation of the last clause is that which makes it mean that the walls shall afford safety (ch. 26 : 1) and the gates occasion of praise. Henderson's explanation, that the gates shall resound with praise, does not agree well with the parallel. Some understand by praise the praise of God for her continued safety; others the praise or fame of her defences, considered either as arising from victorious resistance to assault, or as preventing it. For עָרָה the Septuagint has *γλυμμα* sculpture, and for עָרָה the Vulgate *occupabit*. Thou shalt call, as in many other cases, means, thou shalt have a right and reason so to call them. With this verse compare ch. 65 : 19–25.

V. 19. *No more shall be to thee the sun for a light by day, and for brightness the moon shall not shine to thee, and Jehovah shall become thy*

*everlasting light, and thy God thy glory.* The ה before אֲנִי is neglected by the ancient versions, and Hitzig in like manner makes it a sign of the nominative absolute, *as for the brightness of the moon*, etc. (See above, ch. 32 : 1, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 534.) But the masoretic accents require אֲנִי־לְךָ to be construed separately as meaning *with its light* (Gesenius), or *for light* (English Version). Some regard this merely as a figurative promise of prosperity, of which light is a natural and common emblem. Others understand it as a promise of God's residence among his people, clothed in such transcendent brightness as to make the light of the sun and the moon useless. The true sense of the figures seems to be that all natural sources of illumination shall be swallowed up in the clear manifestation of the presence, power, and will of God. According to Henderson, this verse and the next depict the superlative degree of happiness which shall be enjoyed by the new and holy Jerusalem church, expressed in language of the most sublime imagery. Why we are thus more at liberty to treat the sun and moon of this passage as mere "imagery," while the trees of v. 13 "must be literally explained" as meaning timber, we are not informed.—With this verse compare Rev. 21 : 23. 22 : 5.—Lowth and J. D. Michaelis needlessly insert *by night*, on the authority of the ancient versions, which prove nothing, however, as to a difference of text. The occasional violation of the exact parallelism is not so much a blemish as a beauty.

V. 20. *Thy sun shall set no more, and thy moon shall not be withdrawn ; for Jehovah shall be unto thee for an eternal light, and completed the days of thy mourning.* There is no need of supposing any want of consistency between this verse and that before it, nor even that the Prophet gives a new turn to his metaphor. *Thy sun shall set no more*, is evidently tantamount to saying, thou shalt no more have a sun that sets or a moon that withdraws herself, because, etc. The active verb אֲנִי־לְךָ is used in the same way by Joel, where he says that the stars *withdraw THEIR brightness*, i. e. cease to shine. The expression is generic, and may comprehend all failure or decrease of light, whether by setting, waning, or eclipse, or by the temporary intervention of a cloud. The last words of this verse are correctly said by Henderson to furnish a key to the whole description, by identifying joy with light, and grief with darkness.—Compare with this verse ch. 25 : 8. Zech. 14 : 7. Rev. 7 : 16. 21 : 4 ; and for the phrase, *days of mourning*, Gen. 27 : 41.

V. 21. *And thy people, all of them righteous, for ever shall inherit the earth, the branch (or shoot) of my planting, the work of my hands, to glorify myself (or to be glorified).*—Compare ch. 4 : 3. 33 : 24. 35 : 8. 52 : 1.

Rev. 21 : 7, 27. The first clause may also be read as two distinct propositions, *thy people all of them are (or shall be) righteous, for ever they shall inherit the earth.* According to the literal interpretation, so called, this is a promise that the Jews shall possess the Holy Land for ever. But even granting *land* to be a more literal and exact translation, which it is not, still the usage of the Scriptures has attached to this prophetic formula a much higher meaning, the possession of the land being just such a type or symbol of the highest future blessings as the exodus from Egypt is of ultimate deliverance, or the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah of sudden, condign, irretrievable destruction. But in favour of the wider version, *earth*, is the analogy of ch. 49 : 8, where Israel is represented as occupying and restoring the desolate heritages of the whole earth.—The Septuagint renders אֶרֶץ by *γῆλόσσωρ*, as if written אֶרֶץ. For the meaning of the word, see above, ch. 11 : 1. 14 : 19, and the Earlier Prophecies, pp. 218, 286. According to Hendewerk, it here denotes the population of the new Jerusalem, and is identical with the *plant* and *root* of ch. 53 : 2; from which he gravely infers that the אֶרֶץ of this verse and the אֶרֶץ of ch. 53 : 11 must also be identical. The dependence of God's people on himself for the origin and sustentation of their spiritual life is forcibly expressed by the figure of a plant which he has planted (Ps. 92 : 14. Matt. 15 : 13. John 15 : 1, 2), and by that of a work which he has wrought (ch. 29 : 23. 43 : 7) : in reference to the last of which the Apostle says (Eph. 2 : 10), *we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them*; and in reference to the first, our Lord himself (John 15 : 8), *herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit, so shall ye be my disciples*; and again, with an entire change of figure (Matt. 5 : 16), *let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.* The same ultimate design is set forth in the words of the verse before us.—The textual reading אֶרֶץ is regarded by Gesenius and most other writers as an error of transcription for אֶרֶץ, as given in the margin. But Rosenmüller seems to think that the pronoun of the third person may refer to אֶרֶץ, which is sometimes masculine; De Dieu refers it to the people; and Maurer thinks it possible to connect it with Jehovah, by a sudden enallage so common in the prophets; which last is approved by Hitzig, but avoided as too harsh in his translation. As to his notion that אֶרֶץ describes God as being proud of Israel, see above, on v. 13.—To the question whether all the restored Jews are to be righteous, Henderson says nothing; but Michaelis maintains that this expression does not necessarily imply regeneration or denote true piety, but simply signifies the prevalence of social virtue, such as may exist even among the heathen, much more among those who are in possession of the true religion,

—According to my own view of the Prophet's meaning, he here predicts the elevation of the church to its normal or ideal state, a change of which we may already see the rudiments, however far we may be yet from its final consummation.

V. 22. *The little one shall become a thousand, and the small one a strong nation; I, Jehovah, in its time will hasten it.* The superlative sense given to the adjectives *little* and *small* by Gesenius and Ewald is a needless departure from the idiomatic form of the original. The substantive verb with  $\text{ב}$  may also be rendered *shall be for*, i. e. shall be so reckoned, which amounts to the same thing. Kimchi, and Rosenmüller after him, very unnecessarily observe that small and little here relate to number, not to size. Gesenius and several of the later writers understand them as denoting one without a family, or with a small one; in which case the  $\text{קִטְנֹתָי}$  might be taken in its genealogical sense of household, family, or other subdivision of a tribe. (Judges 6 : 15. 1 Sam. 10 : 12. 23 : 23. Micah 5 : 1.) But this whole interpretation is less natural than that of Vitringa, who applies the epithets to Israel itself, falsely, according to Gesenius, whose *ipse dixit* loses much of its authority in consequence of his own frequent changes of opinion upon insufficient grounds, or none at all. The verse, on the face of it, is simply a description of increase, like that in ch. 26 : 15. 49 : 19, 20. etc.—The pronouns in the last clause are correctly explained by Knobel as neuters, referring to the whole preceding series of prophecies. (Compare ch. 43 : 13. 46 : 11.) The *his* in the common version is equivalent to *its* in modern English, a possessive form apparently unknown to the translators of the Bible.—*I will hasten it*, has reference to the time ordained for the event, or may denote the suddenness of its occurrence, without regard to its remoteness or the length of the intervening period, which seems to be the sense conveyed by the Vulgate version, *subito faciam*. (See above, ch. 13 : 22, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 266.)—The reference of these promises to the literal Jerusalem is ascribed by Jerome to the Jews and half-Jews (*semi-judæi*) of his own day, and opposed by Vitringa on a very insufficient ground, viz. the impossibility of ascertaining the precise site of the ancient Jerusalem, an impossibility which may be considered as already realized. (See Robinson's Palestine, I. p. 414.) The true ground of objection is the violation of analogy involved in this interpretation. The idea of Eusebius and Procopius, that the prophecy is literal, but conditional, and now rescinded by the unbelief of those to whom it was addressed, opens the door to endless license and makes exegesis either useless or impossible. It is a curious fact that Gregory VII. applied this passage to the church of Rome, in the palmy state to which she was exalted by himself. The hypothesis of Grotius, that it has exclusive reference to the restoration of the Jews from Babylon, is

now the current one among the Germans, who of course are unaffected by Vitringa's objection that the prophecy in this sense never was fulfilled. The real argument against it, is the absence of explicit reference to the supposed subject, and the ease with which an indefinite number of analogous restrictions or specific applications might be devised and carried out on grounds of equal plausibility. The only hypothesis which seems to shun the opposite extremes of vagueness and minuteness, and to take the language in its obvious sense, without forced constructions or imaginary facts, is the one proposed in the introduction, and on which the exposition of the chapter has been founded. It is not the doctrine of some early writers, that the Jerusalem or Zion of this passage is the primitive or apostolic church, to which the description is in many points inapplicable; whereas it is perfectly appropriate to the New Jerusalem, the Christian Church, not as it was, or is, or will be at any period of its history exclusively, but viewed in reference to the whole course of that history, and in contrast with the many disadvantages and hardships of the old economy.

---

## CHAPTER LXI.

AFTER describing the new condition of the Church, he again introduces the great personage by whom the change is to be brought about. His mission and its object are described by himself in vs. 1-3. Its grand result shall be the restoration of a ruined world, v. 4. The church, as a mediator between God and the revolted nations, shall enjoy their service and support, vs. 5, 6. The shame of God's people shall be changed to honour, v. 7. His righteousness is pledged to this effect, v. 8. The church, once restricted to a single nation, shall be recognised and honoured among all, v. 9. He triumphs in the prospect of the universal spread of truth and righteousness. vs. 10, 11.

V. 1. *The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah (is) upon me, because Jehovah hath anointed me to bring good news to the humble, he hath sent me to bind up the broken in heart, to proclaim to captives freedom, and to the bound open opening (of the eyes or of the prison-doors.)* Unction in the Old Testament is not a mere sign of consecration to office, whether that of a Prophet, Priest, or King (1 Kings 19 : 16. Lev. 8 : 12. 1 Kings 1 : 31), but the symbol of spiritual influences, by which the recipient was both

qualified and designated for his work (See 1 Sam. 10 : 1, 6. 16 : 13.) Hence Kimchi's definition of the rite, as a sign of the divine choice (זֶה הַנִּיחָה לְיָהוָה), although not erroneous, is inadequate. The office here described approaches nearest to the prophetic. The specific functions mentioned have all occurred and been explained before. (See above, on ch. 42 : 1-7. 48 : 16. 49 : 1-9. 50 : 4. 51 : 16.) The proclamation of liberty has reference to the year of jubilee under the Mosaic law (Lev. 25 : 10, 13. 27 : 24. Jer. 34 : 8-10), which is expressly called the year of liberty or liberation by Ezekiel (46 : 17).—חֲפֹצֵת-חַיִּים is explained by Kimchi and Jarchi to mean *opening of the prison*, the second word being regarded as a derivative of חָפַץ to take. De Dieu obtains the same sense by appealing to the Ethiopic usage. Gesenius and the other modern writers are disposed to follow Aben Ezra in treating it as one word (חֲפֹצֵת-חַיִּים), not a compound but an intensive or reduplicated form, intended to express the idea of complete or thorough opening. (See above, ch. 2 : 20, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 36.) This Gesenius understands to mean the opening of the prison, but in opposition to the settled usage which restricts חָפַץ and its derivatives to the opening of the eyes and ears, and which cannot be set aside by alleging that the corresponding verb in Arabic is used more widely. Ewald adheres to the only authorized sense, but explains it as a figurative description of deliverance from prison, which may be poetically represented as a state of darkness, and deliverance from it as a restoration of the sight. But for reasons which have been already given, the only natural sense which can be put upon the words is that of spiritual blindness and illumination. (See above, on ch. 42 : 7. 50 : 10.) With this question is connected another as to the person here introduced as speaking. According to Gesenius, this is the last of the Prophet's self-defences (*Selbstapologie*); and he even goes so far as to assert that all interpreters are forced (*nothgedrungen*) to regard Isaiah as himself the speaker. Umbreit supposes him to be the speaker, but only as the type and representative of a greater Prophet. Vitringa and other orthodox interpreters regard the question as decided by our Lord himself in the synagogue at Nazareth, when, after reading this verse and a portion of the next from *the book of the Prophet Isaiah*, he began to say unto them, *this day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears*. (Luke 4 : 16-22.) The brevity of this discourse, compared with the statement which immediately follows, that *the people bore him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth*, and connected with the singular expression that *he began* thus to say unto them, makes it probable that we have only the beginning or a summary of what the Saviour said on that occasion. That the whole is not recorded may however be regarded as a proof that his discourse contained no interpretation of the place before us which may not be gathered from the few words

left on record, or from the text and context of the prophecy itself. Now it must be admitted that the words of Christ just quoted do not necessarily import that he is the direct and only subject of the prophecy; for even if the subject were Isaiah, or the Prophets as a class, or Israel, yet if at the same time the effects foretold were coming then to pass, our Lord might say, *this day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears*. Upon this ground J. D. Michaelis adopts the application to Isaiah, without disowning the authority of Christ as an interpreter of prophecy. But this restriction of the passage is at variance with what we have already seen to be the true sense of the parallel places (ch. 42: 1-7 and ch. 49: 1-9), where the form of expression is the same, and where all agree that the same speaker is brought forward. If it has been concluded on sufficient grounds that the ideal person there presented is the Messiah, the same conclusion cannot, without arbitrary violence, be avoided here, and thus the prophecy itself interprets our Lord's words instead of being interpreted by them. This in the present case is more satisfactory, because it cuts off all objection drawn from the indefinite character of his expressions. At the same time, and by parity of reasoning, a subordinate and secondary reference to Israel as a representative of the Messiah, and to the Prophets as in some sense the representatives of Israel as well as of Messiah in their prophetic character, must be admitted; and thus we are brought again to Christ as the last and the ideal Prophet, and to the ground assumed by the profound and far-seeing Calvin, for which he has been severely censured even by Calvinistic writers, and which Vitranga, while professing to defend him, calls a concession to the Jews (*hic aliquid indulgendum censuit Judæis*), instead of a concession to candour, faith, good taste, and common sense. Henderson's exposition of this passage differs from that of other orthodox interpreters only in connecting the Messiah's office, here described specifically, with the future restoration of the Jews. It might have been supposed that some obstruction would have been presented to a literal interpreter in this case by the very strong expression of our Lord, *this day is this prophecy fulfilled in your ears*. But the process of literal interpretation is in practice very simple and convenient. While the personal reference of the words to Christ, which is not affirmed by himself at all, is represented as "the highest possible authority" for so explaining them, the actual fulfilment of the prophecy at that time, which is affirmed as strongly as it could be, goes for nothing. The two parts of this singular process cannot be presented in more striking contrast than by direct quotation. "No principle of accommodation, or of secondary application, can at all satisfy the claims of the announcement, *this day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears*. It must, however, be observed, that this completion merely lay in our Lord's entering upon the public discharge of his prophetic office among the Jews. Far from being confined to the



instructions of that particular day, it was to be exercised in perpetuity, during the continuance of the church upon earth, AND PRE-EMINENTLY AS IT RESPECTS THE JEWS, at the future period here referred to." This principle of gradual or continued fulfilment, not at a single point of time, but through a course of ages, is not only sound and often absolutely necessary to a correct interpretation of the prophets, but the very principle which in a hundred other instances is sacrificed without a scruple to the chimera of a purely "literal" interpretation. Another remarkable comment of the same able writer upon this verse is as follows: "The terms *captives* and *prisoners* are to be taken metaphorically, and have no reference to external restraint." It is only Jerusalem and Zion, and the temple and the trees required in building it, that "must be literally explained." See above on ch. 60 : 13.

V. 2. *To proclaim a year of favour for Jehovah and a day of vengeance for our God, to comfort all mourners.* Gesenius and Rosenmüller explain ה as the idiomatic sign of the genitive when separated from its governing noun, 'Jehovah's year of grace, God's day of vengeance.' It is equally agreeable to usage, and more natural in this case, to give the particle its wider sense as denoting relation in general, a year of favour as to or concerning God, which may here be expressed by the English *for*. Vitringa quotes Clement of Alexandria as inferring from the use of the word *year* in this verse that our Lord's public ministry was only one year in duration, a conclusion paradoxically maintained by Gerard John Vossius, but wholly irreconcilable with the gospel history. The expression is correctly explained by Vitringa as a poetical equivalent to *day*, suggested by the previous allusion to the year of jubilee; and Hitzig adds that there is probably a reference to God's vengeance as a transitory act, and to his mercy as a lasting one. The same two words occur as parallels in ch. 34 : 8. 63 : 4, while in ch. 49 : 8 we have the general expression *time of favour*. For the meaning of the last words of the verse, see above, on ch. 49 : 13 and 57 : 18. They may either be descriptive of sufferers, as the persons needing consolation, or of penitents, as those who shall alone receive it.

V. 3. *To put upon Zion's mourners—to give them a crown instead of ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, a garment of praise for a faint spirit; and it shall be called to them (or they shall be called) the oaks of righteousness, the planting of Jehovah (i. e. planted by Jehovah) to glorify himself.* The construction seems to be interrupted and resumed, a practice not unfrequent with Isaiah. There is no need, therefore, of supplying *joy* after the first verb, as Houbigant and Lowth do. Of the many senses which might here be attached to the verb שָׂם, the most appropriate is that of *putting on*,

as applied to dress, though with another particle, in Gen. 37 : 34. 41 : 42, and often elsewhere. The English Version has *appoint*, and Gesenius *give*; both of which are justified by usage, but less suitable in this case than the one above proposed. By the repetition of the word *mourners*, this verse is wrought into the foregoing context in a mode of which we have had several examples. (See above, on ch. 60 : 15.) *Zion's mourners* may be simply those who mourn in Zion, or those who mourn for her (ch. 66 : 10); but as these ideas are not incompatible, both may be included. (Compare ch. 57 : 18. 60 : 20.) Gesenius speaks of the paronomasia between מִאֲנָחִים and מִאֲנָחִים as something entirely distinct from the antithesis in sense between an ornamental head-dress and the ashes strewn upon the head by mourners. But this relation of ideas may be looked upon as really essential to a true paronomasia. Augusti's ridiculous travesty of this phrase (*Putz für Schmutz*) has been actually revived by De Wette. Ewald with purer taste neglects the verbal assonance, and reproduces Jerome's fine translation (*coronam pro cinere*.) That ointment was not used by mourners but rejoicers, may be learned from a comparison of 2 Sam. 14 : 2 with Ps. 23 : 5. Hitzig derives מִאֲנָחִים from the Kal of מִאֲנָחִים and explains it to mean *brightness* as the parallel term מִאֲנָחִים is applied to a pale colour (Lev. 13 : 21); but a sufficient contrast is afforded by the usual sense *praise*, the whole phrase meaning garments which excite admiration. For the meaning and translation of מִאֲנָחִים, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 21. By oaks of righteousness Gesenius understands such as enjoy the divine favour or blessing; Lowth, such as prove by their flourishing condition that they were planted by him; Henderson, such as bear the fruit of righteousness; Luzzatto, terebinths of long duration, as in ch. 1 : 26; instead of city of righteousness and faithful city, he reads city of permanence, enduring city. The mixture not only of metaphors but also of literal and figurative language in this verse, shows clearly that it has respect to spiritual not external changes. (Compare ch. 44 : 4. 60 : 21.)

V. 4. *And they shall build up the ruins of antiquity, the desolations of the ancients they shall raise, and shall renew the cities of ruin* (i. e. ruined cities), *the desolations of age and age*. Both the thought and language of this verse have been explained already. (See above, on ch. 49 : 8. 54 : 3. 58 : 12.) Lowth, not contented with the difficulty of explaining מִאֲנָחִים in ch. 58 : 12, would insert it here, on the authority of four manuscripts and David Kimchi; but Kocher understands the latter as distinctly pointing out the difference between the places.—The older writers take מִאֲנָחִים as an adjective agreeing with מִאֲנָחִים, but this is feminine; Gesenius and Ewald, as an absolute adjective or noun corresponding to *majores*, ancestors or ancients; Umbreit, as a noun meaning ancient times.—Hendewerk agrees with Gese-

nus, but applies the term specifically to the Jews who were alive at the destruction of the temple. The verb *renew* is applied as in 2 Chr. 15 : 8. 24 : 4.—According to Henderson, this verse and the next “admit of no consistent interpretation except on the principle that the Jews are to be restored to the land of their fathers. The ruins and desolations are those of cities that had once been inhabited, and cannot, without the utmost violence, be applied to the heathen world.” But why may they not be explained as “imagery,” like ch. 60 : 19, 20, or be “taken metaphorically” and without reference to external desolation, like the *captives* and *prisoners* of v. 1? If this be what is meant by “consistent interpretation,” it is very dearly purchased by assuming as a “principle” a fact not mentioned in the text or context, and supposing this to be literally alluded to wherever the hypothesis is possible, while all the accompanying circumstances are explained away as figures.

V. 5. *Then shall stand strangers and feed your flocks, and the children of outland (shall be) your ploughmen and your vinedressers.* For the sense of וְיִשְׁתַּלְּחוּ, see above, on ch. 60 : 10. Kimchi explains *stand* to mean, they shall rise and come for the purpose. Some suppose it to be an idiomatic pleonasm, others a periphrasis for service; but the first is a mere evasion, and the second sense belongs to the verb only when standing in the presence of another is expressed or implied. (Deut. 1 : 38. 1 Kings 1 : 28. Jer. 52 : 12.) The conjunction of these verbs here and in Mic. 5 : 3 may justify the supposition that the primary reference in either case is to a practice of the oriental shepherds. As to the meaning of the prophecy, interpreters are much divided. Some seem to take it in the strictest sense as a promise that the heathen should be slaves to the Jews. (See above, ch. 14 : 2, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 268.) Gesenius understands it as meaning that the Jews should confine themselves to spiritual services, and leave mere secular pursuits to the gentiles. Nearly allied to this is Hitzig's explanation, that the Jews and gentiles are described as sustaining the relation of priests and laymen to each other. Ewald qualifies it still more by describing the relation to be that of the Levites to the other tribes, and even this restricted by the promise in ch. 66 : 21. But that verse shows conclusively that no exclusive promise of Levitical or sacerdotal rank to the Jews, as distinguished from the gentiles, can be here intended. This is confirmed by the language of Peter, who applies the promise of the next verse to the Christian church (1 Pet. 2 : 5). The only way in which all these seeming discrepancies can be reconciled, is by supposing, as we have done hitherto, that even in Ex. 19 : 6 the promise is addressed to Israel not as a nation but a church; so that when the Jewish people ceased to bear this character, they lost all claim to the fulfilment of the promise, which is

still in force and still enures to the benefit of those to whom it was originally given, namely, the Israel of God, that is to say, his church or chosen people. This view of the matter sets aside not only the interpretations which have been already mentioned as confining the promise to the natural descendants of Israel, but also that of Jerome and Procopius, who, although they correctly recognise the church as the object of address, make this a threatening that the Jews shall be supplanted by the gentiles as the pastors or ministers of the flock of God. That the holders of this office might in strict accordance with the usage of Scripture and of this book be described as shepherds, husbandmen, and vinedressers, may be seen by a comparison of ch. 3 : 14. 5 : 1. 11 : 6. 27 : 2. 30 : 23, 24. 40 : 11 with Acts 20 : 28. 1 Cor. 3 : 9. 9 : 7, and with the imagery of our Saviour's parables. It does not follow necessarily, however, that the office here assigned to strangers and foreigners is that of spiritual guides, much less that they are doomed to a degrading servitude. The simplest explanation of the verse is that which understands it as descriptive not of subjugation but of intimate conjunction, as if he had said, those who are now strangers and foreigners shall yet be sharers in your daily occupations and intrusted with your dearest interests. By strangers we are then to understand not gentiles as opposed to Jews, but all who have been aliens from the covenant of mercy and the church of God.—The only comment made by Henderson on this verse is included in the observation already quoted that these two verses (4 and 5) “admit of no consistent interpretation, except on the principle that the Jews are to be restored to the land of their fathers.” How the author would apply this in detail to the fifth verse we can only argue analogically from his exposition of the fourth ; and as he there insists upon a literal rebuilding of the cities once inhabited by Jews as the only sense of which the prophecy admits “without the utmost violence,” so here he may be understood as tacitly believing in a future subjection of the gentiles to the restored Jews, as their husbandmen and shepherds. If, on the other hand, he understands the service here exacted to be metaphorical or spiritual, we have only to repeat what we have said before as to the worth of that “consistent interpretation” which results from the application of this novel “principle.”

V. 6. *And ye (or more emphatically, as for you), the priests of Jehovah shall ye be called, the ministers of our God shall be said to you (or of you), the strength of nations shall ye eat, and in their glory shall ye substitute yourselves (or into their glory shall ye enter by exchange).* Most of the earlier writers, down to Gesenius in his Commentary, agree substantially with Jerome in his version of the last word (*superbietis*), which they regard as a cognate form or an orthographical variation of אֶתְּבַתְּוּ in Ps. 94 : 4, where it seems to denote talking of one's self, and, by a natural transition, glorying

or boasting. Albert Schultens tried to found upon an Arabic analogy the sense of 'providing for one's self,' and Scheid that of 'floating or swimming in abundance.' But all the latest writers, not excepting Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, have gone back to Jarchi's explanation of the word as denoting 'mutual exchange or substitution.' This supposes it to be derived from  $\text{רָצַח}$ , a cognate form and synonyme of  $\text{רָצַח}$ , to change or exchange, occurring only in the Hiphil, Jer. 2 : 11. This word is important as determining the sense not only of the whole verse, but of that before it, by requiring both to be considered as descriptive not of exaltation and subjection, but of mutual exchange, implying intimate association. Some, it is true, attempt to carry out the first idea even here, by making this last word denote an absolute exclusive substitution, i. e. the dispossession of the gentiles by the Jews. But the context, etymology, and usage, all combine to recommend the idea of reciprocal exchange or mutual substitution. Interpreters in seeking a factitious antithesis between the verses, have entirely overlooked the natural antithesis between the clauses of this one verse. They have supposed the contrast intended to be that between servitude and priesthood: 'they shall be your servants, and ye shall be their priests.' But we have seen already that the fifth verse cannot, in consistency with ch. 66 : 10, denote any thing but intimate conjunction and participation. The true antithesis is: 'ye shall be their priests, and they shall be your purveyors; you shall supply their spiritual wants, and they shall supply your temporal wants.' This explanation of the verse, to which we have been naturally led by philological induction and the context, coincides, in a manner too remarkable to be considered accidental, with the words of Paul in writing to the Romans of the contribution made by the churches of Macedonia and Achaia for the poor saints at Jerusalem: *It hath pleased them verily, and their debtors they are* (i. e. they have chosen to do it, and indeed were bound to do it); *for if the gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.* (Rom. 15 : 27.) This may seem, however, to determine the object of address to be the Jews; but no such inference can fairly be deduced from the words of the Apostle, who is only making one specific application of the general truth taught by the Prophet. What was true of the gentile converts then, in relation to the Jewish Christians as their mother-church, is no less true of the heathen now, or even of converted Jews, in reference to the Christians who impart the gospel to them. The essential idea in both places is, that the church, the chosen people, or the Israel of God, is charged with the duty of communicating spiritual things to those without, and entitled in return to an increase of outward strength from those who thus become incorporated with it.—But it is not merely in this lower sense that the people of God are in the law, (Ex. 19 : 20) and the gospel (1 Pet. 1 : 3), as

well as in the prophets, represented as the ministers and priests of God. Not only as instructors and reclaimers of the unbelieving world do they enjoy this sacred dignity, but also as the only representatives of their Great High Priest, in him and through him possessing free access to the fountain of salvation and the throne of grace. (Heb. 4 : 14-16.) In this respect, as in every other which concerns the method of salvation and access to God, there is no distinction of Jew and gentile, any more than of Greek and barbarian, male and female, bond and free ; but all are Christ's, and Christ is God's, and all alike are priests and ministers of God.—It only remains to add, that on the principle of limiting this prophecy to the future restoration of the Jews, it might have been supposed that this verse would be literally understood as promising both temporal and spiritual superiority to other nations ; but according to the able representative of that opinion, who has been so often quoted, it “implies holiness, spirituality, and devotedness to the service of God ; so abundant shall be the supplies, that there shall be no absorption of time by the cares and distraction of business.” This, it seems, is the literal interpretation of the promise that the Jews shall be the priests and ministers of God, and as such shall consume the wealth of the nations and have their riches at command ; for such is the meaning put upon הַתְּהַבְּרָה by Henderson, who traces it to הָצַד, in the sense of commanding. Why there is any less “violence” in this interpretation of the verse before us than in the reference of v. 4 to the universal spread of the gospel, does not appear.

V. 7. *Instead of your shame (ye shall have) double, and (instead of their) confusion, they shall celebrate their portion ; therefore in their land shall they inherit double, everlasting joy shall be to them.* Vitranga and Rosenmüller understand the *therefore* at the beginning of the second clause as deciding that the recompense must be described exclusively in that clause, while the first is wholly occupied with the account of their previous sufferings : ‘Instead of your double shame, and instead of your lamenting (or their exulting), that confusion was their portion,’ etc. From this and other similar unnatural constructions, Gesenius and all the later writers have gone back to the one given in the Targum and by Jarchi, which makes *double* refer not to shame but recompense, and gives הַתְּהַבְּרָה the same subject with the other verbs. It is still considered necessary, however, to assume an enallage of person, so that *your shame* and *their portion* may relate to the same subject. It is not impossible, however, that the Prophet has in view the same two classes who are distinctly mentioned in the preceding verses,—a construction which would not only do away with the enallage, but go far to confirm the explanation which has been already given of those verses as descriptive of mutual participation.—There is no need of explaining הַתְּהַבְּרָה with Gesenius

as an accusative of place, or supplying *in* before it, with the older writers; since the verb may govern it directly, as in Ps. 51 : 16. 59 : 17.—Lowth complains of the confusion in the Hebrew text, and applies an extraordinary remedy, by substituting the Pesbito version, after first amending it.—According to Henderson, this verse means that the honour conferred by God upon the restored Jews, and the estimation in which they shall be held by believing gentiles, will far overbalance the contempt to which they have been subject. The limitation of the passage to the “restored Jews” is as groundless and arbitrary here as elsewhere.—*Double* is used indefinitely to denote a large proportion. Compare ch. 40 : 2.

V. 8. *For I am Jehovah, loving justice, hating* (that which is) *taken away unjustly, and I will give their hire truly, and an everlasting covenant I strike for them.* The Vulgate and the rabbins give  $\text{יִזְלֶה}$  its usual sense of a burnt-offering, and explain the clause to mean that God hates unjust violence, especially (or even) in religious offerings. The modern writers generally follow the Septuagint in making it synonymous with  $\text{יִזְלֶה}$  (which is actually found in a few manuscripts), an explanation countenanced by the undoubted use of the corresponding plural and paragogic forms in that sense. (Job 5 : 16. Ps. 58 : 3. 64 : 7.) Jerome’s objection that all robbery is unjust, would apply to a multitude of other places where there seems to be a redundance of expression, and proceeds upon the false assumption that  $\text{יִזְלֶה}$  necessarily expresses the complex idea *robbery*, whereas it may be here used in its primary and strict sense of violent seizure or privation, the idea of injustice, which is commonly implied, being here expressed.—For the usage of  $\text{יִזְלֶה}$ , see above, on ch. 40 : 11, and for that of  $\text{יִזְלֶה}$ , on ch. 28 : 15. 55 : 3.—This verse is commonly applied to the violence practised upon Israel by the Babylonians. (Compare ch. 42 : 24.) It is rather an enunciation of the general truth, that the divine justice renders absolutely necessary the destruction of his obstinate enemies, and the deliverance of his people from oppression. (Compare 2 Thess. 1 : 6–8.)

V. 9. *Then shall be known among the nations their seed, and their issue in the midst of the peoples. All seeing them shall acknowledge them that they are a seed Jehovah has blessed.* Vitringa, Gesenius, and some later writers, give to  $\text{יָדָע}$  the emphatic sense of being famous or illustrious, as in Ps. 76 : 2, where the parallel expression is  $\text{יָדָעוּ}$ . But in the case before us, the parallelism, far from requiring this peculiar sense, requires the usual one of *being known*, as corresponding better to the phrase *they shall recognise them*. Thus understood, the first clause means that they shall be known among the nations in their true character as a seed or race highly favoured of Jehovah. *Issue* means progeny or offspring, as in ch. 48 : 19.

In order to apply this to the restored Jews, we must depart from the literal and obvious import of *among* and *in the midst*, and understand them as denoting merely that they shall be heard of; for how can they be said to be among and in the midst of the nations at the very time when they are gathered from them to their own land. And yet the whole connexion seems to favour the first meaning, and to show that they are here described as being scattered through the nations, and there recognised by clear distinctive marks as being God's peculiar people, just as the Jews took knowledge of Peter and John that they had been with Jesus. (Acts 4 : 13.) It may be on account of this apparent inconsistency between the obvious sense of this verse and his own adopted "principle," that Henderson has no remark upon it, save that "ב in בְּרִייתוֹ is pleonastic." Some of the older writers, to avoid this assumption, render בְּ *because*,—'all that see them shall acknowledge them, because they are a seed which Jehovah has blessed.' But, as Vitringa well observes, the verb requires a more specific statement of its object. Gesenius and the later writers liken the construction to that in Gen. 1 : 4, God saw the light that it was good; not simply saw that the light was good, but saw the light itself, and in so doing saw that it was good. So here the meaning is not merely that all seeing them shall acknowledge that they are a seed, etc., but that all seeing them shall recognise them by recognising the effects and evidences of the divine blessing.—The ellipsis of the relative is the same in Hebrew and colloquial English.—The true application of the verse is to the Israel of God in its diffusion among all the nations of the earth, who shall be constrained by what they see of their spirit, character, and conduct, to acknowledge that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed. The glorious fulfilment of this promise in its original and proper sense, may be seen already in the influence exerted by the eloquent example of the missionary on the most ignorant and corrupted heathen, without waiting for the future restoration of the Jews to the land of their fathers.

V. 10. (*I will*) joy, *I will joy in Jehovah, let my soul exult in my God; for he hath clothed me with garments of salvation, a mantle of righteousness has he put on me, as the bridegroom adjusts his priestly crown, and as the bride arrays her jewels.* Vitringa here leads his chorus off the stage, where he has kept it since the beginning of v. 4, and lets the church come on, but whether as a male or female he considers a doubtful and perplexing question. To a reader unencumbered with this clumsy theatrical machinery, it must be evident that these are the words of the same speaker who appears at the beginning of this chapter and the next. J. D. Michaelis supposes an allusion to the oriental practice of bestowing the *caftan* or honorary dress upon distinguished culprits who have been acquitted. Luzzatto, in order



to avoid the assumption of a root  $\text{נָצַח}$  in this one case, reads  $\text{נִצְנָחַי}$  from  $\text{נָצַח}$ ; but this, besides being arbitrary, throws the syntax of the tenses into a confusion which, although it may be elsewhere unavoidable, is not to be assumed in any case without necessity.— $\text{הָרָה}$  is to put on or wear, but always used in reference to ornaments.  $\text{פְּלִימִים}$  may signify not merely gems, but ornamental dress in general. (See Deut. 22 : 5.)—Gesenius in his Commentary gives  $\text{הָרָה}$  the general sense of beautifying or adorning; but in his Thesaurus he agrees with the modern writers in acknowledging the derivation from  $\text{פָּהַר}$  a priest, for which no satisfactory etymology has yet been proposed. ‘As the bridegroom priests his turban.’ So Aquila  $\omega\varsigma \nuύμφιον \iotaερατευόμενον \sigmaτεφάρον$ . The reference is no doubt to the sacerdotal mitre, which was probably regarded as a model of ornamental head-dress, and to which  $\text{הָרָה}$  is explicitly applied (Ex. 39 : 28. Ez. 44 : 18).—Salvation and righteousness are here combined, as often elsewhere, to denote the cause and the effect, the justice of God as displayed in the salvation of his people. (See v. 8, above.) Or righteousness may be referred to the people, as denoting the practical justification afforded by their signal deliverance from suffering.

V. 11. *For as the earth puts forth its growth, and as the garden makes its plants to grow, so shall the Lord Jehovah make to grow righteousness and praise before all the nations.* Compare ch. 45 : 8 and Ps. 85 : 11, 12. The exact construction of the first clause may be, *like the earth (which) puts forth*; or the idiom may resemble that in vulgar English which employs *like* as a conjunction no less than a preposition, *like the earth puts forth*. (See above, ch. 8 : 23, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 153.) The studied assonance of  $\text{הָרָה}$ ,  $\text{הָרָה}$ , and  $\text{הָרָה}$ , is retained in the latest versions, after the example of the Vulgate, which has *germen, germinat, and germinabit*. By praise we are to understand the manifestation of excellence in general, by righteousness that of moral excellence in particular. The confusion of these terms by Vitringa and some later writers, as all denoting salvation, is as bad in its effect as it is groundless in its principle.—Knobel thinks it probable that the writer had by this time heard the news of Cyrus’s conquests in the west, by which his somewhat languid hopes had been revived. But there is nothing either in the text or context to restrict this verse to the former restoration of the Jews from the Babylonian exile, any more than to their future restoration to the Holy Land. The glory of the promise is its universality, in which the fulfilment will no doubt be coextensive with the prophecy itself.

## CHAPTER LXII.

THE words of the great Deliverer are continued from the foregoing chapter. He will not rest until the glorious change in the condition of his people is accomplished, v. 1. They shall be recognised by kings and nations as the people of Jehovah, vs. 2, 3. She who seemed to be forsaken is still his spouse, vs. 4, 5. The Church is required to watch and pray for the fulfilment of the promise, vs. 6, 7. God has sworn to protect her and supply her wants, vs. 8, 9. Instead of a single nation, all the nations of the earth shall flow unto her, v. 10. The good news of salvation shall no longer be confined, but universally diffused, v. 11. The glory of the church is the redemption of the world, v. 12.

V. 1. *For Zion's sake I will not be still, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until her righteousness go forth as brightness, and her salvation as a lamp (that) burneth.* Hitzig argues from the absence of the copulative particle, that this is the beginning of a new discourse, and that if the Prophet be the speaker here, he cannot be the speaker in the two preceding verses. Both these conclusions are unfounded; since the particle is frequently omitted where the same subject is still treated, and in the same manner. On the other hand, the Prophet constantly assumes the person and expresses the feelings of different characters in this great drama, without any express intimation of the change in the text itself. Kimchi follows the Targum in explaining this verse as the language of Jehovah, who, as J. D. Michaelis thinks, is here replying to the thanksgiving of the church in the foregoing verses. The rest and silence must be then understood to denote inaction and indifference, as in ch. 42: 14. In like manner Grotius makes it a specific promise of Jehovah that he will not rest until Cyrus is victorious. Cocceius supposes the Messiah to be speaking, and assuring his people of his intercession. Henderson also, on the ground of the frequency with which the Redeemer is thus abruptly introduced by our Prophet, supposes the Messiah to be here represented as interesting himself for the prosperity of Zion, and assuring her that through his mediatorial intercession the Jews shall be restored to their standing in the church of God. Vitringa thinks it clear from the analogy of v. 6, that the silence here prohibited is that of Zion's watchmen or the rulers of the church, of whom he accord-

ingly makes up a chorus in accordance with his favourite theatrical hypothesis. A simpler and more obvious sense is the one now commonly adopted, that the Prophet himself declares his resolution not to cease from the prediction of Zion's future glory, as Forerius supposes, but according to the general opinion, from prayer to God on her behalf. Eichhorn absurdly ascribed the passage to a Jew in Palestine who wrote it on hearing of the edict by Cyrus for the restoration of the exiles. Perhaps the most satisfactory conclusion is, that if the Prophet here speaks of himself, he also speaks by implication of his associates and successors in the office, not excluding Christ as the last and greatest of the series; so that several of the exegetical hypotheses already mentioned may in this way be combined and reconciled. If an exclusive subject must be chosen, it is no doubt the same as in the first verse of the foregoing chapter. The sense of righteousness and salvation is the same as in ch. 61:10 and elsewhere. By a singular change of the abstract to the concrete, the Vulgate has *justus ejus et salvator ejus*.—The going forth here mentioned is the same as in Ps. 19:6, 7; and brightness, or as Lowth translates it, strong light, may specifically signify the dawn of day or the rising of the sun as in Prov. 4:18. Lowth's version of the parallel expression (*blazing torch*) is stronger than the common version, but adheres less closely to the form of the original.

V. 2. *And nations shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory; and there shall be called to thee a new name, which the mouth of Jehovah shall utter* (or pronounce distinctly). Here again the Vulgate applies the abstract terms to Christ, by rendering them *justum tuum, inclytum tuum*. Grotius retains this inaccurate translation, but applies the epithets to Cyrus, as the illustrious patron of the Jews, and at the same time a type of Christ. The substitution of *glory* for *salvation* does not seem to be regarded by any of the modern writers as a proof that *salvation* means *glory*, although quite as clear as that *righteousness* means *salvation*. The mention of kings is intended to imply the submission even of the highest ranks to this new power. (Compare ch. 49:7, 23. 52:15.) Vitranga's explanation of אָרָא as meaning to experience or to know in a spiritual sense, at once perverts the Prophet's meaning, and enfeebles his expression. The idea evidently is that they shall witness it and stand astonished.—The *new name* may be that which is afterwards stated in v. 4, or the expression may be understood more generally as denoting change of condition for the better. (See above, ch. 1:26. 60:14, and compare Jer. 3:16. 33:16. Ezek. 48:35. Rev. 2:17. 3:12.) Some one quoted by Vitranga supposes an allusion to the change in the name of the chosen people from Jew to Christian; but the former name is still applied to the spiritual Israel, in Rom. 2:9 and Rev. 2:9. (See below, on ch. 65:15.) J. D. Michaelis supposes an allusion

to the oriental practice of imposing new names upon towns which have been ruined and rebuilt. The translation of the last verb by Lowth (*shall fix upon thee*) and by Noyes (*shall give thee*) does not convey its exact sense, which, according to the lexicons is that of pronouncing or uttering distinctly, though the common version (*shall name*) is justified by usage. (Compare Num. 1 : 17. 1 Chron. 12 : 31. Amos 6 : 1.) Henderson finds no difficulty in admitting that this clause is not to be understood of a mere name, but has special reference to state and character, according to the common idiom by which any thing is said to be called what it really is. Is it absolutely certain then that Israel, Jerusalem, and Zion, are in all cases strictly national and local designations, and that they never have respect to state and character rather than to natural descent or geographical position ?

V. 3. *And thou shalt be a crown of beauty in Jehovah's hand, and a diadem of royalty in the palm of thy God.* The only difficulty in this verse has respect to the crown's being twice emphatically placed in the hand and not upon the head. Aben Ezra refers to the practice of wearing wreaths and circlets on the arms; but the text speaks expressly of the hand and of the palm, and both the ornaments described are such as were worn upon the head. Some of the older writers quote Suetonius's account of the athletae as wearing the Olympic crown upon the head and carrying the Pythian in the hand; but this, as Rosenmüller well says, was a mere act of necessity, and what is here said has respect to royal not athletic crowns. Ewald agrees with Brentius in supposing that Jehovah is here represented as holding the crown in his hand to admire it; Cocceius and Ewald, for the purpose of exhibiting it to others; Piscator, for the purpose of crowning himself. J. D. Michaelis takes *in the hand of God* to mean at his disposal, or bestowed by him. This is a good sense in itself; but upon whom could Zion or Jerusalem be thus bestowed? Hitzig and Henderson think it perfectly obvious that it would be incongruous to place the crown upon Jehovah's head; and as it could not be placed upon the ground, as in ch. 28 : 1, the only place remaining was the hand! Gesenius understands the hand of God to mean his power or protection, which approaches nearly to Vitringa's explanation of the phrase as meaning he shall hold it fast or keep it safe. (Compare Rev. 3 : 11.) Maurer gives the same sense to the phrase, but connects it with the subject of the verse, and not with the figure of a crown; as if it had been said, under his protection thou shalt be a crown of beauty and a diadem of royalty.—Lowth's version of the last phrase *in the grasp of thy God* is vigorous but inexact. The true sense is the one expressed by Henderson (*the palm*). The original combination of two nouns is more expressive than the adjective construction into which it is resolved by most translators. The *beautiful crown* of Lowth and the *magni-*

*ficent crown* of Noyes, are much inferior to the literal translation, *crown of beauty* or *of glory*, and not required by the parallelism, since the corresponding phrase strictly means a *diadem of royalty*. According to Gataker the last word is added to distinguish the כִּיָּצֵן here mentioned from the sacerdotal turban or mitre.

V. 4. *No more shall it be called to thee* (shalt thou be called) *Azubah* (*Forsaken*), and *thy land shall no more be called Shemamah* (*Desolate*); but thou shalt be called *Hephzibah* (*my delight is in her*), and *thy land Beulah* (*Married*), for *Jehovah delights in thee*, and *thy land shall be married*. The joyful change of condition is further expressed in the Prophet's favourite manner, by significant names. The common version not only mars the beauty of the passage, but renders it in some degree unintelligible to the English reader, by translating the first two names and retaining the others in their Hebrew dress. It is obvious that all four should be treated alike, i. e. that all the Hebrew forms should be retained, or none. Henderson prefers the latter method on the ground that "the names are merely symbolical and will never be employed as proper names." It is probable, however, that they were all familiar to the Jews as female names in real life. This we know to have been the case with two of them: the mother of Jehoshaphat was named Azubah (1 Kings 22 : 42), and the mother of Manasseh Hephzibah (2 Kings 21 : 1). It is better therefore to retain the Hebrew forms, in order to give them an air of reality as proper names, and at the same time to render them intelligible by translation. In the last clause there is reference to the primary meaning of the verb, viz. that of owning or possessing; and as the inhabitants of towns are sometimes called in Hebrew their *possessors*, יֹשְׁבֵי אֶרֶץ a noun derived from this very verb (Josh. 24 : 11. Judg. 9 : 2. 2 Sam. 21 : 12 compared with 2 Sam. 2 : 4), its use here would suggest, as at least one meaning of the promise, thy land shall be inhabited, and so it is translated in the Targum.

V. 5. *For (as) a young man marrieth a virgin, (so) shall thy sons marry thee, and (with) the joy of a bridegroom over a bride shall thy God rejoice over thee*. The particles of comparison are omitted as in Jer. 17 : 21. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that the comparison is only an implied one, and that the strict translation is, 'a young man marrieth a virgin, thy sons shall marry thee,' leaving the copula *and so* to be suggested by the context. So in the other clause there is no absolute need of assuming an ellipsis; since the Hebrew idiom admits of such expressions as *joying the joy* of a bridegroom, just as we may say in English a man *lives the life* of a saint, or *dies the death* of the righteous, both which combina-

tions occur in our translation of the Bible. (Gal. 2 : 20. Num. 23 : 10.) In order to avoid the seeming incongruity of a mother's being married to her sons, Lowth reads בָּנָיֶיךָ thy Builder or Founder; an emendation which J. D. Michaelis rejects in his notes upon Lowth's Lectures, but adopts in his translation of Isaiah. To Gesenius's objection, that the pluralis majesticus is construed with a verb in the singular, Henderson conclusively replies by citing Gen. 20 : 13. 35 : 7. 2 Sam. 7 : 23. The true objection to the change is that it is not necessary. The solution of the difficulty in the common text is afforded by the explanation already given of the strict sense of בָּנָיֶיךָ and the usage of the derivative noun בְּנֵיךָ. As בְּנֵיךָ in v. 4 really means thou shalt be inhabited, so בָּנָיֶיךָ here conveys the same idea as well as that of marriage, and *thy sons* has reference not to the latter but the former sense. Vittinga gives substantially the same explanation, when he says that the Prophet mixes two distinct metaphors in one expression.

Vs. 6, 7. *On thy walls, oh Jerusalem, I have set watchmen; all the day and all the night long they shall not be silent. Ye that remind Jehovah, let there be no rest to you, and give no rest to him, until he establish and until he place Jerusalem a praise in the earth.* According to Vittinga, the prophetic chorus is here relieved by an ecclesiastical one; and as the first words do not well suit this imaginary speaker, he removes all difficulty by supplying *thus saith Jehovah*. To the more obvious supposition that Jehovah is himself the speaker he makes a very singular objection, viz. that the Prophet would hardly have introduced God as speaking for so short a time. According to the Targum and the Rabbins, he is here represented as appointing angels to keep watch over the ruined walls of Zion. Ewald adopts a similar interpretation, and refers to Zech. 1 : 12-17, upon which the Jewish exposition may be founded. Gesenius understands these as the words of the Prophet himself, and by watchmen, devout Jews among the ruins of Jerusalem awaiting the return of the exiles, and praying to God for it. For this limitation of the passage to Jerusalem in ruins and to the period of the exile there is not the least foundation in the text. The promise is a general one, or rather the command that those who are constituted guardians of the church should be importunate in prayer to God on her behalf. מְזַכְּרֵי אֱלֹהֵינוּ admits of three interpretations, all consistent with Isaiah's usage. In ch. 36 : 3, 22 it seems to mean an official recorder or historiographer. In ch. 66 : 3 it means one burning incense as a memorial oblation. Hence זָכָרָה the name used in the law of Moses to denote such an offering. (See Lev. 2 : 2. 5 : 12. 24 : 7. Num. 5 : 26.) In ch. 43 : 26 the verb means to remind God of something which he seems to have forgotten; and as this is an appropriate description of importunate intercession,

it is here entitled to the preference. Gesenius speaks of a belief in the effect of such entreaties as peculiar to the ancient Orientals; but our Lord himself expressly teaches it (Luke 18 : 1), and Tertullian finely says of it, *haec vis Deo grata est*.

V. 8. *Sworn hath Jehovah by his right hand and by his arm of strength, If I give (i. e. I will not give) thy corn any more as food to thine enemies, and if the sons of the outland shall drink thy new wine which thou hast laboured in (I am not God).* On the elliptical formula of swearing, see above, on ch. 22 : 14, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 69. The declaration though conditional in form is in fact an absolute negation. In swearing by his hand and arm, the usual symbols of strength, he pledges his omnipotence for the fulfilment of the promise: 'As sure as I am almighty, thou shalt suffer this no more.'—For the true sense of אֶמְצֵא אֶמְצֵא, see above, on ch. 56 : 3.

V. 9. *For those gathering it shall eat it and shall praise Jehovah, and those collecting it shall drink it in my holy courts (or in the courts of my sanctuary).* The אֲנִי is not directly equivalent to *but*, as some explain it, but retains its proper meaning, in relation to an intermediate thought not expressed. As if he had said, it shall not be so, or, it shall be far otherwise, because those gathering, etc. Lowth has *they that reap the harvest* and *they that gather the vintage*, which, although correct in sense, is not a version but a paraphrase. The indefinite *it* takes the place both of *corn* and *wine*, but all ambiguity is removed by the use of the verbs *eat* and *drink*. Gesenius and Rosenmüller agree with Grotius and the other early writers in supposing an allusion to the sacrificial feasts of the Mosaic law. (See Lev. 19 : 23–25. Deut. 12 : 17, 18. 14 : 23.) But Hitzig and Knobel refer what is here said simply to the sacerdotal standing to be occupied by Israel in reference to the gentiles. (See above on ch. 61 : 6.) To the former supposition Knobel objects that the Levitical feasts had exclusive reference to the tithes and first-fruits, whereas the promise here is universal. This appears to be a needless refinement, and is wholly insufficient to explain away the obvious allusion in the terms of the promise to the ancient institutions of the law. That these, however, are but types and emblems of abundance, and security, and liberty of worship, is acknowledged even by that school of interpreters supposed to be most strenuous in favour of attaching to these promises their strictest sense. Thus Henderson, instead of urging, as consistency might seem to require, that the language of this passage, like that of ch. 60, "must be literally explained," interprets it as meaning that "the enemies of Israel having all been swept away by the powerful judgments of God, the most perfect tranquillity shall reign throughout the land,

and those who may go up to worship at Jerusalem shall enjoy unmolested the fruit of their labour." Here again we may perceive, although unable to reduce to rule, the exercise of a large discretion in determining what shall and what shall not be strictly understood. The literal Jerusalem, with its temple and its courts, and literal corn and wine, appear to be intended; but for aught that appears, the eating and drinking in the courts of that temple is a mere figure for exemption from annoyance and loss while present there for worship.

V. 10. *Pass, pass through the gates, clear the way of the people, raise high, raise high the highway, free (it) from stones, raise a banner (or a signal) over the nations.* Vitranga puts these words into the mouth of his prophetic chorus; Maurer thinks they may be uttered by the watchmen of v. 6; but most interpreters appear to be contented with the obvious hypothesis that Isaiah is here speaking in the name of God. As to the object of address, Eichhorn supposes it to be the Jews still lingering among the ruins of the Holy City; Maurer, the remaining population of that city, which he seems to think considerable; Gesenius, the exiled Jews in Babylon and other lands; Henderson, "the inhabitants of the cities that may lie in the way of the returning Israelites." The readiness with which these interpreters accommodate the terms of the text to their several hypotheses may show how little ground there is for any definite conclusion, and thus serve to recommend the hypothesis of Hitzig, that the order is supposed to be given to those whose duty it is to execute it. Another subject of dispute is the direction of the march required. According to Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Henderson, 'pass through the gates' means, go out of them; according to Gesenius and others, go into them. It means neither one nor the other, but go through them, leaving the direction to be gathered from the context, which, combined with the analogy of ch. 57: 14, makes it probable that what is here described is the entrance of the nations into Zion or the church, an event so frequently and fully set forth in the preceding chapters. The use of the term גוֹיִם in the last clause is so favourable to this exposition, or at least so adverse to the supposition that the restoration of the Jews from Babylon is here intended, that Gesenius, in order to evade this difficulty, has recourse to an expedient which he would have laughed to scorn if used in vindication of the truth of prophecy. This is the explanation of גוֹיִם as meaning tribes, or more specifically those of Israel, on the authority as he alleges of Deut. 32: 8. 33: 3, 19. Nothing but extreme exegetical necessity could warrant this interpretation of the word here, if it were true that Moses so employed it. But this very fact is still more doubtful than the one which it is called in to confirm, or rather it is still more certain that גוֹיִם in Deuteronomy denotes the gentiles than it is in this case. On the



other hand, the singular form  $\text{בָּנֵי}$  is used repeatedly in these very prophecies to signify the gentiles or mankind at large. (See above, ch. 42 : 5. 49 : 8.) It may therefore be alleged in opposition to the views which have been quoted, with as much plausibility at least, that this is not a prediction of the former restoration of the Jews from Babylon, or of their future restoration from the ends of the earth, but of the increase of the church or chosen people by the accession of the gentiles. The gates are then the gates of the ideal Zion or Jerusalem, the passage is an inward not an outward passage, and the exhortation of the text is one to all concerned, or all who have the opportunity to take away obstructions and facilitate their entrance. The argument in favour of the reference to Babylon, derived from the analogy of ch. 57 : 19, lies equally against the hypothesis of Henderson, who cannot consistently repel it, as we do, by appealing to our uniform assertion that the Babylonish exile is referred to only as a signal example of deliverance. What is said in one place, therefore, with acknowledged reference to Babylon proves nothing where the same generic terms are used without any trace of local allusion. The verb  $\text{בָּנֵי}$ , which is ambiguous (compare ch. 5 : 2 and 2 Sam. 16 : 6), is here determined by the addition of the phrase  $\text{בְּנֵי אֱמֻנָה}$ , in which the noun is used as a collective. In the last clause, some explain  $\text{בָּנֵי}$  with the Septuagint and Vulgate as simply meaning *to*, others with J. D. Michaelis *for*. Knobel not only makes it perfectly synonymous with  $\text{בָּנֵי}$ , but then notes this imaginary fact as one proof of a later age. The most exact and at the same time most poetical idea is Luther's, 'raise the banner high above the nations ;' to which Hitzig theoretically acquiesces, but translates the preposition *for*, like others.

V. 11. *Behold, Jehovah has caused it to be heard to the end of the earth, Say ye to the daughter of Zion, behold, thy salvation cometh, behold, his reward is with him and his hire before him.* There is some doubt as to the connexion of the clauses. It may be questioned whether the verse contains the words uttered by Jehovah to the end of the earth, and if so, whether these continue to the end of the verse, or only to the third *behold*. Hitzig supposes  $\text{וַיְהִי כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַבְּנֵי אֱמֻנָה$  to be absolutely used, and to denote that God has made a proclamation, but without saying what ; after which the Prophet goes on to address the messengers mentioned in ch. 40 : 9 and 52 : 7. But as the verb  $\text{וַיְהִי כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' אֶת הַבְּנֵי אֱמֻנָה$  seems to require an object after it, and as the words immediately succeeding are precisely such as might thus be uttered, it is certainly most natural to understand what follows as the words or substance of the proclamation. It has also been made a question whether the pronoun *his* refers to Jehovah or to the nearest antecedent, *salvation* ; and if the latter, whether that word is to be translated *saviour*, as it is by Lowth and in the ancient versions. This last is a question of mere form, and

the other of but little exegetical importance, since the saviour or salvation meant is clearly represented elsewhere as identical with God himself. The last clause is a repetition of ch. 40 : 10, and if ever the identity of thought, expression, and connexion, served to indicate identity of subject, it is so in this case. The reader therefore may imagine the inducement which could lead even Henderson to speak of the two places as "strictly parallel in language, though the advents in the two passages are different." If this be so, then nothing can ever be inferred from similarity of language, and an unlimited discretion is allowed to the interpreter to parry all attacks upon his theory by stoutly maintaining a diversity of subject in the very places where the opposite appears to be most manifest. Another arbitrary statement rendered necessary in a dozen lines by the determination to apply the passage to the future restoration of the Jews to Palestine, is that "the daughter of Zion means here the rightful inhabitants of Jerusalem scattered over the face of the earth," a sense which even this interpreter attaches to the words in this place only, out of the many in which Isaiah uses them. But while these violent expedients are required to bring the passage even into seeming application to the future restoration of the Jews, it is, if possible, still more inapplicable to their former restoration from the Babylonish exile. In the first place, why should the ends of the earth be summoned to announce this event to Zion? Hitzig replies, as we have seen already, that the two clauses are entirely unconnected; Knobel more boldly explains end of the earth to mean "the end of the oriental world, whose west end touched the Mediterranean sea, i. e. Palestine"! Whether a theory requiring such contrivances can well be sound, is left to the decision of the reader. But another difficulty in the way of this interpretation is presented by the last clause. Even supposing that the old opinion as to this clause is the true one, and that *his reward* means that which he bestows, in what sense can the restoration of the Jews from Babylon be represented as the coming of salvation (or a saviour) to the daughter of Zion, bringing a reward? The daughter of Zion is throughout these prophecies the suffering person, and the object of encouraging address. Even where it primarily means the city, it is only as the centre, representative, and symbol of the church or chosen people. How then could the saviour be described as coming to his people, bringing themselves with him as a recompense for what they had endured. But if, for reasons given in expounding ch. 40 : 10, we understand *his reward* as meaning that which he receives, what constitutes this recompense in the case supposed? The image then presented is that of Jehovah coming back to his people, and bringing his people with him as his recompense. The incongruity of this verse with the Babylonian theory was either overlooked by its ablest modern champions, or occasioned such laconic comments as that of Rosenmüller, who contents himself with saying

that the last clause has already been explained in the note upon ch. 40 : 10 ; while Gesenius still more briefly says, “dieselben Worte 40 : 10 ;” and Maurer, “eadem verba legimus 40 : 10.” This is the entire exposition of the whole verse by these three distinguished writers, while those of later date, who have been less reserved, have found themselves driven to the forced constructions which have been already mentioned. On the other hand, the plain sense of the words, the context here, and the analogy of ch. 40 : 10, are all completely satisfied by the hypothesis that the Messiah (or Jehovah) is here described as coming to his people, bringing with him a vast multitude of strangers, or new converts, the reward of his own labours, and at the same time the occasion of a vast enlargement to his church. At the same time, let it be observed that this hypothesis is not one framed for the occasion, without reference, or even in opposition to the previous explanation of passages in every point resembling this, but one suggested at the outset of the book, and found upon comparison, at every step of the interpretation, to be more satisfactory than any other.

V. 12. *And they shall call them the Holy People, the redeemed of Jehovah, and thou shalt be called Derushah (sought for), Ir-lo-nee-zabah (City not forsaken).* The first verb is indefinite, they (i. e. men) shall call ; hence the parallel expression has the passive form. On the construction and the idiomatic use of *call*, see ~~the Earlier Prophecies~~, p. 18. The distinction here so clearly made by the use of the second and third persons, is supposed by the modern Germans to be that between the city and her returning citizens ; but this, as we have seen repeatedly before, involves a constant vacillation between different senses of Jerusalem and Zion in the foregoing context. The only supposition, which can be consistently maintained, is that it always means the city, but the city considered merely as a representative or sign of the whole system and economy of which it was the visible centre. The true distinction is between the church or chosen people as it is, and the vast accessions yet to be received from the world around it. Even the latter shall be honoured with the name of Holy People, while the church itself, becoming coextensive with the world, shall cease to be an object of contempt or disregard to God or man. The sense of *sought for* seems to be determined by the parallel description in Jer. 30 : 14, as expressing the opposite of the complaint in ch. 49 : 14.—According to Henderson, the meaning of the verse is that “the Jews shall now,” i. e. after their restoration to their own land, “be a holy people, redeemed from all iniquity, and thronging their ancient capital for religious purposes.” The only prospect opened to the gentiles in the whole prediction, thus expounded, is that of becoming ploughmen, shepherds, and purveyors to the favoured nation.

## CHAPTER LXIII.

THE influx of the gentiles into Zion having been described in the preceding verses, the destruction of her enemies is now sublimely represented as a sanguinary triumph of Jehovah or the Messiah, vs. 1-6. The Prophet then supposes the catastrophe already past, and takes a retrospective view of God's compassions towards his people, and of their unfaithfulness during the old economy, vs. 7-14. He then assumes the tone of earnest supplication, such as might have been offered by the believing Jews when all seemed lost in the destruction of their commonwealth and temple, vs. 15-19.

V. 1. *Who (is) this coming from Edom, bright (as to his) garments from Bozrah, this one adorned in his apparel, bending in the abundance of his strength? I, speaking in righteousness, mighty to save.* The hypothesis that this is a detached prophecy, unconnected with what goes before or follows, is now commonly abandoned as a mere evasion of the difficulty. Hitzig indeed adheres to it in order to sustain his theory as to the gradual composition of the book. The dramatic form of the description is recognised by modern writers, without the awkward supposition of a chorus, adopted by Vitringa and Lowth. It is not necessary even to introduce the people as a party to the dialogue. The questions may be naturally put into the mouth of the Prophet himself. Interpreters are much divided as to the Edom of this passage. That it is not merely a play upon the meaning of the name (viz. red), is clear from the mention of the chief town, Bozrah. The reference to Rome, whether the Roman Empire or the Romish Church, is purely fanciful. J. D. Michaelis consistently applies the passage, like the foregoing context, to a future event; but Henderson unexpectedly pronounces it unjustifiable "to apply it to any future judgments to be inflicted on the country formerly occupied by the Edomites." His own opinion is that "the object of the Prophet is to deduce an argument from God's dealings with his ancient people in favour of his graciously regarding them in their then distantly future dispersion." He does not explain why this is any less "unjustifiable" than the reference of the passage to a "distantly future" event. While J. D. Michaelis thus makes both the threatening and the promise alike future, and Henderson makes one distantly future and the other distantly past, Knobel makes both past, and supposes Jehovah to be here described merely as coming through the land

of Edom from the slaughter of the nations confederate with Croesus, who had just been overthrown by Cyrus in a battle near Sardis. With these exceptions, most interpreters, even of the modern German school, suppose Edom to be here, as in ch. 34, the representative of Israel's most inveterate enemies. For this use of the name, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 560. The connexion with what goes before, as Rosenmüller states it, is that the restored Jews might apprehend the enmity of certain neighbouring nations, who had rejoiced in their calamity; and that the prophecy before us was intended to allay this apprehension.  $\text{הִרְרִיחַ}$  strictly means fermented, then acetous, sharp, but is here applied to vivid colour, like the Greek  $\delta\acute{\xi}\iota\lambda\iota\ \chi\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ .  $\text{הִרְרִיחַ}$  properly means swollen, inflated, but is here metaphorically used in the sense of adorned, or, as Vitringa thinks, terrible, inspiring awe. For the sense of the word  $\text{זָבַח}$ , see above, on ch. 51: 14. Vitringa understands it to mean here the restless motion of one not yet recovered from the excitement of a conflict; Gesenius, the tossing or throwing back of the head as a gesture indicative of pride; Hitzig, the leaning of the head to one side with a similar effect. The Vulgate version (*gradiens*) conveys too little. *Speaking in righteousness* is understood by most of the modern writers in the sense of speaking about it or concerning it, in which case righteousness must have the sense of deliverance, or at least be regarded as its cause. It is much more natural, however, to explain the phrase as meaning, I that speak in truth, I who promise and am able to perform.—The terms of this description are applied in Rev. 19: 13 to the victorious Word of God, a name which has apparently some reference to  $\text{הִרְרִיחַ}$ .

V. 2. *Why (is there) redness to thy raiment, and (why are) thy garments like (those of) one treading in a wine-press?* The adjective  $\text{אֵדָם}$  is here used substantively, just as we speak of a deep red in English. Or the word here employed may be explained as the infinitive of  $\text{אָדַם}$  to be red. There is no need, in any case, of making the  $\text{ל}$  pleonastic or a sign of the nominative case, with Rosenmüller and some older writers, or of reading  $\text{מִלְבוּשָׁיךְ}$  with Lowth. Twenty-one manuscripts and one edition give the noun a plural form, but of course without effect upon the meaning. The allusion is of course to the natural red wine of the east, that of some vineyards on Mount Lebanon, according to J. D. Michaelis, being almost black. The  $\text{תֵּיבָה}$  is the wine-press properly so called, as distinguished from the  $\text{בֵּרֶךְ}$  or reservoir. It is a slight but effective stroke in this fine picture, that the first verse seems to speak of the stranger as still at a distance, whereas in the second he has come so near as to be addressed directly.

V. 3. *The press I have trodden by myself, and of the nations there was not a man with me; and I will tread them in my anger and trample them in*

*my fury, and their juice shall spirt upon my garments, and all my vesture I have stained.* The word here used for *press* is different from that in the foregoing verse, and occurs elsewhere only in Hagg. 2 : 16. According to its seeming derivation, it denotes the place where grapes are crushed or broken, as פַּדְדָּה does the place where they are pressed or trodden. The comparison suggested in the question (v. 2) is here carried out in detail. Being asked why he looks like the treader of a wine-press, he replies that he has been treading one, and that alone, which Rosenmüller understands to mean without the aid of labourers or servants. The meaning of the figure is then expressed in literal terms. ‘Of the nations there was not a man with me.’ This expression and the otherwise inexplicable alternation of the tenses make it probable that two distinct treadings are here mentioned, one in which he might have expected aid from the nations, and another in which the nations should themselves be trodden down as a punishment of this neglect. Or the futures may denote merely a relative futurity, i. e. in reference to the act first mentioned. The more general opinion is, however, that but one act of treading is here mentioned, and that the nations are themselves represented as the grapes. In order to make this appear more natural, Jarchi and Tremellius explain *with me* as meaning *against me*, or to contend with me, which is not justified by usage. The most satisfactory solution seems to be that these words are added to convey the idea that all the nations were on the adverse side, none on that of the conqueror. The sense will then be not that they refused to join in trampling others, but simply that they were among the trampled. As if he had said, I trod the press alone, and all the nations, without exception, were trodden in it. By all the nations we are of course to understand all but God’s people. The principle of this limitation is recognised by Knobel, though he makes an absurd application of it by supposing the exception to be Cyrus and the Persians, who derived no aid from other nations in the overthrow of Croesus. Henderson understands it as implying that the punishment here mentioned was inflicted upon Edom without the intervening aid of any foreign power, which he thinks was verified in their subjection by a native Jewish conqueror, Hyrcanus. The meaning given to צָבַח is justified by the use of the verb in Arabic as meaning to sprinkle. צָבַח is a mixed form, considered by the modern Germans as a proof of later date; but such anomalies are usually introduced by slow degrees, and may for the most part be traced back to certain singularities of diction in the older books. The treading of the wine-press alone is an expression often applied in sermons and in religious books and conversation to our Saviour’s sufferings. This application is described as customary in his own time by Vitringa, who considers it as having led to the forced exposition of the whole passage by the Fathers and Cocceius as a description of Christ’s passion. While the impossibility of

such a sense in the original passage cannot be too strongly stated, there is no need of denying that the figure may be happily accommodated in the way suggested; as many expressions of the Old Testament may be applied to different objects with good effect, provided we are careful to avoid confounding such accommodations with the strict and primary import of the passage.

V. 4. *For the day of vengeance (is) in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come.* For the sense of *day* and *year* in this connexion, see above, on ch. 61 : 2. *In my heart*, i. e. my mind or purpose. Some writers needlessly and arbitrarily change *my redeemed* to *my redemption*. It is not even necessary to explain the participle in a future sense (*to be redeemed*), since their redemption was as firmly settled in the divine purpose as the day of vengeance.

V. 5. *And I look, and there is none ~~leaping~~ ; and I stand aghast, and there is none sustaining ; and my own arm saves for me, and my fury it sustains me.* These expressions have already been explained in ch. 59 : 16. Hitzig's idea that this is the original, and that a quotation from memory, and his inference that this is the older composition, are alike unfounded. With equal if not greater plausibility it might be argued from the greater regularity and finish of the sentence here, that it is an improvement on the other. Fury here takes the place of righteousness in ch. 59 : 16, not as a synonyme but as an equivalent. God's wrath is but the executioner and agent of his justice. Upon either he might therefore be described as exclusively relying. The present form is used in the translation, on account of the uncertainty in which the use of the tenses is involved, and which may arise in part from an intentional confusion of the past and future in the mind of one who had begun a great work, and was yet to finish it. hel

V. 6. *And I tread the nations in my anger, and I make them drunk in my wrath, and I bring down to the earth their juice.* The use of the word *tread* leads to the resumption of the figure of a wine-press, which is employed besides this passage in Lam. 1 : 15. Joel 4 : 13. Rev. 14 : 19, 20. For אֶשְׁכַּרְם I make them drunk, most of the modern writers since Cappellus read אֶשְׁכַּרְם I crush them; which is not only confirmed by many manuscripts and some editions, as well as by the Targum, but recommended by its suiting the connexion better. This very circumstance, however, throws suspicion on the emendation, as a device to get rid of a difficulty. In order to connect the common reading with the context, we have only to assume a mixture of metaphors, such as we continually meet with in Isaiah. There

is no need of going with Vitringa to the extravagant and revolting length of supposing that the nations are described as rolling in their own blood till it gets into their mouths and down their throats. There is simply a sudden change of figure, which is not only common, but characteristic of Isaiah, notwithstanding Gesenius's paradoxical denial.

V. 7. *The mercies of Jehovah I will cause to be remembered, the praises of Jehovah according to all that Jehovah hath done for us, and the great goodness to the house of Israel which he hath done for them, according to his compassions and according to the multitude of his mercies.* The sudden change of tone in this verse has of course led to many suppositions as to its connexion with what goes before and follows. The easiest expedient is the one which Lowth adopts, by denying all immediate connexion with what goes before; but it is also the least satisfactory. Ewald begins the closing section of the book here, and thinks it quite indubitable that events had made considerable progress between the dates of the sixth and seventh verses. The prevalent opinion among Christian interpreters is that we have here the beginning of a prophecy relating to the future restoration of Israel. Even Vitringa, who shows little partiality to this hypothesis in the foregoing chapters, acquiesces in it here. His arguments, however, only go to show that this interpretation is better than the one which applies the passage to the Babylonish exile. Lowth simply says that it is so, without assigning any reason. On the general principle assumed throughout our exposition as to the design and subject of these prophecies, a more general application is entitled to the preference, and the passage must be understood as relating to the favours experienced and the sins committed by the chosen people throughout the period of the old dispensation. There is no need of assuming any speaker but the Prophet himself. The plural form *mercies*, may be intended to denote abundance. *I will cause to be remembered*, may have reference to men; in which case the phrase is equivalent to celebrate, record, or praise. But as these acknowledgments are merely preparatory to a prayer that God would renew his ancient favours to them, it is better to understand it as meaning, I will cause God himself to remember, or remind him, in which application the verb is often used, e. g. in the titles of Ps. 38 and 70. (See Hengstenberg on the Psalms, vol. II. p. 293.) There is no need of giving to *ההלות* the factitious sense of praiseworthy acts or virtues, as the Septuagint does (*ἀρεταίς*). The proper sense of *praises* is appropriate and sufficient. For the sense of *קָנַל* and *קָנַל*, see above on ch. 59 : 18. We have here another illustration of the ease with which the parallelism may be urged on different sides of the same question. It had been made a question whether *רַב טִיב* is governed by *אוֹבֵי־י* or by *כַּנְל*. The former is



maintained by Maurer, the latter by Hitzig, on precisely the same ground: *ita postulante parallelismo*, says the one—*diess verlangt der Parallelismus*, says the other.

V. 8. *And he said, Only they are my people, (my) children shall not lie (or deceive), and he became a saviour for them.* To the general acknowledgment of God's goodness to his people, there is now added a specification of his favours, beginning with the great distinguishing favour by which they became what they were. This verse is commonly explained as an expression of unfounded confidence and hope on God's part, *surely they are my people, children that will not lie*. This must then be accounted for as anthropopathy; but although the occurrence of this figure in the Scriptures is indisputable, it is comparatively rare, and not to be assumed without necessity. Besides, the explanation just referred to rests almost entirely on the sense attached to אֵל as a mere particle of asseveration. Now, in every other case where Isaiah uses it, the restrictive sense of *only* is not admissible merely, but necessary to the full force of the sentence. It is surely not the true mode of interpretation, to assume a doubtful definition for the sake of obtaining an unsatisfactory and offensive sense. Another advantage of the strict translation is, that it makes the Prophet go back to the beginning of their course, and instead of setting out from the hopes which God expressed after the choice of Israel, records the choice itself. Thus understood, the first clause is a solemn declaration of his having chosen Israel, to the exclusion of all other nations. *Only they (and no others) are my people*. The objection which may seem to arise from the collocation of אֵל with אֱלֹהֵי rather than אֱלֹהֵי, applies only to the occidental idiom; since in Hebrew a qualifying particle is often attached to the first word of the clause, even when it is more closely related to some other. But even if the force of this objection were allowed, it could not prove that אֵל must here be taken in a sense which does not properly belong to it, but only that it must be made to qualify אֱלֹהֵי. The sense will then be, they are only my people, i. e. nothing else; which, although less satisfactory than the other sense, is still far better than the one which makes Jehovah here express a groundless expectation.—The second clause may possibly mean, *(their) sons shall not deal falsely*, i. e. degenerate from their fathers' faith. In either case, the future is the future of command, as in the decalogue, not that of mere prediction. Gesenius explains אֱלֹהֵי as an elliptical expression, to be supplied by the analogy of Ps. 44 : 18 and 89 : 34; but it is simpler to understand it absolutely, as in 1 Sam. 15 : 29.—The English Version, *so he was their saviour*, is a needless departure from the simplicity of the original, and aggravates the misinterpretation of the first clause, by suggesting that he

was their saviour because he believed they would be faithful. The verse in Hebrew simply states two facts, without intimating any causal relation between them. He chose them *and* he saved them.

V. 9. *In all their enmity he was not an enemy, and the angel of his face (or presence) saved them, in his love and in his sparing mercy he redeemed them, and he took them up and carried them all the days of old.* The first clause is famous as the subject of discordant and even contradictory interpretations. These have been multiplied by the existence of a doubt as to the text. The Masora notes this as one of fifteen places in which אֱלֹהִים *not* is written by mistake for ה' *to him* or *it*. Another instance of the same alleged error in the text of Isaiah occurs in ch. 9 : 2. (See the Earlier Prophecies, p. 156.) Rabbi Jonah, according to Solomon Ben Melek, understands the amended text to mean that in all their distress they still had a rock or refuge, making אֱלֹהִים synonymous with צִיּוּן, which is wholly unsustained by usage. A far better sense is that of Aben Ezra, that in all their distress there was distress to him, or as the English Version renders it, in all their affliction he was afflicted. This explanation, with the text on which it is founded, and which is exhibited by a number of manuscripts and editions, is approved by Luther, Vitringa, Clericus, Hitzig, Ewald, Umbreit, Hendewerk, and Knobel. It is favoured, not only by the strong and affecting sense which it yields, but by the analogy of Judges 10 : 16. 11 : 7, in one of which places the same phrase is used to denote human suffering, and in the other God is represented as sympathizing with it. The objections to it are, that it gratuitously renders necessary another anthropopathic explanation ; that the natural collocation of the words, if this were the meaning, would be ה' אֱלֹהִים, as in 2 Sam. 1 : 26 ; that the negative is expressed by all the ancient versions ; and that the critical presumption is in favour of the Kethib, or textual reading, as the more ancient, which the Masorites merely corrected in the margin, without venturing to change it, and which ought not to be now abandoned, if a coherent sense can be put upon it, as it can in this case. Jerome, in his version, makes the clause assert the very opposite of that sense which is usually put upon the marginal reading, or *Keri*, *in omni tribulatione eorum non est tribulatus*. The Septuagint makes it contradict the next clause, as it is usually understood, by rendering it οὐ πρόσωπον οὐδὲ ἄγγελος ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς. This is followed by Lowth even so far as to connect the first words of the clause with the preceding verse : *and he became their saviour in all their distress. It was not an envoy nor an angel of his presence that saved them*, etc. Not to mention other difficulties in the way of this interpretation, its making אֱלֹהִים synonymous with צִיּוּן is wholly arbitrary. Another forced construction, given by Cocceius, and

approved by Rosenmüller, Maurer, and almost by Gesenius, explains *there was not an adversary, and he saved them*, to mean, there scarcely was (or no sooner was there) an adversary, when he saved them. The only example of this harsh and obscure syntax which is cited, namely 2 Kings 20 : 4, is nothing to the purpose, because there it is expressly said, and no doubt meant, that Isaiah had not gone out into the court; whereas here it cannot possibly be meant that Israel had no adversaries. A much more natural construction is the one proposed by Jerome in his commentary, ‘in all their affliction he did not afflict (them);’ which, however, is scarcely reconcilable with history. This difficulty is avoided by Henderson’s modification of the same construction, *in all their affliction he was not an adversary*, i. e. although he afflicted them, he did not hate them. This agrees well with what immediately follows, but is still liable to the objection that it takes צָרָה and צָרָה in entirely different senses, which can only be admissible in case of necessity. Others accordingly regard them as synonymous expressions, and in order to remove the appearance of a contradiction, supply some qualification of the second word. Thus Jarchi understands the clause to mean that in all their affliction there was no such affliction as their sins had merited. Aurivillius supposes the masculine form to express the same thing with the feminine essentially, but in a higher degree, ‘in all their affliction there was no extreme or fatal affliction.’ Gesenius rejects this explanation of the forms as too artificial, but adopts a similar interpretation of the clause, which he explains to mean that in all their distress there was no real or serious distress, none that deserved the name; which could hardly be alleged with truth. It is also hard to account in this case for the use of the different forms צָרָה and צָרָה to express the same idea, after rejecting Aurivillius’s solution. This circumstance appears to point to an interpretation which shall give the words essentially the same sense, yet so far modified as to explain the difference of form. Such an interpretation is the one suggested by De Wette’s version of the clause, which takes צָרָה and צָרָה as correlative derivatives from one sense of the same root, but distinguished from each other as an abstract and a concrete, *enemy* and *enmity*. A real difficulty in the way of this interpretation, is the want of any usage to sustain the latter definition, which, however, is so easily deducible from the primary meaning, and so clearly indicated by the parallel expression, that it may perhaps be properly assumed in a case where the only choice is one of difficulties. Thus understood, the clause simply throws the blame of all their conflicts with Jehovah on themselves: *in all their enmity (to him) he was not an enemy (to them)*. The proof of this assertion is that *he saved them*, not from Egypt merely, but from all their early troubles, with particular reference perhaps to the period of the Judges, in the history of which this verb very frequently occurs. (See Judges 2 : 16, 18. 3 : 15. 6 : 14. etc.) This salvation is ascribed,

however, not directly to Jehovah, but to *the angel of his face or presence*. Kimchi explains this to mean the agency of second causes, which he says are called in Scripture angels or messengers of God. Abarbenel gives it a personal sense, but applies it to the angels collectively. Jarchi makes it not only a personal but an individual description, and explains it to mean Michael, as the tutelary angel of Israel (Dan. 12 : 1). Aben Ezra, with sagacity and judgment superior to all his brethren, understands it of the angel whom Jehovah promised to send with Israel (Ex. 23 : 20-23), and whom he did send (Ex. 14 : 19. Num. 20 : 16), and who is identified with the presence of Jehovah (Ex. 33 : 14, 15) and with Jehovah himself (Ex. 33 : 12). The combination of these passages determines the sense of *the angel of his presence*, as denoting the angel whose presence was the presence of Jehovah, or in whom Jehovah was personally present, and precludes the explanation given by Clericus and many later writers, who suppose it to mean merely an angel who habitually stands in the presence of Jehovah (1 Kings 22 : 19), just as human courtiers or officers of state are said to see the king's face (Jer. 52 : 25). Even Hitzig admits the identity of the angel of Jehovah's presence with Jehovah himself, but explains it away by making angel an abstract term, not denoting in any case a person, but the manifestation of Jehovah's presence at a certain time and place. Hendewerk, on the other hand, alleges that the angel is always represented as a personality distinct from Jehovah himself. By blending these concessions from two writers of the same great school, we obtain a striking testimony, if not to the absolute truth, to the scriptural correctness of the old Christian doctrine, as expounded with consummate force and clearness by Vitringa in his comment on this passage, viz. the doctrine that the Angel of God's presence, who is mentioned in the passages already cited, and from time to time in other books of the Old Testament (Gen. 28 : 13. 31 : 11. 48 : 16. Ex. 3 : 2. Josh. 5 : 14. Judges 13 : 6. Hos. 12 : 5. Zech. 3 : 1. Mal. 3 : 1. Ps. 34 : 8), was that divine person who is represented in the New as the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person (Heb. 1 : 3), the image of God (2 Cor. 4 : 4. Col. 1 : 15), in whose face the glory of God shines (2 Cor. 4 : 6), and in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the godhead bodily (Col. 2 : 9). Lowth's unfortunate adoption of the Septuagint version or perversion of the text, led him to argue ingeniously, but most unfairly, that although the Angel of Jehovah's presence is sometimes identified with Jehovah himself, yet in other places he is explicitly distinguished from him, and must therefore be considered as a creature ; so that in the case before us, which is one of those last mentioned, the honour of Israel's deliverance is denied to this angel and exclusively ascribed to God himself. All this not only rests upon a fanciful and false translation, but is contradicted by the unanimous consent of Jews

and Infidels as well as Christians, that the salvation of God's people is directly ascribed to the Angel of Jehovah's presence.—Vitringa insists, perhaps with too much pertinacity, upon applying what immediately follows to the Angel and not to Jehovah: first, because the question is in fact a doubtful one, and both constructions are grammatical; and secondly, because it is a question of no moment, after the essential identity of the Angel and Jehovah has been ascertained from other quarters.—The Hebrew  $\text{זֶרְעֹךָ}$ , from  $\text{זָרַע}$  to *sow*, has no exact equivalent in English, and can only be expressed by a periphrasis. The same affections towards Israel are ascribed to Jehovah in the Pentateuch. (Deut. 32 : 9–11. Ps. 77 : 15.)—For the true sense of what follows, as to taking up and carrying them, see above, on ch. 46 : 3. — $\text{לְעוֹלָם}$ , which Vitringa regards as identical with the Latin *olim*, is like it applied as well to the past as to the future. It originally signifies unknown or indefinite duration, and in such a case as this, remote antiquity; the whole phrase being used precisely in the same sense as by Amos (9 : 11) and Micah (7 : 14).—The verb *redeem* is not only one of frequent occurrence in these prophecies (ch. 43 : 1. 44 : 22, 23. 48 : 20. 49 : 7. etc.), but is expressly applied elsewhere to the redemption of Israel from Egypt (Ex. 6 : 5. Ps. 74 : 2. 77 : 16), and is therefore applicable to all other analogous deliverances.

V. 10. *And they rebelled and grieved his holy spirit (or spirit of holiness), and he was turned for them into an enemy, he himself fought against them.* The pronoun at the beginning is emphatic: they on their part, as opposed to God's forbearance and long-suffering. There seems to be an allusion in this clause to the injunction given to the people at the exodus, in reference to the Angel who was to conduct them: Beware of him and obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him (Ex. 23 : 21). From this analogy Vitringa argues that the verse before us has specific reference to the disobedience or resistance offered by the people to the Angel of God's presence. As the next clause may have reference to Jehovah, it cannot be demonstrated from it that the spirit here mentioned is a personal spirit, and not a mere disposition or affection. But the former supposition, which is equally consistent with the language here used, in itself considered, becomes far more probable when taken in connexion with the preceding verse, where a personal angel is joined with Jehovah precisely as the Spirit is joined with him here. Assuming that the following words relate to this Spirit, he is then described as endued with personal susceptibilities and performing personal acts, and we have in these two verses a distinct enumeration of the three divine persons. That the Spirit of this verse, like the Angel of the ninth, is represented as divine, is evident not only from a comparison of Ps. 78 : 17, 40,

where the same thing is said of God himself, but also from the fact that those interpreters who will not recognise a personal spirit in this passage, unanimously understand the spirit either as denoting an attribute of God or God himself. Henderson thinks it necessary to explain away a seeming contradiction between this verse and the first clause of v. 9, by making  $\text{רָצָה}$  a stronger expression than  $\text{אִי־רָצָה}$ . The true solution is, that the passage is in some sort historical, and shows the progress of the alienation between God and Israel. Having shown in the preceding verse that it began upon the part of Israel, and was long resisted and deferred by Jehovah, he now shows how at length his patience was exhausted, and he really became what he was not before. This is the true sense of the verb  $\text{רָצָה}$ , to which many of the moderns give a reflexive form, he changed himself. The disputes among interpreters whether this verse has reference to the conduct of the people in the wilderness, or under the judges, or before the Babylonish exile, or before the final destruction of Jerusalem, are only useful as a demonstration that the passage is a general description, which was often verified.—From this verse Paul has borrowed a remarkable expression in Eph. 4 : 30. (Compare Matt. 12 : 31. Acts 7 : 51. Heb. 10 : 29.)

V. 11. *And he remembered the days of old, Moses (and) his people. Where is he that brought them up from the sea, the shepherd of his flock? Where is he that put within him his Holy Spirit?* Grotius and others make Jehovah the subject of the first verb, and suppose him to be here described as relenting. This construction has the advantage of avoiding an abrupt change of person without any intimation in the text. But as the following can be naturally understood only as the language of the people, especially when compared with Jer. 2 : 6, most writers are agreed in referring this clause to the people also. Cyril and Jerome, it is true, combine both suppositions, by referring *he remembered* to Jehovah, and explaining what follows as the language of the people. But a transition so abrupt is not to be assumed without necessity. The Targum gives a singular turn to the sentence by supplying *lest they say* before the second clause, which then becomes the language of the enemies of Israel, exulting in the failure of Jehovah's promises. This explanation may appear to derive some support from the analogy of Deut. 32 : 17, which no doubt suggested it; but a fatal objection is the one made by Vitringa, that the essential idea is one not expressed but arbitrarily supplied. Another singular interpretation is the one contained in the Dutch Bible, which makes God the subject of the first verb but includes it in the language of the people, complaining that he dealt with them no longer as he once did: Once he remembered the days of old etc. but now where is he etc. But here again *but now*, on which the whole depends, must be supplied without authority. The modern writers, since

Vitringa, are agreed that the first clause describes the repentance of the people, and that the second gives their very words, contrasting their actual condition with their former privileges and enjoyments. There is still a difference of opinion, however, with respect to the grammatical construction of the first clause. Rosennüller and most of the later writers follow Jarchi in making זָכוֹ the subject of the verb: and his people remembered the days of old etc. As such a collocation falls in with the German idiom, the writers in that language have easily been led to regard it as entirely natural, though really as foreign from Hebrew as from English usage. The solitary case which Hitzig cites (Ps. 34 : 22) would prove nothing by itself, even if it were exactly similar and unambiguous, neither of which is really the case. But another difficulty still remains, viz. that of construing the words בְּיָמָיו זָכוֹ, which seem to stand detached from the remainder of the sentence. Lowth resorts to his favourite but desperate method of reading יָדָיו זָכוֹ *his servant*, on the authority of the Peshito and a few manuscripts. Gesenius, on the other hand, is half inclined to strike out בְּיָמָיו as a marginal gloss still wanting in the Septuagint. These emendations, even if they rested upon surer grounds, would only lessen not remove the difficulty as to the construction of בְּיָמָיו זָכוֹ or זָכוֹ with what goes before. Gesenius makes *days of old* a complex noun governing Moses: the ancient days of Moses. This construction, harsh and unusual as it is, has been adopted by the later German writers except Maurer, who, after denying the existence of the difficulty, brings out as if it were a new discovery, the old construction, given in the English Bible and maintained at length by Vitringa, which makes *Moses* and *his people* correlatives, as objects of the verb *remembered*: He remembered the ancient days, viz. those of Moses and his people. So Gesenius, in the notes to the second edition of his German version, calls attention to the explanation of בְּיָמָיו as a noun or participle meaning the deliverer of his people, as having been recently proposed by Horst, whereas it is at least as old as Aben Ezra, who recites without adopting it.—Henderson is disposed to omit the pronoun in הֵבִיאוּ אֹתוֹ, on the authority of two old manuscripts, apparently confirmed by that of two old versions, or to gain the same end by regarding the construction as an Aramaic one, in which the pronoun is prefixed in pleonastic anticipation of the noun which follows. In either case the אֹתוֹ will be not a preposition meaning *with*, but the objective particle, ‘he that brought up from the sea the shepherds of his flock.’ The objection to making אֹתוֹ a preposition is that it seems to separate the case of Moses from that of the people. The Targum seems to make it a participle of likeness or comparison, as a shepherd does his flock, which Gesenius thinks a far better sense; but Hitzig thinks it false, because shepherds do not bring their flocks up from the sea. The simplest construction is to repeat הֵבִיאוּ אֹתוֹ before רָכַב: Where is

he that brought them up from the sea, (that brought up) the shepherd of his flock? All these constructions suppose the shepherd to be Moses; but Knobel understands it to be God himself, as in Ps. 78 : 52, and repeats the verb remembered, 'it (the people) remembered the shepherd of his flock,' which makes an equally good sense. But nearly sixty manuscripts and forty editions read רָזַי in the plural, which may then be understood as including Aaron (Ps. 77 : 21), and as Vitringa thinks Miriam (Micah 6 : 4), or perhaps the seventy elders who are probably referred to in the last clause as under a special divine influence. (See Num. 11 : 17. Compare Ex. 31 : 3. 35 : 31.) The suffix in רָזַיִם refers to זָרָה. The noun itself is used as in 1 Kings 17 : 22. The clause implies, if it does not express directly, the idea of a personal spirit, as in the preceding verse.

V. 12. *Leading them by the right hand of Moses (and) his glorious arm, cleaving the waters from before them, to make for him an everlasting name?* The sentence and the interrogation are continued from the foregoing verse. The participle with the article there defines or designates the subject as *the one bringing up*; the participle here without the article simply continues the description. Vitringa and the later writers follow Jarchi in giving a very different construction to the first clause, making *his glorious arm* the object of the verb. The meaning of the whole then is as follows: causing his glorious arm to march at the right hand of Moses, i. e. as Jarchi explains it, causing his almighty power, of which the arm is the established symbol (ch. 40 : 10. 59 : 16. 63 : 5), to be near or present with the Prophet when he needed its interposition. This is a good sense, but it seems more natural to give אֶרְבֵּי־יָמִי the same object as in the next verse, the pronoun which is there expressed being here understood. The ל, which the writers above mentioned understand as in Ps. 16 : 8, may agreeably to usage denote general relation, the specific sense of *by* being not expressed but suggested by the context. The *right hand* may be mentioned in allusion to the wielding of the rod by Moses, and the *glorious arm* may be either his or that of God himself, which last sense is expressed in the English version by a change of preposition (*by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm*). The same ambiguity exists in the last clause, where the *everlasting name* may be the honour put upon Moses or the glory which redounded to Jehovah himself, as in ch. 55 : 13. Knobel is singular and somewhat paradoxical in understanding אֶרְבֵּי־יָמִי as descriptive of the smiting of the rock to supply the people's thirst, simply because the passive of the same verb is applied in ch. 35 : 6 to the bursting forth of water in the desert; whereas it is repeatedly employed, both in the active and the passive form, in reference to the cleaving of the waters of the Red Sea (Ex. 14 : 21. Ps. 78 : 13.



Neh. 9: 11), and is so understood here by all other writers whom I have consulted. It also agrees better with the expression *from before them*, which implies the removal of a previous obstruction.

V. 13. *Making them walk in the depths, like the horse in the desert they shall not stumble.* The description of the exodus is still continued, and its perfect security illustrated by comparisons. There is no need of giving to נִחַזְּוּ with the modern writers the distinct sense of *waves* in this and other places, as the proper meaning *depths* is more appropriate and striking in a poetical description. The desert is commonly supposed to be referred to as a vast plain free from inequalities. But J. D. Michaelis, after twice announcing that he never rode on horseback through a desert in his life, makes the point of comparison to lie in the fine gravel or coarse sand with which the desert of Arabia is covered, and which makes an admirable footing for horses. In the same note and in the same spirit he discards the word *stumbling* (*straucheln*), which he says would be employed by one who never sat upon a horse, and substitutes another (*anstossen*) as the technical term of the *manège*, although requiring explanation to the common reader. The last verb would seem most naturally to refer to *the horse*; but its plural form forbids this construction, while its future form creates a difficulty in referring it to Israel. Most versions get around this difficulty by periphrasis, *without stumbling, so as not to stumble*, or the like. The true solution is afforded by the writer's frequent habit of assuming his position in the midst of the events which he describes, and speaking of them as he would have spoken if he had been really so situated. The comparison in the first clause brings up to his view the people actually passing through the wilderness; and in his confident assurance of their safe and easy progress he exclaims, 'they will not stumble!' The same explanation is admissible in many cases where it is customary to confound the tenses, or regard their use as perfectly capricious. As Knobel in the foregoing verse supposes an allusion to the smiting of the rock, so here he refers the description to the passage of the Jordan, as if unwilling to acknowledge any reference to the Red Sea or the actual exodus from Egypt.

V. 14. *As the herd into the valley will go down, the Spirit of Jehovah will make him rest.* So didst thou lead thy people, to make for thyself a name of glory.—נִחַזְּוּ is probably here used in its collective sense of *cattle*, rather than in that of an individual animal or beast. This version is not only more exact than the common one, but removes the ambiguity in the construction, by precluding the reference of *him*, in *make him rest*, to the preceding noun, which is natural enough in the English Version, though forbidden in Hebrew by the difference of gender.—The *him* really refers to

Israel or people. J. D. Michaelis and Lowth follow the ancient versions, which they understand as reading *וַיְהִי וַיְהַדְּרֵהוּ* *will guide him*. But the idea of guidance is sufficiently implied in the common reading, which may be understood as meaning 'will bring him to a place of rest,' a form of expression often used in reference to the promised land. (Deut. 12 : 9, 10. Ps. 95 : 11. etc.) A similar agency is elsewhere ascribed to the Spirit of God. (Ps. 143 : 10. Hagg. 2 : 5. Neh. 9 : 20.)—The use of the futures in this clause is precisely the same as in the foregoing verse. In the last clause the Prophet ceases to regard the scene as actually present and resumes the tone of historical retrospection, at the same time summing up the whole in one comprehensive proposition, *thus didst thou lead thy people*.—With the last words of the verse compare ch. 60 : 21. 61 : 3.

V. 15. *Look (down) from heaven and see from thy dwelling-place of holiness and beauty! Where is thy zeal and thy might (or mighty deeds)? The sounding of thy bowels and thy mercies towards me have withdrawn themselves.* The foregoing description of God's ancient favours is now made the ground of an importunate appeal for new ones. The unusual word for dwelling-place is borrowed from the prayer of Solomon. (1 Kings 8 : 13.) For a similar description of heaven, see above, ch. 57 : 15. God is here represented as withdrawn into heaven and no longer active upon earth. For the meaning of his *zeal*, see above, on ch. 59 : 17. Jarchi adds *הַרְאָתָהּ* i. e. thy *former zeal*. Eighteen manuscripts, two editions, and the ancient versions, read *וַיִּזְרֹק* in the singular. The plural probably denotes mighty deeds or feats of strength, as in 1 K. 15 : 23. 16 : 27. 22 : 46. *וַיִּזְרֹק* is not to be taken in its secondary sense of *multitude*, as it is by the Septuagint (*πληθος*) and the Vulgate (*multitudo*), but in its primary sense of *commotion*, *noise*. The verbal root is applied in like manner to the movements of compassion, ch. 16 : 11. Jer. 31 : 20. 48 : 36, in the last of which places it is connected with the verbal root of *וַיִּזְרֹק* the parallel expression in the case before us. Although we are obliged to render one of these nouns by a literal and the other by a figurative term, both of them properly denote the viscera, on the figurative use of which to signify strong feeling, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 322.—The last verb in the verse denotes a violent suppression or restraint of strong emotion (Gen. 43 : 30. 45 : 1), and is sometimes applied directly to God himself. (See above, ch. 42 : 14, and below, ch. 64 : 11.) The last clause may be variously divided without a material change of meaning. The English Version makes the last verb a distinct interrogation, *are they restrained?* Henderson makes the second question the larger of the two, *are the sounding of thy bowels etc.?* The objection to both is that the second question is not natural, and that they arbitrarily assume an interrogative construction without any thing

to indicate it, as the *where* cannot be repeated. Vitringa and Hitzig make the whole one question and supply the relative before the last verb, *where is thy zeal etc. which are restrained?* But the simplest construction is that which makes the last clause a simple affirmation (Gesenius), or an impassioned exclamation (Ewald). There is something peculiarly expressive in Luther's paraphrase of this last clause: *deine grosse herzliche Barmherzigkeit hält sich hart gegen mich.*

V. 16. *For thou (art) our father; for Abraham hath not known us, and Israel will not recognise us, thou Jehovah (art) our father, our redeemer of old (or from everlasting) is thy name.* The common version needlessly obscures the sense and violates the usage of the language by rendering the first  $\text{וְ}$  *doubtless*, and the second *though*. Rosenmüller gives the first the sense of *but*, simply observing that the particle is here not causal but adverbative. This wanton variation from the ordinary sense of terms, whenever there appears to be the least obscurity in the connexion, is one of the errors of the old school of interpreters, retained by Rosenmüller, who is a kind of link between them and the moderns. The later German writers are more rigidly exact, and Maurer in particular observes in this case that the  $\text{וְ}$  has its proper causal sense in reference to the first clause of v. 15. Why do we ask thee to look down from heaven and to hear our prayer? *Because thou art our father.* This does not merely mean our natural creator, but our founder, our national progenitor, as in Deut. 32 : 6. Here, however, it appears to be employed in an emphatic and exclusive sense, as if he had said, 'thou and thou alone art our father;' for he immediately adds, as if to explain and justify this strange assertion, 'for Abraham has not known us, and Israel will not recognise or acknowledge us.' The assimilation of these tenses, as if both past or future, is entirely arbitrary; and their explanation as both present, a gratuitous evasion. As in many other cases, past and future are here joined to make the proposition universal. Dropping the peculiar parallel construction, the sense is that neither Abraham nor Israel have known or will know any thing about us, have recognised or will hereafter recognise us as their children. The meaning, therefore, cannot be that Abraham and Israel are ashamed of us as unworthy and degenerate descendants, as Piscator understands it; or that Abraham and Israel cannot save us by their merits, as Cocceius understands it; or that Abraham and Israel did not deliver us from Egypt, as the Targum understands it; or that Abraham and Israel, being now dead, can do nothing for us, as Vitringa and the later writers understand it. All these interpretations, and a number of unnatural constructions and false versions, some of which have been already mentioned, owe their origin to the insuperable difficulty of applying

these words, in their strict and unperverted sense, to the Jews as the natural descendants of the patriarchs in question. Henderson's mode of reconciling what is here said with his general application of the prophecy is curious enough. After justly observing that "the hereditary descent of the Jews from Abraham, and their dependence upon his merits and those of Isaac and Jacob, form the proudest grounds of boasting among them at the present day, as they did in the time of our Lord," he adds that "when converted, they shall be ashamed of all such confidence, and glory in Jehovah alone." Such an effect of individual conversion and regeneration may be certainly expected; but a general restoration of the Jews as a people, not only to the favour of God but to the land of their fathers, and not only to the land of their fathers, but to pre-eminence among the nations, so that their temple shall again be universally frequented, and the whole world reduced to the alternative of perishing or serving them, is so far from naturally tending to correct the evil which has been described, that nothing but a miracle would seem sufficient to prevent its being aggravated vastly by the very means which Henderson expects to work a final cure. The true sense of the verse, as it appears to me, is that the church or chosen people, although once, for temporary reasons, coextensive and coincident with a single race, is not essentially a national organization, but a spiritual body. Its father is not Abraham or Israel, but Jehovah, who is and always has been its redeemer, who has borne that name from everlasting; or as Hitzig understands the last clause, he is our redeemer, whose name is from everlasting. Most interpreters, however, are agreed in understanding this specific name of *our redeemer* to be here described as everlasting or eternal. According to the explanation which has now been given, this verse explicitly asserts what is implied and indirectly taught throughout these prophecies, in reference to the true design and mission of the Church, and its relation to Jehovah, to the world, and to the single race with which of old it seemed to be identified. This confirmation of our previous conclusions is the more satisfactory, because no use has hitherto been made of it, by anticipation, in determining the sense of many more obscure expressions, to which it may now be considered as affording a decisive key. It only remains to add, as a preventive of misapprehension, that the strong terms of this verse are of course to be comparatively understood, not as implying that the church will ever have occasion to repudiate its historical relation to the patriarchs, or cease to include among its members many of their natural descendants, but simply as denying all continued or perpetual pre-eminence to Israel as a race, and exalting the common relation of believers to their great Head as paramount to all connexion with particular progenitors—the very doctrine so repeatedly and emphatically taught in the New Testament.

V. 17. *Why wilt thou make us wander, oh Jehovah, from thy ways ; (why) wilt thou harden our heart from thy fear? Return, for the sake of thy servants, the tribes of thy inheritance.* The earnestness of the prayer is evinced by an increasing boldness of expostulation. Rosenmüller shows, by a reference to Deut. 2 : 28 and 1 Sam. 14 : 36, that the Hiphil often signifies permission rather than direct causation. But although this usage is indisputable, it is here forbidden by the parallel expression, which can hardly mean to suffer to grow hard, and rendered unnecessary by the frequency and clearness with which such an agency is ascribed to God himself elsewhere. As to the sense of such expressions, see the Earlier Prophecies, p. 96. Equally shallow and malignant are the comments of the German writers on this subject ; as a specimen of which may be given Hitzig's statement that "Jehovah makes men sinners for the sake of punishing them afterwards ; to the question why he does so, the East [by which he means the Bible] makes no answer. Compare Rom. 9 : 17-22." The future verbs are not to be arbitrarily explained as preterites, or (with Hitzig) as implying that the action still continues, but as asking why he will continue so to do. The second verb occurs only here and in Job 39 : 16, where it is applied to the ostrich's hard treatment of her young. It is obviously near akin to  $\text{הִצִּיחַ}$ , and Vitrिंगa thinks the substitution of the stronger guttural has an intensive effect upon the meaning. The particle in *from thy fear* is commonly supposed to have a privative or negative meaning, so as not to fear thee ; but there is rather an allusion to the wandering just before mentioned, as if he had said, 'and why wilt thou make us to wander, by hardening our heart, from thy fear?' This last expression, as in many other cases, includes all the duties and affections of true piety.—For the sense of God's returning to his people, see above, on ch. 52 : 8. *The tribes of thine inheritance* is an equivalent expression to *thy people* ; which originated in the fact that Israel, like other ancient oriental races, was divided into tribes. The argument drawn from this expression in favour of applying the whole passage to the Jews, proves too much ; for the distinction into tribes is as much lost now among the Jews as among the gentiles. The Jews, indeed, are properly but one tribe, that of Judah, in which the remnants of the others were absorbed after the exile.

V. 18. *For a little thy holy people possessed, our enemies trod down thy sanctuary.* The sense of this verse is extremely dubious.  $\text{הִצִּיחַ}$  is elsewhere used in reference to magnitude (Gen. 19 : 20) and number (2 Chr. 24 : 24), not to time. J. D. Michaelis connects it with the foregoing verse, and reads, 'the tribes of thy inheritance have become a little thing,' i. e. an object of contempt. So the Vulgate, *quasi nihilum*. The Septuagint also

joins the first clause with v. 17, and omits the second, 'that we may inherit a little of thy holy mountain,' reading  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  for  $\text{כִּי}$  which is approved by Lowth. Cocceius takes  $\text{כִּי־כְעָרְבָה}$  in the sense of *almost*, like  $\text{כְּעָרְבָה}$  (Gen. 26 : 10. Ps. 73 : 2). Lowth, Kocher, and Rosenmüller make it equivalent to the Latin *parvum*. But Vitranga and the later writers understand it as an adverb of time, cognate and equivalent to  $\text{כְּעָרְבָה}$  (ch. 10 : 25. 29 : 17). Another question is whether *thy holy people* is the subject or object of the verb *possessed*. Thus Grotius understands the clause to mean that the enemy *for a little while possessed thy holy people*; and Cocceius, that *they almost possessed thy holy people*; Kocher and Rosenmüller, it was not enough that they possessed thy holy people, they also trampled on thy sanctuary; Lowth, it was little that they did both, if God had not besides rejected them. The subject is then to be supplied from the other clause, or brought into this, by a removal of the accent and a consequent change of interpunction. The modern writers are agreed, however, in making *holy people* the subject of the verb, and supplying the object from the other clause, *thy sanctuary*, which is understood by Hitzig as denoting the entire *holy land* (Zech. 2 : 16), as the cities of Judah are, he thinks, called *holy cities* in ch. 64 : 9. Maurer suggests another method of providing both a subject and an object to the verb by omitting the makkeph and reading  $\text{כִּי־כְעָרְבָה־אֶת־הַקֹּדֶשׁ}$ , the people possessed thy holy (thing or place). According to the usual construction of the sentence, it assigns as a reason for Jehovah's interference, the short time during which the chosen people had possessed the land of promise. But it may be objected that  $\text{כִּי־כְעָרְבָה}$  would naturally seem to qualify both clauses, which can only be prevented by supplying arbitrarily between them *and then* or *now*. This consideration may be said to favour Grotius's construction; which is further recommended by its grammatical simplicity, in giving to both verbs one and the same subject. What is common to both explanations is the supposition that the verse describes a subjection to enemies. The question upon which they disagree is whether this subjection is itself described as temporary, or the peaceable possession which preceded it. In no case can an argument be drawn from it to prove that this whole passage has respect to the Jews in their present dispersion: first, because the sufferings of the church in after ages are frequently presented under figures drawn from the peculiar institutions of the old economy; and secondly, because the early history of Israel is as much the early history of the Christian church as of the Jewish nation, so that we have as much right as the Jews to lament the profanation of the Holy Land, and more cause to pray for its recovery by Christendom, than they for its restoration to themselves. Gesenius's translation of  $\text{כִּי־כְעָרְבָה}$  as meaning *plundered*, although copied by Umbreit, is most probably an inadvertence; as no such meaning

of the verb is given or referred to in any of his Hebrew lexicons. The error was observed and corrected even by De Wette and Noyes, the two most faithful followers of Gesenius in his version of Isaiah.

V. 19. *We are of old, thou hast not ruled over them, thy name has not been called upon them. Oh that thou wouldst rend the heavens (and) come down, (that) from before thee the mountains might quake (or flow down).* Most of the modern writers have adopted a construction of the first clause suggested by the paraphrastic versions of the Septuagint and Vulgate. This supposes the description of the people's alienation from God to be continued: We have long been those (or like those) over whom thou didst not rule, and who were not called by thy name; that is to say, thou hast long regarded and treated us as aliens rather than thy chosen people. The עָזְבוּנוּ is then referred to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar or by Titus, according to the general exegetical hypothesis of each interpreter. The ellipsis of the relative involved in this construction can create no difficulty, as it is one of perpetual occurrence; but the sense which it puts upon the clause is very far from being obvious, or one which a Hebrew writer would be likely to express in this way. Another old and well known construction of the clause is founded on the Chaldee Paraphrase, which understands this not as a description of their misery but an assertion of their claim to relief, in the form of a comparison between themselves and their oppressors. This is the sense given in the English Version: *We are thine, thou never barest rule over them etc.* To this form of the interpretation it has been objected, not without reason, that it puts upon the verb *we are* or *have been* a sense not justified by usage, or in other words, that it arbitrarily supplies the essential idea upon which the whole turns, namely, *thine* or *thy people*. But this objection may be easily removed by connecting the verb with עָזְבוּנוּ, *we are of old*. The point of comparison is then their relative antiquity, the enemy being represented as a new race come into possession of the rights belonging to the old. There is then no need of supplying *thine*, the relation of the people to Jehovah being not particularly hinted here, although suggested by the whole connexion. With this modification the construction of the Targum and the English Bible seems entitled to the preference—*Thou didst not rule over them*. This has no reference, of course, to God's providential government, but only to the peculiar theocratical relation which he bears to his own people. The same idea is expressed by the following words, as to the sense of which see above on ch. 48 : 1. The inconvenience of strongly marked divisions in a book like this, is exemplified by the disputes among interpreters, whether the remaining words of this verse as it stands in the masoretic text should or should not be separated from it and connected with the following chapter. Gesenius and the later

writers choose the latter course, while Rosenmüller steadfastly adheres to the masoretic interpunction. The simple truth is that there ought to be no pause at all in this place, the transition from complaint to the expression of an ardent wish being not only intentional but highly effective. It is true that this clause ought not to be separated from what follows; but it does not follow that it ought to be severed from what goes before,—a gross *non sequitur*, with which the reasoning of some learned writers is too often justly chargeable. Ewald reckons the remainder of this sentence as the first verse of the sixty-fourth chapter, on the authority of the ancient versions, but obviates the inconvenience commonly attending it, by throwing the whole context from v. 18 to v. 5 of the next chapter, both inclusive, into one unbroken paragraph. Our own exposition will proceed upon the principle heretofore applied, that this is a continuous composition, that the usual divisions are mere matters of convenience or inconvenience as the case may be, and that more harm is likely to result from too much than from too little separation of the parts. The passionate apostrophe in this clause, far from being injured or obscured, is rendered more expressive by its close connexion with the previous complaints and lamentations. The idea now suggested is, that weary of complaint the people or the prophet speaking for them suddenly appeals to God directly with an ardent wish that he would deal with them as in days of old. For the construction of the optative participle אֲבִי, see above, on ch. 48: 18. The Targum and Luzzatto make it negative, as if written אֲבִי or אֲבִי, a variation which does not materially affect the sense, but merely changes the expression of a wish that something might be done, to a complaint that it is not done: ‘thou hast not rent the heavens,’ etc. The remaining words are a poetical description of Jehovah’s interposition or the manifestation of his presence, under figures drawn perhaps from the account of his epiphany on Sinai. Gesenius explains אֲבִי to denote commotion: Ewald adheres to the old etymology and sense of melting.

---

 CHAPTER LXIV.

THIS chapter, like the one before it, from which it is in fact inseparable, has respect to the critical or turning point between the old and new dispensations, and presents it just as it might naturally have appeared to the believing Jews, i. e. the first Christian converts, at that juncture. The



strongest confidence is expressed in the divine power, founded upon former experience, vs. 1–3. The two great facts of Israel's rejection as a nation, and the continued existence of the church, are brought together in v. 4. The unworthiness of Israel is acknowledged still more fully, vs. 5, 6. The sovereign authority of God is humbly recognised, v. 7. His favour is earnestly implored, v. 8. The external prerogatives of Israel are lost, v. 9. But will God for that cause cast off the true Israel, his own church or people? v. 10.

V. 1. *As fire kindles brush, fire boils water—to make known thy name to thine enemies, from before thee nations shall tremble.* The last clause coheres directly with the preceding verse, while the first is a parenthetical comparison; for which cause some of the latest writers throw the last words of ch. 63 into this sentence. This, for reasons which have been already given, is unnecessary; it is sufficient to observe the connexion upon which the proposed arrangement rests. As  $\text{הִנִּיחַ}$  is both transitive and intransitive, either of two constructions may be here adopted—as a fire of brushwood burns, or, as fire kindles brush—the last of which is preferred by most interpreters, as simpler in itself, and because *fire* is the subject of the verb in the next clause also. The various explanations of  $\text{עֲרֹבֶנָה}$  by the older writers are detailed by Vitringa and Rosenmüller. The ancient versions and several of the rabbins derive it from  $\text{עֲרָב}$  to melt, but in violation of etymological analogy. The first hint of the true sense was given by Rabbi Jonah, who pronounces it to mean dry stubble ( $\text{עֲרֹב}$   $\text{עֲרָב}$ ), and the definition has been since completed by the Arabic analogy. Schultens' construction of the next words, *aquae effervescunt igne*, involves a twofold irregularity, viz. in gender and in number, which is not to be assumed without necessity. The point of comparison in both these clauses is the rapidity and ease with which the effect is produced. Hitzig supposes a specific allusion in the second to the bouleversement or complete transposition of the particles of boiling water, as an emblem of the general confusion which the presence of Jehovah would produce; but this is more ingenious and refined than natural. The literal effect is described in the next words, to make known thy name, i. e. to manifest thy being and thine attributes to thine enemies. In both parts of the sentence the construction passes as it were insensibly from the infinitive to the future, a transition not unfrequent in Hebrew syntax. The last future is supposed by the latest writers to be still dependent on the optative particle in ch. 63: 19, 'oh that the nations at thy presence might tremble.' But as the infinitive immediately precedes, and as  $\text{לֵאמֹר}$  is there construed with the praeter, it is better to regard  $\text{וַיִּהְיֶה}$  simply as a statement of what would be the effect of God's appearance.

V. 2. *In thy doing fearful things (which) we expect not, (oh that) thou wouldst come down, (that) the mountains from before thee might flow down.* There are two very different constructions of this verse. Gesenius agrees with the English Version in making it a direct historical statement of a past event: When thou didst terrible things which we looked not for, thou camest down, the mountains flowed down at thy presence. This seems to be the simplest possible construction; but it is attended by a serious grammatical difficulty, viz. the necessity of referring the future  $\text{יִבֹּרֵךְ}$  to past time, without any thing in the connexion to facilitate or justify the version. On the other hand, this word appears to be decisive of the future bearing of the whole verse, and in favour of the syntax adopted by Hitzig, Ewald, and Knobel, which supposes the influence of the optative particle to be still continued through this verse, as well as that before it: (Oh that) in doing terrible things, such as we expect not, thou wouldst come down, etc. There is then no need of resorting to forced explanations of the sense in which the Prophet could speak as if he had been present at Mount Sinai. The construction of the praeterite with  $\text{לִיִּא}$  is the same as in ch. 63 : 19.

V. 3. *And from eternity they have not heard, they have not perceived by the ear, the eye hath not seen, a God beside thee (who) will do for (one) waiting for him.* This verse assigns a reason why such fearful things should be expected from Jehovah, namely, because he alone had proved himself able to perform them. Kinchi supplies  $\text{אֱלֹהֵי־נַחֲשׁוּת}$  nations, as the subject of the plural verbs; but they are really indefinite, and mean that men in general have not heard, or, as we should say, that no one has heard, or in a passive form, it has not been heard. *Do* may be either taken absolutely, or as governing *them*, i. e. the fearful things mentioned in v. 2. *Waiting for God* implies faith, hope, and patient acquiescence. (See above, on ch. 40 : 31.) The construction here given is the one now commonly adopted, and is also given in the margin of the English Bible, and by Grotius and Cocceius; while the text of that version, with Vitranga and others, makes  $\text{אֱלֹהֵי־יְהוָה}$  a vocative, and ascribes to God not only the doing but the knowledge of the fearful things in question. This construction is preferred by Vitranga, Rosenmüller, and many others, and agrees better with Paul's quotation (2 Cor. 2 : 9) of the words as descriptive of the gospel as a mystery or something hidden till revealed by the Spirit. (Compare Rom. 15 : 26, and Matth. 13 : 17.) But in this, as in many other cases, the apostle, by deliberately varying the form of the expression, shows that it was not his purpose to interpret the original passage, but simply to make use of its terms in expressing his own thoughts on a kindred subject. Least of all can any emendation of the text be founded upon this quotation, such as the change of  $\text{יִהְיֶה}$  to  $\text{יִהְיֶה}$  from  $\text{הַבֵּב}$ , which, as

Vitringa well observes, although applied to the divine love for man, is inappropriate to human love for God, not to mention the unusual construction with  $\text{ב}$ .

V. 4. *Thou hast met with one rejoicing and executing righteousness ; in thy ways shall they remember thee ; behold, thou hast been wroth, and we have sinned ; in them is perpetuity, and we shall be saved.* There is perhaps no sentence in Isaiah, or indeed in the Old Testament, which has more divided and perplexed interpreters, or on which the ingenuity and learning of the modern writers have thrown less light. To enumerate the various interpretations, would be endless and of no avail. Gesenius professes to recite them, but gives only a selection. A more full detail is furnished by Vitringa and Rosenmüller, and in Poole's Synopsis. Nothing more will here be attempted than to give the reader some idea of the various senses which have been attached to the particular expressions, as a means of showing that we have at best but a choice of difficulties, and of procuring for our own exposition a more favourable hearing than it might be thought entitled to in other circumstances. The first verb has been variously taken in the sense of meeting as an enemy and meeting as a friend, making a covenant, removing out of life, interceding, and accepting intercession. It has been construed as a simple affirmation, both in the past and present form ; as a conditional expression (*si incidas*) ; and as the expression of a wish (*utinam offenderes*). The next verb has been also treated both as a direct and as a relative expression, they will remember thee, and those who remember thee. *Thy ways* has been explained to mean the way of God's commandments and of his providential dispensations. *In them* has been referred to ways, to sins, to sufferings, to the older race of Israelites.  $\text{וְלֹא־יִשָּׁבֵר}$  has been treated as a noun and as an adverb ; as meaning perpetuity, eternity, a long time, and for ever.  $\text{וְיִשָּׁבֵר}$  has been changed to  $\text{וְיִשָּׁבֵר}$ , and the common reading has been construed interrogatively (shall or could we be saved?), optatively (may we be saved), and indicatively, present, past, and future (we have been, are, or shall be saved). Of the various combinations of these elements on record, the most important in relation to the first clause are the following : Thou hast taken away those who rejoiced to do righteousness and remembered thee in thy ways (Kimchi). Thou didst accept the intercession of those who rejoiced etc. (Aben Ezra). Thou didst encounter or resist as if they had been enemies those who rejoiced etc. (Cocceius). Thou meetest as a friend him rejoicing etc. (Jerome). If thou meet with or light upon one rejoicing etc. they will remember thee in thy ways (Vitringa). Oh that thou mightest meet with one rejoicing etc. (Ros).—Of the second clause, the following constructions may be noted : In them (i. e. our sins) we have been always, and yet we shall be saved

(Jerome). We have sinned against them (i. e. thy ways) always, and yet have been delivered. In them (i. e. thy ways of mercy) there is continuance, and we are saved (Piscator). Thou wast angry after we had sinned against them (i. e. our fathers), and yet we are safe (Vitranga). J. D. Michaelis: we sinned an eternity (i. e. for ages) among them (the heathen) and apostatized (אָפּוֹסְטָטִיזִירט). Lowth: thou art angry, for we have sinned; because of our deeds (בְּמַעֲשֵׂי־לֵלֵינוּ), for we have been rebellious (אָפּוֹסְטָטִיזִירט). Rosenmüller: we have sinned in them (thy ways) of old, and can we be saved? Kocher: in them (our miseries) there is long continuance; oh may we be saved! Maurer: in them (the ways of duty) let us ever go, and we shall be saved. Hitzig: thou wast angry, and we sinned on that account (בְּהַיְבָרָה) continually, and can we be saved? Grotius: had we been always in them (thy ways), we should have been saved. Gesenius substantially agrees with Kocher; De Wette and Umbreit with Rosenmüller; Henderson with Piscator; Ewald with Hitzig; Hendewerk with Grotius; Knobel, partly with Jerome, partly with Lowth, and partly with Kocher. It is curious enough that Vitranga, whose construction has probably never been adopted by another writer on the passage, says of it himself, *sensus facillimus et optimus ut quisque viderit*. Yet in his exposition of the very next verse he says, *aegre aspicio homines, ne videantur nihil scribere, ea in certis consignare, quae ipsi facile praevideant neminem recepturum esse*. As if to show that exegetical invention is not yet exhausted, the ingenious modern rabbin, Samuel Luzzatto, closes his curious notes on Isaiah, prefixed to the abridgment of Rosenmüller's Scholia, with still another exposition of this verse, and of the whole connexion, which deserves to be stated, were it only for its novelty. He understands the people as denying at the close of the preceding chapter (v. 19) that Jehovah had attested his divinity by suitable exertion of his power in their behalf. At the beginning of this chapter they correct themselves, and own that he has proved himself able to secure his ends as easily as fire kindles chaff or causes water to boil (v. 1); but as he does not do it, this neglect is to be regarded as the cause or the occasion of their sins. They then assure him that they know his ancient deeds, even when they were not looked for (v. 2), and can compare them not only with the impotence of idols (v. 3), but with his present inaction: 'Thou hast to do with those who remember thee as joyfully exercising righteousness in thy ways (or dispensations); oh that thou wouldst persevere in them (those ways) for ever, that we might be saved.'—I shall not attempt to define what is correct and what erroneous in these various constructions, but simply to justify the one assumed in my own version. The general meaning of the sentence may be thus expressed in paraphrase: 'Although thou hast cast off Israel as a nation, thou hast nevertheless met or favourably answered every one rejoicing to do righteousness, and in thy ways or future dispensations

such shall still remember and acknowledge thee ; thou hast been angry, and with cause, for we have sinned ; but in them, thy purposed dispensations, there is perpetuity, and we shall be saved.' The abrogation of the old economy, though fatal to the national pre-eminence of Israel, was so far from destroying the true church or the hopes of true believers, that it revealed the way of life more clearly than ever, and substituted for an insufficient, temporary system, a complete and everlasting one. In this construction of the sentence, the verb  $\text{נָשַׁב}$  and the noun  $\text{נִשְׁבָּע}$  are taken in their usual sense, and the pronoun in  $\text{בָּהֶן}$  refers to its natural antecedent  $\text{הָרִבְּבוֹת}$ .

V. 5. *And we were like the unclean all of us, and like a filthy garment all our righteousnesses (virtues or good works), and we faded like the (fading) leaf all of us, and our iniquities like the wind will take us up (or carry us away).* Having shown what they are or hope to be through the mercy of God and the righteousness of Christ, they state more fully what they are in themselves, and what they must expect to be if left to themselves. This twofold reference to their past experience and their future destiny accounts for the transition from the praeter to the future, without arbitrarily confounding them together.—Vitringa makes  $\text{טִמְאָה}$  descriptive of a leper, which is wholly arbitrary ; the adjective appears to be used absolutely for *the unclean*, or that which is unclean, perhaps with a superlative emphasis, like  $\text{טִמְאָה טְהוֹרָה}$ , in ch. 60 : 22. Vitringa and Gesenius dwell with great zest and fulness on the strict sense of  $\text{עָרֵב עָרֵב}$ . Some understand the comparison with withered leaves as a part of the description of their sin, while others apply it to their punishment. The first hypothesis is favoured by the difference of the tenses, which has been already noticed ; the last by the parallelism of the clauses. It is probable, however, that here as in ch. 1 : 4 the two things ran together in the writer's mind, and that no refined distinction as to this point was intended. (With the figures of the last clause compare ch. 57 : 13. Ps. 1 : 1. Job 27 : 21.) Hitzig and Hendewerk apply this last expression to the actual deportation of the Jews to Babylon. Vitringa, having satisfied himself that this whole context has respect to the present exile and dispersion of the Jews, takes pleasure in applying the particular expressions to the circumstances of that great affliction. It is very remarkable, however, that in this, as in other cases heretofore considered, there is no expression which admits of this application exclusively, and none which admit of it at all but for their generality and vagueness, which would equally admit an application to any other period of distress which had been previously set down as the specific subject of the prophecy.

V. 6. *And there is no one calling on thy name, rousing himself to lay hold on thee ; for thou hast hid thy face from us, and hast melted us because*

*of* (or *by means of*) *our iniquities*. The German writers make the whole historical and retrospective, so as to throw what is here described far enough back to be the antecedent and procuring cause of the Babylonish exile. But although there is evident allusion to the past implied in the very form of the expression, the description reaches to the present also, and describes not only what the speakers were, but what they are when considered in themselves, as well as the effects of their own weakness and corruption, which they have already experienced.—Calling on the name of God is here used in its proper sense of praying to him and invoking his assistance and protection; which idea is expressed still more strongly by the next phrase, rousing himself (which implies a just view of the evil and a strenuous exertion to correct it) to lay hold upon thee, a strong figure for attachment to a person and reliance on him.—Lowth's version of the next words, 'therefore thou hast hidden,' is wholly unauthorized and wholly unnecessary, since the withdrawal of divine grace is constantly spoken of in Scripture both as the cause and the effect of men's continued alienation from God. Grotius, Cappellus, Houbigant, Lowth, and Ewald, read הַיָּמִינִי from יָמֶיךָ, 'thou hast delivered us into the hand of our iniquities.' (See Gen. 14 : 20. Prov. 4 : 9.) This sense is also expressed by several of the ancient versions, but has probably arisen not from a difference of text, but from a wish to assimilate the verb to the following expression, *in the hand*. Gesenius and most of the late writers, suppose יָמֶיךָ in this one place to have the transitive sense of causing to dissolve, in which twofold usage it resembles the corresponding English verb *to melt*. Hitzig notes this among the indications of a later writer, notwithstanding the analogous use of יָמֶיךָ by Amos (9 : 14). *In the hand* may either mean *by means of*, *in the midst of*, or *because of*; or we may suppose with Rosenmüller that the phrase strictly means, *thou dost melt us into the hand of our iniquities*, i. e. subject us to them, make us unable to resist them, and passively submissive to their power.

V. 7. *And now, Jehovah, our father (art) thou, we the clay and thou our potter, and the work of thy hand (are) we all*. Instead of relying upon any supposed merits of their own, they appeal to their very dependence upon God as a reason why he should have mercy on them. Lowth follows two editions and five manuscripts in reading אֵתְּ twice, which repetition has great force, he thinks, whereas the other word may well be spared. In other cases where a word is repeated in the common text, he substitutes a different one, because the repetition is inelegant. The Bishop's judgment upon such points was continually warped by his predominant desire to change the text. He overlooked in this case the obvious use of *now*, not merely as a particle of time, but as a formula of logical resumption, which could not be omitted without obscuring the relation of this verse to the preceding context,

as a summing up of its appeals and arguments. Vitringa regards  $\text{הָאֵל}$  as the origin of the Homeric  $\alphaῖτα, \tauῆτα$ ; but the Hebrew word is not expressive of endearment, it is absolutely necessary to the sense. The Prophet here resumes the thought of ch. 63 : 16, where, as here, the paternity ascribed to God is not that of natural creation in the case of individuals, but the creation of the church or chosen people, and of Israel as a spiritual and ideal person. The figure of the potter and the clay, implying absolute authority and power, is used twice before (ch. 29 : 6. 45 : 9), and is one of the connecting links between this book and the acknowledged Isaiah.—There is more dignity in the original expression than in the English phrase *our potter*, as the Hebrew word properly denotes one forming or imparting shape to any thing, though specially applied in usage to a workman in clay, when that material is mentioned. Lowth retains the general meaning, but in order to avoid the ambiguity attending the word *former*, treats it as a finite verb, *thou hast formed us*, which is clear enough, but inexact and drawling. The use of the word *all* in this verse, and its emphatic repetition in the next, exclude the application of the passage to an idolatrous party in the Babylonish exile, even if that limitation would be otherwise admissible. The same plea, derived from the relation of the creature to the maker, is used in Ps. 138 : 8, *forsake not the work of thy hands*. (Compare Ps. 76 : 1. 79 : 1.) In either case there is a tacit appeal to the covenant and promise in Gen. 17 : 7. Lev. 26 : 42–45. Deut. 7 : 6. 26 : 17, 18.

V. 8. *Be not angry, oh Jehovah, to extremity, and do not to eternity remember guilt; lo, look, we pray thee, thy people (are) we all.* This is the application of the argument presented in the foregoing verse, the actual prayer founded on the fact there stated. The common version of  $\text{כִּי־אֵי־בָרָא}$  (*very sore*) fails to reproduce the form of the original expression, as consisting of a preposition and a noun. This is faithfully conveyed in Lowth's version (*to the uttermost*), and still more in Henderson's (*to excess*); although the latter is objectionable as suggesting the idea of injustice or moral wrong, which is avoided in the version above given. The first defect is also chargeable upon the common version of  $\text{לְעֹלָם}$ , *for ever*; which, although a fair equivalent, and perfectly sufficient in all ordinary cases, is neither so exact nor so expressive as the literal translation in the case before us, where there seems to be an intentional regard to the peculiar form and sound as well as to the meaning of the sentence. The common version is besides defective, or at least ambiguous, in seeming to make  $\text{הִנֵּה}$  a verb and  $\text{נָא}$  a particle of time; whereas the former is an interjection, and the latter the peculiar Hebrew formula of courteous or importunate entreaty.

V. 9. *Thy holy cities are a desert, Zion is a desert, Jerusalem a waste.*

By holy cities, Grotius understands the towns of Judah; Vitringa, Jerusalem alone, considered as consisting of two towns, the upper and the lower, here called Zion and Jerusalem, though each of these names sometimes comprehends the whole, and the latter is dual in its very form. Gesenius cites Ps. 78 : 54 to show that even the frontier of the land was reckoned holy, and that its cities might be naturally so described likewise. But the question is not one of possibility or propriety, but of actual usage; not what they might be called, but what they are called. The passage in the Psalms, moreover, is itself too doubtful to throw light upon the one before us. A better argument is that of Hitzig, in his note on ch. 63 : 18, drawn from the use of the phrase ארצה קדש by Zechariah (2 : 16) in application to the whole. Even this, however, is not conclusive; since the writer, if he had intended to employ the terms in this wide sense, would hardly have confined his specifications in the other clause to Zion and Jerusalem. In any case, these must be regarded as the chief if not the only subjects of his proposition.—There is something worthy of attention in the use here made of the substantive verb היה. To express mere present existence, Hebrew usage employs no verb at all, though the pronoun which would be its subject is occasionally introduced. The preterite form of the verb as here used must either have the sense of *was*, in reference to a definite time past, or *has been*, implying a continuation of the same state till the present. The former meaning is excluded and the latter rendered necessary by the obvious allusions in the context to the evils mentioned as being still experienced.<sup>2</sup> To express the idea *has become*, which is given in some versions, usage would require the verb to be connected with the noun by the preposition ל. On the whole, the true sense of the verse, expressed or implied, appears to be that Zion has long been a desolation and Jerusalem a waste.

V. 10. *Our house of holiness and beauty (in) which our fathers praised thee has been burned up with fire, and all our delights (or desirable places) have become a desolation.* The elliptical use of the relative in reference to place is the same as in Gen. 39 : 20. *Burned up*, literally, become a burning of fire, as in ch. 9 : 6. The reference in this verse is of course to the destruction of the temple, but to which destruction is disputed. The modern Germans all refer it to the Babylonian conquest, when the temple, as we are expressly told, was burnt (Jer. 52 : 13); Grotius to its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes, at which time, however, it was not consumed by fire; Vitringa and many later writers, with the Jews themselves, to its destruction by the Romans, since which the city and the land have lain desolate. To the first and last of these events the words are equally appropriate. Either hypothesis being once assumed, the particular expressions admit of being easily adapted to it. With our own hypothesis the passage



may be reconciled in several different ways. There is nothing, however, in the terms themselves, or in the analogy of prophetic language, to forbid our understanding this as a description of the desolations of the church itself expressed by figures borrowed from the old economy and from the ancient history of Israel. If literally understood, the destruction of the temple and the holy city may be here lamented as a loss not merely to the Jewish nation, but to the church of God to which they rightfully belong and by which they ought yet to be recovered, a sense of which obligation blended with some superstitious errors gave occasion to the fanatical attempt of the crusades. (See above, on ch. 63 : 18.)

V. 12. *Wilt thou for these (things) restrain thyself, oh Jehovah, wilt thou keep silence and afflict us to extremity?* This is simply another application of the argument by way of an importunate appeal to the divine compassions. Self-restraint and silence, as applied to God, are common figures for inaction and apparent indifference to the interests and especially the sufferings of his people. (See above, on ch. 42 : 14 and 63 : 15.) The question is not whether God will remain silent in spite of what his people suffered, but whether the loss of their external advantages will induce him to forsake them. The question as in many other cases implies a negation of the strongest kind. The destruction of the old theocracy was God's own act and was designed to bring the church under a new and far more glorious dispensation. How the loss of a national organization and pre-eminence was to be made good is fully stated in the following chapter.

---

 CHAPTER LXV.

THE great enigma of Israel's simultaneous loss and gain is solved by a prediction of the calling of the gentiles, v. 1. This is connected with the obstinate unfaithfulness of the chosen people, v. 2. They are represented under the two main aspects of their character at different periods, as gross idolaters and as pharisaical bigots, vs. 3-5. Their casting off was not occasioned by the sins of one generation but of many, vs. 6, 7. But even in this rejected race there was a chosen remnant, in whom the promises shall be fulfilled, vs. 8-10. He then reverts to the idolatrous Jews and threatens them with condign punishment, vs. 11, 12. The fate of the unbelieving carnal Israel is compared with that of the true spiritual Israel, vs. 13-16.

The gospel economy is described as a new creation, v. 17. Its blessings are described under glowing figures borrowed from the old dispensation, vs. 18, 19. Premature death shall be no longer known, v. 20. Possession and enjoyment shall no longer be precarious, vs. 21-23. Their very desires shall be anticipated, v. 24. All animosities and noxious influences shall cease for ever, v. 25.

V. 1. *I have been inquired of by those that asked not, I have been found by those that sought me not, I have said, Behold me, behold me, to a nation (that) was not called by my name.* There is an apparent inconsistency between the first two members of the sentence in the English Version, arising from the use of the same verb (*sought*) to express two very different Hebrew verbs. שָׁאַר is here used in the general sense of *seeking* or trying to obtain, שָׁאַר in the technical religious sense of *consulting* as an oracle. In the latter case the difficulty of translation is enhanced by the peculiar form of the original, not simply passive but reflexive, and capable of being rendered in our idiom only by periphrasis. The exact sense seems to be, I allowed myself to be consulted, I afforded access to myself for the purpose of consultation. This is not a mere conjectural deduction from the form of the Hebrew verb or from general analogy, but a simple statement of the actual usage of this very word, as when Jehovah says again and again of the ungodly exiles that he will not be inquired of or consulted by them (Ez. 14 : 3. 20 : 3), i. e. with effect or to any useful purpose. In this connexion it is tantamount to saying that he will not hear them, answer them, or reveal himself to them ; all which or equivalent expressions have been used by different writers in the translation of the verse before us. There is nothing therefore incorrect in substance, though the form be singular, in the Septuagint version of this verb, retained in the New Testament, viz. ἐμφανίς ἐγερύθη, I became manifest, i. e. revealed myself. The object of the verb *asked*, if exact uniformity be deemed essential, may be readily supplied from the parallel expression *sought me*.—*Behold me*, or as it is sometimes rendered in the English Bible, *here I am*, is the usual idiomatic Hebrew answer to a call by name, and when ascribed to God contains an assurance of his presence rendered more emphatic by the repetition. (See above, ch. 52 : 6. 58 : 9.) It is therefore equivalent to being inquired of and being found. This last expression has occurred before in ch. 55 : 6, and as here in combination with the verb *to seek*. *A people not called by my name*, i. e. not recognised or known as my people. (See above, ch. 48 : 2.) All interpreters agree that this is a direct continuation of the foregoing context, and most of them regard it as the answer of Jehovah to the expostulations and petitions there presented by his people. The modern Germans and the Jews apply both this verb and the next to Israel. The obvious objection

is that Israel even in its worst estate could never be described as a nation which had not been called by the name of Jehovah. Jarchi's solution of this difficulty, namely, that they treated him as if they were not called by his name, is an evasion tending to destroy the force of language and confound all its distinctions. It is a standing characteristic of the Jews in the Old Testament, that they were called by the name of Jehovah; but if they may also be described in terms directly opposite, whenever the interpreter prefers it, then may any thing mean any thing. With equal right may we allege that the seed of Abraham in ch. 41 : 8 means those who act as if they were his seed, and that the nation who had never known Messiah (ch. 55 : 5) means a nation that might just as well have never known him. On the other hand, Kimchi's explanation of the clause as meaning that they were unwilling to be called his people, is as much at variance with the facts of history as Jarchi's with the principles of language. In all their alienations, exiles, and dispersions, the children of Israel have still retained that title as their highest glory and the badge of all their tribes. The incongruity of this interpretation of the first verse is admitted by Rabbi Moshe Hacohen among the Jews, and by Hendewerk among the Germans; the last of whom pronounces it impossible, and therefore understands the passage as applying to the Persians under Cyrus, who, without any previous relation to Jehovah, had been publicly and honourably called into his service. A far more obvious and natural application may be made to the gentiles generally, whose vocation is repeatedly predicted in this book, and might be here used with powerful effect in proof that the rejection of the Jews was the result of their own obstinate perverseness, not of God's unfaithfulness or want of power. This is precisely Paul's interpretation of the passage in Rom. 9 : 20, 21, where he does not as in many other cases merely borrow the expressions of the Prophet, but formally interprets them, applying this verse to the gentiles and then adding, 'but to Israel (or of Israel) he saith' what follows in the next verse. The same intention to expound the Prophet's language is clear from the apostle's mention of Isaiah's boldness in thus shocking the most cherished prepossessions of the Jews. Grotius takes no notice of this apostolical interpretation, but applies both verses to the Jews in Babylon, although Abarbenel himself had been constrained to abandon it, and understand the passage as referring to the Jews in Egypt. Gesenius merely pleads for the reference to Babylon as equally admissible with that which Paul makes, and as better suited to the context in Isaiah. Hitzig as usual goes further, and declares it to be evident (*offenbar*) that the words relate only to the Jews as alienated from Jehovah. This contempt for Paul's authority is less surprising in a writer who describes Jehovah's answer to the expostulations of the people as moving in a circle, and pronounces both incompetent to solve the question, why Jehovah should

entice men into sin and then punish them. Instead of אָרָב Lowth reads אָרָבָה (never invoked my name) on the authority of the Septuagint (ἐκάλεισαν). The last clause is not included in Paul's quotation.

V. 2. *I have spread (or stretched) out my hands all the day (or every day) to a rebellious people, those going the way not good, after their own thoughts (or designs).* The gesture mentioned in the first clause is variously explained as a gesture of simple calling, of instruction, of invitation, of persuasion. According to Hitzig it is an offer of help on God's part, corresponding to the same act as a prayer for help on man's. (See ch. 1 : 15.) All agree that it implies a gracious offer of himself and of his favour to the people. Whether *all the day* or *every day* be the correct translation, the idea meant to be conveyed is evidently that of frequent repetition, or rather of unremitting constancy. There is no need of supposing with Vitranga and others, that it specifically signifies the period of the old dispensation. The rebellious people is admitted upon all hands to be Israel. The last clause is an amplification and explanatory paraphrase of the first. *Going* and *way* are common figures for the course of life. *A way not good*, is a litotes or meiosis for a bad or for the worst way. (See Ps. 36 : 5. Ezek. 36 : 31. *Thoughts*, not opinions merely, but devices and inventions of wickedness. (See above, on ch. 55 : 7.) With this description compare that of Moses, Deut. 32 : 5, 6.

V. 3. *The people angering me to my face continually, sacrificing in the gardens, and censuring on the bricks.* We have now a more detailed description of the *way not good*, and the *devices* mentioned in the foregoing verse. The construction is continued, *the people provoking me* etc. being in direct apposition with the *rebellious people* etc. *To my face*, not secretly or timidly (Job 31 : 27), but openly and in defiance of me (ch. 3 : 9. Job 1 : 11), which is probably the meaning of *before me* in the first commandment (Ex. 20 : 3). Animal offerings and fumigations are combined to represent all kinds of sacrifice. As to the idolatrous use of groves and gardens, see above, on ch. 57 : 5, and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 20. Vitranga's distinction between groves and gardens is gratuitous, the Hebrew word denoting any enclosed and carefully cultivated ground, whether chiefly occupied by trees or not. Of the last words, *on the bricks*, there are four interpretations. The first is that of many older writers, who suppose an allusion to the prohibition in Exod. 20 : 24, 25. But bricks are not there mentioned, and can hardly come under the description of "hewn stone," besides the doubt which overhangs the application of that law, and especially the cases in which it was meant to operate. This evil is not remedied but rather aggravated, by supposing an additional allusion to Lev. 26 : 1 and

Num. 33 : 52, as Grotius does, and understanding by *the bricks* such as were impressed with unlawful decorations or inscriptions. A second hypothesis is that of Bochart, who supposes bricks to mean roofing-tiles (Mark 2 : 4. Luke 5 : 19), and the phrase to be descriptive of idolatry as practised on the roofs of houses. (2 Kings 23 : 12. Jer. 19 : 13. 32 : 29. Zeph. 1 : 5.) Ewald approves of this interpretation, and, to make the parallelism perfect, changes *garden* to *roofs*. Vitringa's objection to this reading, drawn from the analogy of ch. 1 : 29 and 56 : 17, Ewald converts into a reason for it, by supposing the common text to have arisen from assimilation. An objection not so easily disposed of is the one alleged by Knobel, namely, that Hebrew usage would require a different preposition before *garden*. A third hypothesis is that of Rosenmüller, who supposes an allusion to some practice now unknown, but possibly connected with the curiously inscribed bricks found in modern times near the site of ancient Babylon. Gesenius hesitates between this and a fourth interpretation, much the simplest and most natural of all, viz. that the phrase means nothing more than altars, or at most altars slightly and hastily constructed. Of such altars bricks may be named as the materials, or tiles as the superficial covering.

V. 4. *Sitting in the graves and in the holes they will lodge, eating the flesh of swine, and broth of filthy things (is in) their vessels.* All agree that this verse is intended to depict in revolting colours the idolatrous customs of the people. Nor is there much doubt as to the construction of the sentence, or the force of the particular expressions. But the obscurity which overhangs the usage referred to, affords full scope to the archaeological propensities of modern commentators, some of whom pass by in silence questions of the highest exegetical importance, while they lavish without stint or scruple time and labour, ingenuity and learning, on a vain attempt to settle questions which throw no light on the drift of the passage, nor even on the literal translation of the words, but are investigated merely for their own sake or their bearing upon other objects, so that Rosenmüller interrupts himself in one of these antiquarian inquiries by saying, *sed redeamus ad locum vatis in quo explicando versamur.* Such are the questions, whether these idolaters sat in the graves or among them; whether for necromantic purposes, i. e. to interrogate the dead, or to perform sacrificial rites to their memory, or to obtain demoniacal inspiration; whether *monuments* means monuments, or caves, or temples; whether they were lodged in for licentious purposes, or to obtain prophetic dreams; whether they are charged with simply eating pork for food, or after it had been sacrificed to idols; whether swine's flesh was forbidden for medicinal reasons, or because

the heathen sacrificed and ate it, or on other grounds; whether פֶּזֶם means broth or bits of meat, and if the former, whether it was so called on account of the bread broken in it, or for other reasons, etc. The only question of grammatical construction which has found a place among these topics of pedantic disquisition, is as such entitled to consideration, though of small importance with respect to the interpretation of the passage. It is the question whether עֲרֵבֵי־זֶבֶד is to be governed by a preposition understood (Rosenmüller), or explained as an accusative of place (Gesenius), or as the predicate of the proposition, *broth of abominable meats are their vessels* (Maurer). This last construction is retained by Knobel, but he changes the whole meaning of the clause by explaining the last word to mean *their instruments or implemets*, and giving to פֶּזֶם the sense of *bits or pieces*: 'pieces of abominable meat are their instruments of divination,' in allusion to the mantic inspection of the sacrificial victims by the heathen priests as means of ascertaining future events. Even if we should successively adopt and then discard every one of the opinions some of which have now been mentioned, the essential meaning of the verse would still remain the same, as a highly wrought description of idolatrous abominations.

V. 5. *The (men) saying, Keep to thyself, come not near to me, for I am holy to thee, these (are) a smoke in my wrath, a fire burning all the day (or every day).* Gesenius's obscure addition *und noch sagt* is faithfully transcribed by Noyes, *who yet say*. The peculiar phrase אֲרֵבֵי־זֶבֶד is analogous but not precisely equivalent to אֲרֵבֵי־זֶבֶד in ch. 49 : 20. (See above, p. 190.) The literal translation is *approach to thyself*; and as this implies removal from the speaker, the essential meaning is correctly expressed, though in a very different form from the original, both by the Septuagint (πόλλω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ) and by the Vulgate (*recede a me*). The common English version (*stand by thyself*) and Henderson's improvement of it (*keep by thyself*) both suggest an idea not contained in the original, viz. that of standing alone, whereas all that is expressed by the Hebrew phrase is the act of standing away from the speaker, for which Lowth has found the idiomatic equivalent (*keep to thyself*). Another unusual expression is אֲרֵבֵי־זֶבֶד, which may be represented by the English words, *I am holy thee*. The Targum resolves this into אֲרֵבֵי־זֶבֶד אֲרֵבֵי־זֶבֶד, and Vitringa accordingly assumes an actual ellipsis of the preposition אֲרֵבֵי as a particle of comparison. But as this ellipsis is extremely rare, De Dieu and Cocceius assume that of ל, *I am holy to thee*. Gesenius adopts the same construction, but explains the אֲרֵבֵי as a mere pleonasm, and translates accordingly, *I am holy*, which is merely omitting what cannot be explained. The particle no doubt expresses general relation, and the phrase means, *I am holy with respect to thee*; and as this

implies comparison, the same sense is attained as by the old construction, but in a manner more grammatical and regular. The implied comparison enables us to reconcile two of the ancient versions as alike in spirit, although in letter flatly contradictory. The Septuagint has *I am pure* (i. e. in comparison with thee); the Vulgate, *Thou art impure* (i. e. in comparison with me). There is no need, therefore, of resorting to the forced explanation proposed by Thenius in a German periodical, which takes וַיִּפְרָדֵם in the sense of separating, one which occurs no where else in actual usage, and is excluded even from the etymon, by some of the best modern lexicographers. Equally gratuitous is Hitzig's explanation of the verb (in which he seems to have been anticipated by Luther) as transitive, and meaning, *lest I hallow thee*, i. e. by touching thee, a notion contradictory to that expressed in Hagg. 2 : 12, 13, and affording no good sense here, as the fear of making others holy, whether as an inconvenience or a benefit, would hardly have been used to characterize the men described. As to the question who are here described, there are two main opinions: first, that the clause relates to the idolaters mentioned in the foregoing verses; the other, that it is descriptive of a wholly different class. On the first supposition, Gesenius imagines that Jewish converts to the Parsee religion are described as looking at their former brethren with contempt. On the other, Henderson assumes that the Prophet, having first described the idolatrous form of Jewish apostasy, as it existed in his own day and long after, then describes the pharisaical form of the same evil, as it existed in the time of Christ, both being put together as the cause of the rejection of the Jews. To any specific application of the passage to the Babylonish exile, it may be objected that the practice of idolatry at that time by the Jews can only be established by a begging of the question in expounding this and certain parallel passages. The other explanation is substantially the true one. The great end which the Prophet had in view was to describe the unbelieving Jews as abominable in the sight of God. His manner of expressing this idea is poetical, by means of figures drawn from various periods of their history, without intending to exhibit either of these periods exclusively. To a Hebrew writer what could be more natural than to express the idea of religious corruption by describing its subjects as idolaters, diviners, eaters of swine's flesh, worshippers of outward forms, and self-righteous hypocrites. Of such the text declares God's abhorrence. Smoke and fire may be taken as natural concomitants and parallel figures, as if he had said, against whom my wrath smokes and burns continually. Or the smoke may represent the utter consumption of the object, and the fire the means by which it is effected, which appears to have been Luther's idea. That אף in such connexions does not mean the nose, but wrath itself, has been shown in the exposition of ch. 48 : 9. (See above, p. 158.)

Vs. 6, 7. *Lo, it is written before me. I will not rest except I repay, and I will repay into their bosom your iniquities and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith Jehovah, who burned incense on the mountains and on the hills blasphemed me, and I will measure their first work into their bosom.* The particle at the beginning calls attention both to the magnitude and certainty of the event about to be predicted.—Lowth, for some reason unexplained, thinks proper to translate  $\text{כִּי־כָתוּב}$  *is recorded in writing*, which is abridged by Noyes to *stands recorded*, and still more by Henderson to *is recorded*. One step further in the same direction brings us back to the simple and perfectly sufficient version of the English Bible, *it is written*. This may serve as an instructive sample of the way in which the later English versions sometimes improve upon the old. The figure which these verbs express is variously understood by different writers. Umbreit seems think that what is said to be written is the eternal law of retribution. Hitzig and Knobel understand by it a *book of remembrance* (Mal. 3 : 16), i. e. a record of the sins referred to afterwards, by which they are kept perpetually present to the memory of Jehovah (Daniel 7 : 10). Viringa and most later writers understand by it a record, not of the crime, but of its punishment, or rather of the purpose or decree to punish it (Dan. 5 : 5, 24), in reference to the written judgments of the ancient courts (ch. 10 : 1). This last interpretation does not necessarily involve the supposition that the thing here said to be written is the threatening which immediately follows, although this is by no means an unnatural construction.—*I will not rest or be silent*, an expression used repeatedly before in reference to the seeming inaction or indifference of Jehovah. (See above, ch. 42 : 14. 57 : 11, and compare Ps. 50 : 21. Hab. 1 : 13.)—Gesenius and De Wette follow the older writers in translating, *I will not keep silence, but will recompense*. But although  $\text{אֵין־דָּבָר}$ , like the German *sondern*, is the usual adversative after a negation, this construction of the preterite  $\text{אֵין־כָּתוּב}$  would be contrary to usage, and  $\text{אֵין־דָּבָר}$  must be construed as it usually is before the preterite, as meaning unless or until, in which sense it is accurately rendered both by Hitzig (*bis*) and Ewald (*ausser*). See above, on ch. 55 : 10, where this same construction is gratuitously set aside by Hitzig on the ground that it would argue too much knowledge of natural philosophy in a Hebrew writer. (Compare also 2 Sam. 1 : 18.)—For *repay into their bosom*, we have in the seventh verse *measure into their bosom*, which affords a clue to the origin and real meaning of the figure; as we read that Boaz said to Ruth, Bring the veil (or cloak) that is upon thee and hold it, and she held it, and he measured six (measures of) barley and laid it on her (Ruth 3 : 15). Hence the phrase to measure into any one's bosom, i. e. into the lap or the fold of the garment covering the bosom. (See above, on ch. 49 : 22.) The same figure is employed by Jer. 32 : 18 and in Ps. 79 : 12, and is explained by



Rosenmüller in his *Scholia* on the latter, and by Winer in his *Lexicon*, as implying abundance, or a greater quantity than one could carry in the hand. (Compare Luke 6 : 38.) But Gesenius and Maurer understand the main idea to be not that of abundance, but of retribution, any thing being said to return into one's own bosom, just as it is elsewhere said to return upon his own head (Judg. 9 : 57. Ps. 7 : 17). Both these accessory ideas are appropriate in the case before us. In Jer. 32 : 18 and Ps. 79 : 12 the preposition  $\text{בָּאָזְנוֹ}$  is used, and the same form is also found here in some manuscripts, and even in the Masora upon the next verse, though the  $\text{בָּאֵלֶיךָ}$  is no more likely to be wrong there than here, nor at all, according to Maurer, who explains it as denoting motion towards an object from above. The sudden change from *their* to *your* at the beginning of v. 7, has been commonly explained as an example of the enallage personae so frequently occurring in Isaiah. This supposition is undoubtedly sufficient to remove all difficulty from the syntax. It is possible, however, that the change is not a mere grammatical anomaly or license of construction, but significant, and intended to distinguish between three generations. I will repay into their bosom (that of your descendants) your iniquities and the iniquities of your fathers. If this be not a fanciful distinction, it gives colour to Henderson's opinion that the previous description brings to view successively the gross idolatry of early times and the pharisaical hypocrisy prevailing at the time of Christ. Supposing his contemporaries to be the immediate objects of address, there would then be a distinct allusion to their idolatrous progenitors, the measure of whose guilt they filled up (Matt. 23 : 32), and to their children, upon whom it was to be conspicuously visited (Luke 24 : 28). But whether this be so or not, the meaning of the text is obvious, as teaching that the guilt which had accumulated through successive generations should be visited, though not exclusively, upon the last.—The whole of idolatry is here summed up in *burning incense on the mountains*, which are elsewhere mentioned as a favourite resort of those who worshipped idols (ch. 57 : 7. Jer. 3 : 6. Ez. 6 : 13. 18 : 6. Hos. 4 : 13), and *blaspheming God upon the hills*, which may either be regarded as a metaphorical description of idolatry itself, or strictly taken to denote the oral expression of contempt for Jehovah and his worship, which might naturally be expected to accompany such practices.—There is some obscurity in the word  $\text{רְאשִׁיטָה}$  as here used. Ewald takes it as an adverb, meaning first, or at first (*zuerst*), and appears to understand the clause as meaning, *their reward* (that of your fathers) *will I measure first into their bosom*. But this does not seem to agree with the previous declaration that the sons should suffer for the fathers' guilt and for their own together. At the same time, the construction is less natural and obvious than that of Gesenius and other writers, who make  $\text{רְאשִׁיטָה}$  an adjective agreeing with  $\text{הַמְּצֵאָה}$ , *their former work*, i. e. its product

or reward, as in ch. 40 : 10. (See above, p. 11.) The only sense in which it can be thus described is that of ancient, as distinguished not from the subsequent transgressions of the fathers, but from those of the children who came after them.—According to the sense which the Apostle puts upon the two first verses of this chapter, we may understand those now before us as predicting the excision of the Jews from the communion of the church and from their covenant relation to Jehovah, as a testimony of his sore displeasure on account of the unfaithfulness and manifold transgressions of that chosen race throughout its former history, but also on account of the obstinate and spiteful unbelief with which so many later generations have rejected the Messiah for whose sake alone they ever had a national existence and enjoyed so many national advantages.

V. 8. *Thus saith Jehovah, as (when) juice is found in the cluster and one says, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it, so will I do for the sake of my servants, not to destroy the whole.* Gesenius objects to the translation of כְּאִם as *if*, or *as when*, in the Vulgate and many other versions, on the ground that, though אִם is sometimes elliptically used for *when*, the compound particle never denotes *as when*. He therefore gives it the conditional sense of *if* or *when*, as in Gen. 27 : 40, and takes ו as in that case for the sign of the apodosis, '*when (or if) juice is found in the cluster, then one says,*' etc. But most interpreters consider it more natural to make כְּאִם and ו correlatives, as usual in cases of comparison, equivalent to *as* and *so* in English. We may then either supply *when*, as Maurer does, or translate it strictly, with Ewald and the English Version, *as the new wine is found in the cluster, and one says destroy it not, so will I do, etc.*—Although בִּירֵי־שָׂרֵשׁ, according to the derivation usually given, means fermented grape-juice of the first year, it is evidently here applied to the juice in its original state, unless we understand it to be used proleptically for the pledge or earnest of new wine. *A blessing is in it*, seems to mean something more than that it has some value. The idea meant to be suggested is, that God has blessed it, and that man should therefore not destroy it. The meaning of the simile in this clause appears obvious, and yet it has been strangely misconceived both by the oldest and the latest writers. Knobel understands it to mean that as a grape or a cluster of grapes is preserved for the sake of the juice, notwithstanding the presence of the stem, skin, and stones, which are of no use, so the good Jews shall be saved, notwithstanding the bad ones who are mingled with them. But this explanation would imply that men are sometimes disposed to destroy good grapes because they consist partly of unprofitable substances, and need to be reminded that the juice within is valuable. Much nearer to the truth, and yet erroneous, is Jerome's explanation of the clause as relating to a single good grape in a cluster,

which diminishes the force of the comparison by making the redeeming element too insignificant. The image really presented by the Prophet, as Vitranga clearly shows, and most later writers have admitted, is that of a good cluster (עֵץ זֵיט), in which juice is found, while others are unripe or rotten.—*I will do* is by some understood as meaning *I will act*, or I will cause it to be so; but this is not the usage of the Hebrew verb, which rather means precisely what the English *I will do* denotes in such connexions, i. e. I will do so, or will act in the same manner.—*My servants* is by some understood to mean the patriarchs, *the fathers*, for whose sake Israel was still beloved (Rom. 11 : 28). It is more natural, however, to apply it to the remnant, according to the election of grace (Rom. 11 : 5), the true believers represented by the ripe and juicy cluster in the foregoing simile.—The construction of the last words is the same as in ch. 48 : 9.—*The whole* is a literal translation of the Hebrew phrase, and at once more exact and more expressive than the common version, *them all*.

V. 9. *And I will bring forth from Jacob a seed and from Judah an heir of my mountains, and my chosen ones shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there.* This is an amplification of the promise, *I will do so*, in the foregoing verse. Knobel's interpretation of עֵדָוָה as meaning a generation, i. e. a body of contemporaries, is at variance both with etymology and usage, with the parallel expression *heir* or *inheritor*, and with the figurative import of the verb, which is constantly applied to the generation of new animal and vegetable products. (See ch. 1 : 4.) That there is reference to propagation and increase is also rendered probable by the analogy of ch. 27 : 6 and 37 : 31. Objections of the same kind may be urged against the needless attenuation of the proper sense of עֵדָוָה, so as to exclude the idea of regular succession and hereditary right. *My mountains* is supposed by Vitranga to denote Mount Zion and Moriah, or Jerusalem as built upon them; but the later writers more correctly suppose it to describe the whole of Palestine, as being an uneven, hilly country. See the same use of the plural in ch. 14 : 25, and the analogous phrase, *mountains of Israel*, repeatedly employed by Ezekiel (36 : 1, 8. 38 : 8). The corresponding singular, *my mountain* (11 : 9. 57 : 13), is by many understood in the same manner. Lowth restores that reading here on the authority of the Septuagint and Peshito, but understands it to mean Zion, which he also makes the antecedent of the suffix in the phrase *inherit it*, while Maurer refers it to the land directly, and some of the older writers make it a collective neuter. The adverb at the end of the sentence properly means *thither*, and is never perhaps put for *there* except in cases where a change of place is previously mentioned or implied. If so, the sense is not merely that they shall abide there, but that they shall first go or return thither, which in this connexion is peculiarly

appropriate.—Of the promise here recorded there are three principal interpretations. The first, embraced by nearly all the modern Germans, is that the verse predicts the restoration of the Jews from Babylon. The second may be stated in the words of Henderson, viz. that “the future happy occupation of Palestine by a regenerated race of Jews is here clearly predicted.” The third is that the verse foretells the perpetuation of the old theocracy or Jewish church; not in the body of the nation, but in the remnant which believed on Christ; and which, enlarged by the accession of the gentiles, is identical in character and rights with the church of the old dispensation, the heir to all its promises, and this among the rest, which either has been or is to be fulfilled both in a literal and figurative sense; in the latter, because the Church already has what is essentially equivalent to the possession of the land of Canaan under a local ceremonial system; in the former, because Palestine is yet to be recovered from the Paynim and the Infidel, and rightfully occupied, if not by Jews, by Christians, as the real seed of Abraham, partakers of the same faith and heirs of the same promise (Heb. 11 : 9), for the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham, or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4 : 13). If it should please God to collect the natural descendants of the patriarch in that land and convert them in a body to the true faith, there would be an additional coincidence between the prophecy and the event, even in minor circumstances, such as we often find in the history of Christ. But if no such national restoration of the Jews to Palestine should ever happen, the extension of the true religion over that benighted region, which both prophecy and providence encourage us to look for, would abundantly redeem the pledge which God has given to his people in this and other parts of Scripture.

V. 10. *And Sharon shall be for (or become) a home of flocks, and the Valley of Achor a lair of herds, for my people who have sought me.* This is a repetition of the promise in the foregoing verse, rendered more specific by the mention of one kind of prosperity, viz. that connected with the raising of cattle, and of certain places where it should be specially enjoyed, viz. the valley of Achor and the plain of Sharon. Two reasons have been given for the mention of these places, one derived from their position, the other from their quality. As the valley of Achor was near Jericho and Jordan, and the plain of Sharon on the Mediterranean, between Joppa and Cesarea, some suppose that they are here combined to signify the whole breadth of the land, from East to West. And as Sharon was proverbial for its verdure and fertility (see above, ch. 33 : 9. 35 : 2), it is inferred by some that Achor was so likewise, which they think is the more probable because Hosea says that the valley of Achor shall be a door of hope (Hos. 2 : 17). But this

may have respect to the calamity which Israel experienced there at his first entrance on the land of promise (Josh. 7 : 26), so that where his troubles then began his hopes shall now begin. For these or other reasons Sharon and Achor are here mentioned, in Isaiah's characteristic manner, as samples of the whole land, or its pastures, just as flocks and herds are used as images of industry and wealth, derived from the habits of the patriarchal age. That this is the correct interpretation of the flocks and herds, is not disputed even by the very writers who insist upon the literal construction of the promise that the seed of Jacob shall possess the land, as guaranteeing the collection of the Jews into the region which their fathers once inhabited. By what subtle process the absolute necessity of literal interpretation is transformed into a very large discretion when the change becomes convenient, is a question yet to be determined.—That to *seek Jehovah* sometimes has specific reference to repentance and conversion, on the part of those who have been alienated from him, may be seen by a comparison of ch. 9 : 12 and 55 : 6.

V. 11. *And (as for) you, forsakers of Jehovah, the (men) forgetting my holy mountain, the (men) setting for Fortune a table, and the (men) filling for Fate a mingled draught.* This is only a description of the object of address; the address itself is contained in the next verse. The form  $\text{פָּנֵי}$  indicates a contrast with what goes before, as in ch. 3 : 14. The class of persons meant is first described as forsakers of Jehovah and forgetters of his holy mountain. Rosenmüller understands this as a figurative name for the despisers of his worship; but Knobel, as a literal description of those exiles who had lost all affection for Jerusalem, and had no wish to return thither. The description of the same persons in the last clause is much more obscure, and has occasioned a vast amount of learned disquisition and discussion. The commentators on the passage who have gone most fully into the details, are Vitrina and Rosenmüller; but the clearest summary is furnished by Gesenius. The strangest exposition of the clause is that of Zeltner, in a dissertation on the verse (1715), in which he applies it to the modern Jews as a prolific and an avaricious race. Many interpreters have understood the two most important words ( $\text{גַּד}$  and  $\text{מִנְיָן}$ ) as common nouns denoting *troop* and *number* (the former being the sense put upon the name *Gad*, in Gen. 30 : 11), and referred the whole clause either to convivial assemblies, perhaps connected with idolatrous worship, or to the troop of planets and the multitude of stars, as objects of such worship. But as the most essential words in this case are supplied, the later writers, while they still suppose the objects worshipped to be here described, explain the descriptive terms in a different manner. Luther retains the Hebrew names *Gad* and *Meni*, which are also given in the margin of the English Bible; but most inter-

preters explain them by equivalents. Gesenius ingeniously argues from the etymology of the names that they relate to human destiny; and from the mythology of the ancient eastern nations, that they relate to heavenly bodies. He dissents, however, from Vitringa's opinion that the sun and moon are meant, as well as from the notions of older writers, that the names are descriptive of the planetary system, the signs of the Zodiac, particular constellations, etc. His own opinion is that  $\text{כֶּזֶב}$  is the planet Jupiter (identical with Bel or Baal), and  $\text{זִכְרָה}$  the planet Venus (identical with Ashtoreth), which are called in the old Arabian mythology the Greater and Lesser Fortune or Good Luck, while Saturn and Mars were known as the Greater and Lesser Evil Fortune or Ill Luck. J. D. Michaelis had long before explained the names here used as meaning Fortune and Fate, or Good and Evil Destiny; and Ewald, in like manner, understands the planets here intended to be Jupiter and Saturn, while Knobel goes back to the old hypothesis of Vitringa and the others, that the names denote the Sun and Moon, the latter assumption being chiefly founded on the supposed affinity between  $\text{זִכְרָה}$  and  $\mu\upsilon\eta$ . Others connect it with the Arabic  $\text{مساق}$ , an idol worshipped at Mecca before the time of Mohammed. Some supposed the moon to be called  $\text{זִכְרָה}$  (from  $\text{זָכַר}$  to measure), as a measure of time. Amidst this diversity of theories and explanations, only a very minute part of which has been introduced by way of sample, it is satisfactory to find that there is perfect unanimity upon the only point of exegetical importance, namely, that the passage is descriptive of idolatrous worship; for even those who apply it directly to convivial indulgences connect the latter with religious institutions. This being settled, the details still doubtful can be interesting only to the philologist and antiquarian. The kind of offering described is supposed to be identical with the *lectisternia* of the Roman writers; and Gesenius characteristically says, the show-bread in the temple at Jerusalem was nothing else (*nichts anders*). The heathen rite in question consisted in the spreading of a feast for the consumption of the gods. Herodotus mentions a  $\text{τραπέζα ἑλίον}$  as known in Egypt; and Jeremiah twice connects this usage with the worship of the queen of heaven. (Jer. 7 : 18. 44 : 17.)  $\text{מִצְרָה}$  denotes *mixture*, and may either mean spiced wine, or a compound of different liquors, or a mere preparation or infusion of one kind. (See the *Earlier Prophecies*, p. 78.)—As to the application of the passage, there is the usual division of opinion among the adherents of the different hypotheses. Henderson's reasoning upon this verse is remarkable. Having applied vs. 3–5 to the ancient Jewish idolatry, he might have been expected to attach the same sense to the words before us, where the Prophet seems to turn again to those of whom he had been speaking when he began to promise the deliverance of the elect remnant (v. 8). But “it seems more natural to regard them as the impe-

nitent and worldly portion of the Jews who shall live at the time of the restoration." The reason given for this sudden change can only satisfy the minds of those who agree with the author in his foregone conclusion, namely, that "the persons addressed in this and the four following verses are contrasted with those who are to return and enjoy the divine favour in Palestine." But even after the application of the terms is thus decided, there is a question not so easily disposed of, as to what they mean. The principle of strict interpretation might be thought to require the conclusion doubtfully hinted at by J. D. Michaelis, that the Jews are to worship Gad and Meni hereafter. But, according to Henderson, "there is no reason to imagine that the Jews will again become actual idolaters," as if the strict interpretation of this verse would not itself afford a reason, not for imagining but for believing, that it will be so. But rather than admit this, he declares that "all attempts to explain *Gad* and *Meni* of idols literally taken, are aside from the point." From what point they are thus aside does not appear, unless it be the point of making half the prophecy a loose metaphorical description, and cutting the remainder to the quick by a rigorously literal interpretation. "Israel," "Jerusalem," "the land," *must* all denote the "Israel," "Jerusalem," and "land" of ancient times and of the old economy; but all attempts to explain Gad and Meni of idols literally taken are aside from the point. And thus we are brought to the curious result of one literal interpretation excluding another as impossible. The true sense of the passage seems to be the same as in vs. 3-7, where Henderson himself regards the Prophet as completing his description of the wickedness of Israel, by circumstances drawn from different periods of his history, such as the idolatrous period, the pharisaical period, etc.

V. 12. *And I have numbered you to the sword, and all of you to the slaughter shall bow; because I called and ye did not answer, I spake and ye did not hear, and ye did the (thing that was) evil in my eyes, and that which I desired not ye chose.* The preceding verse having reference only to the present and the past, the *Vav* at the beginning of this can have no conversive influence upon the verb, which is therefore to be rendered as a preterite. The objections to making it the sign of the apodosis have been already stated. The paraphrastic version, *therefore*, is entirely gratuitous. Gesenius gives the verb in this one place the diluted sense of allotting or appointing; but the strict sense of numbering or counting is not only admissible, but necessary to express a portion of the writer's meaning, namely, the idea that they should be cut off one by one, or rather one with another, i. e. all without exception. (See ch. 27 : 12 and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 467.) Knobel, indeed, imagines that a universal slaughter cannot be intended, because he goes on to tell what shall befall the survivors, viz.

hunger, thirst, disgrace, distress, etc. Hitzig had taste enough to see that these are not described as subsequent in time to the evils threatened in the verse before us, but specifications of the way in which that threatening should be executed. The sense above given to  $\text{קָרַח}$  is confirmed and illustrated by its application elsewhere to the numbering of sheep. (Jer. 33 : 13.) In its use here there is evident allusion to its derivative  $\text{קָרַח}$  in the preceding verse, which some of the German writers try to make perceptible to German readers by combining cognate nouns and verbs, such as *Shicksal* and *schicke*, *Verhängniss* and *verhänge*, *Bestimmung* and *bestimme*, etc. The same effect, if it were worth the while, might be produced in English by the use of *destiny* and *destine*. Vitringa, in order to identify the figures of the first and second clauses, makes  $\text{קָרַח}$  mean a butcher's knife; but an opposite assimilation would be better, namely, that of making  $\text{קָרַח}$  mean slaughter in general, not that of the slaughter-house exclusively. Both sword and slaughter are familiar figures for violent destruction. The verb  $\text{קָרַח}$  is also applied elsewhere to one slain by violence (Judg. 5 : 27. 2 Kings 9 : 24). Bowing or stooping to the slaughter is submitting to it either willingly or by compulsion. Gesenius takes  $\text{קָרַח}$  in the local sense of *Schlachtbank*, to suit which he translates the verb *kneel*, and the particle *before*. This last Noyes retains without the others, in the English phrase *bow down before the slaughter*, which is either unmeaning, or conveys a false idea, that of priority in time. The remainder of the verse assigns the reason of the threatened punishment. The first expression bears a strong resemblance to the words of Wisdom, in Prov. 1 : 24-31. Knobel's explanation of the 'thing that was evil in my eyes' as a description of idolatry, is as much too restricted as Vitringa's explanation of 'that which I desired not or delighted not in' as signifying ritual or formal as opposed to spiritual worship. Of the two the former has the least foundation, as the only proof cited is ch. 38 : 3, whereas Vitringa's explanation of the other phrase derives no little countenance from Ps. 40 : 7. 51 : 18. Hos. 6 : 6. The only objection to either is that it mistakes a portion of the true sense for the whole.—As to the application of the words, there is the usual confidence and contradiction. Knobel regards them as a threatening of captivity and execution to the Jews who took sides with the Babylonians against Cyrus. Henderson applies them to the inevitable and condign punishment of those Jews who shall prefer the pleasures of sin to those of true religion embraced by the great body of the nation, which punishment, he adds, "will, *in all probability*, be inflicted upon them in common with the members of the antichristian confederacy, after their believing brethren shall have been securely settled in Palestine." The grounds of this all-probable anticipation are not given. Vitringa understands the passage as predicting the excision of the Jewish nation from the church, not only for the crowning sin of rejecting Christ,



but for their aggregate offences as idolaters and hypocrites, as rebels against God and despisers of his mercy, with which sins they are often charged in the Old Testament (e. g. ch. 50 : 2. 65 : 2. 66 : 4. Jer. 7 : 13, 25), and still more pointedly by Christ himself in several of his parables and other discourses, some of which remarkably resemble that before us both in sentiment and language. (See Matt. 23 : 37. 22 : 7. Luke 19 : 27, and compare Acts 13 : 46.) Besides the countenance which this analogy affords to Vitranga's exposition, it is strongly recommended by its strict agreement with what we have determined, independently of this place, to be the true sense of the whole foregoing context. Interpreted by these harmonious analogies, the verse, instead of threatening the destruction of the Babylonish Jews before the advent, or of the wicked Jews and Antichrist hereafter, is a distinct prediction of a far more critical event than either, the judicial separation of the Jewish nation and the Israel of God, which had for ages seemed inseparable, not to say identical.

Vs. 13, 14. *Therefore thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Lo! my servants shall eat and ye shall hunger; lo, my servants shall drink and ye shall thirst; lo, my servants shall rejoice and ye shall be ashamed; lo, my servants shall shout from gladness of heart, and ye shall cry from grief of heart, and from brokenness of spirit ye shall howl.* These verses merely carry out the general threatening of the one preceding, in a series of poetical antitheses, where hunger, thirst, disgrace, and anguish, take the place of sword and slaughter, and determine these to be symbolical or emblematic terms. Knobel's interpretation of these verses as predicting bodily privations and hard bondage to those who should escape the sword of Cyrus, is entitled to as little deference as he would pay to the suggestion of Vitranga, that the eating and drinking have specific reference to the joy with which the first Christian converts partook of the Lord's supper (Acts 2 : 46. 9 : 31). This is no doubt chargeable with undue refinement and particularity, but notwithstanding this excess, the exposition is correct in principle, as we may learn from the frequent use of these antagonist metaphors to signify spiritual joy and horror, not only in the Prophets (see above, ch. 8 : 21. 33 : 16. 55 : 1. 58 : 14), but by our Saviour when he speaks of his disciples as eating bread in the kingdom of heaven (Luke 14 : 13), where many shall come from the east and the west, and sit down (or recline at table) with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. 8 : 11); and ascribes to the king in the parable the solemn declaration, I say unto you none of those men that were bidden shall taste of my supper (Luke 14 : 24). Thus understood, the passage is a solemn prediction of happiness to the believing and of misery to the unbelieving Jews. The latter are directly addressed, the former designated as *my servants*.—*Gladness of heart*, literally goodness of heart,

which in our idiom would express a different idea, on account of our predominant use of the first word in a moral sense. For the Hebrew expression see Deut. 28 : 47. Judg. 19 : 6, 22. For *brokenness of spirit*, compare ch. 61 : 1 and Ps. 51 : 17.—To be ashamed, as often elsewhere, includes disappointment and frustration of hope.

V. 15. *And ye shall leave your name for an oath to my chosen ones, and the Lord Jehovah shall slay thee, and shall call his servants by another name* (literally, call another name to them). The object of address is still the body of the Jewish nation, from which the believing remnant are distinguished by the names *my chosen* and *my servants*. *Oath* is here put for curse, as it is added to it in Dan. 9 : 11, and the two are combined in Num. 5 : 21, where the *oath of cursing* may be regarded as the complete expression of which *oath* is here an ellipsis. To leave one's name for a curse, according to Old Testament usage, is something more than to leave it to be cursed. The sense is that the name shall be used as a formula of cursing, so that men shall be able to wish nothing worse to others than a like character and fate. This is clear from Jer. 29 : 22 compared with Zech. 3 : 2, as well as from the converse or correlative promise to the patriarchs and their children that a like use should be made of their names as a formula of blessing (Gen. 22 : 18. 48 : 20). As in other cases where the use of names is the subject of discourse, there is no need of supposing that any actual practice is predicted, but merely that the character and fate of those addressed will be so bad as justly to admit of such an application.—Ewald ingeniously explains the words  $\text{וְיִשְׁמְרֶנּוּ אֶת־שְׁמֵךְ לְעִוְבֹתֵיךְ}$  as the very form of cursing to be used, *so may the Lord Jehovah slay thee!* This construction, though adopted by Umbreit and Knobel, is far from being obvious or natural. The preterite, though sometimes construed with the optative particles, would hardly be employed in that sense absolutely, especially in the middle of a sentence, preceded and followed by predictive clauses, each beginning with  $\text{וְ}$ , which on Ewald's supposition must be either overlooked as pleonastic or violently made to bear the sense of *so*. Even if this were one of the meanings of the particle, a more explicit form would no doubt have been used in a case where the comparison is every thing. The wish required by the context is that God would kill them so, or in like manner; a bare wish that he would kill them, would be nothing to the purpose. The violence of this construction might be counteracted as an argument against it by exegetical necessity, but no such necessity exists. The use of the singular pronoun *thee*, so far from requiring it, is in perfect keeping with the rest of the sentence. As the phrase *your name* shows that the object of address is a plurality of persons bearing one name, or in other words an organized community, so the singular form *slay thee* is entirely appropriate to this collective

or ideal person.—Of the last clause there are three interpretations. The rabbinical expounders understand it as the converse of the other clause. As your name is to be a name of cursing, so my servants are to have another name, i. e. a name of blessing, or a name by which men shall bless. Others give it a more general sense, as meaning their condition shall be altogether different. A third opinion is that it relates to the substitution of the Christian name for that of Jew, as a distinctive designation of God's people. The full sense of the clause can only be obtained by combining all these explanations, or at least a part of each. The first is obviously implied, if not expressed. The second is established by analogy and usage, and the almost unanimous consent of all interpreters. The only question is in reference to the last, which is of course rejected with contempt by the neologists, and regarded as fanciful by some Christian writers. These have been influenced in part by the erroneous assumption that if this is not the whole sense of the words, it cannot be a part of it. But this is only true in cases where the two proposed are incompatible. The true state of the case is this: According to the usage of the prophecies the promise of another name imports a different character and state, and in this sense the promise has been fully verified. But in addition to this general fulfilment, which no one calls in question, it is matter of history that the Jewish commonwealth or nation is destroyed; that the name of Jew has been for centuries a bye-word and a formula of execration, and that they who have succeeded to the spiritual honours of this once favoured race, although they claim historical identity therewith, have never borne its name, but another, which from its very nature could have no existence until Christ had come, and which in the common parlance of the Christian world is treated as the opposite of Jew. Now all this must be set aside as mere fortuitous coincidence, or it must be accounted for precisely in the same way that we all account for similar coincidences between the history of Christ and the Old Testament in minor points, where all admit that the direct sense of the prophecy is more extensive. As examples, may be mentioned John the Baptist's preaching in a literal wilderness, our Saviour's riding on a literal ass, his literally opening the eyes of the blind, when it is evident to every reader of the original passage that it predicts events of a far more extensive and more elevated nature. While I fully believe that this verse assures God's servants of a very different fate from that of the unbelieving Jews, I have no doubt that it also has respect to the destruction of the Jewish state and the repudiation of its name by the true church or Israel of God.

V. 16. *(By) which the (man) blessing himself in the land (or earth) shall bless himself by the God of truth, and (by which) the (man) swearing in the land (or earth) shall swear by the God of truth, because forgotten*

are the former enmities (or troubles), and because they are hidden from my eyes. Two things have divided and perplexed interpreters in this verse, as it stands connected with the one before it. The first is the apparent change of subject, and the writer's omission to record the new name which had just been promised. The other is the very unusual construction of the relative  $\text{וְשֵׁם}$ . The first of these has commonly been left without solution, or referred to the habitual freedom of the writer. The other has been variously but very unsuccessfully explained. Kinchi takes it in the sense of *when*, Luther in that of *so that*. Vitringa connects it with the participle, as if it were a future. Rosenmüller and Gesenius regard it as redundant, which is a mere evasion of the difficulty, as the cases which they cite of such a usage are entirely irrelevant, as shown by Maurer, whose own hypothesis is not more satisfactory, viz. that either the article or relative was carelessly inserted (*negligentius dictum*). Ewald gives the relative its strict sense, and makes Jehovah the antecedent, by supplying before it, thus saith Jehovah (or saith he) by whom the man that blesses etc. This has the advantage of adhering to the strict sense of the pronoun, but the disadvantage of involving an improbable ellipsis, and of making the writer say circuitously what he might have said directly. Thus saith he by whom the person blessing blesses by the God of truth, is perfectly equivalent to Thus saith the God of truth. Both these objections may be obviated by referring  $\text{וְשֵׁם}$  to an expressed antecedent, viz. name, a construction given both in the Septuagint and Vulgate versions, although otherwise defective and obscure. Another advantage of this construction is that it removes the abrupt transition and supplies the name, which seems on any other supposition to be wanting. According to this view of the place, the sense is that the people shall be called after the God of truth, so that his name and theirs shall be identical, and consequently whoever blesses or swears by the one blesses or swears by the other also. The form in which this idea is expressed is peculiar, but intelligible and expressive: 'His people he shall call by another name, which (i. e. with respect to which, or more specifically by which) he that blesseth shall bless by the God of truth,' etc. Ewald supposes blessing and cursing to be meant, as oath is used above to signify a curse; but most interpreters understand by blessing himself, praying for God's blessing, and by swearing, the solemn invocation of his presence as a witness, both being mentioned as acts of religious worship and of solemn recognition.— $\text{וְשֵׁם}$  is probably an adjective meaning *sure*, trustworthy, and therefore including the ideas of reality and faithfulness, neither of which should be excluded, and both of which are comprehended in the English phrase, the true God, or retaining more exactly the form of the original, *the God of truth*. Henderson's version, "faithful God," expresses only half of the idea. This Hebrew word is retained in the Greek of the New Testament, not only as a participle

of asseveration, but in a still more remarkable manner as a name of Christ (Rev. 1 : 18. 3 : 14), with obvious reference to the case before us ; and there must be something more than blind chance in the singular coincidence thus brought to light between this application of the phrase and the sense which has been put upon the foregoing verse, as relating to the adoption of the Christian name by the church or chosen people. As applied to Christ, the name is well explained by Vitringa to describe him as *very God*, as a witness to the truth, as the substance or reality of the legal shadows, and as the fulfiller of the divine promises. Ewald agrees with the older writers in rendering  $\text{בְּאֶרֶץ}$  *in the earth*, but most interpreters prefer the more restricted version, *in the land*. The difference is less than might at first sight be supposed, as 'in the land' could here mean nothing less than in the land of promise, the domain of Israel, the church in its widest and most glorious diffusion.—The last clause gives the reason for the application of the title, God of truth, viz. because in his deliverance of his people he will prove himself to be the true God in both senses, truly divine and eminently faithful. This proof will be afforded by the termination of those evils which the sins of his own people once rendered necessary. Usage is certainly in favour of the common version, troubles or distresses ; but there is something striking in Lowth's version, *provocations*, which agrees well with what seems to be the sense of  $\text{צָרָה}$  in ch. 63 : 9. As commonly translated, it is understood by Gesenius as meaning that God will forget the former necessity for punishing his people, which is equivalent to saying that he will forget their sins. But Maurer understands the sense to be that he will think no more of smiting them again. Both seem to make the last words a poetical description of oblivion ; but Knobel refers what is said of forgetting to the people, and only the remaining words to God.

V. 17. *For lo I (am) creating (or about to create) new heavens and a new earth, and the former (things) shall not be remembered, and shall not come up into the mind (literally, on the heart).* Some interpreters refer *former* to heavens and earth, which makes the parallelism more exact ; but most interpreters refer it to  $\text{הַקְּדִמָּה}$  in v. 16, where the same adjective is used, or construe it indefinitely in the sense of *former things*. Of the whole verse there are several distinct interpretations. Aben Ezra understands it as predicting an improvement in the air and soil, conducive to longevity and uninterrupted health ; and a similar opinion is expressed by J. D. Michaelis, who illustrates the verse by the supposition of a modern writer who should describe the vast improvement in Germany since ancient times, by saying that the heaven and the earth are new. A second explanation of the verse is that of Thomas Burnet and his followers, which makes it a

prediction of the renovation of the present earth with its skies etc. after the destruction of the present at the day of judgment. A third is that of Vitringa, who regards it as a figurative prophecy of changes in the church, according to a certain systematic explication of the several parts of the material universe as symbols. Better than all these, because requiring less to be assumed, and more in keeping with the usage of prophetic language, is the explanation of the verse as a promise or prediction of entire change in the existing state of things, the precise nature of the change and of the means by which it shall be brought about forming no part of the revelation here. That the words are not inapplicable to a revolution of a moral and spiritual nature, we may learn from Paul's analogous description of the change wrought in conversion (2 Cor. 5 : 17. Gal. 6 : 15), and from Peter's application of this very passage, Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness (2 Peter 3 : 13). That the words have such a meaning even here, is rendered probable by the last clause, the oblivion of the former state of things being much more naturally connected with moral and spiritual changes than with one of a material nature.

V. 18. *But rejoice and be glad unto eternity (in) that which I (am) creating, for lo I (am) creating Jerusalem a joy, and her people a rejoicing,* i. e. a subject or occasion of it. There is no need of explaining the imperatives as futures, though futurity is of course implied in the command. It would be highly arbitrary to explain *what I create* in this place as different from the creation in the verse preceding. It is there said that a creation shall take place. It is here enjoined upon God's people to rejoice in it. But here the creation is declared to be the making of Jerusalem a joy and Israel a rejoicing. Now the whole analogy of the foregoing prophecies leads to the conclusion that this means the exaltation of the church or chosen people; and the same analogy admits of that exaltation being represented as a revolution in the frame of nature. On the other hand, a literal prediction of new heavens and new earth would scarcely have been followed by a reference merely to the church; and if Jerusalem and Zion be explained to mean the literal Jerusalem and the restored Jews, the only alternative is then to conclude that as soon as they return to Palestine, it and the whole earth are to be renewed, or else that what relates to Jerusalem and Israel is literal, and what relates to the heavens and the earth metaphorical, although, as we have just seen, the connexion of the verses renders it necessary to regard the two events as one. From all these incongruities we are relieved by understanding the whole passage as a poetical description of a complete and glorious change. et

V. 19. *And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people; and there shall not be heard in her again the voice of weeping and the voice of crying.* Considered as the language of the Prophet himself, this would express his sympathetic interest in the joyous changes which awaited his people. But such an application would be wholly arbitrary, as Jehovah is undoubtedly the speaker in the foregoing verse, where he claims creative power; and even here there is an implication of divine authority in the promise that weeping shall no more be heard in her. There is something very beautiful in the association of ideas here expressed. God shall rejoice in his people, and they shall rejoice with him. They shall no longer know what grief is, because he shall cease to grieve over them; their former distresses shall be forgotten by them and for ever hidden from his eyes.

V. 20. *There shall be no more from there an infant of days, and an old man who shall not fulfil his days; for the child a hundred years old shall die, and the sinner a hundred years old shall be accursed.*—Some refer  $\text{הַיּוֹם}$  to time, and understand it to mean *thenceforth*, a departure from the settled usage which can be justified only by necessity. Others regard the preposition as unmeaning, and read *there*, which is as arbitrary as Lowth's reading  $\text{שָׁם}$ , neither of which proceedings can be justified by the example of the ancient versions. The strict translation *thence (from there)* is not only admissible but necessary to the sense. It does not, however, mean springing or proceeding thence, but taken away thence, or as Kimchi has it, carried thence to burial. It is thus equivalent to  $\text{הָיָה}$  in the next clause, and denotes that none shall die there in infancy. In consequence of not correctly apprehending this, Hitzig alleges that this first clause by itself can only mean that there shall be no longer any infants, to avoid which paralogism he connects  $\text{עוֹלַם יָמָיו}$  as well as  $\text{זָקֵן}$  with the following words: neither infant nor old man who shall not fulfil their days. But there is no need of this tautological construction if  $\text{הַיּוֹם}$  implies death, and  $\text{הַיּוֹם}$  a few days only, which last is more agreeable to usage than the specific sense of *year*, which some assume. A curious turn is given to the sentence by some of the older writers, who take *fulfil his days* in the moral sense of spending them well, with special reference to improvement in knowledge, and *the child* as meaning one who even at a very advanced age continues still a child in understanding, and shall therefore die. Still more unnatural is the modification of this exposition by Cocceius, who explains the whole to mean that men shall have as abundant opportunities of instruction in the truth as if they enjoyed a patriarchal longevity, so that he who perishes for lack of knowledge will be left without excuse. Vitranga justly repudiates these far-fetched explanations, but agrees with them in understanding *shall*

*die* as an emphatic threatening, and in departing from the ordinary sense of  $\text{דָּוָה}$ , which he takes to be here an equivalent to *sinner*. All the modern writers are agreed as to the literal meaning of this last clause, though they differ as to the relation of its parts. Some regard it as a synonymous parallelism, and understand the sense to be that he who dies a hundred years old will be considered as dying young, and by a special curse from God, interrupting the ordinary course of nature. Others follow De Dieu in making the parallelism antithetic, and contrasting the child with the sinner. Perhaps the true view of the passage is, that it resumes the contrast drawn in vs. 13-15 between the servants of Jehovah and the sinners there addressed. Vs. 16-19 may then be regarded as a parenthetical amplification. As if he had said, My servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall mourn; my servants shall be just beginning life when ye are driven out of it; among the former, he who dies a hundred years old shall die a child; among you, he who dies at the same age shall die accursed. On the whole, however, the most natural meaning is the one already mentioned as preferred by most modern writers. Premature death, and even death in a moderate old age, shall be unknown; he who dies a hundred years old shall be considered either as dying in childhood, or as cut off by a special malediction. The whole is a highly poetical description of longevity, to be explained precisely like the promise of new heavens and a new earth in v. 17. Beck's gross expressions of contempt for the absurdity of this verse are founded on a wilful perversion or an ignorant misapprehension. Ewald is equally unjust but less indecent in his representation of this verse as a fanatical anticipation of the literal change which it describes.

Vs. 21, 22. *And they shall build houses and inhabit (them), and shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them, they shall not build and another inhabit, they shall not plant and another eat; for as the days of a tree (shall be) the days of my people, and the work of their hands my chosen ones shall wear out (or survive).* This is a promise of security and permanent enjoyment, clothed in expressions drawn from the promises and threatenings of the Mosaic law. By the age of a tree is generally understood the great age which some species are said to attain, such as the oak, the banyan, etc. But Knobel takes it in the general sense of propagation and succession, and understands the promise to be that, as trees succeed each other naturally and for ever, so shall the chosen of Jehovah do. The essential idea is in either case that of permanent continuance, and the figures here used to express it make it still more probable that in the whole foregoing context the predictions are to be figuratively understood.



V. 23. *They shall not labour in vain, and they shall not bring forth for terror; for the seed of the blessed of Jehovah are they, and their offspring with them.* The sense of *sudden destruction* given to  $\text{הִנְיָה־בָּ}$  by some modern writers, is a mere conjecture from the context, and no more correct than the translation *curse*, which others derive from the Arabic analogy, and which Henderson regards as the primitive meaning. The Hebrew word properly denotes extreme agitation and alarm, and the meaning of the clause is that they shall not bring forth children merely to be subjects of distressing solitudeness. Knobel, as in ch. 1 : 4, takes  $\text{בְּנֵי־יָמֵי}$  in the sense of a generation or contemporary race; but it adds greatly to the strength of the expression if we give its more usual sense of progeny or offspring: they are themselves the offspring of those blessed of God, and their own offspring likewise, as the older writers understand  $\text{בְּנֵי־יָמֵי}$ , while the moderns suppose it to mean *shall be with them*, i. e. shall continue with them, as opposed to the alarm referred to in the other clause. Umbreit's idea that the picture of domestic happiness is here completed by the unexpected stroke of parents and children still continuing to live together, is ingenious and refined, perhaps too much so to be altogether natural in this connexion.

V. 24. *And it shall be (or come to pass), that they shall not yet have called and I will answer, yet (shall) they (be) speaking and I will hear.* A strong expression of God's readiness to hear and answer prayer, not a mere promise that it shall be heard (like that in Jer. 29 : 12. Zech. 13 : 9), but an assurance that it shall be granted before it is heard. The nearest parallel is Matth. 6 : 8, where our Lord himself says, Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. (Compare ch. 30 : 19. 58 : 9. Ps. 145 : 18, 19.)— $\text{וְעַד־יִקְרָאוּ}$  is commonly explained here as a conjunction, *before they call*, and Gesenius gives this as the primary meaning of the Hebrew particle. But according to Hitzig and Maurer, this is always expressed by the compound form  $\text{וְעַד־יִקְרָאוּ}$ , and the simple form invariably means *not yet*. This construction, which might otherwise seem very harsh, is favoured by the use of the conjunction *and*, which, on the usual hypothesis, must be omitted or regarded merely as a sign of the apodosis, whereas in the parallel clause it occupies precisely the same place, and can only be taken in its usual sense. Lowth attempts to reproduce the form of the original, but not with much success, by rendering the last clause, "they shall be yet speaking and I shall have heard." The parallel verbs both mean to hear prayer in a favourable sense, and are therefore rendered in the Vulgate by the cognate forms *audiam* and *exaudiam*. The last verb is curiously paraphrased in the Septuagint, *I will say, what is it?* ( $\epsilon\grave{\iota}\rho\omega\ \tau\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ ;) )

V. 25. *The wolf and the lamb shall feed as one, and the lion like th*

ox shall eat straw, and the serpent dust (for) his food. They shall not hurt and they shall not corrupt (or destroy) in all my holy mountain, saith Jehovah. The promise of a happy change is wound up in the most appropriate manner by repeating the prophecy in ch. 11 : 6-9, that all hurtful influences shall for ever cease in the holy hill or church of God. Yet Knobel ventures to assert that it is an unmeaning imitation of that passage, introduced here without any just connexion, and perhaps by a different hand from that of the original writer. Another fact which had escaped preceding writers, is that the phrase *as one* belongs to the later Hebrew, because used in Ecc. 11 : 6, whereas it is essentially identical with *as one man* in Judges 20 : 8. 1 Sam. 11 : 7. It is not a simple synonyme of *הִתְּוַי* together (the word used in ch. 11 : 6), but much stronger and more graphic ; so that Lowth only weakens the expression by proposing to assimilate the readings on the authority of a single manuscript. Another point in which the description is here heightened is the substitution of *הִתְּוַי*, a young and tender lamb, for *בֶּן־שָׁנָה*, a he-lamb of riper age. Ewald expresses the distinction here by using the diminutive term *Lämmlein*.—Instead of *the lion like the ox*, the Vulgate has *the lion and the ox (leo et bos)*, and that the *et* is not an error of the text for *ut* appears from the plural form of the verb *comedent*.—Most of the modern writers construe *הִתְּוַי* as a nominative absolute, *as for the serpent, dust (shall be) his food*. A more obvious construction is to repeat the verb *shall eat*, and consider *dust* and *food* as in apposition. J. D. Michaelis supplies *continue (bleibe)*, and most writers regard this idea as implied though not expressed : The serpent shall continue to eat dust. Michaelis and Gesenius suppose an allusion to the popular belief that serpents feed on dust because they creep upon the ground, and understand the prophecy to be that they shall henceforth be contented with this food and cease to prey on men or other animals. But this, as Vitringa well observes, would be too small a promise for the context, since a very small part of the evils which men suffer can arise from this cause. He therefore understands the clause to mean that the original curse upon the serpent who deceived Eve (Gen. 3 : 14) shall be fully executed. (Compare Rev. 20 : 1-3.) He refers to some of his contemporaries as explaining it to mean that the serpent should henceforth prey only upon low and earthly men ; but this would be too large a concession, and the true sense seems to be that, in accordance with his ancient doom, he shall be rendered harmless, robbed of his favourite nutriment, and made to bite the dust at the feet of his conqueror. (Gen. 3 : 15. Rom. 16 : 20. 1 John 3 : 8. Compare Isaiah 49 : 20.)—The last clause resolves the figures of the first. The verbs are therefore to be understood indefinitely, as in ch. 11 : 9 ; or if they be referred to the animals previously mentioned, it is only a symbolical or tropical expression of the same idea. Hitzig gratuitously says that the verbs which in the other place relate

to men, are here determined to refer to animals by the connexion ; to which Knobel flippantly replies that this is not the case, because there is no connexion to determine it. The truth is that the form of expression is the same in either case, except that what begins a verse in the eleventh chapter here concludes one. Had the passage here repeated been in one of the so-called later chapters, it would no doubt have been cited as a proof of the author's identity ; but no such proof can be admitted by the "higher criticism" in favour of identifying the writer of this chapter with the genuine Isaiah. Rather than listen to such reasoning, the "higher critics" make it a case of imitation and abridgment, and one of them, as we have seen, of ignorant interpolation.—For any further explanation of this verse, the reader is referred to the Earlier Prophecies, pp. 224-227.

---

## CHAPTER LXVI.

THIS chapter winds up the prophetic discourse with an express prediction of the change of dispensations, and a description of the difference between them. Jehovah will no longer dwell in temples made with hands, v. 1. Every sincere and humble heart shall be his residence, v. 2. The ancient sacrifices, though divinely instituted, will henceforth be as hateful as the rites of idolatry, v. 3. They who still cling to the abrogated ritual will be fearfully but righteously requited, v. 4. The true Israel cast out by these deluded sinners shall ere long be glorified, and the carnal Israel fearfully rewarded, vs. 5, 6. The ancient Zion may already be seen travailing with a new and glorious dispensation, vs. 7-9. They who mourned for her seeming desolation now rejoice in her abundance and her honour, vs. 10-14. At the same time the carnal Israel shall be destroyed, as apostates and idolaters, vs. 14-17. The place which they once occupied shall now be filled by the elect from all nations, v. 18. To gather these, a remnant of the ancient Israel shall go forth among the gentiles, v. 19. They shall come from every quarter and by every method of conveyance, v. 20. They shall be admitted to the sacerdotal honours of the chosen people, v. 21. This new dispensation is not to be temporary, like the one before it, but shall last for ever, v. 22. While the spiritual Israel is thus replenished from all nations, the apostate Israel shall perish by a lingering decay in the sight of an astonished world, vs. 23, 24.

V. 1. *Thus saith Jehovah, The heavens (are) my throne, and the earth my footstool; where is (or what is) the house which ye will build for me, and where is (or what is) the place of my rest? literally the place my rest, i. e. the place which is or can be my rest or permanent abode.* The same term is elsewhere applied to the temple, as distinguished from the tabernacle or moveable sanctuary. (See 2 Sam. 7 : 6. 2 Chron. 6 : 41. Ps. 132 : 8.) As to the sense of *מִיָּמִי*, see above on ch. 50 : 1. In this case *where* is less appropriate than *what*, as the inquiry seems to have respect to the nature or the quality rather than the mere locality of the edifice in question. Hitzig translates *מִיָּמִי* strictly *a house*, and *בְּבִנְיָתְכֶם* is variously rendered *ye build*, in the English Bible; *ye would build*, by Ewald; *ye could build*, by Gesenius, etc.; but the simplest and best version is *ye will build*, as including all the others. All interpreters agree that this question implies disapprobation of the building, as at variance with the great truth propounded in the first clause, namely, that the frame of nature is the only material temple worthy of Jehovah. This obvious relation of the clauses is sufficient of itself to set aside two of the old interpretations of the passage. The first is that of Kimchi, favoured more or less by Calvin and some later writers, which supposes that this chapter is a counterpart to the first, and that the Prophet here recurs to his original theme, the corruptions and abuses of his own age. But besides the undisputed references to the future in the latter part of this very chapter, it has been conclusively objected by Vitringa to the theory in question, that in the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah there could be no thought of building or rebuilding, nor even of repairing or adorning the temple, but rather of despoiling it. (2 Kings 16 : 17. 18. 18 : 15.) The same objection lies against the theory of Grotius, that this chapter was intended to console the pious Jews who were debarred from the customary public worship during the profanation of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes. In neither of these cases could there be occasion for objecting to the building or rebuilding of the temple. Those who refer this whole series of predictions to the period of the Babylonish exile find it hard to explain this chapter upon that hypothesis, since the building of the temple is urged upon the people as a duty by the acknowledged prophets of the exile. In order to facilitate the process, some of them detach it from the foregoing context, on the ground of its abrupt commencement, which is not at all more striking than in other cases where no such conclusion has been drawn, because not felt to be necessary for the critic's purpose. Eichhorn found this a fit occasion for the application of the "higher criticism," and he accordingly strikes out vs. 1-17 of this chapter as an older composition than the rest, the exact date not definable, but certainly prior to the downfall of the Jewish monarchy. Paulus and Rosenmüller, on the other hand, regard the whole as later than the first return from Babylon. Between these extremes Gesenius as usual under-

takes to mediate, condemns the first as "trennende Kritik," and refutes it by a copious but superfluous detail of minute coincidences both of thought and language between the disputed passage and the foregoing chapters, which he therefore supposes to belong to the same period. From this decision there is no material dissent among the later writers, although Hitzig asserts in the strongest terms the utter want of connexion between this and the preceding chapters. The same assertion might be made with equal plausibility in any other case of a continued composition where the writer is not trammelled by a systematic method, but passes freely from one topic to another, in obedience to a lively and unchecked association of ideas. No reader or interpreter who has not a hypothesis to verify will find any reason for supposing a greater interruption here than at the end of an ordinary paragraph. The fallacy of the contrary assertion has been shown by Vitringa to consist in assuming that the passages are unconnected unless the first verse of the second carries out the thought expressed in the last verse of the first, whereas the chapter now before us is in some sense parallel to that before it, taking up the subject at the same point and bringing it at last to the same issue. That exposition is indeed most probably the true one which assumes the most intimate connexion of the chapters here, and is least dependent upon forced divisions and arbitrary intervals crowded with imaginary events. Thus Rosenmüller thinks that in the interval between these chapters the tribes of Benjamin and Judah had resolved to exclude the others from all participation in the rebuilding of the temple, and that the passage now before us was intended to reprove them for their want of charity, as if this end could be accomplished by proclaiming the worthlessness of all material temples, which is tantamount to saying, why do you refuse to let your countrymen assist in the rebuilding of the temple, since no temples are of any value? Hitzig's imagination is still more prolific, and invents a project to erect another temple in Chaldea as a succedaneum for returning to Jerusalem. At the same time his superior acuteness guards against the palpable absurdity already mentioned, by supposing the error here corrected to be that of believing that the mere erection of a temple would discharge their obligations and secure their welfare, without any reference to what Jehovah had commanded. They are therefore taught that he has no need of material dwellings, and that these, to be of any value, must be built exactly when and where and as he pleases to require. (1 Sam. 15 : 22, 23.) This ingenious exposition would be faultless if it rested upon any firmer basis than a perfectly imaginary fact. That there is any proof of it from other quarters, is not pretended. That it is not a necessary inference from that before us, will be clear when the true interpretation has been given. It is necessary first to state, however, that while Hitzig thus infers from the text itself a fact unknown to history because it never happened, Henderson with equal

confidence infers from it a fact as little known to history, but for a very different reason. While the one considers it as proving that a party of the exiles in Babylon desired to build a temple there instead of going back to Palestine, the other considers it as proving that part of the restored Jews will unlawfully attempt to rebuild the old temple in Palestine itself, and that this passage is intended to reprove them. Yet in ch. 60 : 7, 13 we read not only of a sanctuary to be literally built of the most costly timber, but of an altar and of victims to be offered on it ; all which may be tortured into figures, it appears, provided that the future restoration of the Jews be strictly expounded in a local sense.—With these interpretations, and the forced hypotheses which they involve, we may now compare another which has been approved by various judicious writers, but by none more clearly stated or more successfully maintained than by Vitringa. It is simply this, that having held up in every point of view the true design, mission, and vocation of the church or chosen people, its relation to the natural descendants of Abraham, the causes which required that the latter should be stripped of their peculiar privileges, and the vocation of the gentiles as a part of the divine plan from its origin, the Prophet now addresses the apostate and unbelieving Jews at the close of the old dispensation, who, instead of preparing for the general extension of the church and the exchange of ceremonial for spiritual worship, were engaged in the rebuilding and costly decoration of the temple at Jerusalem. The pride and interest in this great public work, felt not only by the Herods but by all the Jews, is clear from incidental statements of the Scriptures (John 2 : 20. Matt. 24 : 1) as well as from the ample and direct assertions of Josephus. That the nation should have been thus occupied precisely at the time when the Messiah came, is one of those agreements between prophecy and history which cannot be accounted for except upon the supposition of a providential and designed assimilation. To the benefit of this coincidence the exposition which has last been given is entitled, and by means of it the probabilities, already great, may be said to be converted into certainties, or if any thing more be needed for this purpose it will be afforded by the minuter points of similarity which will be presented in the course of the interpretation. One advantage of this exposition is that it accounts for the inference here drawn from a doctrine which was known to Solomon and publicly announced by him (1 Kings 8 : 27), though described by Gesenius as unknown to the early Hebrews, who supposed that God was really confined to earthly temples. (1 Chron. 28 : 2. Ps. 99 : 5. 132 : 5.) It may be asked, then, why this truth did not forbid the erection of the temple at first, as well as its gorgeous reconstruction in the time of Christ. The answer is, that it was necessary for a temporary purpose, but when this temporary purpose was accomplished it became not only useless but unlawful. Henceforth the worship was to be a spiritual worship, the

church universally diffused, and the material sanctuary, as J. D. Michaelis says, no longer an earthly residence for God but a convenient place of meeting for his people.

V. 2. *And all these my own hand made, and all these were (or are), saith Jehovah; and to this one will I look, to the afflicted and contrite in spirit and trembling at my word.* By all these it is universally admitted that we are to understand the heavens and the earth, of which he claims to be not only the sovereign, as in the preceding verse, but the creator.—The next expression may be differently understood. Lowth supplies לִי *to me*, on the authority of the Septuagint (*ἕστω ἐμῷ*), and adds that this word is absolutely necessary to the sense. But according to Hebrew usage, the verb would not have been expressed if this had been the meaning; and the clause as Lowth completes it does not mean *they are mine*, but *they were (or have been) mine*. The same objection lies in some degree against the explanation of וַיִּהְיֶה without לִי as meaning *they exist* (i. e. by my creative power). The reference is rather to the time of actual creation, *my hand made them and they were*, i. e. began to be. (See Gen. 1 : 3. Ps. 33 : 9.) Both tenses of the verb are combined to express the same idea in Rev. 4 : 11. J. D. Michaelis and Ewald show the true connexion by translating, ‘my hand made them and so they were or came into existence.’—It is important to the just interpretation of these verses to observe the climax in them. First the temples made by men are contrasted with the great material temple of the universe; then this is itself disparaged by Jehovah as his own handiwork, and still more in comparison with a nobler temple of a spiritual nature, the renewed and contrite heart. (See ch. 57 : 15. 2 Cor. 6 : 16.) The same condescending favour is expressed for the same objects elsewhere. (Ps. 34 : 19. 138 : 6.) To look to, is to have regard to, and implies both approbation and affection. (See Gen. 4 : 4, 5. Ex. 2 : 25. Num. 16 : 15. Judg. 6 : 14. Ps. 25 : 16.) The Septuagint and Vulgate make the last clause interrogative: To whom shall I look but? etc.—*Contrite or broken in heart or spirit* is a scriptural description of the subjects of divine grace in its humbling and subduing influences. (Ch. 61 : 1. 65 : 14.) The Septuagint renders it ἡσύχιος *quiet*, implying patient acquiescence in the will of God.—The הָרַר refers to the following description, like זָרַח in ch. 56 : 2.—Gesenius illustrates עַל הָרַר *על* by citing 1 Sam. 4 : 13, where Eli is described as trembling for the ark of God; but Hitzig justly represents the cases as unlike, and explains the one before us as denoting not solicitude about the word of God, but an earnest inclination to it, or as Ewald renders it a *trembling to his word*, i. e. an eager and yet fearful haste to execute his will. (Compare Hos. 3 : 5. 11 : 10, 11.) The use of the phrase in historical prose by Ezra (9 : 4. 10 : 3) is probably borrowed from the place before us.

V. 3. *Slaying the ox, smiting a man—sacrificing the sheep, breaking a dog's neck—offering an oblation, blood of swine—making a memorial of incense, blessing vanity—also they have chosen their ways, and in their abominations has their soul delighted.* This translation, although scarcely English, will convey some idea of the singular form of the original, and render intelligible what is said as to the different constructions of the sentence.—The first clause consists of four similar members, in each of which are coupled a form of sacrifice under the Mosaic law and an offering which according to that law was inadmissible and even revolting. The ox and the sheep represent the animal sacrifices, the  $\text{חֶלֶב}$  or meat-offering, and the incense those of an unbloody nature. The verbs connected with these nouns are likewise all selected from the technical vocabulary of the law.  $\text{שָׁחַט}$  and  $\text{חָטַט}$  both originally signify to slay or slaughter, but are especially applied to sacrificial slaughter in the Pentateuch.  $\text{אֲשַׁחֵט}$  is the participle of a verb which means to cause to ascend, and in the language of the ritual, upon the altar.  $\text{אֲשַׁחֵט}$  is another, of obscurer origin and strict signification, though its use and application are as clear as any of the rest. The modern writers commonly derive it from the noun  $\text{חֶלֶב}$  the technical name of a certain kind of offering, especially of incense (Lev. 24 : 7) with or without other vegetable substances (Num. 5 : 26). It seems to mean *memorial* and is usually so translated, and explained upon the ground that the fumes of the incense were conceived of as ascending into heaven and reminding God of the worshipper. The same figure was then transferred to prayers and other spiritual offerings.—Thus we read in Acts 10 : 4 that the angel said to Cornelius, thy prayers and thine alms are come up before God *for a memorial*  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ , the very phrase employed by the Septuagint in the case before us. The verb then means to offer this oblation, but may be considered as expressing more directly the recalling of the worshipper to God's remembrance, as it literally means to *remind*. Being also used in the sense of mentioning, it is so understood here by Luther, while the Vulgate gives it the meaning of its primitive, remembering.—*Smiting* has here, as often elsewhere, the emphatic sense of wounding mortally or killing. (Gen. 4 : 15. Ex. 2 : 12. Josh. 20 : 5. 1 Sam. 17 : 26.)  $\text{שָׁחַט}$  (from  $\text{שָׁחַט}$  the neck) is a technical term used in the law to denote the breaking of the neck of unclean animals when not redeemed from consecration to Jehovah. (Ex. 13 : 13. Deut. 21 : 4.) It expresses therefore a peculiar mode of killing. The dog has ever been regarded in the east as peculiarly unclean, and in that light is coupled with the swine not only in the Bible (Matt. 7 : 6. 2 Pet. 2 : 22) but by Horace, who twice names dog and swine together as the vilest animals. *Swine's blood* alone is without a verb to govern it, which Lowth thinks a defect in the existing text, while Hitzig ascribes it to the haste of composition. Bochart supplies *eating*, but Vitranga properly



objects that all the rest relates to sacrifice. The simplest course is to repeat the leading verb of the same member.— $\text{וְיָסֵף}$  is commonly supposed to mean an idol, as it does in a few places; but it is better to retain its generic sense, as more expressive. This is by some understood to be vanity, non-entirety, or worthlessness, as attributes of idols; by others, injustice or iniquity in general. The whole phrase is commonly explained to mean *blessing* (i. e. praising or worshipping) *an idol*, or as Hitzig thinks, *saluting* it by kissing (1 Kings 19 : 18. Job 31 : 27); but Luther gives it the general sense of *praising wickedness*, an act to which he supposes that of *mentioning incense* to be likened, while Knobel understands  $\text{וְיָסֵף}$  adverbially, and the phrase as meaning one who worships God unlawfully or wickedly; but this would be comparing a thing merely with itself, and as all the other secondary phrases denote rites of worship, it is better so to understand this likewise. Such is the meaning of the several expressions; but a question still remains as to their combination. The simplest syntax is to supply the verb of existence, and thus produce a series of short propositions: He that slays an ox smites a man, etc. Lowth and Ewald understand this to mean that the same person who offers sacrifice to God in the form prescribed by law is also guilty of murder and idolatry, a practice implying gross hypocrisy as well as gross corruption. The ancient versions all supply a particle of likeness—he that slays an ox is like one that murders a man, etc. This is adopted by most of the modern writers, but of late without supplying any thing, the words being taken to assert not mere resemblance but identity, which is the strongest form of comparison. It is certainly more expressive to say that an offerer of cattle is a murderer, than to say that he is like one, though the latter may be after all the real meaning. He is a murderer, i. e. God so esteems him. According to Lowth and Ewald, the verse describes the coexistence of ritual formality with every kind of wickedness, especially idolatry, as in the first chapter. Gesenius objects that this presupposes the existence of the Mosaic ritual when the passage was written, never dreaming that instead of presupposing it might prove it. His own interpretation and the common one is that the passage relates not to the actual practice of the abominations mentioned, but to the practice of iniquity in general, which renders the most regular and costly offerings as hateful to Jehovah as the most abominable rites of idolatry. Among those who adopt this explanation of the sentence there is still a difference as to its application. Gesenius applies it to the worthlessness of ritual performances without regard to moral duty; Hitzig and Knobel to the worthlessness of sacrifices which might be offered at the temple built in Babylonia; Henderson to the unlawfulness of sacrifices under the Christian dispensation, with particular reference to the case of the restored Jews and their temple at Jerusalem. I still regard Vitringa's exposition as the most exact, profound, and satisfactory, whether considered

in itself or in relation to the whole preceding context. He agrees with Gesenius in making the text the general doctrine that sacrifice is hateful in the sight of God if offered in a wicked spirit, but with a special reference to those who still adhered to the old sacrifices after the great sacrifice for sin was come and had been offered once for all. Thus understood this verse extends to sacrifices that which the foregoing verses said of the temple, after the change of dispensations.

V. 4. *I also will choose their vexations, and their fear I will bring upon them; because I called and there was no one answering, I spake and they did not hear, and they did evil in my eyes, and that which I delight not in they chose.* The larger part of this verse, from *because* to the end, is repeated from ch. 65 : 12, and serves not only to connect the passages as parts of an unbroken composition, but also to identify the subjects of discourse in the two places. According to the usual analogy of the masoretic interpunction, the first words of the verse before us ought to be connected as a parallel clause with the last words of v. 3, partly because each verse is complete and of the usual length without the clause in question, partly because the parallelism is indicated by the repetition of the  $\text{עַל}$ . This repetition occurs elsewhere as an equivalent to the Greek  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ — $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , the Latin *et*—*et*, and our *both*—*and*, as in the phrase *also yesterday, also to-day* (Ex. 5 : 14). In the case before us it is paraphrased by some translators, *as they chose, so I choose*, by others, *as well they as I chose*; but perhaps the nearest equivalent in English is, *on their part they chose, and on my part I choose*. The obvious antithesis between the pronoun of the third and first person precludes the supposition that a different class of persons is denoted by  $\text{הֵמָּה עַל}$ . The common version of  $\text{עַל$ — $\text{לֵבָבָם}$  (*delusions*) seems to be founded on a misconception of the Vulgate *illusiones*, which was probably intended to suggest the idea of derision like the  $\epsilon\mu\pi\alpha\iota\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  of the Septuagint. The true sense of the word here is essentially the same but somewhat stronger, viz. annoyances, vexations, which last is employed to represent it by Cocceius. It is in the cognate sense of petulance, caprice, that it is used to denote children in ch. 3 : 4. This etymological affinity is wholly disregarded by translating the word here calamities, with Lowth, Gesenius, and others. *Their fear* is the evil which they fear, as in Prov. 10 : 24, where the same idea is expressed almost in the same words.

V. 5. *Hear the word of Jehovah, ye that tremble at his word. Your brethren say, (those) hating you and casting you out for my name's sake, Jehovah will be glorified and we shall gaze upon your joy—and they shall be ashamed.* Trembling at (or rather to) Jehovah's word seems to mean reverently waiting for it. Ye that thus expect a message from Jehovah,

now receive it. Vitringa adheres strictly to the masoretic accents, which connect *for my name's sake* with what follows: 'Your brethren say—those hating you and casting you out—for my name's sake Jehovah shall be glorified.' To this construction there are two objections: first, that the same persons who are three times mentioned in the plural are abruptly made to speak in the singular, for *my name's sake*, an enallage which although possible is not to be assumed without necessity; and secondly, that *for my name's sake* is not the appropriate expression of the thought supposed to be intended, which would rather be *by my means*. The majority of later writers are agreed in so far departing from the accents as to join the phrase in question with what goes before; which is the less objectionable here, as we have seen already in the preceding verses some appearance of inaccuracy in the masoretic interpunction. The neuter verb  $\text{קָדַשׁ}$  is here applied to God, as it is elsewhere to men (Job 14 : 21) and cities (Ezek. 27 : 25), in the sense of being *glorious* rather than *glorified*, which would require a passive form. It may be construed either as an optative or future; but the last is more exact, and really includes the other. All are agreed that these two words ( $\text{קָדַשׁ יְהוָה}$ ) are put into the mouth of the brethren before mentioned; but it is made a question whether the next phrase,  $\text{וְיִרְאוּ אֶת שְׂמֵיךָ}$ , is spoken by them likewise. Piscator, followed by the English and Dutch versions, makes this the language of the Prophet, and translates it, *and he shall appear to your joy*. Besides the doubtful sense thus put upon the preposition, this translation really involves a change of pointing, so as to read  $\text{וְיִרְאוּ}$  or a very unusual construction of the participle. Vitringa makes these words the language of a chorus, and supposes them to mean, 'but we shall see your joy and they shall be ashamed.' The modern writers who refer  $\text{וְיִרְאוּ}$ , as we have seen, to God himself, are obliged to make  $\text{וְיִרְאוּ}$  the language of another speaker,—unless they assume a pluralis majestaticus, as some old Jewish writers did, according to Aben Ezra, which they do by adding it to what immediately precedes,—'Your brethren say, Jehovah shall be glorified and we shall see your happiness;' the verb  $\text{רָאָה}$ , as usual when followed by the preposition  $\text{ב}$ , meaning to view or gaze at with strong feeling, and in this case with delight. This construction is unanimously sanctioned by the latest German writers, and is in itself much simpler and more natural than any other. As to the application of the verse there is the usual diversity of judgment. Jarchi and Abarbenel apply it to the treatment of the Jews in their present exile by the Mohammedans and Romans, called their brethren because descendants of Ishmael and Esau. Gesenius seems to understand it as relating to the scornful treatment of the exiled Jews in Babylon by their heathen enemies. Knobel denies that the latter would be spoken of as brethren, and applies it to the treatment of the pious Jews by their idolatrous countrymen. Hitzig questions even this application of

*brethren*, and explains the verse of the contempt with which the exiles who were willing to return were treated by the unbelievers who remained behind. But how could those who thus remained be said to *cast out* such as insisted on returning? The phrase may possibly be taken in the vague sense of despising or treating with contempt; but this diluted explanation, though admissible in case of necessity, cannot take precedence of the strict one, or of the interpretation which involves it. Vitringa, although rather infelicitous in his construction and translation of the sentence, has excelled all other writers in his exhibition of its general import. He applies it, in accordance with his previous hypothesis, to the rejection of the first Christian converts by the unbelieving Jews: Hear the word (or promise) of Jehovah, ye that wait for it with trembling confidence: your brethren (the unconverted Jews) who hate you and cast you out for my name's sake, have said (in so doing), 'Jehovah will be glorious (or glorify himself in your behalf no doubt), and we shall witness your salvation' (a bitter irony like that in ch. 5 : 19); but they (who thus speak) shall themselves be confounded (by beholding what they now consider so incredible). Besides the clearness and coherence of this exposition in itself considered, and its perfect harmony with what we have arrived at as the true sense of the whole foregoing context, it is strongly recommended by remarkable coincidences with the New Testament, some of which Vitringa specifies. That the unbelieving Jews might still be called the brethren of the converts, if it needed either proof or illustration, might derive it from Paul's mode of address to them in Acts 22 : 1, and of reference to them in Rom. 9 : 3. The phrase *those hating you* may be compared with John 15 : 18. 17 : 14. Matt. 10 : 22. 1 Thess. 2 : 14; and *casting you out* with John 16 : 2. and Matthew 18 : 17; *for my name's sake* with Matt. 24 : 10; to which may be added the interesting fact that the verb *קָטַף* and its derivatives are used to this day by the Jews in reference to excommunication. Thus understood the verse is an assurance to the chosen remnant in whom the true Israel was to be perpetuated, that although their unbelieving countrymen might cast them out with scorn and hatred for a time, their spite should soon be utterly confounded. The great truth involved in the change of dispensations may be signally developed and exemplified hereafter, as Henderson infers from this passage that it will be, in the case of the restored Jews who receive the doctrine of the gospel and their brethren who persist in endeavouring to establish the old ritual; but we dare not abandon the fulfilment which has actually taken place for the sake of one which may never happen, since we have not been able thus far to discover any clear prediction of it.

V. 6. *A voice of tumult from the city! A voice from the temple! The voice of Jehovah, rendering requital to his enemies!* The Hebrew word

רִשָּׁף is never applied elsewhere to a joyful cry or a cry of lamentation, but to the tumult of war, the rushing sound of armies and the shock of battle, in which sense it is repeatedly employed by Isaiah. The enemies here mentioned must of course be those who had just been described as the despisers and persecutors of their brethren, and whose confusion after being threatened generally in the verse preceding is here graphically represented in detail. Even Aben Ezra says, these enemies of God are those who cast the others out. The description therefore cannot without violence be understood of foreign or external enemies. These data furnished by usage and the context will enable us to estimate the various interpretations of the verse before us. If what has just been stated be correct, the noise heard by the Prophet cannot be the rejoicing of the Maccabees and their adherents when the temple was evacuated by Antiochus, as Grotius imagines; nor the preaching of the gospel by the apostles beginning at Jerusalem, as Junius and Tremellius think; nor a voice calling for vengeance on the Romans, according to Jarchi; nor the blasphemies of the heathen, according to Abarbenel. Nor can the words, if rightly understood as meaning the tumult of war, be applied to the destruction of Gog and Magog, as by Kimchi; or to any other external enemies, as by the modern Germans. These indeed are not a little puzzled to explain the verse in any consistency with their hypothesis. Gesenius admits that there is so far a difficulty as the anti-theocratic party stayed behind in Babylon, and queries whether the Prophet may not have expected many such to go up in the hope of worldly advantages, and there to be smitten by the divine judgments! Maurer as usual sees no difficulty in the case, because Jehovah is described as punishing the wicked Jews not *in* Jerusalem but *from* it. Hitzig makes it a description of the general judgment foretold by Joel, when all the nations should be judged at Jerusalem (Joel 4: 2). Knobel confidently adds that the Prophet expected this great judgment to fall specially upon the Babylonians, whom Cyrus had not punished sufficiently, and with them on the idolatrous exiles. Umbreit, who seems to float in mid-air between faith and unbelief in his interpretation of this passage, makes the noise a joyful noise and separates it from Jehovah's voice bringing vengeance to his external enemies.—The only Christian interpreter that need be quoted here is Henderson, who says that “by a remarkable and astounding interposition of Jehovah the scheme of the Jews shall be defeated; the very temple which they shall be in the act of erecting shall be the scene of judgment.” Then adopting the groundless notion of the German writers, that the *voice of Jehovah* always means thunder, he adds that “in all probability the projected temple will be destroyed by lightning.” This is certainly sufficiently specific, but by no means so entitled to belief as the fulfilment of the prophecy which has already taken place. In strict adherence to the usage of the words and to requisitions of

the context, both immediate and remote, the verse may be applied to the giving up of Zion and the temple to its enemies, as a final demonstration that the old economy was at an end, and that the sins of Israel were now to be visited on that generation. The assailants of Jerusalem and of the Jews were now no longer those of God himself, but rather chosen instruments to execute his vengeance on his enemies, the unbelieving Jews themselves. Vitringa goes too far when he restricts the tumult here described to the noise actually made by the Romans in the taking of Jerusalem.—It rather comprehends the whole confusion of the siege and conquest, and a better commentary on this brief but grand prediction cannot be desired than that afforded by Josephus in his narrative of what may be regarded as not only the most dreadful siege on record but in some respects the most sublime and critical conjuncture in all history, because coincident with the transition from the abrogated system of the old economy to the acknowledged introduction of the new, a change of infinitely more extensive influence on human character and destiny than many philosophical historians have been willing to admit or even able to discover.

V. 7. *Before she travailed she brought forth, before her pain came she was delivered of a male.* All interpreters agree that the mother here described is Zion, that the figure is essentially the same as in ch. 49: 21, and that in both cases an increase of numbers is represented as a birth, while in that before us the additional idea of suddenness is expressed by the figure of an unexpected birth. The difference between the cases is that in the other a plurality of children is described, while in this the whole increase is represented in the aggregate as a single birth. As to the specification of the sex, some regard it as a mere illustration of the oriental predilection for male children, not intended to have any special emphasis, while others make it significant of strength as well as numbers in the increase of the people. As to the application of the passage there is nothing in the terms employed which can determine it, but it must follow the sense put upon the foregoing context or the general hypothesis of the interpreter. Those who see nothing in these chapters but the restoration of the Jews from Babylon explain this verse as meaning simply that the joyful return of the exiles to the long forsaken city would be like an unexpected birth to a childless mother. According to Henderson, “the language forcibly expresses the sudden and unexpected reproduction of the Jewish nation in their own land in the latter day; their future recovery is the object of the divine purpose, and every providential arrangement shall be made for effecting it; yet the event shall be unexpectedly sudden.” In both these cases there is an accommodation of the passage to the exegetical hypothesis without any attempt to show that the latter derives confirmation from it. In both cases too there is a certain

abruptness in the transition from the judgment threatened in the preceding verse to the promise here recorded. Knobel somewhat awkwardly describes the general judgment on the nations at Jerusalem, including specially the Babylonians and apostate Jews, as being *followed* by the speedy return of the believing exiles. Henderson in like manner makes the restoration *follow* the destruction of the projected temple by lightning, and yet supposes it to be described as unexpectedly sudden. Such retrogressions in the order of events are not without example, but they certainly give no advantage to the theories in which they are involved over such as have no need of them. Of this description is Vitring's doctrine that the passage has respect to the vocation of the gentiles as immediately consequent upon the excision of the Jews—a sequence of events which is continually held up to view in the New Testament history. (Luke 24 : 47. Acts 3 : 26. 13 : 46. 18 : 6. Rom. 1 : 16. 2 : 10.) The only questionable point in his interpretation is his pressing the mere letter of the metaphor too far by representing the gentiles or the gentile churches as the male child of which the apostolic church was unexpectedly delivered. It is perfectly sufficient and in better taste, to understand the parturition as a figure for the whole eventful crisis of the change of dispensations, and the consequent change in the condition of the church. This indestructible ideal person, when she might have seemed to be reduced to nothing by the defection of the natural Israel, is vastly and suddenly augmented by the introduction of the gentiles, a succession of events which is here most appropriately represented as the birth of a male child without the pains of childbirth.

V. 8. *Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall a land be brought forth in one day, or shall a nation be born at once? For Zion hath travailed, she hath also brought forth her children.* This verse, in the form of pointed interrogation, represents the event previously mentioned as without example. The terms of the sentence are exceedingly appropriate both to the return from Babylon and the future restoration of the Jews, but admit at the same time of a wider application to the change of economy, the birth of the church of the New Testament.  $\text{וַיֵּלֶד}$  appears to be construed as a masculine, because it is put for the inhabitants, as in ch. 9 : 18. 26 : 18 (compare Judges 18 : 30); or the verb may take that form according to the usual license when the object follows, as in Gen. 13 : 6. Ps. 105 : 30.—The causative sense given to this verb in the English and some other versions is not approved by the later lexicographers, who make  $\text{וַיֵּלֶד}$  a simple passive. Beck's application of the phrase to the creation of the earth is forbidden by the parallel term  $\text{וַיֵּלֶד}$ .—To avoid the apparent contradiction between this and the foregoing verse as to the pains of childbirth, some explain  $\text{גַּם יָלְדָה}$  to mean, 'scarcely had she travailed

when she brought forth,' which is a forced construction. Hitzig attains the same end by making *sons* the object of both verbs, and making both synonymous. Both these expedients are unnecessary, as the reference is merely to the short time required for the birth, as if he had said, she has (already) travailed, she has also brought forth.

V. 9. *Shall I bring to the birth and not cause to bring forth? saith Jehovah. Or am I the one causing to bring forth, and shall I shut up? saith thy God.* Without pretending to enumerate the various explanations of this verse, some of which are as disgusting as absurd, it will be sufficient to adduce as specimens Jerome's interpretation, which supposes him to ask whether he who causes others to bring forth shall not bring forth himself; and that of Cocceius, whether he who causes others to bring forth shall not cause Zion to do so likewise. The sense now put upon the figure by the general consent of interpreters, is that he who begins the work may be expected to accomplish it, to be both its author and its finisher. The reason why it is expressed in this form is not any peculiar adaptation or expressiveness in these unusual metaphors, but simply that the increase of the church had been already represented as a birth, and the additional ideas of the writer are expressed without a change of figure. The precise connexion of the verse with that before it seems to be that it extenuates the wonder which had been described by representing it as something which was to be expected in the case supposed. That is to say, if God had undertaken to supply the place of what his church had lost by new accessions, the extent and suddenness of the effect could not be matters of surprise. On the contrary, it would have been indeed surprising, if he who began the change had stopped it short, and interfered for the prevention of his own designs.—On the metaphor of this verse and the one preceding, compare ch. 26 : 18; on the peculiar use of צָרָה in this application, Gen. 16 : 2. 20 : 18.

V. 10. *Rejoice ye with Jerusalem and exult in her, all that love her; be glad with her with gladness, all those mourning for her.* This is an indirect prediction of the joyful change awaiting Zion, clothed in the form of a command or invitation to her friends to rejoice with her. The expression גִּילֵי בָהּ may either have the same sense, viz. that of sympathetic joy, or it may mean *rejoice in her* or *within her* in a local sense, or *in her* as the object of your joy, all which constructions are grammatical and justifiable by usage. Different interpreters, according to their various exegetical hypotheses, explain this as a prophecy of Israel's ancient restoration from the Babylonish exile, or of their future restoration from the present exile and dispersion, or of the glorious enlargement of the church after the excision of the unbelieving Jews and the throes of that great crisis in which old things passed away and



the new heavens and the new earth came into existence ; which last I believe to be the true sense, for reasons which have been already fully stated.

V. 11. *That ye may suck and be satisfied from the breast of her consolations, that ye may milk out and enjoy yourselves from the fulness (or the full breast) of her glory.* Those who have sympathized with Zion in her joys and sorrows shall partake of her abundance and her glory. The figure of a mother is continued, but beautifully varied. The Targum takes שׁוּב in its usual sense of spoil or plunder ; but see above on ch. 60 : 16. Hendewerk, with some of the older writers, reads *because* instead of *so that* or *in order that* ; but this is a needless substitution of a meaning rare and doubtful at the best. *Suck and be satisfied, milk out and enjoy yourselves*, may be regarded as examples of hendiadys, meaning *suck to satiety* and *milk out with delight* ; but no such change in the form of the translation is required or admissible. The Targum explains יַיִן as meaning *wine* ; Lowth proposes to read יַיִן provision, but there is no such word ; Cocceius translates it *animals*, as in Ps. 50 : 11. 80 : 14, which makes no sense ; Jerome and Symmachus make it mean variety (*omni-noda*) ; but the modern writers are agreed that it originally signifies radiation or a radiating motion, then the radiating flow of milk or other liquids, and then fulness or the full breast whence the radiation flows. Glory includes wealth or abundance, but much more, viz. all visible superiority or excellence.

V. 12. *For thus saith Jehovah, Behold I am extending to her peace like a river, and like an overflowing stream the glory of nations—and ye shall suck—on the side shall ye be borne, and on the knees shall ye be dandled.* As לָקַח is sometimes interchanged with לָקַח, Vitringa here translates *extending over*, i. e. so as to cover or submerge. But the force and beauty of the Prophet's figure is secured, without any departure from the ordinary usage, by supposing it to represent a river suddenly or gradually widening its channel or its flow until it reaches to a certain spot, its actual submersion being not expressed, though it may be implied. That the particle retains its proper meaning may be argued from the use of the entire phrase in Gen. 39 : 21. Another suggestion of Vitringa, which has been rejected by the later writers, is that נָהָר and נִהַל here denote specifically the Euphrates and the Nile, which last he regards as a derivative of the Hebrew word. But the incorrectness of this etymology, the absence of the article which elsewhere makes the nouns specific, and the uselessness of this supposition to the force and beauty of the passage, all conspire to condemn it. *Peace* is here to be taken in its frequent sense of welfare or prosperity. (See above, on ch. 48 : 18.) The words *and ye shall suck* are added to announce a resumption of the figure of the foregoing verse. The Targum and Vulgate read עַל שֵׁר

instead of  $\text{נָשׂוּ בָּנֵי}$ , while Houbigant and Lowth insert the former after *suck* (ye shall suck at the breast, ye shall be carried at the side). Equally gratuitous is the addition of the pronoun by Henderson (ye shall suck them) and Hendewerk (ye shall suck it), and Gesenius's paraphrase (*zum Genuss*). For the sense of  $\text{נָשׂוּ בָּנֵי}$ , see above, on ch. 60 : 4, and compare ch. 49 : 22. The objects of address in this verse, are the sons of Zion, to be gathered from all nations.

V. 13. *As a man whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you, and in Jerusalem shall ye be comforted.* De Wette's version, 'as a man who comforts his mother' (*der seine Mutter tröstet*) is so utterly at variance with the form of the original, that it must be regarded as an inadvertence, or perhaps as an error of the press. The image 48 : 18 is essentially the same with that in ch. 49 : 15, but with a striking variation. The English Version, which, in multitudes of cases, inserts *man* where the original expression is indefinite, translating  $\text{אָדָם}$ , for example, always *no man*, here reverses the process and dilutes *a man* to *one*. The same liberty is taken by many other versions old and new, occasioned no doubt by a feeling of the incongruity of making a full-grown man the subject of maternal consolations. The difficulty might, if it were necessary, be avoided by explaining  $\text{אָדָם}$  to mean a man-child, as it does in Gen. 4 : 1. 1 Sam. 1 : 11, and in many other cases. But the truth is that the solecism, which has been so carefully expunged by these translators, is an exquisite trait of patriarchal manners, in their primitive simplicity. Compare Gen. 24 : 67. Judges 17 : 2. 1 Kings 2 : 19, 20, and the affecting scenes between Thetis and Achilles in the Iliad. Of the modern writers, Umbreit alone does justice to this beautiful allusion, not only by a strict translation, but by adding as a gloss, 'with the consolation of a mother who, as no other can, soothes the ruffled spirit of a man (*des Mannes*).' Equally characteristic is the brief remark of Hitzig, that 'the  $\text{אָדָם}$  is not well chosen.'—Lowth in another respect shows what would now be thought a morbid distaste for simplicity by changing the passive, *ye shall be comforted* into *ye shall receive consolation*, in order to avoid a repetition which to any unsophisticated ear is charming.—The *in Jerusalem* suggests the only means by which these blessings are to be secured, viz. a union of affection and of interest with the Israel of God, to whom alone they are promised.

V. 14. *And ye shall see, and your heart shall leap (with joy), and your bones like grass shall sprout, and the hand of Jehovah shall be known to his servants, and he shall be indignant at his enemies.* The object of address still continues to be those who had loved Zion, and had mourned for her, and whom God had promised to comfort in Jerusalem. They are

here assured that they shall see for themselves the fulfilment of these promises. —Ewald gives עָצָה its primary sense of bounding, leaping, which agrees well with the strong figure in the next clause, where the bones, as the seat of strength, or the framework of the body, are compared with springing herbage to denote their freshness and vigour. Here again Ewald makes the language more expressive by translating *become green like the young grass*, which, however, is a paraphrase and not an exact version, as the primary meaning of the Hebrew verb is to burst out or put forth. (For the figure, compare ch. 27 : 6. 58 : 11. Job 21 : 24. Prov. 3 : 8. 15 : 30. Ps. 51 : 10, and *e converso* Ps. 6 : 3. 22 : 15. 31 : 11.) There is no need of supposing with Hitzig that the human frame is likened to a tree of which the bones are the branches, and the muscles, flesh, and skin, the leaves. (See Job 10 : 11.)—The hand of God is known when his power is recognised as the cause of any given effect. Gesenius makes עָצָה the passive of הִרְדִּיף and עָצָה the sign of the second accusative (it is made known his servants i. e. to his servants). But Hitzig explains the first word as the passive of הִרְדִּיף and עָצָה as a preposition equivalent to עַל in ch. 53 : 1 and to עַל־יָדַי in Ezek. 38 : 23, where the same passive verb is used. The English Version follows Luther in translating עָצָה as a noun, which never has this form, however, out of pause. It is correctly explained by Aben Ezra as a verb with Vav conversive. The עָצָה may be either the objective particle, as this verb usually governs the accusative, or a preposition equivalent to עַל־עָצָה in Dan. 11 : 30, and to our expression, *he is angry with* another. Noyes makes this verb agree with *hand*; which would be ungrammatical, as הַיָּד is feminine. The whole clause is omitted in Hendewerk's translation. It is important as affording a transition from the promise to the threatening, in accordance with the Prophet's constant practice of presenting the salvation of God's people as coincident and simultaneous with the destruction of his enemies.

V. 15. *For lo, Jehovah in fire will come, and like the whirlwind his chariots, to appease in fury his anger, and his rebuke in flames of fire.* This is an amplification of the brief phrase at the end of v. 14. Lowth reads *as a fire*, with the Septuagint version, which is probably a mere inadvertence. Luther and others translate *with fire* (see v. 16), but the modern writers generally *in fire*, that is enveloped and surrounded by it, as on Sinai. (See above, ch. 29 : 6. 30 : 27, 30, and compare Ps. 50 : 3.)—The second clause is repeated in Jer. 4 : 13. The points of comparison are swiftness and violence. The allusion is to the two-wheeled chariots of ancient warfare. Vitringa supposes angels to be meant, on the authority of Ps. 68 : 18. (Compare Ps. 18 : 11.) Hendewerk supposes an allusion to the chariots and horses of fire, mentioned 2 Kings 2 : 11. 6 : 17. (Compare Hab. 3 : 8.) The English Version supplies *with* before *his chariots*, but this is forbidden

by the order of the words in Hebrew, and unnecessary, as the *chariots* may be construed either with *shall come* or with the substantive verb *are* or *shall be*.—Ewald agrees with the older writers who give רָצַח the sense of rendering, returning, recompensing, which it has in Ps. 54 : 7. Hos. 12 : 15, and in which it is construed with *vengeance* in Deut. 32 : 41, 43. Henderson prefers the sense of *causing to return*, implying repetition and severity. Gesenius adheres to the usage of this very verb and noun in Ps. 78 : 38 and Job 9 : 13 (compare Gen. 27 : 44, 45), where it means to withdraw anger i. e. to appease it, which may seem to be at variance with the context here, but is really, as Maurer has observed, the most appropriate and elegant expression of the writer's meaning, which is that of wrath appeased by being gratified. (Compare ch. 1 : 24 and the Earlier Prophecies, p. 17.)—Lowth's emendation of the text by reading רָצַח (from רָצַח) to *breathe out* is gratuitous and not supported by the usage of that verb itself.—Luther and Hendewerk make רָצַח רָצַח a kind of intensive compound (*Zornesgluth*), as in ch. 42 : 25 ; but it is better with Maurer to regard רָצַח רָצַח as qualifying רָצַח and explaining how his anger was to be appeased, viz. in fury, i. e. in the free indulgence of it.—God's *rebuke* is often coupled with his wrath as its effect or practical manifestation. (See above, ch. 17 : 13. 51 : 20. 54 : 9.) Most writers seem to make *rebuke* dependent on the preceding verb ; but Hendewerk apparently regards it as an independent clause, exactly similar in form to the second member of the sentence, *and like the whirlwind his chariots, and his rebuke in flames of fire*. The leading noun may then, instead of being governed by רָצַח, agree with *is* or *shall be* understood. The whole verse represents Jehovah, considered in relation to his enemies, as a consuming fire. (Deut. 4 : 24. Heb. 12 : 29. Comp. 2 Thess. 1 : 8.)

V. 16. *For by fire is Jehovah striving and by his sword with all flesh, and multiplied (or many) are the slain of Jehovah.* Fire and sword are mentioned as customary means of destruction, especially in war. The reflexive form רָצַח רָצַח has here its usual sense of reciprocal judgment, litigation, or contention in general. (See above, ch. 43 : 26.) Gesenius makes it mean directly to punish, which it never means except by implication : and Hitzig, on the same ground, explains רָצַח as the sign of the accusative ; but that it is really a preposition is clear from Ezek. 17 : 20 and Joel 4 : 2.—The repetition of *with* by Noyes and Henderson, 'with fire, with his sword, with all flesh,' is a cacophonous tautology not found in the original, where two distinct prepositions are employed, which Lowth has well translated *by* and *with*.—According to Knobel, *all flesh* means all nations, and especially the Babylonians who had not been sufficiently punished by Cyrus. Henderson applies the verses to the battle of Armageddon, described in Rev. 16 : 14–21. 19 : 11–21, and Vitrina admits a reference to the same event.

But this interpretation rests upon the false assumption, often noticed heretofore, that the Apocalyptic prophecies are exegetical of those in the Old Testament from which their images and terms are borrowed.—A much surer clew to the primary application of the one before us is afforded by our Saviour's words in Matth. 24: 22, where in speaking of the speedy destruction of Jerusalem he says that excepting the elect no flesh should be saved, i. e. no portion of the Jewish race but those who were ordained to everlasting life through faith in him. This application of Isaiah's prophecy agrees exactly with the view already taken of the whole preceding context as relating to that great decisive crisis in the history of the church and of the world, the dissolution of the old economy and the inauguration of the new. According to this view of the passage what is here said of fire, sword, and slaughter, was fulfilled not only as a figurative prophecy of general destruction, but in its strictest sense in the terrific carnage which attended the extinction of the Jewish state, and of which, more emphatically than of any other event outwardly resembling it, it might be said that *many were the slain of Jehovah*.

V. 17. *The (men) hallowing themselves and the (men) cleansing themselves to (or towards) the gardens after one in the midst, eaters of swine's flesh and vermin and mouse, together shall cease (or come to an end), saith Jehovah.* This verse is closely connected with the one before it, and explains who are meant by *the slain of Jehovah*. It is almost universally agreed that these are here described as gross idolaters; but Henderson, with some of the old Jewish writers, is inclined to understand it of the Mohammedans, as we shall see. But even among those who understand it of idolaters, there is no small difference of opinion in relation to particular expressions. The class of persons meant is obviously the same as that described in ch. 65: 3, 5, the gardens and the swine's flesh being common to both. The reflexive participles in the first clause are technical terms for ceremonial purification under the law of Moses, here transferred to heathen rites. The older writers for the most part follow the Vulgate in explaining אֶל-הַגַּדְּוֹת as synonymous with בְּצִנְתָּהּ in ch. 65: 3. Even Gesenius admits this sense, although he gives the preference to that of *for*. But Maurer speaks of it as one no longer needing refutation, and returns to the strict translation of the Septuagint (*eis τοὺς κήπους*), implying that they purified themselves not in but on their way to the gardens, which is essentially the sense conveyed by the translation *for*, i. e. in preparation for the gardens where the idolatrous services were to be performed. The next words (אֶחָד אֶחָד בְּתִנְיָהּ) are those which constitute the principal difficulty of the sentence. This some have undertaken to remove by emendations of the text. Even the Masora reads אֶחָד, which is only changing the gender of the numeral. Ewald assimilates the first two words so as to read אֶחָד אֶחָד,

which he renders *hinten hinten*, i. e. far back. Lowth on the other hand reads אחר אחר *one one*, i. e. one by one, or one after the other. The same reading seems to be implied in Luther's version, one here and another there. The Peshito has one after another, and the same sense is expressed by the Targum, *crowd after crowd*, and by Symmachus and Theodotion *ὀπίσω ἀλλήλων*. Schelling accordingly inserts a word, reading אחר אחר אחר. Whether a various reading is implied in the Septuagint version (*ἐν τοῖς προθύροις*) or merely a peculiar explanation of אחר is a matter of dispute. Some, without a change of text, bring out the same sense by supposing an ellipsis. Most interpreters take אַחַד (or according to the masoretic Keri אֶחָד) as the numeral *one*, agreeing either with grove (Aben Ezra), or with pool (Kimchi), or with tree (Saadias), or with priest or priestess (Gesenius); which last may be given as the current explanation, in which an allusion is supposed to an idolatrous procession led by a hierophant. Maurer applies אַחַד to the idol, which he supposes to be so called in contempt, *one* being then equivalent to the Latin *quidam, nescio quem*. Vitringa follows Scaliger, Bochart, and other learned men of early date, in treating אַחַד as the proper name of a Syrian idol, called by Sanchoiathion *Ἄδωδος* and by Pliny and Macrobius *Adad*, the last writer adding expressly that the name means *one*. For the difference of form various explanations have been suggested, and among the rest a corruption in the classical orthography, which is rendered exceedingly improbable, however, by the substantial agreement of the Greek and Latin writers above cited. Rosenmüller acquiesces in Vitringa's suggestion that the difference of form may be explained by the exclusion of the aspirate from the middle of a Greek word, the hiatus being remedied by the insertion of a dental; but Gesenius replies that אַחַד would more naturally have been written *Ἀχάδος* and *Achadus* in Greek and Latin. The masoretic reading אַחַד is identified by Clericus with *Hecate*, in whose Egyptian worship swine's flesh was particularly used. Henderson calls attention to a very striking coincidence between the use of this word here and the constant application of the cognate one in Arabic (احد) by the Mohammedans to God as being One, in express contradiction to the doctrine of the Trinity. This is especially the case in the 112th Surah of the Koran, to which they attach peculiar doctrinal importance. The common editions of the Vulgate render אַחַד here by *janua* (like the Peshito); but some of more authority have *unam*, in accordance with the marginal Keri. Besides the difficulty which attends the absolute use of the numeral without a noun, there is another of the same kind arising from the like use of אֶחָד *midst* without any thing to limit or determine it. Gesenius attaches to it here, as he does in 2 Sam. 4 : 6, the sense of the interior or court of an oriental house, and applies it to the edifice in which the lustrations were performed before entering the gardens; which may also be the meaning of the Septuagint

version, εἰς τοὺς κήπους, ἐν τοῖς προθύροις. Maurer and others follow Scaliger, who makes it mean the midst of the grove or garden, where the idol was commonly erected. But Knobel, by ingeniously combining Gen. 42 : 5. Ps. 42 : 5. Ps. 68 : 26, makes it not improbable that *in the midst* means in the crowd or procession of worshippers. All these constructions adhere to the masoretic points and interpunction. But Lowth and Henderson follow Theodotus and Symmachus in reading תִּרְבֵּי and connecting it directly with what follows, *in the midst of those eating swine's flesh*, etc. implying, as Lowth thinks, a participation in these impure rites, while Henderson supposes the Mohammedans to be distinguished, as to this point, from the Pagans who surround them. Boettcher departs still further from the usual interpunction, and includes תִּרְבֵּי not in the description of the sin, but in the threatening of punishment—in the midst of the eaters of swine's flesh etc. together shall they perish. One reason urged by Henderson in favour of his own construction is without weight, namely, that תִּרְבֵּי being without the article cannot be in apposition with the words at the beginning of the sentence, but must designate a totally different class of persons. He did not observe that תִּרְבֵּי is rendered definite by the addition of a qualifying noun, which being equivalent to the article excludes it. As to the eating of swine's flesh, see above, on ch. 65 : 4.—יִרְבֵּי may either have its generic sense of abomination or abominable food, or the more specific sense of flesh offered to idols (Hitzig), or of the smaller unclean animals, whether quadrupeds, insects, or reptiles, to which it is specially applied in the Law (Lev. 11 : 41–43), and in reference to which it corresponds very nearly, in effect, to the English word *vermin*. Spencer thinks that it means a kid boiled in its mother's milk. (Ex. 23 : 19. 34 : 26.) Against the wide sense of abomination and in favour of some more specific meaning is the collocation of the word between swine's flesh and the mouse, or as the modern writers understand the word the jerboa or Arabian field-mouse, which is eaten by the Arabs. The actual use of any kind of mouse in the ancient heathen rites has never been established, the modern allegations of the fact being founded on the place before us. As to the application of the passage, those who make the Babylonian exile the great subject of the prophecy, see nothing here but a description of the practices of those Jews who apostatized to heathenism, and who were to be cut off by the same judgments which secured the restoration of their brethren. J. D. Michaelis confesses his uncertainty in what sense this description will be verified hereafter; and Henderson, who holds the same hypothesis, pleads guilty to a part of the same ignorance, but bravely and ingeniously endeavours, by the combination of the particular contrivances already mentioned, to impart some plausibility to his assumption that the prophecy has reference to the future restoration of the Jews. This could not have been done with greater skill

or more success than he has shown in his attempt to make it probable that what is here predicted is the future destruction of the Moslems as the enemies of Christ's divinity, and noted for their trust in outward rites, especially ablutions—their destruction in the midst of the idolaters whom now they hate most bitterly and most profoundly scorn. This explanation seems to have been framed by its ingenious author without any reference to the dictum of the Rabbins, that the first clause of the verse is a description of the Moslems and their purifications, but the next of the Christians as eaters of swine-flesh, and regardless of all difference in meats and drinks. The most offensive part of this interpretation, although extant in the writings of Kimchi himself, has been expunged from most editions for prudential motives. (See Vitranga on the passage.) It is not to be expected that the advocates of any exegetical hypothesis will here abandon it if able by any means to reconcile it with the Prophet's language, and accordingly I see no cause to change my previous conclusion that this prophecy relates to the excision of the Jews and the vocation of the gentiles, or in other words the change of dispensation. The apparent difficulty which arises from the description of such gross idolatry as all admit to have had no existence among the Jews after their return from exile, is removed by the consideration that the Jews were cast off not for the sins of a single generation, but of the race throughout its ancient history, and that idolatry was not only one of these, but that which most abounded in the days of the Prophet; so that when he looks forward to the great catastrophe and paints its causes, he naturally dips his pencil in the colours which were nearest and most vivid to his own perceptions, without meaning to exclude from his description other sins as great or greater in themselves, which afterwards supplanted these revolting practices as the besetting national transgressions of apostate Israel. A writer in the early days of Wilberforce and Clarkson in denouncing God's wrath upon England would most naturally place the oppression of the negro in the foreground of his picture, even if he had been gifted to foresee that this great evil in the course of time would be completely banished from the sight of men by new forms of iniquity successively usurping its conspicuous position, such as excessive luxury, dishonest speculation, and ambitious encroachment on the rightful possessions of inferior powers in the east. If it were really God's purpose to destroy that mighty kingdom for its national offences, he would not lose sight of ancient half-forgotten crimes, because they have long since given place to others more or less atrocious. So in reference to Israel, although the generation upon whom the final blow fell were hypocrites, not idolaters, the misdeeds of their fathers entered into the account, and they were cast off not merely as the murderers of the Lord of Life, but as apostates who insulted Jehovah to his face by bowing down to stocks and stones in groves and gardens, and by



eating swine's flesh, the abomination, and the mouse. And as all this was included in the grounds of their righteous condemnation, it might well be rendered prominent in some of the predictions of that great catastrophe.—Another possible interpretation of the passage, in direct application to the unbelieving Jews who were contemporary with our Saviour, is obtained by supposing an allusion to v. 3, where those who still clung to the abrogated ritual are put upon a level with the grossest idolaters, and may here be absolutely so described, just as the rulers and people of Jerusalem in ch. 1 : 9 are addressed directly as rulers of Sodom and people of Gomorrah, on account of the comparison immediately preceding. This view of the passage is undoubtedly favoured by the mention of swine's flesh in both places, which would naturally make the one suggestive of the other. Neither of these exegetical hypotheses requires the assumption of imaginary facts, such as the practice of idolatry by the Jews in exile, or their return to it hereafter.

V. 13. *And I—their works and their thoughts—it is come—to gather all the nations and the tongues—and they shall come and see my glory.* This is an exact transcript of the Hebrew sentence, the grammatical construction of which has much perplexed interpreters. Luther cuts the knot by arbitrary transposition, *I will come and gather all their works and thoughts with all nations* etc. ; J. D. Michaelis, by a no less arbitrary change of pointing, so as to read, *they are my work, even mine, and my thought*, i. e. care. Tremellius and Cocceius among the older writers, Hitzig and Hendewerk among the moderns, follow Jarchi in taking the pronoun as a nominative absolute and construing כִּנְסֵנִי with the nouns preceding : *As for me—their works and thoughts are come to gather* etc. Hitzig explains *are come* as meaning they have this effect ; while Hendewerk gives to the nouns themselves the sense of recompense, as in ch. 40 : 10 and Rev. 14 : 13. Henderson has substantially the same construction, but supplies *before me* after *come*, and takes יִכְנָסֵנִי as a simple future, *I will assemble* ; both which assumptions are extremely forced. Vitranga, Gesenius, and most other writers, suppose an aposiopesis or a double ellipsis, supplying a verb after כִּנְסֵנִי and a noun before כִּנְסֵנִי. The verb most commonly supplied is *know*, as in the English Version (*I know their works and their thoughts*), and substantially in the Chaldee Paraphrase (*revealed before me are their works and thoughts*). The noun supplied is *time*, according to the dictum of Aben Ezra. But the verb supplied by Maurer is *I will punish*, and he makes כִּנְסֵנִי impersonal, *it comes* or *it is come*, as we say, *Is it come to this?* without referring to a definite subject. In this obscurity and doubt as to the syntax, there is something attractive in the theory of Ewald and Knobel, who supply nothing, but regard the first clause as a series of broken and irregular ejaculations, in which the expression of the thought is interrupted by the

writer's feelings.—Common to all these explanations is the general assumption that the words and thoughts of the persons in question are in some way represented as the cause or the occasion of the gathering mentioned in the other clause. The use of the word *tongues* as an equivalent to *nations*, has reference to national distinctions springing from diversity of language, and is founded on Gen. 10 : 5, 20, 31, by the influence of which passage and the one before us it became a phrase of frequent use in Daniel, whose predictions turn so much upon the calling of the gentiles. (Dan. 3 : 4, 7, 31. 5 : 19.) The representation of this form of speech as an Aramaic idiom by some modern critics is characteristic of their candor.—To *see the glory of Jehovah* is a phrase repeatedly used elsewhere to denote the special manifestation of his presence and his power (ch. 40 : 4. 59 : 19. 60 : 2), and is applied by Ezekiel to the display of his punitive justice in the sight of all mankind (Ezek. 39 : 8). Cocceius refers this passage to the Reformation and the Council of Trent. The Jews understand it of the strokes to be inflicted hereafter on their enemies. But as we have seen that the crimes described in the foregoing verses are not those of the heathen, but of the apostate Jews, whose deeds and thoughts must therefore be intended in the first clause, the explanation most in harmony with this immediate context, as well as with the whole drift of the prophecy thus far, is that which makes the verse before us a distinct prediction of the calling of the gentiles, both to witness the infliction of God's vengeance on the Jews, and to supply their places in his church or chosen people. It is perhaps to the language of this prophecy that Christ himself alludes in Matt. 24 : 31. (Compare also John 5 : 25.)

V. 19. *And I will place in them (or among them) a sign, and I will send of them survivors (or escaped ones) to the nations, Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, drawers of the bow, Tubal and Javan, the distant isles, which have not heard my fame and have not seen my glory, and they shall declare my glory among the nations.* By a *sign* Grotius understands a *signal*, making  $\text{נֹסֵף}$  equivalent to  $\text{נֹסֵף}$  in ch. 5 : 26. 11 : 12. 18 : 3. 62 : 10. Gesenius objects to the sense thus put upon  $\text{נֹסֵף}$  as not sustained by usage; but Maurer defends it as easily deducible from that of a military standard, which it has in Num. 2 : 2. Most modern writers agree, however, with Gesenius in determining the sense of the whole phrase from that which it evidently has in Ex. 10 : 1, 2, where God is twice said to have *placed his signs among the Egyptians*, with evident allusion to the plagues as miraculous evidences of his power. Explained by this analogy, the clause before us would appear to mean, I will work a miracle among them or before them.—The  $\text{נֹסֵף}$ , as in ch. 4 : 3, are the survivors of the judgments previously mentioned. These are sent to *the nations*, of whom some are then particularly

mentioned. For the sense of *Tarshish*, see above, on ch. 60 : 9. Its use here may be regarded as decisive of the question whether it denotes *the sea*. Even the Septuagint, the oldest authority for that interpretation, here retains the Hebrew word; and Luther, though he still translates it *sea*, is compelled to avoid a palpable absurdity by altering the syntax so as to read *to the nations on the sea*, whereas *Tarshish* is added to the general term *nations* precisely as the other names are added afterwards. The incongruity of this translation of the word is exhibited without disguise in the Vulgate, *ad gentes, in mare, in Africam*, etc., so that *the sea* stands first in a catalogue of *nations*.—*Pul* is identified by Bochart with the island *Philæ* in the Nile on the frontier of Ethiopia and Egypt; which Gesenius rejects as improbable, without proposing any better explanation. Hitzig and Knobel regard it as an orthographical variation or an error of the text for *Put* or *Phut*, which is elsewhere joined with *Lud* (Jer. 46 : 9. Ezek. 27 : 10) and repeatedly written in the Septuagint  $\Phi\omicron\upsilon\delta$  (Gen. 10 : 6. 1 Chron. 1 : 8), the same form which that version here employs. All agree that the name belongs to Africa, like that which follows, *Lud*, the *Ludim* of Gen. 10 : 3 and Jer. 46 : 9, elsewhere represented as archers (Ezek. 27 : 10. 30 : 5). There is no ground, therefore, for suspecting, with Lowth and J. D. Michaelis, that  $\text{רשבי קש}$  is an error of the text for  $\text{רשבי}$  *Meshech*, although that name frequently occurs in connexion with the following name *Tubal* (Gen. 10 : 2. Ez. 27 : 13, etc.) as denoting the *Μόσχοι καὶ Τιβαρηνοὶ* of Herodotus. *Javan* is the Hebrew name for Greece (Gen. 10 : 2. Dan. 8 : 21. Zech. 9 : 13), perhaps identical with *Ion* or *Ionia*. Gesenius quotes a Scholiast on Aristophanes as saying, *πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας Ἰάονας οἱ βιάβαροι ἐκαλοῦν*. The same name essentially exists in Sanscrit. Even Henderson, instead of finding here, as might perhaps have been expected, a specific promise of the future conversion (or reconversion) of the nations specified, affirms that they are “obviously given as a sample.” This is rendered still more certain by the addition of the general expression, *the remote coasts or islands*; for the sense of which see above, on ch. 41 : 1. It is not without plausibility suggested by Vitringa, that some of the obscure names here used were selected for the express purpose of conveying the idea of remote and unknown regions. The restriction of the promise to the very places mentioned would be like the proceeding of a critic who should argue hereafter from the mention of Greenland, India, Africa, and Ceylon, in Heber’s Missionary Hymn, that the zeal of English Protestants extended only to those portions of the heathen world. As this interpretation of the hymn would be forbidden, not only by the general analogy of figurative language and of lyric composition, but by the express use of such universal phrases as “from pole to pole” in the very same connexion, so in this case it is plain that the essential meaning of the whole enumeration is that expressed in the following clause: *who*

*have not heard my fame and have not seen my glory?* Lowth's poor attempt at emendation of the text by reading *name* for *fame* (נִשְׁמָה for נִשְׁמָתִי) is not only built upon a false assumption of unvaried uniformity in the expression of the same idea, but unsupported even by the Septuagint version (*ὄνομα*), which Koehler has shown to be a frequent equivalent in that translation for the Hebrew נִשְׁמָתִי.—As to the meaning of the whole verse, or the nature of the event which it predicts, interpreters differ in exact accordance with their several hypotheses. Gesenius understands by the *sign* here promised, the extraordinary confluence of Jews from all parts of the world. Hitzig agrees with the Rabbins in supposing it to designate a miraculous slaughter of the enemies of Zion, which they however represent as future, while he supposes that the writer expected it to take place at the time of the return from Babylon. According to Henderson, "the missionaries to be sent to the different parts of the world are gentiles, who shall have been present at, but have not perished in, the great overthrow in Palestine." All these explanations proceed upon the supposition that the pronoun *them*, which is twice used in the first clause, must refer to the *tongues and nations* mentioned in the preceding verse, and Henderson speaks of its reference to the Jews themselves as "violent." But this is only true on the assumption that the nineteenth verse describes something subsequent in time to the eighteenth, which is not only needless but at variance with the context. For with what consistency could the Prophet represent *all nations* as assembled at Jerusalem and then the survivors or escaped among them being sent to *all the nations*? To say that the first is a figure of speech, is only saying what may just as well be said of the other. If the Prophet really presents to us in v. 18 the image of a general assemblage of the nations, we have no right to suppose that in the next verse he has quite forgotten it. The only way in which these seeming contradictions can be reconciled is by assuming what is in itself most natural and perfectly agreeable to usage, namely, that v. 19 does not describe the progress of events beyond the time referred to in v. 18, but explains in what way the assemblage there described is to be brought about. I will gather all nations. By what means? I will send those who escape my judgments to invite them. Both verses being then collateral and equally dependent on v. 17, the pronoun *them* refers to the persons there described, viz. the apostate Jews whose excision is the subject of this prophecy. The whole may then be paraphrased as follows: Such being their character, I will cast them off and gather the nations to take their place; for which end I will send forth the survivors of the nation, the elect for whose sake these days shall be shortened when all besides them perish, to declare my glory in the regions where my name has never yet been heard. Thus understood, the passage is exactly descriptive of the preaching of the gospel at the beginning of the new dispensation. All the first preachers were escaped

Jews, plucked as brands from the burning, saved from that perverse generation (Acts 2:40). The *sign* will then denote the whole miraculous display of divine power, in bringing the old dispensation to a close and introducing the new, including the destruction of the unbelieving Jews on the one hand, and on the other all those signs and wonders and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost (Heb. 2:4), which Paul calls the signs of an apostle (2 Cor. 12:12), and which Christ himself had promised should follow them that believed (Mark 16:17). All these were signs placed among them, i. e. among the Jews, to the greater condemnation of the unbelievers, and to the salvation of such as should be saved.—That there will not be hereafter an analogous display of divine power in the further execution of this promise, cannot be proved, and need not be affirmed; but if there never should be, it will still have had a glorious fulfilment in a series of events compared with which the restoration of the Jewish people to the land of Canaan is of little moment.

V. 20. *And they shall bring all your brethren from all nations, an oblation to Jehovah, with horses, and with chariot, and with litters, and with mules, and with dromedaries, on my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith Jehovah, as the children of Israel bring the oblation in a clean vessel to the house of Jehovah.* The verb at the beginning may be construed either with the messengers of v. 19, or indefinitely as denoting ‘men shall bring your brethren,’ equivalent in Hebrew usage to ‘your brethren shall be brought.’ Although this last construction is in perfect agreement with analogy, the other is not only unobjectionable but entitled to the preference as much more graphic and expressive. The survivors sent forth to the nations are then described as bringing back the converts to the true religion as an offering to Jehovah. Their return for this purpose is described as easy, swift, and even splendid, all the choicest methods of conveyance used in ancient times being here combined to express that idea. As to the sense of the particular expressions there is no longer any dispute or doubt, and a general reference may be made to the lexicons. Lowth here exhibits an extraordinary lapse of taste and judgment in transforming litters into *counes*, as if this uncouth Persian word, which he had found in Thevenot, could make the sentence either more perspicuous or better English. With equal right he might have introduced the native or vernacular name of the peculiar oriental mule etc. It does not even matter as to the general meaning of the verse, whether a  $\text{רָכָב}$  was a coach, a litter, or a wagon, since either would suggest the idea of comparatively rapid and convenient locomotion.—The  $\text{מִנְחָה}$  was the stated vegetable offering of the Mosaic ritual. It was commonly composed of flour with oil and incense; but the name, in its widest sense, may be considered as including fruits and grain in a crude as well as a prepared

state. This oblation seems to be selected here as free from the concomitant ideas of cruelty and grossness which were inseparable from bloody sacrifices. The  $\text{קָרְבַּן}$  at the end cannot be grammatically rendered as a past tense, which form Hitzig here adopts perhaps in accommodation to his theory as to the composition of the passage during the Babylonish exile. Even in that case, however, the future would be perfectly appropriate, as implying an expected restoration of the ancient rites, much more if we suppose that the verse was written before they had ever been suspended.—The only general exegetical question in relation to this verse is whether *your brethren* means the scattered Jews or the converted gentiles. Here again all depends upon a foregone conclusion. Henderson says, “that *your brethren* means the Jews there can be no doubt,” in which he is sustained by the Jews themselves, and by Maurer, Hitzig, Hendewerk, and Knobel; while the opposite conclusion is considered equally indubitable not only by Vitringa, but by Gesenius, Ewald, and Umbreit. In answer to the question how the Jews are to be thus brought by the nations, when the gathering of the nations is itself to be occasioned by the previous gathering of the Jews, he replies that the verse “regards such Jews as might not yet have reached the land of their fathers,” as if this contingent possible residuum could be described as *all your brethren from all nations!* How inextricably this one case is implicated in the general question as to the subject and design of the prophecy, appears from the fact that those who apply this expression to the Jews content themselves with citing all the other places in Isaiah where precisely the same doubt exists as in the case before us. In favour of the other explanation Vitringa adduces and perhaps too strongly urges Paul’s description of the gentiles as an oblation which he as an officiating priest offered up to God. (Rom. 15 : 26.) Although it may be doubted whether Paul, as Vitringa says, there formally explains or even quotes this prophecy, his obvious allusion to its images and terms shows at least that he considered them as bearing such an application, and in the absence of any other gives it undoubtedly a clear advantage. Another suggestion of Vitringa, not unworthy of attention, is that there may here be special reference to the early converts from the heathen world considered as the *first fruits* of the spiritual harvest; which agrees well with the wide use of the technical term  $\text{קָרְבַּן}$  as already stated, and with the frequent application of the figure of first fruits to the same subject in the books of the New Testament.

V. 21. *And also of them will I take for the priests for the Levites saith Jehovah.* Many manuscripts supply *and* before the second *for*, and Lowth considers it necessary to the sense, and accordingly inserts it. The peculiar form of the common text may be intended to identify the two

classes, as in point of fact the priests were all without exception Levites. It seems at least to be implied that the distinction is in this case of no consequence, both names being given lest either should appear to be excluded. The only question here is to what the pronoun *them* refers. The Jews of course refuse to understand it of the gentiles; and even Joseph Kimchi, who admits this application as required by the context, avoids all inconvenient consequences by explaining *for the priests and Levites*, to mean for their service, as hewers of wood and drawers of water! Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Ewald, and Umbreit, do not hesitate to understand the promise of the gentiles, and to see in it an abrogation of the ancient national distinctions, without seeming to remember the directly opposite interpretation put by some of themselves upon ch. 61 : 5, 6. Hitzig and Knobel, more consistent in their exposition, go back to the ground maintained by Grotius and the rabbins, namely, that *of them* means of the scattered Jews, who should not be excluded from the honours of the priestly office. But why should mere dispersion be considered as disqualifying Levites for the priesthood? Or if the meaning be that the levitical prerogative should be abolished, why is the promise here restricted to the exiles brought back by the nations? If the Prophet meant to say, all the other tribes shall share the honours of the tribe of Levi, he could hardly have expressed it more obscurely than by saying, 'also of them (the restored Jews) will he take for priests and Levites.'—Of those who adopt the natural construction which refers *of them* to gentile converts, some with Cocceius understand this as a promise that they shall all be admitted to, the spiritual priesthood common to believers. But Vtringa objects that the expressions *I will take* and *of them*, both imply selection and discrimination. He therefore refers it to the Christian ministry, to which the gentiles have as free access as Jews. There can be no doubt that this office might be so described in a strongly figurative context, where the functions of the ministry were represented in the same connexion as sacerdotal functions. But the only offering here mentioned is the offering of the gentile converts as an oblation to Jehovah, and the priesthood meant seems therefore to be merely the ministry of those by whom their conversion was effected. The most natural interpretation therefore seems to be as follows. The mass of the Jewish people was to be cast off from all connexion with the church; but the elect who should escape were to be sent among the nations and to bring them for an offering to Jehovah, as the priests and Levites offered the oblation at Jerusalem. But this agency was not to be confined to the Jews who were first entrusted with it; not only of them, but also of the gentiles themselves, priests and Levites should be chosen to offer this oblation i. e. to complete the vocation of the gentiles. Should the context be supposed to require a still more general meaning, it may be that the sacerdotal mediation of the ancient Israel

between Jehovah and the other nations, which was symbolized by the Levitical and Aaronic priesthood, was to cease with the necessity that brought it into being, and to leave the divine presence as accessible to one race as another.

V. 22. *For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I am making (or about to make), are standing (or about to stand) before me, saith Jehovah, so shall stand your name and your seed.* To the reference of the preceding verse to the gentiles it is urged as one objection, that the verse before us does not give a reason for the promise so explained; for how could it be said that God would put them on a level with the Jews because the name and succession of the latter were to be perpetual? But this objection rests upon the false assumption, running through the whole interpretation of this book, that the promise is addressed to Israel as a nation; whereas it is addressed to Israel as a church, from which the natural descendants of Jacob for the most part have been cut off, and the object of this verse is to assure the church that notwithstanding this excision it should still continue to exist, not only as a church but as *the church*, the identical body which was clothed in the forms of the old dispensation and which still survives when they are worn out and rejected. The grand error incident to a change of dispensations was the very one which has perverted and obscured the meaning of these prophecies, the error of confounding the two Israels whom Paul so carefully distinguishes, and of supposing that the promises given to the church when externally identified with one race are continued to that race even after their excision from the church. It was to counteract this very error that the verse before us was recorded, in which God's people, comprehending a remnant of the natural Israel and a vast accession from the gentiles, are assured that God regards them as his own chosen people, not a new one, but the same that was of old, and that the very object of the great revolution here and elsewhere represented as a new creation was to secure their perpetuity and constant recognition as his people. Since then he creates new heavens and a new earth for this very purpose, that purpose cannot be defeated while these heavens and that earth endure.—The Jews themselves understand this as a promise that their national pre-eminence shall be perpetual, and several of the modern German writers give it the same sense in reference to the New Jerusalem or Jewish state after the Babylonish exile. Henderson goes with them in making it a promise to the Jews, but stops short at the turning-point and represents it as ensuring merely that “they shall never be any more rejected, but shall form one fold with the gentiles under the one Shepherd and Bishop of souls, the Great Messiah.” How this assurance affords any ground or reason for the previous declaration, as explained by Henderson, “that the performance of divine service



shall not be restricted to the tribe of Levi, but shall be the common privilege of the whole people," does not appear, and cannot well be imagined.

V. 23. *And it shall be (or come to pass) that from new-moon to new-moon (or on every new-moon), and from sabbath to sabbath (or on every sabbath), shall come all flesh to bow themselves (or worship) before me, saith Jehovah.* The form of expression in the first clause is so idiomatic and peculiar that it does not admit of an exact translation. A slavish copy of the original would be, 'from the sufficiency of new moon in its new moon and from the sufficiency of sabbath in its sabbath.' As to *וַיִּבֹּאוּ*, see above, ch. 28: 19. It often stands where we should say *as often as* (1 Sam. 18: 30. 1 Kings 14: 28). The antecedent of the pronoun seems to be the noun itself. Gesenius accordingly explains the whole to mean, as often as the new-moon comes in its new-moon, i. e. its appointed time. (Compare Num. 28: 10.) But although the form is so peculiar, there is no doubt among modern writers as to the essential meaning, viz. from new-moon to new-moon or at every new-moon. The idea of Cocceius that every new-moon is here represented as occurring in a new-moon, and every sabbath in a sabbath, because there is one perpetual new-moon and sabbath, shows a disposition to convert an idiom into a mystery. The Septuagint and Vulgate read 'there shall be a month from a month, and a sabbath from a sabbath,' which appears to have no meaning. The other ancient versions are equally obscure.—At these stated periods of public worship under the old economy (those of most frequent recurrence being specified) *all flesh shall come up to worship before me.* According to the Jewish doctrine this can only mean 'must come up to Jerusalem,' and the Septuagint actually has the name. Against this restriction Henderson protests, "as it is absolutely impossible that all should be able to repair thither." Yet in his note upon the next verse he observes that "the scene is laid in the environs of Jerusalem;" and he makes no attempt to indicate a change of subject in the verbs, or an interruption of the regular construction. By combining his two comments, therefore, we obtain this sense, that 'from month to month and from sabbath to sabbath all flesh shall come to worship before God, wherever they may be, in all parts of the earth, and shall go out into the environs of Jerusalem and see' etc. If it be possible in any case to reason from the context, it would seem plain here, that as the scene in the last verse is laid in the environs of Jerusalem it must be laid there in the one before it; as the same sentence is continued through both verses, and the subjects of the verbs in the contiguous clauses are confessedly identical. On our hypothesis there is no more need of excluding Jerusalem from one verse than the other, since the Prophet, in accordance with his constant practice, speaks of the emancipated church in language borrowed from her state of bondage; and that

this form of expression is a natural one, may be inferred from the facility with which it is perpetuated in the common parlance of the church and of religion, the Jerusalem or Zion of our prayers and hymns being perfectly identical with that of the prophecy before us. Thus understood, the verse is a prediction of the general diffusion of the true religion with its stated observances and solemn forms.

V. 24. *And they shall go forth and gaze upon the carcasses of the men who revolted (or apostatized) from me, for their worm shall not die and their fire shall not be quenched, and they shall be an horror to all flesh.* The first verb may be construed as it is by Ewald indefinitely, 'they i. e. men,' without defining them; but in so vivid a description, it is certainly more natural to give the verbs a definite subject, and especially the one that had been previously introduced, viz. the worshippers assembled from all nations to do homage at Jerusalem.—The noun  $\text{רָצוֹן}$  occurs only here and (with a slight variation) in Dan. 12: 2. The ancient versions seem to have derived it from  $\text{רָצָה}$ , and to have given it the sense of sight or spectacle. The Septuagint has simply  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{ ὄρασις}$ ; but the Targum and Vulgate seem to make the word a compound from  $\text{רָצָה}$  and  $\text{רָי}$ , as the former has, 'the wicked shall be judged in Gehenna till the just say of them, we have seen enough,' and the latter, *erunt usque ad satietatem visionis*. The modern lexicographers refer it to an Arabic root expressive of repulsion, and explain the noun itself to mean *abhorrence* or *disgust*.—This sublime conclusion has been greatly weakened and obscured, by the practice of severing it from the context as a kind of moral, application, practical improvement, or farewell warning to the reader. All this it is incidentally and with the more complete effect because directly and primarily it is an integral part of the "great argument" with which the whole book has been occupied, and which the Prophet never loses sight of to the end of his last sentence. The grand theme of these prophecies, as we have seen, is the relation of God's people to himself and to the world, and in the latter stages of its history, to that race with which it was once outwardly identical. The great catastrophe with which the vision closes is the change of dispensations, comprehending the final abolition of the ceremonial law, and its concomitants, the introduction of a spiritual worship and the consequent diffusion of the church, its vast enlargement by the introduction of all gentile converts to complete equality of privilege and honour with the believing Jews, and the excision of the unbelieving Jews from all connexion with the church or chosen people, which they once imagined to have no existence independent of themselves. The contrast between these two bodies, the rejected Jews, and their believing brethren forming one great mass with the believing gentiles, is continued to the end, and presented for the last time in these two concluding verses, where the

whole is condensed into a single vivid spectacle, of which the central figure is Jerusalem and its walls the dividing line between the two contrasted objects. Within is the true Israel, without the false. Within, a great congregation, even "all flesh," come from the east and the west, and the north and the south, while the natural children of the kingdom are cast out. (Math. 8: 12.) The end of the former is left to be imagined or inferred from other prophecies, but that of the latter is described, or suggested in a way more terrible than all description. In the valley of the son of Hinnom, under the very brow of Zion and Moriah, where the children were once sacrificed to Moloch, and where purifying fires were afterwards kept ever burning, the apostate Israel is finally exhibited, no longer living but committed to the flames of Tophet. To render our conception more intense the worm is added to the flame, and both are represented as undying. That the contrast hitherto maintained may not be forgotten even in this closing scene, the men within the walls may be seen by the light of those funereal fires coming forth and gazing at the ghastly scene, not with delight as some interpreters pretend, but as the text expressly says with horror. The Hebrew phrase here used means to look with any strong emotion, that of pleasure which is commonly suggested by the context being here excluded not by inference or implication merely but by positive assertion. The whimsy of Grotius that the verse describes the unburied bodies of the enemies slaughtered by the Maccabees and the protracted conflagration of their dwellings, needs as little refutation as the Jewish dream that what is here described is the destruction of the enemies of Israel hereafter. In its primary meaning, I regard it as a prophecy of ruin to the unbelieving Jews, apostate Israel, to whom the Hebrew phrase here used (הַשִּׁמְרֵי בָּ) is specially appropriate. But as the safety of the chosen remnant was to be partaken by all other true believers, so the ruin of the unbelieving Jew is to be shared by every other unbeliever.—Thus the verse becomes descriptive of the final doom of the ungodly, without any deviation from its proper sense, or any supposition of a mere allusion or accommodation in the use of the same figures by our Lord himself in reference to future torments. All that is requisite to reconcile and even to identify the two descriptions is the consideration that the state of ruin here described is final and continuous, however it may be divided, in the case of individuals, between the present life and that which is to come. Hell is of both worlds, so that in the same essential sense although in different degrees it may be said both of him who is still living but accursed, and of him who perished centuries ago, that his worm dieth not and his fire is not quenched.



















BS1515 A374 v.2  
The later prophecies of Isaiah



1 1012 00036 6262