

# **CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions**

BY

**E.W. HENGSTENBERG**

Preface by Merrill F. Unger, Th.D., Ph.D.

COMPLETE IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOL. II

KREGEL PUBLICATIONS

GRAND RAPIDS 6, MICHIGAN

1956

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 55-9467

This reprint edition is an exact reproduction of the latest British Edition printed in 1872-79. Translated from the German by Theod. Meyer and James Martin

PHOTOLITOPRINTED BY CUSTING--MALLOY, INC.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 1956

## **THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN THE PROPHETS**

### **THE PROPHET ISAIAH**

#### ***GENERAL PRELIMINARY REMARKS***

isaiah is the principal prophetic figure in the first period of canonical prophetism, *i.e.*, the Assyrian period, just as Jeremiah is in the second, *i.e.*, the Babylonian. With Isaiah are connected in the kingdom of Judah: Joel, Obadiah, and Micah; in the kingdom of Israel: Hosea, Amos, and Jonah.

The name "Isaiah" signifies the "Salvation of the Lord." In this name we have the keynote of his prophecies, just as the name Jeremiah: "The Lord casts down," indicates the

nature of his prophecies, in which the prevailing element is entirely of a threatening character. That the proclamation of salvation occupies a very prominent place in Isaiah, was seen even by the Fathers of the Church. *Jerome* says: "I shall expound Isaiah in such a manner that he shall appear not as a prophet only, but as an Evangelist and an Apostle;" and in another passage: "Isaiah seems to me to have uttered not a prophecy but a Gospel." And *Augustine* says, *De Civ. Dei*, 18, c. 29, that, according to the opinion of many, Isaiah, on account of his numerous prophecies of Christ and the Church, deserved the name of an Evangelist rather than that of a Prophet. When, after his conversion, *Augustine* applied to *Ambrose* with the question, which among the Sacred Books he should read in preference to all others, he proposed to him Isaiah, "because before all others it was he who had more openly declared the Gospel and the calling of the Gentiles." (*Aug. Conf.* ix. 5.) With the Fathers of the Church *Luther* coincides. He says in commendation of Isaiah: "He is full of loving, comforting, cheering words for all poor consciences, and wretched, afflicted hearts." Of course, there is in Isaiah no want of severe reproofs and threatenings. If it were otherwise, he would have gone beyond the boundary by which true prophetism is separated from false. "There is in it," as *Luther* says, "enough of threatenings and terrors against the hardened, haughty, obdurate heads of the wicked, if it might be of some use." But the threatenings never form the close in Isaiah; they always at last run out into the promise; and while, for example, in the great majority of *Jeremiah's* prophecies, the promise, which cannot be wanting in any true prophet, is commonly only short, and hinted at, sometimes consisting only of words which are thrown into the midst of the several threatenings, *e. g.*, 4:27: "Yet will I not make a full end,"—in Isaiah the stream of consolation flows in the richest fulness. The promise absolutely prevails in the second part, from chap. 40-66. The reason of this peculiarity is to be sought for chiefly in the historical circumstances. Isaiah lived at a time in which, in the kingdom of Judah, the corruption was far from having already reached its greatest height,—in which there still existed, in that kingdom, a numerous "election" which gathered round the prophet as their spiritual centre. With a view to this circle, Isaiah utters the words: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people." The contemporary prophets of the kingdom of the ten tribes, which was poisoned in its very first origin, found a different state of things; the field there was already ripe for the harvest of judgment. And at the time of *Jeremiah*, Judah had become like her apostate sister. At that time it was not so much needed to comfort the miserable, as to terrify sinners in their security. It was only after the wrath of God had manifested itself in deeds, only after the judgment of God had been executed upon Jerusalem, or was immediately at hand,—it was only then that, in *Jeremiah*, and so in *Ezekiel* also, the stream of promise broke forth without hinderance.

Chronology is, throughout, the principle according to which the Prophecies of Isaiah are arranged. In the first six chapters, we obtain a survey of the Prophet's ministry under *Uzziah* and *Jotham*. Chap. 7 to 10:4 belongs to the time of *Ahaz*. From chap. 10:4 to the close of chap. 35 every thing belongs to the time of the Assyrian invasion in the fourteenth year of *Hezekiah*; in the face of which invasion the prophetic gift of Isaiah was displayed as it had never been before. The section, chap. 36-39, furnishes us with the historical commentary on the preceding prophecies from the Assyrian period, and forms, at the same time, the transition to the second part, which still belongs to the same period, and the starting point of which is Judah's deliverance from *Asshur*. In this most remarkable year of the prophet's life—a year rich in the manifestation of God's glory in judgment and mercy—his prophecy flowed out in full streams, and spread to every side. Not the destinies of Judah only, but those of the Gentile nations also are drawn within its sphere. The Prophet does not confine himself to the events immediately at hand, but in his

ecstatic state, the state of an elevated, and, as it were, armed consciousness, in which he was during this whole period, his eye looks into the farthest distances. He sees, especially, that, at some future period, the Babylonian power, which began, even in his time, to germinate, would take the place of the Assyrian,—that, like it, it would find the field of Judah white for the harvest,—that, for this oppressor of the world, destruction is prepared by *Koresh* (Cyrus), the conqueror from the East, and that he will liberate the people from their exile; and, at the close of the development, he beholds the Saviour of the world, whose image he depicts in the most glowing colours.

Isaiah has especially brought out the view of the Prophetic and Priestly offices of Christ, while in the former prophecies it was almost alone the Kingly office which appeared; it is only in Deut. 18 that the Prophetic office, and in Ps. 110 that the Priestly office, is pointed at. Of the two states of Christ, it is the doctrine of the state of humiliation, the doctrine of the suffering Christ, which here meets us, while formerly it was the state of exaltation which was prominently brought before us,—although Isaiah too can very well describe it when it is necessary to meet the fears regarding the destruction of the Theocracy by the assaults of the powerful heathen nations. The first attempt at a description of the humbled, suffering, and expiating Christ, is found in chap. 11:1. The real seat of this proclamation is, however, in the second part, which is destined more for the election, than for the whole nation. In chap. 42 we meet the servant of God, who, as a Saviour meek and lowly in heart, does not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax, and by this merciful love establishes righteousness on the whole earth. In chap. 49, the Prophet describes how the covenant-people requite with ingratitude the faithful labours of the Servant of God, but that the Lord, to recompense Him for the obstinacy of Israel, gives Him the Gentiles for an inheritance. In chap. 1 we have presented to us that aspect of the sufferings of the Servant of God which is common to Christ and His people—viz., how, in fulfilling His calling, He offered His back to the smiters, and did not hide His face from shame and spitting. Then, finally, in chap. 53—that culminating point of the prophecy of the Old Testament—Christ is placed before our eyes in His highest work, in His atoning and vicarious suffering, as the truth of both the Old Testament high-priest, and the Old Testament sin-offering.

There are still the following Messianic features which are peculiar to Isaiah. A clear Old Testament witness for the divinity of Christ is offered by chap. 9:5 (6); the birth by a virgin, closely connected with His divinity, is announced in chap. 7:14; according to chap. 8:23 (9:1) Galilee, and, in general, the country surrounding the Sea of Gennesareth, being that part of the country which hitherto had chiefly been covered with disgrace, are, in a very special manner, to be honoured by the appearance of the Saviour, who shall come to have mercy upon the miserable, and to seek that which was lost. Isaiah has, further, first taught that, by the redemption, the consequences of the Fall would disappear in the irrational creation also, and that it should return to paradisaic innocence, chap. 11:6-9. He has first announced to the people of God the glorious truth, that death, as it had not existed in the beginning, should, at the end also, be expelled, chap. 25:8; 26:19. The healing powers which by Christ should be imparted to miserable mankind, Isaiah has described in chap. 35 in words, which by the fulfilment have, in a remarkable manner, been confirmed.

Let us endeavour to form, from the single scattered features which occur in the prophecies of Isaiah, a comprehensive view of his prospects into the future.

The announcement first uttered by Moses of an impending exile of the people, and desolation of the country, is brought before us by Isaiah in the first six chapters, in the prophecies belonging to the time of Uzziah and Jotham, at which the future had not yet been so clearly laid open before the Prophet as it was at a later period, at the time of Ahaz, and, very especially, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. A reference to the respective announcements of the Pentateuch is found in chap. 37:26, where, in opposition to the imagination of the King of Asshur, that, by his own power, he had penetrated as a conqueror as far as Judah, Isaiah asks him whether he had not heard that the Lord, long ago and from ancient times, had formed such a resolution regarding His people. These words can be referred only to the threatenings of the Pentateuch, which a short-sighted criticism endeavoured to ascribe to a far later period, without considering that the germ of this knowledge of the future is found in the Decalogue also, the genuineness of which is, at present, almost unanimously conceded: "In order that thy (Israel's) days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

In the solemnly introduced short summary of the history of the covenant-people, in chap. 6, there is, after the announcement of the impending complete desolation of the country and the carrying away of its inhabitants in ver. 11, 12, the indication of a *second* judgment which will not less make an end, in ver. 13: "But yet there is a tenth part in it, and it shall again be destroyed;" and this goes hand in hand with the promise that the *election* shall become partakers of the Messianic salvation.

The Prophet clearly sees that, by the *Syrico-Ephraemitic* war, the full realization of that threatening of the Pentateuch will not be brought about, as far as Judah is concerned; that here a faint prelude only to the real fulfilment is the point in question. Although the allied kings speak in chap. 7:6: "Let us go up against Judea and vex it, and let us conquer it for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal," the Lord speaks in chap. 7:7: "It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass." And although the heart of the king and the heart of his people were moved as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind, the Prophet says: "Fear not, let not thy heart be tender for the tails of those two smoking firebrands."

It is Asshur that shall do more for the realization of that divine decree first revealed by Moses. It is he who, immediately after that expedition against Judah, shall break the power of the kingdom of the ten tribes, chap. 8:4: "Before the child shall be able to cry: 'My father and my mother,' the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried before the King of Assyria." The communion of guilt into which it has entered with Damascus shall also implicate it in a communion of punishment with it, chap. 17:3. The adversaries of Rezin shall devour Israel with open mouth, chap. 9:11,12. Yea Asshur shall, some time afterwards, put an end altogether to the kingdom of Israel; "Within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken that it shall not be a people any more," chap. 7:8. Upon Judah also severe sufferings shall be inflicted by Asshur. He shall invade and devastate their land, chap. 7:17, and chap. 8. He shall irresistibly penetrate to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, chap. 10:28-32. But when he is just preparing to inflict the mortal blow upon the head of the people of God, the Lord shall put a stop to him: "He shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by the mighty one," chap. 10:34. "Asshur shall be broken in the land of the Lord, and upon His mountains be trodden under foot; and his yoke shall depart from off them, and his burden depart from off their shoulders," chap. 14:25. "And Asshur shall fall with the sword not of a man," chap. 31:8. These prophecies found their fulfilment in the destruction of

Sennacherib's host before Jerusalem,—an event which no human ingenuity could have known even a day beforehand. But Isaiah does not content himself with promising to trembling Zion the help of God against Asshur in that momentary calamity. In harmony with Hosea and Micah, he promises to Judah, in general, security from Asshur. He says to Hezekiah, after that danger was over, in chap. 38:6: “And I will deliver thee and this city out of the hand of the King of Assyria, and I will defend this city.”

Behind the Assyrian kingdom, the Prophet beholds a new power germinating, viz., the Babylonian or Chaldean; and he announces most distinctly and repeatedly that from this shall proceed a comprehensive execution of the threatenings against unfaithful Judah. According to chap. 23:13, the Chaldeans overturn the Assyrian monarchy, and conquer proud Tyre which had resisted the assault of the Assyrians. Shinar or Babylon appears in chap. 11:11, in the list of the places to which Judah has been removed in punishment. In chap. 13:1-14:27, Babylon is, for the first time, distinctly and definitely mentioned as the threatening power of the future, by which Judah is to be carried into captivity. The corresponding announcement in chap. 39 is so closely and intimately interwoven with the historical context, that even *Gesenius* did not venture to deny its origin by Isaiah, just as he was compelled also to acknowledge the genuineness of the prophecy against Tyre, in which the Babylonian dominion is most distinctly foretold, and even the duration of that dominion is fixed. The 70 years of Jeremiah have here already their foundation.

The Prophet sees distinctly and definitely that Egypt, the rival African world's power, on which the sharp-sighted politicians of his time founded their hope for deliverance, would not be equal to the Asiatic world's power representing itself in the Assyrian and Babylonian phases. He knows what he could not know from any other source than by immediate communication of the Spirit of God, that, by its struggle against the Asiatic power, Egypt would altogether lose its old political importance, and would never recover it; compare remarks on chap. 19.

As the power which is to overthrow the Babylonian Empire appear, in chap. 33:17, the Medes. In chap. 21:2, Elam, which, according to the *usus loquendi* of Isaiah, means Persia, is mentioned besides Media. This power, and at its head, the conqueror from the East, Cyrus, will bring deliverance to Judah. By it they obtain a restoration to their native land.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless Elam appears in chap. 22:16 as the representative of the world's power oppressing Judah in the future; and from chap. 11:11 we are likewise led to expect that the world's power will in future shew itself in an Elamitic phase also, and that the difference between Babel and Elam is one of degree only, just as, indeed, it appeared in history; comp. Neh. 9:36, 37.

An intimation of an European phasis of the world's power, hostile to the kingdom of God, is to be found in chap. 11:11.

After the Kingdom of God has, for such protracted periods, been subject to the world's power, the relation will suddenly be reversed; at the end of the days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be exalted above all the hills, and all nations shall flow into it, chap. 2:2.

This great change shall be accomplished by the Messiah, chaps. 4, 9, 11, 33:17, who proceeds from the house of David, chap. 9:6 (7), 55:3, but only after it has sunk down to the utmost lowliness, chap. 11:1. With the human, He combines the divine nature. This appears not only from the names which are given to Him in chap. 9:5 (6), but also from

the works which are assigned to Him,—works by far exceeding human power. He rules over the whole earth, according to chap. 11; He slays, according to 11:4, the wicked with the breath of His mouth (compare chap. 50:11, where likewise He appears as a partaker of the omnipotent punitive power of God); He removes the consequences of sin even from the irrational creation, chap. 11:6-9; by His absolute righteousness He is enabled to become the substitute of the whole human race, and thereby to accomplish their salvation resting on this substitution, chap. 53.

The Messiah appears at first in the form of a servant, low and humble, chap. 11:1, 53:2. His ministry is quiet and concealed, chap. 42:2, as that of a Saviour who with tender love applies himself to the miserable, chap. 42:3, 61:1. At first it is limited to Israel, chap. 49:1-6, where it is enjoyed especially by the most degraded of all the parts of the country, viz., that around the sea of Galilee, chap. 8:23 (9:1). Severe sufferings will be inflicted upon Him in carrying out His ministry. These proceed from the same people whom He has come to raise up, and to endow (according to chap. 42:6, 49:8), with the full truth of the covenant into which the Lord has entered with them. The Servant of God bears these sufferings with unbroken courage. They bring about, through His mediation, the punishment of God upon those from whom they proceeded, and become the reason why the salvation passes over to the Gentiles, by whose deferential homage the Servant of God is indemnified for what He has lost in the Jews, chap. 49:1-9, 50:4-11. (The foundation for the detailed announcement in these passages is given already in the sketch in chap. 6,—according to which an election only of the people attain to salvation, while the mass becomes a prey to destruction.) But it is just by these sufferings, which issue at last in a violent death, that the Servant of God reaches the full height of His destination. They possess a vicarious character, and effect the reconciliation of a whole sinful world, chap. 52:13-53:12. Subsequently to the suffering, and on the ground of it, begins the exercise of the Kingly office of Christ, chap. 53:12. He brings law and righteousness to the Gentile world, chap. 42:1; light into their darkness, chap. 42:6. He becomes the centre around which the whole Gentile world gathers, chap. 11:10: “And it shall come to pass in that day, the root of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and His rest shall be glory;” comp. chap. 40, where the delighted eye of the Prophet beholds how the crowds of the nations from the whole earth turn to Zion; chap. 18, where the future reception of the Ethiopians into the Kingdom of God is especially prophecied; chap. 19, according to which Egypt turns to the God of Israel, and by the tie of a common love to Him, is united with Asshur, his rival in the time of the Prophet, and so likewise with Israel, which has so much to suffer from him; chap. 23, according to which, in the time of salvation, Tyre also does homage to the God of Israel. The Servant of God becomes, at the same time, the *Witness*, and the Prince and Lawgiver of the nations, chap. 55:4. Just as the Spirit of the Lord rests upon Him, chap. 11:2, 42:1, 61:1, so there takes place in His days an outpouring of the Holy Spirit, chap. 32:15, 44:3, comp. with chap. 54:13. Sin is put an end to by Him, chap. 11:9, and an end is put especially to war, chap. 2:4. The Gentiles gathered to the Lord become at last the medium of His salvation for the covenant-people, who at first had rejected it, chap. 11:12, 60:9, 66:20, 21. The end is the restoration of the paradisaic condition, chap. 11:6-9, 65:25; the new heavens and the new earth, chap. 65:17, 66:22; but the wicked shall inherit eternal condemnation, chap. 66:24.

## THE PROPHECY, CHAP. 2-4

### THE SPROUT OF THE LORD

It has been already proved, in Vol. i, p. 416 ff., that this discourse belongs to the first period of the Prophet's ministry. It consists of three parts. In the first, chap. 2:2-4, the Prophet draws a picture of the Messianic time, at which the Kingdom of God, now despised, should be elevated above all the kingdoms of the world, should exercise an attractive power over the Gentiles, and should cause peace to dwell among them; comp. Vol. i., p. 437 ff. In the second part, from chap. 2:5-4:1, the Prophet describes the prevailing corruption, exhorts to repentance, threatens divine judgments. This part is introduced, and is connected with the preceding, by the admonition in 2:5, addressed to the people, to prepare, by true godliness, for a participation in that blessedness, to beware lest they should be excluded through their own fault. In the third part, chap. 4:2-6, the prophet returns to the proclamation of salvation, so that the whole is, as it were, surrounded by the promise; It was necessary that this should be prominently brought out, in order that sinners might not only be terrified by fear, but also allured by hope, to repentance,—and in order that the elect might not imagine that the sin of the masses, and the judgment inflicted in consequence of it, did away with the mercy of the Lord towards His people, and with His faithfulness to His promises. Salvation does not come without judgment. This feature, by which true prophetism is distinguished from false, which, divesting God of His righteousness, announced salvation to unreformed sinners, to the whole rude mass of the people,—this feature is once more prominently brought out in ver. 4. But salvation for the elect comes as necessarily as judgment does upon the sinners. In the midst of the deepest abasement of the people of God, God raises from out of the midst of them the Saviour by whom they are raised to the highest glory, chap. 4:2. They are installed into the dignity of the saints of God, after the penitent ones have been renewed by His Spirit, and the obstinate sinners have been exterminated by His judgment, ver. 3, 4. God's gracious presence affords them protection from their enemies, and from all tribulation and danger, ver. 5, 6.

The first part, in which Isaiah follows Micah (comp. the arguments in proof of originality in Micah, Vol. i., p. 413 ff.), has already been expounded on a former occasion. We have here only to answer the question, why it is that the Prophet opens his discourse with a proclamation of salvation borrowed from Micah? His object certainly was to render the minds of the people susceptible of the subsequent admonition and reproof, by placing at the head a promise which had already become familiar and precious to the people. The position which the Messianic proclamation occupies in Isaiah is altogether misunderstood if, with *Kleinert* and *Ewald*, we assume that the passage does not, in Isaiah, belong to the real substance of the prophecy; that it is merely placed in front as a kind of text, the abuse and misinterpretation of which the Prophet meets in that which follows, so that the sense would be: the blessed time promised by former prophets will come *indeed*, but *only* after severe, rigorous judgments upon all who had forsaken Jehovah. It is especially ver. 5 which militates against this interpretation, where, in the words: "Come ye and let us walk in the light of the Lord,"<sup>2</sup> the prophet gives an *express declaration* as to the object of the description which he has placed in front, and expresses himself in regard to it in perfect harmony with Heb. 4:1: φοβηθῶμεν οὐκ ἵνα καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας . . . δοκῆ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκεῖναι. This shows, that after the manner of an evangelical preacher, and in conformity with his name, he wishes to allure to repentance by pointing to the

great salvation of the future;—that the ἡγγικε ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν of the first part serves as a foundation to the μετανοεῖτε οὖν of the second.

The threatening of punishment contained in the second part is destitute of any particular reference. It bears a general character, comprehending the whole of the mischief with which the Lord is to visit the unfaithfulness of His people. Most thoroughly was the animating idea realized in the Roman catastrophe, the consequence of which is the helplessness which still presses upon the people. The preparatory steps were the decay of the people at the time of Ahaz—especially the Chaldean overthrow—and, generally, everything which the people had to suffer in the time of the dominion of the Assyrian, Chaldean, Medo-Persian, and Greek kingdoms. As none of these kingdoms were as yet on the stage, or in sight, it is quite natural that the threatening here keeps altogether within general terms; it was given to Isaiah himself afterwards to individualize it much more.

It is with the third part only that we have here more particularly to employ ourselves.

Ver. 2. *“In that day the Sprout of the Lord becomes for beauty and glory, and the fruit of the land for exaltation and ornament, to the escaped of Israel.”*

Ver. 3. *“And it shall come to pass, he that was left in Zion, and was spared in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, every one that is written to life in Jerusalem.”*

Ver. 4. *“When the Lord has washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall remove the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of right and the spirit of destruction.”*

Ver. 5. *“And the Lord creates over the place of Mount Zion, and over her assemblies clouds by day and smoke, and the brightness of flaming fire by night, for above all glory is a covering.”*

Ver. 6. *“And a tabernacle shall be for a shadow by day from the heat, and for a refuge and covert from storm and from rain.”*

Ver. 2. *“In that day,”* i.e., not by any means *after* the suffering, but *in the midst of it*, comp. chap. 3:18; 4:1, where, by the words “in that day,” contemporaneousness is likewise expressed. Parallel is chap. 9:1 (2), where the people that walketh in darkness seeth a great light. According to Micah 5:2 (3) also, the people are given up to the dominion of the world’s powers until the time that she who is bearing has brought forth. Inasmuch as the Messianic proclamation bears the same general comprehensive character as the threatening of punishment, and includes in itself beginning and end, the suffering may partly also reach into the Messianic time. It dismisses from its discipline those who are delivered up to it, gradually only, after they have become ripe for a participation in the Messianic salvation.—There cannot be any doubt that, by the “*Sprout of the Lord*” the Messiah is designated,—an explanation which we meet with so early as in the Chaldee Paraphrast (שִׁיחַ דָּי לְחַדְוָה וְלִיקְרָבָעֲדָנָא הָהוּא יְהִי מְ), from which even *Kimchi* did not venture to differ, which was in the Christian Church, too, the prevailing one, and which Rationalism was the first to give up. The Messiah is here quite in His proper place. The Prophet had, in chap. 3:12-15, in a very special manner, derived the misery of the people from their bad rulers. What is now more rational, therefore, than that he should connect the salvation and prosperity likewise with the person of a Divine Ruler? comp. chap. 1:26. In the adjoining prophecies of Isaiah, especially in chaps. 7, 9, and 11, the person of

the Messiah likewise forms the centre of the proclamation of salvation; so that, *a priori*, a mention of it must be expected here. To the same result we are led by the analogy of Micah; comp. Vol. i. p. 443-45, 449. *Farther*—The representation of the Messiah, under the image of a sprout or shoot, is very common in Scripture; comp. chap. 11:1-10; 53:2; Rev. 5:5. But of decisive weight are those passages in which precisely our word חֲמַצ occurs as a designation of the Messiah. The two passages, Jer. 23:5: “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, and I raise unto David a righteous Sprout;” and 33:15: “In those days, and at that time, shall I cause the Sprout of righteousness to grow up unto David,” may at once and plainly considered as an *interpretation* of the passage before us, as a commentary upon it; and that so much the more there, as well as here, all salvation is connected with this Sprout of Jehovah; comp. Jer. 23:6: “In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is His name whereby he shall be called: The Lord our righteousness,” The two other passages, Zech. 3:8: “Behold, I bring my servant *Zemach*” and 6:12: “Behold, a man whose name is *Zemach*” are of so much the greater consequence that in them *Zemach* (*i.e.* Sprout) occurs as a kind of *nomen proprium*, the sense of which is supposed as being known from former prophecies to which the Prophet all but expressly refers; or as *Vitringa* remarks on these passages: “That man who, in the oracles of the preceding Prophets (Is. and Jer.) bears the name of ‘Sprout.’” Of no less consequence, *finally*, is the parallel passage, chap. 28:5: “In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty unto the residue of His people.” The words יבֹצ and תִּרְאֶפֶת there meet us again. The same is there ascribed to the Lord which is here attributed to the Sprout of the Lord. That can be readily accounted for, only if the Sprout of the Lord be the Messiah. For the Messiah appears everywhere as the channel through which the Lord imparts to His Church all the fulness of His blessings, as the Immanuel by whom the promise given at the very threshold of the Old Testament; “I dwell in the midst of them,” is most perfectly realized. “This is the name whereby He shall be called: The Lord our righteousness,” says Jeremiah, in the passage quoted.—The “Sprout of the Lord” may designate either him whom the Lord causes to sprout, or him who has sprouted forth from the Lord, *i.e.*, the Son of God. Against the latter interpretation it is objected by *Hoffmann* (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*. Th. 1, S. 214): חֲמַצ is an intransitive verb, so that צָמַח may be as well connected with a noun which says, who causes to sprout forth, as with one which says, whence the thing sprouts forth. Now it is quite obvious that, in the passage before us, the former case applies, and not the latter, inasmuch as one cannot say that something, or even some one, sprouts forth from Jehovah; it is only with a thing, not with a person, that חֲמַצ can be connected.” But it is impossible to admit that this objection is well founded. The person may very well be conceived of as the soil from which the sprout goes forth. Yet we must, indeed, acknowledge that the Messiah is nowhere called a Sprout of David. But what decides in favour of the first view are the parallel passages. In Jer. 23:5, 33:15, the Lord raises to David a righteous Sprout, and causes Him to grow up to David. Hence here, too, the Sprout will in that sense only be the Lord’s, that he does not sprout forth out of Him, but through Him. In Zech. 3:8 the Lord brings his servant *Zemach*; in Ps. 132:17, it is said: “There I cause a horn to sprout to David,” and already in the fundamental passage, 2 Sam. 23:5, which contains the first germ of our passage, David says: “For all my salvation and all my pleasure should He not make it to *sprout* forth.”—As the words “Sprout of the Lord” denote the heavenly origin of the Redeemer, so do the words יֶרֶבָה the earthly one, the soil from which the Lord causes the Saviour to sprout up. These words are, by *Vitringa* and others, translated: “the fruit of the earth,” but the correct translation is “the fruit of the *land*.” The passages, Num. 13:26: “And shewed them the fruit of the land;”

and Deut. 1:25: “And they took in their hands of the fruit of the land, and brought it unto us, and brought us word again, and said, good is the land which the Lord our God doth give us,”—these two passages are, besides that under consideration, the only ones in which the phrase *ירפ פראה* occurs; and there is here, no doubt, an allusion to them. The excellent natural fruit of ancient times is a type of the spiritual fruit. To the same result that *פראה* designates the definite land, that land which, in the preceding verses, in the description of the prevailing corruption, and of the divine judgments, was always spoken of,—to this result we are led by the fact also, that everywhere in the Old Testament where the contrariety of the divine and human origin of the Messiah is mentioned, the human origin is more distinctly qualified and limited. This is especially the case in those passages which, being dependent upon that before us, may be considered as a commentary upon it; in Jer. 23:5, 33:15, where the Lord raises a Sprout unto *David*, and Zech. 6:12, where the man whose name, is *Zemach* (Sprout) grows up out of its soil; comp. Heb. 7:14, where, in allusion to the Old Testament passages of the Sprout—the verb *ἀνατέλλειν* is commonly used of the sprouting forth of the plants (see *Bleek* on this passage)—it is said: *ἐξ Ἰουδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, Bengel: ut germen justitiae:* farther, Mic. 5:1 (2), where the eternal existence of the Messiah, and His birth in Bethlehem are contrasted with one another; Is. 9:5. (6), where the words; “Unto *us* a child is born, unto *us* a son is given,” are contrasted with the various designations of the Messiah, according to His divine majesty. This qualification and limitation which everywhere takes place, have their ground in the circumstances that the Messiah is constantly represented to the covenant-people as their property; and that He, indeed, was, inasmuch as salvation went out from the Jews (John 4:22), and was destined for the Jews, into whose communion the Gentiles were to be received; comp. my Commentary on Revel. 7:4. “The Sprout of the Lord,” “the fruit of the land,” is accordingly He whom the Lord shall make to sprout forth from Israel. The Sprout of the Lord, the fruit of the land is to become to the escaped of Israel for *beauty* and *glory*, for *exaltation* and *ornament*. The passages to be compared are 2 Sam. 1:19, where Saul and Jonathan are called *לְאַרְשֵׁי יָבֵץ*; farther, Is. 28:5: “In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of beauty, and for a diadem of ornament unto the residue of His people,” where the words *יָבֵץ* and *תְּרַאפֶּת* are likewise used; *finally*, chap. 24:16, where, in reference to the Messianic time, it is said: “From the uttermost part of the earth do we hear songs of praise: beauty (*יָבֵץ*) to the righteous.” By the appearance of Christ, the covenant-people, hitherto despised, were placed in the centre of the world’s history; by it the Lord took away the rebuke of His people from off all the earth, chap. 25:8. There is evidently in these words a reference to the preceding threatening of punishment, especially to chap. 3:18: “In that day the Lord will take away the ornament,” &c.: But *Drechsler* is wrong in fixing and expressing this reference thus: “Instead of farther running after strange things, Israel will find its glory and ornament in Him who is the long promised seed of Abrahamitic descent.” For it is not the position which Israel takes that is spoken of, but that which is granted to them. The antithesis is between the false glory which God takes away, and the true glory which He gives. The Lord cannot, by any possibility, for any length of time, appear merely *taking away*; He takes those seeming blessings, only in order to be able to give the true ones. Every taking away is a prophecy of giving.—“*To the escaped of Israel*,” who, according to the idea of a people of God, and according to the promise of the Law (comp. Deut. 30:1, ff.) can never be wanting, as little as it is possible that the salvation should be partaken of by the whole *mass* of the people; sifting judgments must necessarily go before and along with it. True prophetism everywhere knows of salvation for a remnant only. On

הטילפ, which does not mean “deliverance,” so that the abstract would thus here stand for the concrete, but “that which has escaped.” comp. remarks on Joel 3:5, Vol. 1, p. 338.

All which now remains is to examine those explanations of this verse which differ from the Messianic interpretation. 1. Following the interpretation of *Grotius* and others, *Gesenius*, in his Commentary, understands by the Sprout of the Lord the new growth of the people after their various defeats. His explanation is: “Then the sprout of Jehovah will be splendid and glorious, and the fruit of the land excellent and beautiful for the escaped of Israel.” *Fruit of the land* he takes in its literal sense, and understands it to mean the product of the land. The same view is held by *Knobel*: “*He becomes for beauty and glory, i.e., the people, having reformed, prosper and form a splendid, glorious state.*” And *Maurer* in his Dictionary says: “The Sprout of Jehovah seems to be the morally improved remnant, the new, sanctified increase of the people.” But in opposition to such a view there is, *first*, the circumstance, that according to it the ל before יבצל and דובכל must be understood differently from what it is in וואגל, and דראפתל which immediately follow and exactly correspond with them. There are, *secondly*, the parallel passages chap. 28:5, 24:16, according to which יבצ “beauty” is conferred upon the escaped, but they themselves do not become beauty. *Finally*—It is always most natural to suppose that הוהי and המצ and ירפ and קראה correspond with one another, and denote the same subject which is here described after his various aspects only. For in the same manner as המצ and ירפ go hand in hand, both being taken from the territory of botany, so הוהי and קראה also stand in a contrast which is not to be mistaken. 2. *Hitzig, Ewald, Meier*, and others not only refer “the fruit of the land,” but also the “Sprout of Jehovah” to that which Jehovah makes to sprout forth.<sup>3</sup> It is true that, in the prophetic announcements, among the blessings of the future the rich produce of the land is also mentioned (comp. chap. 30:23-25), and the same is very expressly done in the Law also; but in not a single one of these passages does the strange expression occur, that this fruitfulness should serve to the escaped for beauty and glory, for exaltation and ornament, or any other that bears the slightest resemblance to it. Against this explanation there is, *in addition*, the circumstance that the barrenness of the country is not at all pointed out in the preceding context. *Finally*—”When we understand this expression as referring to the Messiah, this verse, standing as it does at the head of the proclamation of salvation, contains the fundamental thought; and in what follows we obtain the expansion. In the verse before us we are told that in Christ the people attain to glory,—and, in those which follow, how this glory is manifested in them. But according to this view, every internal connexion of the verse before us with what follows is entirely destroyed. 3. According to *Hendewerk*, by the “Sprout of the Lord,” “the collective person of the ruling portion in the state during the Messianic happy time,” is designated. This opinion is the beginning of a return to the Messianic interpretation. But then only could that ideal person be here referred to, if elsewhere in Isaiah too it would come out strongly and decidedly. As this, however, is not the case; as, on the contrary, the Messiah everywhere in Isaiah meets us in shining clearness, it would be arbitrary to give up the *person* in favour of a *personification*. 4. *Umbreit* acknowledges that, in the case of המצ, הוהי, the Messianic interpretation is the only correct one. “The two subsequent prophecies in chap. 9 and 11,” he says, “are to be considered as a commentary on our short text.” But it is characteristic of his compromising manner that by “the fruit of the land” he understands “the consequences of the dominion of the Messiah for the land, the fruits which, in consequence of his appearing, the consecrated soil brings forth,”—thus plainly overlooking the clear contrast between the Sprout of the

Lord, and the fruit of the land by which evidently the same thing is designated from different aspects.

Ver. 3. The Prophet now begins to show, more in detail, in how far the Sprout of the Lord and the fruit of the land would serve for the honour and glory of the Church. The words: "He that was left in Zion and was spared in Jerusalem," take up the idea suggested by the "escaped of Israel" in ver. 2. The double designation is intended to direct attention to the thought that the remnant, and the remnant only, are called to a participation in the glory. *Zion* and *Jerusalem*, as the centre of the covenant-people, here represent the whole; this is evident from the circumstance that at the close of ver. 2, which is here resumed, the escaped of *Israel* were spoken of. Ever since the sanctuary and the royal palace were founded at Zion, it was in a spiritual point of view, the residence of all Israel, who even personally met there at the high festivals.—Whoever is left in Zion "*shall be called holy.*" The fundamental notion of holiness is that of separation. God is holy, inasmuch as He is separated from all that is created and finite, and is elevated above all that is finite; comp. my Commentary on Rev. 4:8. *Believers* are holy, because they are separated from the world as regards their moral existence and their destiny. Here only the latter aspect is considered. Holy in a moral sense they were already, inasmuch as it is this which forms the condition of their being spared in the divine judgments. They became holy because they are partakers of the beauty, of the exaltation, and ornament which are to be bestowed upon the escaped by the Sprout of the Lord. The circumstance that they have been installed into the dignity of the saints of God implies that, when the Spirit of the Lord has appeared, the world's power has no longer any dominion over them, but that, on the contrary, they shall judge the world. In like manner we read in Exod. 19:6, in the description of the *reward* for faithfulness: "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation;" comp. ver. 5: "And now if you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, ye shall be a property unto me out of all people." In reference to the exalted dignity and glory, holiness occurs in Deut. 7:6: "For thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God; the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself out of all the people that are upon the face of the earth." "When the company of Korah said: "All the congregation, they are holy" (Numb. 16:3), they had in view, not the moral holiness but the dignity—a circumstance which is quite obvious from words added: "And in the midst of them is the Lord." And so Moses likewise speaks of the dignity in Numb. 16:7: "Whom the Lord shall choose, he is the holy one." In Rom. 1:7; Heb. 3:1, holiness is declared to consist in being loved, called, and chosen by God.—As regards the fulfilment of this promise, it has its *horas* and *moras*. It began with the first appearance of Christ, by which the position of the true Israel to the world was substantially and fundamentally changed. It was not without meaning that, as early as in the apostolic times, the "Saints" was a kind of *nomen proprium* of believers, comp. Acts 9:13, 32. We are even now the sons of God, and hence even already installed into an important portion of the inheritance of holiness; but it has not yet appeared what we shall be, 1 John 3:2. But the beginning, and the continuation pervading all ages, viz., God's dealings throughout the whole of history, whereby he ever anew lifts up His Church from the dust of lowliness, afford to us the guarantee for the completion, which is, with graphic vividness, described in the last two chapters of Revelation.—"*To be called*" is more than merely "to be;" it indicates that the *being* is so marked as to procure for itself acknowledgment.—The words: "*Every one that is written to life in Jerusalem*" anew point out that judgment will go before, and by the side of grace. The meaning of *חיים* is, according to the fundamental passage in Ps. 69:29, "not living ones" (*Hoffmann, Weiss, i. S. 208*), but "life." In Revelation, too, the book of life, and not the book of the living

ones, is spoken of. "To be written to life" is equivalent to being ordained to life, Acts 13:48; comp. my Comment, on Ps. 69:29; Rev. 3:5. Life is not naked life,—a miserable life is, according to the view of Scripture, not to be called a life, but is a form of death only—but life in the full enjoyment of the favour of God; comp. my Comment, on Ps. 16:11; 30:6; 36:10; 42:9; 63:4. The Chaldean thus paraphrases it: "All they that are written to eternal life shall see the consolation of Jerusalem, *i.e.* the Messiah." Comp. Dan. 12:1; Rev. 3:5, 13:8, 20:15, 22:19; Phil. 4:3; Luke 10:20. The bodily death of believers cannot exclude them from a participation in being written to life; for, being a mere transition to life, it can, in truth, not be called a death. Here, too, the word of Christ applies: "The maid is not dead but sleepeth," Matt. 9:24. The fact that there is no contradiction between bodily death and life, *i.e.* a participation in the blessings of the Kingdom of Christ, is pointed out by Isaiah himself in chap. 26:19: "Thy dead men shall *live*, my dead bodies shall rise, for a dew of light is thy dew."

Ver. 4. The Prophet points out that before the Church is raised to the dignity of the saints of God, a thorough change of its moral conditions, an energetic expunging of the *sin* now prevailing in her, must take place, " *When the Lord has washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion.*" The "daughters of Zion" are none other than those whose haughtiness, luxury, and wantonness were described in chap. 3:16 ff., and to whom the deepest abasement was then threatened. The filth, under the image of which sin is here represented (comp. Prov. 30:12); "A generation pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness," forms the contrast to the splendid attire which is there spoken of. Behind this splendid attire the filthiness is concealed. The filth is not washed away (1 Cor. 6:11; Eph. 5:26) from the daughters of Jerusalem,—for, inasmuch as this washing away is accomplished by means of the spirit of destruction, it could not apply to them—but from Jerusalem; comp. the phrase, "from the midst thereof," which immediately follows. Jerusalem, the city of the Lord, in which no unclean person, and no unclean thing are permitted to dwell, is cleansed from the filth with which its unworthy daughters contaminate it. " *And shall remove the blood of Jerusalem.*" The "blood of Jerusalem" is the blood which attaches to Jerusalem, which has been shed in it. The connection of the punishment of the sins of avarice on the part of the rulers, in chap. 3:13-15, with the punishment of the luxury and ostentation on the part of the women, is illustrative of the relation of filth and blood to each other. Blood is shed in order to furnish pride and vanity with the means of their gratification. The avarice of the rulers, and their shedding of blood, are put together in Ezek. 22:13; comp. ver. 27: "Her princes are in the midst thereof like wolves ravaging the prey, shedding blood, destroying souls, to get dishonest gain." Bloodguiltiness those too incur who deprive the poor of the necessary means of support, Mic. 3:2, 3. The comparison of chap. 1:15: "Your hands are full of blood," and of ver. 21: "But now murderers," compared with vers. 17, 23, 26, shews that we have to think especially of unjust judges and avaricious rulers. Yet, there is no reason for limiting ourselves to the nobles and rulers *alone*; comp. Ezek. 22:29: "The people of the land use oppression, and boldly practice robbery, and vex the poor and needy, and oppress the stranger." Where sins so gross are still prevalent, where the law of the Lord is so wantonly broken, an installation into the dignity of the saints of God is out of the question. For that, it is absolutely essential that exertions be made that the high destination of the people: "Ye shall be holy for I am holy," become a truth; that in a moral point of view it show itself as truly separated from the world,—and that is something so infinitely great, that men are utterly unable for it, that it can proceed from God only, with whom nothing is impossible.—The last words of the verse are commonly explained: "by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of destruction or burning." In that case the putting

away of the filth and blood by the judging activity of the Lord, by the destruction of sin, would be spoken of. **שפט**, however, may also be taken in the sense of “right:” by the spirit of right which lays hold of, and changes the well disposed (comp. Mic. 3:8: “But I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of *right* and might”), and by the spirit of destruction which consumes the disobedient. In favour of the latter view are the parallel passages; above all, chap. 28:6, where it is said of the Messianic time, “In that day the Lord will become, &c.,” “And for a spirit of right to him that sitteth for right;” farther, chap. 1:27, 28: “Zion shall be redeemed by right, and her converts by righteousness. But the transgressors and sinners are destroyed together, and they that forsake the Lord are consumed,” Comp. Matt. 3:11: **αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί**, where likewise a double washing, that of grace and that of wrath, is spoken of. In chap. 32:15: “Until the Spirit be poured out upon us from on high,” Isaiah likewise points to the regeneration which, in the Messianic time, will be accomplished by the Spirit; and it is, according to the whole *usus loquendi* of the Old Testament, most natural to think of the Spirit transforming from within. The Spirit of God scarcely occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament as he executor of God’s judgments; so that the supposition is very natural that the spirit of destruction has been brought in by the spirit of right only.—The word **רעב** is, by some, understood as “burning,” by others, as “destruction.” We ourselves decide in favour of the latter signification, which occurs also in chap. 4:13, for this reason, that it is in that signification that **רעב** is, in Deuteronomy, used as the *terminus technicus* of the extirpation of the wicked. If the Church does not comply with the command: **ἐξατεῖτε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν**, 1 Cor. 5:13: Deut. 13:6 (5), God himself will enforce His authority by His Spirit, who carries out the judgments of the avenging God, just as He carries out every influence of the Creator upon the created. On the “Spirit of the Lord,” comp. my remarks on Rev. 1:4.

Ver. 5. The image is here taken from the journey of Israel through the wilderness. During that journey, they were guided and protected by a symbol of God’s presence, which by day presented itself as smoke, and by night assumed the form of flaming fire. By this symbol the God of Israel was designated as the jealous God, as the living, personal energy, energetic in His love for His people, energetic in wrath against His and their enemies. Comp. especially Exod. 13:21: “And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud to lead them on the way, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light;” and 40:38: “For a cloud was upon the tabernacle by day, and fire was on it by night;” comp. Numb. 9:15, 16. The same phenomenon is to be repeated in future, although in a different form. In a manner the most real, the Lord will manifest himself as the living energy of His Church, dwelling in the midst of her, and ruling over her as a protector, so that the world’s power can no longer injure her. That such will be done in and by His *Sprout*, in Christ, appears from the relation of the verse under consideration to ver. 2; for the verse before us still belongs to the expansion of the proposition placed at the head of the whole: “The *Sprout* of the Lord becomes for beauty and glory, and the fruit of the land for exaltation and ornament to the escaped of Israel.” Christ in His person and Spirit is the true Shechinah, the true indwelling of God in His Church. This indwelling is, even in the Law, designated as the highest privilege of the covenant-people; its being raised to a higher power is therefore to the Prophet the highest blessing of the future, the source from which all blessings flow. That which the heathen in vain longed for and imagined; that which Israel hitherto possessed only very imperfectly, a *praesens numen*, whereby the antithesis of heaven and earth is done away with, and earth is glorified into a heaven;—that, the purified Church of the Lord possesses in the most perfect and real manner, and in it, absolute security against the world, a decided victory

over it. The words: “*Over her assemblies,*” show that the whole life of the people shall then bear a religious character, and shall be a continual service of God, comp. Acts 2:42, where, as a type of the completion of the Church, it is said: “And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” אַרְקָמַ is only the name for that which is called, “the assembly,” and stands in Levit. 23 and Is. 1:13 of the religious assemblies which were held on the holy days, comp. my pamphlet: *Ueber den Tag des Herrn* S. 32. The same phenomenon is, according to its appearance by day, designated, at the same time, as *clouds* and *smoke*. Smoke is never “vapour, vapoury clouds” (*Knobel*); and here the smoke by day corresponds with the *flaming fire* by night. If then the smoke can be considered as a product of the fire only (comp. my remarks on Rev. 15:8), the cloud cannot come into consideration according to its matter, but according to its form only. The smoke assumes the form of a cloud which affords protection from the burning sun of tribulations, as once, in the burning desert, from the scorching heat of the natural sun, comp. Num. 10:34: “And the cloud of the Lord was upon them;” Ps. 105:39: “He spread a cloud for a covering;” Is. 25:5. The cloud which thus affords protection to the Church turns a threatening face towards her enemies, Rev. 15:8.—The words: “*For above fill glory is a covering,*” point to the ground of the protecting, gracious presence of God in the Church. Several interpreters explain the sense thus: “As we cover and preserve precious things more carefully, in order that they may not be injured, so does God in His grace surround His Church, which has been adorned with glorious virtues, and raised to the high dignity of the saints of God, and protects her from every danger.” Others understand by דּוֹבַכ־לֵב the whole glory mentioned in the preceding context; but in that case we should expect the article. One may also supply the limitation: For, *in the Kingdom of God*, there is a covering over all glory.

Ver. 6. God—this is the same sense—protects His Church from every danger and calamity. By His gracious presence in His Sprout, He affords to them that protection which a hut does from sun, storms, and rain. Luther says: “In this passage, accordingly, Christ is held up to us as He who in all tribulations, bodily as well as spiritual, is our protection.” There is an allusion to the 21st verse of Ps. 31 (which was written by David): “Thou hidest them in the secret of thy countenance from the conspiracy of every one; thou keepest them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues.” The pavilion in this Psalm is a spiritual one, viz., God’s grace and protection. That word of David shall be gloriously fulfilled when the Sprout of the Lord shall appear. The “*Sun*” comes into consideration in its scorching quality; and the “*heat*” is in Scripture the image of temptations, sufferings, and trials; comp. remarks on Rev. 8:12, 16:8; Song of Sol. 1:6; Ps. 121:6; Matt. 13:6, compared with 5:21; Is. 49:10, 25:4; and, according to the last passage, we must especially have in view the enmity and assaults of the world’s power. The “*rain*” appears as an image of tribulation in the Song of Sol. 2:11; Is. 25:4: “The spirit of the terrible ones (the passions of the kings of the world, and conquerors) is like a violent shower against the wall;” 32:2.—A comparison of the Messianic prophecy in chap. 2 with that which we have now considered shows very clearly how necessary it is to regard the single Messianic prophecies as fragments only, supplementing one another, inasmuch as commonly a few aspects only were presented to the spiritual eye of the Prophet. Just as the description in chap. 2 receives an important supplement from the passage now considered, inasmuch as the latter contains the mention of the personal Messiah, so it, again, supplements that before us by announcing the participation by the Gentiles in the blessings of the Messianic Kingdom.

## THE PROPHECY, CHAP. 7

### IMMANUEL

A crisis of the most important nature in the history of Israel is formed by the Syrico-Ephraemitic war, by the expedition of the allied kings, Bezin of Damascus, and Pekah of Samaria, which had been already prepared under the reign of Jotham, and which broke out in the first years of Ahaz. It was in consequence of this war that Asshur came into the land. The inroad of the Assyrian King, Pul, under Menahem of Israel, had been transitory only, comp. Vol. 1. p. 165. It was only with the invasion under Ahaz that the tendency of Asshur began of making lasting conquests on the other side of the Euphrates, which could not fail to bring about a collision with the Egyptian power. The succeeding powers in Asia and Europe followed Asshur's steps. "Hitherto,"—so says *Caspari*, in his pamphlet on the Syrico-Ephraemitic war, S. 17 ff.—"hitherto Israel had to do with the small neighbouring nations only,—now, in punishment of their sins, oppressed by them; then, in reward of their obedience, oppressing and ruling over them. And the Syrico-Ephraemitic war itself had been a link only in the chain of these attacks—its last link. Israel, having arrived at the point of being hardened, and having entered upon a path in accordance with this tendency, required another more severe corrective—its being crushed by the mighty world's power. The appearance of these mighty powers, just at the period when Israel entered upon their hardening, is most providential.—The beginning of the end of the kingdom of the ten tribes had come, and the breaking up of its independent political existence had commenced. As enmity to Judah had given its origin to the kingdom of the ten tribes, so also did it bring about its destruction; born out of it, it died of it. It owed its existence to the incipient enmity; when the latter was accomplished (Is. 7:6), it caused its death.—The Assyrians came to the help of Judah, but charged a high price for their help, viz., Judah's submission and fealty. Thirty heavy years of servitude, and, to a great part, of fears of the worst, 2 Kings 16:18; Is. 33:18 (?); 37:3, followed for this kingdom also; and when, at the close of this period, it freed itself from them after the fashion of the kingdom of Israel, it shared nearly the same fate, 2 Kings 18:31 ff. It was only to the mercy of the Lord who looked graciously upon the feeble beginnings of conversion, that it owed its deliverance. The Assyrian power, which had put an end to the kingdoms of Damascus and Israel, and which was the first power that appeared on the stage of history and came into conflict with the people of God, became a significant sign of the final fate of the world's power in its attacks upon the Kingdom of God. But, as a prelude to the long series of visitations which it had to endure from the world's power in its different phases, Judah was even now led to the very brink of destruction; there came a period, the 14th year of Hezekiah, when almost nothing more of it was to be seen by the outward eye than its metropolis exposed to the utmost danger."

A remarkable proof of the fact that the spirit which filled the prophets was a higher one than their own, is the fact that Isaiah recognized so distinctly and clearly the importance of the decisive moment.

In close connection with the great crisis at which the history of the people of God had arrived, stands the richer display of the Messianic announcement which begins with the chapter before us. Messiah is henceforth represented to Judah as an Immanuel against the world's powers, as the surety for its deliverance from the severe oppressions hanging over it, as He who at last, at His appearance, would conquer the world, and lay it at the feet of the people of God.

After these general introductory remarks, let us turn more peculiarly to the contents of the chapter before us. It was told to the house of David: "Aram is encamped in Ephraim." The position of Ahaz was, humanly considered, desperate. His enemies were far superior to him, and he could scarcely hope for help from heaven, for he had an evil conscience. The idea of seeking help from Asshur was natural. Isaiah received a commission to oppose this idea before it became a firm resolution. In doing so he, by no means, occupies the position of an ingenious politician. On the contrary, the whole commission is forced upon him. It can scarcely be doubted that the Assyrians would have penetrated to Western Asia, even if Ahaz had not called them to his assistance. The expedition of the Syrians and Ephraimites with the view of making conquests, could not but turn their attention to that quarter. As the instruments of the judgments upon Damascus and Samaria, which Isaiah announced as impending under any circumstances, we can surely think of none but Asshur. But if once they came into these regions, in order to chastise the haughtiness of the Syrians and Ephraimites, who would set up as a new conquering power, then was Judah too threatened by them. *In a political point of view it did not make any great difference whether Ahaz sought help from the Assyrians, or not;* on the contrary, the king of Asshur could not but be more favourably disposed towards him for so doing. *Isaiah, throughout, rather occupies the position of the man of God.* The kings of the people of God were, in general, not prevented from forming alliances; but such alliances must belong to the category of permitted human resources. Such, however, was not the case here. Asshur was a conquering power, altogether selfish. His help had to be purchased with dependance, and with the danger of entire destruction; to stay upon him was to stay upon their destroyer, Is. 10:20. Such an alliance was a *de facto* denial of the God of Israel, an insult to His omnipotence and grace. If Ahaz had obeyed Him; if he had limited himself to the use of the human means granted to him by the Lord without trusting in them, and had placed all his confidence in the Lord, He would have delivered him in the same manner as He afterwards delivered Hezekiah, in the first instance from Aram and Ephraim, and then from Asshur also. But although Ahaz did not follow the prophet, his mission was by no means in vain. Even before the mission, this result lay open before the Lord who sent him; The great point was to establish, before the first conflict of Israel with the world's power, thus much, that this conflict had been brought about by the sin of the house of David, and that hence it did not afford any cause for doubting the omnipotence and mercy of the Lord whose help had been offered, but rejected.

The Prophet seeks out the king at a place to which he had been driven by his despairing disquietude which was clinging convulsively to human resources. He endeavours, first, to exert an influence upon him by taking with him his son, whose symbolical name, containing a prophecy of the future destinies of the people, indicated that the king's fear of a total destruction of the State was without foundation. After the king has thus been prepared, he endeavours to make a deeper impression upon him by the announcement, distinct and referring to the present case, that the enemies should not only entirely fail in their intention of conquering and dividing between themselves the kingdom of Judah; but that the kingdom of Ephraim was itself hastening towards that destruction which it was preparing for its brethren, and that after sixty-five years it should altogether lose its national, independence and existence, ver. 1-9. But Ahaz makes no reply; and his whole deportment shows that he does not follow the Prophet's exhortation to "take heed and be quiet," and that the words: "If ye do not believe, ye shall not be established," with which the Prophet closes his address, have not made any impression upon him. In order that the greatness of the king's hardness of heart may become manifest, the Prophet offers, in the commission of the Lord, to confirm the certainty of his statement by a miraculous sign,

which the king himself is called upon to fix, without any restriction, in order that any suspicion of imposition may be removed. "But Ahaz, the unbeliever, is afraid of heavenly communications, has already chosen his help, wishes that every thing should go on in an easy human manner, and refuses the Lord's offer in a polite turn which even refers to the Law. A sign is then forced upon him, because as the king of Judah, he must see and hear for all Judah that the Lord is faithful and good."<sup>5</sup> The Prophet, in ver. 14, points to the birth of the Saviour by a Virgin. How then was it possible that in the present collision that people should be destroyed, among whom, according to former promises, He was to be born; that that family should be extinguished from which he was to be descended? The name "Immanuel," by which the future Saviour is designated as "He in whom the Lord is, in the truest manner, to be with His people," is a guarantee for His help in the present distress also. The Prophet then states the time in which the land shall be entirely delivered from its present enemies. The contemporaries, as the representative of whom the child appears (the Prophet, in the energy of his faith, has transferred the birth of this child from the future to the present), shall, after the short space of about two years, again obtain the full enjoyment of the products of the land, ver. 15. For, before this period has elapsed, destruction will fall upon the hostile kings in their own land, ver. 16. The danger, however—and this is pointed out in ver. 17-25—will come from just that quarter from which Ahaz expects help, viz., from Asshur. But the security for deliverance from this danger also—the conqueror of the world's power which was soon to begin its course in Asshur, is none other than Immanuel, whom the Prophet, in the beginning of the humiliation of the people of God, makes, so to say, to become man, in order that, during the impending deep humiliation of the people of God, He may accompany it in its history during all the stages of its existence, until He should really become man. He is, however in this discourse, not yet pointed out as the deliverer from Asshur, and the world's power represented by him. The darkness of the misery to be inflicted by Asshur should not, and could not, in the meantime, be cleared up for Ahaz; the picture must end in night. But in the following discourse, chap. 8:1, 9:6 (7), which serves as a necessary supplement to the one before us, the Saviour is depicted before the eyes of those despairing in the sight of Asshur; and the twofold repetition of His name Immanuel, in chap. 8:8, 10, serves to show that the two discourses are intimately connected, and form one whole.

Ahaz persevered in his unbelief, according to 2 Kings 16:7, 8, He sent messengers with large presents to Tiglath-pileser, King of Assyria, saying: "I am *thy servant* and *thy son* (a word as ominous as that: "We have no king but Caesar," in John 19:35); come up and save me out of the hand of the King of Aram, and out of the hand of the King of Israel which rise up against me." But before the asked-for help came, king and people had to endure very severe sufferings from Aram and Ephraim. Ahaz, after having first made preparations to secure Jerusalem against the impending siege, sent out his armies. They met with a twofold heavy defeat from the divided armies of the allied kings,<sup>5</sup> from which he might have been spared by being still, and hoping. The hostile armies then came up to Jerusalem, and laid siege to it. It was probably by the intelligence of the advance of Asshur that they were induced to raise the siege. It was now confirmed that the Prophet had been right in designating the two hostile kings as mere tails of smoking firebrands. Damascus was taken by the King of Ophir; the inhabitants were carried away into exile to Kir; Rezin was slain, 2 Kings 16:9: the land of Israel was devastated; a portion of its inhabitants was carried away into exile; the king was made tributary, 2 Kings 15:29. Exactly at the time fixed by the Prophet, the overthrow of the two hostile kingdoms took place; but the deliverance which, without any farther sacrifice, Ahaz would have obtained, if he had believed the Prophet, had now to be purchased by very heavy

sacrifices; and with perfect justice it is said in 2 Chron. 28:20, 21, that the king of Asshur did not help him, but rather, by coming unto him, distressed him. Ahaz purchased this help at the price of his independence, and had probably to submit to very hard claims being made upon him. (*Caspari*, S. 60.) The world's power, to which Ahaz had offered a finger, seized, more and more, the whole hand, and held it by a firm grasp. Under Hezekiah, faith broke through the consequences of the sin of the family; but this interruption lasted as long only as did the faith. In addition to that which Ahaz had, for his unbelief, to suffer from Aram, Ephraim, and Asshur, came the rebellion of the neighbouring nations,—of the Edomites, according to 2 Chron. 28:17, and of the Philistines, according to ver. 18.

Ver. 1. *“And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, that Rezin, the king of Aram, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, the king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem, to war against it, and could not fight against it.”*

In thus tracing back the pedigree of Ahaz to Uzziah, there is a reference to chap. 6:1: “In the year that King Uzziah died,” &c. These two chapters stand related to each other as prophecy and fulfilment. It was in the year of Uzziah's death that the Prophet had been seized with fearful forebodings; and by the divine word these fearful forebodings had soon been raised into a clear knowledge of the threatening judgments which were impending. Under Ahaz, the second successor of Uzziah, this knowledge began to be realized, keeping pace with the hardening which in Ahaz had become personified, He, the type of the unbelieving Jewish people, did not hear and understand, did not see and perceive; and the announcement of the Prophet served merely to increase his hardening. Even as early as that, the germ of the carrying away of the people, announced by the Prophet in chap. 11, was formed.—The circumstance of the hostile kings being introduced as *going up* implies the spiritual elevation of Jerusalem; comp. remarks on Ps. 48:3; 48:17. The city of God is unconquerable unless her inhabitants and, above all, the anointed one of God, make, by their unbelief, their glorious privilege of no avail. In the last words: *“And could not fight against it”* (the singular לְבִי, because Rezin is the chief person, Rezin and Pekah being identical with Rezin with Pekah, comp. Esth. 4:16), the result of the siege is anticipated; and this is easily accounted for by the consideration that ver. 1 serves as an introduction to the whole account, stating, in general terms, the circumstances which induced the Prophet to come publicly forward. In the following verses, the share only is mentioned which the Prophet took in the matter; and the account is closed after he has discharged his commission. The apparent contradiction to 2 Kings 16:5, according to which Jerusalem was really besieged,—a contradiction which occurs also in that passage itself: *“And they besieged Ahaz, and could not fight”*—is most simply reconciled by the remark that a fruitless struggle can, as it were, not be called a struggle, just as, *e.g.*, in the Old Testament, such as have a name little known are spoken of as being without a name.

Ver. 2. *“And it was told to the house of David, saying; Aram, rests upon Ephraim. Then his heart trembled, and the heart of his people, like as the trembling of the trees of the wood before the wind.”*

The representative of the house of David was, according to ver. 1, Ahaz, to whom the suffix in וּבְבֵל refers. It is thereby intimated that Ahaz does not come into consideration as an individual, but as a representative of the whole Davidic family, of which the members were responsible, conjunctly and severally, and which in Ahaz denied their God, and gave

themselves up to the world's power,—a deed of the family from the consequence of which a heroic faith only, like that of Hezekiah, could deliver, but in such a manner only that it at once became valid again when this faith ceased, until at length in Christ the house of David was raised to glory. Ver. 19 shows that חזן must be taken in the signification “to let oneself down,” “to sit down,” “to encamp.” The anguish of the natural man, who has not his strength in God at the breaking in of danger, is most graphically described.

Ver. 3. *“And the Lord said to Isaiah: Go out to meet Ahaz, thou and Shearjashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller's field.”*

Why is the Prophet to seek out the king just at this place? The answer is given by chap. 22:2. “And a reservoir you make between the two walls for the waters of the old pool: and not do ye look unto him who makes it (viz., the impending calamity), and not do ye regard him who fashioned it long ago.” When a siege of Jerusalem was imminent, in the lower territory, the first task was to cut off the water from the hostile army. This measure Hezekiah, according to 2 Chron. 32:3, took against Sennacherib: “And he took counsel with his princes and his mighty men, to stop the waters of the fountains which were without the city, and they helped him.” That might be done in faith; but he who, like Ahaz, did not stand in the faith, sought in it, *per se*, his safety; his despairing heart clung to such measures. The stopping of the fountains was, in his case, on a level with seeking help from the Assyrians. It is thus in the midst of his sin that the Prophet seeks out the king, and recalls to his conscience; “take heed and be quiet.” But why did the Prophet take his son Shearjashub with him? It surely cannot be without significance; for otherwise it would not have been recorded, far less would it have been done at the express command of the Lord. As the boy does not appear actively, the reason can only be in the signification of the name. According to chap. 8, the Prophet was accustomed to give to his sons symbolical names which had a relation to the destinies of the nation. They were, according to chap. 8:18, “for signs and for wonders in Israel.” But as an interpretation of the name, the passage chap. 10:21 is to be considered: “The remnant shall return, the remnant of Jacob unto the mighty God.” The word בוש can, accordingly, be understood of returning to the Lord, of repentance only, comp. chap. 1:27; Hos. 3:5. But with repentance the recovery of salvation is indissolubly connected. The reason why it is impossible that they who commit the sin against the Holy Ghost shall never recover salvation lies solely in the circumstance, that it is impossible that they should be renewed to repentance. The fundamental passage, which is comprehended in the name of the Prophet's son: “And thou returnest unto the Lord thy God. . . . And the Lord thy God turneth thy captivity (*i.e.*, thy misery), and hath compassion upon thee, and returneth and gathereth thee from all the nations” (Deut. 30:2, 3), emphatically points out the indissoluble connection of the return to the Lord, and of the return of the Lord to His people. This connection comes out so much the more clearly, when we consider that, according to Scripture, repentance is not the work of man but of God, and is nothing else but the beginning of the bestowal of salvation; comp. Deut. 30:6: “And the Lord thy God circumciseth thine heart, and the heart of thy seed to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live;” Zech. 12:10. King and people feared entire destruction; and it was at this that their powerful enemies aimed. Isaiah took his son with him, “as the living proof of the preservation of the nation, even amidst the most fearful destruction of the greater part of it.” After having in this manner endeavoured to free their minds from the extreme of fear, he seeks to elevate them to joyful hopes, by the

prophetical announcement proper, which showed that, from this quarter, not even the future great judgment, which would leave a portion only, was to be feared.

Ver. 4. *“And say unto him: Take heed and be quiet; fear not, nor let thy heart be tender for the two ends of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin and Aram, and of the son of Remaliah.”*

The words *“Take heed”* point to the dangerous consequents of fear; comp. ver. 9: “If ye do not believe, ye shall not be established.” On the words *“be quiet,”* lit., make quiet, viz., thy heart and walk, comp. chap. 30:15: “For thus saith the Lord: by returning and rest ye shall be saved; in *quietness* and confidence shall be your strength; and ye would not.” Such as he was, Ahaz could not respond to the exhortations to be quiet. Quietness is a product of *faith*. But the way of faith stood open to Ahaz every moment, and by his promising word and by his example, the Prophet invited him to enter upon it. In the words: “Fear not,” &c., there is an unmistakable reference to Deut. 20:1, ff., according to which passage the priest was, on the occasion of hostile oppression, to speak to the people: “Let not your hearts be tender, and be not terrified.” That which, in the Law, the priest was commanded to do, is here done by the Prophet, who was obliged so often to step in as a substitute, when the class of the ordinary servants fell short of the height of their calling.—The “firebrand” is the image of the conqueror who destroys countries by the fire of war, comp. remarks on Rev. 8:8. The Prophet is just about to announce to the hostile kings their impending overthrow; for this reason, he calls them *ends* of firebrands, which no longer blaze, but only glimmer. He calls them thus because he considers them with the eye of *faith*; to the bodily eye a bright flame still presented itself, as the last words: “For the fierce anger,” &c., and vers. 5 and 6 show. *Chrysostom* remarks: “He calls these kings ‘firebrands,’ to indicate at the same time their violence, and that they are to be easily overcome; and it is for this reason that he adds ‘smoking,’ i.e., that they were near being altogether extinguished.”

Vers. 5, 6. *“Because Aram meditates evil against thee, Ephraim and the son of Remaliah, saying: Let us go up against Judah, and drive it to extremity, and conquer it for us, and set up as a king in the midst of it the son of Tabeal.”*

We have here, farther carried out, the thought indicated by the words; “for the fierce anger,” &c. The interval, in the original text, between vers. 6 and 7, is put in to prevent the false connection of these verses with ver. 7 (*Hitzig* and *Ewald*).—*אִי* always means “to loathe,” “to experience disgust;” here, in Hiph., “to cause disgust,” “to drive to extremity;” comp. my work on Balaam, Rem. on Num. 22:3.—*עָקַב* means always: “to cleave asunder,” “to open,” “to conquer.”—The words: “For us,” show that Tabeal is to be the vassal only of the two kings. The absolute confidence with which the Prophet recognizes the futility of the plan of the two kings, forms a glaring contrast to the modern view of Prophetism. Ver. 2 shows in what light ordinary consciousness did, and could not fail to look on the then existing state of things.

Ver. 7. *“Thus saith the Lord Jehovah: It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass.”* (A plan stands when it is carried out.)

Ver. 8. *“For the head of Aram is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin, and in threescore and five years more, Ephraim shall be broken, and be no more a people.”*

Ver. 9. “*And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah’s son. If ye believe not, ye shall not be established.*”

Each of these two verses forms a complete whole.—The words: “For the head of Aram,” &c., to “Rezin” receive their explanation from the antithesis to vers. 5 and 6, where the king of Aram and the king of Ephraim had declared their intention of extending their dominion over Judah. As, concerning this intention and this hope, the Lord has declared His will that it shall not be, we must understand: Not as regards Judah, and not as regards Jerusalem. It is in vain that men’s thoughts exalt themselves against the purposes of God. From Aram, the Prophet turns, in the second part of the verse, to Ephraim: “And even Ephraim! What could it prevail against the Lord and His Kingdom! It surely should give up all attempts to get more; its days are numbered, the sword is already suspended over its own head.” But inasmuch as it is possible, although not likely, that Ephraim, before its own overthrow, may still bring evil upon Judah, this is expressly denied in ver. 9: Samaria, according to the counsel of God, and the limit assigned to it, is the head of Ephraim only, and, not, at the same time, of Judah, &c. With this are then connected the closing words: “If ye believe not, ye shall not be established” (properly, the consequence will be that ye do not continue), which are equivalent to it: it is hence not Samaria and the son of Remaliah that you have to fear; the enemy whom you have to dread, whom you have to contend against with prayer and supplication, is in yourselves. Take heed lest a similar cause produce a similar effect, as in the last clause of ver. 8 it has been threatened against Ephraim.—This prophecy and warning, one would have expected to have produced an effect so much the deeper, because they were not uttered by some obscure fanatic, but by a worthy member of a class which had in its favour the sanction of the Lawgiver, and which in the course of centuries had been so often and so gloriously owned and acknowledged by God.<sup>6</sup>

Vers. 10, 11. “*And the Lord spake farther unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it from the depth, or above from the height.*”

Ahaz observed a dignified silence after those words of the Prophet; but his whole manner shews the Prophet that they have not made any impression upon him. If David’s spirit had rested on Ahaz, he would surely, if he had wavered at all, have, on the word of the Prophet, thrown himself into the arms of his God. But in order that the depth of his apostasy, the greatness of his guilt, and the justice of the divine judgments may become manifest, God shows him even a deeper condescension. The Prophet offers to prove the truth of his announcement by any miraculous work which the king himself should determine, and from which he might, at the same time, see God’s omnipotence, and the Divine mission of the Prophet. As Ahaz refused the offered sign, the word 2 Tim. 2:12, 13: εἰ ἀρνούμεθα, κακείνος ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ἐκείνος πιστὸς μένει—ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται came into application. According to Deut. 7:9 ff. the truth and faithfulness of God must now manifest itself in the infliction of severe visitations upon the house of David.—The character of a *sign* is, in general, borne by everything which serves for certifying facts which belong to the territory of faith, and not to that of sight 1. In some instances, the sign consists in a mere naked word; thus in Exod. 3:12: “And this shall be the sign unto thee that I have sent thee: When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain.” Moses’ doubts of the truth of his Divine mission originated in the consciousness of his own unworthiness, and in the condition of those to whom he was sent. From these doubts he was delivered by the announcement that, at the place where he had been called, he, at the head of the

delivered people, should serve his God. This was to him a *sign* that God was in earnest in calling him. 2. In other instances the assurance given by the sign consists in its perceptibility and corporeality; so that the word assumes, as it were, flesh and blood. A case of this kind it is, *e.g.*, when, in chap. 8:18, Isaiah calls his two sons, to whom, at the command of God, he had given symbolical names, expressive of the future salvation of the covenant-people, "Signs and wonders in Israel;" farther, chap. 20:3, where the Prophet walks naked and barefoot for a sign of the calamity impending over Egypt and Ethiopia in three years. 3. In another class of signs, a fact is announced which is, in itself, natural, but not to be foreseen by any human combination, the coming to pass of which, in the immediate future, furnishes the proof that, at a distant future, that will be fulfilled which was foretold as impending. The wonderful element, and the demonstrative power do not, in such a case, lie in the matter of the sign, but in the telling of it beforehand. It is in this sense that, in 1 Sam. 10, Samuel gives several *signs* to Saul, that God had destined him to be king, *e.g.*, that in a place exactly fixed, he would meet two men who would bring him the intelligence that the lost asses were found; that, farther onwards, he would meet with three men, one of whom would be carrying three kids, another, three loaves of bread, and another, a bottle of wine, &c. In 1 Sam. 2:34, the sudden death of his two sons is given to Eli as a sign that all the calamities threatened against his family should, certainly come to pass. In Jer. 44:29, 30, the impending defeat of Pharaoh-Hophras is given as a *sign* of the divine vengeance breaking in upon the Jews in Egypt. Even before the thing came to pass, it could not in such a case, be otherwise than that the previous condition and foundation brought before the eyes in a lively manner (Jer. 44:30; "*Behold*, I give Pharaoh-Hophras into the hands of his enemies") gave a powerful shock to the doubts as to whether the fact in question would come to pass. 4. In other cases, the assurance was given in such a manner, that all doubts as to the truth of the announcement were set at rest by the immediate performance of a miraculous work going beyond the ordinary laws of nature. Thus, *e.g.*, Isaiah says to Hezekiah, in chap. 38:7: "And this shall be the sign unto thee from the Lord, that the Lord will do this thing which He has spoken," and, as a *sign* that the Lord would add fifteen years to the life of the King, who was sick unto death, he makes the shadow on the sun-dial of Ahaz to go back ten degrees. Of this description were also the signs granted to Gideon, and, in many respects, the plagues in Egypt also. In the passage before us, no other sign can possibly be spoken of than one of the *two last classes*. For it was a real, miraculous sign only which could possibly exert any influence on a mind so darkened as was that of Ahaz, and it was the vain offer of such an one only which was fitted to bring to light his obduracy. If, then, the Prophet was willing and able to give a real, miraculous sign, why, then, is the answer of Ahaz so unsuitable? And we can surely not suppose, as *Meier* does, that he should have intentionally misunderstood the Prophet. The temptation of the Lord by the children of Israel, to which the word of the Lord, Deut. 6:16, quoted by Ahaz, refers, consisted, according to Exod. 17, in their having asked *water*, as a *miraculous sign* that the Lord was truly in the midst of them. How could the Prophet reproach Ahaz with having offended, not men merely, but God, unless he had offered to prove, by a fact which lay absolutely beyond the limits of nature, the truth of his announcement, the divinity of Him who gave it, the divinity of his own mission, and the soundness of his advice? *Hendewerk* is of opinion that "it is difficult to say what the author would have made to be the sign in the heavens; probably, a very simple thing." But in making this objection it is forgotten that Isaiah gives *free choice* to the king. *Hitzig* says: "Without knowing it, Isaiah here plays a very dangerous game. For if Ahaz had accepted his proposition, Jehovah would probably have left His servant in the lurch, and he would have begun to doubt of his God and of himself." In these words, at all events, it is conceded that the prophets themselves

would not be what people in modern times would have them to be. If such was their position towards *miracles*, then, in their own convictions, *prophecies*, too must be something else than general descriptions, and indefinite forebodings. But how should it have been possible that an order could have maintained itself for centuries, the most prominent members of which gave themselves up to such enthusiastic imprudence and rashness? Moreover, it is overlooked that afterwards, to Hezekiah, our Prophet grants that in reality which here he offers to Ahaz in vain,—קומעה and הבגה are *Infin. absol.* “going high,” “going low.” The Imperat. הלאש must be understood after הבגה also. Some explain הלאש by “to hell,” “down to hell;” but this is against the form of the word, which it would be arbitrary to change. Nor does one exactly see how, if we except, perhaps, the apparition of one dead, Isaiah could have given to the king a sign from the Sheol; and in other passages, too (comp. Joel 3:3 [2:30]), signs in the heavens and in the earth are contrasted with one another. *Theodoret* remarks that both kinds of miracles, among which the Lord here allowed a choice to Ahaz, were granted by Him to his pious son, Hezekiah, inasmuch as He wrought a phenomenon in *heaven* which affected the going back of the shadow on the sun-dial of Ahaz; and on *earth*, inasmuch as He, in a wonderful manner, destroyed the Assyrians, and restored the king to health. *Jerome* farther remarks, that, from among the plagues in Egypt, the lice, frogs, &c., were signs on earth; the hail, fire, and three day’s darkness, were signs in the heaven. It is on the passage before us that the Pharisees take their stand, when in Matt. 16:1 they ask from the Lord that He should grant them a sign from heaven. If even the Prophet Isaiah offered to prove in such a manner his divine mission, then, according to their opinion, Christ was much more bound to do this, inasmuch as He set up far higher claims. But they overlooked the circumstance that enough had already, been granted for convincing those who were well disposed, and that it can never be a duty to convince obstinate unbelief in manner so palpable.

Ver. 12. “*And Ahaz said: I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord.*”

Ahaz declines the offer by referring to Deut. 6:16, and thus assuming the guise of reverence for God and His commandment. “He pretends,” says *Calvin*, “to have faith in the words of the Prophet, and not to require anything besides the word.” The same declarations of the Law, the Lord opposes to Satan, when the latter would induce Him to do something for which he had no word of God, Matt. 4:7. That would really have been a tempting of God. Ahaz had no doubt that the miracle would really be performed; but he had a dislike to enter within the mystical sphere. Who knows whether the God who grants the miracle is really the highest God? comp. Is. 10:10, 11, 36:18-20, 37:10-12. Who knows whether He is not laying for him a trap; whether, by preventing him from seeking the help of man, He is not to bring upon him the destruction which his conscience tells him he has so richly deserved? At all events the affording of His help is clogged with a condition which he is resolved not to fulfil, viz., his conversion. A better and easier bargain, he thought, could be struck with the Assyrians; how insatiable soever they might be, they did not ask the heart. How many do even now-a-days rather perish in sin and misery, than be converted!

Ver. 13. “*And he said: Hear ye now, O house of David: Is it too little for you to provoke man, that you provoke also my God?*”

When Ahaz had before refused to believe in the simple announcement of the Prophet, his sin was more pardonable; for, inasmuch as Isaiah had not proved himself outwardly as a divine ambassador, Ahaz sinned to a certain degree against *man* only, against the Prophet

only, by unjustly suspecting him of a deceitful pretension to a divine revelation. Hence, Isaiah continues mild and gentle. But when Ahaz declined the offered sign, *God himself* was provoked by him, and his wickedness came evidently to light. It is substantially the same difference as that between the sin against the *Son of Man*, the Christ coming outwardly and as a man only (Bengel: *pro statu conspicuo, quatenus aequo tum loco cum hominibus conversabatur*), and the sin against the Holy Ghost who powerfully glorifies Him outwardly and inwardly. It is the antithesis of the relative ignorance of what one is doing, and of the absolute unwillingness which purposely hardens itself to the truth known, or easy to be known. We say *relative* ignorance; for an element of obduracy and hardening already existed, if he did not believe the Prophet, even without a sign. For the fact that the Prophet was sent by God, and spoke God's word, was testified to all who would hear it, even by the inner voice, just as in every sin against the Son of Man there is always already an element of the sin against the Holy Ghost.—The truth that godlessness is the highest folly is here seen in a very evident manner. The same Ahaz who rejects the offer of the living God, who palpably wishes to reveal to him that He is a living God, sacrifices his son to the dead idol Moloch, who never yet gave the smallest sign of life! In this mirror we may see the condition of human nature.—The circumstance that it is not Ahaz, but the house of David that is addressed, indicates that the deed is a deed of the whole house.—The Prophet says, “*My God,*” *i.e.*, the God whose faithful servant I am, and in whom ye hypocrites have no more any share. In Ver. 11, the Prophet had still called Him the God of Ahaz.

Ver. 14. “*Therefore the Lord himself giveth you a sign: Behold the Virgin is with child, and beareth a Son, and thou callest his name Immanuel.*”

Ahaz had refused the proffered sign; the whole depth of his apostasy had become manifest; no further regard was to be had to him. But it was necessary to strengthen those who feared God, in their confidence in the Lord, and in their hope in him. For this reason, the Prophet gives a sign, even against the will of Ahaz, by which the announcement of the deliverance from the two kings was confirmed. Your weak, prostrate faith, he says, may erect itself on the certain fact that, in the Son of the Virgin, the Lord will some day be with us in the truest manner, and may perceive therein a guarantee and a pledge of the lower help in the present danger also. “*Therefore*”—because ye will not fix upon a sign. *Reinke*, in the ably written Monograph on this passage, assigns to כָּל the signification, “*nevertheless,*” which is not supported by the *usus loquendi*.—הִנֵּה must be translated as a Present: for the Pregnancy of the Virgin and birth of Immanuel are present to the Prophet; and the fact cannot serve as a sign, in so far as it manifests itself outwardly, but only in so far as, by being foretold, it is realized as present.—הִנֵּה *He, i.e.*, of His own accord, without any co-operation, such as would have taken place if Ahaz had asked the sign.—כָּל refers by its form to the house of David; but in determining the sign, it is not the real condition of its representative at that time which is regarded, but as he ought to be. In substance, the sign given to ungodly Ahaz is destined for believers only.—הִנֵּה “*behold*” indicates the energy with which the Prophet anticipates the future; in his spirit it becomes to him the immediate present. Thus it was understood as early as by *Chrysostom*: μόνον γὰρ οὐκ ὀρώμενος ν τὰ γινόμενα καὶ φανταζομένου καὶ πολλὴν χοντος ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰρημένων πληροφορίαν, τῶν γὰρ ἡμετέρων ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκεῖνοι σαφέστερον τὰ μὴ ὀρώμενα βλέπον.—The article in הַמַּלְעָה cannot refer to *the virgin known* as the mother of the Saviour; for, besides the passage before us, it is only Micah 5:2 (3) which mentions the mother of the Saviour, and it is our passage only which speaks of her as a *virgin*. In harmony with הִנֵּה, the article in הַמַּלְעָה might be explained from the circumstance that the

Virgin is present to the inward perception of the Prophet—equivalent to “the virgin there.” But since the use of the article in the *generic* sense is so general, it is most natural to understand “the virgin as forming a contrast to the married or old woman, and hence, in substance, as here equivalent to *a* virgin. To this view we are led also by the circumstance that, in the parallel passage, Mic. 5:2 (3) הדלוי “a bearing woman” is used without the article.—המלע is, by old expositors, commonly derived from מלע in the signification “to conceal.” A virgin, they assume, is called a *concealed* one, with reference to the customs of the East, where the virgins are obliged to lead a concealed life. Thus it was understood by *Jerome* also: “*Almah* is not applied to girls or virgins generally, but is used emphatically of a hidden and concealed virgin, who is never accessible to the look of males, but who is with great care watched by the parents.” But all parties now rightly agree that the word is to be derived from מלע, in the signification, “to grow up.” To offer here any arguments in proof would be a work of supererogation, as they are offered by all dictionaries. But with all that, *Luther’s* remark is even now in full force: “If a Jew or a Christian can prove to me that in any passage of Scripture *Almah* means “a married woman,” I will give him a hundred florins, although God alone knows where I may find them.” It is true that המלע is distinguished from הלותר, which designates the virgin state as such, and in this signification occurs in Joel 1:8. also where the bride laments over her bridegroom whom she has lost by death. Inviolable chastity is, in itself, not implied in the word. But certain it is that המלע designates an unmarried person in the first years of youth; and if this be the case, unviolated chastity is a matter of course in this context; for if the mother of the Saviour was to be an *unmarried* person, she could be a virgin only; and, in general, it is inconceivable that the Prophet should have brought forward a relation of impure love. In favour of “an unmarried person” is, in the first instance, the derivation. Being derived from מלע, “to grow up,” “to become marriageable,” המלע can denote nothing else than *puella nubilis*. But still more decisive is the *usus loquendi*. In Arabic and Syriac the corresponding words are never used of married women, and *Jerome* remarks, that in the Punic dialect also a virgin proper is called המלע. Besides in the passage before us, the word occurs in Hebrew six times (Gen. 24:43; Exod. 2:8; Ps. 68:26; Song of Sol. 1:3, 6:8; Prov. 30:19); but in all these passages the word is undeniably used of unmarried persons. In the two passages of the Song of Solomon, the תומלע designate the nations which have not yet attained to an union with the heavenly Solomon, but are destined for this union. In chap. 6:8, they are, as *brides*, expressly contrasted with the *wives* of the first and second class. Marriage forms the boundary; the *Almah* appears here distinctly as the antithesis to a married woman. It is the passage in Proverbs only which requires a more minute examination, as the opponents have given up all the other passages, and seek in it alone a support for their assertion that המלע may be used of a married woman also. The passage in its connection runs as follows: Ver. 18. “There be three things which are too wonderful for me, and four which I know not. Ver. 19. The way of an eagle in the air, the way of a serpent upon the rock, the way of a ship in the heart of the sea, and the way of a man with a maid. Ver. 20. This is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth and saith; I have done no wickedness.” According to *De Wette*, *Bertheau*, and others, the *tertium comparationis* for every thing is to lie in this only, that the ways do not leave any trace that could be recognized. But the traceless disappearing is altogether without foundation; there is not one word to indicate it; and it is quite impossible that that on which every thing depends should have been left to conjecture, farther,—instead of the eagle, every other bird might have been mentioned, and the words “in the air” would be without meaning, as well as the words “in the heart of the sea” mentioned in reference to the ship. But the real point of

view is expressly stated in ver. 18. It is the *incomprehensible*. It is thus only that ver. 20, for which the other verses prepare the way, falls in with the tendency of the whole. In the way of the adulteress, that which is pointed out is not that it cannot be known, but the moral incomprehensibility that she, practising great wickedness which is worthy of death, and will unavoidably bring destruction upon her, behaves as if there were nothing wrong, as if a permitted enjoyment were the point in question, that she eats the poisoned bread of unchaste enjoyment as if it were ordinary bread; comp. 9:17, 20:17; Ps. 14:4. Four incomprehensible things in the natural territory are made use of to illustrate an incomprehensible thing in the ethical territory. The whole purpose is *to point out the mystery of sin*. In the case of the *eagle*, it is the boldness of his flight in which the miraculous consists. The speed and boldness of his flight is elsewhere also very commonly mentioned as the characteristic of the eagle; it is just that which makes him the king of birds. In the case of the *serpent*, the wonder is that, although wanting feet, it yet moves over the smooth rock which is inaccessible to the proud horse; comp. Amos 6:12: "Do horses run upon the rock." In the *ship*, it is the circumstance that she safely passes over the abyss which, as it would appear, could not fail to swallow her up. *The way of a man with a maid* occupies the last place in order to intimate that קָרַד, as in the case of the adulteress, denotes the *spiritual way*. What is here meant is the relation of the man to the virgin, *generally*, for if any *particular* aspect had been regarded, *e.g.*, that of boldness, cunning, or secrecy, it ought to have been pointed at. The way of the man with the maid is the secret of which mention is made as early as in Gen. 2:24,—the union of the strong with the weak and tender (comp. the parallel passage, Jer. 31:22), the secret attraction which connects with one another the hearts, and at last, the bodies. The end of the way is marriage. It is the *young* love which specially bears the character of the mysterious; after the relation has been established, it attracts less wonder.—הָרָדָה is the fem. of the verbal adj. הָרָה. The fundamental passage, Gen. 16:11, where the angel of the Lord says to Hagar: "Behold thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael, because the Lord has heard thy affliction," shows that we must translate: The virgin *is* with child, and not: becomes with child. The allusion to that passage in Genesis is very significant. In that case, as well as in the one under consideration, salvation is brought into connection with the birth of a child. To the birth of Ishmael, the despairing Hagar is directed as to a security for the divine favour; to the birth of Immanuel, the desponding people are directed as to the actual proof that God is with them. If the *Almah* represents herself to the Prophet as being already with child, then passages such as Is. 29:8, Matt. 11:5, are not applicable. A virgin who is with child cannot be one who was a virgin.—The form הָאֲרָקָה may be 3d fem, for הָאֲרָקָה, comp. Jer. 44:23; but the fundamental passage in Gen. 16:11 is decisive for considering it as the 2d fem.: "thou callest," as an address to the virgin; in which case the form is altogether regular. It was not a rare occurrence in Israel that mothers gave the name to children, Gen. 4:1, 25, 19:37, 29:32. The circumstance, therefore, that the giving of the name is assigned to the mother (the virgin) affords no ground for supposing, as many of the older expositors do, that this is an intimation that the child would not have a human father. "Thou callest" can, on the contrary, according to the custom then prevalent, be substantially equivalent to: they shall name, Matt. καλέσουσι, *Jerome: vocabitur*. The name is, of course, not to be considered as an ordinary *nomen proprium*, but as a designation of his nature and character. It may be understood in different ways. Several interpreters, *e.g.*, *Jerome*, referring to passages such as Ps. 46:8, 89:25, Is. 43:2, Jer. 1:8, see in it nothing else than an appeal to, and promise of divine aid. According to others, the name is to be referred to God's becoming man in the Messiah; thus *Theodoret* says: "The name reveals the God who is with us, the God who became man, the God who took upon Him the human nature." In a similar

manner *Irenaeus, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Lactantius, Calvin*, and others, express themselves. But those very parallel passages just quoted show that the name in itself has no distinct reference to the incarnation of God in Christ. But from the passage chap. 9:5 (6), which is so closely connected with the one before us, and in which the Messiah is called *God-hero*, (the mighty God), and His divine nature so emphatically pointed out (comp. also Mic. 5:1 [2],) it plainly appears that the Prophet had in view the highest and truest form of God's being with His people, such as was made manifest when the word became flesh. (Chrysostom says: "Then, above all, God was with us on earth, when He was seen on earth, and conversed with man, and manifested so great care for us.")

According, then, to the interpretation given, this verse before us affirms that, at some future period, the Messiah should be born by a virgin, among the covenant people, who in the truest manner would bring God near to them, and open the treasures of His salvation. In Vol. I. p. 500 ff., we proved that this explanation occurs already in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. According to the interpretation of the Apostle, the passage can refer to Christ only, and finds in him not only the highest, but the only fulfilment. In the Christian Church, throughout all ages, the Messianic explanation was the prevailing one. It was held by all the Fathers of the Church, and by all other Christian commentators down to the middle of the 18th century,—only that some, besides the higher reference to the Messiah, assumed a lower one to some event of that period. With the revival of faith, this view, too, has been revived. It is proved by the parallel passage, chap. 9:5 (6). That passage presents so remarkable an agreement with the one now under consideration, that we cannot but assume the same subject in both. "Behold, a virgin is with child, and beareth a son"—"A child is born unto us, a son is given;"—"They call him Immanuel," *i.e.*, Him in whom God will be with us in the truest manner—"They call Him Wonder-Counsellor, the God-Hero, Ever-Father, the Prince of Peace." Both of these passages can the less be separated from one another, that chap. 8:8 is evidently intended to lead from the one to the other. In this passage it is said of the *world's power*, which in the meantime, and in the first place, was represented by *Asshur*: "And the stretchings out of his wings are the fulness of the breadth of thy land, Immanuel," *i.e.*, his wings will cover the whole extent of thy land,—the stretching of the wings of this immense bird of prey, Asshur, comprehends the whole land. In the words: "Thy land, O Immanuel," the prophecy of the wonderful Child, in chap. 8:23-9:6 (9: 1-7), is already prepared. The land in which Immanuel is to be born, which belongs to Him, cannot remain continually the property of heathen enemies. Every destruction is, at the same time, a prophecy of the restoration. A look to the wonderful Child, and despair must flee. Behind the clouds, the sun is shining. Every attempt to assign the Immanuel to the lower sphere, must by this passage be rendered futile. For how, in that case, could Canaan be called *His* land? The signification "native country" which ארץ, it is true, sometimes receives by the context, does not suit here. For the passage just points out the contrast of reality and idea, that the world's power takes possession of the land which *belongs* to Immanuel, and hence prepares for the announcement contained in that which follows, *viz.*, that this contrast shall be done away with, and that this shall be done as soon as the legitimate proprietor comes into His kingdom. Farther,—Decisive in favour of the Messianic explanation is also the passage Mic. 5:1, 2, (2, 3), where, in correspondence to *virgin* here, we have, *she who is bearing*. "The latter, indeed, is not expressly called a virgin; but it follows, as a matter of course, that she be so, as she is to bear the Hero of Divine origin ("*of eternity*"), who, hence, cannot have been begotten by any mortal. Both of the prophecies mutually illustrate one another. Micah designates the Divine origin of the Promised One; Isaiah, the miraculous circumstances of His birth" (*Rosenmüller*). Just as Isaiah holds up the

birth of Immanuel as the pledge that the covenant-people would not perish in their present catastrophe; just as he points to the shining form of Immanuel, announcing the victory over the world, in order to comfort them in the impending severe oppression by the world's power (8:8);—so Micah makes the oppression by the world's power continue only until the time that she who is bearing brings forth. As Micah, in 5:1 (2), contrast the divine dignity and nature with the birth in time, so, in Isaiah, Immanuel, He in whom God will most truly be with His people, is born by a virgin.

The arguments which the Jews, and, following their example, the rationalistic interpreters, especially *Gesenius*, and with them *Olshausen*, have advanced against the Messianic explanation, prove nothing. They are these:

1. “A reference to the Messiah who after the lapse of centuries, is to be born of a virgin, appears to be without meaning in the present circumstances.” This argument proves too much, and, hence, nothing. *It would be valid against Messianic prophecies in general*, the existence of which certainly cannot be denied. Do not Jeremiah and Ezekiel, at the time when the people were carried away into captivity, comfort them by the announcement that the kingdom of God should, in a far more glorious manner, be established by Messiah, whose appearance was yet several centuries distant? The highest proof of Israel's dignity and election, was the promise that, at some future time, the Messiah was to be born among them. How, indeed, could the Lord leave, without the lower help in the present calamity, a people with whom He was to be, at some future period, in the truest manner? The Prophet refers to the future Saviour in a way quite similar to that in which the Apostle refers to Him, after He had appeared: “Who did not spare His only begotten Son, but gave Him up for us all, how should He not in Him give us all things freely?” Let us only realize the truth that the hope in the Messiah formed the centre of the life of believers; that this hope was, by fear, repressed only, but not destroyed. All which was needed, therefore, was to revive this hope, and with it the special hope for the present distress also was given—the assurance, firm as a rock, that in it the covenant-people could not perish. This revival took place in this way, that in the mind of the Prophet, the Messianic hope was by the Holy Spirit, rekindled, so that at his light all might kindle their lights. The Messianic idea here meets us in such originality and freshness, as if here were its real fountain head. The faith already existing in only the foundation, only the point of connexion. What is essential is the new revelation of the old truth, and that could not fail to be affecting, overpowering to susceptible minds.

2. “The ground of consolation is too *general*. The Messiah might be born from the family of Ahaz without the Jewish state being preserved in its then existing condition, and without Ahaz continuing on the throne. The Babylonish captivity intervened, and yet Messiah was to be born. Isaiah would thus have made himself guilty of a false sophistical argumentation.”—We answer: What they, at that time, feared, was the total destruction of state and people. This appears sufficiently from the circumstance that the prophet takes his son Shearjashub with him; and indeed the intentions of the enemy in this respect are expressed with sufficient clearness in ver. 6. It is this *extreme* of fear which the Prophet here first opposes. Just as, according to the preceding verses, he met the fear of entire destruction by taking with him his son Shearjashub, “the remnant will be converted,” without thereby excluding a temporary carrying away, so he there also prepares the mind for the announcement contained in vers. 15, 16, of the near deliverance from the present danger, by first representing the fear of an entire destruction to be unfounded. A people, moreover, to whom, at some future period, although it may be at a very remote future, a

divine *Saviour* is to be sent, must, in the present also, be under special divine protection. They may be visited by severe sufferings, they may be brought to the very verge of destruction,—whether that shall be the case the Prophet does not, as yet, declare,—but one thing is sure, that to them all things must work together for good; and that is the main point. He who is convinced of this, may calmly and quietly look at the course of events.

3. “The sense in which תּוֹא is elsewhere used in Scripture, is altogether disregarded by this interpretation. For, according to it, תּוֹא would refer to a future event; but according to the *usus loquendi* elsewhere observed, תּוֹא is a prophesied second event, the earlier fulfilment of which is to afford a sure guarantee for the fulfilment of the first, which is really the point at issue.” But, in opposition to this, it is sufficient to refer to Exod. 3:12, where Moses receives this as a sign of his Divine mission, and of the deliverance of the people to be effected by him: “When thou hast brought forth my people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain.” In chap. 37:30, our Prophet himself, as a confirmation of the word spoken in reference to the king of Asshur: “I make thee return by the way by which thou earnest,” gives this sign, that, in the third year after this, agriculture should already have altogether returned into its old tracks, and the cultivation of the country should have been altogether restored.<sup>7</sup> The fact here given as a sign is later than that which is to be thereby made sure. The sign consists only in this, that the idea is vividly called up and realized in the mind, that the land would recover from the destruction; and this of course, implies the destruction of the enemy. But in our chapter itself,—the name of Shearjashub affords the example of a sign (comp. chap. 7:18), which is taken from the territory of the distant future. It is true that *commonly* תּרֵא is not used of future things; but this has its reason not in the idea of תּוֹא, but solely in the circumstance that, ordinarily, the future cannot serve as a sign of assurance. But it is quite obvious that, in the present case, the Messianic announcement *could* afford such a sign, and that in a far higher degree than the future facts given as signs in Exod. 3, and Isa. 37. The kingdom of glory which has been promised to us, forms to us also a sure pledge that in all the distresses of the Church, the Lord will not withhold His help from her. But the Covenant-people stood in the same relation to the first appearance of Christ, as we do to the second.

(4.) “The passage, chap. 8:3, 4, presents the most marked resemblance to the one before us. If *there* the Messianic explanation be decidedly inadmissible, it must be so *here* also. The name and birth of a child serves, there as here, for a sign of the deliverance from the Syrian dominion. If then *there* the mother of the child be the wife of the Prophet, and the child a son of his, the same must be the case *here* also.” But it is *a priori* improbable that the Prophet should have given to two of his sons names which had reference to the same event. To this must be added the circumstance, that the *time is wanting* for the birth of two sons of the Prophet. Before Immanuel knows to refuse the evil and choose the good, the country of both the hostile kings shall be desolated, chap. 7:15; before Mahershalalhashbaz knows to cry My Father, My other, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried before the king of Assyria, chap. 8:4. The two births hence coincide. At all events, it is impossible to find the time for a double birth by the same mother. Several interpreters (*Gesenius, Hitzig, Hendewerk*) assume the identity of Immanuel and Mahershalalhashbaz; but this is altogether inadmissible, even from the difference of the names. It is the less admissible to assume a double name for the child, as the name Shearjashub plainly enough shews that the Prophet was in earnest with the names of his children; and indeed, unless they had been real proper names, there would have existed no reason at all for giving them to them. To have assigned several names to one child would have weakened their power. The agreement must, therefore, rather be

explained from the circumstance, that it was by the announcement in chap. 7:14 that the Prophet was induced to the symbolical action in chap. 2:3, 4. He has, in chap. 7:14, given to the despairing people the birth of a child, who would bring the highest salvation for Israel, as a pledge of their deliverance. The birth of a child and its name were then required as an actual prophecy of help in the present distress,—a help which was to be granted with a view to that Child, who not only indicates, but grants deliverance from all distresses, and to whom the Prophet reverts in chap. 9, and even already in chap. 8:8.—Moreover, besides the agreement there is found a thorough difference. In chap. 7 the mother of the child is called *המלעה*, whereby a virgin only can be designated; in chap. 8, the prophetess.” In chap. 7 there is not even the slightest allusion to the Prophet’s being the father; while in chap. 8. This circumstance is expressly and emphatically pointed out. In chap. 7 it is the mother who gives the name to the child; in chap. 8 it is the Prophet. Far closer is the agreement of chap. 9:5 (6) with chap. 7:14. It especially appears in the circumstances that in neither of them is the father of the child designated; and, farther, in the correspondence of Immanuel with *לוא רובג*, God-Hero.

(5.) “Against the Messianic explanation, and in favour of that of a son of the Prophet, is the passage chap. 7:18, where the Prophet says that his sons have been given to him for signs and wonders in Israel.” But although Immanuel be erroneously reckoned among the sons of the Prophet, there still remain Shearjashub and Mahershalalhashbaz. The latter name refers, *in the first instance only*, to Aram and Ephraim specially; or the general truth which it declares is applied to this relation only. But, just as the name Shearjashub announces new *salvation* to the prostrate *people of God*, so the second name announces near *destruction* to the triumphing *world* hostile to God; so that both the names supplement one another. As *signs*, these two sons of the Prophet pointed to the future deliverance and salvation of Israel, and the defeat of the world; and the very circumstance that they did so when, humanly viewed, all seemed to be lost, was a subject for wonder. But that we can in no case make Immanuel a third son of the Prophet, we have already proved.

Ver. 15. *Cream and honey shall he eat, when he knows to refuse the evil and choose the good.* Ver. 16. *For before the boy shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the country shall be forsaken of the two kings of which thou standest in awe.*

The older Messianic explanation has, in these two verses, exposed itself to the charge of being quite arbitrary. Most of the interpreters assume that, in ver. 15, the true humanity of the Saviour is announced. The name Immanuel is intended to indicate the divine nature; the eating of milk and honey the human nature. Milk and honey are in this case considered as the ordinary food for babes; like other children, He shall grow up, and, like them, gradually develop. Thus *Jerome* says: “I shall mention another feature still more wonderful: That you may not believe that he will be born a phantasm, He will use the food of infants, will eat butter and milk.” *Calvin* says: “In order that here we may not think of some spectre, the Prophet states signs of humanity from which he proves that Christ, indeed put on our flesh.” In the same manner *Irenæus*, *Chrysostom*, *Basil*, and, in our century, *Kleuker* and *Rosenmüller* speak.—But this explanation is altogether overthrown by ver. 16. Most interpreters assume, in the latter verse, a change of subject; by *רענ*, not Immanuel, but Shearjashub, who accompanied the Prophet, is to be understood. According to others, it is not any definite boy who is designated by *רענ*; but it is said in general, that the devastation of the hostile country would take place in a still shorter time than that which elapses between the birth of a boy and his development. Such

is Calvin's view. But the supposition of a change of subject is altogether excluded, even by the circumstance that one and the same quality, the distinction between good and evil, is in both verses ascribed to the subject. Others, like *J. H. Michaelis*, refer ver. 16 also to the Messiah, and seek to get out of the difficulty by a *jam dudum*. It is not worth while to enter more particularly upon these productions of awkward embarrassment. All that is required is, to remove the stone of offence which has caused these interpreters to stumble. Towards this a good beginning has been made by *Vitringa*, without, however, completely attaining the object. In ver. 14, the Prophet has seen the birth of the Messiah as present. Holding fast this idea, and expanding it, the Prophet makes him who has been born accompany the people through all the stages of its existence. We have here an *ideal, anticipation of the real incarnation*, the right of which lies in the circumstance, that all blessings and deliverances which, before Christ, were bestowed upon the covenant-people, had their root in His future birth, and the cause of which was given in the circumstance, that the covenant-people had entered upon the moment of their great crisis, of their conflict with the world's powers, which could not but address a call to invest the comforting thought with, as it were, flesh and blood, and in this manner to place it into the midst of the popular life. What the Prophet means, and intends to say here is this, *that, in the space of about a twelvemonth, the overthrow of the hostile kingdoms would already have taken place*. As the representative of the cotemporaries, he brings forward the wonderful child who, as it were, formed the soul of the popular life. *At the time when this child knows to distinguish between good and bad food, hence, after the space of about a twelvemonth, he will not have any want of nobler food*, ver. 15, *for before he has entered upon this stage, the land of the two hostile kings shall be desolate*. In the subsequent prophecy, the same wonderful child, grown up into a warlike hero, brings the deliverance from Asshur, and the world's power represented by it—We have still to consider and discuss the particulars. *What is indicated by the eating of cream and honey?* The erroneous answer to this question, which has become current ever since *Gesenius*, has put everything into confusion, and has misled expositors such as *Hitzig* and *Meier* to cut the knot, by asserting that ver. 15 is spurious. Cream and honey can come into consideration as the noblest food only; the eating of them can indicate only a *condition of plenty and prosperity*. "A land flowing with milk and honey" is, in the books of Moses, a standing expression for designating the rich fulness of noble food which the Holy Land offers. A land which flows with milk and honey is, according to Numb. 14:7, 8, a "very good land." The *cream* is, as it were, a gradation of *milk*. Considering the predilection for fat and sweet food which we perceive everywhere in the Old Testament, there can scarcely be anything better than cream and honey; and it is certainly not spoken in accordance with Israelitish taste, if *Hofmann* (*Weiss*, i. S. 227) thus paraphrases the sense: "It is not because he does not know what tastes well and better (cream and honey thus the evil!), that he will live upon the food which an uncultivated land can afford, but because there is none other." In Deut. 32:13, 14, cream and honey appear among the noblest products of the Holy Land. Abraham places cream before his heavenly guests, Gen. 18:8. The plenty in honey and cream appears in Job 20:7, as a characteristic sign of the divine blessing of which the wicked are deprived. It is solely and exclusively vers. 21 and 22 that are referred to for establishing the erroneous interpretation. It is asserted that, according to these verses, the eating of milk and honey must be considered as an evil, as the sad consequence of a general devastation of the land. But there are grave objections to any attempt at explaining a preceding from a subsequent passage; the opposite mode of proceeding is the right one. It is altogether wrong, however, to suppose that vers. 21, 22, contain a threatening. In those verses the Prophet, on the contrary, allows, as is usual with him, a *ray of light* to fall upon the dark picture of the calamity which threatens from

Asshur; and it could, indeed, *a priori*, be scarcely imagined that the threatening should not be interrupted, at least by such a gentle allusion to the salvation to be bestowed upon them after the misery (comp. in reference to a similar sudden breaking through of the proclamation of salvation of Hosea, Vol. L, p. 175, and the remarks on Micah 2:12, 13); but then he returns to the threatening, because it was, in the meantime, his principal vocation to utter it, and thereby to destroy the foolish illusions of the God-forgetting king. It is in the subsequent prophecy only, chap. 8:1; 9:6 (7) that that which is alluded to in vers. 21, 22 is carried out, The little which has been left—this is the sense—the Lord will bless so abundantly, that those who are spared in the divine judgment will enjoy a rich abundance of divine blessings. Parallel is the utterance of Isaiah in 2 Kings 19:30: “And the escaped of the house of Judah, that which has been left, taketh root downward, and beareth fruit upward.”—If thus the eating of cream and honey be rightly understood, there is no farther necessity for explaining, in opposition to the rules of grammar, וְתַעֲדָלַי by “(only) until he knows” (comp. against this interpretation *Drechster’s Comment*), וְתַעֲדָלַי can only mean: “belonging to his knowledge, *i.e.*, when he knows. *Good* and *evil* are, as early as Deut. 1:39: “Your sons who to-day do not know good and evil,” used more in a physical than in a moral sense. Michaelis: “*rerum omnium ignari.*” The parallel expression, “not to be able to discern between the right hand and the left hand,” in Jonah 4:11 (Michaelis: “*discretio rationis et iudicii, ut sciant utra manus sit dextra aut sinistra*”) likewise loses sight of the moral sense. But *good* and *evil* are very decidedly used in a physical sense in 2 Sam. 19:36 (35), where Barzillai says: “I am this day fourscore years old, can I discern between good and evil, or has thy servant a taste of what I eat or drink, or do I hear any more the voice of singing men or singing women?” The connection with the eating of cream and honey, by which the good and evil is qualified, clearly proves that good and evil are, in our passage, used in a similar sense. To the same result we are led by the circumstance also, that the evil *precedes*, which must so much the rather have a meaning, that nowhere else is this the case with this phrase. The evil, the bad food in the time of war, precedes; the good follows after it: Cream and honey, the good, he will eat when he knows to refuse the evil and choose the good, *i.e.*, when he is beyond the time where he does not yet know to make any great difference between the food, and in which, therefore, the evil, the bad food, is felt as an evil. If the good and the evil be understood in a physical sense, then, in harmony with chap. 8:4, we must think of the period of about one year. Moral consciousness develops much later than sensual liking and disliking.—The construction of סָאֵם and רָחַב with בּ points to the affection which accompanies the action.—יִכּ in ver. 16 suits very well, according to the view which we have taken, in its ordinary signification, “for.” The full enjoyment of the good things of the land will return in the period of about twelve months (in chap. 37:30 a longer term is fixed, because the Assyrian desolation was much greater than the Aramean); *for*, even before the year has expired, devastation shall be inflicted upon the land of the enemies. הַמְדָּאָה comprehends at the same time the Syrian and Ephraimitish land.

From ver. 17-25 the Prophet describes how the Assyrians, the object of the hope of the house of David, and also the Egyptian attracted by them, who, however, occupy a position altogether subordinate, shall fill the land, and change it into a wilderness. The fundamental thought, ever true, is this: He who, instead of seeking help from his God, seeks it from the world, is ruined by the world. This truth, which, through the fault of Ahaz, did not gain any *saving* influence, obtained an *accusing* one; it stood there as an incontrovertible testimony that it was not the Lord who had forsaken His people, but that they had forsaken themselves. It was a necessary condition of the blessed influence of the impending calamity that such a testimony should exist; without it, the calamity would not

have led to repentance, but to despair and defiance.—From the circumstance that in ver. 17, which contains the outlines of the whole, upon the words: “The Lord shall bring upon thee and thy people,” there follow still the words: “And upon thy father’s house,” it appears that the fulfilment must not be sought for in the time of Ahaz only. In the time of Ahaz, the *beginning* only of the calamities here indicated can accordingly be sought for,—the *germ* from which all that followed was afterwards developed. Nor shall we be allowed to limit ourselves to that which Judah suffered from the Assyrians, commonly so called. It is significant that, in 2 Kings 23:29, Nebuchadnezzar is called King of Asshur. Asshur, as the first representative of the world’s power, represents the world’s power in general.

-----

We have still to submit to an examination those explanations of vers. 14-16 which differ, in essential points, from that which we have given. Difference of opinion—the characteristic sign of error—meets us here, and that in a very striking manner, in those who oppose the convictions of the whole Christian Church.

1. *Rosenmüller* expressed his adherence to the Messianic explanation, but supposed that the Prophet was of opinion that the Messiah would be born in his time. Even *Bruno Bauer* (*Critik der Synopt.* i. S. 19) could not resist the impression that Immanuel could be none other than the Messiah. But he, too, is of opinion that Isaiah expected a Messiah, who was to be born at once, and to become the “deliverer from the collision of that time.” This view has been expanded especially by *Ewald*. “False,” so he says, “is every interpretation which does not see that the Prophet is here speaking of the Messiah to be born, and hence of Him to whom the land really belongs, and in thinking of whom the Prophet’s heart beats with joyful hope, chap. 8:8, 9:5, 6 (6, 7).” But not being able to realize that which can be seen only by faith—a territory, in general, very inaccessible to modern exposition of Scripture—he, in ver. 14, puts in the *real* Present instead of the *ideal*, and thinks that the Prophet imagined that the conception and birth of the Messiah would take place at once. By *המלע* he understands, like ourselves, a virgin; but such an one as is so at the present moment only, but will soon afterwards cease to be so;—and in supposing this, he overlooks the fact that the virgin is introduced as being already with child, and that her bearing appears as present. In ver. 15, the time when the boy knows &c., is, according to him, the maturer juvenile age from ten to twenty years. It is during this that the devastation of the land by the Assyrians is to take place, of which the Prophet treats more in detail afterwards in ver. 17 ff. But opposed to this view is the circumstance that, even before the boy enters upon this maturer age (ver. 16), hence in a few years after this, the allied Damascus and Ephraim shall be desolated; so little are these two kings able to conquer Jerusalem, and so certain is it that a divine deliverance is in store for this country in the immediate future. And, in every point of view, this explanation shows itself to be untenable. The supposition that a *real* Present is spoken of in ver. 14 saddles upon the Prophet an absurd hallucination; and nothing analogous to it can be referred to in the whole of the Old Testament. According to statements of the Prophet in other passages, he sees yet many things intervening between the Messianic time and his own; according to chap. 6:11-13, not only the entire carrying away of the whole people, (and he cannot well consider the Assyrians as the instruments of it, were it only for this reason, that he is always consistent in the announcement that they should not succeed in the capture of Jerusalem), but also a later second divine judgment. According to chap 11, the Messiah is to grow up as a twig from the stem of Jesse completely cut down. This supposition of His

appearance, the complete decay of the Davidic dynasty, did not in any way exist in the time of the Prophet. According to chap. 39, and other passages, the Prophet recognised in Babylon the appearance of a new phase of the world's power which would, at some future period, follow the steps of the Assyrian power which existed at the time of the Prophet, and which should execute upon Judah the judgment of the Lord. We pointed out (Vol. I. p. 417 ff.) that in the Prophet Micah also, the contemporary of Isaiah, there lies a long series of events between the Present and the time when she who is bearing brings forth. *Farther*—In harmony with all other Prophets, Isaiah too looks for the Messiah from the house of David, with which, by the promise of Nathan in 2 Sam. 7 salvation was indissolubly connected, and the high importance of which for the weal and woe of the people appears also from the circumstance of its being several times mentioned in our chapter. Hence it would be a son of Ahaz only of whom we could here think; and then we should be shut up to Hezekiah, his first-born. But in that case there arises the difficulty which Luther already brought forward against the Jews: "The Jews understand thereby Hezekiah. But the blind people, while anxious to remedy their error, themselves manifest their laziness and ignorance; for Hezekiah was born nine years before this prophecy was uttered!"—"The eating of cream and honey" is, in this explanation, altogether erroneously understood as a designation of the devastated condition of the land. From our remarks, it sufficiently appears that the expression "to refuse the evil," &c., cannot denote the maturer juvenile age. And many additional points might, in like manner, be urged.

2. Several interpreters do not indeed deny the reference to the Messiah, but suppose that, *in the first instance*, the Prophet had in view some occurrence of his own time. They assume that the Prophet, while speaking of a boy of his own time, makes use, under the guidance of divine providence, of expressions, which apply more to Christ, and can, in an improper and inferior sense only, be true of this boy. This opinion was advanced as early as in the time of Jerome, by some anonymous author who, on that account, is severely censured by him: "Some Judaizer from among us asserts that the Prophet had two sons, Shearjashub and Immanuel. Immanuel too was, according to him, born by the prophetess, the wife of the Prophet, and a type of the Saviour, our Lord; so that the former son Shearjashub (which means 'remnant,' or 'converting') designates the Jewish people that have been left and afterwards inverted; while the second son Immanuel, 'with us is God,' signifies the calling of the Gentiles after the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." This explanation was defended by, among others *Grotius*, *Richard Simon*, and *Clericus*; and then, in our century, by *Olshausen*, who says: "The unity of the reference lies in the name Immanuel; the son of Isaiah had the *name* but Christ the *essence*. He was the visible God whom the former only represented." In a modified form, this view is held by *Lowth*, *Koppe*, and *von Meyer*, also. According to them, the Prophet is indeed not supposed to speak of a definite boy who was to be born in his time, but yet, to connect the destinies of his land with the name and destinies of a boy whose conception he, at the moment, imagines to be possible. "The most obvious meaning which would present itself to Ahaz," says *von Meyer*, "was this: If now a girl was to marry, to become pregnant, and to bear a child, she may call him 'God with us,' for God will be with us at his time." But the prophecy is, after all, to have an ultimate reference to Christ. "The prophecy," says *Lowth*, "is introduced in so solemn a manner; the sign, after Ahaz had refused the call to fix upon any thing from the whole territory of nature, according to his own choice, is so emphatically declared to be one selected and given by God himself; the terms of the prophecy are so unique in their kind, and the name of the child is so expressive; they comprehend in them so much more than the circumstances of the birth of an ordinary child require, or could even permit, that we may easily suppose, that in minds, which

were already prepared by the expectation of a great Saviour who was to come forth from the house of David, they excited hopes which stretched farther than any with which the present cause could inspire them, especially if it was found that in the succeeding prophecy, published immediately afterwards, this child was, under the name of Immanuel, treated as the Lord and Prince of the land of Judah. Who else could this be than the heir of the throne of David, under which character a great, and even divine person had been promised?" The reasons for the Messianic explanation are very well exhibited in these words of *Lowth*; but he, as little as any other of these interpreters, has been able to vindicate the assumption of a *double sense*. When more closely examined, the supposition is a mere makeshift. On the one hand, they could not make up their minds to give up the Messianic explanation, and, along with it, the authority of the Apostle Matthew. But, on the other hand, they were puzzled by the *sanctum artificium* by which the Prophet, or rather the Holy Spirit speaking through him, represents Christ as being born even before His birth, places Him in the midst of the life of the people, and makes Him accompany the nation through all the stages of its existence. In truth, if the real, or even the nearest fulfilment is sought for in the time of Ahaz, there is no reason whatever for supposing a higher reference to Christ. The עִמָּנוּאֵל is then one who was a virgin, who had nothing in common with the mother of Jesus, Mary, who remained a virgin even after her pregnancy. The name Immanuel then refers to the help which God is to afford in the present distress.

3. Many interpreters deny every reference to Christ. The interpretation remained for a long time the exclusive property of the Jews, until *J. E. Faber* (in his remarks on *Harmar's* observations on the East, i. S. 281), tried to transplant it into the Christian soil.<sup>8</sup> He was followed by the Roman Catholic, *Isenbiehl* (*Neuer Versuch über die Weissagung vom Immanuel*, 1778) who, in consequence of it; was deposed from his theological professorship, and thrown into gaol. The principal tenets of his work he had borrowed from the lectures of *J. D. Michaelis*. In their views about the *Almah*, who is to bear Immanuel, these interpreters are very much at variance.

(a) The more ancient Jews maintained that the *Almah* was the wife of Ahaz, and Immanuel, his son Hezekiah. According to the *Dialog*, c. *Tryph.* 66, 68, 71, 77, this view prevailed among them as early as the time of *Justin*. But they were refuted by *Jerome*, who showed that Hezekiah must, at that time, have already been at least nine years old. *Kimchi* and *Abarbanel* then resorted to the hypothesis of a second wife of Ahaz.

(b) According to the view of others, the *Almah* is some virgin who cannot be definitely determined by us, who was present at the place where the king and Isaiah were speaking to one another, and to whom the Prophet points with his finger. This view was held by *Isenbiehl*, *Stuedel* (in a Programme, Tübingen, 1815), and others.

(c) According to the view of others, the *Almah* is not a *real* but only an *ideal* virgin. Thus *J. D. Michaelis*: "At the time when one, who at this moment is still a virgin, can bear," &c. *Eichhorn*, *Paulus*, *Stähelin*, and others. The sign is thus made to consist in a mere poetical figure.

(d) A composition of the two views last mentioned is the view of *Umbreit*. The virgin is according to him, an actual virgin 'whom the Prophet perceived among those surrounding him; but the pregnancy and birth are imaginary merely, and the virgin is to suggest to the Prophet the idea of pregnancy. But this explanation would saddle the Prophet with something indecent. *Farther*: It is not a birth possible which is spoken of, but an actual

birth. From chap. 8:8, it likewise appears that Immanuel is a real individual, and He one of eminent dignity; and this passage is thus at once in strict opposition to both of the explanations, viz. that of any ordinary virgin, and that of the ideal virgin. It destroys also

(e) The explanation of *Meier*, who by the virgin understands the people of Judah, and conceives of the pregnancy and birth likewise in a poetical manner. The fact, the acknowledgment of which has led *Meier* to get up this hypothesis, altogether unfounded, and undeserving of any minute refutation, is this: “*The mother is, in the passage before us, called a virgin, and yet is designated as being with, child.* The words, when understood physically and outwardly, contain a contradiction.” But this fact is rather in favour of the Messianic explanation.

(f) Others, farther, conjecture that the wife of the Prophet is meant by the *Almah*. This view was advanced as early as by *Abenezra* and *Jarchi*. By the authority of *Gesenius*, this view became, for a time, the prevailing one. Against it, the following arguments are decisive; part of them being opposed to the other conjectures also. As *המלע* designates “virgin” only, and never a young woman, and, far less, an older woman, it is quite impossible that the wife of the Prophet, the mother of Shearjashub could be so designated, inasmuch as the latter was already old enough to be able to accompany his father. *Gesenius* could not avoid acknowledging the weight of this argument, and declared himself disposed to assume that the Prophet’s former wife had died, and that he had thereupon betrothed himself to a virgin. *Olshausen*, *Maurer*, *Hendewerk*, and others, have followed him in this. But this is a story entirely without foundation. In chap. 8:13, the wife of the Prophet is called simply “the prophetess.” Nor could one well see how the Prophet could expect to be understood, if, by the general expression: “the virgin” he wished to signify his presumptive betrothed. *There is an entire absence of every intimation whatsoever of a nearer relation of the Almah to the Prophet*; and such an intimation could not by any means be wanting if such a relation really existed. One would, in that case at least, be obliged to suppose, as *Plüschke* does, that the Prophet took his betrothed with him, and pointed to her with his finger,—a supposition which too plainly exhibits the sign of embarrassment, just as is the case with the remark of *Hendewerk*: “Only that, in that case, we must also suppose that his second wife was sufficiently known at court even then, when she was his betrothed only, although her relation to Isaiah might be unknown; so that, for this very reason, we could not think of a frustration of the sign on the part of the king.” *Hitzig* remarks: “The supposition of a former wife of the Prophet is altogether destitute of any foundation.” He then, however, falls back upon the hypothesis which *Gesenius* himself admitted to be untenable, that *המלע*, “virgin” might not only denote a young woman, but sometimes also an older woman. Not even the semblance of a proof can be advanced in support of this. It is just the juvenile age which forms the fundamental signification of the word. In the wife of the Prophet we can the less think of such a juvenile age, that he himself had already exercised his prophetic office for about twenty years. *Hitzig* has indeed altogether declined to lead any such proof. A son of the Prophet, as, in general, every subject except the Messiah, is excluded by the circumstance that in chap. 8:8, Canaan is called the land of Immanuel.—*Farther*,—In all these suppositions, *תוא* is understood in an inadmissible signification. It can here denote a fact only, whereby those who were really susceptible were made decidedly certain of the impending deliverance. This appears clearly enough from the relation of this sign to that which Ahaz had before refused, according to which the difference must not be too great, and must not refer to the substance. To this may be added the solemn tone which induces us to expect something grand and important. A

mere poetical image, such as would be before us according to the hypothesis of the ideal virgin, or of the real virgin and the ideal birth, does surely not come up to the demand which in this context must be made in reference to this *sign*. And if the Prophet had announced so solemnly, and in words so sublime, the birth of *his own* child, he would have made himself ridiculous. *Farther*,—How then did the Prophet know that after nine months a child would be born to him, or, if the pregnancy be considered as having already commenced, how did he know that just a *son* would be born to him? That is a question to which most of these Rationalistic interpreters take good care not to give any reply. *Plüschke*, indeed, is of opinion that, upon a bold conjecture, the Prophet had ventured this statement. But in that case it might easily have fared with him as in that well known story in *Worms*, (*Eisenmenger, entdecktes Judenthum* ii, S. 664 ff), and his whole authority would have been forfeited if his conjecture had proved false. And this argument holds true in reference to those also who do not share in the Rationalistic view of Prophetism. Predictions of such a kind may belong to the territory of foretelling, but not to that of Prophecy.

## **THE PROPHECY, CHAP. 8:23-9:6**

(Chap. 9:1-7)

### **UNTO US A CHILD IS BORN**

In the view of the Assyrian catastrophe, the Prophet is anxious to bring it home to the consciences of the people that, by their own guilt, they have brought down upon themselves this calamity, and, at the same time, to prevent them from despairing. Hence it is that, soon after the prophecy in chap. 7, he reverts once more to the subject of it. The circumstances in chap. 8:1-9:6 (7) are identical with those in chap. 7. Judah is hard pressed by Ephraim and Aram. Still, some time will elapse before the destruction of their territories. The term in chap. 7:16: “Before the boy shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good,” and in chap. 8:4: “Before the boy shall know to cry, My father and my mother,” is quite the same. This is the less to be doubted when it is kept in mind that, in the former passage, evil and good must be taken in a physical sense. The sense for the difference of food is, in a child, developed at nearly the same time as the ability for speaking. If it had not been the intention of the Prophet to designate one and the same period, *he ought to have fixed more distinctly the limits between the two termini*. It might, indeed, from chap. 8:3, appear as if at least the nine months must intervene between the two prophecies of the conception of the son of the Prophet, and his birth. As, however, it cannot be denied that there is a connection between the giving of the name, and the drawing up of the document in ver. 1 and 2, we should be obliged to suppose that, in reference to the first two futures with *Vav confers*, the same rule applies as in reference to דלתו, in Gen. 2:19. The progress lies first in דלתו; the event falling into that time is the birth.

Chap. 8:1-9:6 (7), forms the necessary *supplement* to chap. 7, the germ of which is contained already in chap. 7:21, 22. The Prophet saw, by the light of the Spirit of God, that the fear of Aram and Ephraim was unfounded; the enemy truly dangerous in Asshur, *i.e., the whole world's power first represented by Asshur*. For the King of Asshur is, so to say, an ideal person to the Prophet. The different phases of the world's powers are intimated as early as chap. 8:9, where the Prophet addresses the “nations,” and “all the far-off countries;” and, at a later period, he received disclosures regarding all the single

phases of the world's power which began its course with Asshur. With this the Prophet had only threatened in chap. 7; here, however, he is pre-eminently employed with it, *exhorting, comforting, promising*, so that thus the two sections form one whole in two divisions. *His main object is to induce his people, in the impending oppression by the world's power, to direct their eyes steadily to their heavenly Redeemer, who, in due time, will bring peace instead of strife, salvation and prosperity instead of misery, dominion instead of oppression.* As in chap. 7:14, the picture of Immanuel is placed before the eyes of the people desponding on account of Aram and Ephraim, so here the care, anxiety, and fear in the view of Asshur are overcome by pointing to the declaration: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." It is of great importance for the right understanding of the Messianic announcement in chap. 7:23, 9:6, that the historical circumstances of the whole section, and its tendency be clearly understood. As, in general, the Messianic announcement under the Old Testament bears a onesided character, so, for the *present occasion*, those aspects only of the picture of the Saviour were required which were fitted effectually to meet the despondency of the people in the view, and under the pressure of the world's power.

After these preliminary remarks, we must enter still more in detail upon the arrangement and construction of the section before us.

The Prophet receives, first, the commission to write down, like a judicial document, the announcement of the speedy destruction of the present enemies, and to get it confirmed by trust-worthy witnesses, chap. 8:1, 2. He then, farther, receives the commission to give, to a son that would be born to him about the same time, a name expressive of the speedy destruction of the enemies, vers. 3, 4. Thus far the announcement of the deliverance from Aram and Ephraim. There then follows, from vers. 5-8, an announcement of the misery which is to be inflicted by *Asshur*, of whom Ahaz and the unbelieving portion of the people expected nothing but deliverance. *Up to this, there is a recapitulation only, and a confirmation of chap. 7.* But this misery is not to last for ever, is not to end in destruction. In vers. 9,10, the Prophet addresses exultingly the hostile nations, and announces to them, what had already been gently hinted at at the close of ver. 8, that their attempts to put an end to the covenant-people would be vain, and would lead to their own destruction. The splendour of Asshur must *fade* before the bright image of Immanuel which calls to the people: "Be ye of good cheer, I have overcome the world." *Calvin* strikingly remarks: "The Prophet may be conceived of, as it were, standing on a watch tower, whence he beholds the defeat of the people, and the victorious Assyrians insolently exulting. But by the name and view of Christ he recovers himself, forgets all the evils as if he had suffered nothing, and, freed from all misery, he rises against the enemies whom the Lord would immediately destroy." The Prophet then interrupts the announcement of deliverance, and exhibits the subjective conditions upon which the bestowal of deliverance, or rather the *partaking* in it, depends, along with the announcement of the fearful misery which would befall them in case these conditions were not complied with. But, so he continues in vers. 11-16, he who is to partake of the deliverance which the Lord has destined for His people, must in firm faith expect it from Him, and thereby inwardly separate himself from the unbelieving mass, who, at every appearance of danger, tremble and give up all for lost. He who stands as ill as that mass in the trial inflicted by the Lord; he to whom the danger becomes an occasion for manifesting the unbelief of his heart;—he indeed will perish in it. At the close, the prophet is emphatically admonished to impress this great and important truth upon the minds of the susceptible ones. In ver. 17: "And I waited upon the Lord," &c., the Prophet reports what effect was produced upon him by this revelation

from the Lord,—thereby teaching indirectly what effect it ought to produce upon all. In ver. 18, the Prophet directs the desponding people to the example of himself who, according to ver. 17, is joyful in his faith, and to the names of his sons which announced deliverance. Deliverance and comfort are to be sought from the God of Israel only. Vain, therefore,—this he brings out, vers. 19-22—are all other means by which people without faith seek to procure help to themselves. They should return to God’s holy Law which, in Deut. 18:14, ff. commands to seek disclosures as regards the future, and comfort from His servants the Prophets only, and which itself abounds in comfort and promise. If such be not done, misery without any deliverance, despair without any comfort, are the unavoidable consequences. From ver. 23, the Prophet continues the interrupted announcement of deliverance. That which, in the preceding verses, he had threatened in the case of apostacy from God’s Word, and of unbelief, viz., *darkness*, i.e., the absence of deliverance, will, as the Prophet, according to vers. 21, 22, foresees, really befall them in future, as the people will not fulfil the conditions held forth in vers. 16 and 20, as they will not speak: “To the Law and to the testimony,” as they will not in faith lay hold of the promise, and trust in the Lord. The calamity having, in the preceding verses, been represented as *darkness*, the deliverance which, by the grace of the Lord, is to be bestowed upon the people (for the Lord indeed chastises His people on account of their unbelief, but does not give them up to death), is now represented as a great *light* which dispels the darkness. It shines most clearly just where the darkness had been greatest—in that part of the country which, being outwardly and inwardly given up to heathenism, seemed scarcely still to belong to the land of the Lord, viz., the country lying around the lake of Gennesareth. The people are filled with joy on account of the deliverance granted to them by the Lord,—their deliverance from the yoke of their oppressors, from the bondage of the world which now comes to an end. As the bestower of such deliverance, the Prophet beholds a divine child, who having obtained dominion, will exercise it with the skill of the God-man; who will, with fatherly love, in all eternity care for His people and create peace to them; who will, at the same time, infinitely extend His dominion, the kingdom of David, not by means of the force of arms, but by means of right and righteousness, the exercise of which will attract the nations to Him; so that with the increase of dominion, the increase of peace goes hand in hand. The guarantee that these glorious results shall really take place is the zeal of the Lord, and it is this to which the Prophet points at the close.

Chap. 8:23 (9:1). *“For not is darkness to the land, to which is distress; in the former time he has brought disgrace upon the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali, and in the after-time he brings it to honour, the region on the sea, the other side of the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles.”*

כ׳ stands in its ordinary signification, “for.” Allow not yourselves to be turned away by anything from trusting in the God of Israel; hold fast by His word alone, and by His servants,—such was the fundamental thought of the whole preceding section. It meets us last in ver. 20, in the exhortation: “To the Law and to the testimony!” in so far as this is rich in consolation and promise. The Prophet, after having, in the preceding verses, described the misery which will befall those who do not follow this exhortation, supports and establishes it by referring to the *help of the Lord* already alluded to in vers. 9 and 10, and to the *light of His grace* which He will cause to shine into the darkness of the people,—a darkness produced by their unbelief and apostacy; and this light shall be brightest where the darkness was greatest. All the attempts at connecting this כ׳ with the verse immediately preceding instead of referring it to the main contents of the preceding

section, have proved futile. יכ can neither mean “nevertheless,” nor “yea;” and the strange assertion that it is almost without any meaning at all cannot derive any support from Isaiah 15:1: “The *burden* of Moab, *for* in the night the city of Moab is laid waste;” for only in that case is יכ without any meaning at all, if אשמ be falsely interpreted.—Ver. 22, where the phrase הַקּוֹצַי יוֹעַמ “darkness of distress” is equivalent to “darkness which consists in distress” (compare also: “behold trouble and darkness” in the same verse), shows that מוֹעַף and קְצוֹמ are substantially of the same meaning.—Our verse forms an antithesis to ver. 22; the latter verse described the darkness brought on by the guilt of the people; the verse under consideration describes, in contrast to it, the *removal* of it called forth by the grace of the Lord.—אל may either be connected with the noun, or it may be explained: not *is* darkness. It cannot be objected to the latter view that, in that case, יא should rather have stood; while the analogy of the phrase: “Not didst thou increase the joy,” in chap. 9:2 (3), seems to be in favour of it. Here we have the negative, the ceasing of darkness; in chap. 9:1 (2) the positive, the appearance of light. The suffix. in הל refers, just as the suffix. in הב in ver. 21, to the omitted קרא.—The כ in תעב is, by many interpreters, asserted to stand in the signification of רשאכ: “Just as the former time has brought disgrace, &c. But as it cannot be proved that כ has ever the meaning, “just as;” and as, on the other hand, תעב frequently occurs in the signification, “at the time” (compare my remarks on Numb. 23:13 in my work on Balaam), we shall be obliged to take, here too, the כ as a temporal particle, and to supply, as the subject, Jehovah, who always stands before the Prophet’s mind, and is often not mentioned when the matter itself excludes another subject. Moreover, it is especially in favour of this view that, in vers. 3 (4), the Lord himself is expressly addressed.—As regards זורחא, either תעב may be supplied,—and this is simplest and most natural—or it may be taken as an Accusative, “for the whole after-time.”—לקה means properly to “make light,” then “to make contemptible,” “to cover with disgrace,” and דיבכה properly then, “to make heavy,” “to honour,”—a signification which indeed is peculiar to *Piel*, but in which the *Hiphil*, too, occurs in Jer. 30:19; the two verbs thus form an antithesis. The ה locale in הצרא (the word does not occur in Isaiah with the ה *paragog.*) shews that a certain modification of the verbal notion must be assumed: “to bring disgrace and honour.” הצרא thus would mean “towards the land.” The scene of the disgrace and honour, which at first was designated in general only, is afterwards *extended*. First, the land of Zebulon and Naphtali only is mentioned, because it was upon it that the disgrace had pre-eminently fallen, and it was, therefore, preeminently to be brought to honour; then the whole territory along the sea on both sides of it.—ס can, in this context which serves for a more definite qualification, mean the sea of Gennesareth only (ס תרנב Numb, 34:11, and other passages), just as, in Matt. 4:13, the designation of Capernaum as ἡ παραθαλασσία receives its definite meaning from the context.—ךרד occurs elsewhere also in the signification of *versus*, e.g., Ezek. 8:5, 40:20, 46; it will be necessary to supply after it קרא, just as in the case of the רבע זדריה רבע following. It is without any instance that ררד “way” should stand for “region,” “country.” The region on the sea is then divided into its two parts רבע זדריה רבע, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, the land on the east bank of Jordan, and Galilee. The latter answers to the land of Zebulon and Naphtali; for the territory of these two tribes occupied the centre and principal part of Galilee. In opposition to the established *usus loquendi*, many would understand רבע זדריה רבע as meaning the land “on the side,” *i.e.*, this side “of the Jordan,” proceeding upon the supposition that the local designations must, from beginning to end, be congruous. Opposed to it is also the circumstance that, in 2 Kings 15:29, the most

eastward and most northward countries, Peraea and Galilee are connected. In that passage the single places are mentioned which Tiglath-pilezer took; then, the whole districts, "Gilead and Galilee, the whole land of Naphtali." By the latter words, that part of Galilee is made especially prominent upon which the catastrophe fell most severely and completely. In the phrase, "Galilee of the Gentiles," Galilee is a geographical designation which was already current at the time of the Prophet. There is no reason for fixing the extent of ancient Galilee differently from that of the more modern Galilee,—for assigning to it a more limited extent. We are told in 1 Kings 9:11, that the twenty cities which Solomon gave to Hiram lay in the land of *Galil*, but not that the country was limited to them. The qualification, "of the Gentiles," is nowhere else met with in the Old Testament; it is peculiar to the Prophet. It serves as a hint to point out in what the disgrace of Galilee and Peraea consisted. This *Theodoret* also saw. He says: "He calls it 'Galilee of the Gentiles' because it was inhabited by other tribes along with the Jews; for this reason, he says also of the inhabitants of those countries, that they were walking in darkness, and speaks of the inhabitants of that land as living in the shadow and land of death, and promises the brightness of heavenly light." It is of no small importance to observe that Isaiah does not designate Galilee according to what it was at the time when this prophecy was uttered, *but according to what it was to become in future*. The distress by the Gentiles appears in chap. 7 and 8 everywhere as a *future one*. At the time when the Prophet prophesied, the Jewish territory still existed in its integrity. In vers. 4, and 5-7, he announces Asshur's inroad into the land of Israel as a *future one*; in the present moment, it was the kingdom of the ten tribes in connection with Aram which attacked and threatened Judea. The superior power of the world which, according to the clear foresight of the Prophet, was threatening, could not but be sensibly felt in the North and East. For these formed the border parts against the Asiatic world's power; it was from that quarter that its invasions commonly took place; and it was to be expected that there, in the first instance, the Gentiles would establish themselves, just as, in former times, they had maintained themselves longest there; comp. Judges 1:30-38; *Keil* on 1 Kings 9:11. But very soon after this, the name "Galilee of the Gentiles" ceased to be one merely prophetic; Tiglathpilezer carried the inhabitants of Galilee and Gilead into exile, 2 Kings 15:29. *At a later period*, when the Greek empire "peopled Palestine, in the most attractive places, with new cities, restored many which, in consequence of the destructive wars, had fallen into decay, filled all of them, more or less, with Greek customs and institutions, and, along with the newly-opened extensive commerce and traffic, everywhere spread Greek manners also," this change was chiefly limited to Galilee and Peraea; Judea remained free from it; comp. *Ewald, Geschichte Israel's*, iii. 2 S. 264 ff. In 1 Maccab. 5 Galaaditis and Galilee appear as those parts of the country where the existence of the Jews is almost hopelessly endangered by the Gentiles living in the midst of, and mixed up with them. What is implied in "Galilee of the Gentiles" may be learned from that chapter, where even the *expression* reverts in ver. 15. With external dependence upon the Gentiles, however, the spiritual dependence went hand in hand. These parts of the country could the less oppose any great resistance to the influences of heathendom, that they were separated, by a considerable distance, from the religious centre of the nation—the temple and *metropolis*, in which the higher Israelitish life was concentrated. A consequence of this degeneracy was the contempt in which the Galileans were held at the time of Christ, John 1:47, 7:52; Matt. 27:69.—But in what consisted the *honour* or the *glorification* which Galilee, along with Peraea, was to obtain in the after-time? Chap. 9:5 (6), where the deliverance and salvation announced in the preceding verses are connected with the person of the *Redeemer*, show that we must not seek for it in any other than that of the Messianic time. Our Lord spent the greater part of His public life in the

neighbourhood of the lake of Gennesareth; it was there that Capernaum—His ordinary residence—was situated, Matt. 9:1. From Galilee were most of His disciples. In Galilee He performed many *miracles*; and it was there that the preaching of the Gospel found much entrance, so that even the name of the Galileans passed over in the first centuries to the Christians. *Theodoret* strikingly remarks: “Galilee was the native country of the holy Apostles; there the Lord performed most of His miracles; there He cleansed the leper; there He gave back to the centurion his servant sound; there He removed the fever from Peter’s wife’s mother; there He brought back to life the daughter of Jairus who was dead; there He multiplied the loaves; there He changed the water into wine.” Very aptly has *Gesenius* compared Micah 5:1 (2). Just as in that passage the birth of the Messiah is to be for the honour of the small, unimportant Bethlehem, so here Galilee, which hitherto was covered with disgrace, which was reproached by the Jews, that there no prophet had ever risen, is to be brought to honour, and to be glorified by the appearance of the Messiah. It was from the passage under review that the opinion of the Jews was derived, that the Messiah would appear in the land of Galilee. Comp. *Sohar*, p. 1. fol. 119 ed. Amstelod; fol. 74 ed. Solisbac: אֵלֶּנְתִּי לִילְגֵד הָעָרָאב אֶת־יִשְׁמֵ אֶצְלָם. “King Messiah will reveal himself in the land of Galilee.” But we must beware of putting prophecy and fulfilment into a merely accidental outward relation, of changing the former into a mere foretelling, and of supposing, in reference to the latter, that, unless the letter of the prophecy had existed, Jesus might as well have made Judea that exclusive scene of His ministry. Both prophecy and history are overruled by a higher idea, by the truth absolutely valid in reference to the Church of the Lord, that where the distress is greatest, help is nearest. If it was established that the misery of the covenant-people, both outward and spiritual, was especially concentrated in Galilee, then it is also sure that He who was sent to the lost sheep of Israel must devote His principal care just to that part of the country. The prophecy is not exhausted by the one fulfilment; and the fulfilment is a new prophecy. Wheresoever in the Church we perceive a new Galilee of the Gentiles, we may, upon the ground of this passage, confidently hope that the saving activity of the Lord will gloriously display itself.

Chap. 9:1 (2). “*The people that walk in darkness see a great light, they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them light ariseth.*”

“The people” are the inhabitants of the countries mentioned in the preceding verse; but they are not viewed in contrast to, and exclusive of the other members of the covenant-people,—for according to chap. 8:22, darkness is to cover the whole of it—but only as that portion which comes chiefly into consideration. *Light* is, in the symbolical language of Scripture, salvation. That in which the *salvation* here consists cannot be determined from the words themselves, but must follow from the context. It will not be possible to deny that, according to it, the darkness consists, in the first instance, in the oppression by the Gentiles, and, hence, salvation consists in the *deliverance* from this oppression, and in being raised to the dominion of the world; and in ver. 2 (3) ff., we have, indeed, the farther displaying of the light, or deliverance. But it will be as little possible to deny that the sad companion of outward oppression by the Gentile world is the *spiritual* misery of the inward dependence upon it. *Farther*,—It is as certain that the elevation of the covenant-people to the dominion of the world cannot take place all on a sudden, and without any farther ceremony, inasmuch as, according to a fundamental view of the Old Testament, all outward deliverance appears as depending upon conversion and regeneration. “Thou returnest,” so we read in Deut. 30:2, 3, “to the Lord thy God, and the Lord thy God turneth to thy captivity,” And in the same chapter, vers. 6, 7: “The Lord thy

God circumciseth thy heart, and *then* the Lord thy God putteth all these curses upon thine enemies.” Before Gideon is called to be the deliverer of the people from Midian, the Prophet must first hold up their sin to the people, Judg. 6:8 ff., and Gideon does not begin his work with a struggle against the outward enemies, but must, first of all, as Jerubbabel, declare war against sin. All the prosperous periods in the people’s history are, at the same time, periods of spiritual revival. We need only think of David, Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah. Outward deliverance always presents itself in history as an *addition* only which is bestowed upon those seeking after the kingdom of God. “Without the inward foundation, the bestowal of the outward blessing would be only a mockery, inasmuch as the holy God could not but immediately take away again what He had given. But the circumstance that it is the *outward* salvation, the deliverance from the heathen servitude, the elevation of the people of God to the dominion of the world, as in Christ it so gloriously took place, which are here, in the first instance, looked at, is easily accounted for from the historical cause of this prophetic discourse which, *in the first instance, is directed against the fears of the destruction of the kingdom of God by the world’s power.* Ps. 23:4; “Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil; for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff they comfort me,” must so much the more be considered as the fundamental passage of the verse under consideration, that the Psalm, too, refers to the whole Christian Church. It was in the appearance of Christ, and the salvation brought through Him, in the midst of the deepest misery, that this Psalm found its most glorious confirmation.—תומלצ, “darkness of death,” is the darkness which prevails in death or in Sheol. Such compositions commonly occur in proper names only, not in appellatives; and hence, by “the land of the darkness (shadow) of death,” hell is to be understood. But darkness of hell is, by way of a shortened comparison, not unfrequently used for designating the deepest darkness. The point of comparison is here furnished by the first member of the verse. Parallel in Ps. 88:4 ff., where Israel laments that the Lord had thrust it down into dark hell. The Preterite sense of the verbs in our verse is to be explained from the prophetic view which converts the Future into the Present. How little soever modern exegesis can realise this seeing by, and in faith, and how much soever it is everywhere disposed to introduce the *real* Present instead of the *ideal*, yet even *Ewald* is compelled to remark on the passage under consideration: “The Prophet, as if he were describing something which in his mind he had seen as certain long ago, here represents everything in the past, and scarcely makes an exception of this in the new start which he takes in the middle.” At the time when the Prophet uttered this Prophecy, even the *darkness* still belonged to the future. As yet the world’s power had not gained the ascendancy over Israel; but here the light has already dispelled the darkness.

It now merely remains for us to view more particularly the quotation of these two verses in Matt. 4:12-17. Ἀκούσας δὲ—thus the section begins—ὅτι Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Since, in these words, we are told that Jesus, after having received the intelligence of the imprisonment of John, withdrew into Galilee, we cannot for a moment think of His having sought in Galilee, safety from Herod; for Galilee just belonged to Herod, and Judea afforded security against him. The verb ἀναχωρεῖν denotes, on the contrary, the with-drawing into the *angulus terrae* Galilee, as contrasted with the civil and ecclesiastical centre. The *time* of the beginning of Christ’s preaching (His ministry hitherto had been merely a kind of prelude) was determined by the imprisonment of John, as certainly as, according to the prophecy of the Old Testament, the territories of the activity of both were immediately bordering upon one another, and by that very circumstance *the place*, too, was indirectly determined; for it was fixed by the prophecy under consideration that Galilee was to be the scene of the chief ministry of

Christ. If then, the time for the beginning of the ministry had come, He must also depart into Galilee. The connection, therefore, is this: After he had received the intelligence of the imprisonment of John—in which the call to Him for the beginning of His ministry was implied—He departed into Galilee, and especially to Capernaum, vers. 12, 13; for it was this part of the country which, by the prophecy, was fixed as the main scene of His Messianic activity, vers. 14-16. It was there, therefore, that He continued the preaching of John, ver. 17.—Καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρέτ—it is said in ver. 13—ἐλθὼν καταακησεν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ τὴν παραθαλασσίαν, ἐν ὄριοις Ζαβουλῶν καὶ Νεφθαλείμ. Christ had hitherto had His settled abode at Nazareth, and thence undertook His wanderings. The immediate reason why He did not remain there is not stated by Matthew; but we learn it from Luke and John. In accordance with his object, Matthew takes cognizance of this one circumstance only, that, according to the prophecy of the Old Testament, Capernaum was very specially fitted for being the residence of Christ. The town was situated on the western shore of the Lake of Gennesareth. Quite in opposition to his custom elsewhere, Matthew describes the situation of the town so minutely, because this knowledge served to afford a better insight into the fulfilment of the prophecy of the Old Testament. The designation τὴν παραθαλασσίαν stands in reference to ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, in ver. 15. Ἐν ὄριοις, &c., may either mean: “In the borders of Zebulon and Naphtali,” *i.e.* in that place where the borders of both the countries meet,—or τὸ ὄρια may, according to the analogy of the Hebrew מִלְּבוֹג denote the borders in the sense of “territory,” as in Matt. 2:16. From a comparison γῆ Ζαβουλῶν καὶ Νεφθαλείμ of the prophecy in ver. 15, to which the words stand in direct reference, it follows that the latter view is the correct one. “Whether Capernaum lay just on the borders between the two countries was of no consequence to the prophecy, and hence was of none to Matthew.—The phrase ἵνα πληρωθῆ does not, according to the very sound remark of *De Wette*, point to the intention, but to the objective aim. The question, however, is to what the ἵνα πληρωθῆ is to be referred,—whether merely to that which immediately precedes, *viz.*, the change of residence from Nazareth to Capernaum, or, at the same time to ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. The latter is alone correct. The prophecy which the Evangelist has in view referred mainly to Galilee, or the territory of Zebulon and Naphtali in general; but, according to the express remark of the Evangelist, Nazareth itself was likewise situated in Galilee. The advantage which Capernaum had over it was this only, that in Capernaum the ὁδὸν θαλάσσης of the prophecy was found again, and that, therefore, thence the πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου of the prophecy also could be better realized, inasmuch as across the lake there was an easy communication from that place with the country beyond Jordan. The connection is hence this: After the imprisonment of the Baptist, Jesus, in order to enter upon His ministry, went to Galilee, and especially to Capernaum, which was situated on the lake, in order that thus the prophecy of Isaiah as to the glorification of Galilee, and of the region on the lake, might be fulfilled.—Matthew has abridged the passage. From chap. 8:23 (9:1) he has taken the designation of the part of the country, in order that the agreement of fulfilment and prophecy might become visible. The words from γῆ—τῶν ἐλθῶν may either be regarded as a fragment taken out of its connection, so that they are viewed as a quotation, and as forming a period by themselves (this, from a comparison of the original, seems most natural);—or we may also suppose, that the Evangelist, having broken-up the connection with the preceding, puts these words into a new connection, so that, along with the ὁ λαός, which has become an apposition, they form the subject of the following sentence. At all events, ὁδόν takes here the place of the adverb, although it may not be possible to adduce instances and proofs altogether analogous from the Greek *usus loquendi*.—The confidence with which Matthew explains chap. 8:23, and 9:1 of Christ

can be accounted for only from the circumstance that he recognized Christ as He who in chap. 9:5, 6, (6, 7) is described as the author of all the blessings designated in the preceding verses. It was therefore altogether erroneous in *Gesenius* to assert that there was the less reason for holding the Messianic explanation of chap. 9:5, 6, as there was no testimony of the New Testament in favour of it.—It is quite obvious that Matthew does not quote the Old Testament prophecy in reference to any single special event which happened at Capernaum; but that rather the whole following account of the glorious deeds of Christ in Galilee, as well as in Peraea, down to chap. 19:1, serves to mark the fulfilment of this Old Testament prophecy, and is subservient to this quotation. *This passage of Matthew explains the reason, why it is that he, and Luke and Mark who closely follow him, report henceforth, until the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, exclusively facts which happened in Galilee, and in Peraea, which likewise was mentioned by Isaiah.* The circumstance that this fact, which is so obvious, was not perceived, has called forth a number of miserable conjectures, and has even led some interpreters to assail the credibility of the Gospel. To Matthew, who wished to show that Jesus was the Christ, the Messiah promised in the Old Testament, the interest must, in the view of the prophecy under consideration, be necessarily concentrated upon Galilee; and Mark and Luke followed him in this, perceiving that it was not becoming to them to open up a path altogether new. This was reserved to the second Apostle from among the Evangelists.

Ver. 2 (3). *“Thou multiplieth the nation to which thou didst not increase the joy; they joy before thee like the joy in harvest, and as they rejoice when they divide the spoil.”*

The Prophet beholds the joy of the Messianic time as present; he beholds the covenant-people numerous, free from all misery, and full of joy; full of delight he turns to the Lord, and praises Him for what He has done to His people,—One of the privileges of the people of God is the increase which at all times takes place after they are sifted and thinned by judgments. Thus, *e.g.*, it happened at the time after their return from the captivity, comp. Ps. 107:38, 39: “And He blesseth them, and they are multiplied greatly, and He suffereth not their cattle to decrease. They who were minished and brought low through affliction, oppression, and sorrow.” But this increase took place most gloriously at the time of Christ, when a numerous multitude of adopted sons from among the Gentiles were received into the Church of God, and thus the promise to Abraham: “I will make of thee a great nation” (גו' as in the passage before us, and not גוּם), received its final fulfilment.

From the arguments which we advanced in Vol. i. on Hosea 2:1, it appears that the increase which the Church received by the reception of the Gentiles is, according to the biblical view, to be considered as an increase of the people of Israel. The fundamental thought of Ps. 87 is: Zion the birth-place of the nations; by the new birth the Gentiles are received in Israel. The manner in which the Gentiles show their anxiety to be received in Israel is described by Isaiah in chap. 44:5. The commentary on the words: “Thou multiplieth the nation,” is furnished to us by chap. 54:1 ff., where, in immediate connection with the prophecy regarding the Servant of God who bears the sin of the world, it is said: “Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear, break forth into singing, and shout thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord.” Comp. also chap. 66:7-9, and Ezek. 37:25, 26: “And my servant David shall be their prince for ever. And I make a covenant with them and multiply them.” Several interpreters, *e.g. Calvin, Vitringa*, suppose that the Prophet in this verse (and so likewise in the two following verses) speaks, in the first instance, of a nearer prosperity, of the rapid increase of the people after the Babylonish captivity. *Vitringa* directs attention to the fact, that the Jewish people after the captivity

did not only fill Judea, but spread also in Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy. And surely we cannot deny that in this increase, no less than in the new flourishing of the people after the defeat of Sennacherib also, there is a *prelude* to the real fulfilment; and that so much the more that these precursory increases, happening, as they did, regularly after the decreases, were bestowed upon the covenant-people with a view to the future appearance of Christ. These increases enter into a still closer relation to the prophecy under consideration, if we keep in mind that in chap. 7 the Prophet anticipates in spirit the appearance of Christ, and that it is with this representation that, in the section before us, chap. 8:8, 10 are connected. In order to refute the explanation of *Umbreit*: “Thou hast multiplied the *heathen*, and thereby thou hast removed all joy; but now,” &c., it will be quite sufficient to refer to the parallel passage, chap. 26:15: “Thou increasest the *people*, O Lord, thou art glorified, thou removest all the boundaries of the land,” where, just as in the verse before us, by יגג “the people,” Israel is designated; and that is frequently the case where the notion of the multitude, the mass only is concerned, comp. Gen. 12:2.—“*Thou didst not increase the joy*” stands for: to whom thou formerly didst not increase the joy, to whom thou gavest but little joy, upon whom thou inflictedst severe sufferings. The antithesis is quite the same as in chap. 8:23 (9:1), where the former distress is contrasted with the light which is now to shine upon them, the former disgrace with the later glory; and in the same manner in chap. 9:1 (2), where the present *light* is rendered brighter by being contrasted with the former *darkness*. The contrast of the present *increase* with the former absence of joys shows that the joy is to be viewed as being connected with the increase, and that if formerly the joy was less, the reason of it was chiefly in the *decrease*. Ps. 107:38, 39, 41, shews how affliction and decrease, joy and increase, go hand in hand; farther, Jerem. 30:19: “And out of them proceed thanksgivings, and the voice of the merry ones; and I multiply them, and they do not decrease; and I honour them, and they are not small” The decrease is a single symptom only of a depressed, joyless condition, which everywhere in the kingdom of God shall be brought to an end by Christ. Most of the ancient translators (LXX., Chald., Syr.) follow the marginal reading לו, “to him” hast thou increased the joy. According to many modern interpreters לם is supposed to be a different mode of writing for לו. But no *proof* that could stand the test can be brought forward for such a mode of writing; nor is there any reason for supposing that לם stands here in a different sense from what it does in chap. 8:23, and it would indeed be strange that לו should have been placed before the verb. At most, it might be supposed that the Prophet intended an ambiguous and double sense: not/to him didst thou increase the joy. But altogether to him apart from such an ambiguous and double sense, behind the negative, at all events, the positive is concealed; thou multiplies! the people, and increasest to them the joy, thou who formerly didst decrease their joy, &c.; and it is to this positive that the words refer which, in Luke 2:10, the angels address to the shepherds μη φοβεῖσθε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην τις σται παντὶ ττ λαα τι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτήρ, ὃς ἐστὶ Χριστὸς Κύριος; comp. Matth. 2:10. In the following words, the Prophet expresses, in the first instance, the nature of the joy, then its greatness. The joy over the blessings received is a joy *before God*, under a sense of His immediate presence. The expression is borrowed from the sacrificial feasts in the courts before the sanctuary, at which the partakers rejoiced *before the Lord*, Deut. 12:7, 12, 18, 14:26. In Immanuel, God with his blessings and gifts has truly entered into the midst of His people. With the joy at *the dividing of the spoil*, the joy is compared only to show its greatness, just as with the joy *in the harvest*; and it is in vain that *Knobel* tries here to bring in a dividing of spoil.

Vers. 3, (4). *“For the yoke of his burden and the staff of his neck, the rod of his driver thou hast broken as in the day of Midian.”*

In this verse, the reason of the people’s joy announced in the preceding verse is stated: it is the deliverance from the world’s power, under the oppression of which they groaned, or, in point of fact, were to groan. He who imposes the *yoke* and the *staff*, the *driver*, (an allusion to the Egyptian taskmasters, comp. Exod. 3:7; 5:10), is Asshur, and the *whole* world’s power hostile to the Kingdom of God, which is represented by him, and which by Christ was to receive, and has received, a mortal blow. A prelude to the fulfilment took place by the defeat of Sennacherib under Hezekiah, comp. chap. 10:5, 24, 27; 14:25. After him, Babel had to experience the destructive power of the Lord, the single phases of which, pervading, as they do, all history, are here comprehended in one great act. Although the definitive fulfilment begins first with the appearance of Christ in the flesh, who spoke to His people: *θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον*, yet after what we remarked on ver. 2, we are fully entitled to consider the former catastrophes also of the kingdoms of the world as preludes to the real fulfilment.—*שכם* “shoulder” does not suit as the *membrum cui verbera infliguntur*; it comes, as is commonly the case, into consideration as that member with which burdens are borne. The *staff* or tyranny is a heavy *burden*, comp. chap. 10:27: “His burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder.” “*As in the day of Midian*” is equivalent to: as thou once didst break the yoke of Midian. This event was especially fitted to serve as a type of the glorious future victory over the world’s power, partly because the oppression by Midian was very hard,—according to Judges 7:12. Midian, Amalek, and the sons of the East broke in upon the land like grasshoppers for multitude, and their camels were without number, as the sand by the seaside for multitude—partly because the help of the Lord (*thou hast broken*) was at that time specially visible. “I will be with thee,” says the Lord to Gideon in Judges 6:16, “and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man;” and Judges 7:2: “The people that are with thee are too many, as that I could give the Midianites into their hands, lest Israel vaunt themselves against me, saying: Mine own hand hath saved me.”

Vers. 4, (5). *“For every war-shoe put on with noise, and the garment rolled in blood: it is for burning, food of fire.”*

We have here the reason why the tyranny is broken: *for* the enemies of the Kingdom of God shall entirely and for ever be rendered incapable of carrying on warfare. If the noisy war-shoes, and their blood-stained garments are to be burned, they themselves must, of course, have been previously destroyed. But, if that be the case, then all war and tyranny are come to an end, “for the dead do not live, and the shades do not rise,” chap. 26:14. The parallel passages, Ps. 46:10, and Ezek. 39:9, 10, do not permit us to doubt that the burning of the war-shoes and of the bloody garments come into consideration here as a consequence of the destruction of the conquerors. Nor can we, according to these passages, entertain, for a moment, the idea of *Meier*, that those bloody garments belong to *Israel*.

Vers. 5 (6). *“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government is upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called Wonder-Counsellor, God-Hero, Ever-Father, Prince of Peace.”*

The Prophet had hitherto spoken only of the salvation which is to spread from Galilee over the rest of the country; it is first here that its author, in all His sublime glory, comes before him; and, having come to him, the prophecy rises to exalted feelings of joy. In

chap. 7:14, the Prophet beholds the Saviour as being already born; hence the Preterites **לִי** and **תָּנָה**. If any one should imagine that from the use of these Preterites he were entitled to infer that the subject of the prophecy must, at that time, already have been born, he must also, on account of the Preterites in vers. 1 (2) suppose that the announced salvation had at that time been already bestowed upon Israel,—which no interpreter does. *Hitzig* correctly remarks: “Because He is still *future*, the Prophet in His first appearance, beholds Him as a child, and as the son of another.” *Whose* son He is we are not told; but it is supposed to be already known. Ever since the revelation in 2 Sam. 7, the Messiah could be conceived of as the Son of David only; compare the words: “Upon the throne of David” in vers. 6 (7), and chap. 11:1, 55:3. As the Son of God the Saviour appears as early as in Ps. 2; and it is to that Psalm that the “God-Hero” alludes, and connects itself. Alluding to the passage before us, we read in John 3:16: οὐτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον (“The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this,”) vers. 6 [7], ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν.—When grown up, the Son has the government upon His shoulder. The Prophet contrasts Christ with the *world's power*, which threatened destruction to the people of God. This, then, refers to the *Kingly office* of Christ, and the state of glory. Parallel is the declaration of Christ in Matt. 28:18, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία. The Lord has also, in John 18:37, confirmed the truth that He is *King*; and it is upon the ground of His own declaration that Pilate designates Him upon the cross as a King, Although His Kingdom is not of this world, John 18:36, it is, just for that very reason, so much the more all-governing. The ἐντεῦθεν in that passage is contrasted with the words “from heaven” in Dan. 2, by which, in that passage, its absolute superiority over all the kingdoms of the world, and its crushing power are declared to be indissolubly connected.—“*The shoulder*” comes, here also, as in vers. 3 (4), chap. 10:27, into consideration in so far as on it we *bear*; comp. Gen. 49:15; Ps. 81:7. The bearer of an office has it, as it were, on his shoulders.—The Jewish interpreters, despairing of being able, with any appearance of truth, to apply the following attributes to Hezekiah, insist that, with the exception of the last, they denote Him who calls, not Him who is called: the Wonderful, &c., called him Prince of peace. Altogether apart from the consideration that this is in opposition to the accents, the mentioning of so many names of Jehovah is here quite unsuitable; and, in all other passages, the noun put after **וּמַשׁ אֲרַק** designates always him who is called. Modern Exegesis has tried everything with a view to deprive the names of their deep meaning, in order to adapt them to a Messiah in the ordinary Jewish sense, hence, to do that of which the Jews themselves had already despaired. But, in doing so, they have considered the names too much by themselves, overlooking the circumstance that the full and deeper meaning of the individual attributes, as it at first sight presents itself, must, in the connection in which they here occur, be so much the rather held fast. The names are completed in the number *four*,—the mark of that which is complete and finished. *They form two pairs, and every single name is again compounded of two names.* The first name is **אֵלֹהִים**. That these two words must be *connected* with one another (*Theodor.*—θαυμαστῶς βουλευόν) appears from the analogy of the other names, especially of **לִי גְבוּרָה** with whom **אֵלֹהִים** forms one pair; and then from the circumstance that **אֵלֹהִים** alone would, in this connection, be too indefinite. The words do not stand in the relation of the *Status constructs*, but are connected in the same manner as **אֵלֹהִים** in Gen. 16:12. **אֵלֹהִים** designates the attribute which is here concerned, while **אֵלֹהִים** points out the supernatural, superhuman degree in which the King possesses this attribute, and the infinite riches of consolation and help which are to be found in such a King, As a *Counsellor*, He is a *Wonder*, absolutely elevated above everything which the earth possesses in excellency of counselling. As **אֵלֹהִים** commonly denotes “wonder” in the

strictest sense (comp. chap. 25:1: “I will exalt thee, I will praise thy name, for thou hast done wonders,” Ps. 77:15: “Thou art the God that doest wonders;” Exod. 15:11); as it here stands in parallelism with אֱלֹהִים God; as the whole context demands that we should take the words in their full meaning;—we can consider it only as an arbitrary weakening of the sense, that several interpreters explain אֱלֹהִים by “extraordinary Counsellor.” Parallel is Judges 13:18 where the Angel of the Lord, after having announced the birth of Samson, says: “Why askest thou thus after my name?—it is wonderful,” אֱלֹהִים, *i.e.*, my whole nature is wonderful, of unfathomable depth, and cannot, therefore, be expressed by any human name. *Farther*—Revel. 19:12 is to be compared, where Christ has a name written that no man knows but He himself, to intimate the immeasurable glory of His nature. That which is here, in the first instance, said of a single attribute of the King, applies, at the same time, to all others, holds true of His whole nature; the King is a Wonder as a Counsellor, because His whole person is wonderful. A proof, both of the connection of the two words, and against the weakening of the sense, is afforded by the parallel passage, chap. 28:29, where it is said of the Most High God הַצֶּעֶף אֵלֵינוּ, “He shows himself wonderful in His counsel.”—The second name is אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר “God-Hero.” Besides the ability of giving good counsel, a good government requires also גִּבּוֹר strength, heroic power: comp. chap. 11:2, according to which the spirit of counsel and strength rests upon the Messiah. “What may not be expected from a King who not only, like a David in a higher degree, possesses the greatest *human measure* of heroic strength, but who is also a *God-Hero*, and a *Hero-God*, so that with His appearance there *disappears* completely the contrast of the invisible Head of the people of God, and of His visible substitute,—a contrast which so often manifested itself, to the great grief of the covenant-people? The God-Hero forms the contrast to a human hero whose heroic might is, after all, always *limited*. אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר can signify God-Hero only, a Hero who is infinitely exalted above all human heroes by the circumstance that He is *God*. To the attempts at weakening the import of the name, chap. 10:21, where אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר is said of the Most High, appears a very inconvenient obstacle,—a parallel passage which does not occur by chance, but where אֱשׁוּרֵי רֵאשִׁי stands with an intentional reference to chap. 7: “The remnant shall return, the remnant of Jacob, unto the Hero-God,” who is furnished with invincible strength for His people; comp. Ps. 24:8: “The Lord strong and a hero, the Lord a hero of war.” The older Rationalistic exposition endeavoured to set aside the deity of the Messiah by the explanation: “strong hero.” So also did *Gesenius*. This explanation, against which chap. 10:21 should have warned, has been for ever set aside by the remark of *Hitzig*: “Commonly, in opposition to all the *usus loquendi*, the word is translated by: *strong hero*. But אֱלֹהִים is always, even in passages such as Gen. 31:29, “God,” and in all those passages which are adduced to prove that it means “*princeps*” “*potens*,” the forms are to be derived not from אֱלֹהִים, but from אֱלֹהֵי, which properly means ‘ram,’ then ‘leader,’ ‘prince.’” By this explanation, especially the passage Ezek. 32:21, which had formerly been appealed to in support of the translation “strong hero,” is set aside; for the אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹרִים of that passage are “rams of heroes.” Rationalistic interpreters now differ in their attempts at getting rid of the troublesome fact. *Hitzig* says, “Strong God”—he erroneously views אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר, which always means “hero,” as an adjective—“the future deliverer is called by the oriental not strictly separating the Divine and human, and He is called so by way of exaggeration, in so far as He possesses divine qualities.” A like opinion is expressed by *Knobel*: “Strong God the Messiah is called, because in the wars with the Gentiles He will prove himself as a hero equipped with divine strength. The expression proves a divine nature as little as when in Ps. 82:1-6, comp. John 10:34, 35, kings are, in general, called אֱלֹהִים, gods. *Like* God, to be compared to Him, a worthy representative of Him, and

hence, likewise, called God.” It is true that there is one אל גבור only, and that, according to chap. 10:21, the Messiah cannot be אל גבור beside the Most High God, excepting *by partaking in his nature*. Such a participation in the nature, not His being merely filled with the power of God, is absolutely required to explain the expression. It is true that in the Law of Moses all those who have to command or to judge, all those to whom, for some reason or other, respect or reverence is due, are consecrated as the representatives of God on earth; *e.g.*, a court of justice is of God, and he who appears before it appears before God. But the name *Elohim* is there given *in general only to the judicial court*, which represents God—to the *office*, no to the single individuals, who are invested with it. In Ps. 82:1, the name *Elohim* in the expression: “He judgeth among the gods” is given to the single, judging individual; comp. also ver. 6; but this passage forms an isolated exception. To explain, from it, the passage before us is inadmissible, even from chap. 10:21, where אל גבור stands in its fullest sense. It must not be overlooked that that passage in Ps. 82 belongs to higher poetry; that the author himself there mitigates in ver. 6, in the parallel member, the strength of the expression: “I have said ye are *Elohim*, and sons of the Most High ye all;” and, finally, that there *Elohim* is used as the most vague and general name of God, while here *El*, a personal name, is used. *Hendewerk, Ewald*, and others, finally, explain “*God’s hero*,” *i.e.*, “a divine hero, who, like an invincible God, fights and conquers.” But in opposition to this view, it has been remarked by *Meier* that then necessarily the words ought to run, אל גבור. It is farther obvious that by this explanation the אל גביר here is, in a manner not to be admitted, disconnected and severed from those passages where it occurs as an attribute of the Most High God; comp. besides chap. 10:21; Deut. 10:17; Jer. 32:18.

The third name is *Father of eternity*. That admits of a double explanation. Several interpreters refer to the Arabic *usus loquendi*, according to which he is called the father of a thing who possesses it; *e.g.*, Father of mercy, *i.e.*, the merciful one. This *usus loquendi*, according to the supposition formerly very current, occurs in Hebrew very frequently, especially in proper names, *e.g.*, בוט יבא. “Father of goodness,” *i.e.*, the good one.

According to this view, Father of eternity would be equivalent to Eternal one. According to the opinion of others, Father of eternity is *he who will ever be a Father, an affectionate provider*, comp. chap. 22:21, where Eliakim is called “*Father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem*;” Job 29:16; Ps. 68:6. *Luther*, too, thus explains: “Who at all times feeds His Kingdom and Church, in whom there is a fatherly love without end.” The *latter* view is to be preferred unconditionally. Against the former view is the circumstance that all the other names stand in direct reference to the salvation of the covenant-people, while, in the mere eternity, this reference would not distinctly enough appear. And it has farther been rightly remarked by *Ewald*, that that *usus loquendi* in Arabic always belongs to the artificial, often to jocular discourse. “Whether it occur in Hebrew at all is still a matter of controversy; *Ewald*, § 27, denies that it occurs in proper names also. On the other hand, the paternal love, the rich kindness and mercy, exceedingly well suit the first two names which indicate unfathomable *wisdom*, and divine *heroic strength*. The rationalistic interpreters labour very hard to *weaken* the idea of *eternity*. But the “*Provider for life*” agrees very ill with the *Wonder-Counsellor*, and the *God-hero*. The absolute eternity of the Messiah’s dominion is, on the foundation of 2 Sam. 7, most emphatically declared in other passages also (comp. vol. i., p. 132, 133), and meets us here again immediately in the following verse. The name Ever-Father, too, leads us to *divine Majesty*, comp. chap. 45:17: “Israel is saved by the Lord with an *everlasting* salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded in all *eternity*” chap. 57:15, where God is called דע זבש “the ever

dwelling;” farther, Ps. 68:6: “A *Father* of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows is God in His holy habitation,” where the providence of God for the *personae miserabiles* is praised with a special reference to that which He does for His poor people.—*Hitzig’s* explanation: “Father of prey,” does not suit the prophetic style, and has, in general, no analogy from Hebrew to adduce in its favour. The circumstance that, in the verse immediately following, the eternity of the government is mentioned, shows that עַד must be taken in its ordinary signification “eternity.”

The fourth name, *Prince of peace*, stands purposely at the end, and is to be considered as strongly emphatic. War, hostile oppression, the distress of the servitude which threatens the people of God,—these are the things which, in the first instance, have directed the Prophet’s eye to the Messiah. The name points back to Solomon who typified Christ’s dominion of peace, and who himself, in the Song of Solomon, transfers his name to Christ (comp. my Comment. S. 1 ff.); then to the Shiloh, Gen. 49:10 (comp. vol. i. 84, 85). We should misunderstand the name were we to infer from it that, in the Messianic time, all war should cease. Were such to be the case, why is it that, immediately before, the Redeemer is designated as *God-Hero*? Peace is the aim; it is offered to all the nations in Christ; but those who reject it, who rise up against His Kingdom, He throws down, as the God-Hero, with a powerful hand, and *obtains by force* peace for His people. But war, as far as it takes place, is carried on in a form different from that which existed under the Old dispensation. According to Micah 5:9 (10), ff., the Lord makes His people outwardly defenceless, before they become in Christ world-conquering; comp. vol. i., p. 515. According to chap. 11:4, Christ smiteth the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips He slayeth the wicked.

Ver. 6 (7). “*To the increase of the government and to the peace, there is no end, upon the throne of David and over his kingdom, so that he establisheth it, and supporteth it by justice and righteousness, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts shall perform this.*”

There is no reason for connecting this verse with the preceding one; in which case the sense would be: “For the increase of government and for peace without end.” For chap. 2:7; Nah. 2:10; Job. 16:3—in which ל with קַץ occurs in the very same sense—clearly show that the ל in מוֹלֵשׁ and הַבְּרַמֶּל may very well be understood as a mere sign of the Dative. And the objection that the following וַיְכַהֵל, &c. would, in that case, be unsuitable, is removed if it be explained: so that He established, &c., or: by His establishing, &c.; comp. *Ewald, Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache* § 280 d. The words designate the basis on which the increase of government and the peace rest, The Kingdom of God will through the Redeemer, acquire an ever increasing *extent*, and, along with it, perfect *peace* shall be enjoyed by the world. For it is not by rude force that this kingdom is to be founded and established, as is the case with worldly kingdoms, in which increase of government and peace, far from being always connected, are, on the contrary, irreconcilable opponents, but by *justice* and *righteousness*. Parallel is Ps. 72. In vers. 11-15 of that Psalm, the Psalmist just points to that “by which all nations and kings are induced to do homage to that king; it is just that which, in the whole Psalm, appears as the root of everything else, viz., the absolute justice of the king.” *Decrease* of government and *war* without end were, meanwhile, in prospect, and they were so, because those who were sitting on the throne of David did not support his kingdom by justice and righteousness. But the Psalmist intimates to the trembling minds that such is not the end of the ways of God with His people; that at last the idea of the Kingdom of God will be realized. From the

fundamental passage, Ps. 72:8-11, and parallel passages, such as chap. 2:2, 4; Mic. 5:3 (4); Zech. 9:10, it is obvious that, as regards the endless increase of the government, the Prophet thinks of all the nations of the earth. On the *peace* without end, comp. Ps. 72:7; chap. 2:4; Mic. 5:4 (5). and the words: “He speaketh peace unto the heathen,” Zech. 9:10. The ל designates the substratum on which the increase of dominion and the peace manifest themselves; the dominion of the Davidic family and its kingdom gain infinitely in extent, and in the same degree peace also increases. In these words the Prophet gives an intimation that the Messiah will proceed from David’s family, comp. chap. 11:1 where he designates Him as the twig of Jesse.—יָכִיחַ “to confirm,” “to establish,” used of throne and kingdom, 1 Sam. 13:13, comp. 14; 1 Kings 2:12, comp. ver. 24, and farther, chap. 16:5.—The words: “from henceforth even for ever” do not, as *Umbreit* supposes, refer to every thing in this verse, but to the words immediately preceding. That the words must be understood in their full sense, we have already proved in our remarks on the fundamental passage, 2 Sam. 7:13: “And I will establish the throne of His kingdom for ever;” see Vol. i. p. 131. *Michaelis* says: “So that that promise to David shall never fail.” The הָרַע does not refer to the *actual*, but to the *ideal* present, to the first appearance of the Redeemer, to the words: “Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government is upon His shoulder.”—This great change is brought about by the *zeal* of the Lord who raises this glorious King to His people; comp. John 3:16. The zeal in itself is only *energy*; the sphere of its exercise is, in every instance, determined by the context. In Exod. 15:5; Deut. 4:24; Nah. 1:2, the zeal is the energy of wrath. In the passage before us, as in the Song of Solomon 8:6, and in chap. 37:32: “For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and escaped ones out of Mount Zion; the zeal of the Lord of hosts shall do this,” the zeal of God means the energetic character of His love to Zion.

We must, in conclusion, still make a few remarks, on the interpretation of vers. 5 and 6. The older interpreters were unanimous in referring these verses to the Messiah. Even by the Jews, this explanation was abandoned at a subsequent period only. To the Messiah this passage is referred by the Chaldean Paraphrast, by the Commentary on Genesis known by the name *Breshith Rabbah* in the exposition of Genesis 41:44 (see *Raim. Martini Pugio fidei*, Vol. iii. sec. 3, chap. xiv, § 6), by “Rabbi *Jose Galilaeus* in the book *Ekha Rabbati*, a Commentary on Lamentations (see *Raim. Mart. iii. 3 chap. 4, § 13*). *Ben Sira* (fol. 40 ed., Amstel. 1679), mentions among the eight names of the Messiah, the following from the passage before us: “Wonderful, Counsellor, El Gibbor, Prince of Peace. But the late Jewish interpreters found it objectionable that the Messiah, in opposition to their doctrinal views; was here described as God; for doctrinal reasons, therefore, they gave up the received interpretation, and sought to adapt the passage to Hezekiah. Among these, however, *Rabbi Lipmann* allows the Messianic explanation to a certain degree to remain. Acknowledging that the prophecy could not refer exclusively to Hezekiah, he extends it to all the successors from the House of David, including the Messiah, by whom it is to attain its most perfect fulfilment. Among Christian interpreters, *Grotius* was the first to abandon the Messianic explanation. Even *Clericus* acknowledges that the predicates are applicable to Hezekiah “*sensu admodum diluto*” only. At the time when Rationalism had the ascendancy, it became pretty current to explain them of Hezekiah. *Gesenius* modified this view by supposing that the Prophet had connected his Messianic wishes and expectations with Hezekiah, and expected their realization by him. At present this view is nearly abandoned; after *Gesenius*, *Hendewerk* is the only one who still endeavours to defend it.

Against the application to Hezekiah even this single argument is decisive, that a glory is here spoken of, which is to be bestowed especially upon Galilee which belonged to the kingdom of the ten tribes. *Farther*—Although the prophecy be considered as a human foreboding only, how could the Prophet, to whom, everywhere else such a sharp eye is ascribed, that, from it, they endeavour to explain his fulfilled prophecies,—how could the Prophet have expected that Hezekiah, who was at that time a boy of about nine years of age, and who appeared under such unfavourable circumstances, should realize the hopes which he here utters in reference to the world's power, should conquer that power definitively and for ever, should infinitely extend his kingdom, and establish an everlasting dominion? How could he have ascribed divine attributes to Hezekiah who, in his human weakness, stood before him? *Finally*—The undeniable agreement of the prophecy before us with other Messianic passages, especially with Ps. 72 and Is. 11, where even *Gesenius* did not venture to maintain the reference to Hezekiah, is decidedly in opposition to the reference to Hezekiah

## **THE TWIG OF JESSE**

(Chap. 11, 12)

These chapters constitute part of a larger whole which begins with chap. 10:5. With regard to the time of the composition of this discourse, it appears, from chap. 10:9-11, that Samaria was already conquered. The prophecy, therefore, cannot be prior to the sixth year of Hezekiah. On the other hand, the defeat of the Assyrian host, which, under Sennacherib, invaded Judah, is announced as being still future. The prophecy, accordingly, falls into the period between the 6th and the 14th year of Hezekiah's reign. From the circumstance that in it the king of Asshur is represented as being about to march against Jerusalem, it is commonly inferred that it was uttered shortly before the destruction of the Assyrian host, and hence, belongs to the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. But this ground is not very safe. It would certainly be overlooking the liveliness with which the prophets beheld and represented future things as present; it would be confounding the *ideal* Present with the *actual*, if we were to infer from vers. 28-32 that the Assyrian army must already have reached the single stations mentioned there. The utmost that we are entitled to infer from this liveliness of description is, that the Assyrian army was already on its march; but not even that can be inferred with certainty. In favour of the immediate nearness of the danger, however, is the circumstance that, in the Prophecy, the threatening is kept so much in the background; that, from the outset, it is comforting and encouraging, and begins at once with the announcement of Asshur's destruction, and Judah's deliverance. This seems to suggest that the place which, everywhere else, is occupied by the threatening, was here taken by the events themselves; so that of the two enemies of salvation, proud security and despair, the latter only was here to be met. The prophecy before us opens the whole series of the prophecies out of the 14th year of Hezekiah, the most remarkable year of the Prophet's life, rich in the revelations of divine glory, in which his prophecy flowed in full streams, and spread on all sides.

The prophecy divides itself into two parts. The first, chap. 10:5-34, contains the threatening against Asshur, who was just preparing to inflict the deadly blow upon the people of God. The fact that in chap. 11 we have not an absolutely new beginning before us, sufficiently appears from the general analogy, according to which, as a rule, the Messianic prophecy does not *begin* the prophetic discourse; but still more clearly from

the circumstance that chap. 11 begins with “and;” to which argument may still be added the fact that the figure in the first verse of this chapter evidently refers to the figure in the last verse of the preceding chapter. Asshur had there been represented as a stately forest which was to be cut down by the hand of the Lord; while here the house of David appears as a stem cut down, from the roots of which a small twig shall come forth, which, although unassuming at first, is to grow up into a fruit-bearing tree. The purpose of the whole discourse was to strengthen and comfort believers on the occasion of Asshur’s inroad into the country; to bring it home to the convictions of those who were despairing of the Kingdom of God, that He who is in the midst of them is greater than the world with all its apparent power; and thereby to awaken and arouse them to resign themselves entirely into the hands of their God. It is for this purpose that the Prophet first describes the catastrophe of Asshur; that, then, in chap. 11, he points to the highest glorification which in future is destined for the Church of God by the appearance of Christ, in order that she may the more clearly perceive that every fear regarding her existence is folly.

The connection of the two passages appears so much the more plainly when we consider, that that which, in chap. 10, was said of Asshur, and especially the close in vers. 33 and 34: “Behold Jehovah of hosts cuts down the branches with power, and those of a high stature shall be hewn down, and the high ones shall be made low. And He cuts down the thickets of the forest with the iron, and Lebanon shall fall by the glorious one, *refers to him as the representative of the whole world’s power*; that the defeat of Sennacherib before Jerusalem is to be considered as the nearest fulfilment only, but not as the *full and real* fulfilment.

From the family of David sunk into total obscurity—such is the substance—there shall, at some future period, rise a Ruler who, at first low and without appearance, shall attain to great glory and bestow rich blessings,—a Ruler furnished with the fulness of the Spirit of God and of His gifts, filled with the fear of God, looking sharply and deeply, and not blinded by any appearance, just and an helper of the oppressed, an almighty avenger of wickedness, ver. 1-5. By him all the consequences of the fall, even down to the irrational creation, in the world of men and of nature, shall be removed, ver. 6-9. Around Him the Gentiles, formerly addicted to idols, shall gather, ver. 10. In ver. 11-16 the Prophet describes what he is to do for Israel, to whom the discourse was in the first instance addressed, and upon whom it was to impress the word: “Fear not.” Under Him they obtain deliverance from the condition of being scattered and exiled from the face of the Lord, the removal of pernicious dissensions, conquering power in relation to the world which assails them, and the removal of all obstacles to salvation by the powerful arm of the Lord.

The reference of the prophecy to the Messiah is, among all the explanations, the most ancient. We find it in the Targum of Jonathan, who thus renders the first verse: אכלמ קפיו יברתי יהונב אחישמו ישיד יהונב. St. Paul quotes this prophecy in Rom. 15:12, and proves from it the calling of the Gentiles. In 2 Thes. 2:8 he quotes the words of ver. 4, and assigns to Christ what is said in it. In Rev. 5:5, 22:16, Christ, with reference to ver. 1 and 10, is called the root of David. The Messianic explanation was defended by most of the older Jewish interpreters, especially by *Jarchi*, *Abarbanel*, and *Kimchi*.<sup>9</sup> It is professed even by most of the rationalistic interpreters, by the modern ones especially, without any exception (*Eichhorn*, *De Wette*, *Gesenius*, *Hitzig*, *Maurer*, *Ewald*), although, it is true, they distinguish between Jesus Christ and the Messiah of the Old Testament,—as, e.g., *Gesenius* has said: “Features such as those in ver. 4 and 5 exclude any other than the

political Messiah, and King of the Israelitish state,” and *Hitzig*: “A political Messiah whose attributes, especially those assigned to him ver. 3 and 4, are not applicable to Jesus.”

But the non-Messianic interpretation, too, has found its defenders. According to a statement of Theodoret, the passage was referred by the Jews to Zerubbabel.<sup>10</sup> Interpreters more numerous and distinguished have referred it to Hezekiah. This interpretation is mentioned as early as by *Ephraem Syrus*; among the Rabbis it was held by *Moses Hakkohen*, and *Abenezra*; among Christian interpreters, *Grotius* was the first who professed it, but in such a manner that he assumed a higher reference to Christ. (“The Prophet returns to praise Hezekiah in words under which the higher praises of Christ are concealed.”) He was followed by *Dathe*. The exclusive reference to Hezekiah was maintained by *Hermann v. d. Hardt*, in a treatise published in 1695, which, however, was confiscated; then, by a number of interpreters at the commencement of the age of Rationalism, at the head of whom was *Bahrtdt*. Among the expositors of the last decade, this interpretation is held by *Hendewerk* alone.

The reasons for the Messianic interpretation, and against making Hezekiah the subject of the prophecy, are, among others, the following:—

1. *The comparison of the parallel passages.* The Messiah is here represented under the figure of a shoot or sprout. This has become so common, as a designation of the Messiah, that the name “Sprout” has almost become a proper name of the Messiah; compare the remarks on chap. 4:2. A striking resemblance to ver. 1 is presented by chap. 58:2, where the Messiah, to express His lowliness at the beginning of His course, is, in the same manner as here, compared to a feeble and tender twig. Ps. 72 and the prophecies in chap. 2, 4, 7, 9, and Mic. 5, present so many agreements and coincidences with the prophecy under consideration, that they must necessarily be referred to one and the same subject. The reception of the Gentile nations into the Kingdom of God, the holiness of its members, the cessation of all hostilities, are features which constantly recur in the Messianic prophecies.
2. There are features interwoven with the prophecy which lead to a more than human dignity of its subject. Even this circumstance is of importance here, that the *whole earth* appears as the sphere of His dominion. Still more distinctly is the human sphere overstepped by the announcement that, under His government, *sin*, yea, even all destruction in the outward nature is to cease, and the earth is to return to the happy condition in which it was before the fall. According to ver. 4, He slays the wicked in the whole earth by His mere word,—a thing which elsewhere is said of *God* only; and according to ver. 10, the heathen shall render Him religious reverence.
3. A *future* scion of David is here promised. For *יצא* in ver. 1 must be taken as a *praeteritum propheticum*, as is evident from its being connected with the preceding chapter, which has to do with future things, and in which the preterites have a prophetic meaning; as also by the analogy of the following preterites from which this can by no means be separated. But at the time when this prophecy was composed, Hezekiah had long ago entered upon the government.
4. The circumstances under which the Prophet makes the King appear are altogether different from those at the time of Hezekiah. According to ver. 1 and 10, the royal house of David would have entirely declined, and sunk into the obscurity of private life, at the

time when the Promised One would appear. The Messiah is there represented as a tender twig which springs forth from the roots of a tree cut down. In the circumstance, too, that the stem is not called after David, but after Jesse, it is intimated that the royal family is then to have sunk back into the obscurity of private life. This does not apply to Hezekiah, under whom the Davidic dynasty maintained its dignity, but to Christ only. *Farther*: In ver. 11 there is an announcement of the return of not only the members of the kingdom of the ten tribes, but also of the members of the kingdom of Judah from all the countries in which they were dispersed. This must refer to a far later time than that of Hezekiah; for at his time no carrying away of the inhabitants of Judah had taken place. This argument is conclusive also against the false modified Messianic explanation as it has been advanced by *Ewald*, according to which the Prophet is supposed to have expected that the Messiah would appear immediately after the judgment upon the Assyrians, and after the conversion and reform of those in the Church who had been spared in the judgment. The facts mentioned show that between the appearance of the Messiah, and the Present and immediate Future, there lay to the Prophet still a wide interval in which an entire change of the present state of things was to take place. Ver. 11 is here of special importance. For this verse opens up to us the prospect of a whole series of catastrophes to be inflicted upon Israel by the world's powers, all of which are already to have taken place at the time of the King's appearance, and which lay beyond the historical horizon at the time of the Prophet.

A certain amount of truth, indeed, lies at the foundation of the explanation which refers the prophecy to Hezekiah. The fundamental thought of the prophecy before us: "The exaltation of the world's power, is a prophecy of its abasement; the abasement of the Davidic Kingdom is a prophecy of its exaltation," was, in a prelude, to be realized even at that time. But the Prophet does not limit himself to these feeble beginnings. He points to the infinitely greater realization of this idea in the distant future, where the abasement should be much deeper, but the exaltation also infinitely higher. To him who had first, by a living faith, laid hold of Christ's appearance, it must be easy, even in the present difficulty, to hope for the lower salvation.

The distinction between the "political Messiah" of the prophecy before us, and "Jesus of Nazareth"—a distinction got up by Rationalism—rests chiefly upon the fact that Rationalism knows Christ as the *Son of Man* only, and is entirely ignorant of His true eternal Kingdom. Hence a prophecy which, except the intimation, in ver. 1, of His lowliness at first, refers altogether to the glorified Christ, could not but appear as inapplicable. But it is just by ver. 4, to which they chiefly appeal, that a "political Messiah" is excluded; for to such an one the words: "He smiteth the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips He slayeth the wicked" do not in the least apply. And so likewise vers. 6-9 altogether go beyond the sphere of a political Messiah. All that at first sight seems to lead to such an one belongs to the imagery which was, and could not fail to be, taken from the predecessors and types on the throne of David, since Christ was to be represented as He in whom the Davidic Kingdom attains to its full truth and glory.

In the whole section, the Redeemer appears as a *King*. This is altogether a matter of course, for He forms the antithesis to the king of Asshur. It is quite in vain that *Umbreit* has endeavoured to bring political elements into the description. Thereby the sense is essentially altered. We must keep closely in view the Prophet's starting-point. Before those who were filled with cares and fears, lest the Davidic Kingdom should be

overturned by the Assyrian kingdom, he holds up the bright image of the Kingdom of David, in its last completion. When they had received that into their hearts, the king of Asshur could not fail to appear to them in a light altogether different, as a miserable wretch. The giant at once dwindled down into a contemptible dwarf, and with tears still in their eyes they could not avoid laughing at themselves for having stood so much in awe of him.

As is commonly the case in the Messianic prophecies, so here, too, no attention is paid to the development of Christ's Kingdom in time. Everything, therefore, is fulfilled only as to its beginning; and the complete fulfilment still stands out for that future in which, after the fulness of the Gentiles has been brought in, and apostate Israel has been converted, the consequences of the fall shall, in the outward nature also, be removed.

Ver. 1. "And there cometh forth a twig from the stump of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit."

The circumstance that the words in the first verse are completed in the number seven, divided into three and four, intimates that the Prophet here enters upon the territory of the revelation of a mystery of the Kingdom of God. Totally different—so the Prophet begins—from the fate of Asshur, just now proclaimed, shall that of the royal house of David be. Asshur shall be humbled at a time when he is most elevated. Lebanon falls through the mighty One: but the house of David shall be exalted at a time when he is most humbled. Who then would tremble and be afraid, although it go downward? *Luther* says: "This is a short summary of the whole of theology and of the works of God, that Christ did not come till the trunk had died, and was altogether in a hopeless condition; that hence, when all hope is gone, we are to believe that it is the time of salvation, and that God is then nearest when He seems to be farthest off." The same contrast appears in Ezek. 17:24. The Lord brings down the high tree of the world's power, and exalts the low tree of the Davidic house. The word עץ does not mean "stem" in general, as several rationalistic interpreters, and *Meier* last, have asserted, but rather stump, *truncus*, κορμός, as *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, translate. This is proved from the following reasons: (1) the derivation from עץ, in Arabic *secuit*, equivalent to דע, "to cut off," chap. 9:9; 10:33. The עץ in latter passage clearly refers to the עץ here. The proud trees of Asshur shall be *cut down*; from the cut down trunk of David there shall grow up a *new* tree overshadowing the earth, and offering glorious fruits to them that dwell on it—(2) The *usus loquendi*. The signification, "stump," is, by the context, required in the two passages in which the word עץ still occurs. In Job 14:8, it is obvious. The whole passage there from vers. 7-9 illustrates the figurative representation in the verse under review. "For there is hope of a tree; if it be *cut down* it will sprout again, and its tender branch does not cease. Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the *stump* thereof die in the dust, through the scent of waters it buds, and brings forth boughs, like one newly planted." We have here the figure of our verse carried out. That which water is to the natural tree decaying, the Spirit and grace of God are to the dying tree, cut down to the very roots, of the Davidic family. In the second passage, Is. 40:23, 24, it is only by a false interpretation that עץ has been understood of the stem in general. "He bringeth princes to nothing, He destroyeth the kings of the earth. They are not planted; they are not sown; their *stump* does not take root in the earth." The Prophet, having previously proved God's elevation over the creature, from the creation and preservation of the world, now proves it from the nothingness of all that which on earth has the greatest appearance of independent power. It costs Him no effort to destroy all earthly greatness which places itself in opposition to

Him. He blows on them, and they have disappeared without leaving any trace. If God's will be not with it, princes will not attain to any firm footing and prosperity (they are not planted and sown); they are like a cut-down stem which has no more power to take root in the earth. A tree not planted dries up; corn not sown does not produce fruit; a cut down tree does not take root.—(3) The connection. In the second member of the verse we read: "A branch from his roots shall bear fruit." Unless we mean to adopt the altogether unsuitable expedient of explaining it of a wild twig which shoots forth from the roots of a still standing tree, we cannot but think of a stem cut down to the very root. Against the opinion of *Hendewerk* who remarks: "An indirect shoot from the root which comes forth from the root through the stem;" and against *Meier's* opinion: "The root corresponds with the stem, and both together form the living tree," it is decisive, that in ver. 10, the Messiah is simply, and without any mention being made of the stem, designated as שרש "a shoot from the root" Farther, chap. 53:2, where the Messiah is represented as a shoot from the root out of a dry ground—(4.) It is only when עזג has the meaning, "stump," that it can be accounted for why the עזג of Jesse, and not of David, is spoken of.—(5.)

The supposition that the Messiah shall be born at the time of the deepest humiliation of the Davidic family, after the entire loss of the royal dignity, pervades all the other prophetic writings. That Micah views the Davidic family as entirely sunk at the time of Christ's appearance, we showed in vol. I, p. 508-9. Compare farther the remarks on Amos 9:11, and those on Matth. 2:23 immediately following.—*Hitzig* is obliged to confess that עזג can designate the cut-off stem only; but maintains that Jesse, as an individual long ago dead, is designated as a cut-off tree. But against this opinion is the relation which, as we proved, exists between this verse and the last verses of the preceding chapter; the undeniable correspondence, of עזג with מיעדג in chap. 10:33. In that case the antithesis also, so evidently intended by the Prophet, would be altogether lost. It is not by any means a thing so uncommon, that a man who is already dead should have a glorious descendant. To this it may further be added that, according to this supposition, the circumstance is not all accounted for, that Jesse is mentioned, and not David, the royal ancestor, as is done everywhere else. *Finally*—In this very forced explanation, the parallel passages are altogether left out of view, in which likewise the doctrine is contained that, at the time of Christ's appearance, the Davidic family should have altogether sunk. The reason of these futile attempts at explaining away the sense so evident and obvious, is none other than the fear of acknowledging in the prophecy an element which goes beyond the territory of patriotic fancy and human knowledge. But this dark fear should here so much the more be set aside, that, according to other passages also, the Prophet undeniably had the knowledge and conviction that Israel's course would be more and more downward before it attained, in Christ, to the full height of its destiny, "We need remind only of the prophecies in chap. 5 and 6; and it is so much the more natural here to compare the latter of them, that, in it, in ver. 13, Israel, at the time of the appearing of the Messianic Kingdom, is represented as a felled tree,—a fact which has for its ground the sinking of the Davidic race which is here announced. We farther direct attention to the circumstance that in our prophecy itself, Israel's being carried away into all the countries of the earth is foreseen as future,—a circumstance which is so much the more analogous, that there also, as here, the foreknowledge clothes itself in the form of the *supposition* and not of express announcement. With regard to the latter point, it may still be remarked that Amos also, in chap. 9:11, by speaking of the raising up of the tabernacle of David which is fallen, anticipates its future lowliness.—The question still arises:—Why is it that the Messiah is here designated as a rod of Jesse, while elsewhere, His origin is commonly traced back to David? *Umbreit* is of opinion that the mention of Jesse may be explained from the Prophet's desire to trace the pedigree as far back as

possible in its apparent extinction, the family of the Messiah was to be pointed out as a *very old* one. But if this had been his intention, he would have gone back beyond Jesse to the older ancestors whom the Book of Ruth mentions; and if he had been so anxious to honour the family of the Messiah, it would, at all events, have been far more suitable to mention David than Jesse, who was only one degree removed from him. The sound view has been long ago given by Calvin, who says: “The Prophet does not mention David; but rather Jesse. For so much was the dignity of that family diminished, that it seemed to be a rustic, ignoble family rather than a royal one.” It was appropriate that that family, upon whom was a second time to be fulfilled the declaration in Ps. 113:7, 8: “He raiseth up the poor out of the dust; He lifteth up the needy out of the dunghill, that He may set him with princes, with the princes of His people,”—in which, the second time, the transition should take place from the low condition to the royal dignity, should not be mentioned according to its royal, but according to its rustic character. This explanation of the fact is confirmed by the circumstance that it agrees exceedingly well with the right interpretation of עֲזָג: Jesse is mentioned and not David, because the Davidic dignity had become a עֲזָג. The mention of Jesse’s name thus explained, agrees, then, with the birth of Christ at Bethlehem, announced by Isaiah’s cotemporary, Micah. Christ was to be born at Bethlehem, because that residence was peculiar to the family of David during its lowliness; comp. vol. I., p. 508-9.—The second hemistich of the verse may either be explained: “a twig from his roots shall bear fruit,” or, as agrees better with the accents: “a twig shall from his roots bear fruit.” The sense, at all events, is: A shoot proceeding from his roots (*i.e.*, the cut-off stem of Jesse) shall grow up into a stately fruitful tree; or: As a tree cut down throws out from its roots a young shoot which, at first inconsiderable, grows up into a stately fruit-bearing tree, so from the family buried in contempt and lowliness, a *King* shall arise who, at first humble and unheeded,<sup>11</sup> shall afterwards attain, to great glory. Parallel is Ezek. 17:22-24. The Messiah is there compared to a tender twig which is planted by the Lord on a high hill, and sends forth branches and bears fruit, so that all the birds dwell in the shadow of its branches.—It has now become current to explain: “A branch breaks forth or sprouts;” but that explanation is against the *usus loquendi*. הרפ is never equivalent to ms “to break forth;” it has only the signification “to bear,” “to bear fruit,” “to be fruitful.” Gesenius who, in the later editions of his translation, here explains הרפ by, “to break forth,” knows, in the *Thesaurus*, of no other signification. In the passage of Ezekiel referred to, which may be considered as a commentary on the verse before us, ירפ השע corresponds to the הרפי here. The change of the tense, too, suggests that הרפי does not contain a mere repetition, but a progress. This progress is necessary for the sense of the whole verse. For it cannot be the point in question that, in general, a shoot comes forth; but the point is that this shoot shall attain to importance and glory. הרפי comprehends and expresses in one word that which, in the subsequent verses of the section, is carried out in detail. First, there is the bestowal of the Spirit of the Lord whereby He is enabled to bear fruit; then, the fruit-bearing itself.

We here subjoin the discussion of the New Testament passage which refers to this verse.

## ON MATTHEW 2:23

Καὶ ἔλθὼν καττήκεισεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ· ὅπως πληρωθῆτο τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.

We here premise an investigation as regards the name of the town of Nazareth. Since that name occurs in the New Testament only, different views might arise as to its orthography and etymology. One view is this: The name was properly and originally רצנ. Being the name of a town, it received, in Aramean, in addition, the feminine termination נ. And, finally, on account of the original appellative signification of the word, a ת, the designation of the *status emphaticus* of feminine nouns in נ, was sometimes added. We have an analogous case in the name *Dalmanutha*, the same place which, with the Talmudist, is called צלמנא. Compare *Lightfoot decas chorog. Marc. praem., opp. II.*, p. 411 sqq. So it is likewise probably that γαββαθα, נבתא is formed from the masculine נב, *dorsum*. Our view is that the original name was *Nezer*, that this form of the name was in use along with that which received a ת added, and that this ת served for the designation of the *status emphaticus* only; or also, if we wish to take our stand upon the Hebrew form, was a mere hardening of the ה Femin. (either of which suppositions is equally suitable for our purpose); and this our view we prove by the following arguments: 1. The testimonies of the Jews. *David de Pomis* (in *De Dieu. critic. sacr.* on M. II. 23) says: דלונש ימ רצנ “A Nazarene is he who is born in the town of *Nezer*, in Galilee, three days’ journey from Jerusalem.” In the Talmud, in *Breshith Rabba*, and in *Jalkut Shimeoni* on Daniel, the contemptuous name of *Ben Nezer*, i.e., the Nazarene, is given to Christ; compare the passage in *Buxtorf, lex. c.* 1383; in *Lightfoot disquis. chorog. Johan. praem. opp. II.*, 578 sqq.; *Eisenmenger*, I., p. 3139. It is true, *Gieseler* (on Matth. 2:23, and in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1831, III. S. 591) has tried to give a different interpretation to this appellation. He is of opinion that this appellation has reference to Is. 11:1; that it had come to the Jews from the Christians, who called their Messiah נב רצנ, because He was He who had been promised by Isaiah. But this supposition is correct thus far only, that, no doubt, this appellation was chosen by the Jews with a reference to the circumstance that the Christians maintained that Jesus was the רצנ announced by Isaiah, just as, for the very same reasons, they also assign to Him the names מצר נאפוף “adulterous branch,” and בעתנ רצנ “abominable branch” (from Is. 14:19); comp. *Eisenmenger* I, S. 137, 138. But *Gieseler* is wrong in deriving, from this reference to Is. 11:1, the origin of the appellation, be it properly or mainly only. Against that even the very appellation is decisive, for in that case it ought to have been *Nezer* only, and not *Ben-Nezer*. *Gieseler*, it is true, asserts that he in whom a certain prophecy was fulfilled is called the “Son of the prophecy,” and in confirmation of this *usus loquendi* he refers to the circumstance that the pseudo-Messiah under Hadrian assumed, with a reference to the בכוכ in Numb. 24:17, the name בכיכ נב or אבכוכ רב, in so far as the star there promised had appeared in him. But this confirmation is only apparent; it can as little be proved from it, that Christ could be called *Ben-Nezer* because He was He in whom the prophecy of the *Nezer* was fulfilled, as it can be proved from the appellation

*Ben Nezer* that that pseudo-Messiah could be called *Bar Cochba*, only because it was believed that in him the prophecy of the star was fulfilled. *Reland* has already proved (Geogr. II. p. 727) that *Barcochba* probably had that name because he was a native of *Cocab*, a town or district in the country beyond Jordan. And the reason why he laid such special stress upon that descent was, that he sought a deeper meaning in this agreement of the name of his birthplace with the designation of the subject of the prophecy in Numb. 24. Moreover the supposition that, by the Jews, he in whom some prophecy was fulfilled, was called the son of that prophecy; that, *e.g.*, the Messiah, the Servant of God, the Prince of Peace were called the Son of the Messiah, &c., is not only destitute of all foundation, but is, even in itself, most improbable. To this must still be added the consideration that this interpretation of *Ben-Nezer* is opposed by the constant interpretation of the Jews. *Jarchi*, in a gloss on that passage of the Talmud referred to, explains *Ben Nezer* by: "He who has come from the town of Nazareth." *Abarbanel* in his book *Majenekajeshua*, after having quoted from *Jalkut Shimeoni* the passage in question, observes: "Remark well how they have explained the little horn in Daniel 7:8, of the *Ben Nezer* who is Jesus the *Nazarene*." From the *Lexicon Aruch* which forms a weighty authority, Buxtorf quotes: "רצנ ללקמה ירצנ Nezer, (or Ben Nezer), is the accursed *Nazarene*." Finally—It could not well be supposed that the Jews, in a contest where they heap the most obnoxious blasphemies on Christ, should have given Him an honourable epithet which they had simply received from the Christians.

2. The result which we have obtained is confirmed by the statements of Christian writers. Even at the time of *Eusebius* (Hist. Eccles. i. 7), and of *Jerome*, the place was called *Nazara*. The latter says; "*Nazareth*: there exists up to this day in Galilee a village opposite Legio, fifteen miles to the east of it, near Mount Tabor, called *Nazara*" (comp. *Reland* i. S. 497). In *Epistol xvii. ad Marcellum* he expressly identifies the name with *Nezer*, by saying: "Let us go to Nazareth, and according to a right interpretation of that name, we shall see there the flower of Galilee."

3. To this may be added, that the *Gentilitia* formed from Nazareth can be explained only when the ת is not considered as belonging to the original form of the name. For, in that case, it must necessarily be found again in the *Gentilitia*, just as, *e.g.*, from תתנע we could not by any means form יתנע, but only יתתנע. In the New Testament the two forms Ναζωραῖος Ναζαρηνός only occur, never the form Ναζαρεταῖος. *Gieseler* has felt the difficulty which these names present to the common hypothesis, but has endeavoured (1. c. p. 592) to remove them by the conjecture that this form, so very peculiar, had been coined by a consideration of רצנ which the first Christians were accustomed to bring into connection with תרצנ. But this conjecture would, at most, be admissible, only if, with the Jews too, the form ירצנ were not found throughout without a ת, and if the Arabic form also were not entirely analogous<sup>12</sup>

The question now is:—In what sense was רצנ assigned as a *nomen proprium* to a place in Galilee? Certainly, we must at once reject the supposition of *Jerome* that Nazareth was thus called, as being "the flower of Galilee," partly because רצנ never occurs in this signification; partly because it is not conceivable that the place received a name which is due to it κατ' ἀστίφρασιν only. It is much more probable that the place received the name on account of its smallness: a weak twig in contrast to a stately tree. In this signification רצנ occurs in Is. 11:1, 14:19, and in the Talmudical *usus loquendi* where מירצנ signifies "*virgulta salicum decorticata, vimina ex quibus corbes fiunt*." There was so much the

greater reason for giving the place this name that people had the symbol before their eyes in its environs; for the chalk-hills around Nazareth are over-grown with low bushes (comp. Burkhardt II. S. 583). That which these bushes were when compared with the stately trees which adorned other parts of the country, Nazareth was when compared with other cities.

This *nomen* given to the place on account of its small beginnings, resembling, in this respect, the name of Zoar, *i.e.*, a small town, was, at the same time, an *omen* of its future condition. The weak twig never grew up into a tree. Nowhere in the Old Testament is Nazareth mentioned, probably because it was built only after the return from the captivity. Neither is it mentioned in *Josephus*. It was not, like most of the other towns in Palestine, ennobled by any recollection from the olden times. Yea, as it would appear, a special contempt was resting upon it, besides the general contempt in which all Galilee was held; just as every land has some place to which a disgrace attaches, which has often been called forth by causes altogether trifling. This appears not only from the question of Nathanael, in John. 1:47: "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" but also from the fact, that from the most ancient times the Jews thought to inflict upon Christ the greatest disgrace, by calling Him the Nazarene, whilst, in later times, the disgrace which rested on all Galilee was removed by the circumstance that the most celebrated Jewish academy, that of Tiberias, belonged to it.

Let us now examine in how far Christ's abode at Nazareth served the purpose of fulfilling the Old Testament prophecy. It is, throughout, the doctrine of the prophets, that the Messiah, descending from the family of David, sunk into utter lowliness, would at first appear without any outward rank and dignity. The fundamental type for all other passages here concerned is contained in that passage of Is. 11:1, now under consideration: "And there cometh forth a twig from the stump of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit," which is strikingly illustrated in the following words of *Quenstedt*, in his *Dissertatio de Genuine Jehovae*, in the *Thesaurus theol. plilol.* I. p. 1015: The stem of Jesse which, from low beginnings, was, in David, raised to the glory of royal majesty, shall then not only be deprived of all royal dignity, and all outward splendour which it received in David, but shall again have been reduced to the private condition in which it was before David; so that it shall present the appearance of a stem deprived of all boughs and foliage, and having nothing left but the roots; nevertheless out of that stem thus reduced and cut off, and, as it appeared, almost dry, shall come forth a royal rod, and out of its roots shall grow the twig upon whom shall rest the Spirit of the Lord," &c. Quite in harmony with this, it is said in chap. 53:2: "He grew up before the Lord as a tender twig, and as a root out of a dry ground." To רִצּוֹן, in chap. 11, corresponds קִנּוּי in chap. 53; to שֵׁרֶשׁ the רִטּוֹחַ; to the cut-off stem the dry land, with this difference, however, that by the latter designation, the low condition of the Servant of God, generally, is indicated; but His descent from the family of David sunk in lowliness, is not specially pointed at thereby, although it is necessarily implied in it. The same thought is further carried out in Ezek. 17:22-24. As the descendant of the family of David sank in lowliness, the Messiah appears in that passage as a small tender twig which is taken by the Lord from a high cedar, and, being planted upon a high mountain, grows up into a lofty tree, under which all the fowls dwell. In Jeremiah and Zechariah, the Messiah, with reference to the image of a cut-off tree used by Isaiah, is called the Sprout of David, or simply the Sprout; compare remarks on Zech. 3:8, 6:12. All that is here required is certainly only to place beside one another, on the one hand, prophecy, and, on the other, history, in order clearly and evidently to point out the fulfilment of the former in the latter. It was not at

Jerusalem, where there was the seat of His royal ancestor, where there were the thrones of His house (comp. Ps. 122), that the Messiah took up his residence; but it was in the most despised place of the most despised province that, by divine Providence, He received His residence, after the predictions of the prophets had been fulfilled by His having been born at Bethlehem. The name of that place by which His lowliness was designated was the same as that by which Isaiah had designated the lowliness of the Messiah at His appearing.

We have hitherto considered prophecy and fulfilment independently of the quotation by St. Matthew. Let us now add a few remarks upon the latter.

1. It seems not to have been without reason that the wider formula of quotation: τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν is here chosen, although *Jerome* infers too much from it when he remarks: “If he had wished to refer to a distinct quotation from Scripture, he would never have said: ‘As was spoken by the prophets,’ but simply, ‘as was said by the prophet.’ By using prophets in the plural, he shows that it is the sense, and not the words which he has taken from Scripture.” No doubt St. Matthew has one passage chiefly in view—that in Is. 11:1, which, besides the general announcement of the Messiah’s lowliness, contains, in addition, a special designation of it which is found again in the *nomen* and *omen* of his native place. This appears especially from the circumstance that, if it were otherwise, the quotation: ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται, would be inexplicable, since it is very forced to suppose that “Nazarene” here designates generally one low and despised.<sup>13</sup> But he chose the general formula of quotation (comp. *Gersdorf, Beiträge zur Sprachcharacteristik* I. S. 136), in order thereby to intimate that in Christ’s residence at Nazareth those prophecies, too, were at the same time fulfilled, which, in the essential point—in the announcement of Christ’s lowliness—agree with that of Isaiah. But it is just this additional reference which shows that, to Matthew, this was indeed the essential point, and that the agreement of the name of the town with the name which Christ has in Isaiah, appears to him only as a remarkable outward representation of the close connection of prophecy and fulfilment; just as, indeed, every thing in the life of Christ appears to be brought about by the special direction of Divine providence.

2. The phrase ὅτι κληθήσεται likewise is explained from the circumstance that Matthew does not restrict himself to the passage Is. 11:1, but takes in, at the same time, all those other passages which have a similar meaning. From among them, it was from Zech. 6:12: “Behold a man whose name is the Sprout,” that the phrase ὅτι κληθήσεται flowed. There is hence no necessity for explaining this circumstance solely from the custom of the later Jews,<sup>14</sup> of claiming as the names of the Messiah all those expressions by which, in the Old Testament, His nature is designated, inasmuch as, in doing so, they followed the custom of the prophets themselves, who frequently bring forward as the name of the Messiah that which is merely one of His attributes. This hypothesis is inadmissible, because otherwise it would be difficult to point out any case in which the Evangelists had not admixed something of their own with a quotation which they announced as a literal one.

Ver. 2. “*And the Spirit of the Lord resteth upon Him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.*”

The Spirit of the Lord is the general, the principle; and the subsequent terms are the single forms in which he manifests himself, and works. But, on the other hand, in a formal point of view, the Spirit of the Lord is just co-ordinate with the Spirit of wisdom, &c. Some, indeed, explain: the Spirit of God, who is the Spirit of, &c.; but that this is inadmissible appears with sufficient evidence from the circumstance that, by such a view, the sacred number, seven, is destroyed, which, with evident intention, is completed in the enumeration; compare the *seven* spirits of God in Rev. 1:4. To have the Spirit is the necessary condition of every important and effective ministry in the Kingdom of God, from which salvation is to come forth; comp. Num. 27:18. It is especially the blessed administration of the regal office which depends upon the possession of the Spirit; comp. 1 Sam. 16:13 ff. where it is said of David: “And Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed him: and the Spirit of the Lord came upon him from that day forward;” comp. 1 Sam. 10:6, 10. The circumstance that the Spirit of the Lord resteth upon the Messiah does not form a contradiction to His *divine nature*, which is intimated by his being born of the Virgin, chap. 7:14, by the name **רוּבֵג לֵא** in chap. 9:5, and elsewhere (comp. Vol. I., p. 400, 491), and is witnessed even in this prophecy itself; but, on the contrary, the pouring out of the Spirit fully and not by measure (John 3:39) which is here spoken of, *implies* the divine nature. In order to receive the Spirit of God in such a measure that He could baptize with the Holy Spirit (John 1:33), that out of His fulness all received (John 1:16), that, in consequence of His fulness of the Spirit overflowing from Him to the Church, the earth could be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters covering the sea (ver. 9), He could not but be highly exalted above human nature. It was just because they remained limited to the insufficient substratum of human nature, that even the best kings, that even David, the man after God’s own heart, received the Spirit in a scanty measure only, and were constantly in danger of losing again that which they possessed, as is shown by David’s pitiful prayer: “Take not thy Holy Spirit from me” (Ps. 51:13). It was for this reason, therefore, that the theocracy possessed in the kings a very insufficient organ of its realization, and that the stream of the divine blessings could not flow freely. In Matt. 3:16: καὶ εεδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσει περιστερὰν καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπ’ αὐτόν, it is not the passage before us only which lies at the foundation, but also, and indeed preeminently, the parallel passage, chap. 42:1: “Behold my Servant whom I uphold, mine Elect in whom my soul delighteth; I put my Spirit upon Him,” as is apparent from the circumstance that it is to this passage that the voice from heaven refers in Matt. 3:17: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν εὐδόκησα. But a reference to the passage before us we meet most decidedly in John 1:32, 33: Τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ μείνεν ἐπ’ αὐτόν· Καγὼ οὐκ ἤδην αὐτόν, ἀλλ’ ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι, ἐκεῖνός μοι εεπεν· Ἐφ’ ν ν δης τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ’ αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεῦματι ἁγίῳ. The word **נח**, which in Numb. 11:25 also is used of the Spirit, combines in itself both the **καταβαίνειν** and the **μένειν**; it is *requiescere*. As the fulfilment of this prophecy, however, we must not look to that event only where it received a symbolical representation, but also to Acts 2:3: καὶ φθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμενα γλῶσσαι ὡσει πυρός, ἐκάθισέ τε ἐφ’ να καστον αὐτῶν; Comp. 1 Pet. 4:14: ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται (this most exactly answers to **נח**). For it is not merely for himself that Christ here receives the Spirit; but He receives Him as the transforming principle for the human race; He is bestowed upon Him as the Head of the Church.—In the enumeration of the forms in which the Spirit manifests himself, it was not the intention of the Prophet to set forth *all* the perfections of the Messiah; he rather, by way of example mentions some only after having comprehended all of them in the general: The Spirit of the Lord. Thus, *e.g.*, *justice*,

which is mentioned immediately afterwards in ver. 5, is omitted here.—The first pair are wisdom and understanding. *Wisdom* is that excellency of knowledge which rests on moral perfection. It is opposed to הלבנ, foolishness in a moral sense, which may easily be combined with the greatest ingenuity and cleverness. The excellence of knowledge resting on a moral basis manifests itself in the first instance, and preeminently, in the הניב, understanding, the sharp and penetrating eye which beholds things as they are, and penetrates from the surface to their hidden essence, undisturbed by the dense fogs of false notions and illusions which, in the case of the fool, are formed by his lusts and passions. Neither of these attributes can, in its absolute perfection, be the possession of any mortal because even in those who, morally, are most advanced, there ever remains sin, and, therefore, a darkening of the knowledge.—The second pair, counsel and might, are, just as in the passage before us, ascribed to the Messiah in chap. 9:5 (6), by His receiving the names “Wonder-Counsellor,” “God-Hero.” From chap. 36:5 it is seen that, for the difficult circumstances of the struggle, *counsel* is of no less consequence than *might*. The last pair, knowledge and fear of the Lord, form the fundamental effect of the Spirit of the Lord; all the great qualities of the soul, all the gifts which are beneficial for the Kingdom of God, rest on the intimacy of the connection with God which manifests itself in living knowledge and fear of the Lord; the latter not being the servile but the filial fear, not opposed to love, but its constant companion. The Prophet has but this pair at the close, only because he intends to connect with it that which immediately follows. We have already remarked that the Spirit of the Lord, &c., is bestowed upon the Messiah not for himself alone, but as the renovating principle of the Church.—Old Testament analogies and types are not wanting in this matter. Moses puts of his spirit upon the seventy Elders, and the spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha, and likewise on the whole crowd of disciples who gathered around him (2 Kings 2:9).

Ver. 3. “*And He hath His delight in the fear of the Lord, and not after the sight of His eyes doth He judge, nor after the hearing of His ears doth He decide.*”

We now learn how the glorious gifts of the Anointed, described in ver. 2, are displayed in His government. All attempts to bring the second and third clauses under the same point of view as the first, and to derive them from the same source are in vain. That He has delight in the fear of the Lord, is the consequence of the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord resting upon Him,—He loves what is congenial to His own nature. That He does not judge after the sight of His eyes, &c., is the consequence of His having the Spirit of wisdom and understanding. It is thereby that He is freed from the narrow superficiality which is natural to man, and raised to the sphere of that divine clearness of vision which penetrates to the depths. חירה with the accusative is “to smell something;” with ב, to “smell at something;” “to smell with delight.” The fear of the Lord appears as something of a sweet scent to the Messiah. The other explanations of the first clause abandon the sure, ascertained *usus loquendi* (comp. Exod. 30:38; Levit. 26:31; Am. 5:21), and, therefore, do not deserve any mention. On the second and third clauses 1 Sam. 16:7, is to be compared: “And the Lord said unto Samuel: Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature, because I have refused him; for not that which man looks at (do I look at); for man looketh on the eyes (and, in general, on the outward appearance), and I look on the heart.” It is especially John who repeatedly mentions that Christ really possessed the gift here assigned to Him, of judging, not from the first appearance, and according to untrustworthy information, but of penetrating into the innermost ground of the facts and persons, comp. 2:24, 25: αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντα καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ

ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. Farther—chap. 21:17 where Peter says to Christ: Κύριε σὺ πάντα οὐδας· σὺ γινώσκεις τι φιλῶ σε. Farther, 1:48, 49; 4:18,19; 6:64. In Revel. 2:23, Christ says: “And all Churches shall know that I am He which searcheth the reins and hearts.”

Ver. 4. “*And He judgeth in righteousness the lowly, and doeth justice in equity to the weak of the earthy and smiteth the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His tips He slayeth the wicked.*”

The King shall be adorned with perfect justice, and, in the exercise of it, be supported by His omnipotence,—differently from what was the case with David, who, for want of power, was obliged to allow heinous crimes to pass unpunished (2 Sam. 3:39). Just as by the excellency of His *will* He is infinitely exalted above all former rulers, so is He also by the excellency of *might*. Where, as in His case, the highest might stands in the service of the best will, the noblest results must come forth. The first two clauses refer to Ps. 72, which was written by Solomon, and where, in ver. 2 it is said of Christ: “He shall judge thy people in righteousness, and thy lowly ones in judgment,” and in ver. 4: “He shall judge the lowly of thy people, He shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressors;” compare farther Prov. 29:14: “A king that in truth judgeth the lowly, his throne shall be established for ever.” The earth forms the contrast to the limited territory which was hitherto assigned to the theocratic kings.—In the second part of the verse ארץ does not by any means stand in contrast to מילד, and מיונע, and, in parallelism to עשר, designate the wicked ones; but ארץ “earth” stands in antithesis to the narrow territory in which earthly kings are permitted to dispense law and justice. It is a matter of course, and is, moreover, expressly stated in the second clause, that the earth comes into consideration with a view to those only who are objects of His judging activity. From that which follows, where changes are spoken of which shall take place on the whole earth, it follows that ארץ must be taken in the signification of “earth,” and not of “land.” Hand in hand with the infinite extent of the King’s exercise of justice goes also the manner of it. “The whole earth,” and the “breath of the mouth,” correspond with one another.—In the words “with the rod of His mouth,” a tacit antithesis lies at the foundation. As kings strike with the sceptre, so He smiteth with His mouth.—טבש, the ensign of royal dignity, is the symbol of the whole earthly power, which, being external and exercised by external means, must needs be limited, and insufficient for the perfect exercise of justice. The exercise of justice on the part of earthly kings reaches so far only as their hand armed with the smiting sceptre. But that great King is, in the exercise of justice, supported by His *Omnipotence*. He punishes and destroys by His mere word. Several interpreters understand this as a mere designation of His severity in punishing,—“the rod of His mouth” to be equivalent to “severity of punishment;”—but that such is not the meaning appears from the following clause, where likewise special weight is attached to the circumstance that the Messiah inflicts punishment by His mere word; “the breath of His lips” is equivalent to “mere words,” “mere command;” compare “breath of His mouth,” in Ps. 33:6. *Hitzig’s* explanation, “the angry breath of His lips,” does not interpret, but interpolate. In the future Son of David every word is, at the same time, a deed; He speaks and it is done. The same which is here said of the Messiah is, in other passages, attributed to *God*; compare Job 15:30, where it is said of the wicked: “By the breath of His mouth he shall go away;” Hos. 6:5: “I have slain them by the word of my mouth.” In general, according to the precedent in Gen. 1, doing by the mere word is, in Scripture, the characteristic designation of Divine Omnipotence. Parallel is chap. 49:2, where Christ says: “And He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword,” equivalent to: He

has endowed me with His Omnipotence, so that my word also exercises destructive effect, just as His. In Rev. 1:16, it is said of Christ: “And out of His mouth went a sharp two-edged sword,”—to designate the destructive power of His word borne by Omnipotence, the omnipotent punitive power of Christ against enemies, both internal and external. An instance of the manner in which Christ smites by the word of His mouth is offered by Acts 5:3 (where according to the analogy of the word spoken in the name of God by Elijah, 2 Kings 1:10, 12, and by Elisha, 2 Kings 2:24, 5:27, the Apostles are to be considered only as His instruments): ἀκούων δὲ Ἀνανίας τοὺς λόγους τούτους πεσὼν ἐξέψυξε, comp. ver. 10; 13:11. The Chaldee translates: “And by the word of His lips wicked Armillus shall die.” He refers רשע not to the ideal person of the wicked, but to an individual, *Armillus*, (ἐρημόλαος, corresponding to the name of Balaam, compounded of עלב “devouring,” “destruction,” and עם “people”) the formidable, last enemy of the Jews who shall carry on severe wars with them, slay the Messiah ben Joseph, but at length be slain by the Messiah ben David with a mere word, compare *Buxtorf, Lex. Chald.* chap. 221-224: *Eisenmenger, entdecktes Judenthum* ii. S. 705 ff. In 2 Thess. 2:8, in the description of Antichrist’s destruction by Christ: ὃν ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀναλώσει ττ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, there is an intentional and significant allusion to the passage before us, Antichrist there being, like רשע here, an ideal person; for the arguments in proof, see my Comment, on Revelation, vol. ii.

Ver. 5. “*And righteousness is the girdle of His loins, and faithfulness the girdle of His reins.*”

Righteousness and faithfulness are in a similar manner connected in 1 Sam. 26:13 (? Prov. 12:17). Faithfulness is trustworthiness. The point of comparison with the girdle is the closeness of the union; comp. Ps. 109:19; Jer. 13:1, 2, 11.

In ver. 6, the Prophet passes from the *person* of the glorious King to a description of His Kingdom. “With regard to ver. 6-8, the question arises, whether the description is to be understood figuratively or literally; whether the Prophet intends to describe the cessation of all hostility ‘among men, or whether he expected that, in the Messianic time, even among the irrational creation, all hostility and destruction, every thing pernicious was to cease. Most of the ancient interpreters are attached to the former view. Thus *Theodoret* says: “In a figurative manner, under the image of domesticated and wild animals, the Prophet taught the change of the habits of men.” He refers every thing to the union, within the Christian Church, of those who, in their natural condition, lived far separated from one another, and in hostility the one to the other. *Jerome* considers the opposite view as even a species of heresy. He says: “The Jews and the Judaizers among ourselves maintain that all this shall be fulfilled according to the letter; that in the light of Christ who, they believe, shall come at the end of the days, all beasts shall be reduced to tameness, so that the wolf, giving up its former ferocity, shall dwell with the lamb, &c.” Upon the whole, he states the sense in the same manner as *Theodoret*, from whom he sometimes differs in the allegorical explanation of the details only. In a similar manner *Luther* also explains it, who, *e.g.*, on ver. 6, “the wolf shall dwell with the lambs, etc.” remarks: “But these are allegories by which the Prophet intimates that the tyrants, the self-righteous and powerful ones in the world, shall be converted, and be received into the Church.” *Calvin* says: “By these images, the Prophet indicates that, among the people of Christ there will be no disposition for injuring one another, nor any ferocity or inhumanity.” The circumstance that the use of animal symbolism is widely spread throughout Scripture is in favour of this interpretation. One may, *e.g.*, compare Ps. 22,

where the enemies of the righteous are represented under the image of dogs, lions, bulls, and unicorns; Jer. 5:6, where, by lion, wolf, and leopard, the kingdoms of the world which are destructive to the people of God are designated; the four beasts in Dan. 7; but especially Is. 35:9: "There (on the way of salvation which the Lord shall, in the future, open up for His people) shall not be a lion, nor shall any ravenous beast go up thereon,"—where the ravenous beasts are the representatives of the world's power, hostile to the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless, the literal interpretation, defended by several Jewish expositors, maintains an undeniable preference. In favour of it are the following arguments: 1. The circumstance that it is impossible to carry through, in the details, the figurative interpretation; and it is by this that our passage is distinguished from all the other passages in which the wild, cruel, and destructive tendencies in the human sphere appear under the images of their representatives in the animal world. The supposition that "we have here before us only a poetical enlargement of the thought that all evil shall cease" (*Hendewerk, Knobel*), removes the boundaries which separate prophecy from poetry. 2. The parallelism with the condition of the creation before the fall, as it is described to us by Holy Scripture. It is certainly not without reason that, in the account of the creation, so much emphasis is laid on the circumstance that all which was created was *good*. This implies a condition of the irrational creation different from what it is now; for in its present state it gives us a faithful copy of the first fall, inasmuch as every heinous vice has its symbols and representatives in the animal kingdom. According to Gen. 2:19, 20, the animals recognize in Adam their lord and king, peaceably gather around him, and receive their names from him. According to Gen. 1:30, grass only was assigned to animals for their food; the whole animal world bore the image of the innocence and peace of the first man, and was not yet pervaded by the law of mutual destruction. Where there was not a Cain, neither was there a lion. The serpent has not yet its disgusting and horrible figure, and fearlessly men have intercourse with it; comp. Vol. i. p. 15, 16. But the influence of sin pervaded and penetrated the whole nature, and covered it with a curse (comp. Gen. 3:17-19); so that it not only bears evidence to the existence of God, but also to the existence of sin. Now, as it is by sin that outward discord, and contention, and destruction *arose* in the irrational creature, so we may also expect that, when the cause has been removed, the effect too will disappear; that, with the cessation of the discord and enmity among men, which according to ver. 9, the Prophet expected of the Messianic time, discord and enmity in the animal world will cease also. In the individual features, the Prophet seems even distinctly to refer to the history of the creation; compare ver. 7: "The lion shall eat straw like the ox," with Gen. 1:30; ver. 8: "the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp," with Gen. 3:15. 3. The comparison of other passages of Scripture, according to which likewise the reflection of the evil in the irrational creation shall cease, after the evil has been removed from the rational creation; compare chap. 65:25, 66:22; Matt. 19:28, where the Lord speaks of the *παλιγγενεσία*, the return of the whole earthly creation to its original condition; but especially Rom. 8:19 ff.—that classical passage of the New Testament which is really parallel to the passage before us. 4. A subordinate argument is still offered by the parallel descriptions of heathen writers. From the passages collected by *Clericus, Louth, and Gesenius*, we quote a few only. In the description of the golden age, *Virgil* says, *Ecl. iv. 21 sqq.; v. 60: Occidet et serpens et fallax herba veneni occidet.—Nec magnos metuent armenta leones.—Nec lupus insidias pecori. Horat. Epod. xiv. 53: Nec vespertinus circumgemit ursus ovile nec intumescit alta viperis humus.—Theocrit. Idyll, xxiv. 84.* Utterances such as these show how unnatural the present condition of the earth is. They are, however, not so much to be regarded as the remains of some outward tradition (against such a supposition it is decisive that they occur chiefly with *poets*), but rather as utterances of an indestructible longing in man, which, being so

deeply rooted in human nature, contains in itself the guarantee of being gratified at some future period. But, with all this, we must do justice to the objection drawn from the evident parallelism of passages such as chap. 35:9, and to another objection advanced by *Vitringa*, that it is strange that there is so much spoken of animals, and so little of men. This we shall do by remarking that, in the description of the glorious effects which the government of Christ shall produce on the earth, the Prophet at once proceeds to the utmost limit of them; and that the removal of hostility and destruction from the irrational creation implies that all will be removed which, in the rational creation, proceeds from the principle of hatred, inasmuch as it is certain that the former is only a reflection of the latter, and that the Prophet speaks with a distinct reference to this supposition which he afterwards, in ver. 9, distinctly expresses. Hence, to a certain degree, a double sense takes place; and, in the main, *J. H. Michaelis* has hit the right by comparing, first, Gen. 1 and Rom. 8, and then continuing: “Parabolically, however, by the wild beasts, wild and cruel nations are understood, which are to be converted to Christ; or violent men who, by the Spirit of Christ, are rendered meek and gentle, just as Paul, from a wolf, was changed into a lamb.” We are the less permitted to lose sight of the reference to the lions and bears on the spiritual territory, that ver. 6 is, in the first instance, connected with vers. 4 and 5, in which the all-powerful sway of Christ’s justice on earth is described, of which the consequences must, in the first instance, appear in the *human territory*; and, farther, that the point from which the prophecy started, is the raging of the wolf and bear of the world’s power against the poor defenceless flock of the Lord.

Ver. 6. “*And the wolf dwelleth with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, (he calf, and the lion and the falling together, and a little child leads them.)*”

Ver. 7. “*The cow and bear go to the pasture; their young ones lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.*” (The going to pasture of the bear corresponds with the lion’s eating straw [comp. Gen. 1:30], and we are not allowed to supply the “together” in the first clause.)

Ver. 8. “*And the sucking child playeth on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child putteth his hand into the den of the basilisk.*”

The change in the irrational creation described in the preceding verses is a consequence of the removal of sin in the rational creation; this removal the Prophet now proceeds to describe.

Ver. 9. “*They shall not do evil, and shall not sin in all my holy mountain, for the earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters covering the sea.*”

The subject are the dwellers in the Holy Mountain. The Holy Mountain can, according to the *usus loquendi*, be Mount Zion only, and not, as was last maintained by *Hofmann*, the whole land of Canaan, which is never designated in that manner; comp. chap. 27:13, and my Commentary on Ps. 78:54. The second part of the verse, connected with the first by means of *for*, agrees with the first only in the event that Mount Zion is viewed as the spiritual dwelling place of the inhabitants of the earth, just as, under the Old Testament dispensation, it was the *ideal* dwelling place of all the Israelites, even of those who outwardly had not their residence at Jerusalem; on the spiritual dwelling of the servants of the Lord with Him in the temple, compare remarks on Ps. 27:4, 36:9, 65:5, 84:3, and other passages. In chap. 2:2-4, 66:23, the Holy Mountain, too, appears as the centre of the whole earth in the Messianic time. From chap. 19:20, 21, where, in the midst of converted

Egypt, an altar is built, and sacrifices are offered up, it appears that it is this in an *ideal* sense only, that under its image the *Church* is meant. The designation, “my Holy Mountain,” intimates that the state of things hitherto, when unholiness prevailed in the Kingdom of the Holy God, is an unnatural one; that at some future period the *idea* necessarily must manifest its power and right in opposition to the *reality*.—In the second clause, the ground and fountain of this sinlessness is stated. In Zion, in the Church of God, there will then be no more any sins; for the earth is then full of the knowledge of the Lord, by which the sins are done away with. The general outpouring of the Holy Ghost forms one of the characteristics of the Messianic time; and the *consequence* of this outpouring is, according to ver. 2, the knowledge of the Lord,—so that the clause may be thus paraphrased: For, in consequence of the Spirit poured out, in the first instance, upon Him, the earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord; comp. chap. 32:15: “Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high; 54:13; Joel 3:1; 2:28; Jer. 31:34. That ארץ is here not the “land,” or “country,” but the “*earth*” is sufficiently evident from the antithesis of the *sea*; as the *sea* is full of water, so the *earth* is full of the knowledge of the Lord. To this reason it may still be added that in vers. 6-8 changes are spoken of, which concern the whole territory of the earthly creation, the παλιγγενεσία of the whole earth. As the relation of these changes to that which is stated here is that of cause and effect, here, too, the whole earth can only be thought of. *Finally*,—The following verse too supposes the spreading of salvation over the whole earth. The entire relation of the first section to the second and third makes it obvious that by ארץ the whole earth is to be understood. The passage under consideration is alluded to in Hab. 2:14: “For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters covering the sea.” In that passage, the enforced knowledge of the Divine glory which manifests itself in punitive justice, forms the subject of discourse; but that enforced knowledge forms the necessary condition of the knowledge which is voluntary and saving.

Ver. 10. “*And it shall come to pass in that day, the root of Jesse which standeth for an ensign to the people, it shall the Gentiles seek, and His rest is glory.*”

The words, “and it shall come to pass,” introduce a new section; so that the interval in the Hebrew manuscripts is here quite in its place. With ver. 11 again, a new section begins. In ver. 1-9 we have the appearance of the Messiah in relation to the whole earth; then, in the second section, the way in which he becomes a centre to the whole *Gentile world*; and in ver. 11 ff., what He grants to the *old covenant-people*, for whom the Prophet was, in the first instance, prophesying, and whose future he therefore describes more in detail. Why His relation to the Gentile world is *first spoken of* appears from ver. 12; the Gentiles gathered to the Lord are the medium of His salvation to the old covenant-people.—The *root* designates here (and likewise in chap. 53:2), and in the passages founded upon this, viz., in Rev. 5:5, 22:16, the *product* of the root, that whereby the root manifests itself, the shoot from the root; just as “seed” so very often occurs for “product of the seed.” This appears from a comparison with ver. 1, where, more fully, the Messiah is called a twig from Jesse’s roots. *Bengel* has already directed attention to the antithesis of the root and ensign, in his Commentary on Rom. 15:12: “A sweet antithesis: the root is undermost, the ensign rises uppermost; so that even the nations farthest off may behold it.”—אֶרֶץ with ל, אֶל, and אֵל, has the signification “to apply to the true God, or some imaginary god, in order to seek protection, help, counsel, advice, disclosures regarding the future;” comp. Is. 8:19; Deut. 12:4, 5, and other passages in *Gesenius’ Thesaurus*. The Gentiles feel that they cannot do without the Redeemer; they see, at the same time, His riches and their poverty; and this knowledge urges them on to *seek* Him, that from him they may obtain

*light* (chap. 42:6), that He may communicate to them His *law* (chap. 42:4), that he may teach them of His ways, and that they may walk in His paths (chap. 2:3), &c. St. Paul, in Rom. 15:12, following the LXX., has ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσι, which, as regards the sense, fully agrees with the original. The beginning of the seeking took place when the representatives of the Gentile world, the Magi from the East, came to Jerusalem, saying: "Where is He that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen His star in the East and are come to worship Him," Matt. 2:2. The historical foundation and the type are the homage which, from the Gentile world, was offered to Solomon, 1 Kings 10—הַחֹנוּם "resting place," "dwelling place," "habitation;" comp. Ps. 132:13, 14: "For the Lord hath chosen Zion; He hath desired it for His *habitation*. This is my *rest* (יְתַחֲנוּם) for ever; here will I  *dwell*, for I have desired it." The glory of the King passes over to His residence to which the Gentile world are flowing together, in order to do homage to Him; comp. Ps. 72:10: "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts." The comparison of this passage alone is sufficient to refute the absurd interpretation, according to which מִיִּזְוֹ and מִיִּמְעֵם are referred to the Israelitish tribes,—an interpretation which has been tried with as little success in the fundamental passage (Gen. 49:10), according to which the מִיִּמְעֵם are to adhere to Shiloh; compare Vol. i. p. 62.

Ver. 11. "And it shall come to pass in that day, the Lord shall continue a second time with His hand to ransom the remnant of His people which has remained from Asshur and from Egypt, from Patros and from Cush, from Elam and from Shinar, from Hamath and from the islands of the sea."

From the Gentiles, the Prophet now turns to Israel. The reception of the Gentiles into the Messianic Kingdom is not by any means to take place at the expense of the old covenant-people; even they shall be brought back again, and shall be received into the Kingdom of God. מִיִּסְוִי must be connected with תּוֹנֵקֵל, comp. 2 Sam. 24:1: "And the Lord continued to kill, לְהַרְגֵם. It is unnecessary and arbitrary to supply וְדִי לְהַרְגֵם Accusative, "as to his hand," equivalent to "with His hand;" comp. Ps. 3:5, 17:10, 11, 13, 14. Just the hand of God, which here comes into consideration as the instrument of *doing*, is repeatedly mentioned in the account of the deliverance from Egypt; comp. Exod. 3:20, 7:4, 13:9. The expression: "*He shall continue*," in general, points out the idea that it is not a new beginning which is here concerned, but the continuation of former acting, by which believing was rendered so much the more easy. The expression, "a *second time*," points more distinctly to the type of the *deliverance from Egypt* with which the redemption to be effected by Christ is frequently paralleled; comp. vers. 15, 16; Vol. i. p. 218, 219. "*From Asshur*," &c., must not be connected with תּוֹנֵקֵל, but with רַאשֵׁי, comp. 5:16, those who have remained from Asshur, &c., *i.e.*, those whom Asshur and the other places of punishment, with their hostile influences, have left, who have been preserved in them. The fact that destructive influences may proceed from those nations also which do not properly belong to the number of the kingdoms of the world, is plainly shown by the history of the Jews after Christ. It would be against the accents, both here and in ver. 6, to connect it with תּוֹנֵקֵל; the words "which shall remain" would, in that case, appear to be redundant; and, farther, it is opposed by Exod. 10:3: "And eats the residue of that which is escaped, which remaineth unto you from the hail," equivalent to; which the hail has left to you. Similar to this is 2 Chron. 30:6, where Hezekiah exhorts the children of Israel: "Turn again unto the Lord . . . in order that He may again return to the remnant which has been left to you from the hand of the kings of Asshur." A question here arises, *viz.*, whether the dispersion of Israel which is here described, had already taken place at the

time of the Prophet, or whether the Prophet, transferring himself in the Spirit into the distant future, describes the dispersion which took place at a later period, after the carrying away of the ten tribes into the Assyrian exile had preceded, viz., that which took place when Judah was carried away into the Babylonish exile, and especially after the destruction of Jerusalem. The latter view is the correct one. The whole tenor of the Prophet's words shows that he supposes a *comprehensive* dispersion of the people. It is true that, at the time when the prophecy was written, the ten tribes had already been carried away into captivity; but the kingdom of Judah, the subjects of which, according to ver. 12, likewise appear as being in the dispersion, had not yet suffered any important desolation. The few inhabitants of Judah who, according to Joel 4:6 (3:6), and Amos 1:6, 9, had been sold as slaves by the Philistines and Phoenicians, and others, who, it may be, in hard times had spontaneously fled from their native country, cannot here come into consideration. Just as here, so by Hosea too, the future carrying away of the inhabitants of Judah is anticipated; comp. vol. i., p. 219, 220. The fundamental passage is in Deut. 30:3, 4, where the gathering of Israel is promised "from all the nations whither the Lord thy God has scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out into the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will He fetch thee." This passage shows with what clearness the future scattering lay before the eyes of the holy men, even at the first beginnings of the people of God. In vers. 11 and 12 we have the summary of the whole of the second part of Isaiah, in which the announcement of Israel's being gathered and brought back is constantly repeated; and it is quite incomprehensible how some grant the genuineness of the prophecy before us, and yet bring forward, against this second part of Isaiah, the argument that the Prophet could not *suppose* the scattering, that it must really have taken place, since he simply announces their being brought back,—regards the redemption from the scattering, all that which history is realised in a series of events, is here united in one view. There is no reason for excluding the deliverance under Zerubbabel; for it, too, was already granted for the sake of Christ, whose incarnation the Prophet anticipates in faith; compare remarks on chaps. 7, 9. This redemption, however, in which those who have been brought back remain servants in the land of the Lord, can be considered as only a prelude to the true one; comp. vol. i., p. 220 f. 448. The true fulfilment began with the appearance of Christ, and is still going on towards its completion, which can take place even without Israel's returning to Canaan, comp. vol. i., p. 222. Asshur opens the list, and occupies the principal place, because it was through him who, under the very eyes of the Prophet, had carried away the ten tribes, that the dispersion began. But the Prophet does not limit himself to that which was obvious,—did not expect, from the Messiah, only the healing of already existing hurts.—With Asshur, *Egypt* is connected in one pair. Egypt is the *African* world's power struggling for dominion with the *Asiatic*. Its land serves not only as a refuge to those oppressed by the Asiatic world's power (comp. Jer. 42 ff.), but, in that struggle with the Asiatic power, itself invades and oppresses the land; comp. chap. 7:18; 2 Kings 23:29 ff.: "In his days Pharaoh Necho, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria." In a similar connection, Asshur and Egypt, the kingdoms on the Euphrates and the Nile, appear in chap. 27:13: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great trumpet is blown, and they come, the perishing ones in the land of Asshur, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and worship the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem;" Micah 7:12; Jer. 2:18; Lam. 5:6. As annexed to Egypt, the *second* pair presents itself, representing the uttermost *South*; compare the expression, "from the four corners of the earth," in ver. 12. Pathros, in Jer. 44:1, 15, also appears as a dependency of Egypt; and Cush, Ethiopia, was, at the Prophet's time, the ally of Egypt, chap. 37:9, 18, 20:3-6. *Gesenius* remarks on chap. 20:4: "Egypt and Ethiopia are, in the oracles of this time, always connected, just as the

close political alliance of these two countries requires.”—From the uttermost South, the Prophet turns to the uttermost East. “Elam is,” as *Gesenius* in his Commentary on chap. 21:2 remarks, “in the pre-exilic writers, used for Persia in general, for which afterwards סרפ becomes the ordinary name;” and according to Dan. 8:2, the Persian Metropolis Shushan is situated in Elam. It appears in chap. 22:6 as the representative of the world’s power which in future will oppress Judah, and we hence expect that it will appear in an Elamitic phase also.—Shinar, the ancient name for Babylon, is that world’s power which, according to chaps. 13, 14, 39, and other passages, is to follow after the Assyrian, and is to carry away Judah into exile. Elam and Madai appear in chap. 21:2 as the destroyers of the Babylonian world’s power; hence the Elamitic phase of it can follow after the Babylonish only. The geographical arrangement only can be the reason why it is here placed first.—The last of the four pairs of countries is formed by Hamath, representing Syria, (comp. 1 Maccab. 12:25, according to which passage Jonathan the Maccabee marches into the land of Hamath against the army of Demetrius,) and the islands of the sea, the islands and the countries on the shores of the Mediterranean in the uttermost West. As early as in the prophecy of Balaam, in Numb. 24:24: “And ships come from the side of Chittim and afflict Asshur, and afflict Eber, and he also perisheth,” we find the announcement that, at some future time, the Asiatic kingdoms shall be conquered by a power which comes from the West in ships, by European nations—an announcement which was realised in history by the dominion of the Greeks and Romans in Asia.

Ver. 12. *“And He setteth up an ensign to the Gentiles and assembleth the exiled of Israel, and gathereth together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.”*

The setting up of the ensign for the Gentiles, around which they are to assemble for the purpose of restoring Israel, took place, in a prelude, under Cyrus; comp. chap. 14:2, 49:22: ‘Thus saith the Lord God: Behold I lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the nations, and they bring thy sons on their bosom, and thy daughters are carried upon their shoulders;’ where the sons and daughters correspond to the exiled men of Israel, and to the dispersed women of Judah, equivalent to all the exiled and dispersed men and women. As early as in the Song of Solomon, we are taught that in the Messianic time the Gentile nations will take an active part in the restoration of Israel. According to the first part of that Song, the appearance of the heavenly Solomon is connected with the reception of the Gentiles into His Kingdom, and that, through the instrumentality of the old covenant people, as is intimated by the name of the daughters of Jerusalem; comp. my Comment. on Song of Solomon, 3:9-11. In the second part of that Song we have a description of the reunion of apostate Israel with Christ,—which reunion takes place by the co-operation of the daughters of Jerusalem, the same whom they formerly brought to salvation. According to Is. 66:20, the Gentiles, converted to the Lord in the time of salvation, bring the children of Israel for an offering unto the Lord.—A significant allusion to the passage before us is found in John 11:52: καὶ οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ θνους μόνον, ἀλλ’ να καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγη εἰς ν. It is the same mercy seeking that which is lost that manifests itself in the gathering of apostate Israel, and in the gathering of the Gentiles. What is said of the one furnishes, at the same time, the guarantee for the other.

Ver. 13. *“And the envy of Ephraim departeth, and the adversaries of Judah are cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.”*

According to the explanatory fourth clause, the “adversaries of Judah” in the second clause, can only be those among Judah who vex Ephraim. At the very beginning of the separation of the two kingdoms, their future reunion had been announced by a prophet; and this must now take place as certainly as Jehovah is God, who had promised to David and his house the eternal dominion over all Israel. The separation had taken place because the house of David had become unfaithful to its vocation. In the Messiah, the promise to the Davidic race is to be completely realized; *and this realization has*, for its necessary consequence, the *removal for ever* of the separation; comp. Ezek. 37:22. It was a *prelude* to the fulfilment, that a portion of the subjects of the kingdom of the ten tribes united with Judah in all those times when in the blessing accompanying the enterprises of a pious son of David, the promise granted to David was, in some measure realized,—as was the case under Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah. Even before Christ appeared in the flesh, the announcement here made was all but realized. The exile put an end to the kingdom of the ten tribes, and hence also to the unnatural separation which had been designated as the severest calamity of the past, chap. 7:17. The other tribes joined Judah and the restored sanctuary; comp. Acts 26:7; Luke 2:36. The name of “*Jews*” passed over to the whole nation; the jealousy disappeared. This blessing was conferred upon the people for Christ’s sake, and with a view to His future appearance. In Christ, the bond of union and communion is so firmly formed that no petty discord can alienate the hearts from one another.

Ver. 14. “*And they fly upon the shoulder of the Philistines toward the West, spoil together the children of the East; Edom and Moab shall be their assault, the children of Ammon their obedience.*”

As Israel is united internally, so it shall be externally powerful. According to the Song of Solomon 6:10, the congregation of Israel when, by her renewed connection with the Lord and His heavenly Solomon, she has regained her former strength, is “terrible as an army with banners.”—The nations mentioned are those of the Davidic reign. Even before the time of the Prophet, they had been anew conquered by Jehoshaphat, in whom the spirit of David had been revived anew; compare 2 Chron. 20; Ps. 83. A prelude to the fulfilment of the prophecy before us took place at the time of the Maccabees, comp. Vol. i. p. 467, 468. But as regards the fulfilment, we are not entitled to limit ourselves to the names here mentioned. These names are the accidental element in the prophecy; the thought is this: As soon as Israel realizes its destiny, it partakes of God’s inviolability, of God’s victorious” power. The Prophet’s sole purpose is to point out the victorious power, to give prominence to the thought that outward prosperity is the necessary consequence of inward holiness.—In the first clause, the image is taken from birds of prey; comp. Hab. 1:8: “They fly as an eagle hastening to eat,” which passage refers to the enemies of Israel at the time of wrath. In the time of *grace*, the relation will be just the reverse.—די חלשם occurs, in a series of passages in Deuteronomy, of that which is taken in hand, undertaken. Edom and Moab are no longer an object of *Noli me tangere* for them.

Ver. 15. “*And the Lord destroys the tongue of the Sea of Egypt, and waves His hand over the River with the violence of His wind, and smiteth it into seven streams, that one may go through in shoes.*”

Ver. 16. “*And there shall be a highway for the remnant of His people which was left from Asshur; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt.*”

The miraculous power of the Lord shall remove all obstacles to deliverance. These obstacles are represented by the Euphrates and the Red Sea (the tongue of the Sea of Egypt, equivalent to the point of it), with a reference to the fact that, among the countries, in ver. 11, from which Israel is to be delivered, there had been mentioned, *Egypt*, between which and the Holy Land was the Red Sea, and Asshur, situated on the other side of Euphrates. To Euphrates, upon which there will be repeated that which, in ancient times, was done in the case of Jordan, the Prophet assigns, in ver. 15, the last place, on account of ver. 16. The highway in that verse is prepared by the turning off of Euphrates, so that we might put: “And thus,” at the beginning of the verse. As regards the destroying, *מורחה*, it is the forced devoting to God of that which would not spontaneously serve him; compare remarks on Mal. 3:24. Objects of such devoting can properly be *persons* only, because they only are capable of spontaneous sanctification to God, as well as of wilful desecration. The fact that it is here transferred to the sea may be accounted for by its being personified. The destruction which is inflicted upon the sea is, in it, inflicted upon the enemies of God thereby represented, inasmuch as it opposes the people of God, and thus, as it were, strives against God.—*With the violence or terror of His wind, i.e.,* with His violent, terrible wind. There is in this an allusion to Exod. 14:21, according to which the Lord dried up the Red Sea by a violent wind. Against *Drechsler*, who thinks of “God’s breathing of anger,” first, this reference to Exod. 14:21, and farther, the circumstance that the *חור* appears as something which the Lord has in His hand, are decisive.—In ver. 16 we need not, after “from Asshur,” supply the other nations mentioned in ver. 11, which would be unexampled; but Asshur appears as the representative of all the enemies of God. Similarly in Micah also, Asshur is, with evident intention, used typically; comp. Vol. i. p. 515, 516.

## **CHAPTER 12**

This chapter contains Israel’s hymn of thanks after having obtained redemption and deliverance, and is connected with chap. 9:2 (3), where the Prophet had, in general, mentioned the joy of the elect in the Messianic time. Here he embodies it in words. The hymn, which forms a kind of close, and, to a certain degree, belongs to the whole cycle of the preceding Messianic prophecies, is based upon the hymn of thanksgiving by Israel after having passed through the Red Sea,—that historical fact which contained so strong a guarantee for the future redemption, and is in harmony with chap. 11:15, 16, where the Prophet had announced a renewal of those wonderful leadings of the Lord. The hymn falls into three stanzas, each consisting of two verses. In ver. 1 and 2, and in ver. 4 and 5, the redeemed ones are introduced speaking; ver. 3 and 5, which likewise form a couple, contain an epilogue of the Prophet on the double *jubilus* of the congregation.

Ver. 1. “*And in that day thou sayest: I will praise thee, O Lord, for thou wast angry with me, and now thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me. Ver. 2. Behold, God is my salvation; I trust, and am not afraid; for my strength and song is the Lord, and He became my Saviour.*”

The words “my strength and my song,” are from Exod. 15:2. The two members of the verse enter into the right relation to one another, and the *י* becomes intelligible, only if we keep in mind that the words at the beginning. “The Lord is my salvation,” are an expression of the conviction of the speaker; hence are equivalent to: we acknowledge Him as our God; so that the first part expresses the subjective disposition of the Church;

the second, the objective circumstance of the case—that on which that disposition is founded, and from which it grew up.

Ver. 3. “*And ye draw water in joy out of the wells of salvation.*”

During the journey through the wilderness, the bestowal of salvation had been represented under the form of granting water. It is to it that we have here an allusion. The spiritual water denotes salvation.

Ver. 4. “*And in that day ye say: Praise the Lord, proclaim His name, declare His doings among the nations, make mention that His name is exalted.* Ver. 5. “*Praise the Lord, for He hath done great things; this is known in all the earth.*”

Ver. 6. “*Cry out and shout thou inhabitant of Zion; for great is the Holy One of Israel in thy midst.*”

-----

There now follows a cycle of ten prophecies, which, in the inscriptions, have the name מִשָּׁר “burden,” and in which the Prophet exhibits the disclosures into the destinies of the nations which he had received on the occasion of the threatening Assyrian invasion under Sennacherib. For, from the prophecies against Asshur in chap. 14:24, 25, which is contained in the very first burden, it clearly appears that the cycle which, by the equality of the inscriptions, is connected into one well arranged and congenial whole belongs to this period. This prophecy against Asshur forms one whole with that against Babel, and by it the latter was suggested and called forth. In that prophecy, the defeat of Asshur, which took place in the 14th year of Hezekiah, is announced as future. It is true that the second burden, directed against the Philistines, in chap. 14:28-32, seems to suggest another time. Of this burden it is said, in ver. 28, that it was given in the year that king Ahaz died; not in the year in which his death was impending, but in that in which he died, comp. chap. 6:1. The distressed circumstances of the new king raised the hopes of the Philistines, who, under Ahaz, had rebelled against the Jewish dominion. But the Prophet beholds in the Spirit that, just under this king, the heavenly King of Zion would destroy these hopes, and would thrust down Philistia from its imaginary height. But from the time of the original composition of the prophecy, that of its *repetition* must be distinguished. That took place, as is just shewn by the prophecy’s being received in the cycle of the *burdens*, at the time when the invasion of Sennacherib was immediately impending. The Assyrians were the power from the *North*, by whom the threatened destruction would break in upon the Philistines; and the truth of the word should be verified upon them, that prosperity is only the forerunner of the fall. In the view of the fulfilment, Isaiah repeated the prophecy.

From the series of these *burdens*, we shall very briefly comment upon those which are of importance for our purpose. First,

## **CHAPTERS 13:1-14:27**

This prophecy does not contain any characteristically expressed Messianic element; but it is of no small consequence for bringing out the whole picture of the future, as it was before the mind of the Prophet. It is in it that Babel meets us distinctly and definitely as

the threatening world's power of the future, by which Judah is to be carried away into captivity.

The genuineness is incontrovertibly testified by the close; and it is only by a naturalistic tendency that it can be denied. With the announcement of the deliverance from Babel is first, in chap. 14:24, 25, connected an announcement of deliverance from Asshur; and then follows in ver. 26 and 27, the close of the whole prophecy from chap. 13:1, onward. Vers. 26 and 27, which speak of the whole earth and of all the nations, refer to chap. 13, where the Prophet had spoken of an universal judgment, comp. ver. 5, 9, 10, &c.; while, in the verses immediately preceding, one single people, the Assyrian only, were spoken of. It is thereby rendered impossible to separate chap. 14:24, 27 from the whole.

Behind the world's power of the present—the Assyrian—the Prophet beholds a new one springing up—the Babylonish. Those who have asserted that the prophecy against Babel is altogether without foundation as soon as Isaiah is supposed to have composed it, are utterly mistaken. Although the prophecy was by no means destined for the contemporaries only, as prophecy is generally destined for all times of the Church, yet, even for the Prophet's contemporaries, every letter was of consequence. If Israel's principal enemies belonged to the future, how very little was to be feared from the present ones; and especially if Israel should and must rise from even the deepest abasement, how should God not then deliver them from the lower distress and need? But just because weak faith does not like to draw such *inferences* the Prophet at the close expressly adverts to the present affliction, and gives to the weak faith a distinct and sure word of God, by which it may support itself, and take encouragement in that affliction.

The points of connection must not be overlooked which the prophecy in chap. 11 offers for the prophecy before us. We already met there the total decay of the royal house of David, the carrying away of Judah into exile, and their dispersion into all lands. It is on this foundation that the prophecy before us takes its stand: it points to the power by which these conditions are to be brought about. Farther—There, as well as here, the conditions of the future are not expressly *announced* as such, but *supposed*: the Prophet takes his stand in the future. There as well as here, the Prophet draws consolation in the sufferings of the present from a salvation to be bestowed in a far distant future only.

From the very outset, the Prophet announces an impending carrying away of the people, and, at the same time, that, even in this distress, the Lord would have compassion upon His people, comp. *e.g.* chaps. 5, 6. From the very outset, the Prophet clearly saw that it was not by the Assyrians that this carrying away would be effected. This must we consider to be fully proved by history. The progress which the prophecy before us offers, when compared with those former ones, consists in this circumstance only, that the Prophet here expressly mentions the names of the future destroyers. And in reference to this circumstance we may remark, that, according to the testimony of history, as early as at that time, the plan of the foundation of an independent power was strongly entertained and fostered at Babylon, as is clearly enough evidenced by the embassy of the viceroy of Babylon to Hezekiah.

In chap. 23:13—the prophecy against Tyre, which is acknowledged to be genuine by the greater number of rationalistic interpreters—the Prophet shows the clearest insight into the future universal dominion of Chaldea, which forms the point of issue for the prophecy before us. With perfect clearness this insight meets us in chap. 39 also, on which even *Gesenius* cannot avoid remarking: “The prophetic eye of Isaiah foresaw, even at that

time, that in a political point of view, Babylon would, in a short time, altogether enter into the track of Assyria.”

## **CHAPTERS 17, 18**

These two chapters form one whole, as, generally, the series of the ten *burdens* is nowhere interrupted by inserted, heterogeneous, independent portions. Chapter 20 forms an appendix only to chapter 19. In the same manner, the prophecy against Sebna in chap. 22:16-25, stands in an internal connection with vers. 1-15; in that which befel him, the destinies of the people were to be typified. That these two chapters belong to one another is clearly proved by the parallelism of chap. 17:10, 11, and chap. 18:4-6.

The inscription runs: “Burden of Damascus.” It is at the commencement of the prophecy that the Syrians of Damascus are spoken of; the threatening soon after turns against Judah and Israel. This is easily accounted for by the consideration that the prophecy refers to a relation where Judah and Israel appear in the retinue of Damascus. It was from Damascus that, in the Syrico-Damascenic war, the whole complication proceeded. Aram induced Israel to join him in the war against Judah, and misled Judah to seek help from Asshur. In a general religious point of view, also, all Israel, the kingdom of the ten tribes, as well as Judah, were at that time, as it were, incorporated into Damascus; comp. ver. 10, according to which Israel’s guilt consisted in having planted strange vines in his vineyard, with 2 Kings 16:10, according to which Ahaz got an altar made at Jerusalem after the pattern of that which he had seen at Damascus. The circumstance that Israel had become like Damascus, was the reason why it was given up the Gentiles for punishment.

From the comparison of chap. 10:28-34, it appears that chap. 17:12-14 belongs to the time of Hezekiah, when Israel was threatened by the invasion of Sennacherib. In chap. 17:1-11, in which, at first, the overthrow of Damascus and the kingdom of the ten tribes appears as still future, the Prophet thus transfers himself back to the stand-point of an earlier time. To this result we are also led by the chronological arrangement of the whole collection. The Prophet, stepping back in spirit to the beginning of the complication, surveys the whole of the calamity and salvation which arise to Israel from the relation to Asshur and the whole world’s power represented by Asshur—a relation into which it had been led by Damascus—and takes a view of the punishment which it receives by its sins, by its having become worldly, and of the Divine mercy which sends deliverance and salvation.

The threatening goes as far as chap. 17:11. The rod of chastisement is, in the first instance, in the hand of Asshur; but he, as has been already mentioned, represents the world’s power in general. With this, the promise connects itself. The oppressors of the people of God are annihilated, chap. 17:12-14. All the nations of the earth, especially Ethiopia, which was, no less than Israel, threatened by Asshur (comp. chap. 37:9), and to which Egypt at that time occupied the position of a subordinate ally, perceive with astonishment the catastrophe by which God brings about the destruction of His enemies, chap. 18:1-3. Or, to state it more exactly; Messengers who, from the scene of the great deeds of the Lord, hasten in ships, first, over the Mediterranean, then, in boats up the Nile, bring the intelligence of the catastrophe which has taken place to Gush, the land of the rustling of the wings—thus named from the rustling of the wings of the royal eagle of the world’s power, which, being in birth equal to Asshur, has there its seat, vers. 1 and 2; comp. chap. 8:8. All the inhabitants of the earth shall look with astonishment at the

catastrophe which is taking place, ver. 3, where the Prophet who, in vers. 1 and 2, had described the catastrophe as having already taken place, steps back to the stand-point of reality. In vers. 4-6, we have the graphic description of the catastrophe. At the close, we have, in ver. 7, the words which impart to the prophecy importance for our purpose.

*“In that time shall be brought, as a present unto the Lord of hosts, the people far stretched and shorn, and from the people terrible since it (has been) and onward, and from the people of law-law and trampling down, whose land streams divide, to the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the Mount Zion.”*

The expression, “shall be brought as a present,” (the word *שׁ* occurs, besides in this passage, only in Ps. 68:30; 76:12) points back to the fundamental passage in Ps. 68:30, where David says, “Because of thy temple over Jerusalem shall kings bring presents unto thee.” As outwardly, so spiritually too, the sanctuary lies *over* Jerusalem. The sanctuary of God over Jerusalem is the emblem of His protecting power, of His saving mercy watching over Jerusalem; so that, “because of thy temple over Jerusalem they bring,” &c., is equivalent to: On account of thy glorious manifestation as the God of Jerusalem. Gush is in that Psalm, immediately afterwards, expressly mentioned by the side of Egypt, which, at the Prophet’s time, was closely connected with it. “Princes shall come out of Egypt, Gush makes her hands to hasten towards God.”—According to *Gesenius*, and other interpreters, the *p* from the second clause is to be supplied before *דְּשַׁמְמָם*. But this is both hard and unnecessary. It is quite in order that, first, the offering of persons, and, afterwards, the offering of their gifts should be mentioned. Parallel is chap. 45:14: “The labour of Egypt and the merchandize of Ethiopia, and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine;” the difference is only this, that there first the goods are mentioned, and then the men. In chap. 66:20, we likewise meet men who are brought for an offering. The designations of the people who here appear as the type of the whole Gentile world to be converted at some future period, and who have been chosen for this honour in consequence of the historical circumstances which existed at the time of the Prophet, are taken from ver. 2. *Gesenius* is wrong in remarking in reference to them: “All these epithets have for their purpose to designate that distant people as a powerful and terrible one.” As *Gesenius* himself was obliged to remark in reference to the last words, “Whose land streams divide:” “This is a designation of a striking peculiarity of the country, not of the people,”—the purpose of the epithets can generally be this only, to characterise the people according to their different prominent peculiarities.—*דְּשַׁמְמָם* properly “drawn out,” “stretched,” Prov. 13:12, corresponds to the *הַדָּמ יִשְׁנָא* “men of extension or stature,” in chap. 45:14. High stature appears, in classical writers also, as a characteristic sign of the Ethiopians.—On *טְרוּמָה* “closely shorn” comp. chap. 50:6, where *טְרוּמָה* is used of the plucking out of the hair of the beard.—“To the people fearful since it and onward,” equivalent to: which all alone, and throughout its whole existence, has been terrible; compare *אִיֵּה יִמִּיֵּה* Nah. 2:9, and the expression: “from this day and forward,” 1 Sam. 18:9. For every-where one people only is spoken of, comp. ver. 1, according to which Egypt cannot be thought of.—*רַק רַק* “law-law” is explained from chap. 28:10, 13, where it stands beside *וְצַו וְצַו*, and designates the mass of rules, ordinances, and statutes. This is characteristic of the Egyptians, and likewise of the Ethiopians, who bear so close an intellectual resemblance to them. With regard to the connection of the verse with what precedes, *Gesenius* remarks: “The consequence of such great deeds of Jehovah will be, that the distant, powerful people of the Ethiopians shall present pious offerings to Jehovah,”—more correctly, “present themselves and their possessions to Jehovah.”—A

prelude to the fulfilment Isaiah beheld with his own eyes. It is said in 2 Chron. 32:33: “And many (in consequence of the manifestation of the glory of God in the defeat of Asshur before Jerusalem) brought gifts unto the Lord to Jerusalem.” Yet, we must not limit ourselves to that. The real fulfilment can be sought for only at a later time, as certainly as that which the Prophet announces about the destruction of the world’s power exceeds, by far, that isolated defeat of Asshur, which can be regarded as a prelude only to the real fulfilment; and as certainly as he announces the destruction of Asshur generally, and, under his image, of the world’s power. “He who delights in having pointed out the fulfilment of such prophecies in the later history”—*Gesenius* remarks—“may find it in Acts 8:26 ff., and still more, in the circumstance that Abyssinia is, up to this day, the only larger Christian State of the East.”—In consequence of the glorious manifestation of the Lord in His kingdom, and of the conquering power which, in Christ, He displayed in His relation to the world’s power, there once existed in Ethiopia a flourishing Christian Church; and on the ground of this passage before us, we look at its ruins which have been left up to this day, with the hope that the Lord will, at some future time, rebuild it.

## **CHAPTER 19**

The burden of Egypt begins with the words: “Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and cometh into Egypt, and the idols of Egypt are moved at His presence, and the heart of Egypt melteth in the midst of it.” The clouds with which, or accompanied by which, the Lord comes, are, in the Old and New Testament writings, symbolical indications and representations of judgment; compare my remarks on Rev. 1:7; and besides the passages quoted there, compare in addition Jer. 4:13; Rev. 14:14. But what judgment is here spoken of? According to *Gesenius* and other interpreters, the calamity is the victory of Psammeticus over the twelve princes, with which physical calamities are to be joined. But against this view, ver. 11 alone is conclusive, inasmuch as, according to this verse, Pharaoh, at the time when this calamity breaks in upon Egypt, is the ruler of the whole land: “How say ye unto Pharaoh: I am the Son of the wise a (spiritual) son of the kings of ancient times,” who are celebrated for their wisdom. In ver. 2, according to which, in Egypt, kingdom fights against kingdom, we cannot, therefore, think of independent kingdoms: but following the way of the LXX., νόμος ἐπὶ νόμον, of provinces only. Further,—According to *Gesenius*, the fierce lord and cruel king in ver. 4 is assumed to be Psammeticus. But against this the plural alone is decisive. Ezek. 30:12—according to which outward enemies, the מִרְיָא, are the cause of the drying up of the Nile, of the ceasing of wealth and prosperity—militates against the assumption of a calamity independent of the political one. The circumstance, that the prophecy under consideration belongs to the series of the *burdens*, and was written in the view of Asshur’s advance, leaves us no room to doubt that the Lord is coming to judgment in the oppression by the Asiatic world’s power. To this may be added the analogy of the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel against Egypt, which are evidently to be considered as a resumption of the prophecy under consideration, as an announcement that its realization is constantly going on. They do not know any other calamity than being given up to the Asiatic world’s power. Compare *e.g.* Jer. 46:25, 26: “And behold, I visit Pharaoh and Egypt, and their gods and their kings, Pharaoh and them that trust in him. And I deliver them into the hand of those that seek their soul, and into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.” After what we have remarked, the discord among the Egyptians in ver. 2, can be considered as the consequence and concomitant of the real and main calamity only: “Where God is not in the midst, there, commonly, internal discord is wont to follow upon severe outward affliction, inasmuch as one always imputes to the other the cause of

matters going on so badly. And what is said of the drying up of the Nile, we shall thus likewise be obliged to consider as a consequence of the hostile oppression. Waters are, in Scripture, the ordinary image of prosperity; compare remarks on Rev. 17:1, 8, 40; 16:4. Here the Nile specially is chosen as the symbol of prosperity, inasmuch as upon it the woe and weal of Egypt chiefly depended. In consequence of the hostile invasion which consumes all the strength of the land, the Nile of its prosperity dries up; “its very foundations are destroyed, all who carry on craft are afflicted.”

The scope of the prophecy is this: The Lord comes to judgment upon Egypt (through Asshur and those who follow in his tracks), ver. 1. Instead of uniting all the strength against the common enemy, there arises, by the curse of God, discord and dissolution, ver. 2. Egypt falls into a helpless state of distress, ver. 3. “And I give over Egypt into the hand of hard rule, and a fierce king (*Jonathan: potens*, sc. Nebuchadnezzar) shall rule over them, saith the Lord, Jehovah of hosts,” ver. 4. The fierce king is the king of Asshur, the Asiatic kingdom; compare the mention of Asshur in ver. 23-25; LXX. βασιλεῖς σκληροί. For, the fact that the unity is merely an *ideal* one, is most distinctly and intentionally pointed at by the מִנְדָּא preceding. The prosperity of the land is destroyed, ver. 5-10. The much boasted Egyptian wisdom can as little avert the ruin of the country as it did formerly, in ancient times; its bearers stand confounded and ashamed; nothing will thrive and prosper, vers. 11-15. But the misery produces salutary fruits; it brings about the conversion of Egypt to the God of Israel, and, with this conversion, a full participation in all the privileges and blessings of the Kingdom of God shall be connected, ver. 16, and especially vers. 18-25. This close of the prophecy, which for our purpose is of special consequence, we must still submit to a closer examination.

Ver. 18. “*In that day shall be five cities in the land of Egypt which speak the language of Canaan and swear to the Lord of hosts; city of destruction the one shall be called.*”

*Five*, as usual, here comes into consideration as the half of *ten*, which number represents the whole; “*five cities*,” therefore, is equivalent to: a goodly number of cities. On the words: “Who speak the language of Canaan,” *Gesenius* remarks: “With the spreading of a certain religion resting on certain documents of revelation, as *e.g.* the Jewish religion, the knowledge of their language, too, must be connected.” We must not, of course, limit the thought to this, that Hebrew was learned wherever the religion of Jehovah spread. When viewed more deeply, the language of Canaan is spoken by all those who are converted to the true God. Upon the Greek language, *e.g.* the character of the language of Canaan has been impressed in the New Testament. That language which, from primeval times, has been developed in the service of the Spirit, imparts its character to the languages of the world, and changes their character in their deepest foundation.—“To swear to the Lord” is to do Him homage: *Michaelis: Juramento se Domino obstringent*; comp. chap. 45:23: “Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.” In the words: “City of destruction, סָרָה, one shall be called”, there is contained an allusion to סָרָה רִיק, “*city of the Son*” (Heliopolis) which was peculiar to one of the chief seats of Egyptian idolatry. It is the celebrated *On* or *Bethshemish* of which Jeremiah prophesies in chap. 43:13: “And he (Nebuchadnezzar) breaketh the pillars in Bethshemish, that is in the land of Egypt, and the houses of the gods of Egypt he burneth with fire.” This allusion was perceived as early as by *Jonathan*, who thus paraphrases: “*Urbs domus solis quae destructor.*” By this allusion it is intimated that salvation cannot be bestowed upon the Gentile world in the state in which it is; that punitive justice must prepare the way for salvation: that everywhere the destructive activity of God must precede that which builds up; that the

way to the Kingdom of God passes through the fire of tribulation which must consume every thing that is opposed to God; compare that which Micah, even in reference to the covenant-people, says regarding the necessity of taking, before giving can have place, vol. i., p. 517.

Ver. 19. *“In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord.”*

That the altar is to be considered as a “monument” only is a supposition altogether far-fetched, and which can the less find any support in the isolated case, Josh. 22, that that account clearly enough intimates how decidedly the existence of an altar furnishes a foundation for the supposition that sacrifices are to be offered up there, a supposition intimated by the very name in Hebrew. If it was meant to serve some other purpose, it would have been necessary expressly to state it, or, at least, some other place of sacrifice ought to have been assigned for the sacrifices mentioned in ver. 21. But as it stands, there cannot be any doubt that the altar here and the sacrifices there belong to one another. This passage under consideration is of no little consequence, inasmuch as it shows that, in other passages where a going up of the Gentiles to Jerusalem in the Messianic time is spoken of, as, *e.g.*, chap. 66:23, we must distinguish between the thought and the embodiment. The *pillar* at the border bears an inscription by which the land is designated as the property of the Lord, just as it was the custom of the old eastern conquerors, and especially of the Egyptians, to erect such pillars in the conquered territories.

Ver. 20. *“And it is for a sign and for a witness to the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt: When they cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, He shall send them a Saviour and a Deliverer; and he shall deliver them.”*

Altar and pillar, as a sign and witness of the confession to the Lord, are, at the same time, a guarantee of the deliverance to be granted by Him. According to *Gesenius*, the Prophet speaks “without a definite historical reference, of a saving or protecting angel.” But we cannot think of an angel on account of the plain reference to the common formula in the Book of Judges, by which it is intimated that, as far as redemption is concerned, Egypt has been made a partaker of the privileges of the covenant-people. It is just this reference which has given rise to the general expression; but it is Christ who is meant: for the prophets, and especially Isaiah, are not cognizant of any other Saviour for the Gentile world than of Him; and it is He who is suggested by the Messianic character of the whole description.

Ver. 21. *“And the Lord is known to the Egyptians, and the Egyptians know the Lord in that day, and offer sacrifice and oblation, and vow vows unto the Lord, and perform them.”*

Ver. 22. *“And the Lord smiteth the Egyptians so that He healeth them, and they are converted to the Lord, and He shall be entreated by them, and shall heal them.”*

We have here simply a recapitulation. The prophet describes anew the transition from the state of wrath to that of grace—not, as *Drechsler* thinks, what they experience in the latter. Upon Egypt is fulfilled what, in Deut. 32:39, has been said in reference to Israel.

Ver. 23. *“In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Asshur, and Asshur cometh into Egypt, and Egypt into Asshur, and Egypt serveth with Asshur.”*

דָּבַע with תָּא has commonly the signification “to serve some one;” here, however, אֶת is used as a preposition: Egypt serves God *with* Asshur. Yet there is an allusion to the ordinary use of דָּבַע with תָּא in order to direct attention to the wonderful change: First, Egypt serves Asshur, and the powers that follow its footsteps; then, it serves *with* Asshur. Here also it becomes manifest that the deliverer in ver. 20 is no ordinary human deliverer; for such an one could help his people only by inflicting injury upon the hostile power.

Ver. 24. “*In that day Israel shall be the third with Egypt and with Asshur, a blessing in the midst of the earth.*”

The “blessing” is not “that union of people formerly separated,” but it is *Israel* from which the blessing is poured out upon all the other nations; compare the fundamental passage, Gen. 12:1-3, and the word of the Lord: ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν, John 4:22.

Ver. 25. “*For the Lord of Hosts blesseth him, saying: Blessed be Egypt my people, and Asshur the work of mine hands, and Israel mine inheritance.*”

The suffix in וְכָרַב refers to every thing mentioned in ver. 24. “Assyria and Egypt are called by epithets which elsewhere are wont to be bestowed upon Israel only.”

It is scarcely necessary to point out how gloriously this prophecy was fulfilled; how, at one time, there existed a flourishing Church in Egypt. Although the candlestick of that Church be now removed from its place (“*Satanas in hac gente sevit zizania*”—*Vitringa*), yet we are confident of, and hope for, a future in which this prophecy shall anew powerfully manifest itself. The broken power of the Mohammedan delusion opens up the prospect, that the time in which this hope is to be realized is drawing nigh.

## CHAPTER 23

### THE BURDEN UPON TYRE

In the view of Sennacherib’s invasion, the eyes of the Prophet are opened, so that he beholds the future destinies of the nations within his horizon. It is under these circumstances that it is revealed to him that Tyre also, which, not long before, had successfully resisted the attack of Asshur, and had imagined herself to be invincible, would not”, for any length of time, be able to resist the attack of the Asiatic world’s power.

The threatening goes on to ver. 14; it is, in ver. 13, concentrated in the words: “Behold the land of the Chaldeans, this people which was not, which Asshur assigns to the beasts of the wilderness,—they set up their watch-towers, they arouse her palaces, they bring them to ruin,” The correct explanation of this verse has been given by *Delitzsch* in his Commentary on Habakkuk, S. xxi. Before the capture of Tyre could be assigned to the Chaldeans, it was necessary to point out that they should overthrow Asshur, the representative of the world’s power in the time of the Prophet. The Chaldeans, a people which, up to that time, were not reckoned in the list of the kingdoms of the world, destroy, in some future period, the Assyrian power, and shall then inflict upon Tyre that destruction which Asshur intended in vain to bring upon it.

Upon the threatening there follows the promise. Ver. 15. “*And it shall come to pass in that day, and Tyre is forgotten seventy years like the days of one king. After the end of seventy years, it shall be unto Tyre according to the song of the harlot.*” Ver. 16. “*Take the harp, go about the city, forgotten harlot, make sweet melody, sing many songs, that thou mayest be remembered.*” Ver. 17. “*And it shall come to pass, after the end of seventy years, the Lord will visit Tyre, and she returneth to her hire of whoredom, and whoreth with all the kingdoms of the earth upon the surface of the earth.*” Ver. 18. “*And her gain and hire of whoredom shall be holy unto the Lord; not is it treasured and laid up, but to those who sit before the Lord its gain shall be, that they may eat and be satisfied, and for durable clothing.*”

On the “70 years, like the days of one king.” *Michaelis* very pertinently remarks: “Not of one individual, but of “one reign or empire, *i.e.* as long as the Babylonian empire shall last, which, after 70 years, was destroyed by Cyrus.” The necessary qualification follows from ver. 13. According to that verse, the one king can be the king of the Chaldeans only. Parallel are the 70 years which, in Jer. 25:11, 12, are assigned to the Chaldean empire: “And these nations serve the king of Babylon 70 years. And it shall come to pass, when the 70 years are accomplished, I will visit upon the king of Babylon, and upon that nation, saith the Lord, their iniquity.” In the Commentary on Rev. 2:1, p. 75, 200, it was proved that, in Scripture, kings are frequently *ideal* persons; not individuals, but personifications of their kingdoms. *Gesenius*’ objection, that the time of the Babylonish dynasty, from the pretended destruction of Tyre to the destruction of Babylon, did not last 70 years, vanishes by the remark that the Prophet says “like the days;” that, hence, it is expressly intimated that the 70 years here, differently from what is the case in Jeremiah, are to be considered as a *round* designation of the time. From a comparison of Jeremiah we learn that the Chaldean dominion will last 70 years *in all*. Into which point of that period the destruction of Tyre is to fall, Isaiah does not disclose. It is quite proper that in reference to Tyre the announcement should not be so definite, in point of chronology, as in reference to Judah. That the capture of Tyre by the Chaldeans, which is here announced, really took place, has been more thoroughly established in my book: *De rebus Tyrriorum*; and afterwards by *Dreschsler* in his Commentary on Isaiah, and by *Hävernich* in his Commentary on Ezekiel.

After the end of the 70 years, Tyre is to resume her trade of whoring, and is to carry it on to a wide extent, and with great success. “By the image of whoredom”—so we remarked in commenting upon Rev. 14:8—“in some passages of the Old Testament, that selfishness is designated which clothes itself in the garb of love, and, under its appearance, seeks the gratification of its own desires. In Is. 23:15 ff., Tyre is, on account of her mercantile connections, called a whore, and the profit from trade is designated as the reward of whoredom. The point of comparison is the endeavour to please, to feign love for the sake of gain.” Under the dominion of the Persians, Tyre again began to flourish.

Tyre’s reward of whoredom is consecrated to the Lord, and the bodily wants of His servants are provided from it,—quite in agreement with the words of the Apostle: εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐσπείραμεν, μέγα, εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσομεν; 1 Cor. 9:11. Converted Tyre offers, in these gifts, its thanks for the noble gift which it received from the sanctuary. *Vitringa*, who remarks that the Prophet was fully aware of “the great interval of time that would intervene betwixt the restoration of Tyre, and her dedication of herself, with her gains, to the Lord,” is right, while *Drechsler*, who is of opinion that the

doings of consecrated Tyre also are represented under the image of whoring, is wrong. Whoring designates a sinful conversation which is irreconcilable with conversion to the Lord. It does not designate trade, as such, but trade as it is carried on by those who, with unrenewed hearts, serve the god Mammon. We have here before us two stages, strictly separated. *First*, she resumes her old whorings; *then*, she consecrates her gain to the Lord. The severe catastrophe intervening, the new capture of Tyre, as it took place by Alexander, is not yet beheld by Isaiah. The announcement of it was reserved for the post-exilic Prophet Zechariah, chap. 9:3. The announcement of the future conversion of Tyre received, in the time of Christ, a symbolical representation as it were, in the Canaanitish woman. *Vitringa* says: "The first fruits of this grace were received by that wise Canaanitish woman, who had been, taught, as if she had been in the school of Christ, to ask for divine grace; whom Matth. 15:22, calls a woman of Canaan, Mark 7:26, a Syrophenician; but who was no doubt a Tyrian, inasmuch as she obtained mercy from Christ the Lord himself, while He sojourned in the territory of Tyre and Sidon. Paul found at Tyre a congregation of disciples of Christ already in existence, Acts 21:3 ff. At a subsequent period, there existed at Tyre a flourishing and wealthy church. *Eusebius* and *Jerome* describe to us, from their own experience, the fulfilment of this prophecy.

## CHAPTERS 24-27

Upon the ten single "burdens" as they were called forth by the threatening Assyrian catastrophe, there follows here a comprehensive description of the judgments of God upon His people, and upon the world's power hostile to His Kingdom. The characteristic feature in it is, that the Prophet abstains from all details.

The prophecy begins in chap. 24:1-13, with the threatening of the judgment upon Judah. The fact that Judah is here spoken of, not alone, it is true, but together with his companions in suffering, with all the other nations crushed like him by the world's power in its various phases (verse 4 most clearly shows that it is not Judah alone which is spoken of; compare the same comprehensive mode of representation in Jer. 25; Hab. 2:6), appears from ver. 5: "For they transgressed the *laws*, violated the *ordinances*, broke the everlasting *covenant*" where there can exist only a collateral reference to the Gentile world; from ver. 13, where the continuing gleaning is characteristic of the covenant-people (comp. 17:6); but especially from ver. 23, where, after the time of punishment, the Lord reigneth on Mount Zion.

The judgment upon Judah bears a comprehensive character. As the single phases of the world's power, by which the sins of the people of God are visited, there had been mentioned in the cycle of the *burdens.*, Asshur in chap. 14:25; Babylon in chap. 13, 14, 21, (the circumstance that the first *burden* of the first half of the *burdens*, and likewise the first *burden* of the second half of the *burdens*—the ten *burdens* being thus divided into twice five—is directed against Babylon, shows that specially heavy judgments were to be inflicted by Babel); Elam in chap. 22:6 (comp. remarks on chap. 11:11). Here the idea of judgment upon the covenant-people is viewed *per se*, and irrespective of the particular forms of its realisation.

In vers. 14, 15, there is a sudden transition from the threatening to the promise: "They (the remnant left according to ver. 13) shall lift their voice, they shall shout for the majesty of the Lord, they shall cry aloud from the sea,"—from the sea into which they were driven away by the storm of the judgments of the Lord. To the "sea" here,

correspond the “islands of the sea,” in ver. 15; compare the mention of the islands in chap. 11:11. Ver. 15. “Therefore in the light praise ye the Lord, in the isles of the sea the name of the Lord God of Israel.” The words are addressed to the elect in the time of salvation. The Plural מִירָא denotes the *fulness* of light or salvation, comp. chap. 26:19; כּ is, in both instances, used in a local sense. The light is the spiritual territory; the isles of the sea, the natural.

Ver. 16 returns to the threatening; “From the uttermost parts of the earth we hear songs: Glory to the righteous! And I say: Misery to me, misery to me, woe to me! the treacherous are treacherous, and very treacherous are the treacherous.” The song of praise of the redeemed, which is heard coming forth from a far distant future, is suppressed by the same affliction which is immediately impending, by the look to the rod of chastisement by the world’s power with its treachery, its policy feigning love and concealing hatred, with which the Lord is to visit His people, and the floods of which, like a new flood, are, according to ver. 15, to overflow the whole earth. Compare the very similar transition from triumphant hope to lamentation over the misery of the future more immediately at hand, in Hab. 3:16.

In ver. 21, ff. the promise breaks forth anew. Ver. 21: “*And it shall come to pass in that day: the Lord shall visit the host of the height in the height, and the kings of the earth upon the earth.* Ver. 22. *And they are all of them gathered together as prisoners in the pit, and are shut up in the prison, and after many days they are visited.* Ver. 23. *And the moon blusheth, and the sun is ashamed, for the Lord of hosts reigneth on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients is glory.*”

In ver. 21 the destruction of the world’s power is announced. The “kings of the earth” form the explanation of the “host of the height.” It is very common to represent rulers under the image of stars; compare Numb. 24:17; Rev. 6:13, 8:10; Is. 14:12, 34:4, 5, compared with ver. 12. מִירָא is used in reference to the great ones of the earth in ver. 4, and in chap. 26:5, also. The explanation by evil heavenly powers has no Old Testament analogies in its favour.—In ver. 22, the words: “And after many days they are visited,” intimates that the time will appear very long to Zion, until the visitation takes place. “Many days,” or “a long time,” viz., after the beginning of their raging, which was to continue for a series of centuries, until Christ at length spoke: “Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.” The visitation consists in their being gathered together.—In ver. 23, the words: “The Lord reigneth,” contain an allusion to the formula used in proclaiming the accession of earthly kings to the throne, and point to an impending new and glorious manifestation of the government of the Lord,—as it were, a new accession to the throne; compare remarks on Ps. 93:1; Rev. 19:6. The “ancients” are the *ideal* representatives of the Church; compare remarks on Rev. 4:4. Before them is glory, inasmuch as the Lord imparts to them of His glory.

In chap. 25:1-5, the Lord is praised on account of the glorious redemption bestowed upon His people. “For thou hast made”—it is said in ver. 2—“of a city a heap, of a firm city a ruin, the palace of strangers to be no city; it shall not be built in eternity.” The city, palace (we must think of such an one as comes up to a city, as is even now the case with the palaces of the princes in India) bear an ideal character, and represent the whole fashion of the world, the whole world’s power; comp. ver. 12, chaps. 26:5, 27:10. *Gesenius* speaks of “the strange conjectures of interpreters who have guessed all possible cities.” But he himself has lost himself in the sphere of strange conjectures and guesses, by remarking:

“The city whose destruction is here spoken of can be none other than Babylon.” The circumstance that Babylon is not mentioned at all in the whole prophecy in chaps. 24-27 shows plainly enough that a special reference to Babylon cannot here be entertained; and the less so, that it would be against the character of our prophecy, which abstains from all details.

While in vers. 1-5 the discourse was laudatory and glorifying, and addressed to the Lord, in vers. 6-8 the Lord is spoken of:

Ver. 6. *“And in this mountain the Lord of hosts maketh unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of lees well-refined. Ver. 7. And destroyeth in the mountain the surface of the vail covering all the nations, and the covering cast upon all the nations. Ver. 8. And destroyeth death for ever, and the Lord Jehovah, wipeth away the tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of His people shall He take away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken.”*

“In this mountain,” ver. 6, where He enters upon His government (chap. 24:23), and dwells in the midst of His people in a manner formerly unheard of.—“Unto all people,” comp. chap. 2:2 ff. The verse under consideration forms the foundation for the words of Christ in Matth. 8:11: λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἤξουσιν καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; comp. 22:1 ff.; Luke 22:30. In ver. 7, “the surface of the vail” is the vail itself, inasmuch as it lies over it. The “covering” here comes into consideration as a sign of mourning, comp. 2 Sam. 15:30: “And David went up by the ascent of Mount Olivet, weeping, and his head covered, and so also all the people with him.” The explanation is given in ver. 8, where the **עֹלָב** is intentionally resumed. We cannot, therefore, agree with *Drechsler* who explains the being “covered,” by “dullness and deadness in reference to spiritual things.”—The first part of ver. 8 is again resumed in Rev. 7:17, 21:4. As death entered into the world by sin (Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:12), so it ceases when sin is completely overcome; compare 1 Cor. 15:54, where our passage is expressly quoted. Besides death, *tears* also are mentioned, inasmuch as they flow with special bitterness in the case of bereavements by death.—The Lord removes the rebuke of His people when all their hopes which formerly were mocked and laughed at, are fulfilled, and when, out of the midst of them, salvation for the whole world rises.

With the people of God in their exaltation, Moab is, in vers. 9-12, contrasted in its weakness and humiliation, and in its vain attempts to withdraw from the supremacy of the God of Israel. Moab comes here into consideration, only as the representative of all the kingdoms hostile to God, and obstinately persevering in their opposition to His Kingdom; just as Edom in chap. 34, 63. The representative character of Moab was recognized by *Gesenius* also, who thus determines the sense: “Whilst Jehovah’s protecting hand rests upon Zion, His enemies helplessly perish.” It is intentionally that Moab is mentioned, and not Asshur or Babel, because, in its case, the representative character could not so easily be mistaken or overlooked.—Ver. 12 returns to the world’s power in general.

In chap. 26, the rejoicing and shouting for the salvation are continued. A characteristic Messianic feature is contained in ver. 19 only, in which, as in chap. 25:8, the ceasing of death and the resurrection of the righteous appear as taking place in the Messianic time.

Ver. 19. *“Thy dead shall live, my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust! For a dew of light is thy dew, and thou makest fall to the earth the giants.”*

The saints are raised from the earth; the giants are sunk into the earth. The *גיאפּר* “giants” are identical with the *לִבְתַּיבְשִׁי* in ver. 18. There it was said in reference to the time of wrath: “We have not wrought any deliverance in the land, neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen;” compare vers. 9 and 21; Numb. 14:32. Parallel is the announcement of the defeat of “the world’s power in ver. 14. *גיאפּר*, it is true, is there used of the dead; but the signification of the word remains the same: The bodiless spirits were called *giants*, because they were objects of terror to the living; compare remarks on Ps. 88:11. The word is, in ver. 14, used with a certain irony.—“Light” is equivalent to “salvation.” The Plural signifies the fulness of light or salvation. The complete fulfilment which the words, “Thy dead shall live,” will find in the resurrection of the body, affords a guarantee for the fulfilment of the previous stages.

In chap. 27, it is especially ver. 1 which attracts our attention: *“In that day the Lord with His sword, hard, great, and strong, shall visit the leviathan, the tortuous serpent, and killeth the dragon that is in the sea.”*

We have here three designations of one and the same monster. *Gesenius*, on the other hand, rightly brings forward the accumulation of the attributes of the sword: With the three epithets applied to the sword, the three epithets of the monster to be killed by it pertinently correspond. The leviathan, the dragon, is, as it were, the king of the sea-animals, compare remarks on Ps. 74:13, 14. In the spiritual sea of the world, its natural antitype is the conquering world’s power; compare remarks on Rev. 12:3. But that which is meant is the whole world’s power, according to all its phases, which is here viewed as a whole; comp. ver. 13, where it is designated by Asshur and Egypt. The special reference to Babylon rests, here also, on a mere fancy.

-----

After the single discourses out of the Assyrian time, from chap. 7-27, there follows in chap. 28-33 the sum and substance of those not fully communicated. Even the uncommonly large extent of the section suggests to us such a comprehensive character. And so likewise does the fact that the same thoughts are constantly recurring, as is the case in several of the minor prophets also, *e.g.* Hosea. But what is most decisive is, that in chap. 28:1-4 Samaria appears as not yet destroyed. Considering that the chronological principle pervades the whole collection, this going back can be accounted for only by the circumstance that we have here a comprehensive representation. And we are the more led to this opinion that, in other passages of the same section, Jerusalem is represented as being threatened immediately. In this section, it is especially the passage in chap. 28:16 which attracts our attention; since, in the New Testament, it is referred to Christ.

*“Behold I have laid for a foundation in Zion a stone, a tried (stone), a precious corner stone of perfect foundation; he that believeth need not make haste,”* viz., for an escape or refuge for himself, Ps. 55:9. In opposition to false hopes, this stone is pointed to as the only true foundation, and all are threatened with unavoidable destruction who do not make it their foundation. The stone is the Kingdom of God, the Church; compare Zech. 3:9, where the Kingdom of God likewise appears under the image of the stone. But since the Kingdom of God (which in chap. 8:16, had been represented under the image of the quietly flowing waters of Siloah) is, for all eternity, closely connected with the house of David which centres in Christ, *that which, in the first instance, is said of the kingdom of God refers, at the same time, to its head and centre.* Parallel is Is. 14:32; “The Lord hath

founded Zion, and the poor of His people trust in it.” The *הַמִּצֵּד* here corresponds with the *הַצֵּד* with *ב* there. The difference is, that there Zion itself is the object of confidence, while here it is the stone which is in Zion. *There*, Zion is the *spiritual* Zion; not the mountain as an assemblage of stones, nor the outward temple as such, but Zion in so far as it is a sanctuary, the seat of the presence of the Lord. The Lord—such is the sense—has founded His Kingdom among us; and the circumstance that we are citizens of the Kingdom gives us security, enables us to be calm even in the midst of the greatest danger. *Here*, on the contrary, Zion is the outward Zion, and the Kingdom of God is the Church as distinguished from it. The Zion here corresponds to the holy mountains in Ps. 87:1, where, in a similar manner, a distinction is drawn between the material and spiritual Zion: “His foundation is in the holy mountains,” on which I remarked in my Commentary: “The foundation of Zion took place spiritually by its being chosen to be the seat of the sanctuary. It was then only that the place, already existing, received its spiritual foundation.” The stone laid by God as a foundation in Zion, in the passage under consideration, is, in substance, identical with the tent that He placed among men,” in Ps. 78:60. “In substance the sanctuary was erected by God alone, who, by fulfilling His promise, ‘I dwell in the midst of them,’ breathed the living soul into the body, and caused His name to dwell there.” In Ezek. 11 the substance of the sanctuary, the Shechinah, withdraws into heaven.—Our passage, farther, touches very closely upon chap. 8:14: “And He (the Lord) becomes a sanctuary and a stone of offence, and a rock of stumbling to both the houses of Israel, and a snare and a trap to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.” The stone *here* is the Church; *there* it is the Lord himself, according to His relation to Israel, the Lord who has become manifest in His Church. Another point of contact is offered by Ps. 118:22: “The stone which the builders rejected has become the corner-stone.” In that passage, too, the stone is the Kingdom and people of God: “The people of God whom the kingdoms of the world despised, have, by the working of God, then been raised to the dignity of the world-ruling people.”

A simple quotation of the passage before us is found in Rom. 10:11: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνηθήσεται. In chap. 9 ver. 33, we have chap. 8:14, and the passage under consideration blended in a remarkable manner: ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνηθήσεται, and from the remarks already offered, the right to this blending is evident. Peter, in 1 Pet. 2:6, 7, adds to these two passages, that in Ps. 118:22: διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ, ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον, ἐκλεκτὸν, ἔντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνηθῆ, ὅμιν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· ἀπιστοῦσι δὲ λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, on which *Bengel* remarks: “Peter quotes, in ver. 6 and 7, three passages, the first from Isaiah, the second from the Psalms, the third again from Isaiah. To the third he alludes in ver. 8, but to the second and first, in ver. 4, having, even then already both of them in his mind.” Matth. 21:42-44 refers only to Ps. 118 and to Is. 8:14, 15, to the latter passage in ver. 44; Acts 4 has Ps. 118 only in view.

The second Messianic passage of the section which is of importance for our purpose, is chap. 33:17.

*“Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty; they shall see the land that is far off.”*

The “King” is the Messiah. This appears from the reference to the Song of Solomon 1:16, where the bride says to the bridegroom, the heavenly Solomon, “Behold thou art *fair*, my

beloved” (comp. Ps. 45:3;) and from the words immediately following: “they shall see the land that is far off.” The wide extension of the Kingdom of God is indissolubly connected with the appearance of the Messiah. Those who refer the prophecy to Hezekiah refer “the land that is far off” (literally: “the land of distances”) to “a land stretching far out,” in antithesis to the siege when the people of Jerusalem were limited to its area, since the whole country was occupied by the Assyrians. But the passage, chap. 26:15: “Thou increasest the nation, O God, thou art glorified, thou removest all the boundaries of the land,” is conclusive against this explanation. Comparing this passage, as also chap. 60:4; Zech. 10:9, *Michaelis* correctly explains: “The land of distances is the Kingdom of Christ most widely propagated.” In chap. 8:9, likewise, the Gentile countries are designated by the “distances of the earth.” *Farther*—Hezekiah could not be designated simply by לַמְּ without the article. It is only by the utmost violence that the whole announcement can be limited to the events under Hezekiah, which everywhere form the foreground only. We might rather, with *Vitringa*, think of Jehovah, with a comparison of ver. 22: “For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our King; He will save us,” and of Ps. 48:3, where he is called בַּר דְּלֶמַח. To Jehovah, the passage, chap. 30:20, 21 also refers,—a passage which has been so often misunderstood: “And the Lord giveth you bread of adversity, and water of affliction, and not does thy teacher conceal himself any more, and thine eyes see thy Teacher. And thine ears hear a voice behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it; do not turn to the right hand, nor to the left.” The affliction prepares for the coming of the heavenly teacher; by it the eyes of the people have been opened, so that they are able to behold His glorious form. But although we should understand Jehovah by “the King in His beauty,” we must, at all events, think of His glorious manifestation in Christ Jesus, who said, He who sees me sees the Father, and in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily; and it was indeed in Christ that God, in the truest manner, revealed and manifested himself as the Teacher of His people.

The close of the whole of the first part of Isaiah is, in chaps. 34, 35 formed by a comprehensive announcement, *on the one hand*, of the judgments upon the God-hating world, here individualized by Edom, that hereditary enemy of Israel, who was so much the more fitted for this representation that his enmity was the most obstinate of all, and remained the same throughout all the phases of Israel’s oppression by the great kingdoms of the world (he always appears as he who helped to bring misery upon his brethren); and, *on the other hand*, of the mercy and salvation which should be bestowed upon the Church trampled upon by the world.

On chap. 34:4, 5, where the heaven is that of the princes, the whole order of rulers and magistrates; the stars, the single princes and nobles, compare my remarks on Rev. 6:13.

The description of the salvation in store for the Church, in chap. 35, is pre-eminently Messianic, although the lower blessings also are included which preceded the appearance of Christ. The description contains features so characteristic, that we must necessarily submit it to a closer examination.

Ver. 1. “*The wilderness and dry land shall be glad for it, and the desert shall rejoice and sprout like the bulb.*”

The wilderness is Zion—the Church to be devastated by the world.—“For it,”—*i.e.* for the judgment upon the world, as it was described in chap. 34 with which the changed fate of the Church is indissolubly connected.

Ver. 2. “*It shall sprout, and rejoice with joy and shouting. The glory of Lebanon is given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon. They shall see the glory of the Lord, the excellency of our God.*”

“The glory of Lebanon,” &c. is a glory like unto that of Lebanon. The real condition of the glory of Zion, or the Church, is brought before us in the subsequent verses only; it consists in the Lord’s glory being manifested in it. The majestic, wooded Lebanon, and fruitful Carmel, are contrasted with one another; the latter is put together with the lovely fruitful plain of Sharon, rich in flowers; compare remarks on Song of Sol. 7:6. *Michaelis* says: “The Lebanon excels among the forests; the Carmel among the fruitful hills; the Sharon among the lovely fields or valleys.”—To “see the glory of the Lord, the excellency of God” means to behold Him in the revelation of the full glory of His nature. Prophecy would have fed the minds of the people with vain hopes, if God had revealed himself in any other way than in Christ, the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:9), and who, along with His own glory, revealed, at the same time, that of the Father; for it was the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, John 1:14; 2:11.

Ver. 3. *Strengthen ye the slack hands, and confirm ye the tottering knees.*” The words are addressed to all the members of the people of God; they are to strengthen and confirm *one another* by pointing to the future revelation of the glory of the Lord.

Ver. 4. “*Say to them that are of a fearful heart: Be strong, fear not; behold, your God will come for vengeance, for a gift of God: He will come and save you.*”

“To them that are of a fearful heart,”—literally of a “hasty heart,” who allow themselves to be carried away by the Present, and are unmindful of the *respite finem*.—לומג and בָּקֵן Accusatives, used in the same manner as in verbs of motion, to designate the object of the motion.—On לומג, “gift,” comp. remarks on Ps. 7:5. “The gift of God” forms a contrast to the poor gifts, such as men offer. He conies for vengeance upon His enemies, and for bestowing the most glorious divine gifts upon His people. The words: “He will come and save you,” are an explanation of “the gift of God.” It is in Christ that the words: “He will come and save you,” found their true fulfilment,—a fulfilment to which every lower blessing pointed, and which is still going on, and constantly advancing.—That which in the subsequent verses, is said of the concomitant circumstances of this salvation, is by far too high to admit of the fulfilment being sought in any other than Christ. All these forced explanations, such as: “In their joy they feel *as if* they were healed” (*Knobel*, after the example of *Gesenius*), only serve to show this more clearly. They are overthrown even by the parallel announcement of the impending resurrection of the dead in chap. 25:8; 26:19.

Ver. 5. “*Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.*”

The blind and deaf are the individualizing designations of the wretched; in Luke 14:13-21, the blind are named along with the poor, lame, and maimed as an individualizing designation of the whole genus of *personae miserabiles*; compare John 5:3. But this individualizing designation must be carefully distinguished from the image. The blind and deaf are mentioned as the most perspicuous *species* in the *genus*; but they themselves are, in the first instance, meant, and that which has been said must, in the first instance, be fulfilled upon them. *Farther*—as blind and deaf are, without farther remark and qualification, spoken of, we shall, in the first instance, be obliged to think of the bodily

blind and deaf, inasmuch as they, according to the common *usus loquendi*, are thus designated. But a collateral reference to the *spiritually* blind and deaf must so much the rather be assumed, that they, too, form a portion of the genus here represented by the blind and deaf; and the more so that it is just Isaiah who so frequently speaks of spiritual blindness and deafness; compare chap. 29:18: “And in that day (in the time of the future salvation, when the Lord of the Church shall have put to shame the pusillanimity and timidity of His people), the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind see out of obscurity and darkness;” 42:18: “Hear ye deaf, and look ye blind and see;” 43:8: “Bring forth the blind people, that have eyes, and the deaf that have ears;” 56:10; 6:10; Matth. 15:14; John 9:39; Ephes. 1:18; 2 Pet. 1:9. Spiritual blindness and deafness are specially seen in the relation of the people to the leadings of the Church, and to the promises of Scripture. The blind cannot understand the complicated ways of God; the deaf have, especially in the time of misery, no ear for His promises. Besides the natural and spiritual blindness, Scripture knows of still a third; it designates as blind those who cannot see the way of salvation, the helpless and drooping; comp. my Commentary on Ps. 146:8; Zeph. 1:17; Isa. 42:7. Now, it is blindness and deafness of every kind which, along with all other misery, shall find a remedy at the time of salvation.—If we ask for the fulfilment, our eye is, in the first instance, attracted by Matt. 11:5, where, with an evident reference to the passage before us, the Lord gives to the question of John: “Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another,” the matter-of-fact answer, that the blind receive their sight, the deaf hear, the lame walk; comp. Matth. 15:31: ὥστε τοὺς ὄχλους θαυμάσαι βλέποντας κωφοὺς λαλοῦντας, κυλλοὺς ὑγιεῖς, καὶ χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας καὶ τυφλοὺς βλέποντας; 21:14: καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ τυφλοὶ καὶ χωλοὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ ἔθεράπευσεν αὐτούς; Mark 7:37, where after the healing of the deaf and dumb, the people say: καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκεν, καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ [τοὺς] ἀλάλους λαλεῖν. Yet shall we not be able to see, in these facts, the complete fulfilment of the prophecy, in so far as it refers to the healing of the bodily blind and deaf—inasmuch as it promises the healing of all, not of some only—but only a pledge of the complete fulfilment of it; just as Christ’s raising some from the dead only pre-figures what He shall do in the end of the days. The complete fulfilment belongs to the time of the resurrection of the just, of which it is said: Whatever is here afflicted, groans, prays, shall then go on brightly and gloriously. More comprehensive was the fulfilment which the prophecy received, in reference to spiritual blindness and deafness, immediately at the first appearance of Christ, who declared that He had come into the world, that they which see not, might see (John 9:39). But even here the completion as certainly belongs to the future world, as βλέπομεν ῥτι δι’ ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι.

Ver. 6. “*Then shall the lame leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall shout; for in the wilderness shall waters be opened, and streams in the desert.*”

The *leaping and shouting* imply that they have obtained deliverance from their bodily defects,—at this deliverance the preceding verse stopped—and proceed from the natural delight at the appearance of this salvation, personal as well as general, of which these are an emanation. On the first words especially, Acts 3:8 is to be compared, where it is said of the lame man to whom Peter, in the name of Jesus spoke, Arise and walk: καὶ ἔξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει καὶ εἰσῆλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος καὶ αἰνῶν τὸν θεόν; farther, Acts 8:7: πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ ἔθεραπεύθησαν; 14:8; John 5:9. Of *spiritual* lameness, Heb. 12:13 is spoken. It appears especially in dark times of affliction, as *Vitringa* says: “In the time of wild persecution, and when the Church languishes, not a few men begin to halt, to vacillate in their views,

to suspend their opinions,” &c. On the words: “the tongue of the dumb shall shout,” comp. Matt. 12:22: τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ ἔθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν. *Spiritual* dumbness is the incapacity for the praise of God which, in the time when salvation is withheld, so easily creeps in, and which is removed by the bestowal of salvation. The words: “For in the wilderness,” &c., state the ground of the leaping and shouting, point to the bestowal of salvation, which forms the cause. The *waters* are the waters of salvation, comp. remarks on chap. 12:3. The words contain, moreover, an allusion to Exod. 17:3 ff.; Numb. 20:11, where, during the journey through the wilderness, salvation is represented by the bestowal of water. The desert here is an image of misery.

Ver. 7. *“And the scorching heat of the sun becomes a pool, and the thirsty land, springs of water; in the habitation of dragons shall be their couching place, grass where formerly reeds and rushes.”*

“The scorching heat of the sun,” stands for “places scorched by the heat” (“parched ground,” English version). The passage chap. 49:10, forbids us to explain it by *mirage*, the appearance of water. The suffix in הצבר refers to Zion. Dragons like to make their abode especially in the waterless wilderness. The circumstance that Zion has there her couching place, supposes that it has been changed into a garden of God; while, on the contrary, in chap. 34:13, it is said of the world that “it becomes an habitation of dragons.” Besides the dry land, the moor-land which bears nothing but barren reeds, shall undergo a change; nourishing *grass* is to take its place; ריצח has no other signification than this.

Ver. 8. *“And a high-way shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the holy way; an unclean shall not pass over it; and it shall be for them, that they may walk on it, that fools also may not err.”*

“The way” is the way of salvation which God opens up to His people in the wilderness of misery; comp. chap. 43:19: “I will make a way in the wilderness, rivers in the desert;” Ps. 107:4: “They wandered in the wilderness, in the desert without ways,” where the pathless wilderness is the image of misery; Ps. 25:4; 27:11, where the ways of God are the ways of salvation which He reveals to His people, that they may walk in them. The way is *holy* (comp. remarks on chap. 4:3), because inaccessible to the profane world, to the *unclean*, who are not allowed to disturb the righteous walking on it; comp. ver. 9, which shows how entirely out of place is the remark that “the author, in his national hatred, will not allow any Gentiles to walk along with the covenant-people.” It is only as converted, as fellows and companions of the saints, that the Gentiles are allowed to enter on the way, and not as unclean and their enemies. The circumstance that even the foolish cannot miss the way, indicates the abundant fulness of the salvation, in consequence of which it is so easily accessible; and no human effort, skill, or excellence is required to attain the possession of it.

Ver. 9. *“No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast go up thereon, it shall not be found there; and the redeemed walk on it.”*

By the lion, the ravenous beast, heathenish wickedness and tyranny, the world’s power pernicious to the Kingdom of God, is designated; comp. remarks on chap. 11:7. The Lord declared that the fulfilment had taken place, when He said: Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.

Ver. 10. “And the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion, and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads. Joy and, gladness they shall obtain, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.”

## **GENERAL PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON CHAPTERS 40-66**

The historical section, chap. 36-39, forms the transition from the first to the second part of the prophecies of Isaiah. Its close is formed by the announcement of Judah’s being carried away to Babylon, an announcement which Isaiah uttered to Hezekiah after the impending danger from the Assyrians had been successfully warded off, as had been mentioned in the preceding chapter. In chap. 39:6, 7, it is said: “Behold days are coming, and all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon, and nothing shall be left, saith the Lord. And of thy sons shall they take away, and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon.” In this announcement, we have at the same time the concentration of the rebuking and threatening mission of the Prophet, and the point from which proceeds the *comforting* mission which, in the second part, is pre-eminently attended to. This second part at once begins with the words: “Comfort ye, comfort ye my people,” which stand in closest connection with the preceding announcement of a great calamity, yea, even necessarily demand this. It is just for this reason that the historical chapters cannot be a later addition and interpolation, but must be an original element of the collection written by the Prophet himself.<sup>15</sup>

The contents of the second part are stated at once, and generally, in the introductory words, chap. 40:1, 2: “Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak to the heart of Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, that she receives of the Lord’s hand double for all her sins.” The *comfort* must, accordingly, form the fundamental character of the second part. But since, for the people of God, there does not exist any purely external salvation; since, for them, salvation is indissolubly connected with *repentance*,—*exhortation* must necessarily go hand in hand with the announcement of salvation. This second feature and element concealed behind the first, is, moreover expressly brought forward in what immediately follows, inasmuch as by it the “Comfort ye” does not receive any addition, but is only commented upon and enlarged. The servants of the Lord (the whole chorus of the messengers of the divine salvation is addressed in vers. 3, 5), complying with His command, announce the impending salvation, designating it as a manifestation of the Lord’s glory, and exhort to a worthy preparation for it. Vers. 3 and 4 treat of preparing in the desert a high-way for the Lord, who is to manifest himself gloriously. The way is prepared by repentance; the desert symbolizes the condition of bodily and spiritual misery. It is from this miserable condition that the Lord is to deliver and redeem His people; but in order that He may perform His part, they must, previously, have performed theirs. In ver. 5, this manifestation itself is described, with which is connected the fulness of salvation for the covenant-people. The servants of God are to announce the approach of salvation to mourning Jerusalem, in which the covenant-people appears to the Prophet as personified. (Jerusalem does not stand for “the carried away Zionites;” it is an ideal person, the afflicted and bowed down widow sitting on the ground in sackcloth; the distressed and mourning mother of the children partly carried away, and partly killed,—compare chap. 3:26, where Jerusalem, desolate and emptied, sits upon the ground.) But this salvation can be granted to those only whose hearts are prepared to receive it. Thus the announcement of salvation is preceded by the μετανοεῖτε, by the call to remove all the obstacles which

render impassable the path through the desert into the land of promise; which render impossible the transition from misery to salvation; which prevent the Lord from coming to His people in their misery, and leading them out from it. Then, to those who have complied with the exhortation, the manifestation of the glory of the Lord is promised—He comes to them, in a glorious manifestation, in the way which, in the power of His Spirit, they have prepared and opened up to Him—and in, and with it, all the glorious things which, according to ver. 2, the servants of the Lord were to promise regarding the Future.

The comfort oftentimes moves in general terms, and consists in pointing to a Future full of salvation and grace. But, in other passages, the announcement of salvation is more individualised, becomes more special. These special announcements refer to a twofold object. *First*—The Prophet comforts his people by announcing the deliverance from the Babylonish captivity. This deliverance he describes by the most lovely images, frequently taken from the deliverance of the people from Egypt. But it is to be well observed that even those prophecies which pre-eminently refer to the lower object, have something exuberant and overflowing; so that, even after having been fulfilled, they cannot be looked upon as antiquated. He states the name of the ruler, *Koresh*, the king from the rising of the sun, who, sent by the Lord, shall punish the oppressors of Zion, and bring back the people to their land. The *second* object is the deliverance and salvation by the Servant of God, the Messiah, who, after having passed through humiliation, suffering, and death, and having thereby effected redemption, will remove from the glorified Kingdom of God all the evil occasioned by sin. Of this higher salvation the soul of the Prophet is so full, that the references to it are constantly pressing forward, even where, in the first instance, he has to do with the lower salvation. In the description of the higher salvation, the relation of time is not observed. Now, the Prophet beholds its Author in His humiliation and suffering; then, the most distant Future of the Kingdom of Christ presents itself to his enraptured eye,—the time in which the Gentile world, alienated from God, shall have returned to Him; when all that is opposed to God shall have been destroyed; when inward and outward peace shall prevail, and all the evil caused by sin shall have been removed. Elevated above time and space, from the height in which the Holy Spirit has placed him, he surveys the whole development of the Messianic Kingdom, from its small beginnings to its glorious end.

While the first part, containing the predictions which the Prophet uttered for the present generation during the time of his ministry, consists mainly of single prophecies which, separated by time and occasion, were first made publicly known singly, and afterwards united in a collected whole, having been marked out as different prophecies, either by inscriptions, or in any other distinguishable way,—the second part, destined as a legacy for posterity, forms a continuous, collected whole. The fact, first observed by *Fr. Rückert*, that it is divided into *three sections or books*, is, in the first instance, indicated by the circumstance that, at the close of chap. 48 and chap. 58, the same thought recurs in the same words: “There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked;” and that the same thought, viz. the exclusion of the wicked from the promised salvation, is found also a third time of the close of the whole, although there in another form. Yet, if nothing else could be advanced in favour of this tri-partition, we might perhaps be permitted to speak of an accident as *Knobel* indeed does. But a closer consideration shows that the three sections are, inwardly and essentially, distinguished from one another. Beyond chap. 48:22, there is no farther mention of *Babel*, which in the first book is mentioned four times (chap. 43:14, 47:1, 48:14, 20); nor of the *Chaldeans*, which occur there five times

(chap. 43:14, 47:1, 5, 48:14, 20); nor any farther mention of *Koresh*, neither of his name (chap. 44:28, 45:1), nor of his person, which in chap. 40-48, is so prominently brought before us (chap. 41:2, 25, 46:11, 48:14, 15, *i.e.* immediately at the *beginning*, after the introduction contained in chap. 40, at the *close*, and several times in the *middle*); nor of *Bel* and *Nebo*. *Farther*—The whole first book is pervaded with the argumentation by which the God of Israel is proved to be the true God, from his having foretold the deliverance to be effected by *Koresh*. This argumentation we meet with in chap. 41, immediately after the introductory chap. 40, and so still in the last chap. 48; but never again afterwards. “With the end of the first book, this arguing and proving from prophecy, that the Lord is the true God, as well as the reference to *Koresh*, the subject of this prophecy, altogether disappear. But, in like manner, the announcement of a personal Messiah is wanting in the first book, the sole exception being chap. 42:1-9, where, after the first announcement of the author of the lower salvation, the Author of the higher salvation is, by way of anticipation, *contrasted* with him. To give a more minute and finished description of the Author of the higher salvation is the object of the *second* book. In the *third* book, the person of the Redeemer is spoken of briefly only, is, as it were, only hinted at, in order to connect this book with the second; just as, by chap. 42, the first book is connected with the second. The third book in so far as it is *promising*, is taken up with the description of the *glory of the Kingdom of God*, in that new stage upon which it enters by the Redeemer,—a glory, the culminating point of which is the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, chap. 65:17, 66:22. A description of the glory of Zion, like that in chap. 42, is not found in the first and second book. In the third book, however, *reproof and exhortation* prevail, in contradistinction to the first and second book, in which the direct *promise* prevails. A transition from this, however, to the reproof and exhortation, is made at the close of the second book. From chap. 55:1, the preaching of repentance appears first intermingled with the announcement of salvation. Up to that the prevailing tendency of the Prophet had been, throughout, to comfort the godly; but from chap. 55:1, the other tendency shows itself by the side of it, that of calling sinners to repentance, by which alone they can obtain a participation in the promised salvation. In chap. 56:9, 57:21, the latter tendency appears distinctly and exclusively. The second book had commenced with the announcement of salvation, and thence to the close had advanced to reproof and threatening. The third book takes the opposite course; and thus the two principal portions of reproof and threatening border upon one another. Yet, the reproof and threatening do not go on without interruption and distinction, so that no *boundary line* could be recognized between the two books. At the close of the second book, the Prophet has preeminently to do with *apostates*, while, at the beginning of the third, he has to do with *hypocrites*; so that thus these two portions of reproof supplement one another, and conjointly form a complete disclosure of the prevailing corruption, according to its two principal tendencies. But the third book is distinguished from the second by this circumstance, that in it reproof and threatening are not limited to the beginning, which corresponds with the close of the second book. At the close of chap. 59 the Prophet returns to the announcement of salvation; but with chap. 63:7, a new preaching of repentance commences, which goes on to the end of chap. 64. The Prophet, in the Spirit, transposes himself into the time when the visitation has already taken place, and puts into the mouth of the people the words by which they are, at that time, to supplicate for the mercy of the Lord. This discourse implies what has preceded. In the view of the glorious manifestation of the Lord’s mercy and grace which are there exhibited, the Prophet calls here upon the people to repent and be converted, in order that they may become partakers of that mercy. If they, as a people, are anxious to attain that object, they must repeat what the Prophet here pronounces before them. But that up to

this time has not been done, and hence that has taken place which is spoken of by St. Paul: "The election have obtained it, but the rest have been blinded." In chap. 45, which contains the Lord's answer to this repenting prayer of the people, and is nothing else than an indirect *paraenesis*, reproof and threatening likewise prevail, and it is only at the close that the promise appears. The last chapter, too, begins with reproof and threatening. Rightly have the Church Fathers called Isaiah the Evangelist among the prophets. This appears also from the circumstance that the reproof is so thoroughly an appendage of the promise, that it is only at the *close*, after the whole riches of the promise have been exhibited, that it expands itself. It appears, farther, also from the circumstance that, even in the last book, the threatening does not prevail *exclusively*, but that, even there, it is still interwoven with the most glorious promises which are so exceedingly fitted to allure sinners to repentance.

In the whole of the second part, the Prophet, *as a rule*, takes his stand in the time which was announced and foretold in the former prophecies, and especially, with the greatest clearness and distinctness, in chap. 39, on the threshold of the second part,—the time when Jerusalem is captured by the Chaldeans, the temple destroyed, the country desolated, and the people carried away. It is in this time that he thinks, feels, and acts; it has become present to him; from it he looks out into the Future, yet in such a manner that he does not everywhere consistently maintain this ideal stand-point. He addresses his discourse to the people pining away in captivity and misery. He comforts them by opening up a view into a better Future, and exhorts them to remove by repentance the obstacles to the coming salvation.

Rationalistic Exegesis, everywhere little able to sympathize with, and enter into existing circumstances and conditions, and always ready to make its own shadowy, coarse views the rule and arbiter, has been little able to enter into, and sympathize with this ideal stand-point occupied by the Prophet; nor has it had the earnest will to do so. To its rationalistic tendencies, which took offence at the clear knowledge of the Future, a welcome pretext was here offered. Thus the opinion arose, that the second part was not written by Isaiah, but was the work of some anonymous prophet, living about the end of the exile,—an opinion which, at the time of the absolute dominion of Rationalism, has obtained so firm a footing, that it has become all but an *axiom*, and, by the power of tradition, carries away even such as would not think of entertaining it, if they were to enter independently and without prejudice upon the investigation.

The fact which here meets us does not by any means stand isolated. The prophets did not prophesy in the state of rational reflection, but in *exstasis*. As even their ordinary name, "seers," indicates, the objects were presented to them in inward vision. They did not behold the Future from a distance, but they were rapt into the future. This inward vision is frequently reflected in their representation. Very frequently, that appears with them as present which, in reality, was still future. They depict the Future before the eyes of their hearers and readers, and thus, as it were, by force, drag them into it out of the Present, the coercing force of which exerts so pernicious an influence upon them. Our Prophet expressly intimates this peculiar manner of the prophetic announcement by making, in chap. 49:7 the Lord say: "First I said to Zion: *Behold there, behold there*, by which the graphic character of prophecy is precisely expressed, and by which it is intimated that hearers and readers were led *in rem praesentem* by the prophets. Even grammar has long ago acknowledged this fact, inasmuch as it speaks of *Praeterita prophetica*, *i.e.*, such as denote the *ideal* Past, in contrast to those which denote the *real* Past. Unless we have

attained to this view and insight, it is only by inconsistency that we can escape from *Eichhorn's* view, that the prophecies are, for the most part, disguised historical descriptions,—a view into which even expositors, such as *Ewald* and *Hitzig*, frequently relapse. Frequently, the whole of the Future appears with the prophets in the form of the *Present*. At other times, they take their stand in the more immediate Future; and this becomes to them the *ideal Present*, from which they direct the eye to the distant Future. From the rich store of proofs which we can adduce for our view, we shall here mention only a few.

This mode of representation meets us frequently so early as in the parting hymn of Moses, Deut. 32, which may be considered as the germ of all prophetism; compare *e.g.* vers. 7 and 8. On the latter verse, *Clericus* remarks: “Moses mourns over this in his hymn, as if it were already past, because he foresees that it will be so, and he, in the Spirit, transfers himself into those future times, and says that which then only should be said.”

In Isaiah himself, the very first chapter presents a remarkable proof. The Present in chap. 1:5-9 is not a *real*, but an *ideal Present*. In the Spirit, the Prophet transfers himself into the time of the calamity impending upon the apostate people, and, stepping back upon the real Present, he, in the farther course of the prophecy, predicts this calamity as future. The reasons for this view have been thoroughly stated, even to exhaustion, by *Caspari*, in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaia*. In the second half of ver. 2, the kingdom appears as flourishing and powerful. To the same result we are led also by the description of the rich sacrificial worship in vers. 15-19. If, then, we view vers. 5-9 as a description of the Present, we obtain an irreconcilable contradiction. *Farther*—Everywhere else Isaiah always connects, with the description of the sin, that of the punishment following upon it, but never that of the punishment which has followed it.—In chap. 5:13, in a prophecy from the first time of his ministry, the *future carrying away* of the people presents itself to the Prophet as *present*. Similarly, in vers. 25, 26, the Praet. and Fut. with *Vav Conv.* must be understood prophetically; for in chap. 1-5, the Prophet has, throughout, to do with future calamity. In the Present, according to ver. 19, the people are yet in a condition of prosperity and luxury,—as yet, it is the time of *mocking*; it is only of future calamity that vers. 5 and 6 in the parable speak of, the threatenings of which are here detailed and expanded.—In the prophecy against Tyre, chap. 23, the Prophet beholds as present the siege by the Chaldeans impending over the city, and describes as an eye-witness the flight of the inhabitants, and the impression which the intelligence of their calamity makes upon the nations connected with them. From the more immediate Future, which to him has become present, he then casts a glance to the more distant. He announces that after 70 years—counting not from the *real*, but from the *ideal Present*—the city shall again attain to its ancient greatness. His look then rises still higher, and he beholds how at length, in the days of Messiah, the Tyrians shall be received into the communion of the true God.—The future dispersion and carrying away of the people is anticipated by the Prophet in the passage, chap. 11:11, also, which may be considered as a comprehensive view of the whole second part.—It is true that, in the second part, as a rule, the misery, and not the salvation, appears as present; but, not unfrequently, the latter, too, is viewed as present by the Prophet, and spoken of in Preterites, comp. *e.g.*, chap. 40:2, 46:1, 2, 51:3, 52:9, 10, 60:1. If, then, the Prophet is to be measured by the ordinary rule, these passages, too, must have been written at a time when the salvation had already taken place.—In chap. 45:20, the escaped of the nations are those Gentiles who have been spared in the divine judgments. They are to become wise by the sufferings

of others. The Prophet takes his stand in a time when these judgments, which were to be inflicted by Cyrus, had already been completed. Even those who maintain the spuriousness of the second part must here acknowledge that the Prophet takes his stand in an *ideal* Present.—In chap. 53 the Prophet takes his stand between the sufferings and the glorification of the Messiah. The sufferings appear to him as past; the glorification he represents as future.

Hosea had, in Ho 13:1chap. 13, predicted to Israel great divine judgments, the desolation of the country, and the carrying away of its inhabitants by powerful enemies. This punishment and judgment appear in chap. 14:1 (13:16) as still future; but in ver. 2 (1 ff.) he transfers himself in spirit to the time when these judgments had already been inflicted. He anticipates the Future as having already taken place, and does not by any means exhort his *contemporaries* to a sincere repentance, but those upon whom the calamity had already been inflicted: “O Israel return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity.” This parallel passage shews especially, with what right it has been asserted that the addresses to the people pining away in exile “were out of place in the mouth of Isaiah, who, as he lived 150 years before, could *prophesy* only of the exiled” (*Knobel*).—Micah says in chap. 4:8 (compare vol. L, p. 449 ff.): “And thou tower of the flock, hill of the daughter of Zion, unto thee it will come, and to thee cometh the former dominion.” If the Prophet, a cotemporary of Isaiah, speaks here of a *former dominion*, and announces that it shall again come back to the house of David, he transfers himself from his time, in which the royal family of David still existed and flourished, into that period of which he had just before spoken, and during which the dominion of the Davidic dynasty was to cease. In vers. 9, 10: “Now why dost thou raise a cry! Is there no king in thee, or is thy counsellor gone? For pangs have seized thee as a woman in travail, &c., mourning Zion, at the time of the carrying away of her sons into captivity, stands before the eye of the Prophet, and is addressed by him. (In commenting upon this passage, we pointed already to Hosea 13:9-11 as an analogous instance of representing as present the time of the calamity.) The moment of the carrying away into exile forms to him the Present; the deliverance from it, the Future: “There shalt thou be delivered, there the Lord thy God shall redeem thee out of the hand of thine enemies:” In chap. 7:7, Micah introduces, as speaking, the people already carried away into exile, and makes them declare both the justice of the divine punishment, and their confidence in the divine mercy. In the answer of the Lord also, ver. 11, the city is supposed to be destroyed; for He promises that her walls shall be rebuilt.—The anticipation of the Future prevails throughout the whole prophecy of Obadiah also. The song of Habakkuk in chap. 3 takes its stand in the midst of the anticipated misery. In the announcement of the invasion of the Chaldeans in chap. 1:6 ff., the Future presents itself in the form of the Present. Here, as in the case of Obadiah, *Hitzig* and others, overlooking and misunderstanding this prophetic peculiarity, and considering the *ideal*, to be the *real* Present, have been led to fix the age of the Prophet in a Banner notoriously erroneous.—Jeremiah, in chap. 3:22, 25, introduces as speaking the Israel of the Future, In chap. 30 and 31, he anticipates the future carrying away of Judah. Even in the Psalms we perceive a faint trace of this prophetic peculiarity. On Ps. 93:1: “The Lord reigneth, He hath clothed himself with majesty,” &c., we remarked: “The Preterites are to be explained from the circumstance that the Singer as a *seer* has the Future before his eyes. He *beholds* rejoicingly how the Lord enters upon His Kingdom, puts on the garment of majesty, and girds himself with the sword of strength in the face of the proud world.” A similar anticipation of redemption, even before the catastrophe has taken place, we meet with in Ps. 94:1. The situation in the whole Psalm, yea in the whole cycle to which it belongs, the lyrical echo

of the second part of Isaiah, is not a *rent*, but an *ideal* one. This cycle bears witness that the singers and seers of Israel were living in the Future, in a manner which it would be so much the greater folly to measure by our rule as, for the people of the Old Covenant, the Future had a significance altogether different from that which it has for the people of the New Covenant. That which is common to all the Psalms, from 93 onward, is the confident expectation of a glorious manifestation of the Lord, which the Psalmist, following the example of the prophets, beholds as present. A counterpart is the cycle Ps. 138-145, in which David, stirred up by the promise in 2 Sam. 7, accompanies his house throughout history.

Several interpreters cannot altogether resist the force of these facts. They grant “that other prophets also sometimes, in the Spirit, transfer themselves into later times, especially into the idealistic times of the Messiah,” and draw their arguments from the circumstance only, that the latter again came back to their personal stand point, whilst our Prophet continues cleaving to the later time. Now it is true, and must be conceded, that this mode of representation is here employed to an extent greater than it is anywhere else in the Old Testament. But, in matters of this kind, measuring by the ell is quite out of place. In other respects also, the second part of Isaiah stands out as quite unique. There is, in the whole Old Testament, no other continuous prophecy which has so absolutely and pre-eminently proceeded from *cura posteritatis*. If it be acknowledged that the prophesying activity of Isaiah falls into two great divisions,—the one—the results of which are contained in the first 39 chapters—chiefly, pre-eminently indeed, destined for the Present; the other,—which lies before us in the second part, belonging to the evening of the Prophet’s life—forming a prophetic legacy, and hence, therefore, never delivered in public, but only committed to writing;—then we shall find it quite natural that the Prophet, writing, as he did, chiefly for the Future, should here also take his stand in the Future, to a larger extent than he has elsewhere done.

That it is in this manner only that this fact is to be accounted for, appears from the circumstance that, although our Prophet so extensively and frequently represents the Past as Present, yet he passes over, in numerous passages, from the *ideal* into the *real* Present.<sup>16</sup> We find a number of references which do not at all suit the condition of things after the exile, but necessarily require the age of Isaiah, or, at least, the time before the exile. If Isaiah be the author, these passages are easily accounted for. It is true that, in the Spirit, he had transferred himself into the time of the Babylonish exile; and this time had become Present to him. But it would surely be suspicious to us, if the real Present had not sometimes prevailed, and attracted the eye of the Prophet. It is just thus, however, that we find it. The Prophet frequently steps out of his ideal view and position, and refers to conditions and circumstances of his time. *Now*, he has before his eyes the condition of the unhappy people in the Babylonish exile; *then*, the State still existing at his time, but internally deranged by idolatry and apostacy. This apparent contradiction cannot be reconciled in any other way than by assuming that Isaiah is the author. As a rule, the punishment appears as already inflicted; city and temple as destroyed; the country as devastated; the people as carried away; compare *e.g.*, chap. 64:10, 11. But in a series of passages, in which the Prophet steps back from the *ideally* to the *real* stand-point, *the punishment appears as still future; city and temple as still existing*. In chap. 43:22-28, the Prophet meets the delusion, as if God had chosen Israel on account of their deserts. Far from having brought about their deliverance by their own merits, they, on the contrary, sinned thus against Him, that, to the inward apostacy, they added the outward also. The greater part of Israel had left off the worship of the Lord by sacrifices. It is the mercy

alone of the Lord which will deliver them from the misery into which they have plunged themselves by their sins. But how can the Lord charge the people in exile for the omission of a service which, according to His own law, they could offer to Him in their native country only, in the temple consecrated to Him, but then destroyed? The words specially: "Put me in remembrance," in ver. 26, "of what I should have forgotten," imply that there existed a possibility of acquiring apparent merits, and that, hence, the view of our opponents who, in vers. 22-24, think of a compulsory, and hence, guiltless omission of the sacrificial service during the exile, must be rejected. Vers. 27, 28 also, which speak of the punishment which Israel deserves, just on account of the omitted service of the Lord, and which it has found in the way of its works, prove that this view must be rejected, and that vers. 22-24 contain a reproof. The passage can, hence, have been written only at the time when the temple was still standing. Of this there can so much the less be any doubt that, in vers. 27, 28, the exile is expressly designated as future: "Thy first father (the high-priestly office) hath sinned, and thy mediators have transgressed against me." (The sacrificial service was by a disgraceful syncretism profaned even by those whose office it was to attend to it). "Therefore I *will* profane the princes of the sanctuary, and *will* give Jacob to the curse, and Israel to reproaches." Even ללחזו is the common Future, and to הנתאו the ה *optativum* is added; and hence, we cannot by any means translate and explain it by: *I gave*.—In chap. 56:9, it is said: "All ye beasts of the field come ye to devour all the beasts in the forest." This utterance stands in connection with the ויצבקנל, at the close of the preceding verse. The gathering of Israel by God the good Shepherd, promised there, must be preceded by the scattering, by being given up to the world's power—mercy, by judgment. By the wild beasts are to be understood the Gentiles who shall be sent by God upon His people for punishment. This mission they must first fulfil before they can, according to ver. 8, be added to, and gathered along with, the gathered ones of Israel. By the "beasts in the forest," brutalized, degraded, and secularized Israel is to be understood, compare Jer. 12:7-12; Ezek. 34:5; and my Commentary on Rev. 2:1.

The beasts have not yet come; they are yet to come. We can here think of nothing else than the invasion of the Chaldeans, which the Prophet, stepping back to the stand-point of his time, beholds here as future; whilst, in what precedes, from his ideal stand-point, which he had taken in the Babylonish exile, he had, for the most part, considered it as past.—In chap. 56:10-12, we meet with corrupted rulers of the people, who are indolent, when everything depends upon warding off the danger, greedy, luxurious, gormandizing upon what they have stolen. The people are not under foreign dominion, but have rulers of their own, who tyrannize over, and impoverish them; compare Is. chap. 5; Micah, chap. 3.—In chap. 57:1, it is said: "The righteous perisheth and no man layeth it to heart, and the men of kindness are taken away, no one considering that, on account of the evil, the righteous is taken away." The Prophet mentions it as a sign of the people's hardening that, in the death of the righteous men who were truly bearing on their hearts the welfare of the whole, they did not recognize a harbinger of severe divine judgments, from which, according to a divine merciful decree, these righteous were to be preserved by an early death. "On account of the evil," *i.e.*, in order to withdraw them from the judgments, which were to be inflicted upon the ungodly people, compare Gen. 15:15; 2 Kings 22:20; Is. 39:8. The evil, *i.e.* according to 2 Kings 22:20, the Chaldean catastrophe, appears here as still future. In chap. 57:2: "They enter in peace, they rest in their beds who have walked before themselves in uprightness," the "peace" forms the contrast to the awful condition of suffering which the survivors have to encounter.—In chap. 57:9, it is said: "And thou lookest on the king anointed with oil, and increasest thy perfumes, and sendest thy messengers far off, sendest them down into hell." The apostacy from the Lord their

God is manifested not only in idolatry, but also in their not leaving untried any means to procure for themselves human helpers, in their courting human aid. The personification of Israel as a woman, which took place in the preceding verses, is here continued. She leaves no means untried to heighten her charms; she makes every effort to please the mighty kings. The king is an ideal person comprehending a real plurality within himself. A parallel passage, in which the seeking for help among foreign nations is represented under the same image, is Ezek. 16:26 ff., comp. Hos. 12:2 (1). It occurs also in immediate connexion with seeking help from the idols, in chap. 30:1 ff. The verb רָוַח means always “to see,” “to look at;” and this signification is, here too, quite appropriate: Israel is *coquetting* with her lover, the king. The reproach which the Prophet here raises against the people has no meaning at all in the time of the exile, when the national independence was gone. We find ourselves all at once transferred to the time of Isaiah, who, in chap. 31:1, utters a woe upon them “that go down to Egypt for help;”—who, in chap. 30:4, complains: “His princes are at Zoar, and his ambassadors come to Hanes;”—who, in chap. 7, exhibits the dangerous consequences of seeking help from Asshur. The historical point at issue is brought before us by passages such as 2 Kings 16:7: “And Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, saying: I am thy servant and thy son; come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Aram, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, who rise against me.”—In chap. 57:11-13, the thought is this: Israel is not becoming weary of seeking help and salvation from others than God. But He will soon show that He alone is to be feared, that He alone can help; that they are nothing against whom, and from whom help is sought. The words in ver. 11: “Am I not silent, even of old; therefore thou fearest me not;” state the cause of the foolish forgetfulness of God, and hence form the transition to the subsequent announcement of judgment. The prophecy is uttered at a time when Israel still enjoyed the sparing divine forbearance, inasmuch as for time immemorial (since they were in Egypt), no destructive catastrophe had fallen upon them. It was in the Babylonish catastrophe only that the Egyptian received its counterpart. But how does this suit the time of the Babylonish exile, when the people were groaning under the severe judgments of God, and had not experienced His forbearance, but, on the contrary, for almost 70 years, the full energy of His punitive justice? In ver. 13, it is said: “In thy crying, let thy hosts (thy whole Pantheon so rich, and yet so miserable) help thee.” “In thy crying,” *i.e.*, when *thou*, in the judgment to be inflicted upon thee in future, wilt cry for help.” In chap. 66 the punishment appears as future; temple and city as still existing; the Lord as yet enthroned in Zion. So specially in ver. 6: “A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple, the voice of the Lord that rendereth recompence to His enemies.” A controversy with the hypocrites who presumed upon the temple and their sacrificial service, in vers. 1, 3, has, at the time of the exile, no meaning at all. *Gesenius*, indeed, was of opinion that the Prophet might judge of the worship of God in temples, and of the value of sacrifices, although they were not offered at that time; but it must be strongly denied that the Prophet could do so in such a context and connection. For, the fact that the Prophet has in view a definite class of men of his time, and that he does not bring forward at random a *locus communis* which, at his time, was no longer applicable—a thing which, moreover, is not by any means his habit—appears from the close of the verse, and from ver. 4, where divine judgment is threatened to those men: “Because they choose their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations: I also will choose their derision, and will bring their fears upon them.” Even in ver. 20: “And they (the Gentiles who are to be converted to the Lord), shall bring all your brethren out of all nations for a meat-offering unto the Lord, upon horses, &c., just as the children of Israel are bringing (וְאוֹבִי, expresses an habitual offering), the meat-offering in a clean vessel into the house of the Lord,” the house of God appears as still

standing, the sacrificial service in full operation; the future spiritual meat-offering of the Gentiles is compared to the bodily meat-offering which the children of Israel are now offering in the temple.

*Throughout the whole second part we perceive the people under the, as yet, unbroken power of idolatry.* It appears everywhere as the principal tendency of the sinful apostacy among the people; to counteract it appears to be the chief object of the Prophet. The controversy with idolatry pervades everything. At the very commencement, in chap. 40:18-26, we are met with a description of the nothingness of idolatry, and an impressive warning against it. In the whole series of passages, commencing with chap. 41—of which we shall afterwards speak more in detail—the sole Deity of the God of Israel, and the vanity of the idols are proved from prophecy in connection with its fulfilment; and this series has for its supposition the power which, at the time when the prophecy was uttered, idolatry yet possessed over the minds of men. Chap. 42:17 announces that the future historical development shall bring confusion upon those “that trust in graven images, that say to the molten images: Ye are our gods.” In chap. 44:12-20, the absurdity of idolatry is illustrated in a brilliant description. We have here before us the real *locus classicus* of the whole Scripture in this matter, the main description of the nothingness of idolatry. The emotion and excitement with which the Prophet speaks, shew that he has here to do with the principal enemy to the salvation of his people. According to chap. 46 the idols of Babel shall be overturned and carried away. From this, Israel may learn the nothingness of idolatry, and the apostates may return to the Lord. In the hortatory and reproofing section, the punishment of idolatry forms the beginning; in chap. 57 idolatry is described as far-spread, manifold, advancing to the greatest horrors. The offering up of children as sacrifices especially appears as being in vogue; and it can be proved that this penetrated into Israel, from the neighbouring nations, at the time of the Prophet (compare 2 Chron. 28:3; 33:6), while, at the time of the exile, there was scarcely any cause for warning against it,—at least, existing information does not mention any such sacrifices among the Babylonians (compare *Münter, die Religion der Babylonier*, S. 72). The people appear as standing under the dominion of idolatry in chap. 65:3: “The people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face, that sacrificeth in gardens, and burneth incense upon the bricks;” comp. ver. 7: “Who have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed me upon the hills;” chap. 66:17: “They that sanctify themselves and purify themselves in the gardens behind one in the midst, who eat swine’s flesh, and the abominations, and mice, shall be consumed together, saith the Lord.” Idolatry is the service of nature, and was, therefore, chiefly practised in places where nature presents herself in all her splendour, as in gardens and on the hills. The gardens are mentioned in a similar way in chap. 1:29: “Ye shall blush on account of the *gardens* that ye have chosen.” (On the words which precede in that verse: “For they shall be ashamed of the *oaks* which ye have desired,” chap. 57:5 offers an exact parallel: “Who inflame themselves among the *oaks* under every green tree.”) In chap. 65:11, they are denounced who forsake the Lord, forget His holy mountain (on which, at the time when this was written, the temple must still have stood), who prepare a table to *Fortune*, and offer drink-offerings to *Fate*. The second main form of sinful apostacy—hypocrisy and dead ceremonial service—is only rarely mentioned by the Prophet (in chap. 57, 66), while he always anew reverts to idolatry. Now *this absolutely prevailing regard to idolatry can be accounted for, only if Isaiah be the author of the second part.* From Solomon, down to the time of the exile, the disposition to idolatry in Israel was never thoroughly broken. During Isaiah’s ministry, it came to the fullest display under Ahaz. Under Hezekiah it was kept down, indeed; but with great difficulty only, as appears from the fact that, under the reign of Manasseh, who

was a king after the heart of the people, it again broke openly forth; comp. 2 Kings 21:1-18; 2 Chron. 33:1-18; 2 Kings 21:6, according to which Manasseh made his own son to pass through the fire. But it is a fact generally admitted, and proved by all the books written during and after the exile, that, with the carrying away into exile, the idolatrous disposition among the people was greatly shaken. This fact has its cause not only in the deep impression which misery made upon their minds, but still more in the circumstance that it was chiefly the godly part of the nation that was carried away into captivity. The disproportionately large number of *priests* among the exiled and those who returned—they constitute the tenth part of the people—is to be accounted for only on the supposition, that the heathenish conquerors saw that the real essence and basis of the people consisted in the faith in the God of Israel, and were, therefore, above all, anxious to remove the priests as the main representatives of this principle. If, for this reason, they carried away the priests, we cannot think otherwise but that, in the selection of the others also, they looked chiefly to the theocratic disposition on which the nationality of Israel rested. To this we are led by Jer. 24 also, where those carried away are designated as the flower of the nation, as the nursery and hope of the Kingdom of God. Incomprehensible, for the time of the exile, is also the *strict antithesis* between the servants of the Lord, and the servants of the idols—the latter hating, assailing, and persecuting the former—an antithesis which meets us especially in the last two chapters; comp. especially chap. 65:5 ff. 13-15; 66:16. That such a state of things existed at the time of the Prophet is, among other passages, shown by 2 Kings 21:16, according to which Manasseh shed much innocent blood at Jerusalem, and, according to ver. 10, 11, especially the blood of the prophets, who had borne a powerful testimony against idolatry.

*If it be assumed that the second part was composed during the exile, then those passages are incomprehensible, in which the Prophet proves that the God of Israel is the true God, from His predicting the appearance of the conqueror from the east, and the deliverance of the people to be wrought by Him in connection with the fulfilment of these predictions.* The supernatural character of this announcement which the Prophet asserts; and which forms the ground of its probative power, took place, only if it proceeded from Isaiah, but not if it was uttered only about the end of the exile, at a time when Cyrus had already entered upon the stage of history. These passages, at all events, admit only the alternative,—either that Isaiah was the real author, or that they were forged at a later period by some deceiver; and this latter alternative is so decidedly opposed to the whole spirit of the second part, that scarcely any one among the opponents will resolve to adopt it. Considering the very great and decisive importance of these passages, we must still allow them to pass in review one by one. In chap. 41:1-7, the Lord addresses those who are serving idols, summons them triumphantly to defend themselves against the mighty attack which He was just executing against them, and describes the futility of their attempts at so doing. The address to the Gentiles is a mere form; to work upon Israel is the real purpose. To secure them from the allurements of the world's religion, the Prophet points to the great confusion which the Future will bring upon it. This confusion consists in this:—that the prophecy of the conqueror from the East, as the messenger and instrument of the Lord—a prediction which the Prophet had uttered in the power of the Lord—is fulfilled without the idolaters being able to prevent it. The answer on the words in ver. 2: “Who hath raised up from the East him whom righteousness calleth whither he goes, giveth the nations before him, and maketh kings subject to him, maketh his sword like dust, and his bow like driven stubble?” is this: According to the agreement of prophecy and fulfilment, it is none other than the Lord, who is, therefore, the only true God, to whose glory and majesty every deed of His servant Koresh bears witness. The

argumentation is unintelligible, as soon as, assuming that it was Isaiah who wrote down the prophecy, it is not admitted that he, losing sight of the *real* Present, takes his standpoint in an *ideal* Present, viz., the time of the appearance of the conqueror from the East, by which it becomes possible to him to draw his arguments from the prophecy in connection with the fulfilment. It is altogether absurd, when it is asserted that the second part is spurious, and was composed at a time when Cyrus was already standing before Babylon. It would indeed have required an immense amount of impudence on the part of the Prophet to bring forward, as an unassailable proof of the omniscience and omnipotence of God, an event which every one saw with his bodily eyes. By such argumentation, he would have exposed himself to general *ridicule*.—In chap. 41:21-29, the discourse is formally addressed to the Gentiles; but in point of fact, the Prophet here, too, has to do with Judah driven into exile, to whom he was called by God to offer the means to remain steadfast under the temptations from the idolaters by whom they were surrounded. Before the eyes, and in the hearing of Israel, the Lord convinces the Gentiles of the nothingness of their cause. They are to prove the divinity of their idols by showing forth the announcements of the Future which proceeded from them. But they are not able to comply with this demand. It is only the Lord, the living God, who can do that. Long before the appearance of the conqueror from the North and East, He caused it to be *foretold*, and comforted His Church with the view of the Future. Hence, He alone is God, and vanity are all those who are put beside Him. It is said in ver. 22: “Let them bring forth and shew to us what shall happen; the former things, what they be, show and we will consider them and know the latter end of them; or the coming (events make us to hear).” *The former things* are those which are prior on this territory; hence the former prophecies, as the comparison of the parallel passage, chap. 42:9, clearly shows. The *end* of prophecy is its fulfilment. תואבה “the coming, or future,” are the events of the more distant Future. As the Prophet demands from the idols and their servants that only which the true God has already performed by His servants, we have here, on the one hand, a reference, to the whole cycle of prophecies formerly fulfilled, as *e.g.*, that of the overthrow of the kingdoms of Damascus and Ephraim, and the defeat of Asshur,—and, on the other hand, to the prophecy of the conqueror from the East, &c., contained in the second part. The *former* prophecies, however, are here mentioned altogether incidentally only; the real demand refers, as is shown by the words: “What shall happen,” only to the prophecies in reference to the Future, corresponding to those of our Prophet regarding the conqueror from the East, whose appearance is here represented as belonging altogether to the *Future*, and not to be known by any human ingenuity. In ver. 26: “Who hath declared (such things) from the beginning, that we may know, and long beforehand, that we may say: he is righteous?” the שארם “from the beginning” puts insurmountable obstacles in the way of the opponents of the genuineness. If the second part of Isaiah be *spurious*, then the idolaters might put the same scornful question to the God of Israel. The שארם denotes just the opposite of a *vaticinium post eventum*.—In chap. 42:9: “The former (things), behold, they are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth, I let you hear,” the Prophet proves the true divinity of the Lord, from the circumstance that, having already proved himself by prophecies fulfilled, He declares here, in the second part, the future events before they spring forth, before the facts begin to sprout forth from the soil of the Present, and hence could have been known and predicted by human combination. The words, “before they spring forth,” become completely enigmatical, if it be denied that Isaiah wrote the second part; inasmuch as, in that case, it would have in a great part, to do with things which did not belong to the territory of prophetic foresight, but of what was plainly visible.—In chap. 43:8-13, the Prophet again proves the nothingness of idolatry, and the sole divinity of the God of Israel, from the great work,

declared beforehand by the Lord, of the deliverance of Israel, and of the overthrow of their enemies. He is so deeply convinced of the striking force of this argument, that he ever anew reverts to it. After having called upon the Gentiles to prove the divinity of their idols by true prophecies given by them, he says in ver. 9: "Let them bring forth their witnesses, that they may be justified." By the witnesses it is to be proved, by whom, to whom, and at what time the prophecies were given, in order that the Gentiles may not refer to deceitfully forged prophecies, to *vaticinia post eventum*. According to the hypothesis of the spuriousness of the second part, the author pronounced his own condemnation by thus calling for witnesses. "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and witness is my Servant whom I have chosen," is said in ver. 10. While the Gentiles are in vain called upon to bring forward witnesses for the divinity of their idols, the true God has, for His witnesses, just those whose services he claimed. The prophecies which lie at the foundation of their testimony, which are to be borne witness to, are those of the second part. The Prophet may safely appeal to the testimony of the whole nation, that they were uttered at a time, when their contents could not be derived from human combination. "The great unknown" (*Ewald*), could not by any possibility have spoken thus.—In chap. 45:19-21, it is proved from the prophecy, in connection with the fulfilment, that Jehovah alone is God,—the like of which no Gentile nation can show of their idols. The argumentation is followed by the call to all the Gentiles to be converted to this God, and thus to become partakers of His salvation—a call resting on the striking force of this argumentation—and with this call is, in ver. 23-25, connected the solemn declaration of God, that, at some future time, this shall take place; that, at some future time, there shall be one shepherd and one flock. How would these high, solemn, words have been spoken in vain, if "the great unknown" had spoken them! In ver. 19 it is said: "I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth; I said not unto the seed of Jacob: Seek ye me in vain; I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare rectitude." The Lord here says, first, in reference to His prophecies, those namely which He gave through our Prophet, that *they were made known publicly*, that, hence, there could not be any doubt of their genuineness,—altogether different from what is the case with the prophecies of idolatrous nations which make their appearance *post eventum* only, *no one knowing whence*. Every one might convince himself of their truth and divinity. This is expressed by the words: "I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth." Then he says that the Lord had not deceived His people, like the idols who leave their servants without disclosures regarding the Future; but that, by the prophecies granted to our Prophet, He had met the longings of his people for revelations of the Future. While the gods of the world leave them in the lurch, just when their help is required, and never answer when they are asked, the Lord, in reference to prophecies, as well as in every other respect, has not spoken: "Seek ye me in vain," but rather: When ye seek, ye shall find me. And, finally, he says that his prophecies are true and right; that the heathenish prophets commit an *unrighteousness* by performing something else than that which they promised to perform. To declare *righteousness* is to declare that which is righteous, which does not conceal internal emptiness and rottenness under a fair outside. The words: "I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare rectitude," could not but have died on the lips of the "great unknown."—In chap. 46:8-13 the apostates in Israel are addressed. They are exhorted to return to the true God, and to be mindful, 1. of the nothingness of idols, ver. 8; 2. of the proofs of His sole divinity which the Lord had given throughout the whole of the past history; 3. of the new manifestation of it in announcing and sending Koresh (Cyrus), ver. 10, 11; "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying: My counsel shall stand, and I will do all nay pleasure. Calling from the East an eagle, from a far country the man of His counsel; I have spoken it, and will

also bring it to pass; I have formed it, and will also do it.” To the תּוֹנֵשׂאֵר, the former events, the fulfilled prophecies from former times (comp. 42:9), here the new proof of the sole divinity of the God of Israel is added, in that He sends Koresh: God *now* declares. The Prophet, by designating the time in which the announcement was issued as תִּישָׂאֵר and מִדָּק, as beginning and ancient times, and by founding the proof of the divinity of the Lord just upon the high age of the announcement, again puts an insurmountable obstacle in the way of the opponents of the genuineness. The announcement and declaration prove any thing in connection with the execution only; the bringing to pass, therefore, is connected with the declaring, the doing with the speaking. These words are *now* spoken, since, from the ideal stand-point, the carrying out is at hand; they form the antecedent to the *calling*, of which ver. 11 treats. מִוֶּקַּח properly “to rise,” opposed to the laying down, means “to bring to stand,” “to bring about,” to be fulfilled.” “The counsel,” *i.e.*, the contents of the prediction which was spoken of before; it is the divine counsel and decree to which Koresh served as an instrument.—*Finally*—In chap. 48, the same subject is treated of; the divinity of the Lord is proved from His prophecies, in three sections, ver. 1-11, ver. 12-16, ver. 22. Here, at the close of the first book of the second part, the argumentation occurs once more in a very strong accumulation, because the Prophet is now about to leave it, and, in general, the whole territory of the lower salvation. First, in ver. 1-11: Israel should return to the Lord, who formerly had manifested and proved His sole divinity by a series of prophecies and their fulfilments, and *now* was granting new and remarkable disclosures regarding the Future. Ver. 6: “New things I shew thee from this time, hidden things, and thou didst not know them, ver. 7. Now they have been created and not of old, and before this day thou heardest them not; lest thou shouldst say: Behold, I knew them.” The deliverance of Israel by Cyrus—an announcement uttered in the preceding, and to be repeated immediately afterwards—is called *new* in contrast to the old prophecies of the Lord already fulfilled; *hidden* in contrast to the facts which are already subjects of history, or may be known beforehand by natural ingenuity. *To be created* is equivalent to being made manifest, inasmuch as the hidden Divine counsel enters into life, only by being manifested, and the prophesied events are created for Israel, only by the prophecy. Ver. 8: “Thou didst not hear it, nor didst thou know it, likewise thine ear was not opened beforehand; for I knew that thou art faithless, and wast called a transgressor from the womb.” I have, says the Lord, communicated to thee the knowledge of events of the Future which are altogether unheard of, of which, before, thou didst not know the least, nor couldst know. The reason of this communication is stated in the words: “for I knew,” &c. It is the same reason which, according to vers. 4, 5, called forth also the former definite prophecies regarding the Future, now already fulfilled, *viz.*, the unbelief of the people, which requires a *palpable* proof that the Lord alone is God, because it is but too ingenious in finding out seeming reasons for justifying its apostacy. All that is perfectly in keeping with, and suitable to the stand-point of Isaiah, but not to that of “the great unknown,” at whose time the conqueror from the East was already beheld with the bodily eye; and Habakkuk had long ago prophesied the destruction of the Babylonish world’s power, and Israel’s deliverance; and Jeremiah had announced the destruction of Babylon by the Medes much more distinctly and definitely than is done here in the second part of Isaiah. In ver. 16 it is said: “Come ye near unto me, hear this: from the beginning I have not spoken in secret; from the time that it was, I was there, and now the Lord God hath sent me and His Spirit.” The sense is: Ever since the foundation of the people, I have given them the most distinct prophecies, and made them publicly known (referring to the whole chain of events, from the calling of Abraham and onward, which had been objects of prophecy); by mine omnipotence I have fulfilled them; and now I have sent my servant Isaiah, and filled him with my Spirit, in order that, by a new

distinguished prophecy, he may bear witness to my sole divinity. It is only the accompanying mission of the Spirit which gives its importance to that of the Prophet. It is from God's Spirit searching the depths of the Godhead, and knowing His most hidden counsels, that those prophecies of the second part, going beyond the natural consciousness, have proceeded.

We believe we have incontrovertibly proved that we are not entitled to draw any arguments against Isaiah's being the author of the second part, from the circumstance "that the exile is not announced, but that the author takes his stand in it, as well as in that of Isaiah's time, inasmuch as this standpoint is an assumed and ideal one. But if the *form* can prove nothing, far less can the *prophetic contents*. It is true that these contents cannot be explained from the natural consciousness of Isaiah; but it is not to be overlooked, that the assailed prophecies of Isaiah are even as directly as possible opposed to the rationalistic notion of prophetism, which is arbitrary, and goes in the face of all facts, and from which the arguments against their genuineness are drawn. In a whole series of passages of the second part (the same which we have just been discussing), the Prophet intimates that he gives disclosures which lie beyond the horizon of his time; and draws from this circumstance the arguments for his own divine mission, and the divinity of the God of Israel. He considers it as the disgrace of idolatry that it cannot give any definite prophecies, and with a noble scorn, challenges it to vindicate itself by such prophecies. That rationalistic notion of prophetism removes the boundaries which, according to the express statements of our Prophet, separate the Kingdom of God from heathenism. The rationalistic *national* God, however, it is true, can as little prophesy as the heathenish gods of stone and wood, of whom the Psalmist says: "They have ears, but they hear not, *neither speak they through their throat.*"

It is farther to be considered that the predictions of the Future, in those portions of Isaiah which are assailed just on account of them, are not so destitute of a foundation as is commonly assumed. There existed, in the present time and circumstances of the Prophet, important actual points of connection for them. They farther rest on the foundation of ideal views and conceptions of eternal truths, which had been familiar to the Church of the Lord from its very beginnings. They only enlarge what had already been prophesied by former prophets; and well secured and ascertained parallels in the prophetic announcement are not wanting for them.

The carrying away of the covenant-people into exile had been actually prophesied by the fact, that the land had spued out its former inhabitants on account of their sins. The threatening of the exile pervades the whole Pentateuch from beginning to end; compare *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, p. 270 ff. It is found in the Decalogue also: "That thy days may he long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." David shows a clear knowledge of the sufferings impending over his family, and hence also over the people of God; compare my Commentary on Song of Sol. S. 243. Solomon points to the future carrying away in his prayer at the consecration of the temple. Amos, the predecessor of Isaiah, foresees with absolute clearness, that, before the salvation comes, all that is glorious, not only in Israel, but in Judah also, must be given over to destruction, compare Vol. i. p. 357. In like manner, too, Hosea prophesies not only the destruction of the kingdom of the ten tribes, but also that Judah shall be carried away into exile, compare Vol. i. p. 176. In Isaiah, the foreknowledge of the entire devastation of the city and land, and the carrying away into captivity of its inhabitants—a foreknowledge which stands in close connection with the energy of the knowledge of sin

with the Prophets—meets us from the very beginning of his ministry, and also in those prophecies, the genuineness of which no one ventures to assail, as, *e.g.*, in chap. 1-6. After the severity of God had been manifested before the bodily eyes of the Prophet in the carrying away of the ten tribes, it could not, even from human considerations, be doubtful to him, what was the fate in store for Judah.

The knowledge, that the impending carrying away of Judah would take place by the Chaldeans, and that Babylon would be the place of their banishment, was not destitute of a certain natural foundation. In the germ, the Chaldean power actually existed even at that time. Decidedly erroneous is the view of *Hitzig*, that a Chaldean power in Babylon could be spoken of only since the time of Nabopolassar. This power, on the contrary, was very old; compare the proofs in *Delitzsch's* Commentary on Habakkuk, S. 21. The Assyrian power, although, when outwardly considered, at its height, when more closely examined, began, even at that time, already to sink. A weakening of the Assyrian power is intimated also by the circumstance, that Hezekiah ventured to rebel against the Assyrians, and the embassy of the Chaldean Merodach Baladan to Hezekiah, implies that, even at that time, many things gave a title to expect the speedy downfall of the Assyrian Empire. But the fact that Isaiah possessed the clear knowledge that, in some future period, the dominion of the world would pass over to Babylon and the Chaldeans,—that they would be the executors of the judgment upon Judah, we have already proved, in our remarks on chaps. 13, 14, from the prophecies of the first part,—from chap. 23:13, where the Chaldeans are mentioned as the executors of the judgment upon the neighbouring people, the Tyrians, and as the destroyers of the Assyrian dominion,—and from chap. 39. The attempt of dispossessing him of this knowledge is so much the more futile, that his contemporary Micah undeniably possesses it; comp. Vol. i. p. 464 So also does Habakkuk, between whose time and that of Isaiah, circumstances had not essentially changed, and who likewise still prophesied before the Chaldean monarchy had been established.

While this foreknowledge of the future *elevation* of Babylon had a *historical* foundation, the foreknowledge of its *humiliation and fate*, following soon after, rested on a *theological* foundation. With a heathenish people, elevation is always followed by haughtiness, with all its consequences; and, according to the eternal laws of the divine government of the world, haughtiness is a matter-of-fact prophecy of destruction. Proceeding from this view, the downfall of the Chaldean monarchy was prophesied by Habakkuk also, at a time when it was still developing, and was far from having attained to the zenith of its power. In the same manner, the foreknowledge of the future *deliverance of Israel* rises on a theological foundation, and is not at all to be considered in the same light as if, *e.g.*, the Prophet had foretold to Moab its deliverance. That which the Prophet here predicts is only the individualization of a general truth which meets us at the very beginnings of the covenant-people. The principle which St. Paul advances in Rom. 11:2: “God hath not cast away His people whom He foreknew,” and ver. 29: “For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,” meets us, clearly and distinctly, as early as in the books of Moses. In Levit. 26:42-45, the deliverance from the land of captivity is announced on the ground of the election of Israel, and of the covenant with the fathers, and as a fulfilment of the promise of future election, which was given by the fact of Israel's being delivered from Egypt. And according to Deut. 9:30, 31, 33, ff., and the close of chap. 32, the end of all the catastrophes which are inflicted upon the covenant-people is always Israel's conversion and reception into favour; behind the judgment, mercy is always concealed. In the prayer of Solomon, the carrying away goes hand in hand with the reception into favour. But it will be altogether fruitless to deny to

Isaiah the knowledge of the future deliverance of Israel from Babylon, since his contemporary Micah, in chap. 4:10, briefly and distinctly expresses the same: "And thou comest to Babylon; there shalt thou be delivered; there shall the Lord redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies."

The only point in the prophetic foreknowledge of the second part which really seems to want, not only a historical or ideal foundation, but also altogether corresponding analogies, is the mention of the name of Koresh. But this difficulty disappears if, in strict opposition to the current notion, it is assumed that Cyrus was induced, by our book only, to appropriate to himself that name. Recent investigation has proved that this name is originally not a proper name, but an honorary title,—that the Greek writers rightly explain it by *Sun*,—that the name of the sun was, in the East generally, and especially with the Persians, a common honorary title of rulers; comp. *Burnouf* and others in *Hävernicks Einleitung*, ii. 2, S. 165. This honorary title of the Persian kings, Isaiah might very easily learn in a natural way. And the fact that this *Nomen dignitatis* became, among several others, peculiar to Cyrus (the mention of the name of Koresh by Isaiah does not originally go beyond the announcement of the conqueror from the East) is explained by the circumstance that Cyrus assumed this name in honour of our book, and as an acknowledgment of the mission assigned to him by it, although the Prophet had not used this name in any other manner than Balaam had that of Agag, perhaps with an allusion to its signification; compare the phrases "from the East," "from the rising of the sun," in chap. 41:2, 25. And it is historically settled and certain, that Cyrus had originally another name, viz., *Agradates*, and that he assumed this name only at the time of his ascending the throne, which falls into the time when the prophecies of our book could already be known to him (comp. the proofs in *Hävernicks Einleit.*) And as it is farther certain that the prophecies of our book made a deep impression upon him, and, in important points, exercised an influence upon his actions (this appears not only from the express statement of *Josephus*, [Arch. xi. c. 1. § 1, 2,] but still more from an authentic document, the Edict of Cyrus, in Ezra 1:1 ff., which so plainly implies the fact reported by *Josephus*, that *Jahn* rightly called *Josephus'* statement a commentary on this Edict, which refers, *partly* with literal accuracy, to a series of passages from the second part of Isaiah, compare the particulars in *Kleinert, über die Echtheit des Jesaias*. S. 142);—as the condition of the Persian religion likewise confirms this result gained from the Edict of Cyrus (*Stuhr, die Religionssysteme des alten Orients*, S. 373 ff., proves that in the time of Cyrus, and by him, an Israelitish element had been introduced into it);—there will certainly not be any reason to consider our supposition to be improbable, or the result of embarrassment.

But to this circumstance we must still direct attention, that those prophetic announcements of the second part which have reference to that which, even at the time of "the great unknown," still belonged to the future, are far more distinct, and can far less be accounted for from natural causes, than those from which rationalistic criticism has drawn inferences as regards the spuriousness of the second part. The personal Messianic prophecies of the second part are much more characteristic than those concerning Cyrus. He who cannot, by the help of history, supplement and illustrate the prophecy, receives only an incomplete and defective image of the latter. And, indeed, a sufficiently long time elapsed before even Exegesis recognised with certainty and unanimity that it was Cyrus who was meant. Doubts and differences of opinion on this point meet us even down to last century. The Medes and Persians are not at all mentioned as the conquerors of Babylon, and all which refers to the person of Cyrus has an altogether ideal character; while the Messiah is, especially in chap. 53, so distinctly drawn, that scarcely any

essential feature in His image is omitted. And it is altogether a matter of course that here, in the antitypical deliverance, a much greater clearness and distinctness should prevail; for it stands in a far closer relation to the idea, so that form and substance do far less disagree.

It would be inappropriate were we here to take up and refute all the arguments against the genuineness of the second part, which rationalistic criticism has brought together. Besides those which we have already refuted, we shall bring into view only this argument, which, at first sight indeed, may dazzle and startle even the well-disposed, viz., the difference between the first and second parts, as regards language and mode of representation. The chief error of those who have adduced this argument is, that they judge altogether without reference to person,—a matter, however, quite legitimate in this case,—that they simply apply the same rule to the productions of Isaiah which, in the productions of less richly endowed persons, has indeed a *certain* right, *e.g.*, on the prophetic territory of Jeremiah, who, notwithstanding the difference of subject, yet does not understand so to change his voice, that it should not soon be recognized by the skilled. More than of all the prophets that holds true of Isaiah, which *Fichte*, in a letter to a *Königsberg* friend, writes of himself (in his *Life*, by his son, i. S. 196): “I have properly no style at all, for I have them all.” “Just as the subject demands,” says *Ewald*, without assigning to the circumstance any weight in judging of the second part, “just as the subject demands, every kind of speech, and every change of style are easily at his command; and it is just this in which here his greatness, as, in general, one of his most prominent perfections, consists.” The chief peculiarities of style in the second part stand in close relation to the subject, and the disposition of mind thereby called forth. The Prophet, as a rule, does not address the mass of the people, but the election (*ἐκλογή*); nor the sinful congregation of the Lord in the present time, but that of the future, purified by the judgments of the Lord, the seed and germ of which were the election of the Present. It is to the congregation of brethren that he addresses *Comfort*. The beginning: “Comfort ye, Comfort ye, Zion,” contains the keynote and principal subject. It is from this that the gentle, tender, soft character of the style is to be accounted for, as well as the frequent repetitions;—the comforting love follows, step by step, the grief which is indefatigable in its repetitions. From this circumstance is to be explained the habit of adding several epithets to the name of God; these are as many shields which are held up against despair, as many bulwarks against the things in sight, by which every thought of redemption was cut off. Where God is the sole help, every thing must be tried to make the Congregation feel what they have in Him. A series of single phrases which several times recur *verbatim*, *e.g.*, “I am the Lord, and none else, I do not give mine honour to any other, I am the first and the last,” are easily accounted for by the Prophet’s endeavour and anxiety to impress upon the desponding minds truths, which they were only too apt to forget. If other linguistic peculiarities occur, which cannot be explained from the subject, it must be considered that the second part is not by any means a collection of single prophecies, but a closely connected whole, which, as such, must necessarily have its own peculiar *usus loquendi*, a number of constantly recurring characteristic peculiarities. The character of unity must necessarily be expressed in language and style also. The fact, however, that, notwithstanding the difference of style betwixt the first and second parts, the second part has a great number of characteristic peculiarities of language and style in common with the first part (a fact which cannot be otherwise, if Isaiah was the author of both), was first very thoroughly demonstrated by *Kleinert*, while *Köper* and *Caspari* have been the first conclusively to prove, that the second part was known and made use of by those prophets who prophesied between the time of Isaiah and that of “the great unknown.”

The close connection of the second part with the first is, among other things, proved also by the circumstance that both are equally strongly pervaded with the Messianic announcement. Chap. 1-12 especially have, in this respect, a remarkable parallel in the second book of the second part. The fact, moreover, that the single Messianic prophecies of the second part agree, in the finest and most concealed features, with those of the first part, will be shown in the exposition.

## **CHAPTER 42:1-9**

The 40th chapter has an introductory character. It comforts the people of the Lord by pointing, in general, to a Future rich in salvation. In chap. 41 the Prophet describes the appearance of the conqueror from the East for the destruction of Babylon,—an event from which he derives, as from a rich source, ample consolations for his poor wretched people, while, at the same time, he represents idolatry as being thereby put to shame. It is on purpose that, immediately after the first announcement of this conqueror from the East, his antitype is, in chap. 42:1-9, contrasted with him. In the preceding chapter, the Prophet had shown how, by the influence of the king from the East, the Lord would put idolatry to shame, and work out deliverance for His Church. In the section now before us, he describes how, by the mission of His servant, the Lord would effect, definitely and absolutely, that which the former had done only in a preliminary, limited, and imperfect manner. In the subsequent section, the Prophet then first farther carries out the image of the conqueror from the East; and from chap. 49 he turns to a more minute representation of the image of the true Saviour. In chaps. 42:10, to 43:7, the discourse turns, from a general description of God's instruments of salvation, to a general description of the salvation in its whole extent; just as it is the manner of the second part ever again to return from the particular to the general. Here, where the Servant of God is first to be introduced, He is at first spoken *of*; it is in ver. 5 that the Lord first speaks *to* His servant. In chap. 49, on the contrary, the Servant of God, being already known from chap. 42, is, without farther remark, introduced as speaking.

In the whole section, the Lord is speaking. It falls into three divisions—First, the Lord speaks *of* His servant, vers. 1-4; then He speaks *to* His servant, ver. 5-7; finally, He addresses some closing words to the Church, ver. 8, 9. The representation, in harmony with the nature of the prophetic vision, bears a dramatic character.

In ver. 1-4, the Lord, as it were, points to His servant, introduces Him to His Church, and commends Him to the world: “Behold my Servant,” &c. He, the beloved and elect One, upheld by God, and endowed with the fulness of the Spirit of God, shall establish righteousness upon the whole earth, and bring into submission to himself the whole Gentile world, by showing himself meek and lowly in heart, an helper of the poor and afflicted, and combining with it never-failing power. The aim: He shall bring forth right to the Gentiles, is at once expressed at the close of ver. 1. In ver. 2-4, the means by which He attains this aim are then stated. The bringing forth, or the establishing of right, recurs again in ver. 3 and 4, in order to point out this relation of ver. 2-4 to ver. 1.

In ver. 6 and 7, after having pointed to His Omnipotence as affording a guarantee for the fulfilment of a prophecy so great that it might appear almost incredible, the Lord turns to His Servant and addresses Him. He announces to Him that it should be His glorious destination, partly to bring, in His person, the covenant with Israel to its full truth, partly

to be the light for the Gentile world,—to be, in general, the Saviour of the whole human race.

In the closing verses, 8, 9, the Lord addresses the Church, and directs its attention to the object which the announcement of the mission of His Servant, declared in the preceding context, serves: God, because He is God, is anxious for the promotion of His glory. In order, therefore, that it may be known that He alone is God, He grants to His people disclosures as regards the distant Future, as yet fully wrapped up in obscurity.

There is no doubt, and it is now generally admitted, that the Servant of the Lord, here described, is the same as He who is brought before us in chap. 49:4; 53, 61. It is, hence, not sufficient to point out an individual to whom, apparently, the attributes contained in this prophecy belong; but we must add and combine all the signs and attributes which are contained in the parallel passages.

The Chaldean Paraphrast who, in so many instances, has faithfully preserved the exegetical tradition, understands the Messiah by the Servant of God; and so, from among the later Jewish expositors, do *Dav. Kimchi* and *Abarbanel*, the latter of whom says of the non-Messianic interpretation, הלא לכש מירונסב וכה מימכה “that all these expositors were struck with blindness.” That this exposition was the current one among the Jews at the time of Christ, appears from Luke 2:32, where Simeon designates the Saviour as the light to be revealed to the Gentiles φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, with a reference to Is. 42:6; 44:6. It is especially the latter passage which Simeon has in view, as also St. Paul in Acts 13:46, 47, as appears from the words immediately preceding ὅτι εεδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, which evidently refer to chap. 49. But chap. 49 is, as regards the point which here comes into consideration, a mere repetition and confirmation of chap. 42.

By the New Testament, this exposition has been introduced and established in the Church of Christ. The words which, at the baptism of Christ, resounded from heaven: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, Matt. 3:17 (comp. Mark 1:11) evidently refer to ver. 1 of the chapter before us, and point out that He who had now appeared was none other than He who had, centuries ago, been predicted by the prophets. And so do likewise the words which, according to Matt. 17:5 (comp. Mark 9:7; Luke 9:35; 2 Pet. 1:17), at the transfiguration of Christ, towards the close of His ministry, resounded from heaven in order to strengthen the Apostles: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα: ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. These voices at the beginning and the close of Christ's ministry have not been sufficiently attended to by those who have raised doubts against the Messianic interpretation; for a doubt in this must necessarily shake also the belief in the reality of those voices. In both of the passages, the place of the Servant of God in chap. 42:1 (which passage is indeed not so much quoted, as only, in a free treatment, referred to) is taken by the Son of God, from Ps. 2:7, just as, at the transfiguration, the words αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε are at once added from Deut. 18:15. The name of the Servant of God was not high enough for the sublime moment; the *Son* formed, in the second passage, the contrast to the *mere* servants of God, Moses and Elijah.—In Matt. 12:17-21, ver. 1-3 are quoted, and referred to Christ. The Messianic explanation of chap. 42, 49 lies at the foundation of all the other passages also, where Christ is spoken of as the παῖς Θεοῦ. In Acts 3:13: ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, we shall be obliged to follow *Bengel* in explaining it by: *ministrum suum*, partly on account of Matt. 12:18, and because the LXX. often render עבד by παῖς; partly on account of the obvious reference to

the Old Testament passages which treat of the Servant of God, and on account of the special allusion to chap. 49:3 in the ἐδόξασε (LXX. δοῦλός μου ἐε σὺ [Ἰσραήλ] καὶ ἐν σοὶ εὐδοξασθήσομαι). And so likewise in Acts 3:26; 4:27: ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν ὃν ἔχρισας, where the last words refer to chap. 61:1; farther, in Acts 4:30. In all these passages it is not the more obvious δοῦλός, but παῖς which is put, in order to remove the low notions which, in Greek, attach to the word δοῦλός.

Taking her stand partly on these authorities, partly on the natural sense of the passage, the Christian Church has all along referred the passage to Christ; and even expositors such as *Clericists*, who, everywhere else, whensoever it is possible, seek to set aside the Messianic interpretation, are here found among its most decided defenders. In our century, with the awakening faith, this explanation has again obtained general dominion; and wherever expositors of evangelical disposition do not yet profess it, this is to be accounted for from the still continuing influence of rationalistic tradition.

We are led to the Messianic interpretation by the circumstance that the servant of God appears here as the antitype of Cyrus. A real person can be contrasted with a real person only, but not with a personification, as is assumed by the other explanations. We are compelled to explain it of Christ by this circumstance also, that it is in Him only that the signs of the Servant of God are to be found,—that in Him only the covenant of God with Israel has become a truth,—that He only is the light of the Gentiles,—that He only, without external force, by His gentleness, meekness, and love, has founded a Kingdom, the boundaries of which are conterminous with those of the earth. The connection, also, with the other Messianic announcements, especially those of the first part, compels us to refer it to Christ.

The reasons against the Messianic interpretation are of little weight. The assertion that nowhere in the New Testament does Jesus appear as the Servant of Jehovah (*Hendewerk*), is at once overthrown by Matt. 12:18, as well as by the other passages already quoted, in which Christ appears as παῖς Θεοῦ. Phil. 2:7, μορφῆν δούλου λαβὼν comes as near the יהוהי דבּע, as it was possible, considering the low notion attached to the Greek δοῦλος. The passages which treat of the obedience of Christ, such as Rom. 5:19; Phil. 2:8; Heb. 5:8; John 17:4: τὸν ῥγον ἐτελείωσα, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι να ποιήσω, give only a paraphrase of the notion of the Servant of the Lord. With perfect soundness *Dr Nitzsch* has remarked, that it was required by the typical connection of the two Testaments, that Christ should somehow, according to His ὑπακοή, ὑποταγή, be represented as the perfect manifestation of the דבּע.—The assertion: “The Messiah is excluded by the circumstance that the subject is not only to be a teacher of the Gentiles, who is endowed with the Spirit of God, but is also to announce deliverance to Israel” (*Gesenius*), rests only on an erroneous, falsely literal interpretation of ver. 7, which is not a whit better than if, in ver. 3, we were to think of a natural bruised reed, a natural wick dimly burning.—The objection that this Servant of the Lord is not foretold as a future person, but is spoken of as one present, forgets that we are here on the territory of prophetic vision, that the prophets had not in vain the name of *seers*, and puts the *real*, in place of the *ideal* Present,—a mistake which is here the less pardonable that the Prophet pre-eminently uses the Future, and, in this way, himself explains the ideal character of the inserted Preterites.—In order to refute the assertion, that the doctrine of the Messiah is foreign to the second part of Isaiah, that (as *Ewald* held) in it the former Messianic hopes are connected with the person of a heathen king, viz., Cyrus (how very little have they who advance such opinions any idea of the nature of Holy Writ!), it is only necessary to refer

to chap. 55:3, 4, where the second David, the Messiah, appears, at the same time, as Teacher, and as the Prince and Lawgiver of the nations, who is to extend the Kingdom of God far over all heathen nations. That which, in that passage, is declared of the Messiah, and that which, in those passages which treat of the Servant of God, is declared of Him, exclude one another, as soon as, by the Servant of God, any other subject than the Messiah is understood.

Even this circumstance must raise an unfavourable prejudice against the non-Messianic interpretation, that its defenders are at one in the negative only, but differ in the positive determination of the subject, and that, hitherto, no one view has succeeded in overthrowing the other; and farther, that ever anon new subtleties are advanced, by means of which it is attempted to patch up and conceal the inadmissibilities of every individual exposition.

Passing over those expositions which have now become obsolete,—such as of Cyrus, the Prophet Isaiah himself—we shall give attention to those expositions only which even now have their representatives, and which have some foundation in the matter itself.

The LXX. already understood Israel by the Servant of the Lord. They translate in ver. 1: *Ἰακωβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ, Ἰσραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.* Among the Jewish interpreters, *Jarchi* follows this explanation, but with this modification, that, by the Servant of the Lord, he understands the collective body of the righteous in Israel. In modern times, this view is defended by *Hitzig*. It appeals especially to the circumstance that, in a series of other passages of the second part, Israel, too, is designated by the Servant of God, viz. in chap. 41:8: “And thou Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, seed of Abraham my friend,” ver. 9: “Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from its sides, and said unto thee: Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away,” chap. 42:19, 43:10, 44:1, 2: “And now hear, O Jacob my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen, Thus saith the Lord that made thee, formed thee from the womb and helpeth thee: Fear not, O Jacob, my servant, and thou Jeshurun, whom I have chosen;” chap. 44:21, 45:4, 48:20; “Say ye, the Lord hath redeemed His servant Jacob.” In the face of this fact, we shall not be permitted to refer to “the general signification of the expression, and its manifold use.” For, generally, it is of very rare occurrence that Israel is personified as the Son of God (in Ps. 105:6, it is not Israel, as *Köster* supposes, but Abraham who is called Servant of God; Jer. 30:10, 46:27; Ezek. 37:25 are, in all probability, dependent upon the second part of Isaiah, by which this designation first obtained a footing), and never occurs in such accumulation as here. For this very reason, we cannot well think of an accident; and if there was an intention, we can seek it only in the circumstance that there exists a close reference to those prophecies which, *ex professo*, have to do with the Servant of God. To this we are led by another circumstance, also. While those passages in which Israel or Jacob is spoken of as the servant of God, occur in great numbers in the first book of the second part of Isaiah, they *disappear* altogether in the second book, which is the proper seat of the detail prophecies of the Servant of God in question, who, in the first book was, by way of anticipation only, mentioned in chap. 42. After chap. 48:20, where the words: “The Lord hath redeemed His servant Jacob,” occur with evident intention, once more at the close of the first book, Jacob, the servant of God, is, in general, no more spoken of, but the Plural is used only of the Israelites as the servants of God in chap. 63:17: “For thy servants’ sake, the tribes of thine inheritance;” 65:8, 9-13, 66:14,—passages which make it only the more evident that the Prophet purposely avoids bringing forward Jacob as the

ideal person of the Servant of the Lord. *Finally*—The idea of chance is entirely excluded by chap. 49:3, where the Messiah is called Israel.

From these facts, however, we are not entitled to infer that, in the prophetic announcement, Israel is simply spoken of as the servant of God; but on the contrary the context must be viewed in a different and *nicer* way. This is evident from the circumstance that, while in the passages chaps. 41:7, 48:20, Israel and Jacob are intentionally spoken of as the servant of God, or, at least, Israel is so distinctly pointed out that it cannot be at all misunderstood, such an express pointing to Israel is (with the sole exception of chap. 49:3), as intentionally, avoided in the prophetic announcement of the Servant of God. The phrase “My servant Jacob,” which, in the former passages is the rule, never occurs in the latter. This circumstance clearly indicates that, besides the agreement, there exists a difference. The facts, however, which point out the agreement, receive ample justice by the supposition *that the Prophet considers Christ as the concentration and essence of Israel*, that he expects from Him the realization of the task which was given to Israel, but had not been fulfilled by them, and just thereby, also, the realization of the promises given to Israel. But, besides other reasons, the fact that the whole description of the Servant of God stands in direct contradiction to what the Prophet elsewhere says of Israel, proves that Israel is not meant in *opposition* to the Messiah,—the body without the head. It is especially chap. 42:19 which here comes into consideration: “Who is so blind as my servant, or so blind as my messenger whom I send?” Israel is here called servant of the Lord, because it had been called by Him to preserve the true religion on earth. Parallel is the appellation: “My messenger whom I send.” Israel, as the messenger of God, was to deliver His commands to the Gentiles. The Prophet sharpens the reproof, in that he always contrasts what the people were, and what they ought to have been, according to the destination given to them by the Lord. The servant of the Lord, who, in order to execute His commissions, must have a sharp eye, is blind; His messenger is deaf and cannot hear what He says to him. The immense contrast between idea and reality which is here pointed out, implies, since the idea must necessarily be realized, that it shall receive another bearer; that in place of the messenger, who has become blind and deaf, there should come the true Messenger who first opens the eyes of Israel, and then those of the Gentiles,—that the destination of Israel, which the members are unfit to realize, should be realized by the head. We are not at liberty to say that the servant who had become blind and deaf shall be converted, shall put off the old man and put on the new man, and shall then accomplish the great things which, in the prophecies of the Servant of God, are assigned to him. For the conversion,—on which everything depends, and apart from which the announcement of the Prophet would be an empty fancy—is, in all these prophecies, not mentioned by a single word. On the contrary, the Servant of God is everywhere, from His very origin, brought before us as the absolutely just. No more glaring contrast can really be imagined than that which exists between that which the Prophet says of the ordinary Israel (whose outward state, as it is described in chap. 42:22: “This is a people robbed and spoiled, they are all of them snared in holes, and hid in prison-houses,” is only a faithful image of the internal condition), and the Son of God in whom His soul delighteth, who in exuberant love seeks that which is lost, whose overflowing righteousness justifies many, and who, as a substitute, can suffer for others. It is in Christ only, that Israel attains to its destination, both in a moral point of view, and as regards the Divine preservation and glorification. To this it may still be added, that neither here, nor in the parallel passage is הוהי דבט ever connected with a Plural, but always with the Singular only; while elsewhere, in the case of collective nouns and ideal persons, the real plurality not uncommonly shines forth from behind the unity; and in

those passages, especially, where Israel appears personified as a unity, the use of the Singular is interchanged with that of the Plural. Comp., e.g., chap. 41:8: “And thou Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, seed (*posterity*) of Abraham, my friend,” chap. 43:10; “*Ye are my witnesses*, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen.” But a circumstance, which alone would be sufficient for the proof, is the fact, that in chap. 41:6. (comp. chap. 49:5, 6) the Servant of the Lord is plainly distinguished from the people. How can the Lord say of the people, that He will give it for a covenant of the people, that in it He will cause the covenant with the people to attain to its truth? The fact, that this passage opposes an insurmountable barrier to the explanation which makes the people the subject, sufficiently appears from the circumstance, that the expositors saw themselves obliged to set aside its natural sense by a forced, unphilological explanation. *Finally*,—In understanding the people by the Servant of God, the prophecies of the Servant of God are brought into irreconcilable contradiction with all other prophecies, with the first part of Isaiah, and even with the second part, inasmuch as things would then be prophesied of the people which, everywhere else, are constantly assigned to the Messiah. This is quite openly expressed by *Köster*: “The Servant of Jehovah is the Jewish people; viewed, however, by the Prophet in such a manner as to combine in itself the attributes of both, the prophets and the Messiah.” Prophetism would have dug its own grave if its organs had, in a manner so inconsiderate, contradicted each other as regards the highest hopes of the people. The national conviction of the inspiration of the prophets, which formed the foundation of their activity and efficiency, could, in that case, not have arisen at all. The same arguments decide partly also against a modification of this explanation which evidently has proceeded from embarrassment only,<sup>17</sup> against those who, by the Servant of God, understand the better portion of Israel,—such as *Maurer, Ewald, Oehler (Ueber den Knecht Gottes, Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1840*. The latter differs from the other supporters of this view in this, that, according to him, the notion of the ideal Israel which, he thinks, prevails in chap. 42 and 49, is, in chap. 53, raised to the view of an individual—the Messiah), *Knobel* (“The theocratic substance of the people, to which especially the prophets and priests belonged.”) By this modification, the explanation which makes the people the subject, loses its only apparent foundation, inasmuch as it can no more appeal to those passages in which Israel is spoken of as the Servant of the Lord; for it is obvious that, in these, not merely the pious portion of the people is spoken of. At the very outset, in ver. 19, the whole of the people are undeniably designated by the Servant of the Lord. It is they only who are blind and deaf in a spiritual point of view. The whole people, and not a portion of them, are in the condition of servitude, ver. 22. In ver. 24, Jacob and Israel are expressly mentioned. The whole people, and not merely the pious portion, are objects of the Lord’s election (chap. 41:8, 44:1, 2); the whole people are to be redeemed from Babylon, chap. 48:20. The hypothesis of the pious portion of the people can as little account for the unexceptional use of the singular, as the hypothesis of the whole people; like it, it isolates the prophecies of the Servant of God, and brings them into contradiction with all the other prophecies, which assign to Christ the same things that are here assigned to the Servant of God. But what is especially in opposition to this hypothesis is ver. 3, where the Servant of God is designated as the Saviour of the poor and afflicted, which, in the first instance, are no other than the better portion of the people; as well as other reasons, which we shall bring out in commenting upon chap. 53 by which section the hypothesis is altogether overthrown.

According to *De Wette (de morte expiat. p. 26)* and *Gesenius*, the subject of the prophecy is the collective body of the prophets. Substantially, *Umbreit* too (*Der Knecht Gottes, Hamburg 1840*) adheres to this interpretation. He rejects the explanation which refers it to

Christ in the sense of the Christian Church, and on p. 13 he completely assents to *Gesenius*, by remarking that he could not find in the prophets any supernatural, distinct predictions of future events. The Prophet, according to him, formed to himself, by his own authority, an "ideal of a Messiah," the abstraction of what he saw before his eyes in the people, especially in the better portion of them, but chiefly in the order of the prophets, and then persuaded himself that this self-invented image would, at some future period, come into existence as a real person. "The highest ideal of the prophetic order, viewed as teaching, is represented in the unity of a person." "We find the prophets as a collective body in the עֲבָדִים, but chiefly, the prophets who, in future only, on the regained paternal soil, are, in some person, to reach the highest perfection."

This hypothesis of the collective body of the prophets violently severs the prophecy before us, and the parallel passages from those passages of the second part in which Israel is spoken of as the Servant of God. It is quite impossible to point out anywhere in the Old Testament, and especially in the second part of Isaiah, an analogous personification of the order of the prophets as the Servant of God. The reference to chap. 44:26: "That establisheth the word of His servant, and performeth the counsel of His messengers; that saith of Jerusalem: She shall be inhabited, and of the cities of Judah: They shall be built, and I will raise up the walls thereof," is, in this respect, altogether out of place, inasmuch as the servant of the Lord, in that verse, is not the collective band of the prophets, but Isaiah himself, just as in chap. 23. The parallelism between the servant of the Lord and His messengers is not a *synonymous*, but a *synthetic* one, just as, afterwards, Jerusalem and the cities of Judah are placed beside one another. The parallel passages clearly intimate that, by the servant of the Lord, Isaiah only is to be understood. Throughout, the Prophet refers exclusively to his own prophecies, as regards the impending salvation of Israel (the prophecies of others he mentions, everywhere else, always in reference to the past only); and it cannot be imagined that, in this single passage only, he should have designated himself as one among the many. If we consider those parallel passages, we must assume that the *messengers* also are represented chiefly by our Prophet; that he is their mouth and organ, just as, in Rev. 1:1, and 22:6, the servants of God and the prophets are represented by John.

*Farther*—It cannot be denied that a certain amount of truth lies at the foundation of the explanation which makes the prophetic order the subject. The Messiah appears in our prophecy pre-eminently as the Prophet, in harmony and connection with Deut. 18 (comp. Vol. i., p. 107); and the substratum of the description forms chiefly the prophetic order, while in the prophecies of the first part, it is chiefly the regal office which appears, and, in chap. 53, the priestly. But the mistake (as *Umbreit* himself partly saw) is, that this explanation changes the person into a personification, instead of recognizing that the idea, which hitherto was only imperfectly realized by the prophetic order, demands a future perfect realisation in an individual, so that we could not but expect such an one even if there did not exist any Messianic prophecy at all. Every prophet who, in human weakness, performed his office, was a guarantee of the future appearance of *the* Prophet, as surely as God never does by halves what, according to His nature, and as proved by the existence of the imperfect, He must do. But the fact that, here, we have not before us a mere personification of the prophetic order, nor, as little, according to the opinion of *Umbreit*, a single individual by whom, in future, the idea of the prophetic order was to be most perfectly realised, is evident from the circumstance that the Servant of God does not, by any means, represent himself as being *only* the Prophet. The contrast between Cyrus and the Servant of God, which *G. Müller* advances: "Evidently, the former is a

conqueror; the latter, a meek teacher,” is onesided; for the Servant of God appears, at the same time, as a powerful *ruler*, just as Christ, in chap. 55:4, is at the same time designated as a *Witness*, and as Prince and Lawgiver of the nations. To the mere teacher not even ver. 3 is applicable, if the parallel passages are compared, but far less ver. 4: “The isles shall wait for *His law*.” Nor does a mere teacher come up to the embodied covenant with Israel in ver. 6, nor to *the light*, *i.e.*, Salvation and Saviour of the Gentiles. By mere teaching, salvation cannot be wrought out. Ver. 7 also does not apply to the mere *teacher*.

The collective body of the prophets, or the ideal prophet, is altogether out of place in chap. 53; for there the Servant of God does not appear as a Prophet, but as a High Priest and Redeemer. This hypothesis meets with farther difficulties by the mention of Israel in chap. 49:3. *Further*—It cannot well be conceived how the Prophet who, according to these expositors, lived about the end of the exile, could expect such glorious things of the prophetic order, as that from it even a preliminary and partial realization of his hopes should proceed. At that time the prophetic order was already dying out; and a prophetic order among the exiled cannot well be spoken of. *Finally*—That which is here ascribed to the Servant of God—the grand influence upon the heathen world—is not of such a character, as that the prophets could be considered as even the precursors and companions in the work of *the Prophet*. Neither prophecy nor history assigns to the prophets any share in this work. This hypothesis severs the second part from its connection with the whole remaining Old Testament, according to which it is by Christ alone that the reception of the Gentiles into the Kingdom of God shall be effected. And in this second part itself, it stands likewise in contradiction to chap. 55:3, 4.

Ver. 1. “Behold my Servant whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon Him, He shall bring forth right<sup>18</sup> to the Gentiles.”

Every pious man is called, in general, “servant of the Lord,” comp. Job 1:8; Ps. 19:12, 14; but ordinarily, the designation is, in a special sense, applied to those whom God makes use of for the execution of His purposes, to whom He entrusts the administration of His affairs, and whom He equips for the promotion of His glory. David, who, according to Acts 13:36, had in his generation served the counsel of God, calls himself in his prayer in 2 Sam. 7, not fewer than ten times, the servant of God, (Vol. i. p. 135, 136); and the same designation he gives to himself in the inscriptions of Ps. 18 and 36. The *Prophets* are called servants of God in 2 Kings 13:3; Jer. 26:5. In the highest and most perfect degree, that designation belongs to Christ, who, in the most perfect manner, carried out the decrees of God, and to whom all former servants and instruments of the Lord in His kingdom, pointed as types. But the designation has not merely a reference to the subjective element of obedience, but points, at the same time, to the *dignity* of him who is thus designated. It is a high honour to be received by God among the number of His servants, who enjoy the providence and protection of their mighty and rich Lord. That this aspect—the *dignity*—comes here chiefly into consideration, in the case of Him who is the Servant of God κατ’ ἐρξοχήν, and in whom, therefore, this *dignity* must reach its highest degree, so that the designation, *My Servant*, borders very closely upon that of *My Son*, (comp. Matth. 3:17, 17:5);—that this aspect comes here chiefly into consideration is probable even from the circumstance that, in those passages of the second part which treat of *Israel* as the servant of God, it is just this aspect which is pre-eminently regarded. Thus it is in chap. 41:8: “And thou Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham, my friend.” To be the servant of God appears here as an honour, as the

privilege which was bestowed upon Israel in preference to the Gentiles. On ver. 9: “Thou, whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and from her borders called thee, and said unto thee: Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away,” Luther remarks: “The name, ‘my servant,’ contains the highest *consolation*, both when we look to Him who speaks, viz., He who has created everything, and also to him who is addressed, viz., afflicted and forsaken man.” In chap. 44:1, 2: “And now hear, O Jacob, my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen; thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, who will help thee: Fear not, O Jacob, my servant, and Jeshurun, whom I have chosen,” all the designations of God and Israel serve only for an introduction to the exhortation: “Fear not,” by laying open the necessity which exists for the promise in ver. 3, which, without such a foundation, would be baseless. The context and the parallelism with “whom I have chosen” show that the designation, “servant of God” in these verses has no reference to a duty imposed, but to a privilege, a relation which is the pledge of divine aid to Israel. Jeshurun stands as a kind of *nomen proprium*, and is not parallel to יַדְבֵּעַ, but to Jacob. In chap. 44:21: “Remember this, O Jacob, and Israel, for thou art my servant, I have formed thee for a servant to me, Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me,” the הַלֵּא “this” refers to the folly of idolatry exhibited in the preceding verses. The duty that Israel should remember this, is founded upon the fact, that he is the servant of the Lord, called by Him to a glorious dignity, to high prerogatives, of which he must not rob himself by apostatizing from Him. It is He who has bestowed upon him this dignity, and He will soon show by deeds, that He cannot forget him, if only his heart does not forget his God. In a similar manner, in chap. 45:4, the protecting providence and love of God are looked to. The aspect of the duty and of the service which Israel has to perform to his Lord, is specially pointed out in a single passage only, in chap. 42:19; all the other passages place the dignity in the foreground. That, in the designation, Servant of God, in the passage before us, prominence is also given to the dignity, is confirmed by the addition of “whom I uphold,” which presents itself as an immediate consequence of the relation of a servant of God, and by the parallel: “mine elect in whom my soul delighteth.”—קַח “to take,” “to seize,” “to hold,” when followed by כּ, always signifies *to lay hold of, to hold fast, to support*. With the words: “Behold my servant whom I uphold,” corresponds what the Lord says in John 8:29: ὁ πέμψας με μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐστίν· οὐκ ἀφήκεν με μόνον, ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάντοτε; comp. John 3:2; Acts 10:38. The Preterite יָתַח is employed, because the communication of the Spirit is the condition of his bringing forth right, just as, in ver. 6, the *calling* is the ground of the preservation. In the whole of the description of the Servant of God, the Future prevails throughout; the *Praeteritum propheticum* is employed only, where something is to be designated, which, relatively, is antecedent; compare the words: “And the Spirit of the Lord rests upon Him,” in chap. 11:2; 61:1; Matt. 3:16; John 3:34. The three passages in Isaiah which speak of the communication of the Spirit to Christ are inseparably connected with one another, and, on the whole Old Testament territory, there is no passage exactly parallel to them. The Hiphel of אָצַח must not be explained by “to announce,” as some interpreters do; for in this signification it nowhere occurs; and according to what follows, and the parallel passages, the Servant of God does not by any means establish right by the mere announcement, but by His holy disposition. But as little can we explain אֵיצוּהוּ by “to lead out,” in contrast to the circumstance that, under the Old Testament, right was limited to a single nation. For in the parallel passage, chap. 51:4: “Hearken unto me, my people, and give ear unto me, O my congregation, for law shall proceed from me, and I will set my right for the light of the nations,” אָצַח does not mean to go *out*, but to go *forth, i.e.*, to proceed. In the same way, in Hab. 1:4: “And not does right go forth for ever,” *i.e.*, it

never comes forth, is never established, comp. Vol. i., p. 442, 443. Hence אִיצוּה here can mean only “to bring to light,” “to bring forth.” טַפְּשָׁם is, by several interpreters, taken in the signification, “religion;” but it is just ver. 4, by which they support their view, which shows that the ordinary signification “right,” must be retained here. For in that verse, *right* stands in parallelism with *law*, by which right is established; comp. chap. 51:4. Before God’s Kingdom was, by the Servant of God, extended to the Gentile nations, there existed among them, notwithstanding all the excellence of outward legal arrangements, a condition without right in the higher sense. Right, in its essence, has its root in God, as may be seen from the Ten Commandments, which everywhere go back to God, and in all of which Luther, in his exposition of the ten commandments, rightly repeats: “We shall fear and love God.” Where, therefore, the living God is not known, there can be no right. The commandment: “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” *e.g.*, has any meaning only where the eye is open for the divine image which the neighbour bears, and for the redemption of which he is a fellow-partaker. The commandment: “Honour thy father and thy mother” will go to the heart only where the divine paternity is known, of which all earthly paternity is only an image. In Deut. 4:5-8, Israel’s happiness is praised, in that they alone, among all the nations, are in possession of God’s laws and commandments. Those privileges of Israel are, by the Servant of God, to be extended to the Gentiles who, because they are destitute of right, are in Deut. 32:21, called a foolish nation. In Ps. 147:19, 20, it is said: “He showeth His word unto Jacob, His statutes and laws unto Israel. He has not dealt so with any nation, and law they do not know.” This passage touches very closely upon that before us; like it, it denies right to the Gentiles in general. “The Gentiles, being without God in the world, do not know any right at all. For that which they call so, is only the shadow of that which really deserves this name, is only a dark mixture of right and wrong.” As regards the first table of the Ten Commandments, they grope entirely in the dark; and with respect to the second table, it is only here and there that they see a faint glimpse of light.—A consequence of the bringing forth of right to the Gentiles is the ceasing of war, as it is described in chap. 2:4. “When right has obtained dominion, it cannot tolerate war beside it; where there is true right, there is also peace. The benefit which, in the first instance, is conferred upon the Gentiles, is enjoyed by Israel also: The intention of comforting and encouraging Israel clearly appears in the parallel passage, chap. 51:4. For the right which obtains dominion among the Gentiles, is Israel’s pride and ornament, so that, along with their God and His right, they obtain also the dominion over the Gentile world, by which they were hitherto kept in bondage; and whensoever and wheresoever the divine right obtains dominion, the violent oppression must cease, under which the people of God had been groaning up to that time. The Servant of God, however, who brings forth right to the Gentiles, forms the contrast to the worldly conqueror, of whom it was said in chap. 41:25: “He cometh upon princes as mortar, and, just as the potter treadeth the clay.”—The words: “He shall bring forth right,” purposely return again in ver. 3; and equally intentionally, the words: “He shall found right on the earth,” in ver. 4, refer to them. “We have thus”—*Stier* pertinently remarks—“in ver. 1, the sum and substance, even to its aim. But it is immediately brought more distinctly to view, what will be the spirit and character, the mode of operation, by which this aim is to be brought about.”

Ver. 2. “*He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause His voice to be heard in the street.*”

After וְשָׁא “he shall lift up,” “His voice” must be supplied from the context. The words must not be understood in such a manner, as if they stood in opposition to chap. 58:1: “Cry with thy throat, do not refrain, lift up thy voice like the trumpet, and show my

people their transgression, and to the house of Jacob their sins.” The Prophet, in that passage, encourages himself; and he cannot mean to represent that as objectionable, by the circumstance that, in the case of the Servant of God, the very ideal of all the servants of God, he points out and praises the very opposite. And, in like manner, every interpretation is to be avoided according to which “dumb dogs which cannot bark” find a pretext in this passage. According to Prov. 1:20: “Wisdom crieth aloud without, she uttereth her voice in the streets. Just as the prohibition of swearing in Matt. 5:34 is qualified by the opposition to Pharisaic levity in cursing and swearing, so here, also, the antithesis to the loud manner of the worldly conqueror must be kept in view,—the contrast to his violence which stakes every thing upon carrying his own will, which cries and rages when it meets with opposition and resistance, (Matt. renders יצק by ἐρίσει, “He shall contend”), to the earnestly sought publicity, to the intention of causing sensation, as it proceeds from vanity or pride. The κραυγάσει, by which Matthew renders the ושא, has nothing in common with the ἔκραξε which, in John 7:28, 37, is said of Christ. With the passionate restlessness, with which the conqueror from the East seeks to carry through his human plans, and to place himself in the centre of the world’s history, is here contrasted the inward composure and deportment of the Servant of God, His equanimity, His freedom from excitement,—all of which are based upon the clear consciousness of His dignity and mission, upon the conviction of the power of the truth which is of God, of the power of the Spirit which opens up the minds and hearts for it, and which has its source in the declaration: “I put my Spirit upon Him,” by which the great wall of separation between Him and the conqueror from the East is set up. It is just because of His not being bent upon carrying through any thing, because of His great confidence, that the Servant of God *gains* everything, and obtains His object of bringing right to the nations.—Matt. in chap. 12:15-21, finds the confirmation of the character here assigned to Christ in two circumstances:—*first*, in His not entering into a violent dispute with the Pharisees opposing Him (οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἐξεληθόντες, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν), in His not exciting against them the masses who were devoted to Him, but in withdrawing from them (ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν, ver. 15), being convinced that the cause was not His but God’s, and that there was no reason for getting angry with those who were contending against God; just as David said of Shimei: “Let him curse, because the Lord has said unto him, Curse David.”—*Secondly*, in the circumstance that instead of availing himself of the excitement of the aroused masses, He charged them that they should not make known His miraculous deeds (καὶ ἐπέτιμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ φανερόν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν, ver. 16), being convinced that He did not need to seek to draw attention to himself, but that, by the secret and hidden power of God, His work would be accomplished.

Ver. 3. *“The bent reed shall He not break, and the dimly burning wick shall He not quench; in truth shall He bring forth right.”*

Here, too, the antithesis to the worldly conqueror who, without mercy, “Cometh upon princes as mortar, and as a potter treadeth the clay” (chap. 41:25), whose mind is bent only upon destroying and cutting off nations not a few (chap. 10:7), who does not give rest until he has fully cast down to the ground the broken power. The Servant of God, far from breaking the bent reed, shall, on the contrary—this is the positive opposed to the negative—care for, and assist the wretched with tender love. Just thereby does He accomplish the object of His efforts. The confirmation of the character here assigned to Christ is, by Matthew, found in His healing the sick (καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας, ver. 15), was prefiguring all that which He, who has declared the object of His coming to

be to seek all that which was lost, did and accomplished, in general, for the misery of the human race. There cannot be any doubt that the bent reed and the dimly burning wick are figurative designations of those who, beaten down by sufferings, feel themselves to be poor and miserable. These, the weary and heavy laden, the Servant of God will not drive to despair by severity, but comfort and refresh by tender love. His conduct towards them is that of a Saviour. As a bent reed, *קוצר הנק*, Pharaoh appears on account of his broken power, in chap. 36:6, and in chap. 58:6, the *מיצור* are the oppressed. The fact, that the *wick* dimly burning and near to being extinguished is an image of exhausted strength, is shown by chap. 43:17, where, in reference to the Egyptians carried away by the judgment, it is said: "They are extinct, they are quenched like a wick." In the parallel passages which treat of the Servant of God, the *weary* in chap. 50:4, and the *broken-hearted* in chap. 61:1, correspond to it. Elsewhere, too, the wretched appear as objects of the loving providence of the Saviour. Thus, in chap. 11:4: "And He judges in righteousness the low;" in Ps. 72:4: "He shall judge the poor of the people; He shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor;" and in vers. 12-14: "For He delivereth the needy when he crieth, and the miserable, and him that hath no deliverer. From oppression and violence He delivereth their soul, and precious is their blood in His sight." Just as, in the passage before us, the bringing forth of right appears as a consequence of the loving providence for the bent reed, and the dimly burning wick, so in that Psalm, the great fact: "And all the kings worship Him, and all the nations serve Him," is traced back to the tender love with which He cares for and helps the poor and needy. In the Sermon on the Mount, the beatitude of the *πτωχοί*, Matt. 5:3, of the *πενθοῦντες*, ver. 4, and in Matt. 11:28, the invitation of the *κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι*, exactly correspond. The wicked and ungodly, upon whom the judgments of God have been inflicted, are not included, because they are not wretched in the full sense; for they harden themselves against the suffering, or seek to divert themselves in it; they do not take it fully to heart. The *τῷ πνεύματι*, "in their consciousness," which in Matthew is added to the simple *πτωχοί*, which alone we find in Luke, must be understood as a matter of course. He only is poor in the full sense, who feels and takes to heart his poverty. According to an interpretation widely spread, repenting sinners are designated by the bent reed, and dimly burning wick. Thus Luther writes: "That means that the wounded conscience, those who are terrified at the sight of their sins, the weak in life and faith are not cast away by Him, are not oppressed and condemned, but that He cares for them, tends and nurses them, makes them whole and embraces them with love." But repenting sinners do not here come into consideration *per se*, but only as one species of the wretched, inasmuch as, according to Luther's expression, truly to feel sin is a torment beyond all torments.—The last words: "In truth shall He bring forth right" again take up the close of ver. 1, after the means have been stated, in the intervening words, by which He is to bring about the result. The *ל תמאל* must not be translated: "For truth" (LXX.: εἰς ἀλήθειαν); or there is a thorough difference between *ל* and *ל*; the former does not, like the latter, designate the motion towards some object, but is rather, here also, a preposition signifying "belonging to;" hence *ל תמאל* means "belonging to truth," "in a true manner," "in truth." By every other mode of dealing, right would be established *in appearance* and *outwardly* only. Matthew renders it: ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν, "until He has led right to victory." By the addition of ἕως he intimates, that the last words state the result which is brought about by the conduct of the Servant of God described in the preceding words. *Εἰς νίκος* is a free translation of *ל תמאל*; *κρίσις* is "right," as in chap. 23:23.—How objectionable and untenable all the non-Messianic explanations are, appears very clearly in this verse. If Israel were the Servant of God, then the *Gentile world* must be

represented by the bent reed and dimly burning wick. But in that case, we must have recourse to such arbitrary interpretations as, *e.g.*, that given by *Köster*: “The weak faith and imperfect knowledge of the Gentiles.” No weak faith, no imperfect knowledge, however, is spoken of; but the Servant of God appears as a Saviour of the poor and afflicted, of those broken by sufferings. Those who, by the Servant of God, understand the better portion of the people, or the prophetic order, speak of “the meek spirit of the mode of teaching, which does not by any means altogether crush the sinner already brought low, but, in a gentle, affectionate manner, raises him up,” (*Umbreit*); or say with *Knobel*: “These poor and afflicted He does not humble still more by hard, depressing words, but *speaks* to them in a comforting and encouraging way, raising them up and strengthening them.” But in this explanation everything is, without reason, drawn into the territory of speech, while Matthew rightly sees, in the healing of the sick by Christ, a confirmation by deeds of the prophecy before us. In chap. 61, also, the Servant of God does not only bring glad tidings, but *creates*, at the same time, the blessings announced. According to chap. 61:3, He gives to them that mourn in Zion beauty for ashes, joy for mourning, garment of praise for a weak (ההכ) spirit. Verse 6 of the chapter before us most clearly indicates how little we are allowed to limit ourselves to mere speaking; for, according to that verse, the Servant of God is himself the covenant of the people, and the light of the Gentiles, and according to ver. 7, He opens the eyes of the blind, &c.

Ver. 4. “*He sit all not fail nor run away until He shall have founded rigid in the earth, and for His law the isles shall wait.*”

On: “He shall not fail,” properly, “He shall not become dim,” comp. Deut. 34:7, where it is said of Moses, the servant of God: “His eye had not become dim, nor had his strength fled.” The קוֹרֵי אֵל “He shall not run away” (properly, “He shall not *run*”) is qualified and fixed by the parallelism with אֵל הֵכִי אֵל “He shall not fail.” קוֹר in other passages also, several times receives, by the context, the qualified signification “to run away,” “to take to flight,” “to flee;” comp. Judges 8:21; Jer. 49:19. The words: “He shall not fail nor run away” imply that, in the carrying out of His vocation, the Servant of God shall meet with powerful *obstacles*, with obstinate *enemies*, and shall have to endure severe sufferings. That which is here merely hinted at, is carried out and detailed in chap. 49, 50, 53. How near He was to failing and running away (David, too, was obliged to say: “Oh! that I had wings like a dove, then would I fly away and be at rest”) is seen from His utterance in Matt. 17:17: ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἔσομαι; ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν.—According to the current opinion, קוֹרֵי is here assumed to be the Future of קָצַר, for קָרַץ, and that in the appropriate signification: “He shall not be broken.” (Thus it was probably viewed by the Chaldean Paraphrast who renders יֵאֵל אֵל *non laborabit*; by the LXX., who translate οὐ θραυσθήσεται, while *Aquila* and *Symmachus*, according to the account of *Jerome*, render, *non curret*, thus following the derivation from קוֹר). As הֵכִי points back to הֵכִי in the preceding verse, so, in that case קוֹרֵי would point back to קָצַר “He shall not break that which is bent, nor quench that which is dimly burning; but neither shall He himself be broken or quenched.” But this explanation is opposed by the circumstance, that we must make up our minds to admit a double anomaly. The territories of the two verbs קָצַר and קוֹר are everywhere else kept distinct, and the former everywhere else means “to break,” and not “to be broken.” In the only passage, Eccl. 12:6, brought forward in support of this irregularity, קוֹר “to run,” “to flee away,” being in parallelism with קָהַרַנ “to be removed,” is quite appropriate; just as in the second clause of that verse קוֹר “to be crushed,” is in parallelism with רָבַשַׁן “to be broken.”—מֵיֵא are, in the *usus*

*loquendi* of Isaiah, not so much the real islands, as rather the islands in the sea of the world, the countries and kingdoms; compare remarks on Rev. 6:14, and Ps. 97:1 (second Edition). The *law* for which the islands wait is not so much a ready-made code of laws, as the single decisions of the living Lawgiver, which the Gentiles, with anxious desire, shall receive as their rule in all circumstances, after they have spontaneously submitted to the dominion of the Servant of God, having been attracted by His loving dispensations. Several unphilologically translate: “for His *doctrine*” which does not even give a good sense, for it is not the doctrine which is waited for; its value is known only after it has been preached. The Servant of God appears here as the spiritual Ruler of the nations; and this He becomes by being, in the fullest sense, the Servant of God, so that His will is not different from the will of God, nor הַרְוֹת from that of God, just as, in a lower territory, even Asaph speaks the bold word: “Hear, my people, my law.” “The singer comes forth as one who has full authority, the “Seer” and “Prophet” utter *laws* which leave no alternative between salvation and destruction.” Parallel is chap. 2:3, 4, where the nations go up to Zion, in order there to seek laws for the regulation of their practical conduct, and according to which the Lord *judges* among the nations, and the law goes forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. The difference is this only,—that, in that passage, the matter is traced back immediately to God, while here, the Servant of God is mentioned as the Mediator between Him and the Gentiles. But we must keep in mind that, for chap. 2 also, the parallel passages in chap. 4, 9, 11, furnish the supplement. We must, farther, compare also chap. 51:5: “My righteousness is near, my salvation goes forth, *mine arms shall judge the nations*, the isles shall wait for me, and on mine arm shall they hope.” The *judging* in that passage does not mean divine punitive judgments; but it is rather thereby intimated that all the nations shall recognise the Lord as their King, to whose government they willingly submit, and with whom they seek the decision of their disputes. Matthew purposely changes it into: “And in *His name* shall the Gentiles trust.” The desire for the commands of the Lord is an effect of the love of His *name*, *i.e.*, of Him who is glorified by His deeds. For the name is the product of deeds,—here especially of those designated in ver. 2 and 3. The commands are desired and longed for, only because the person is beloved on account of His deeds. Matthew has only distinctly brought out that which, in the original text, is intimated by the connection with the preceding verses. In consequence of this, His quiet, just, and merciful dispensation, the isles shall wait for His law.

In ver. 5-7 the Lord addresses His Servant, and promises Him that, by His omnipotence, the great work for which He has called Him, shall be carried out and accomplished, *viz.*, that the covenant relation to Israel shall be fully realized, and the darkness of the Gentile world shall be changed into light.

Ver. 5. “*Thus saith God the Lord, who createth the heavens and stretcheth them out; who spreadeth forth the earth and that which cometh out of it; who giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk thereon.*”

The Prophet directs attention to the omnipotence of God, in order to give a firm support to faith in the promise which exceeds all human conception. It is by this that the accumulation of the predicates is to be accounted for. He who fully realizes what a great thing it is to bring an apostate world back to God, to that God who has become a stranger to it, will surely not explain this accumulation by a “disposition, on the part of the Prophet, to diffuseness.”

Ver. 6. "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and I will seize thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for the covenant of the people and for the Light of the Gentiles."

It is so obvious that קדצב must be translated by "in righteousness," that the explanations which disagree with it do not deserve to be even mentioned. The mission of the Servant of God has its root in the divine *righteousness*, which gives to every one his due,—to the covenant-people, salvation. Even apart from the promise, the appearance of Christ rests on the righteousness of God. For it is in opposition to the nature and character of a people of God to be, for any length of time, in misery, and shut up to one corner of the earth. That which is to be accomplished for Israel by the Servant of God, forms, in the sequel, the first subject of discourse. But even that which He affords to the *Gentiles* is, at the same time, given to Israel, inasmuch as it is one of their prerogatives that salvation for the Gentiles should go forth from them. As, here, the mission of the Servant of God, so, in chap. 45:13, the appearance of the lower deliverer appears as the work of divine righteousness: "I have raised him up in righteousness, and all his ways I will make straight" Similarly also in chap. 41:2: "Who raised up from the East him whom righteousness calls wherever he goes," *i.e.*, him, all whose steps are determined by God's righteousness, who, in all his undertakings, is guided by it.—The seizing by the hand, the keeping, &c., are the consequence of His being called, and are equivalent to: just because I have called him, therefore will I, &c. Luther remarks: "Namely, for this reason, that Satan and the world, with all their might and wisdom, will *resist* thy work." In the words: "For the Covenant of the people, and for the Light of the Gentiles," עם and ייג form an antithesis. The absence of the article shows that we ought properly to translate: "For a Covenant of a people, for a Light of Gentiles." It is thus, in the first instance, only said that the Servant of God should be the personal covenant for a people; but *what* people that should be, cannot admit of a moment's doubt. To Israel, as such, the name of the *people* pre-eminently belongs. Israel, in preference to all others, is called עם (compare *Gesenius'* Thesaurus s.v. ייג), because it is only the people of God that is a people in the full sense, connected by an internal unity; the Gentiles are לא עם, *non-people*, according to Deut. 32:21, because they lack the only real tie of unity. But what is still more decisive is the mention of the *Covenant*. The covenant can belong to the covenant-people only, ὧν αἱ διαθήκαι, Rom. 9:4,—the old, no less than the new one. The covenant with Abraham is an everlasting covenant of absolute exclusiveness, Gen. 17:7. The Servant of God is called the personal and embodied Covenant, because in His appearance the covenant made with Israel is to find its full truth; and every thing implied in the very idea of a covenant, all the promises flowing from this idea, are to be in Him, Yea and Amen. The Servant of God is here called the Covenant of Israel, just in the same manner as in Mic. 5:4 (comp. Ephes. 2:14), it is said of Him: "This (man) is Peace," because in Him, peace, as it were, represents itself personally;—just as in chap. 49:6, He is called the *Salvation* of God, because this salvation becomes personal in Him, the Saviour,—just as in Gen. 17:10, 13, circumcision is called a covenant, as being the embodied covenant,—just as in Luke 22:20, the cup, the blood of Christ, is called the New Covenant, because in it it has its root. The explanation: Mediator of the, covenant, διαθήκης γγνος is meagre, and weakens the meaning. The circumstance that the Servant of God is, without farther qualification, called the Covenant of the people, shows that He stands in a different relation to the covenant from that of Moses, to whom the name of the *Mediator* of the covenant does not the less belong than to Him. From Jer. 31:31, we learn which are the blessings and gifts which the Servant of God is to bestow, and by which He represents himself as the personal Covenant. They are concentrated in the closest connection to be established by Him between God and His people: "I will be their God, and they shall be

my people.” It is only in the New Covenant, described in that passage of Jeremiah, that the Old Covenant attains to its truth. The second destination of the Servant of God, which, according to the context, here comes into special consideration, is, to be *the Light of the Gentiles*. By the realization of this destination, an important feature in the former was, at the same time, realized. For it formed part of the promises of the covenant with Israel that, from the midst of them, salvation for all the families of the earth should go forth, as our Saviour says: ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν. Light is here, according to the common *usus loquendi* of Scripture, a figurative designation of *salvation*. In the parallel passage, chap. 49:6, light is at once explained by salvation. The designation proceeds upon the supposition that the Gentiles not less than Israel, (comp. chap. 9:1 [2]) shall, until the appearance of the Servant of God, sit in darkness and in the shadow of death,—that they are in misery, although, in some instances, it may be a *brilliant* misery. The following verse farther carries out and declares what is implied in the promise: “Light of the Gentiles.” Parallel is chap. 60:3: “And the heathen walk in thy (Zion’s) light”—they become partakers of the salvation which shines for Zion—”and kings in the brightness which riseth to thee.”—The supporters of that opinion, which understands Israel by the Servant of God, are in no small difficulty regarding this verse, and cannot even agree as to the means of escape from that difficulty. Several assume that מַע is used collectively, and refer it to the Gentile nations. But opposed to this explanation is the evident antithesis of מַע and מִיּוֹג; and it is entirely overthrown by the parallel passage in chap. 49. Scripture knows nothing of a covenant with the Gentiles. According to the view of the Old, as well as of the New Testament, the Gentiles are received into the communion of the covenant with Israel. Others (*Hitzig, Ewald*) explain: “covenant-people, *i.e.*, a mediatorial, connecting people, a bond of union between God and the nations.” But the passage, chap. 49:8, is most decidedly opposed to this. *Farther*—The parallelism with מִיּוֹג רוּחַ shows that מַע תִּירַב is the *status constructus*. But *foedus alicujus*, is, according to the remark of *Gesenius, foedus cum aliquo sancitum*. Thus in Lev. 26:45, the covenant of the ancestors is the covenant entered into with the ancestors; Deut. 4:31; Lev. 26:42 (the covenant of Jacob, the covenant of Isaac, &c.) According to *Knobel*: “the true theocrats are to become a covenant of the people, the restorers of the Israelitish Theocracy, they themselves having connection and unity by faithfully holding fast by Jehovah, and by representing His cause.” This explanation, also, is opposed to the *usus loquendi*, according to which “covenant of the people” can have the sense only of “covenant with the people,” not a covenant among the people. And, *farther*, the parallel passage in chap. 49:8 is opposed to this interpretation also, inasmuch as, in that passage, the Servant of the Lord is called מַע תִּירַב, not on account of what He is in himself, but on account of the influence which He exercises upon others, upon the whole of the people: “That thou mayest raise up the land, distribute desolate heritages, that thou mayest say to the prisoners: Go forth,” &c. In that passage the land, the desolate heritages, the prisoners, &c., evidently correspond to the people. *Finally*—A covenant is a relation between two parties standing opposite one another. “The word is used,” says *Gesenius*, “of a covenant formed between nations, between private persons, *e.g.*, David and Jonathan, between Jehovah and the people of Israel.” But here no parties are mentioned to be united by the covenant.

Ver. 7. “*That thou mayest open blind eyes, bring out them that are bound from the prison, and from the house of confinement them that sit in darkness.*”

On account of the connection with the “for the Light of the Gentiles,” which would stand too much isolated, if, in the words immediately following, Israel alone were again the subject of discourse, the activity of God here mentioned refers, in the first instance, to the

*Gentiles*; and the words: “them that sit in darkness,” moreover, evidently point back to “for the Light of the Gentiles.” But from chap. 49:9, and also from ver. 16 of the chapter before us, where the blindness of Israel is mentioned, it appears that Israel too must not be excluded. Hence, we shall say: It is here more particularly described how the Servant of God *proves* himself as the Covenant of the people and the Light of the Gentiles, how He puts an end to the misery under which both equally groan. It will be better to understand *blindness*, in connection with imprisonment, sitting in darkness, as a designation of the need of salvation, than as a designation of spiritual blindness, of the want of the light of knowledge. That is also suggested by the preceding: “for the Light of the Gentiles,” which, according to the common *usus loquendi*, and according to chap. 9:1 (2) is not to be referred to the spiritual illumination especially, but to the bestowal of salvation. To this view we are likewise led by a comparison of ver. 16: “And I will lead the blind by a way that they knew not, I will lead them in paths that they have not known, I will change the darkness before them into light, the crooked things into straightness.” The *blind* in this verse are those who do not know what to do, and how to help themselves, those who cannot find the way of salvation, the miserable; they are to be led by the Lord on the ways of salvation, which are unknown to them. In a similar sense and connection, the blind are, elsewhere also, spoken of, compare Remarks on Ps. 145:8.—On the words: “Bring out them that are bound from the prison,” *Knobel* remarks: “The citizens of Judah were, to a great extent, imprisoned; the Prophet hopes for their deliverance by the theocratic portion of the people.” A strange hope! By this coarsely literal interpretation, the connection with “for the Light of the Gentiles” is broken up; and this is the less admissible that the words at the close of the verse: “those that sit in darkness,” so clearly refer to it. *Imprisonment* is a figurative designation of the *miserable condition*, not less than the *darkness*, which, on account of the light contrasted with it, and on account of chap. 9:1 (2), cannot be understood otherwise than figuratively. Under the image of men bound in dark prisons, the miserable and afflicted appear also in Ps. 107:10-16; Job 36:8, where the words, “bound in fetters,” are explained by the parallel “holden in the cords of misery.” When David, in Ps. 142:8, prays: “Bring my soul out of the prison,” he himself explains this in Ps. 143:11 by the parallel: “Thou wilt bring my soul out of *trouble*;” compare also Ps. 25:17: “O bring thou me out of my *distresses*.” If we here understand the prison literally, we might, with the same propriety in other passages, also, *e.g.*, in Ps. 66:11, understand *literally* the net, the snare, the trap.

Ver. 8. “*I the Lord, that is my name, and my honour I will not give to another, nor my glory to idols.* Ver. 9. *The former (things), behold, they came to pass, and new (things) do I declare; before they spring forth, I cause you to hear.*”

We have here the solemn close and exhortation. At the close of chap. 41 it had been pointed out, how the prediction of the *Conqueror from the East* serves for the glory of Jehovah, who thereby proves himself to be the only true God. Here the zeal of God for His glory is indicated as the reason which has brought forth the prediction of the *Servant of God* and His glorious work,—a prediction which cannot be accounted for from natural causes. It is thus the object of the prophecy which is here, in the first instance, stated. It is intended to manifest the true God as such, as a God who is zealously bent on His glory. But the same attribute of God which called forth the prophecy, calls forth also the events prophesied, *viz.*, the appearance of the Servant of God, and the victory over the idols accomplished thereby, the bringing forth of the law of God over the whole earth through Him, and the full realization of the covenant with Israel. The thought is this:—that a God who does not manifest and prove himself as such, who is contented with the honour

granted to Him without His interference, cannot be a God; that the true God must of necessity be filled with the desire of absolute, exclusive dominion, and cannot but manifest and prove this desire. From this thought, the prophecy and that which it promises flow with a like necessity.—According to *Stier*, תּוֹנֵשׂאֵר, “the former (things)” means “the redemption of the exiled by Cyrus,” which in chaps. 41, 42 forms the historico-typical foreground, whose coming is here anticipated by the Prophet. But the parallel passages, chaps. 41:22, 43:9, 48:3, are conclusive against this view: for, according to these passages, it is only the former already fulfilled predictions of the Prophet and his colleagues, from the beginnings of the people, which can be designated by “the former (things).” By “the new (things)” therefore, is to be understood the aggregate of the events which are predicted in the second part, to which belongs the prophecy of the Servant of God which immediately precedes, and which the Prophet has here as pre-eminently in view (*Michaelis: et nova, imprimis de Messia*), as, in the parallel passage chap. 41:22, the announcement of the conqueror from the East. Both of these verses seem to round off our prophecy, by indicating that such disclosures regarding the Future are not by any means intended to serve for the gratification of idle curiosity, but to advance the same object to which the events prophesied are also subservient, viz., the promotion of God’s glory. The modern view of Prophetism is irreconcilable with the verses under consideration, which evidently shew, that the prophets themselves were filled with a different consciousness of their mission and position. And in like manner it follows from them, that there is reason to put, by means of a forced interpretation, the prophecy within the horizon of the Prophet’s time, seeing that the Prophet himself shows himself to be thoroughly penetrated by its altogether supernatural character.

## **CHAPTER 49:1-9**

The Servant of God, with whose person the Prophet had, by way of preparation, already made us acquainted in the first book of the second part, in chap. 42, is here, at the beginning of the second book, at once introduced as speaking, surprising, as it were, the readers. In ver. 1-3, we have the destination and high calling which the Lord assigned to His Servant; in ver. 4, the contrast and contradiction of the result of this mission; the covenant-people, to whom it is, in the first instance, directed, reward with ingratitude His faithful work. In ver. 5 and 6, we are told what God does in order to maintain the dignity of His Servant; as a compensation for obstinate, rebellious Israel, He gives Him the *Gentiles* for an inheritance. From ver. 7 the Prophet takes the word. In ver. 7 the original contempt which, according to the preceding verses, the Servant of God meets with, especially in *Israel*, is contrasted with the respectful worship of nations and kings which is to follow after it. Ver. 8 and 9 describe how the Servant of God proves himself to be the embodied covenant of the people, and form the transition to a general description of the enjoyment of salvation, which, in the Messianic times, shall be bestowed upon the Congregation of the Lord. This description goes on to chap. 50:3, and then, in chap. 50:4 ff., the person of the Servant of the Lord is anew brought before us.

The Messianic explanation of our passage is already met with in the New Testament. It is with reference to it that Simeon, in Luke 2:30, 31, designates the Saviour as the σωτήριον of God, which He had prepared before the face of all people (comp. ver. 6 of our passage:

“That thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth”), as the φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ; comp. again ver. 6, according to which the Servant of God is to be at the same time, the light of the Gentiles, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. Ver. 1: “The Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath He made mention of my name,” is alluded to in Luke 2:21: Καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, τὸ κληθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου πρὸ τοῦ συλλημφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ (comp. 1:31: συλλήμψη ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν) as is sufficiently evident from ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ *sc. matris*, which exactly answers to the מבוט in the passage before us. In Acts 13:46, 47, Paul and Barnabas prove, from the passage under review, the destination of Christ to be the Saviour of the Gentiles, and their right to offer to them the salvation despised and rejected by the Jews: ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ Κύριος, τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς. In the destination which, in Isaiah, the Lord assigns to Christ, Paul and Barnabas recognize an indirect command for his disciples, a rule for their conduct. In 2 Cor. 6:1, 2, ver. 8 is quoted, and referred to the Messianic time.

It is obvious that the Jews could not be favourable to the Messianic interpretation; but the Christian Church has held fast by it for nearly 1800 years. Even such interpreters as *Theodoret* and *Clericus*, who are everywhere rather disposed to explain away real Messianic references, than to find the Messiah where He is not presented, consider the Messianic interpretation to be, in this place, beyond all doubt. The former says: “This was said with a view to the Lord Christ, who is the seed of Abraham, through whom the nations received the promise.” And when, in our century, men returned to the faith, the Messianic interpretation also returned. If the Church has Christ at all, it is impossible that she should fail to find Him here.

*Gesenius*, and those who have followed him, appeal to the circumstance, that the Messiah could not well be introduced as speaking, and, least of all, in such a manner, without any introduction and preparation. But it is difficult to see how this argument can be advanced by those who themselves assume that a mere personification, the collective body of the prophets, or, as *Beck* expresses it, the Prophet κατ' ἑξοχὴν as a general substantial individual, or even the people, can be introduced as speaking. The introduction of persons is a necessary result of the dramatic character of prophetic speech, comp., *e.g.*, chap. 14, where now the king of Babylon, then the inhabitants of the Sheol, and again Jehovah, are introduced as speaking. The person who is here introduced as speaking is already known from chap. 42, where *he is spoken of*. The prophecy before us stands to that prophecy in the very same relation as does Ps. 2:7-9, where the Anointed One suddenly appears as speaking, to the preceding verses, where He was spoken of. The Messiah is here so distinctly described, as to His nature and character, that it is impossible not to recognise Him. Who but He should be the Covenant of the people, the Light of the Gentiles, the Saviour for all the ends of the earth? The point which was here concerned was not, first to introduce Him to the knowledge of the people. His image existed there already in sharp outlines, even from and since Gen. 49:10, where the Peaceful One meets us, in whom Judah attains to the full height of his destination, and to whom the people adhere. The circumstance that it is just here that the Messiah appears as speaking, forms the most appropriate introduction to the second book, in which He is the principal figure.—It is by a false literal interpretation only that ver. 8, 9 have been advanced in opposition to the Messianic interpretation.

The arbitrariness of the non-Messianic interpretation manifests itself in this also, that its supporters can, up to this day, not agree as to the subject of the prophecy. 1. According to several interpreters—*Hitzig*, last of all—the Servant of God is to be *Israel*, and the idea this, that Israel would, at some future period, be the teacher of the Gentiles, and would spread the true religion on earth. It is apparently only that this interpretation receives some countenance from ver. 3, where the Servant of the Lord is called Israel. For this name does not there stand as an ordinary *nomen proprium*, but as an honorary name, to designate the high dignity and destination of the Servant of God. As this name had passed over from an individual to a people, so it may again be transferred from the people to that person in whom the people attain their destination, in which, up to that time, they had failed. But decisive against this explanation, which makes the whole people the subject, is ver. 5, according to which the Servant of God is destined to lead back to the Lord, Jacob and Israel (in the ordinary sense), who then must be different from Him; ver. 6, according to which He is to raise up the tribes of Jacob; ver. 8, 9, according to which He is to be the Covenant of the people, to deliver the prisoners, &c. (*Knobel* remarks on this verse: “Nothing is clearer than that the Servant of God is not identical with the mass of the people, but is something different.”) Supposing even that the people, destined to be the teachers of the Gentiles, appear here as speaking, it is difficult to see how, in ver. 4, they could say that hitherto they had laboured in vain in their vocation, and seen no fruits, since hitherto the people had made no attempt at all at the conversion of the Gentiles. 2. *Maurer*, *Knobel*, and others, endeavour to explain it of *the better portion of the people*. But conclusive against this interpretation is ver. 6, according to which the Servant of God has the destination of restoring the preserved of Israel, and hence must be distinct from the better portion; ver. 8, according to which He is given for a Covenant of the people, from which, according to ver. 4 and 6, the ungodly are excluded; so that the idea of the people is identical with that of the better portion. In general, the contrasting of the better portion of the people with the whole people, Jacob and Israel, the centre and substance of which was formed just by the ἐκλογή, can scarcely be thought of, and is without any analogy. Nor is the mention of the *womb*, and *bowels of the mother*, in ver. 1, reconcileable with a merely imaginary person, and that, moreover, a person of a character so indistinct and indefinite,—a character which has no definite and palpable historical beginnings. The parallel passages, in which the calling from the womb is mentioned, treat of real persons, of individuals.—3. According to several interpreters (*Jarchi*, *Kimchi*, *Abenezra*, *Grotius*, *Stendel*, *Umbreit*, *Hofmann*), the Servant of the Lord is to be none other than *the Prophet himself*. No argument has been adduced in favour of this view, except the use of the first person, (“If here, without introduction and preparation, a discourse begins with the first person, it refers most naturally to the Prophet, who is the author of the Book”),—an argument of very subordinate significance, and the more so that the person of the Prophet, everywhere else in the second part of Isaiah, steps so entirely into the background behind the great objects with which he is engaged. To follow thus the first appearance may, indeed, be becoming to a eunuch from Ethiopia, but not to a Christian expounder of Scripture. The contents of the prophecy are decidedly in opposition to this opinion. Even the circumstance that a single prophet should assume the name of Israel, ver. 3, appears an intolerable usurpation. *Farther*—Like all the other prophets, Isaiah was sent to the Jews, and not to the Gentiles; but at the very outset, *the most distant lands and all the distant nations* are here called upon to hearken. The Lord says to His Servant that the restoration of Israel was too little for Him, that He should be a light and salvation for all the heathen nations from one end of the earth to the other; kings and princes shall fall down before Him, adoring and worshipping. The Prophet would thus simply have raised himself to be the Saviour; *Umbreit* expressly acknowledges this:

“He is to be the holy pillar of clouds and fire which leads the people back to their native land, after the time of their punishment has expired. But a still more glorious vocation and destination is in store for the prophets; they receive the highest, the Messianic destination.” The usurpation of which the Servant of God would have made himself guilty, appears so much the more clearly, when it is known, that the work of the Servant of God comprehends even all that also, which is described in ver. 10-23, viz., the blossoming of the Church of God, her enlargement by the Gentiles, &c. *It is obvious that, if the interpretation which refers this prediction to the prophets were the correct one, the authority of the Old Testament prophecy would be gone; the authority of the Lord himself would be endangered, inasmuch as He always recognizes, in these prophets, organs of divine inspiration and power.* A vain attempt is made at mitigating this usurpation, by imperceptibly substituting the collective body of the prophets for the single prophet. This view thus leads to, and interferes with another which we shall immediately examine. But if we would not give up the sole argument by which this exposition is supported, viz., the use of the first person, everything must, in the first instance, apply to and be fulfilled in Isaiah; and the other prophets can come into consideration only as continuators of his work and ministry. He is entitled to use the first person in that case only, when he is a perfect manifestation of prophetism.—4. According to *Gesenius*, the Servant of the Lord is to be *the collective body of the prophets*, the prophetic order. In opposition to this view, *Stier* remarks:” We maintain that, according to history, there did not at that time (the time of the exile, in which *Gesenius* places this prophecy) exist any prophetic order, or any distinguished blossom of it; that hence it was impossible for any reasonable man to entertain this hope, when viewed in this way, without looking farther and higher.” Ver. 1 is decisive against a mere personification. The name of Israel, too, in ver. 3, is very little applicable to the whole prophetic order. This is sufficiently evident from the fact that *Gesenius*, in his Commentary, declared this word to be spurious; and it was at a later period only, when he had become bolder, that he endeavoured to adapt it to his self-chosen subject. Nowhere in the Old Testament do the prophets appear like the Servant of God here—as the Covenant of the people, ver. 8, as the Light of the Gentiles, ver. 6.

Ver. 1. “*Listen, O isles, unto me, and hearken ye people from far; the Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels of my mother hath He made mention of my name.*”

As the stand-point which the Messiah occupies in the vision of the Prophet, we have to conceive of the time, at which He had already entered upon His office, and had already experienced many proofs of the Jews’ unbelief and hardness of heart,—an event of the Future, the foresight of which was, even in a human point of view, very readily suggested to the Prophet after the painful experience acquired during his own long ministry; comp. chap. 6. For the fruitlessness of His ministry among the mass of the covenant-people, ver. 4, as well as the great contempt which the Servant of God found among them, ver. 7, are represented as having already taken place: while the enlightenment of the Gentiles, the worship of the kings, &c., which are to be expected by Him, are represented as being still future. In the same manner, in chap. 53, the humiliation of the Servant of God appears as past; the glorification, as future. The reason why the *isles* are addressed (comp. remarks on chap. 42:4) appears in ver. 6 only, at the close of the discourse of the Servant of God, for all that precedes serves as a preparation. In that verse, the Servant of the Lord announces that the Lord had appointed Him to be the Light of the Gentiles; that He should be His salvation unto the ends of the earth. It is very significant that the second book at once begins with an address to the Gentiles, inasmuch as, thus, we are here introduced into the sphere of a redemption which does not refer to a single nation, like

that with which the *first* book is engaged, but to the ends of the earth. At the close of the first book, in chap. 48:20, it was said: “Declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the end of the earth, say ye: The Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob.” The fact that the redemption, in the first instance peculiar to Jacob, is to be proclaimed to all the nations of the earth, leads us to expect that these nations, too, have their portion in the Lord; that at some future period they are to hear a message which concerns them still *more particularly*. This expectation is realized here, at the opening of the second book. The fact that the Gentiles are to listen here, as those who have a personal interest in the message, is proved by the circumstance, that the words: “Unto the ends of the earth,” in ver. 6 of the chapter before us, point back to the same words in chap. 48:20.—*The Lord had called me from the womb*. It is sufficient to go thus far back in order to repress or refute the idea of His having himself usurped His office, and to furnish a foundation for the expectation that God would powerfully uphold and protect His Servant in the office which He himself had assigned to Him. Calvin remarks on these words: “They do not indicate the commencement of the time of His vocation, as if God had, only from the womb, called Him; but it is just as if it were said: Before I came forth from the womb, God had decreed that I was to undertake this office. In the same manner Paul also says that he had been separated from his mother’s womb, although he was chosen before the foundation of the world.” To be called from the womb is, in itself, nothing extraordinary; it is common to all the servants of the Lord. Jeremiah ascribes it to himself in chap. 1:5: “Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou earnest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee;” and in harmony with this passage in Jeremiah—not with that before us—Paul says in Gal. 1:15: ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀφορίσας (corresponding to: I have *sanctified* thee) με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου. But we have here merely the *introduction to what follows*, where the calling, to which the Servant of God had been destined from the womb appears as quite unique.—*From the bowels of my mother hath He made mention of my name*. The name is here not an ordinary proper name, but *a name descriptive of the nature*,—one by which His office and vocation are designated. This making mention was, in the case of Christ, not a thing concealed; the prophecy before us received its palpable confirmation and fulfilment; inasmuch as, in reference to it, Joseph received, even before his birth, the command to call Him Jesus, Saviour: τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, Matth. 1:21, after the same command had previously come to Mary, Luke 1:31; comp. 2:21, where, as we have already remarked, there is a distinct reference to the passage before us.

Ver. 2. “*And He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword, in the shadow of His hand hath He hid me, and He hath made me a sharpened arrow, in His quiver hath He hid me.*”

According to the common interpretation, the words: “He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword, He hath made me a sharpened arrow,” are to express only such a gift of powerful, impressive speech as is common to all the servants of God, to all the prophets. But the two subjoined clauses are opposed to that interpretation. The second and fourth clauses state the reason of the first and third, and point to the source from which that emanates which is stated in them. There cannot be any doubt but that in the second and fourth clauses, the Servant of God indicates that He stands under the protection of divine omnipotence, so that the expression: “Whom I uphold,” in chap. 42:1, is parallel. The *shadow* is the ordinary figure of protection. The figure of the sword is dropped in the second clause, and hence the objection, that a drawn sword does not require any protection, is out of place. This will appear from a comparison of chap. 51:16: “And I put my words in thy mouth, and I cover thee with the shadow of mine hand,” where the

sword is not mentioned at all, and the shadow belongs simply to the person. The quiver which keeps the arrow is likewise a natural image of divine protection. The two accessory clauses do not suit, if the first and third clauses are referred to the *rhetorical endowment* of the Servant of God; *that does not flow from the source of the protecting omnipotence of God*. These accessory clauses rather suggest the idea that, by the comparison of the *mouth* with the sharp sword, of the *whole person* with the sharpened arrow, there is indicated *the absolutely conquering power which, under the protection of omnipotence, adheres to the word and person of the Servant of God*, so that He will easily put down everything which opposes,—equivalent to: *He has endowed me with his omnipotence,, so that my word produces destructive effect, and puts down all opposition, just as does His word*; so that there would be a parallel in chap. 11:4, where the word of the Servant of God likewise appears as being borne by omnipotence: “He smiteth the earth with the rod of His mouth and with the breath of His lips He slayeth the wicked.” To the same result we are led also by a comparison of chap. 51:16, where the word of the Lord, which is put into the mouth of the Servant of God, is so living and powerful, so borne by omnipotence, that thereby the heavens are planted, and the foundations of the earth are laid. But of special importance are those passages of Revelation which refer to the verse under consideration. In chap. 1:16, the sharp two-edged sword does not by any means represent the power of the discourse piercing the heart for salvation; but rather the destructive power of the word which is borne by omnipotence. It designates the almighty punitive power of Christ directed against his enemies. “By the circumstance, that the sword goes out of the mouth of Christ, that destructive power is attributed to His mere word, He appears as partaking of divine omnipotence. For it belongs to God to slay by the words of His mouth, Hos. 6:5.” The same applies to chap. 2:16. On Rev. 19:15: “And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations,” we remarked: “the sharp sword is not that of a teaching king, but that of omnipotence which speaks and it is done, and slayeth by the breath of the lips. How Christ casts down His enemies by the word of His mouth is seen, in a prophetic instance, John 18:6; Acts 9:4, 5.” With the sword, Christ appears even where He does not mean to destroy, but to bring salvation; for, even in those who are to be blessed, hostile powers are to be overcome. The image, however, is here, in the fundamental passage, occasioned by the comparison of the Servant of God with the conqueror from the East, whose *sword*, according to chap. 41:2, the Lord makes as dust, and his bow as the driven stubble. Where the mere *word* serves as a sword, the effect must be much more powerful. The conquering power throwing down every opposing power, which, in the first clause, is assigned to the mouth, is, in the third clause (“And He hath made *me* a sharpened arrow”), attributed to the whole person. He, of whom it was already said in Ps. 45:6: “Thine arrows are sharp, people fall under thee, they enter into the heart of the king’s enemies,” is himself to be esteemed as a sharp arrow.

Ver. 3. “*And He said unto me: Thou art my Servant, O Israel, in whom I glorify myself.*”

“My Servant” stands here as an honorary *designation*; to be the Servant of God appears here as the highest privilege, as is evident not only from the analogy of the parallel passages, which treat of the Servant of God (comp. remarks on chap. 42:1), but also from the parallel second clause. In it, the Servant of God is called *Israel* as the concentration and consummation of the covenant-people, as He in whom it is to attain to its destination, in whom its idea is to be realized. (It is evident from ver. 5, and from those passages in the second part in which the people of Israel is spoken of as the Servant of God [comp. remarks on chap. 42], that Israel must here be understood as the name of the people, not as the name of the ancestor only.) *Hävernick* rightly remarks that the Messiah is here

called Israel, “in contrast to the people to whom this name does not properly belong.” Analogous is Matt. 2:15, where that which, in the Old Testament, is written of Israel, is referred to Christ. As the true Israel, Christ himself also represents himself in John 1:52; with a reference to that which in Gen. 28:12 is written, not of Jacob as an individual, but as the representative of the whole race, it is said there: ἀπ’ ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγῶτα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. All those declarations of the Old Testament, in which the name of Jacob or Israel is used to designate the *election*, to the exclusion of the false seed, the true Israelites in whom there is no guile,—all those passages prepare the way for, and come near to the one before us. Thus Ps. 63:1: “Truly good is God to Israel, to such as are of a clean heart;” and then Ps. 24:6: “They that seek thy face are Jacob,” *i.e.*, those only who, with zeal and energy in sanctification, seek for the favour of God. In the passage before us, the same principle is farther carried out. The true Israel is designated as he in whom God glorifies, or will glorify himself, inasmuch as his glorification will bear testimony to God’s mercy and faithfulness; comp. John 12:23: ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; 17:5: καὶ νῦν δόξασόν με σὺ πάτερ. The verb **פאד** means in *Piel*, “to adorn,” in *Hithp.* “to adorn one’s self,” “to glorify one’s self.” Thus it occurs in Judg. 7:2; Is. 10:15; 60:21: “Work of my hands for glorifying,” *i.e.*, in which I glorify myself; 61:3: “Planting of the Lord for glorifying.” There is no reason for abandoning this well-supported signification either here or in chap. 44:23: “The Lord hath redeemed Israel and glorified himself in Israel.” If God glorifies himself in His Servant, He just thereby gets occasion to glory in Him as a monument of His goodness and faithfulness. Our Saviour prays in John 12:28: Πάτερ δόξασόν σου τὸ νομα. The Father, by glorifying the Son, glorifies at the same time His name. Those who explain **אפנתא** by: *per quem ornabor*, overlook the circumstance that, also in the phrase: “Thou art my Servant,” the main stress does not, according to the parallel passages, lie in that which the Servant has to perform, but in His being the protected and preserved by God.

Ver. 4. “*And I said: I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for emptiness and vanity; but my right is with the Lord, and my reward with my God.*”

The Servant of God, after having spoken of His sublime dignity and mission, here prepares the transition for proclaiming His destination to be a Saviour of the Gentiles, to whom His whole discourse is addressed. He complains of the small fruits of His ministry among Israel; but comforts himself by the confidence placed upon the righteousness of God, that the faithful discharge of the duty committed to Him cannot remain without reward. The speaking on the part of the Servant of God in this verse refers to the speaking of God in verse 3. *Jerome*, who remarks on this point: “But when the Father told me that which I have repeated, I answered Him: How wilt thou be glorified in me, seeing that I have laboured in vain?” recognised this reference, but erroneously viewed the words as being addressed to the Lord. It is a soliloquy which we have here before us. Instead of “I said,” we are not at liberty to put: “I imagined;” the Servant of God had in reality expended His strength for nothing and vanity. As the *scene* of the vain labour of the Servant of God, the *heathen world* cannot be thought of; inasmuch as this is, first in ver. 6, assigned to Him as an indemnification for that which, according to the verse before us, He had lost elsewhere. It is *Israel* only which can be the object of the vain labour of the Servant of God; for it was to them that, according to ver. 5, the mission of the Servant of God in the first instance referred: The Lord had formed Him to be His Servant, to bring back to Him Jacob and Israel that were not gathered. Since, then, the mission is directed to *apostate* Israel, it can the less be strange that the labour was in vain. To the same result

we are led also by the circumstance that, in ver. 6, the saving activity of the Servant of God appears as limited to *the preserved* of Israel, while the original mission had been directed to the *whole*. And this portion to which His activity is limited, is comparatively a *small* portion. For that is suggested by the circumstance that to have the preserved of Israel for His portion is represented as a light thing—not at all corresponding to the dignity of the Servant of God. As, in that verse, the preserved of Israel form the contrast to the mass of the people *given up* by the Lord, so in the verse under consideration, the opposition which the Servant of God finds, is represented as so great, that His ministry was, in the main, in vain; so that accordingly the great mass of the people must have been unsusceptible of it.—In the view that a great portion of the people would reject the salvation offered in Christ, and thereby become liable to judgment, the Song of Solomon had already preceded our Prophet. As regards the natural grounds of this foresight, we remarked in the Commentary on the Song of Solomon, S. 245: “With a knowledge of human nature and especially of the nature of Israel, as it was peculiar to the people from the beginning, and was firmly and deeply impressed upon them by the Mosaic laws,—after the experience which the journey through the wilderness, the time of the Judges, the reign of David and of Solomon also offered, it was absolutely impossible for the enlightened to entertain the hope that, at the appearance of the Messiah, the whole people would do homage to Him with sincere and cordial devotion.” How very much this was the case, the very first chapter of Isaiah can prove. It is impossible that one who has so deeply recognized the corrupted nature of his people, should give himself up to vain patriotic fancies; to such an one, the time of the highest manifestation of salvation must necessarily be, at the same time, a period of the highest realization of judgment. The same view which is given here, we meet with also in chap. 53:1-3. In harmony with Isaiah, Zechariah, too, prophesies, in chaps. 11, 13:8, that the greater portion of the Jews will not believe in Christ. Malachi 3:1-6, 19, 24, contrasts with the longed-for judgment upon the heathen, the judgment which in the Messianic time, is to be executed upon the people itself.—On the words: “My right is with the Lord, and my reward with my God,” comp. Lev. 19:13: “The reward of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning.” The God who watches that among men the well-earned wages of faithful labour shall not be withheld, will surely himself not withhold them from His Servant. The right, the well-deserved reward of His Servant is *with Him*; it is there safely kept, in order that it may be delivered up to Him in due time. That which the Servant of the Lord here, in the highest sense, says of himself, holds true of His inferior servants also. Their labour in the Lord is, in truth, never in vain. Their right and their reward can never fail them.

Ver. 5. “*And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be a Servant to himself, to bring Jacob again to Him, and Israel which is not gathered, and I am honoured in the eyes of the Lord, and my God was my strength.* Ver. 6. *And He saith: It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my Servant only to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel, and I give thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou mayest be my Salvation unto the ends of the earth.*”

The confidence which the Servant of the Lord has placed in Him has not been put to shame by the result, but rather has been gloriously justified by Him. He who was, in the first instance, sent to Israel, is appointed to be the Saviour of the Gentiles, in order to compensate Him for the unbelief of those to whom His mission was in the first instance directed. *And now, i.e.*, since the matter stands thus (Gen. 45:8),—since Israel, to whom my mission is, in the first instance, directed, reject me. *Saith the Lord*—That which the Lord spoke follows in ver. 6 only, which, on account of the long interruption, again

begins with: “And He saith,” equivalent to: I say, He hath spoken. The declaration of the Lord has reference to the destination of His Servant to be the Saviour of the Gentiles. This declaration is, in ver. 5, based upon two reasons:—*first*, the frustration of the original mission of the Servant of the Lord to the Jews; and *secondly*, on the intimate relation in which He stands to the Lord, who cannot withhold from Him the reward which He deserves for His work. In the New Testament, also, the mission of Christ appears as being at first directed to the Jews only. The Lord says, in Matt. 15:24: οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. He says, in Matt. 10:6, to the Apostles, after having forbidden them to go to the heathens, and to the Samaritans, who were nothing but disguised heathens: πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. Paul and Barnabas say, in Acts 13:46: ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐπειδὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀξιους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη. It is rather an idle question to ask what would have happened, if the Jews as a nation had accepted the offered salvation. But so much is certain that here, in the prediction, as well as in history, the rejection of Christ, on the part of the Jews, appears to have been a necessary condition of His entering upon His vocation as the Saviour of the Gentiles. Those who understood the people by the Servant of the Lord refer בבושׁל to Jehovah, and consider it as a Gerund, *reducendo*, or *qui reducit ad se Jacobum*. In the same way they explain also the Infinit. with ל in the following verse, as also in chap. 51:16. But although the Infinit. with ל is sometimes, indeed, used for the Gerund., yet this is neither the original nor the ordinary use; and nowhere does it occur in such accumulation. Moreover, by this explanation, this verse, as well as the following ones, are altogether broken up, and the words בבושׁל בקעי וילי must indicate the destination for which He was formed. And it is not possible that Jehovah’s bringing Jacob back to himself should be a display of Israel’s being formed from the womb to be the Servant, inasmuch as the bringing back would not, like the formation, belong to the first stage of the existence of the people.—“*And Israel, which is not gathered*” Before לֹא ,אשׁר must be supplied. According to the parallel words: “To bring Jacob again to Him,” the not gathering of Israel is to be referred to its having wandered away from the Lord, It was appropriate that this should be expressly mentioned, and not merely supposed, as is the case in: “To bring Jacob again to Him.” The image which lies at the foundation, is that of a scattered flock; comp. Mic. 2:12. Parallel is Isaiah 53:6: “All we *like sheep* have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way.”—To the words under consideration the Lord alludes in Matt. 23:37: Ἱερουσαλὴμ ... ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία ἑαυτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε; comp. also Matt. 9:36: ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα. On account of chap. 11:12, it will not do to take אשׁר in the signification of “to snatch away,” “to carry off,” as is done by *Hitzig*. Moreover אשׁר means, indeed, “to be gathered,” but never “to be carried off.” The Mazoreths would read לֹא for לו: “And that Israel might be gathered to *Him*.” Thus it is rendered, among the ancient translators, by *Aquila* and the Chaldee; while *Symmachus*, *Theodoret*, and the Vulgate express the negation. Most of the modern interpreters have followed the Mazoreths. But the assumption of several of these, that לֹא is only a different writing for לו, is altogether without foundation, compare the remarks on chap. 9:2; and the reading of the Mazoreths is just like all the *Kris*, a mere conjecture, owing its origin, as has already been remarked by *Jerome*, only to a bad Jewish patriotism. The circumstance that, with the sole exception of 2 Chron. 30:3,—an exception which, from the character of the language of that book, is of no importance—the verb אשׁר in the signification “to gather” has the person to whom it is gathered never

joined to it by means of ל, but commonly by means of אל, is of so much the greater importance, that ל has nothing to do with אל. When *Stier* remarks that ver. 6, where Jacob and Israel were again beside each other in a completely parallel clause, proves that Israel's gathering can be spoken of positively only, he has overlooked the essential difference of ver. 5, which refers to the position of the Servant of God towards the whole people and ver. 6, which refers to His destination for the *election*.—The words: "And I am honoured in the eyes of the Lord, and my God is my strength," *i.e.*, my protection and helper, recapitulate what, in ver. 2 and 3, was said about the high dignity of the Servant of God, of which the effect appears, in ver. 6, in His appointment to be the Saviour of the Gentiles, after the mission to Israel has been fruitless. In ver. 6, it is not the decree of the salvation of the Gentiles through Christ which forms the subject (that decree is an eternal one), but rather that this decree should be carried out. It is for this that Israel's unbelief offers an occasion "As the salvation of the elect among Israel (in reference to the great mass, the Servant of God had laboured in vain, ver. 4) would be too small a reward for thee, I assign to thee in addition to them, an infinitely larger inheritance, viz., the whole heathen world." בוש in *Hiphil* frequently means "to lead back," in the ordinary sense, but sometimes also "to lead back into the former, or *normal* condition," "to restore," compare remarks on Dan. 9:25; Ps. 80:4. The parallel, "to raise up," which is opposed to the *lying down* (Ps. 41:9), shows that here it stands in the sense of "to restore." The local leading back belongs to the sphere of Koresh, to whom the first book is dedicated; but, with that, the abnormal condition of misery and abasement, which is so much opposed to the idea of the people of God, is not completely and truly removed. That which the Servant of God bestows upon the elect of Israel, viz., *raising up and restoration*, is, in substance, the same which, according to what follows, He becomes to the *Gentiles*, viz., *light and salvation*. By becoming light and salvation to the elect of Israel, He raises them up and leads them back, inasmuch as this was the normal, natural condition of the covenant-people, from which they had only fallen by their sins. It is to that, that the election is restored by the Servant of God. By the *tribes of Jacob*, the better part only of the people is to be understood, to the exclusion of those souls who are cut off from their people, because they have broken the covenant of the Lord, comp. ver. 4. This appears from the addition: "And the preserved of Israel" (the *Kethibh* יריען is an adjective form with a passive signification; the marginal reading ירוצן is the Part. Pass.); just as, similarly in Ps. 73:1, Israel is limited to the true Israel by the explanatory clause: "Such as are of a clean heart." The verb רצן, "to watch," is, according to *Gesenius*, especially used *de Jehova homines custodiente et tuente*. Hence, the preserved of Israel are those whom God keeps under His gracious protection and care, in contrast to the great mass of the covenant-breakers whom He *gives up*. Chap. 65:13, 14: "Behold my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; behold my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed; behold my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit," likewise points to a great separation which shall take place in the Messianic time. *Light* (compare remarks on chap. 42:6), and *salvation* are related to one another, as the image to the thing itself. From the circumstance that the point here in question is the reward for the Servant of God, who is to be indemnified for the loss which He suffered by Israel (comp. ver. 4), it is obvious that we must not explain: "that my salvation be," but: "that thou mayest be my salvation; for it is only when He is the salvation that such an indemnification is spoken of. Moreover, the Infinitive with ל can here not well be understood otherwise than in the preceding clause. The servant of God is the personal salvation of the Lord for the heathen world; comp. chap. 42:6, and, in the chapter under consideration, ver. 8, where He is

called the *covenant* of the people, because this covenant finds in Him its truth; compare also the expression: “This man is *peace*,” in Mic. 5:4 (5). *Gesenius* rightly remarks, that there is here an allusion to the promises given to the Patriarchs, Gen. 12:3, &c. In Christ, the Shiloh to whom the people adhere, the old promise of the future extension of salvation to all the Gentiles is to be fulfilled.

Ver. 7. “*Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, to Him that is despised by every one, to the abhorrence of the people, to the servant of rulers: Kings shall see and rise up, princes, and prostrate themselves because of the Lord that is faithful, the Holy One of Israel that hath chosen thee.*”

Hitherto, the Servant of the Lord has spoken: here, the Prophet speaks of Him. He gives a short and comprehensive summary of the contents of ver. 1-6, the rejection of the Servant of God by the people to whom His mission was, in the first instance, directed, and His appointment to be the Saviour of the Gentiles. The matter is traced back to the Redeemer of Israel and their Holy One, *i.e.*, the high and glorious God, because the Servant of God is, in the first instance, sent to Israel as διάκονος περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, Rom. 15:8; but still more, because He himself is the concentration of Israel (ver. 3), the κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, Col. 1:18,—He in whose glorification the true Israel, as opposed to the darkened refuse, attain to their right. According to the context, the contempt, &c., must proceed chiefly *from the apostate portion of the covenant-people*: The *princes and kings* must, according to ver. 6 (comp. chap. 52:15), be conceived of as heathenish ones. The verse under consideration merely exhibits, in short outlines, the contrast already alluded to in the preceding context. It cannot appear at all strange that the Prophet foresees the reproach of Christ, and His sufferings from the ungodly world. In those Psalms which refer to the suffering righteous one, righteousness and the hostility of the wicked world are represented as being inseparably connected with each other. Hence it cannot be conceived of otherwise, but that the Servant of God, who, in His person, represented the *ideal* of righteousness, should, in a very special manner, have been liable to this hostility. Moreover, it can be proved that, in some Psalms which refer to the suffering righteous one, David has, besides the individual and the whole people, in view, at the same time, his own family, and Him in whom it was to centre; comp. my commentary on Ps. Vol. iii. p. lxxx. ff. There seems here to be a special reference to Ps. 22:7, 8: “And I am a worm and no man, a reproach of man and despised of the people. All they that see me laugh me to scorn, open their lips, shake their heads;” and it is the more natural to assume this reference that, in chap. 52:14; 53:3, this passage also is referred to. בָּזָה is, after the example of *Kimchi*, viewed by several interpreters as an infinitive form standing in place of a Noun, “despising or contemning,” instead of “contempt,” and this again instead of “object of contempt.” Others view it as the *Stat. construct*, of an adjective בָּזָה with a passive signification. This latter view is more natural; and the reason which *Stier* adduces against it, *viz.*, that of verbs הָל no such forms are found, cannot be considered as conclusive. שִׁפְנוּ-הוּב, literally the “despised one of the *soul*” might, according to Ezek. 36:5: “Against Edom who have taken my land into their possession with the joy of all their heart, with the contempt of their soul,” mean, “who is inwardly and deeply despised,” the soul being viewed as the seat of the affections. But we are led to another explanation by the fundamental passage, Ps. 22:7, and by the circumstance that שִׁפְנוּ is *here* parallel to יוּג, and that the latter corresponds to the עָב in Ps. 22. “The despised one of the soul” must, accordingly, be he who is despised of every one. The soul corresponding to *man* in Ps. 22 is, as it were, conceived of as a great concrete body. In a similar manner, “soul” is used for all that has a

soul, in Gen. 14:21, where the king of Sodom says to Abraham: “Give me the *soul*, and take the goods to thyself.”—“To the *abhorrence of the people*.” תעב in *Piel* never has another signification than “to abhor.” Such is the signification in Job 9:31 also, where the clothes abhor Job plunged in the dirt, resist being put on by him; likewise in Ezek. 15:25, where Judah abhors his beauty, disgracefully tramples under feet his glory, as if he hated it. In favour of the signification: “To cause to abhor” (*Rödiger: horrorem incutiens populo, qui abominationi est populo*), interpreters cannot adduce even one apparent passage, except that before us. We are, therefore, only at liberty to explain, after the example of *Kimchi*: “to the ... people abhorring,” *i.e.*, to him against whom the people feel an abhorrence, יי is used of the Jewish people in Is. 1:4 also. *Hofmann* is of opinion that it ought to have the article, if it were to refer to the Jewish people. But no one asserts a direct reference to them; it designates, in itself, the mass only, in contrast to single individuals, just as עמ in Ps. 22. The abhorrence is felt by the masses—is popular. The fact that it is among Israel that the Servant of God meets this general abhorrence, is not implied in the word itself, but is suggested by the whole context. While שפנ and יי designate the generality of this hatred, מלשם points to the highest places of it. Of heathen rulers this word occurs in chap. 14:5; of native rulers, in chap. 52:5; 28:14. The heathen rulers can here come into consideration, in so far only as they are the instruments of the native ones; comp. John 19:10: λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς; οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχω ἀπολυθῆσαι σε καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαι σε. The *servant of rulers* forms the contrast to the servant of the Lord. But in the words: “Kings shall see,” &c., it is described how the original dignity finally breaks forth powerfully and reacts against the momentary humiliation. It was especially at the crucifixion that Christ presented himself as” He that was despised by every one, as the abhorrence of the people, as the servant of rulers.” The historical commentary on these words we have in Matt. 22:39 ff.: οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων λεγον· ἄλλους σωσεν κ.τ.λ. τὸ δ αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λησταὶ οἱ συσταυρωθέντες αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν.—After יראו “they shall see,” the object must be supplied from ver. 6, viz., the brilliant turn which, under the Lord’s direction. His destiny shall take,—His being constituted the light and salvation of the Gentiles. The kings who sit on their thrones rise up: the nobles who stand around the throne prostrate themselves. The Servant of God is the concentration of Israel, ver. 3. Hence His glorification is, at the close, once more traced back to the *Holy One of Israel*; and that so much the rather, because the glorification which is bestowed upon Him is bestowed upon Him for the benefit of the Congregation, whom He elevates along with himself out of the condition of deep abasement; comp. vers. 8 and 9. The verse before us forms the germ of that which, in chap. 52:13, is carried out and expanded.

Ver. 8. “*Thus saith the Lord: In the time of favour I have heard thee, and in the day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee, and give thee for the Covenant of the people, that thou mayest raise up the land, divide desolate heritages. Ver. 9. That thou mayest say to the prisoners: Go forth; to them that are in darkness: Come to light; they shall feed in the ways, and on all bare hills shall be their pasture.*”

*The time of favour* may be either the time when God shows His delight in, and favour to His Servant, and, in Him, to the Church, *q.d.*, of delight in thee, mercy for thee,—in which case chap. 60:10 would be parallel: “In my *wrath*. I smote thee, and in my favour have I had mercy on thee;” or, “in the time of favour,” may be equivalent to: “at the agreeable, acceptable time” (LXX., which Paul follows in 2 Cor. 6:1, 2, καιρῷ δεκτῷ,

Vulg. *tempore placito*); in contrast to a preceding unacceptable time, in which the Lord seemed to have forsaken His Servant, in which it appeared as if He had laboured in vain, and spent His strength for nought and vanity. Acceptable is the time to all parties, not only to the Servant of God, but also to those who are to be redeemed through Him; and not less to God, to whom it is a joy to pour out upon His Servant the rivers of His salvation. The Preterites in ver. 8 must be viewed as prophetic Preterites. Concerning "Covenant of the people," compare remarks on chap. 42:6. The idea of the people is more closely defined and qualified by ver. 6 and 7. The souls who have been cut off from their people, because they have broken the covenant of the Lord, and despised His Servant, are justly passed by. But since *יְדִי* can here be understood of the better portion of the people only, of the invisible Church in the midst of the visible, the Servant of God cannot be the better portion of the people.—In the words: "That thou mayest raise up the land, divide desolate heritages," the bestowal of salvation is described, under the image of the restoration of a devastated country. In ver. 9, the misery of the Congregation of God is described under the image of pining away in a dark prison; compare remarks on chap. 42:7. With the second half of the verse, there begins a more general description of the glorious salvation which the Lord will grant to His people; and the person of the Mediator steps into the back-ground, in order afterwards to come forth more prominently. The *ways* and *bare hills* have come into consideration as places which, in themselves, are completely barren, and which the wonderful grace of God can alone cause to bud and flourish.

## **CHAPTER 50:4-11**

The Servant of God here also appears as speaking. In ver. 4, He intimates His vocation: God has bestowed upon Him the gift of comforting those who are weary and heavy laden. He then at once turns to His real subject,—the sufferings which, in fulfilment of this vocation he has to endure. The Lord has inwardly manifested to Him that, in the exercise of His office, He shall experience severe trials; and willingly has He borne all these sufferings, all the ignominy and shame, ver. 5, 6. With this willingness and fortitude He is inspired by His firm confidence in the Lord, who, he certainly knows, will help Him and destroy His enemies, ver. 7-9. The conclusion, in ver. 10 and 11, forms the prophetic announcement of the different fates of the two opposing parties among the people. At the foundation of this lies the foresight of heavy afflictions which, after the appearance of the Servant of God, will be laid upon the covenant-people. That portion of the people who are devoted to the Servant of God, are told to hope in the midst of the misery, and may hope; their sorrows shall be turned into joy. But the ungodly who, without regarding the Lord, and without hearkening to His Servant, would help themselves, will bring destruction upon themselves by their self-willed doings, and shall be visited by the avenging hand of the Servant of God.

An intimation of the lowliness of Christ at His first appearance occurs as early as in chap. 11:1. In chap. 42:4, the words: "He shall not fail nor run away," intimate that the Servant of God has to struggle with great obstacles and difficulties in the exercise of His calling. According to chap. 49:4, He will labour in vain among the great mass of the covenant-people, and spend his strength for nought and vanity. In ver. 7, it is expressly intimated that severe sufferings shall be inflicted upon Him by the people. That which was there alluded to, is here *carried out and expanded*. But the suffering of the Servant of God is here described from that aspect only which is common to Christ with His members. It is first in chap. 53 that its vicarious power is pointed out. The Servant of God comes here

before us in His deepest humiliation. Even in the description of His vocation in ver. 4, the most unassuming aspect, the prophetic office only, is brought forward. It is only quite at the close that a gentle intimation is given of the glory concealed behind the lowliness: He there appears as the judge of those who have rejected Him.

In the Messianic explanation of this Section, the Lord himself has gone before His Church. We read in Luke 18:31, 32, παραλαβὼν δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὕβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν. There cannot be any doubt that the Lord here distinctly refers to ver. 6 of the prophecy under consideration. There is, at all events, no other passage in the whole of the Old Testament, except that before us, in which there is any mention made of being spat upon. But in other respects, too, the reference is visible: “I gave my back to the smiters (μαστιγώσαντες, LXX. εἰς μάστιγας), and my cheeks to those plucking (ἐμπτυσθήσεται—the plucking of the beard, an act of degrading wantonness), my face I hid not from shame (ἔβρισθήσεται) and spitting.” *Bengel* draws attention to the fact of how highly Christ, in the passage quoted, placed the prophecy of the Old Testament: “Jesus most highly valued that which was written. The word of God which is contained in Scripture is the rule for all which is to happen, even for that which is to happen in eternal life.” If, in respect of the high estimation of prophecy, our age were to follow in the steps of Jesus, it would also most readily agree with Him as regards the subject of the prophecy before us. This alone is the cause of the aberration from Him, that people confined and shut up the prophet within the horizon of his time, and then imagined that he could not know anything of the suffering of Christ. It was altogether different in the ancient Christian Church. In it, the Messianic interpretation prevailed throughout; and *Grotius*, who in a lower sense would refer the prophecy to Isaiah, and, in a higher sense only, to Christ, met with general opposition, even on the part of *Clericus*.

In favour of the Messianic explanation there is the remarkable agreement existing between prophecy and fulfilment, comp. Matt. 26:67, 68: Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν. Οἱ δὲ ἐρράπισαν λέγοντες· προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, χριστέ, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε; 27:30: καὶ ἐμπτύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν ἔλαβον τὸν κάλαμον καὶ ἔτυπον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ,—an agreement, the significance and importance of which are only enhanced by the circumstance that one of the most individualizing features of the prophecy, viz., the plucking off of the beard, is not met with in the history of Christ; for it is just thereby that this agreement is proved to be a free and spontaneous one. *Farther*—The exactness with which, in ver. 10 and 11, the destinies of Israel, after the rejection of Christ, are drawn; and the destruction which the mass of the people, who did not believe in the Servant of God, prepared for themselves, by their attempts to help themselves by their own strength, by enkindling the flame of war, whilst those who fear the Lord and listen to the voice of His Servant, obtain salvation. *Farther*—Ver. 11, where the Servant of God ascribes to himself the judgment upon the unbelieving mass of the people: “From *my* hand is this to you,” in harmony with Matt. 26:64 and other passages, where the Son of Man appears as executing judgment upon Jerusalem. *Finally*—The parallel passages.

Most of the modern interpreters assume that the Prophet himself, Isaiah, or Pseudo-Isaiah, is the subject of the prophecy. *Jerome* mentions that this explanation was the prevailing one among the Jews of his time. The explanation which refers it to the better portion of

the people, found only one defender, viz., *Paulus*. The explanation which refers it to the *whole* of the Jewish people, or to the collective body of the prophets, has been entirely abandoned, although it is maintained in reference to the parallel passages.

Since it is undeniable that this Section is related to the other prophecies which treat of the Servant of God,—and hence an identity of subject is necessarily required—those who, in the Section under consideration, are compelled to give up their former hypothesis, themselves bear witness against the correctness of it, at the same time, also against the soundness of their explanation of the passage before us. For an explanation which compels to the severance of what is necessarily connected, cannot be right and true. It is only then that Exegesis has attained its object, when it has arrived at a subject in whom all those features, which occur in the single prophecies which are connected with each other, are found at the same time. *Knobel*, in saying: “This small unconnected Section, is the only one in the whole collection, in which the Prophet speaks of himself only, and represents his sufferings and hopes,” has thereby himself pronounced judgment upon his own interpretation of this Section, and at the same time, of the other prophecies of the Servant of God.

Moreover, the Prophet would here form rather a strange figure; he would appear as it were, as if he had been blown in by a snow-storm. According to *Hofmann*, he describes how he is rewarded for his activity and zeal in his vocation. But how does this suit the contents of the second part, which evidently is a whole, the single parts of which must stand in a close relation to its fundamental idea! *It is only a person of central importance that is suitable to this context*. It is only when we refer it to Christ, that the expectations are satisfied which were called forth by the words: Comfort ye, comfort ye my people. This call is answered only by pointing to the future Saviour of the world.

One element of truth, indeed, there is in the explanation which makes the Prophet the subject. It is revealed to him, indeed, that the Servant of God shall undergo persecution, shame, and ignominy; but he has the natural substratum for this knowledge in the experience of himself and his colleagues, compare Matt. 23:29-37; Heb. 11:36, 37. The divine, wherever it enters into the world of sin, as well as the servant of truth who upholds it in the face of prevailing falsehood, must undergo struggles, shame, and ignominy. This truth was confirmed in the case of the prophets as types, in the case of Christ as the antitype. All that which the prophets had to experience in their own cases was a prophecy by deeds of the sufferings of Christ; and we should the less have any difficulty in admitting their knowledge of this, that it would be rather strange if they were destitute of such knowledge.

Ver. 4. “*The Lord Jehovah hath given me a disciple’s tongue, that I should know to help the weary with a word: He awakeneth morning by morning, wakeneth mine ear, that I may hear as the disciples.*”

The greater number of expositors explain a disciple’s tongue by: “A tongue such as instructed people or scholars possess,—an eloquent tongue.” But *דַּמְל*, everywhere else in Isaiah, means “pupil,” “disciple,” and is used especially of the disciples of the Lord, those who go to His school, are instructed by Him; comp. chaps. 8:16; 54:13. A disciple’s tongue is such as the disciples of the Lord possess. Its foundation is formed by the disciple’s *ear* mentioned at the close of the verse. He who hears the Lord’s words, speaks also the Lord’s words. The signification, “learned,” is not suitable in the last clause of the verse, and its reference to the first does not permit of our assuming a different

signification in either clause. Just as here the Servant of God traces back to God that which He speaks, so Jesus says, in John 8:26: καὶ γὰρ ἃ ἤκουσα παρ’ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον, comp. 3:34: ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ. The verb *ἤκουσα*, which occurs only here, means, according to the Arabic, “to help,” “to support;” *Aquila*: ὑποστηρίσαι, Vulg. *sustentare*. Like other similar verbs, e.g., *שמך*, in Gen. 27:37, it is construed with a double accusative: “that I may help the weary, word,” i.e., may support him by comforting words. The weary or fatigued are, like the bent reed, the faintly burning wick, in chap. 42:3; the blind, the prisoners sitting in darkness, *ibid.*, ver. 7; the broken-hearted, chap. 61:1; them that mourn, *ibid.*, ver. 2. Just as here the Servant of God represents the suffering and afflicted ones as the main objects of His mission, so Christ announces, that His mission is specially directed to these, comp. e.g., Matt. 5:4; 11:28. In order to be able to fulfil this mission, He must be able to draw from the fulness of God, who looketh to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, chap. 66:2, and who alone understands to heal the broken in heart, and to bind up their wounds, Ps. 147:3.—In the words: “He wakeneth, &c.” we are told in what manner the Lord gives to His Servant the disciple’s tongue. *To waken the ear* is equivalent to: to make attentive, to make ready for the reception of the divine communications. The expression “morning by morning” indicates that the divine wakening is going on uninterruptedly, and that the Servant of God unreservedly surrenders himself to the influences which come from above, in which He has become an example to us.

Ver. 5. “*The Lord Jehovah hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, and have not turned back.*”

The phrases “to open or uncover the ear” have always the signification, “to make known something to some one,” “to reveal to him something,” “to inform him,” both in ordinary circumstances (comp. 1 Sam. 20:12; Ruth 4:4), and on the religious territory, comp. 2 Sam. 7:27: “For thou, Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, hast opened the ear of thy servant, saying: I will build thee an house;” Isa. 48:8: “Thou heardest not, thou knewest not, nor was formerly thine ear opened;” chap. 42:20: “The ear was opened to him.” According to this well established *usus loquendi*, “The Lord hath opened mine ear,” can only mean: The Lord hath revealed to me, hath informed me inwardly; *Abenezra*: *ל יודוס הלג* “He has made known to me His secret.” What the Lord has made known to His Servant, we are not here expressly told; but it may be inferred from ver. 6, where the Servant declares that which, in consequence of the divine manifestation, He did, viz., that He should give His back to the smiters, &c. The words: “The Lord hath opened mine ear” here are connected with: “The Lord wakeneth mine ear, that I may hear,” in the preceding verse: The Lord has specially made known to me that, in carrying out my vocation, I shall have to endure severe sufferings. *To this subject the Servant of God quickly passes over, after having, in the introduction, described, by a few features, the vocation, in the carrying out of which these sufferings should befall Him.* As the authors of these sufferings, we must conceive of the party opposed to the weary, viz., the proud, secure, unbroken sinners. On “I was not rebellious,” compare what, in Deut. 21:20, is written of the stubborn and rebellious son who will not obey the voice of his father; and farther, the words: *πλήν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ ὡς σύ*, Matt. 26:39.

Ver. 6. “*I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to the pluckers, I hid not my face from shame and spitting.*”

The words express in an individualizing manner the thought, that the Servant of God, in His vocation as the Saviour of the *personae miserabiles*, would experience the most shameful and ignominious treatment, and would patiently bear it. In God's providence, part of the contents was literally fulfilled upon Christ. But the fact that this literal agreement is not the main point, but that it serves as a hint and indication only of the far more important *substantial* conformity which would take place, although the hatred of the world against the Saviour of the poor and afflicted should have manifested itself in forms altogether different,—this fact is evident from the circumstance that regarding the fulfilment of the words: “and my cheeks to the pluckers”—plucking the cheeks, or plucking off of the beard being the greatest insult and disgrace in the East, compare 2 Sam. 10:4—there is no mention in the New Testament history.

In vers. 7-9 we have the future glory, which makes it easy for the Servant of God to bear the sufferings of the Present. If God be for Him, who may be against Him?

Ver. 7. *“But the Lord Jehovah helpeth me, therefore I am not confounded, therefore I make my face like a flint, and I know that I am not put to shame.”*

יִתְמַלְכֵב refers to תּוֹמַלְכֵב in the preceding verse. He whom the Lord helps is not confounded or put to shame by all the ignominy which the world heaps upon him. The expression: “I make my face like a flint” denotes the “holy hardness of perseverance” (*Stier*); comp. Ezek. 3:8. In that passage it is especially the assailing hardness which comes into consideration; here, on the contrary, it is the suffering one. There is an allusion to the passage before us, in Luke 9:51: ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

Ver. 8. *“He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? Let us stand together; who has a right upon me, let him come near me.”*

Ver. 8. *“He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? Let us stand together; who has a right upon me, let him come near me.”*

In the confidence and assurance of Christ, His redeemed ones, too, partake,—those that hear the voice of the Servant of God, ver. 10, comp. Rom. 8:33, 34, where this and the following verse are intentionally alluded to. The justification is one by *deeds*. It took place and was fulfilled, in the first instance, in the resurrection and glorification of Christ, and, then, in the destruction of Jerusalem.—יִטְפַּשֵׁמ לַעֲבָ literally, “the master of my right,” *i.e.*, he who according to his opinion or assertion which, by the issue is proved to be false, has a right over me, comp. the ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐχ ἔχει οὐδέν which, in John 14:30, the Lord says in reference to the chief of His enemies.

Ver. 9. *“Behold the Lord Jehovah will help me; who is he that shall condemn me? Lo, they shall wax old as a garment, the moth shall eat them.”*

That which is said here in reference to the enemies of Christ is, in chap. 51:8, with a reference to our passage, said of the opponents of those who know righteousness, and in whose heart is the law: “The moth shall eat them up like a garment.” Enmity to Christ and His Church is, to those who entertain it, a prophecy of sure destruction. The words: “The moth shall eat them,” are farther expanded in ver. 11, where it is described how the people who ventured to *condemn* the Servant of God, become a prey to destruction.

The Servant of God closes with a double address; first, to the godly; and then, to the ungodly.

Ver. 10. *“Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the word of His Servant? When he walketh in darkness, in which there is no light to him, let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God.”*

From the words: “Of mine hand,” in ver. 11, it appears that the Servant of God is continuing the discourse. Hence “the voice of His Servant,” *q.d.*, the voice of me who am His Servant. By the words: “Among you,” the address is directed to the whole of the people. In this two parties are distinguished. The first is formed by those who fear the Lord, and obey the voice of His Servant. Both of these things appear as indissolubly connected. The fear of God must necessarily prove itself in this, that He whom He has sent is obeyed. It is a mere imagination on the part of the people to think that they can fear God without obeying the voice of His Servant; comp. John 5:23. There is in this an allusion to the emphatic “Unto him ye shall hearken,” which, in Deut. 18:15, had been said in reference to *the* Prophet. From ver. 11 it appears that the darkness in which those walk who fear the Lord, is not to be understood of personal individual calamity which befalls this or that godly one, nor of the sufferings which happen to the pious godly *party*, in contrast to the ungodly wicked, but rather that we have before us the foresight of a dark period of sufferings which, after the appearance of the Servant of God, shall be inflicted upon the whole people; so that both of the parties,—that devoted to the Servant of God, and that opposed to Him,—are thereby affected, but with a different issue. For in ver. 11, it is described how the ungodly, who likewise walk in darkness, endeavour to light up their darkness by a fire which they have kindled, but do so to their own destruction. Behind the exhortation: “Let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God,” there is concealed the promise: he *may* trust, his darkness shall be changed into light, his sorrow into joy. When the destruction of Jerusalem approached, the cry came to believing Israel: Lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh,” Luke 21:28. In the destruction of apostate Israel, not obeying the Servant of God, but persecuting His faithful ones, they beheld the beginning of the victory of the true people of God over the world.

Ver. 11. *“Behold all ye that kindle a fire, that gird sparks,—walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. From mine hand is this to you; ye shall lie down in pain.”*

The image begun in the preceding verse is continued. The pious walk in confidence and patience through the lightless darkness, until the Lord kindles a light to them. Those who do *not* hear the Lord, who do *not* obey the voice of His Servant, kindle a fire which is to light up their darkness; but instead of that, they are consumed by the fire. Thus the Servant of God, who brings this destruction upon them, obtains His right upon them.—The *fire* is often in Scripture the fire of war, chap. 9:18; Jer. 51:5; Rev. 8:7-10. According to several interpreters (*Hitzig, Ewald, Knobel*), it is assumed that the discourse is here not of “self-assistance by rebellion,” but “of the attacks of the wicked upon the godly, and of the destruction, into which these attacks turn out for their authors.” But this view is opposed by the circumstance that the darkness is common to both parties; hence, it must come from some other quarter. The fire which the wicked kindle is destined to enlighten the darkness in which they also are, which is especially evident from the words: “Walk in the *light* of your fire.” They now have a light which enlightens their darkness; but this self-created light consumes them.—To *gird* stands for, “to surround one’s self with a girdle,” “to put on a girdle.” In substance it is equivalent “to provide one’s self with it,”—

The ἀπαξ λεγόμενον תוקי cannot with certainty be explained from the dialects. The connection and parallelism are in favour of the signification “sparks,” “flames,” which is found as early as in the Septuagint (φλόγα), and Vulg. (*flammas*). In Syriac אקיי has the signification “lightning.” Those who explain it by “fiery darts” are not at liberty to refer it to the תוקי in Prov. 26:18. The signification “flames” (not “sparks,” as *Stier* holds), is, in that passage, quite suitable; simple arrows could there not be mentioned after the fiery darts without making the discourse feeble.—וּכְל “walk ye,” is equivalent to: “ye shall walk,” yet with an intimation of the fact that this result, as we are immediately afterwards expressly told, proceeds from the speaker: *sic volo, sic jubeo*. The words: “From mine hand is this to you,” are, by those who make the Prophet the subject of this prediction, supposed to be spoken by Jehovah. But throughout the whole section, the Lord is always only spoken of, and never appears as speaking. The words are in harmony with the exalted dignity which, elsewhere also, is attributed by the Prophet to the Servant of God who plants the heavens, and lays the foundation of the earth, chap. 51:16; whose mouth the Lord makes like a sharp sword, chap. 49:2; who is the personal salvation, the Saviour for the whole earth, chap. 49:6; and the embodied Covenant for the covenant-people, chaps. 42:6; 49:8. The last passages, especially, are of no small importance. The saving and judging activity go hand in hand, and cannot be separated. We have here thus the Old Testament beginnings and preparation for the doctrine of the New Testament, that the Father has given all judgment to the Son. The Servant of God, in the highest sense, is Lord and judge of the fellow servants.—The ל in הַבְּצַעֲמַל serves for designating the condition: so that you belong to pain. בַּכֶּשׂ occurs in chap. 43:17 of the Egyptians lying down; comp. Ps. 41:9: “He that *lieth* shall rise up no more.” In the announcement that Israel’s attempt to help themselves would turn out to their destruction, the Song of Solomon, in chap. 3:1-3; 5:7, has preceded our Prophet: “The daughter of Zion, in her restlessness, endeavours to bring about, by wordly, rebellious doings, the Messianic salvation. It is in vain; what she is seeking she does not find, but the heavenly watchmen find her.”

## **CHAPTER 51:1-16**

Ver. 1. “*And I put my words in thy mouth and cover thee in the shadow of mine hand, that thou mayest plant the heaven and lay the foundation of the earth, and say unto Zion: Thou art my people.*”

The discourse in chap. 51 to 52:12 is not addressed to the whole of Israel, but to the *election*. They are, in chap. 51:1, called those that follow after righteousness, that seek the Lord; in ver. 7, those who know righteousness, in whose heart is the law of the Lord. These the Prophet seeks to comfort and strengthen by pointing to the future glorious mercies of the Lord.

The Section chap. 51:4-8 comforts the elect by the coming of the salvation, by the dominion of the people of God over the whole world; points to the foundation of these successes, viz., the eternity of the salvation and righteousness for the Church; and exhorts them that, having this eternal salvation before them, they might patiently bear the temporal reproach of the world given over to destruction.

In vers. 9-11, the Church calls upon the Lord to do as He had promised; and this prayer, founded upon His almighty love, which in times past had so gloriously manifested itself, passes over, at the close, into hope and confidence.

In vers. 12-16 follows the answer of the Lord, who exhorts the Church to be steadfast, by reminding her that her opponents are weak mortals, while the omnipotent God is her protector; and announces that, with the same omnipotence which He manifests in nature, He would soon bring about her deliverance, and that He would do so by His Servant, in whom all His promises should be Yea and Amen, and whom at the close He addresses, committing to Him the work of redemption. According to the current opinion, the discourse in ver. 16 is addressed to the people. But, in that case, we must also make up our minds to view the Infinitive with  $\bar{\nu}$  a Gerund, "planting," or "by planting,"—a supposition which is beset with great difficulties. It was only by an inconsistency that *Stier*, who, in chap. 49 rejects this view, could here agree to it. And, farther, it is obvious that the words at the close: "Thou art my people," are the *words* which, according to the commencement of the verse, are put into the mouth of the speaker, and that hence, the planting of heaven and earth, which prepares for this speaking, belongs to Him. If this be not supposed, one does not at all see to what the: "I put my words in thy mouth," is to refer. What farther militates against this explanation is the unmistakable relation of the passage before us to chaps. 49, 50, which it is impossible to refer to the people. The same reason is also against the supposition of *Gesenius* and *Umbreit*, that the discourse is addressed to the prophetic order. Nor is it defensible to explain: "to plant the heaven and lay the foundation of the earth," by: to establish the new state of Israel. To these arguments it may be added that, according to this explanation, the words: "Thou art my people," are unsuitable; for Israel was not the people of the Prophet, but the people of God and of His Servant. The discourse is addressed rather to the Messiah, compare the parallel passages, chap. 49, especially ver. 2, and chap. 50, especially vers. 4 and 5. Considering the dramatic character of the whole section, the change of the person addressed is a circumstance of very little importance; and chap. 59:21, where the word of God is put into the mouth of Jacob, is parallel in appearance only. Even *a priori* we could not expect that, in this context, treating, as it does, of the personal Messiah, the whole section, chap. 51:1 to 52:12, should lack all reference to the Messiah. By the words: "I put my word in thy mouth," the Messiah is appointed to be, in the highest sense, the speaker of God; the realization of the divine counsels is committed to Him. For the fact that it is not mere words which are here treated of, but such as are living and powerful, like those which God spoke at the creation, becomes evident by the circumstance that the planting of heaven and earth is attributed to the Servant of God as bearer of His words,—a thing which cannot be done by the ordinary word; comp. Isa. 40:4, according to which the Messiah smites the earth with the rod of His mouth, and slays the wicked with the breath of His lips.—*I cover thee in the shadow of mine hand*, designates the divine protection and providence which are indispensable in order that the Servant of God may fulfil His vocation to be God's speaker. The words form an accessory thought only: I appoint thee my speaker whom, as such, I will keep and protect in order that thou, &c.;—for that which follows is that which the Servant of God is to *perform* as His Speaker. By the word of Omnipotence committed to Him, He plants a new heaven, and lays the foundation of a new earth, and invests Zion with the dignity of the people of God.—To plant the heaven and lay the foundation of the earth, is equivalent to founding a *new* heaven, a *new* earth; compare chaps. 65:17, 66:22; Rev. 22. For, as long as the old heaven and the old earth exist, a planting and founding activity cannot take place in reference to heaven and earth. All that is created, in so far as it opposes the Kingdom of God, is unfit for being an abode

of the glorified Kingdom of God, and must be shaken and broken to pieces, in order that this Kingdom may enter into its natural conditions, and find a worthy abode. The activity of God and His Servant, necessary for this purpose, will most completely take place at the end of days, at the *παλιγγενεσία* announced by the Lord, Matt. 19:28; compare what is said in chap. 11, in reference to the entire change of the conditions of the earth. But in a preparatory manner, this activity pervades all history. The heaven, according to the *usus loquendi* of Scripture, and also of Isaiah, is not only the natural heaven, but also the heaven of princes, the whole order of rulers and magistrates, (compare my remarks on Rev. 6:13), whose form and relation to the Kingdom of God underwent a great change, even at the first appearance of Christ.—The *saying*, according to the preceding: That thou mayest plant, &c., is not to be referred to the mere announcing; but, according to the frequent *usus loquendi*, it includes the performing also, just as *e.g.*, in ver. 12, the comforting is effected by a discourse *in deeds*. The distinction between, and separation of word and deed belongs to human weakness. God speaks and it is done; and what holds true of His word, applies also to the word of His Servant, which he has put into His mouth.

## **CHAPTERS 52:13-53:12**

This section forms the climax of the prophecies of Isaiah, of prophetism in general, of the whole Old Testament, as appears even from the circumstance that the Lord and His Apostles refer to no part of the Old Testament so frequently and so emphatically as to this,—a section which, according to *Luther's* demand, every Christian should have committed *verbatim*. Christ is here, with wonderful clearness, described to us in His highest work—His atoning suffering.

In vers. 13-15 of chap. 52 Jehovah speaks. These verses contain a short summary of what is enlarged upon in chap. 53. The very deepest humiliation of the Servant of God shall be followed by His highest glorification. In consequence of the salvation wrought out and accomplished by Him, the nations of the earth and their kings shall reverently submit to Him. In chap. 53:1-10, the Prophet utters the sentiments of the *elect* in Israel. At first, in His humiliation, they had not recognized the Redeemer; but now they acknowledged Him as their Redeemer and Saviour, and saw that He had taken upon Him His sufferings for our salvation, and that they had a vicarious character. The commencement forms, in ver. 1, the lamentation that so many do not believe in the report of the Servant of God, that so many do not behold the glory of God manifested in Him. In vers. 2 and 3, we have the cause of this fact, *viz.*, the appearance of the Divine, in the form of a Servant—the offence of the cross. In lowliness, without any outward splendour, the Servant of God shall go about. Sufferings, heavier than ever befel any man, shall be inflicted upon Him. In vers. 4-6, the vicarious import of these sufferings is pointed out. The people, seeing his sufferings, and not knowing the cause of them, imagined that they were the well-merited punishment of His own transgressions and iniquities. But the Church, now brought to believe in Him, see that they were wrong in imagining thus. It was not His own transgressions and iniquities which were punished in Him, but ours. His sufferings were voluntarily undergone by Him, and for the salvation of mankind, which else would have been given up to destruction. God himself was anxious to re-unite to himself those who were separated from Him, and who walked in their own ways. To the vicarious import of the sufferings of the Servant of God corresponds, according to ver. 7, His conduct: He

suffers quietly and patiently. In vers. 8-10 we have the reward which the Servant of God receives for His passive obedience. God takes Him to himself, and He receives an unspeakably great generation, ver. 8, the ominous burial with the rich, ver. 9, numerous seed and long life, and that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand, ver. 10. In vers. 11 and 12, the Lord again appears as speaking, and confirms that which has been declared by the faithful Church.

The two verses of the close, together with the exordium, chap. 52:13-15, occupy five verses—five being the signature of the half and incomplete. The main body, ten verses, is divided into seven referring to the humiliation and suffering, and three referring to the exaltation of the Servant of God. The seven are, as usual, divided into three and four. In the three verses, the suffering of the Servant of God is exhibited; in the four, its cause and vicarious import.

By the “*Behold*” with which the prophecy opens, the Prophet intimates that we have here before us a vision beheld by him in the spirit. As the period in which the Prophet beholds the vision, we have to suppose the time between the suffering and the glorification of the Servant of God. The glorification is described chiefly by Futures, the suffering by Preterites; but, from the fact that this stand-point is not strictly adhered to, it is evident that we have to do with a stand-point which is purely ideal.

The section forms, in a formal and material point of view, a whole by itself; but, notwithstanding its absolute independence, it must stand in a certain connection with what precedes and what follows. Let us, therefore, now consider the relation in which it stands to the portions surrounding it. Its relation to what goes before is thus strikingly designated by *Calvin*: “After Isaiah had spoken of the restoration of the Church, he passes over to Christ, in whom all things are gathered together. He speaks of the prosperous success of the Church, at a time when it was least to be expected, which calls them back to their King, by whom all things are to be restored, and exhorts them to expect Him.” The preceding section begins with chap. 51:1. We have already stated the contents up to 51:16. Vers. 17-23 are closely connected with the preceding, in which salvation and mercy were announced to the Church of God. This announcement is here continued in new forms. Chap. 52:1-6: As the Lord had formerly delivered His people out of the hand of Egypt and Asshur, so, now too, He will deliver them. Zion appears under the image of a woman imprisoned, fettered, lying powerlessly in a miserable garment, on a dirty floor, and is called upon do arise, to strengthen herself, to throw off her bands, to put on festive garments, inasmuch as the time of her deliverance from the misery is at hand. Vers. 7-10: In the last words of ver. 6, the Lord had announced that He was already at hand for the redemption of His Church. This salvation now presents itself vividly to the spiritual eye of the Prophet, and is graphically described by him. He beholds a messenger hastening with the glad tidings to Jerusalem; *watchmen*, who are standing on the ruins of Jerusalem in longing expectation, discover him at a distance, and exultingly call upon the ruins to shout aloud for joy.<sup>19</sup> “How beautiful”—so verse 7 runs—“upon the mountains the feet of the Messenger of joy, that announceth peace, that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion: Thy God reigneth.” In Rom. 10:15, the Apostle refers this passage to the preaching of the Gospel. That is more than mere application; it is real explanation. The deliverance from Babylon is only the first faint beginning of the salvation, which the Prophet has before his eye in its whole extent. As the substance of the salvation, the circumstance that Zion’s God reigneth, is intimated. There is, in this, an allusion to the formula which was used in proclaiming the ascension of earthly kings to

the throne. Even this allusion shows that the point here in question is not the continuous government of the Lord, but a new, glorious manifestation of His government, as it were a new ascension to the throne. This “the Lord reigneth,” found a faint beginning only of its confirmation and fulfilment in the destruction of Babylon, and the deliverance of Israel; but as to its full import, it is Messianic. In Christ, the Lord has truly assumed the government, and will still more gloriously reign in future.—Ver. 8: “The *voice* of thy watchmen! they lift up the voice, they shout together; for they see eye to eye that the Lord returneth to Zion.” The watchmen are ideal persons, representatives of the truth that the Lord is around His people, and that the circumstances of His Church are to Him a constant call to help; or they may be viewed as the holy angels who, as the servants of the watchmen of Israel, form the protecting power for the Church. These watchmen continue to stand even on the destroyed walls; for, even in her misery, the Lord is Zion’s God. The anxious waiting eye of the watchmen, and the mercy-beaming eye of God returning to Zion meet one another. The returning here is opposed to the forsaking, over which Zion had lamented in chap. 49:14. Instead of the concealed presence of the Lord during the misery, which, to the feeling, so easily appears as entire absence, there comes the presence of God manifested in the salvation. This return of the Lord to Zion truly took place in Christ only, Luke 1:68.—Ver. 9: “Break forth into joy, shout together, ye ruins of Jerusalem, for the Lord comforteth Jerusalem, redeemeth His people.” This call goes far beyond the time of the restoration of Jerusalem after the exile; for, even at that time, the spiritual eye still beheld ruins, where the bodily eye saw firm, walled buildings. The condition of the Kingdom of God was still miserable, the eye of the faithful remained still fixed, with hopes and longings, upon the Future which was to bring, and has brought, *true* comfort and consolation.—Ver. 10: “The Lord maketh bare His Holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth see the salvation of our God.” The making bare of the arm of the Lord designates the manifestation, by deeds, of the divine power and glory, such as took place by the sending of Christ, and by the wonderful elevation of the Church over the world,—an elevation which has its roots in Him; compare chap. 53:1. In vers. 11 and 12 there is still the exhortation to the Church of the Lord that, by true repentance, she should worthily prepare for the impending salvation.

After the Prophet has, in chap. 51:1 to 52:12, described the transition of the Church of God from humiliation and sorrow to glorification, it is quite natural that he should now turn from the members to the Head, through whose mediation this transition was to be accomplished, after the same contrast had been exhibited in Himself. There is the most intimate connection between the Church of God and His Servant; for, all that He does and suffers, He does and suffers for her; and all that befalls her is prefigured by the way in which He has been led by the Lord.

With what follows, too, the section before us stands in a close relation. The glorification of the Servant of God described at the close of chap. 53, is, in Him, bestowed at the same time, upon the Church. Thus chap. 54, in which the Church is comforted by pointing to her future glorification, is connected with the preceding. The Church of the Lord appears here as a woman who, after having been put away by her husband, and after having, for a long time, lived in a childless, sorrowful solitude, is again received by him, and sees herself surrounded by numerous children. The time of punishment is now at an end, and the time of mercy is breaking.

Chap. 52:13. “*Behold, my Servant shall act wisely, He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.*”

לִיכָשׁ always means “to act wisely” (LXX. συνήσει; *Aquil. Sym.*: ἐπισθημονισθήσεται), never “to be successful” (the Chaldean, whom most of the modern interpreters follow, renders it by לִצַּח), and this ascertained sense (comp. Remarks on Jer. 3:15; 23:5, where the verb is used of the Messiah, just as it is here), must here be maintained so much the more, that our passage evidently refers to David, the former servant of God. Of him it is said in 1 Sam. 18:14, 15: “And David was acting wisely in all his ways, and the Lord was with him. And Saul saw that he was acting very wisely, and was afraid of him; comp. 1 Kings 2:3, where David says to Solomon; “And keep the charge of the Lord thy God .... in order that thou mayest act wisely in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself;” Ps. 101:2, where David, speaking in the name of his family, says: “I will behave myself wisely in a perfect way; and 2 Kings 18:7, where it is said of Hezekiah: “And the Lord was with Him, and whithersoever he went forth, he acted wisely.” According to these fundamental and parallel passages, the expression, “He shall act wisely” refers to the administration of government, and is equivalent to: He shall rule wisely like his ancestor David. *Stier* is wrong in opposing the view, that the Messiah here presents himself as King. He says: “The King has here stepped behind the Prophet, Witness, Martyr, Saviour;” but in chap. 53:12, the royal office surely comes out with sufficient distinctness. We must never forget that the different offices of Christ are intimately connected with one another by the unity of the person. The *prosperity and success* which the Servant of God enjoys, are first brought before us and detailed in what follows; and appear, just as in the fundamental passages quoted, as the consequence of acting wisely; “My Servant shall, after having, through the deepest humiliation, attained to dominion, administer it well, and thereby attain to the highest glory.” To the words: “He shall act wisely” correspond, afterwards, the words: “The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper by His hand,” chap. 53:10. The fact that a person acts wisely is, in a twofold aspect, a fruit of his connection with God: *first*, because God is the source and fountain of all wisdom, and, *secondly*, because from God the blessing proceeds which always accompanies his doings. The ungodly is by God involved in circumstances which, notwithstanding all his wisdom, make him appear as a fool. Compare only chap. 19:11: “The princes of Zoan become fools, the counsel of the wise counsellors of Pharaoh is become brutish; how can ye say unto Pharaoh: a son of the wise am I, a (spiritual) son of the (wise) kings of ancient times?” comp. ver. 13; Job 12:17, 20; Eccles. 9:11. In the second clause the Prophet puts together the verbs which denote elevation, and still adds מְדַבֵּר “very,” in order most emphatically to point out the glory of the exaltation of the Servant of God.

Ver. 14. “As many were shocked at thee—so marred from man was His look, and His form from the sons of man.—Ver. 15. So shall He sprinkle many nations; kings shall shut their mouths on account of Him, for they who had not been told, they see, and they who did not hear, they perceive.”

Ver. 14 contains the *protasis*, ver. 15 the *apodosis*. The former describes the deep humiliation, the latter the highest glorification of the Servant of God. The *so* in ver. 14 begins a parenthesis, in which the reason why many were shocked is stated, and which goes on to the end of the verse. In keeping with the dramatic character of the prophetic discourse, the Lord addresses His Servant in ver. 14: “At thee;” while, in ver. 15, He speaks of Him in the third person: “He shall sprinkle;” “on account of *Him*.” This change has been occasioned by the parenthetical clause which contains a remark of the Prophet, and in which, therefore, the Servant of God could not but be spoken of in the third person. *Hävernick* and *Stier* refuse to admit the existence of a parenthesis. Their reasons: “Parentheses are commonly an ill-invented expedient only,” and: “It is not likely that the

same particle should have a different signification in these two clauses following immediately the one upon the other,” are not entirely destitute of force, but are far-outweighed by counter-arguments. They say that the *apodosis* begins with the first ׀, and that in ver. 15 a second *apodosis* follows. But no tolerable thought comes out in this way;—it is hard to co-ordinate two *apodosis*,—and the transition from the 2d to the 3d person remains unaccounted for. ׀׀׀ “to be desolated” is then transferred to the spiritual desolation and devastation, and receives the signification “to be horrified,” “to be shocked.”—Who the many are that are shocked and offended at the miserable appearance of the Servant of God, appears from chap. 49:4, according to which the opposition to the Servant of God has its seat among the covenant-people; farther, from the contrast in ver. 15 of the chapter before us, according to which the respectful surrender belongs to the *Gentiles*; and farther, from chap. 53:1, where the unbelief of the former covenant-people is complained of; from vers. 2-4, where even the believers from among Israel complain that they had had difficulty in surmounting the offence of the Cross. ׀׀׀, properly “corruption,” stands here as *abstractum pro concreto*, in the signification, “corrupted,” “marred.” As to its form, it is in the *status constructus* which, in close connections, can stand even before Prepositions. From the corresponding ׀׀׀׀׀ in chap. 53:3, it appears that the Preposition stands here only for the sake of distinctness, and might, as well have been omitted. The ׀׀ serves for designating the distance, “from man,” “from the sons of men,” so that He is no more a man, does no more belong to the number of the sons of men. The correctness of this explanation appears from chap. 53:3, and Ps. 22:7: “I am a worm and no man.” As regards the sense of the whole parenthesis, many interpreters remark, that we must not stop at the bodily disfiguration of the Servant of God, but that the expression must, at the same time, be understood figuratively. Thus, Luther says: “The Prophet does not speak of the form of Christ as to His person, but of the political and royal form of a Ruler, who is to become an earthly King, and does not appear in royal form, but as the meanest of all servants; so that no more despised man than He has been seen in the world.” But the Prophet evidently speaks, in the first instance, of the bodily appearance only; and we can the less think of a figurative sense, that bodily disfiguration forms the climax of misery, and that, in this *part*, the *whole* of the miserable condition is delineated. Even the severe inward sufferings are a matter of course, if the outward ones have risen to such a pitch. How both of these go hand in hand is seen from Ps. 22. These interpreters are, farther, wrong in this respect, that they refer the pretended figurative expression solely to the lowliness and humility of the Messiah, and not, at the same time, to His *sufferings* also. Thus, among the ancient interpreters, it was viewed by *Jerome*; “The horrid appearance of His form is not thereby indicated, but that He came in humility and poverty;” and among recent interpreters by *Martini*; “The sense of the passage does not properly refer to the deformity of the face, but to the whole external weak, poor, and humble condition.” But, for that, the expression is by far too strong. Mere lowliness is no object of horror (comp. 1 Cor. 1:23, according to which it is the *Cross* which offends the Jews); it does not produce a deformity of the countenance; it cannot produce the effect that the Servant of God should, as it were, cease to be a man. All this suggests an unspeakable *suffering* of the Servant of God, and that, moreover, a suffering which, in the first instance, manifested itself upon His own holy body. *Farther*—We must also take into consideration that the *sprinkling*, in ver. 15, has for its background the shedding of blood, and is the fruit of it, at first concealed. If any doubt should yet remain, it would be removed by the subsequent detailed representation of that which is here given in outline merely. The sole reason of that narrow view is, that interpreters did not understand the fundamental relation of the section under consideration to the subsequent section; that they did not perceive that, here, we have in a complete sketch what there is given in detail

and expansion.—Ver. 15. The verb *זָרַק* occurs in very many passages, and signifies in *Hiphil*, everywhere, “to sprinkle.” It is especially set apart and used for the sprinkling with the blood of atonement, and the water of purification. When “the anointed priest” had sinned, he took of the blood of the *sacrifice*, and *sprinkled* it before the veil of the sanctuary, Lev. 4:6; comp. 5:16, 17. The high priest had, every year, on the great day of atonement, to sprinkle the *blood* before the Ark of the Covenant, in order to obtain forgiveness for the people, Lev. 16:14, comp. also vers. 18, 19: “And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it (the altar) with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.” In the same manner the verb is used of the sprinkling of blood upon the healed leper, Lev. 14:7, and frequently. According to Numb. 19:19, the *clean* person shall *sprinkle* upon the unclean, on the third day, and on the seventh day, “with the water in which are the ashes of the red heifer” when any one has become unclean by touching a dead body. The outward material purification frequently serves in the Old Testament to denote the spiritual purification. Thus, *e.g.*, in Ps. 51:9: “Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean;” Ezek. 36:25: “And I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your filthiness.” In all those passages there lies, everywhere, at the foundation an allusion to the Levitical purifications (the two last quoted especially refer to Numb. 19); and this allusion is by no means so to be understood, as if he who makes the allusion were drawing the material into the spiritual sphere. On the contrary, he uses as a figure that which is, in the law, used symbolically. All the laws of purification in the Pentateuch have a symbolical and typical character. That which was done to the outward impurity was, in point of fact, done to the *sin* which the people of the Old Testament, well versed in the symbolical language, beheld under its image. Hence, here also, the *sprinkling* has the signification of cleansing from sin. The expression indicates that Christ is the true High Priest, to whom the ordinary priesthood with its sprinklings typically pointed. The expression is a summary of that which in the following chapter, we are told regarding the expiation through the suffering and death of the Servant of God. The words: “When His soul maketh a sin-offering,” in ver. 10, and: “He shall justify,” in ver. 11, correspond. Among the ancient expositors, this translation is followed by the Syriac and Vulgate, the *asperget* of which *Jerome* thus explains: “He shall sprinkle many nations, cleansing them by His blood, and in baptism consecrating them to the service of God.” In the New Testament, it is alluded to in several passages. Thus, in 1 Pet. 1:2, where the Apostle speaks of the ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Farther, in Heb. 10:22: ἔῤῥαντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς; 12:24: καὶ αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ, and also in chap. 9:13, 14. Among Christian interpreters, this view was always the prevailing one, was indeed the view held by the Church. *Schroder observ. ad origin. Hebr.* c. viii. § 10, raised some objections which were eagerly laid hold of, and increased by the rationalistic interpreters. Even some sound orthodox expositors allowed themselves to be thereby dazzled. *Stier* declares “that, for this time, he must take the part of modern Exegesis against the prevailing tradition of the Church.” Yet his disrelish for the doctrine of the atonement held by the Church has no doubt exercised a considerable influence in this matter; and *Hofmann*, too, in so decidedly rejecting this explanation, which rests on such strong arguments, and is not touched by any weighty counter-arguments, seems not to have been guided by exegetical reasons only. But let us submit these objections to a closer examination.

1. “The verb ought not to be construed with the Accusative of the thing to be sprinkled, but with *לְ*.” *Reinke* (in his Monograph on Is. 53) brings forward, against this objection, the passage Lev. 4:16, 17; but he is wrong in this, inasmuch as *אֵת* is there not the sign of the Accusative, but a Preposition. *אֵת* *נִפְ* in the signification “before,” is, elsewhere also,

very frequently used. But even *Gesenius* is compelled to agree with *Simonis*,<sup>20</sup> and to acknowledge that, in the proper name *הזי*, the verb is connected with an Accusative. The deviation is there still greater, inasmuch as the *Kal* is, at the same time, used transitively. But even apart from that, such a deviation cannot appear strange. It has an analogy in chap. 53:11, where *קידצה*, which everywhere else is construed with the Accusative, is followed by *ל*; and likewise in *אפר*, followed by *ל* in chap. 53:5. The signification of the verb, in such cases, undergoes a slight modification. *הזה* with *לע* means “to sprinkle;” with the Accusative, “to sprinkle upon.” This modification of the meaning has the analogy of other languages in its favour. In the Ethiopic, the verb *הזנ*, which corresponds to the Hebrew *הזנ*, is used of the sprinkling of both persons and things; Heb. 9:19, 11:28; Ps. 51:19. In Latin, we may say: *spargere aquam*, but also *spargere corpus aqua*; *aspergere quid alicui*, but also *re aliquem*. *conspergere*, *perspergere*, *respergere quem*. “Why should not this be allowed to the Jews also,”—remarks *Köcher*—“who have to make up for the defect of compound verbs by the varied use of simple verbs? But the Prophet had a special reason, in the liberty specially afforded by the higher style, for deviating from the ordinary connection. The *לע* had to be avoided, because, had it been put, the perception of the correspondence of the subsequent *וילע* with the *דילע*, in ver. 14, would have become more difficult.

2. It is asserted that it is against the connection; that the contrast to *ממש* induces us to expect something corresponding. *Beck* says: “A change in those who formerly abhorred the Servant is to be expressed here, not *a deed by the Servant himself*.” If there were here, indeed, a contrast intended to the many who formerly were shocked, we might answer that, indirectly, the word: “He shall sprinkle,” suggests, indeed, an opposite conduct of the “many Gentiles.” No one is cleansed by the Servant of God, who does not allow himself to be cleansed by Him. But no one will desire to be cleansed by Him, who does not put his whole trust in Him, who does not recognize Him as his King and Lord. To the contempt and horror with which the Jews shrink back from the Messiah in His humiliation, would thus be opposed the faithful, humble confidence, with which the heathens draw near to the glorified Messiah. But the fact that the real contrast to the *ממש* is not *הזי*, but rather *וצפקי*, is clearly shown by *וילע*, which corresponds with *דילע*. The *הזי* corresponds rather to: “He was disfigured.” Just as this states the cause of their being shocked, so in: “He shall sprinkle,” the cause of the shutting of the mouth is stated. This is also seen from a comparison of chap. 53:3, 4. His sufferings appeared formerly as the proof that He was hated by God. Now that the vicarious value of His suffering manifests itself, it becomes the reason of humble, respectful submission. Just as, formerly, many were shocked at Him, because he was so disfigured, so, now, even kings shall shut their mouth at Him on account of His atonement. Moreover, one does not exactly see how this reason could be brought forward, as, in a formal point of view, there is, at all events, “a deed by the Servant himself” before us, in whatever way we may view the *הזי*.

3. “If *sprinkling* were meant to be equivalent to cleansing by blood, the matter of purification could not be omitted. If it were objected to this, that the noun “blood might easily be supplied from the verb’s being ordinarily used of cleansing with blood, the objection would be of no weight, inasmuch as sprinkling was done not only with blood, but also with water and oil.” But the sprinkling with *oil*, denoting sanctification, appears only quite isolated, and has for its foundation the sprinkling with blood, comp. Exod. 29:21: “And thou shalt take of the blood which is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle it upon Aaron, and he shall be hallowed.” The sprinkling with *water* has

likewise the shedding of blood for its foundation. It was done with such water only, as had in it the ashes of the sin-offering of the red heifer. But the Prophet has certainly on purpose made not express mention of the blood, because that water, too, should be included. This fact, that the sprinkling here comprehends both, was perceived by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in chap. 9:13, 14: εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα· πόσω μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ... καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι. The defilement by dead bodies, against which the water of purification was specially used, is the most significant symbol of sinners and sins.

4. "It is, in general, not probable that the Servant of God, who farther down is described as a sacrificial beast (!),—who, by taking upon Himself the sins of His people, dies for them, should here appear as the High Priest justifying them." Thus *Umbreit* argues. But in opposition to this view, it is sufficient to refer to: "He shall justify," in chap. 53:11, which is parallel to "He shall sprinkle." That which, in the typical sacrifices, is separated, is, in the antitypical, most closely connected. Even at the very first beginnings of sacred history, it was established for all times, that the difference between him who offers up, and that which is offered up, should not go beyond the territory of animal sacrifice. But there is the less ground for setting aside the reference to the priestly office of the Messiah, that, even before Isaiah, David, in Ps. 110:4, designates Christ as the true High Priest on account of the atonement to be made by Him; and, after Isaiah, Zechariah says in chap. 6:13: "And He sitteth and ruleth upon the throne, and He is a Priest upon His throne."—It has now become current to derive יָהַי from יָהַי in the signification "to leap"—"He shall cause to leap." This explanation made its appearance at first in a very cautious way. *Martini* says: "I myself feel how very far from a right and sure interpretation that is, which I am now, but very timidly, to advance, regarding the sense of the received reading יָהַי." By and by, however, expositors hardened themselves against the decisive objections which stand in the way of it. These objections are the following. 1. The Hebrew *usque loquendi* is in יָהַי so sure, that we are not entitled to take the explanation from the Arabic. The verb is, in Hebrew, never used except of *fluids*. In *Kal*, it does not mean "to leap," but "to spatter," Lev. 6:20 (27): "And upon whose garment is *spattered* of the blood;" 2 Kings 9:33; Is. 63:5. In *Hiphil*, it is set apart and used exclusively for the holy sprinklings; and the more frequently it occurs in this signification, the less are we at liberty to deviate from it. 2. "He shall make to leap" would be far too indefinite,—a circumstance which appears from the vague and arbitrary conjectures of the supporters of this view. *Gesenius*, in his *Commentary*, *Stier*, and others, think of a leaping for joy, in support of which they have quoted the *Kamus*, according to which the verb is used of wanton asses! According to *Gesenius* in the *Thesaurus*, *Hofmann*, and others, the Gentiles are to leap up, in order to show their *reverence* for the Servant of God. According to *Hitzig* and others, it is to leap for *astonishment*, while, according to *Umbreit* and others, it is for *joyful admiration*. One sees that the mere "He shall make to leap" is in itself too meaningless; and interpreters are obliged to make the best addition which they can.—3. According to this explanation, no cause is assigned by which the homage of the Gentiles is called forth; and that cause can the less be omitted, that the horror of the Jews is traced back to its cause. The parenthesis in ver. 14 lacks its antithesis; and that this antithesis must lie in יָהַי is rendered probable even by the circumstance, that this word signifies, in a formal point of view, something which the Servant of God does, and not something which the Gentiles do, while we should, by the antithesis to וּמַמְנֵהוּ, be led to expect just this<sup>21</sup> — In the *protasis*, the discourse is only of many; here, it is of many nations (*Gousset*: "It is

emphatic, so that it comprehends all, and denotes, at the same time, that they are numerous”), and of kings. This is quite natural; for it was only members of the covenant-people who felt shocked, while the reverence is felt by the whole Gentile world.—The *shutting of the mouth* occurs elsewhere, too, repeatedly, as a sign of reverence and humble submission. The reference of עליו to עליו, shows that *Ewald* is wrong in explaining it by “besides Him.” Since the preceding על designated the object of the horror,—the substratum of it—it must here, too, designate the substratum of the shutting of the mouth, and “over Him,” be equivalent to: “on account of Him,” “out of reverence for Him.”—In the exposition of the last words, the old translations differ. We may explain them either: “They to whom it had not been told, see;” thus the LXX.: οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται, καὶ οὐ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι, συνήσουσι, whom Paul follows in Rom. 15:21. (In that context, however the difference of the two explanations is of no consequence; the passage would be equally suitable, even according to the other interpretation.) Or, we may explain them: “That which had not been told them, they see,” &c. Thus the other ancient translations explain. According to the first view, the connection would be this: For, in order that ye may not wonder at my speaking to you of nations and kings, they who, &c. According to the second view, the ground of the reverence of the heathen kings and their people is stated. That which formerly had not been told to them, had not been heard by them, is the expiation by the Servant of God. By Him they receive a blessing not formerly hoped for or expected, and are thereby filled with silent reverence towards the Author of the gift. We decide in favour of the former view, according to which chap. 66:19: “That have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory,” is parallel. The contrast, in our verse, to those who did not hear and who now perceive, is, in the subsequent verse, formed by those who do hear, and do not believe. The words: “Who had not been told, who did not hear,” refer to the Messianic announcement which was given to Israel only, and from which the Gentiles were excluded.<sup>22</sup>

Upon this sketch, there follows in chap. 53:1-10, the enlargement. First, in vers. 1-3 that is expounded which, in ver. 14 had been said of the many being *shocked*, and of the *cause*. The commentary upon וממש “they were shocked,” is given in ver. 1: a great portion of the Jews do not believe in the salvation which had appeared. The enlargement of: “so marred,” &c., is given in vers. 2, 3. The cause of the unbelief is, that the glory of the Servant of God is concealed behind humiliation, misery, and shame.

Chap. 53:1: “Who believes that which we hear, and the arm of the Lord, to whom is it revealed?”

The Prophet, whose spiritual eye is just falling upon the large, the enormously large number of unbelievers, overlooks, at the moment, the other aspect, and, in his grief, expresses that which took place in a large *portion* only, in such a manner as if it were general. Similar representations we elsewhere frequently meet with, *e.g.*, Ps. 14:3 (compare my Commentary); Jer. 5:1—העמש is commonly understood in the signification, “message” or “discourse.” But in favour of the explanation: “That which is heard by us,” *q.d.*, “that which we hear,” there is, in the first instance, the *usus loquendi*. The word never occurs in any other than its original signification, “that which is heard,” and in the signification, “rumour,” which is closely connected with the former. In Isa. 28:9, a passage which is most confidently referred to in proof of the signification, *institutio, doctrina*, העומש is that which the Prophet hears from God. The mockers who exclaim: “Whom will he make to understand העומש?” take, with a sneer, out of his mouth the word

upon which chap. 21:10: “That which I have heard of the Lord of Hosts, I declare unto you,” forms a commentary. Ἀκοή too, by which, in the New Testament, שמעוה is rendered, has not at all the signification, “discourse,” “preaching.” Ἀκοή in Rom. 10:16, 17, is not the preaching, but the hearing, as is shown by the μὴ οὐκ κούσαν in ver. 18. The ἀκοή, according to ver. 17: ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ῥήματος Θεοῦ, is the passive to the active to the word of God. “Who believes our ἀκοή, our hearing,” *i.e.*, that which we hear, which is made known to us by the Word of God. In a passive sense, ἀκοή stands likewise in the passages Matt. 4:24, 14:1, 24:6, which *Stier* cites in support of the signification “discourse,” “preaching;” it is that which has been heard by some one, “rumour,” “report.” In Heb. 4:2 (as also in 1 Thess. 2:13) λόγος ἀκοῆς is the word which they heard. That passage: οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους μὴ συγκεκρασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασι, may simply be considered as a paraphrase of our: Who believes that which we hear. A second argument in favour of our explanation: “That which we hear” lies in the relation to the preceding, which, only when thus explained, arranges itself suitably: “Those understand what they formerly did not hear; Israel, on the contrary, does not believe that which they have heard.” Of great importance, *finally*, is the circumstance, that it is only with this interpretation that the unity of the speaker in vers. 1-10 can be maintained. In the sequel, the *we* everywhere refers to the *believing Church*. But, for this reason, it is difficult to think here of the order of the teachers, which must be the case when we translate: “Who believes our preaching.” It has been objected that, even in this case, no real change of subject takes place, but that, in both cases, the Prophet is speaking, with this difference only, that, in ver. 1, he numbers himself among the proclaimers of the message, while, in ver. 2 ff., he reckons himself among the believing Congregation. But we shall be obliged not to bring in the Prophet at all. In ver. 2 ff., the speaker is the believing Church of the *Future*, in the time after the appearance of the Saviour, and just so, in ver. 1, the preaching, if it should be spoken of at all, cannot belong to the Prophet and his contemporaries, but to those only who came forward with the message of the manifested Saviour; just as in John 12:38; Rom. 10:16, our verse is referred to the unbelief of the Jews in the manifested Saviour. The cause of the unbelief over which ver. 1 laments is indeed, according to vers. 2 and 3, the appearance of the Saviour in the form of a Servant, and His bitter suffering. That, then, must first have taken place, before the unbelief manifested itself.<sup>23</sup> *Stier* rightly remarks: “Between ‘the arm of God,’ and ourselves, a שמעוה is placed as the medium, and the point is to believe in it.” It is the gospel, the tidings of the manifested Saviour. By the side of the joy over the many Gentiles who with delight hear and understand the message of the Servant of God, there is the sorrow over the many in Israel who do not believe this message.—The *arm of the Lord* comes into consideration as the seat of His divine power; comp. chap. 40:10, 51:5-9, 52:10. According to the context, the manifestation of this power in Christ is here spoken of. *Stier* says: “In this Servant, the redeeming arm manifests itself, personifies itself. Christ himself is, as it were, the outstretched arm of the Lord.” In Rom. 1:16, the Gospel is designated as δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. אלה is elsewhere commonly construed with אל or ל, here with על. This indicates that the revealing of the arm of the Lord is of a *supernatural* kind, such an one as comes down from above. The Lord has revealed His arm, His power and glory, as He has manifested them in the mission of His servant, *in the eyes of all* (comp. chap. 52:10: “The Lord hath made bare His holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth see the salvation of our God”); but it is really seen by those only whose eyes God opens. The deeds of God, even the most manifest, always retain the nature of a mystery which remains concealed to the worldly disposition. God can be recognised only by God. Of the

ungodly it holds true: “With seeing eyes they do not see, and with hearing ears they do not hear.” What was the *cause* of this unbelief in the Son of God, we are told in the sequel. It is the appearance of the Divine in the form of a servant, which the gross carnal disposition cannot understand, and by which it is offended. This offence which, according to the sequel, even the God-fearing had to overcome, is, for the ungodly, a lasting one.

Ver. 2. “*And He grew up as the sprout before Him, and as the root from a dry ground. He had no form nor comeliness; and we see Him, but there is no appearance that we should desire Him.*”

The relation of this verse to the preceding one was correctly seen by *Michaelis*: “The cause of the offence is this, that He does not rise or stand out like the cedar, but He grows up gradually,” &c. The subject, the Servant of God, is easily inferred from וילע in ver. 15. This is the more admissible that ver. 1, too, indirectly refers to Him. He is the subject of the report in whose appearance the arm of the Lord has been revealed. The *sprout*, the twig, designates, even in itself, the poor condition; and, notwithstanding *Stier’s* counter-remarks, it is the pointing to such a poor condition alone which suits the connection, and there is no reason why we should here already supply “from a dry ground.” A member of the royal house before its fall resembled, at his very origin, a proud tree, or, at least, a proud branch of such a tree. The sprout, here, supposes the stump, ענב, in chap. 11:8. קנוי elsewhere always signifies “suckling;” comp. here chap. 11:8. Of the sprout, elsewhere, the feminine תקנוי is used. According to *Stier*, this deviation from the common use is here not a matter of accident. Supposing a double sense, he finds it an indication of the helpless infancy of the Redeemer, and in this a representation of His lowliness. The LXX.: ὠς παιδίον. The suffix in וינפל “before Him” refers to the immediately preceding הוהי not to the people. *Before Him*, the Lord—known to Him, watched by Him, standing under His protection, comp. Gen. 17:18. Job 8:16. The lowliness here, and the contempt of men in ver. 3, form the contrast; He is low, but He will not remain so; for the eye of the Most High is directed towards Him. Before the eyes of men who are not able to penetrate to the substance through the appearance, He is concealed; but God beholds Him, beholds His concealed glory, beholds His high destination; and because He beholds, He also takes care, and prepares His transition from lowliness to glory. But the “before Him” does not by any means here form the main thought; it only gives a gentle and incidental hint.—The *root* denotes here, as in chap. 11:1, 10, the product of the root, that whereby it becomes visible, the sprout from the root. In reference to this parallel passage, *Stier* strikingly remarks: “It is, by our modern interpreters, put aside as quietly as possible; for, with a powerful voice, it proclaims to us two truths: that the same Isaiah refers to his former prophecy,—and that this Servant of the Lord here is none other than the Messiah there.” A twig which grows up from a dry place is insignificant and poor. Just as the Messiah is here, in respect to His state of humiliation, and specially in reference to His origin from the house of David, sunk into complete obscurity, compared to a weak, insignificant twig, so He is, in Ezek. 17:23, in reference to His state of glorification, compared to a lofty, splendid cedar tree, under which all the fowls of heaven dwell. The Jews, in opposition even to ver. 22 of Ezekiel, expected that He should appear so from the very beginning; and since He did not appear so, they despised Him. The והארנו is, by most of the modern interpreters, in opposition to the accents, connected with the first member: “He had no form nor comeliness *that we should have seen Him.*” But from internal reasons, this explanation must be rejected. “To see,” in the sense of “to perceive,” would not be suitable. For, how could they have such views of the condition of the Servant of God, if they overlooked Him? But it is not possible to adduce any real demonstrative parallel

passage in support of האר with the Accusat., without ב, ever having the signification, “to look at,” “to consider with delight.” The circumstance that the Future is used in the sense of the Present: “and we see Him,” is explained from the Prophet’s viewing it as present.—The statement that the Servant of God had no form, nor comeliness, nor appearance, must not be referred to His lowliness before His sufferings only; we must, on the contrary, perceive, in His sufferings and death, the completion of this condition; in the *Ecce Homo*, the full historical realization of it. *Calvin* rightly points out that that which here, in the first instance, is said of the Head, is repeated upon the Church; He says: “This must not be understood of Christ’s person only, who was despised by the world, and was at last given up to an ignominious death, but of His whole Kingdom which, in the eyes of men, had no form, nor comeliness, nor splendour.”

Ver. 3, “*Despised and most unworthy among men, a man of pains and an acquaintance of disease, and like one hiding His face from us, despised, and we esteemed Him not.*”

In the preceding verse, we are told what the Servant of God had *not*, viz., anything which could have attracted the natural man who had no conception of the inward glory, and as little of the cause why the Divine appears in the form of a Servant and a sufferer. Here we are told what He had, viz.: everything to *offend* and *repulse* him to whom the arm of the Lord had not been revealed,—the full measure of misery and the cross. Instead of “the most unworthy among men,” the text literally translated has: “one ceasing from among men” (לדח in the signification “ceasing” in Ps. 39:5), *i.e.*, one who ceases to belong to men, to be a man, exactly corresponding to “from man,” and “from the sons of men,” in the sketch, ver. 14, and to: “I am a worm and no man,” in Ps. 22. The explanation: “Forsaken by men, rejected of men,” is opposed by the *usus loquendi*, and by these parallel passages.—“A man of pains”—one who, as it were, possesses pains as his property. There is a similar expression in Prov. 29:1: “A man of chastenings”—one who is often chastened. “An acquaintance of disease,”—one who is intimately acquainted with it, who has, as it were, entered into a covenant of friendship with it. The passive Participle has no other signification than this, Deut. 1:13, 15, and does not occur in the signification of the active Participle “knowing.”—There is no reason for supposing that disease stands here *figuratively*. It comprehends also the pain arising from wounds, 1 Kings 22:34, Jer. 6:7, 10:19; and there is so much the greater reason for thinking of it here, that ילחה in ver. 10, evidently refers to the ילח in this place. As an acquaintance of disease, the Lord especially showed himself in His *passion*. And then *every sorrow* may be viewed as a disease; every sorrow has, to a certain degree, disease in its train. On Ps. 6, where sickness is represented as the consequence of hostile persecution, Luther remarks: “Where the heart is afflicted, the whole body is weary and bruised; while, on the other hand, where there is a joyful heart, the body is also so much the more active and strong.” ריתסה always means “to hide;” the whole phrase occurs in chap. 50:6, in the signification “to hide the face.” רתסמ is the Participle in *Hiphil* In the singular, it is true, such a form is not found any where else; but, in the Plural, it is, Jer. 29:8. In favour of the interpretation: “Like one hiding His face from us,” is the evident reference to the law in Lev. 13:45: “The leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent and his head bare, *and the beard lie shall have covered over*, and shall cry: Unclean, unclean,”—where that which the leper crieth forms the commentary upon the symbolical act of the covering. They covered themselves, as a sign of shame, as far as possible, in order to allow of breathing, up to the nose; hence the mention of the beard. In my Commentary on the Song of Solomon 1:7, it was proved that covering has every where the meaning of being put to shame—of being in a shameful condition. The leper was by the law condemned to be a

living representation of *sin*. No horror was like that which was felt in his presence. *Hence it is the highest degree of humiliation and abasement which is expressed by the comparison with the leper, who must hide his face, whom God has marked.* It is the more natural to suppose this reference to the leper, that probably, the מִשִּׁיא לְדָרָה likewise pointed to the leper. The leper was “one ceasing from men.” In 2 Kings 15:5; 2 Chron. 26:21, a house in which lepers dwell is called a “house of liberty,” *i.e.*, of separation from all human society; compare the expression “free among the dead,” in Ps. 88:6. Lepers were considered as dead persons. Uzziah, while in his leprosy, was, according to the passage in Chronicles already cited, cut off from the house of the Lord, and forfeited his place there, where all the servants of the Lord dwell with Him. To leprosy, the term עֲוֹנָה in ver. 4 likewise points. *Beck’s* objection: “The point in question here is not that which the unfortunate man does, but that which others do in reference to him,” is based upon a misconception. Neither the one nor the other is spoken of. The comparative כִּי must not be overlooked. The comparison with the leper, the culminating point of all contempt, is highly suitable to the parallelism with הִזְבַּח. Ordinarily רַתְסָה is now understood as a *substantivum verbale*: “He was like hiding of the face before Him,” *i.e.*, like a thing or person before which or whom we hide our face, because we cannot bear its horrible and disgusting appearance. But with one before whom we hide our face, the Servant of God could not be compared; the comparison would, in that case, be weak.—הִזְבַּח is not the 1st pers. Fut. but Partic. Niph., “despised.”—The close of the verse returns to its beginning, after having been, in the middle, established and made good.

The second subdivision from ver. 4 to ver. 7 furnishes us with the key to the sufferings of the Servant of God described in what precedes, by pointing to their *vicarious character*, to which (ver. 7) the conduct of the Servant of God under His sufferings corresponds.

Ver. 4. “*But our diseases He bore, and our pains He took upon Him: and we esteemed Him plagued, smitten of God, and afflicted.*”

The words יָלַח and בָּאֵבָבָה of the preceding verse here appear again. He was laden with disease and pains; but these sufferings, the wages of sin, were not inflicted upon Him on account of His own sins, but on account of our sins, so that the horror falls back upon ourselves, and is changed into loving admiration of Him. *Beck* remarks: “Properly speaking, they had not become sick or unfortunate at all; this had *a priori* been rendered impossible by the vicarious suffering of the Son of God; but since they deserved the sickness and calamity, the averting of it might be considered as a healing.” But this view is altogether the result of embarrassment. Disease is the inseparable companion of sin. If the persons speaking are subject to the latter, the disease cannot be considered as an evil merely threatening them. If they speak of their diseases, we think, in the first instance, of sickness by which they have already been seized; and the less obvious sense ought to have been expressly indicated. In the same manner, the healing also suggests hurts already existing. But quite decisive is ver. 6, where the miserable condition clearly appears to have already taken place.—According to the opinion of several interpreters, by diseases, all inward and outward sufferings are figuratively designated; according to the opinion of others, *spiritual* diseases, sins. But even from the relation of this verse to the preceding, it appears that here, in the first instance, diseases and pains, in the ordinary sense, are spoken of; just as the blind and deaf in chap. 35 are, in the first instance, they who are naturally blind and deaf.—Disease and pain here cannot be spoken of in a sense different from that in which it is spoken of there. Diseases, in the sense of *sins*, do not occur at all in the Old Testament. The circumstance that in the parallel passage, vers. 11

and 12, the bearing of the *transgressions* and *sins* is spoken of, does not prove anything. The Servant of God bears them also in their consequences, in their punishments, among which sickness and pains occupy a prominent place. Of the bearing of outward sufferings, **וְשָׂא** occurs in Jer. 10:19 also. If the words are rightly understood, then at once, light falls upon the apostolic quotation in Matt. 8:16, 17: πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν, ὅπως πληρωθῆ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασε, and this deserves a consideration so much the more careful, that the Evangelist here intentionally deviates from the Alexandrine version (οοτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται). In doing so, “we do not give an external meaning to that which is to be understood spiritually;” but when the Saviour healed the sick, He fulfilled the prophecy before us in its most proper and obvious sense. And this fulfilment is even now going on. For him who stands in a living faith in Christ, sickness, pain, and, in general all sorrow, have lost their sting. But it has not yet appeared what we shall be, and we have still to expect the complete fulfilment. In the Kingdom of glory, sickness and pain shall have altogether disappeared.—Some interpreters would translate **וְשָׂא** by “to take away;” but even the parallel **בָּסַל** is conclusive against such a view; and, farther, the ordinary use of **וְשָׂא** of the bearing of the punishment of sin, *e.g.*, Ezek. 18:19; Num. 14:33; Lev. 5:1, 20:17. But of conclusive weight is the connection with the preceding verse, where the Servant of God appears as the intimate acquaintance of sickness, as the man of pains. He has, accordingly, not only *put away* our sicknesses and pains, but He has, as our substitute, *taken them upon Him*; He has healed us by His having himself become sick in our stead. This could be done only by His having, in the first instance, as a substitute, appropriated our *sins*, of which the sufferings are the *consequence*; compare 1 Peter 2:24: ὃς τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον.—*Plagued, smitten of God, afflicted*, are expressions which were commonly used in reference to the visitation of sinful men. It is especially in the word *plagued*, which is intentionally placed first, that the reference to a self-deserved suffering is strongly expressed, compare Ps. 73:14: “For all the day long am I *plagued*, and my chastisement is new every morning.” Of Uzziah, visited on account of his sin, it is said in 2 Kings 15:5: “And the Lord inflicted *a plague* upon the king, and he was a leper unto the day of his death.” **עָגַ** “plague” is in Lev. 13, as it were, *nomen proprium* for the leprosy, which in the law is so distinctly designated as a punishment of sin.—**הַכָּה** too, is frequently used of the infliction of divine punishments and judgments, Num. 14:12; Deut. 28:22. The people did not err in considering the suffering as a punishment of sin, but only in considering it as a punishment for the sins committed by the Servant of God himself. According to the view of both the Old and New Testament, every suffering is punishment. The suffering of a perfect saint, however, involves a contradiction, unless it be vicarious. By his completely stepping out of the territory of sin, he must also step out of the territory of evil, which, according to the doctrine established at the very threshold of revelation, is the wages of sin, for otherwise God would not be holy and just. Hence, as regards the Servant of God, we have only the alternatives: either His sinlessness must be doubted, or the vicarious nature of His sufferings must be acknowledged. The persons speaking took up, at first, the former position; after their eyes had been opened, they chose the latter.

Ver. 5. “*And He was pierced for our transgressions, crushed for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and by His wounds we are healed.*”

**הוּא** “He” stands in front, in order emphatically to point out Him who suffered as a substitute, in contrast to those who had really deserved the punishment: “He, on account

of our transgressions.” There is no reason for deviating, in the case of הָלַל, from the original signification “to pierce,” and adopting the general signification “to wound;” the LXX. ἐτραυματίσθη. *The chastisement of our peace* is the chastisement whereby peace is acquired for us. Peace stands as an individualizing designation of salvation; in the world of contentions, peace is one of the highest blessings. Natural man is on all sides surrounded by enemies; δικαιωθέντες ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. 5:1, and peace with God renders all other enemies innocuous, and at last removes them altogether. The peace is inseparable from the substitution. If the Servant of God has borne our sins, He has thereby, at the same time, acquired peace; for, just as He enters into our guilt, so we now enter into His reward. The justice of God has been satisfied through Him; and thus an open way has been prepared for His bestowing peace and salvation. The *chastisement* can, according to the context, be only an actual one, only such as consists in the infliction of some *evil*. It is in misconception and narrowness of view that the explanation of the followers of *Menke* originated: “The instruction for our peace is with Him.” This explanation militates against the whole context, in which not the *doctrine* but the *suffering* of the Servant of God is spoken of; against the parallelism with: “By His wounds we are healed;” against the וְלֵי, “upon Him,” which, according to a comparison with: “He bore our disease, and took upon Him our pains,” must indicate that the punishment lay upon the sufferer like a pressing *burden*. It is only from aversion to the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, that we can account for the fact, that that doctrine could be so generally received by that theological school. More candid are the rationalistic interpreters. Thus *Hitzig* remarks: “*The chastisement of our peace* is not a chastisement which would have been salutary for our morality, nor such as might serve for our salvation, but according to the parallelism, such as has served for our salvation, and has allowed us to come off safe and unhurt.” *Stier*, too, endeavours to explain the “chastisement of our peace,” in an artificial way. According to him, there is always implied in רָסַם the tendency towards setting right and healing the chastised one himself; but wherever this word occurs, a retributive pain and destruction are never spoken of. But, in opposition to this view, there is the fact that רָסַם does not by any means rarely occur as signifying the punishments which are inflicted upon stiff-necked obduracy, and which bear a destructive character, and which, therefore, cannot be derived from the principle of correction, but from that of retribution only. Thus, e.g., in Prov. 15:10: “Bad *chastisement* shall be to those that forsake the way, and he that hateth chastisement shall die,” on which *Michaelis* remarks: “*In antanaclasi ad correptionem amicam et paternam, mortem et mala quaelibet inferens, in ira,*” Ps. 6:2. Of destructive punishment, too, the verb is used in Jer. 2:19. But one does not at all see how the idea of “setting right” should be suitable here; for surely, as regards the Servant of God himself, the absolutely Righteous, the suffering here has the character of chastisement. It is not the mere suffering, but the chastisement, which is upon Him; but that necessarily requires that the punishment should proceed from the principle of *retribution*, and that the Servant of God stands forth as our Substitute.—אָפַרַן, Preter. Niph., hence “healing has been bestowed upon us;”—אָפַרַן with לְ, in the signification “to bring healing,” occurs also in chap. 6:10, but nowhere else. The healing is an individualising designation of deliverance from the punishments of sin, called forth by the circumstance that disease occupied so prominent a place among them, and had therefore been so prominently brought forward in what precedes. In harmony with the Apostolic quotation, the expression clearly shows that the punitive sufferings were already lying upon the persons speaking; that by the Substitute they were not by any means delivered

from the future evils, but that the punishment, the inseparable companion of sin, already existed, and was taken away by Him.

Ver. 6. *“All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath made the iniquities of us all to fall upon Him.”*

*Calvin* remarks: “In order the more strongly to impress upon the hearts of men the benefits of Christ’s death, the Prophet shews how necessary is that healing which was mentioned before. There is here an elegant antithesis; for, in ourselves we are scattered, but, in Christ collected; by nature we go astray and are carried headlong to destruction,—in Christ we find the way in which we are led to the gate of salvation; our iniquities cover and oppress us,—but they are transferred to Christ by whom we are unburdened.”—*All we*—in the first instance, members of the covenant-people,—not, however, as contrasted with the rest of mankind, but as partaking in the general human destiny.—*We have turned every one to his own way*; we walked through life solitary, forsaken, miserable, separated from God and the good Shepherd, and deprived of His pastoral care. According to *Hofmann*, the going astray designates the *liability* to punishment, but not the misery of the speakers; and the words also: “We have turned,” &c., mean, according to him, that they chose their own ways, but not that they walked sorrowful or miserable. But the ordinary use of the image militates against that view. In Ps. 119:176: “I go astray like a lost sheep, seek thy servant,” the going astray is a figurative designation of being destitute of salvation. The misery of the condition is indicated by the image of the scattered flock, also in 1 Kings 22:17: “I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills as sheep that have not a shepherd.” *Michaelis* pertinently remarks: “Nothing is so miserable as sheep without a shepherd,—a thing which Scripture so often repeats, Num. 27:17,” &c. As a commentary upon our passage, Ezek. 34:4-6 may serve; and according to that passage we shall be compelled to think of their being destitute of the care of a shepherd: “And they are scattered, because there is no Shepherd; and they become meat to all the beasts of the field. My sheep wander on all the mountains, and on every high hill, and over the whole land my sheep are scattered, and there is none that careth for them, or seeketh them.” The point of comparison is very distinctly stated in Matt. 9:36 also: ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ ἐρρίμμένοι ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα. Without doubt, turning to one’s own ways is sinful, comp. chap. 56:11; but here it is not so much the aspect of sin, as that of misery, which is noticed. As the chief reason of the sheep’s wandering and going astray, the bad condition of the shepherd must be considered, comp. Jer. 50:6: “Perishing sheep were my people; their shepherds led them astray, John 10:8: πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον, κλέπται εἰσὶ καὶ λησταί.—כּגַע with כּ signifies “to hit;” hence *Hiphil*, “to cause to hit.” The iniquities of the whole community *hit* the Servant of God in their punishments; but according to the biblical view, their punishments can come upon Him only as such, only by His coming forward as a substitute for sinners, and not because He suffers for the guilt of others to which He remained a stranger. By this throwing the guilt upon the Servant of God, the condition of being without a shepherd is *done* away with, the flock is gathered from its scattered condition. The wall of separation which was raised by its guilt, and which separated it from God, the fountain of salvation, is now removed by His substitution, and the words: “The Lord is my Shepherd,” now become a truth, comp. John 10:4.

Ver. 7. *“He was oppressed, and when He was plagued, He does not open His mouth, like a lamb which is brought to the slaughter, and as a sheep which is dumb before her shearers, and He does not open his mouth.”*

In these words, we have a description of the manner in which the Servant of God *bore* such sufferings. It flows necessarily from the circumstance, that it was a vicarious suffering. The substitution implies that He took them upon Him spontaneously; and this has patience for its companion. First, the contents of ver. 6 are once more summed up in the word שגג, “He was oppressed:” then, this condition of the Servant of God is brought into connection with His *conduct*, which, only in this connection, appears in its full majesty.—שגג is the Preterite in *Niphal*, and not, as *Beck* thinks, 1st pers. Fut. *Kal*. For the Future would be here unusual; the verb has elsewhere the Future in *o*; the suffix is wanting, and the sense which then arises suits only the untenable supposition that, in vers. 1-10, the *Gentiles* are speaking. The *Niphal* occurs in 1 Sam. 13:6, of Israel oppressed by the Philistines; and in 1 Sam. 14:24, of those borne down by heavy toil and fatigue. שגג and הנענ “to be humbled, oppressed, abused,” do not, in themselves essentially differ; it is only on account of the context, and the contrast implied in it, that the same condition is once more designated by a word which is nearly synonymous. The words “and He” separate הנענ from what precedes, and connect it with what follows. The explanation: “He was oppressed, but He suffered patiently,” has this opposed to it, that the two *Niphals*, following immediately upon one another, cannot here stand in a different meaning. The idea of patience would here not be a collateral, but the main idea, and hence, could not stand without a stronger designation.—In התפי the real Future has taken the place of the ideal Past; it shows that the preceding Preterites are to be considered as prophetic, and that, in point of fact, the suffering of the Servant of God is no less future than His glorification. The *lamb* points back to Exod. 12:3, and designates Christ as the true paschal lamb. With a reference to the verse under consideration, John the Baptist calls Christ the Lamb of God, John 1:29; compare 1 Pet. 1:18, 19; Acts 8:32-35. But since it is not the vicarious character of Christ’s sufferings which here, in the first instance, comes into consideration, but His patience under them, the lamb is associated with the female sheep, and that not in relation to her slayers, but to her shearers. The last words: “And He does not open His mouth,” are not to be referred to the lamb, as some think, (even the circumstance that the preceding לחר is a feminine noun militates against this view), but, like the first: “He does not open His mouth,” to the Servant of God. It is an expressive repetition, and one which is intended to direct attention to this feature; compare the close of ver. 3; Gen. 49:4; Judges 5:16. The fulfilment is shown by 1 Pet. 2:23: ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδορεῖ, πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως; and likewise Matt. 27:12-14: καὶ ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο. Τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος: οὐκ ἀκούεις πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσι; καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ πρὸς οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα, ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ἡγεμόνα λίαν. Comp. 26:62; Mark 15:5; Luke 23:9; John 19:9.

The third subdivision of the principal portion, vers. 8-10, describes *the reward of the Servant of God*, by expanding the words: “Kings shall shut their mouths on account of Him,” in chap. 52:15, and “He shall be exalted,” in ver. 13.

Ver. 8. “*From oppression and from judgment He was taken, and His generation who can think it out; for He was cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people, whose the punishment.*”

God—such is the sense—takes Him to himself from heavy oppression, and He who apparently was destroyed without leaving a trace, receives an infinitely numerous generation (compare John 12:32: καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς πάντας ἐλκύσω πρὸς

ἐμαυτόν), as a deserved reward for having, by His violent death, atoned for the sins of His people, delivered them from destruction, and acquired them for His property.—רצע “oppression,” as Ps. 107:39, properly, according to the signification of the verb: “Shutting up,” “restraining,” “hindering.” From what goes I before, where the evils from which the Servant of God is here delivered are described more in detail, it appears that here we have not to think of a prison properly so called; for there, it is not a prison, but abuse and oppression which are spoken of.—טפשמ is commonly referred to the judgment which the enemies of the Servant of God passed upon Him. The premised רצע then furnishes the distinct qualification of the judgment, shows that that which, in a formal point of view, presents itself as a judicial proceeding, is, in point of fact, heavy oppression. But, the same time, טפשמ serves as a limitation for רצע. We learn from it that the hatred of the enemies moved within the limits of judicial proceedings,—just as it happened in the history Christ. But behind the human judgment, the *divine* is concealed, Jer. 1:16; Ezek. 5:8; Ps. 143:2. This is shown by what precedes, where the suffering of the Servant of God is so emphatically and repeatedly designated as the punishment of sin inflicted upon Him by God.—חקל with נמ “to be taken away from;” according to *Stier*: “taken away from suffering, being delivered from it by God’s having taken Him to himself, to the land of eternal bliss.” This view, according to which the words refer to the glorification of the Servant of God, has been adopted by the Church. It is adopted by the Vulgate: “*De angustia et iudicio sublatus est;*” by *Jerome*, who says on this passage: “From tribulation and judgment He ascended, as a conqueror, to the Father;” and by *Michaelis* who thus interprets it: “He was taken away, and received at the right hand of the Majesty.” By several interpretations, the words are still referred to the state of humiliation of the Servant of God: “*Through* oppression and judgment He was *dragged to execution*” But the Prophet has already, in ver. 3, finished the description of the mere sufferings of the Servant of God—vers. 4-7 exhibit the cause of His sufferings and His conduct under them; חקל cannot, by itself, signify “to be dragged to execution”—in that case, as in Prov. 24:11, “to death” would have been added; נמ must be taken in the signification, “from,” “out of,” as in the subsequent פראמ, compare 2 Kings 3:9, where חקל with נמ signifies “to take from.” In the passage under consideration, as well as in those two passages which refer to the ascension of Elijah, there is a distinct allusion to Gen. 5:24, where it is said of Enoch: “And he was no more, for God had *taken* him.—*And His generation who can think it out?*” רוד, properly “circle,” is not only the communion of those who are connected by co-existence, but also of those who are connected by disposition, be it good or bad.<sup>24</sup> Thus, the generation of the children of God in Ps. 73:15; the generation of the righteous, Ps. 14:5; the generation of the upright, in Ps. 112:2. Here, the generation of the Servant of God is the communion of those who are animated by His Spirit, filled with His life. This company will, after His death, increase to an infinite greatness, חוש and חיש “to meditate,” is commonly connected with ב of the object, but occurs also with the simple Accusative, in the signification “to meditate upon something,” in Ps. 145:5. There is, as it appears, an allusion to the promise to Abraham, Gen. 13:16: “And I make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered,”—a promise which received its complete fulfilment just by the Servant of God. The explanation which we have given as adopted by the LXX.: τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται. Next to it, comes the explanation: “Who can think out His *posterity*;” but against this, it is conclusive that רוד never occurs in the signification “posterity.” The parallel passage in ver. 10: “He shall see seed,” or “posterity,” holds good even for our view; for since the posterity is a *spiritual* one, it is substantially identical with *generation* here. But it may, *a priori*, be expected that the same thing shall be designated from

various aspects. If “generation” be taken in the signification “posterity,” then the words: “He shall see seed” would be a mere repetition. The appropriateness of the sense which, according to our explanation, comes out, will become especially evident, if we consider that, in vers. 8-10, we have the carrying out of that which, in the sketch, was said of the respectful homage of the many nations and kings. A whole host of explanations assigns to רוד significations which cannot be vindicated. Thus, the translation of *Luther*: “Who shall disclose the length of His life?” that of *Hitzig*: His destiny; that of *Beck*: His importance and influence in the history of the world; that of *Knobel*: His dwelling place, *i.e.*, His grave, who considered? The signification, “dwelling place,” does not it all belong to רוד. In Isaiah 38:12, רוד are the cotemporaries from whom the dying man is taken away, and who are withdrawn from him: “My *generation* is taken away, and removed from me like a shepherd’s tent”—dying Hezekiah there laments. Inadmissible, likewise, is the explanation: “Who of His cotemporaries will consider, or considered, it” for אה, the sign of the Accusative, cannot stand before the *Nomin. Absol.* In Nehem. 9:34, this use is by no means certain, and, at all events, we cannot draw any inference from the language of Nehemiah as to that of Isaiah. The Ellipses: “the true cause of His death,” “the importance and fruit of His death,” “the salvation lying behind it” (*Stier*), are very hard, and the sense which is purchased by such sacrifices is rather a common-place one, little suitable to this context, and to the relation to chap. 52:15.—“*For He was cut off from the land of the living, for the transgression of my people, whose the punishment.*” The reason is here stated why the Servant of God receives so glorious a reward; why, after He has been removed to God, a generation so infinitely great is granted to Him. *He has deserved this reward by His having suffered for the sins of His people, as their substitute.* The first clause must not be separated from the second: “for the transgression,” &c. For it is not the circumstance, that the Servant of God suffered a violent death at all, but that for the sin of His people He took it upon Him, which is the ground of His glorification. רגג “to be cut off” never occurs of a quiet, natural death; not even in the passage, quoted in support of this use of the word, *viz.*, Psa. 88:6; Lam. 3:54, but always of a violent, premature death. The cognate רגג also has, in Psa. 31:23, the signification of extermination. ומל, poetical form for מהל, refers to the collective מע. Before it, the relative pronoun is to be understood: for the sin of my people, whose the punishment, *q.d.*, whose property the punishment was, to whom it belonged. *Stier* prefers to adopt the most violent interpretation rather than to conform and yield to this so simple sense, which, as he says, could be entertained only by that obsolete theory of substitution where one saves the other from suffering. Several interpreters take the suffix in ומל as a Singular: “on account of the transgression of my people, punishment was to Him.” And passages, indeed, are not wanting where the supposition that ונ designates the Singular, has some appearance of probability; but, upon a closer examination, this appearance everywhere vanishes.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, as we have already remarked, it is, on account of the sense, inadmissible to separate the two clauses.—By ימע “my people,” the hypothesis of the non-Messianic interpreters is set aside, that in vers. 1-10 the *Gentiles* are speaking. It is a single people to which the speakers belong, the covenant-people, for whose benefit the atonement and substitution of the Servant of God were, *in the first instance*, intended (comp. σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, Matth. 1:21) yea, were, to a certain degree, exclusively intended, inasmuch as the believing *Gentiles* were received into it as adopted children. It is a forced expedient to say: every single individual of the *Gentiles*, or of their princes, says that the Servant of God has suffered for the sin of His people, hence also for His own. And just as inadmissible is the supposition that a representative of the heathen world is speaking; the whole heathen world cannot be designated as a people.

Ver. 9. “And they gave Him His grave with the wicked, and with a rich in His death, because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth.”

וְתָי is intentionally without a definite Subject, *q.d.*: it was given to Him, *Ewald* § 273a. The acting subject could not be at all more distinctly marked out, because there was a *double* subject. Men fixed for Him the ignominious grave with criminals; by the providence of God, He received the honourable grave with a rich, and that for the sake of His innocent sufferings, as a prelude to the greater glorification which, as a reward, was to be bestowed upon Him, as an example of what is said in ver. 12: “He shall divide spoil with the strong.” The *wicked* who are buried apart from others, can be the real criminals only, the transgressors in ver. 12. Criminals received, among the Jews, an ignominious burial. Thus *Josephus*, Arch. iv. 8, § 6. says: “He who has blasphemed God shall, after having been stoned, be hung up for a day, and be buried quietly and without honour.” *Maimonides* (see *Iken* on this passage in the *Biblia Hagana* ii. 2) says: “Those who have been executed by the court of justice are not by any means buried in the graves of their ancestors; but there are two graves appointed for them by the court of justice,—one for the stoned and burnt; the other for the decapitated and strangled.” Just as the Prophet had, in the preceding verse, said that the Servant of God would die a violent death like a criminal, so he says here, that they had also fixed for Him a grave in common with executed criminals. *And with a rich* (they gave Him His grave) *in His death*: they gave Him His grave, first with the wicked; but, indeed, He received it with a rich, since God’s providence was watching over the dead body of His Servant. וְתָי, in so far as it refers to the first clause, receives its limitation by the second. Before their fulfilment, the words had the character of a holy riddle; but the fulfilment has solved this riddle. The designation of Joseph of Arimathea as ἀθροπος πλούσιος in Matt. 26:57, is equivalent to an express quotation. Although it was by a special divine providence that the Singular was chosen, yet we may suppose that, in the first instance, the rich man here is contrasted with the wicked men, and is an ideal person, the personified idea of the species. *In His death* is, in point of fact, equivalent to: “after He had died;” but, notwithstanding, there is no necessity for giving to the כ the signification “after.” Death rather denotes the *condition of death*; *in death* is contrasted with: *in life*. Altogether in the same manner we find in Lev. 11:31: “Whosoever doth touch them in their death,” for, “after they have died.” *Farther*—1 Kings 13:31: “In my death you shall bury me in the sepulchre.” The Plural מִיתוֹת “the deaths,” “conditions of death,” cannot be adduced as a proof that the subject of the prophecy must be a collective person; for, in that case, rather the Plural of the suffix would be required (Ps. 78:64 is a rare exception); and in Ezek. 28:8, 10, death is likewise spoken of in the Plural. The Plural is formed after the analogy of מֵיִח, for which reason it commends itself to explain אֶרֶץ חַיִּים in the preceding verse, “land of life,” instead of “land of the living.” But the Plural can here the less occasion any difficulty, that it is not dying which is spoken of, but the continuing condition of death.—*Because He had done no violence, &c.* לֵעָ לֵעָ very frequently denotes the cause upon which the effect depends, *e.g.*, in 1 Kings 16:7; Ps. 44:23, 69:8; Jer. 15:15; Job 34:6. The whole following clause is treated as a noun. Ordinarily, it is explained: Although, &c. But this use of לֵעָ is quite isolated; it occurs only in two passages of the Book of Job, in 10:7 and 34:6. The former explanation is found in the Alexand. version: ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησε. The innocence is designated negatively, and in an external manner (סמח and המרמ are gross sins). The reason of this is in the intention of His enemies, which is expressed in the preceding words, to give Him His grave with the wicked. Since He had not acted like them, God took care that He did not receive their ignominious burial, but an honourable

one. In reference to the passage under consideration, it is said in 1 Pet. 2:22: ὃς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. Instead of “violence,” Peter intentionally employs “sin.”—*Hofmann* has advanced the following arguments against the explanation which we have given. 1. “By what is this contrast (which, according to our explanation, is contained in the words: They gave Him His grave with the wicked, and with a rich man in His death) to be recognized in the text? There remains no trace of a contrast, unless it be contained in רישע and רישע. Are these really two ideas so contradictory, that they alone are sufficient to bring into contrariety two clauses which have altogether the appearance of being intended for the same purpose?” But in this argument, *Hofmann* overlooks the circumstance, that the wicked are specially *criminals*—for they alone had a peculiar grave—and that it is not the general relation of the wicked and rich to one another which comes into consideration, but especially the relation in which they stand to one another as regards the *burial*. If this be kept in view, it is at once evident that the contrariety is expressed with sufficient clearness. From Isa. 22:16; Job 21:32; Matt. 27:57, it appears that the rich man, and the honourable grave, are closely connected with each other. Hence, it must have been by an opposite activity that to the Servant of God a grave was assigned with the wicked, and with a rich. 2. “To be rich is not in itself a sin which deserved an ignominious burial, far less received it, but on the other hand, to find his grave with a rich man is not an indemnification to the just for the disgrace of having died the death of a criminal.” But the fact that the first Evangelist reports it so minutely (Matt. 27:57-61) clearly enough shows the importance of the circumstance; comp. also how John, in chap. 19:33 ff., points out the circumstance that Christ’s legs were not broken, as were those of the malefactors. In the little, the great is prepared and prefigured. And although the burial with a rich man is, in itself, of no small importance when viewed as the first point where the exaltation began—in the connection with the preceding and following verses, we cannot but look upon it as being symbolically significant and important. And how could it be otherwise, since the burial of the Servant of God with a rich man implies that the rich man himself has been gained for Him? It has, farther, been objected that Christ was not buried *with Joseph*, but in his grave only, but in an ideal point of view *with* has its full right. Comp. chap. 14:19, where it is said to the king of Babylon: “But thou art cast out of thy grave,” although, bodily, he had not yet been in the grave; but he had a right to come like his ancestors; he had, in an ideal point of view, taken his place there.—*Beck* says: “The orthodox expositors are strongly embarrassed with these words.” That is indeed a remarkable interchange of positions. Embarrassment!—that is the sign of everything which unscriptural exegesis advances on this verse. It is concentrated in the רישע. The most varied conjectures and freaks are here so many symptoms of helpless embarrassment. According to the opinion of several interpreters, the rich man here stands in the sense of the ungodly, In this, even *Luther* (marginal note: “rich man, one who in his doings founds himself on riches, *i.e.*, an ungodly man), and *Calvin* had preceded them. The assertion that the rich can simply stand for the wicked, can neither be proved from Job 27:19 (for there, according to the context, the rich is equivalent to “he who is wicked, notwithstanding his riches”), nor from the word of the Lord in Matt. 19:23: δυσκόλως πλουσίους εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. For that which, on a special occasion, the Lord here says of the rich, applies to the poor also. Poverty, not less than wealth, is encompassed with obstacles to conversion, which can be removed only by the omnipotence of divine grace. According to Matt. 13:22, the word is not only choked by the deceitfulness of riches, but is as much so by care also, the dangers of which are particularly set forth by our Lord in Matt. 6:25 ff. In Prov. 30:8, 9 it is said: “Give me neither poverty nor riches, lest I be full and deny thee, and say: Where is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God

in vain.” The dangers of riches are more frequently pointed out in Scripture than those of poverty; but this fact is accounted for by the circumstance, that riches are surrounded with a glittering appearance, and that it is therefore necessary to warn those who are apt to choose them for their highest good. *Stier* rightly calls to mind the promise of earthly blessings to those who fear God. But the circumstance must not be overlooked that the rich comes here into consideration, chiefly as to his *burial*. The Prophet would then not only proceed from the idea that all rich people are wicked, but also would simply suppose that all the rich receive an ignominious burial. But of that, the parable of the rich man in Luke 16:22, knows nothing: ἀπέθανε δὲ καὶ ὁ πλούσιος καὶ ἐτάφη, according to his riches; it is in hell only that he receives his reward. In opposition to *Gesenius*, *Hitzig* remarks: “That transition of the signification is a fable.” Following the example of *Martini* he derives רישע from the Arabic. But in opposition to that, *Gesenius* again remarks in the *Thesaurus*: “*Sed haud minoribus difficultatibus laborat ea ratio, qua improbitatis significationem voluerunt Martinius et Hitzigius, collata nimirum radice רישע “caespitavit.” Tum enim haec radix nullam prorsum cum verbo רישע necessitudinem habet, ita ut רישע h.l. ἀπ. λεγ. esset; tum caespitandi vis nusquam ad peccatum, licet ad fortunam adversam, translata est.*” If, with words of such frequent occurrence, it were allowable to search in the dialects, the business of the expounder would be a very ungrateful one. Nor does the form, which is commonly passive, favour this interpretation. According to *Beck*, רישע is another form for קירע. Others would change the reading. *Ewald* proposes קישע; *Böttcher*, ער ישע. Against all those conjectures, moreover, the circumstance militates, that, according to them, the verse would still belong to the humiliation of the Servant of God; whereas the description of the glorification had already begun in the preceding verse. For בְּמוֹתָיו “in His death,” *Gesenius* and others propose to read בְּמוֹתָיו, to which they assign the signification “His tomb-hill.” But, altogether apart from this arbitrary change of the vowels, there is opposed to this conjecture the circumstance, that המב never occurs of the grave. According to *Gesenius*, תומב, in Ezek. 43 means “tombs;” but the common signification “high places,” must be retained there also. In a spiritual point of view the sanctuaries of the Lord had become “high places.”

Ver. 10. “*And the Lord was pleased painfully to crush Him; when His soul hath given restitution, He shall see seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper through His hand.*”

*And the Lord was pleased*—This pleasure of the Lord is not such an one as proceeds from caprice. The ground on which it rests has already been minutely exhibited in what precedes. By the vicarious influence of this suffering, peace is to be acquired for mankind; and since this object is based upon the divine nature, upon God’s mercy, the choice of the means also, by which alone it could be attained (for, without a violation of the divine character, sin could not remain unpunished), must be traced to the divine character. *Here* the ground on which the pleasure rests is stated in the words immediately following,—a connection which is clearly indicated by the obvious relation in which the הוהי קפח of the close stands to הוהי קפה of the beginning; so that the sense is: It was the pleasure, &c., and this for the purpose that, after having made an offering for sin, He should see seed, &c. Hence the pleasure of the Lord has this in view:—that the will of the Lord should be realized, His Servant glorified, and the salvation of mankind promoted. *Painfully to crush Him.* הלח “to be sick,” “to suffer pains.” In this sense the *Niphal* occurs in Amos 6:6, and the participle הלחח in the signification “painful,” “grievous,” in Nah.

3:19; Jer. 14:17, and other passages. In *Hiphil* it means: “to make painful,” Mic. 6:13. The common explanation, “The Lord was pleased to crush Him, He has made Him sick,” has this against it, that Copula and Suffix are wanting in *לחה*, and that the word would come in unconnected, and in a very disagreeable manner. And then the passage in Micah, which we have quoted, decides against it.—*When His soul hath, given restitution.* There cannot be any doubt that, in a formal point of view, it is the soul which gives restitution. *Knobel’s* explanation: “His soul gives itself,” is not countenanced by the *usus loquendi*; *שמ* is not a reflective verb. As little can we suppose with *Hofmann* that *שמ* is the second person, and an address to Jehovah. In opposition to this view, there is not only the circumstance that Jehovah is spoken of before and afterwards, but, in a material point of view, the circumstance also, that offerings for sin, and, generally, all sacrifices, were never offered up by God, but always to God. The fact also, that according to the sequel, the Servant of God receives the reward for His meritorious work, proves that it is He who offers up the sacrifice. But, on the other hand, it is, in point of fact, the soul only which can be the offering, the restitution; for it could scarcely be imagined that, just here, that should be omitted on which everything mainly depends. It is sufficiently evident, from what precedes, who it is that offers the restitution; what the restitution was, it was necessary distinctly to point out. *Farther*—In the case of sacrifices, it is just the soul upon which every thing depends; so that if the soul be mentioned in a context which treats of sacrifices, it is, *a priori*, probable that it will be the object offered up. In Lev. 17:11, it is said: “For the soul of the flesh is in the blood, and I give it to you upon the altar, to atone for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul,” viz., by the soul “*per animam, vi animae in eo sanguine constantis*” (*Gussetius*).<sup>26</sup> The soul, when thus considered as the passive object, is here therefore in a high degree in its proper place; and there can the less be any doubt of its occurring here in this sense, that it occurs twice more in vers. 11 and 12, of the natural psychical life of the Servant of God, which was given up to suffering and death. But, on the other hand, if the soul be considered as the active object, it stands here at all events rather idle,—a circumstance which is sufficiently apparent from the supposition of several interpreters, that *נפש* “soul,” stands here simply for the personal pronoun,—“His soul,” for “He,” a *usus loquendi* which occurs in Arabic, but not in Hebrew. And, strictly speaking, the offering of the sacrifice does not belong to the soul, but to the spirit of the Servant of God, compare Heb. 9:14, according to which passage, *Christ διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ* and on the subject of the difference between soul and spirit, compare my Commentary on Ps. 4. p. lxxxvii. But how will it now be possible to reconcile and harmonize our two results, that, in a formal point of view, the soul is that which offers up, and, in a material point of view, that which is offered up? By the hypothesis that, *in a rhetorical way of speaking, that is here assigned to the soul as an action which, in point of fact, is done upon it.* All that is necessary is to translate: “If His soul puts or gives a trespass-offering;” for, “to put,” stands here, as it does so frequently, in the sense of “to give,” comp. Ezek. 20:28, where it is used in this sense in reference to sacrifice. But, in point of fact, this is equivalent to: “If it is made a trespass-offering,” or, “If He, the Servant of God, offers it as a trespass-offering.” It is analogous to this when, in Job 14:22, the soul of the deceased laments: and a cognate mode of representation prevails in Rev. 6:9, where, to the souls of the slain, life is assigned for the sole purpose of their giving utterance to that which was the result of the thought regarding them, in combination with the circumstances of the time. To a certain degree analogous is also chap. 60:7, where it is said of the sacrificial animals: “They ascend, for my pleasure, mine altar.” The fact that it is in reality the soul which is offered up, is confirmed also by the remarkable reference to the passage before us in the discourses of our Lord. Our Lord says in John 10:11: Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· ὁ

ποιμὴν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων. Ver. 15: καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων. Vers. 17, 18: διὰ τοῦτό ὁ πατὴρ με ἀγαπᾷ, ὅτι ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν. Οὐδεὶς αἶρει αὐτήν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτήν ἀπ’ ἐμαυτοῦ. ἔξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι αὐτήν, καὶ ἔξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν. In John 15:13: μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῆ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ. The expression: “To put one’s soul for some one,” does not, independently and by itself, occur anywhere else in the New Testament; in John 13:37, 38, Peter takes the word out of the mouth of the Saviour, and in 1 John 3:16, it is used in reference to those declarations of our Lord. The expression is nowhere met with in any profane writers, nor in the Hellenistic *usus loquendi*. The following reasons prove that it refers to the Old Testament, and especially to the passage under consideration. 1. Its Hebraizing character. *De Wette* and *Lücke* erroneously take θεῖναι in the sense of laying down; but that is too negative. It is evident that the Hebraism “to put,” instead of “to give,” has been transferred into Greek, as is proved by the synonymous δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ in Mark 10:45; Matt. 20:28.—2. The fact that the same uncommon expression occurs not fewer than five times in the same discourse of Christ, and that so intentionally and emphatically, is explicable only when it was thereby intended to point to an important fundamental passage of the Old Testament.—3. in the discourse of our Lord, the expression is, no less than in the passage before us, used of His sacrificial death.—If, then, it be established that those passages in which our Lord speaks of a *putting* of His soul, refer to the passage under consideration, this must be acknowledged of those also in which He speaks of a *giving* of His soul, as in Matt. 20:28: δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, where the λύτρον clearly points to the נשׂוּב here. In all those utterances, the Saviour simply has reduced the words to what they signify, just as, in quoting the passage Zech. 13:7, in Matt. 26:31, He likewise drops the rhetorical figure, the address to the sword. He himself appears simply as He who offers up; the soul is that which is offered up.—נשׂוּב is, in Numb. 5:5, called that of which some one has unjustly robbed another, and which he is bound to *repay* to him. An essential feature of sin is the *robbing of God* which is thereby committed, the debt thereby incurred, which implies the necessity of *recompence*. All sin-offerings are in the Mosaic economy, at the same time debt-offerings; and this feature is very intentionally and emphatically pointed out in them. If, besides the sin-offerings, there is still established a kind of trespass-offerings, the נשׂוּב, for sins in which the idea of incurring a debt comes out with special prominence, this is done only with the view, that this feature, thus brought forward by itself and independently, may be so much the more deeply impressed, in order that, in the other sin-offerings too, it may be the more clearly perceived. Compare the investigation on the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings in my work on the *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, ii. p. 174 ff. But the sin- and trespass-offerings of the Old Testament typically point to a true spiritual sin- and trespass-offering; and their chief object was to awaken in the people of God the consciousness of the necessity of substitution (comp. my Book: *Die Opfer der Heil. Schrift*, Berlin 1852). This antotypical sacrifice will be offered up by the true High-Priest. For the sins of the human race which without compensation, cannot be forgiven, He furnishes the restitution which could not be paid by the sinners, and thereby works out the justification of the sinner before God.—To the trespass-offering here, all those passages of the New Testament point, in which Christ is spoken of as the sacrifice for our sins, especially 2 Cor. 5:21, where the apostle says that God made Christ to be ἀμαρτία for us, that in Him we might be made righteous before God; Rom. 8:3, according to which God sent Christ περὶ ἀμαρτίας as a sin-offering; Rom. 3:25, where Christ is called ἱλαστήριον, propitiation: 1 John 2:2: καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, 4:10; Heb.

9:14.—The **אם** at the beginning must not be explained by “as” a signification, which it never has; it has its ordinary signification “when,” and the Future is to be understood as a real Future: the offering of the trespass-offering is the *condition* of His seeing, &c., and, according to the context, indeed, the absolutely *necessary* condition. The translation: “Even if” could proceed from one only who had not understood this context. It is not death in general, but sacrificial death, which is specially spoken of; and to such a death, which is a necessary foundation of the glorification, and especially the foundation of “He shall see seed,” “when” only is suitable, and not “even if.”—In the words: “He shall see seed, prolong His days,” that is, in a higher sense, promised to this Servant of God, which, under the Old Testament, was considered as a distinguished divine blessing. The spiritual interpretation has the less difficulty, that it must necessarily be granted in the case of **אשם**, immediately preceding. Just in the same relation in which the sin-offering of the Servant of God stands to the sin-offering of the bullocks and goats, does His posterity, the length of His days, stand to the ordinary posterity and length of days. The *seed* of the Servant of God, identical with His generation, in ver. 8, are just those for whom, according to the words immediately preceding, He offers His soul as a trespass-offering—the many who, according to ver. 12, are assigned to Him as His portion; who, according to chap. 52:15, are to be sprinkled by Him; who, according to ver. 11, are to be justified by Him; they whose sins He has taken upon Him (ver. 5), and for whom He intercedes before God, ver. 12. Even in the Old Testament, the word “children” is frequently used in a spiritual sense. In Gen. 6:2, believers appear as the children of God. The Israelites are not unfrequently designated as sons of Jehovah. Those prophets who were endowed with specially rich gifts, were surrounded by a crowd of *sons* of the prophets. The wise man, too, looks upon his disciples as his spiritual sons, Prov. 4:20, 19:27; Eccles. 12:12. In the New Testament, the Lord addresses the man sick of the palsy by τέκνον, Matt. 9:2; and with special emphasis, His apostles as *little children*, τέκνία τῶν μικρῶν μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι, John 13:33; and the Apostles, too consider those who have been awakened by their ministry as their spiritual children, 1 Cor. 4:17; 1 Tim. 1:2; 1 Pet. 5:13. *The thought is this*—that in the sacrificial death of the Servant of God there will be an animating power: that, just thereby. He will found His Church. The words: “He shall prolong His days, allude, as it appears, to the promise which was given to David and his seed, comp. Ps. 21:5: “He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it to him, even length of days for ever and ever;” 1 Sam. 7:13: “I will establish the throne of His kingdom for ever,” comp. Ver. 16; Ps. 89:5, 132:12,—a promise which found its final fulfilment in Christ. But the long life here must not be viewed as *isolated*, but must be understood in close connection both with what precedes and what follows. It is the life of the Servant of God in communion with His seed, in carrying out the will of God. **נפח** never means “business,” but always “pleasure;” and this signification, which occurs in chap. 44:28 also, is here the less to be given up, that the **נפח** here, at the close, evidently refers to the **נפח** at the beginning. By this reference, the reason is stated why it was the *pleasure* of the Lord to crush Him. According to vers. 11 and 12, it is the pleasure of God that sinners should be justified through Him, on the foundation of His vicarious suffering; according to chap. 42 and 49, that Israel should be redeemed, and the Gentiles saved. “While the pleasure of the Lord is prospering through His hand, he, at the same time, sees seed.

In vers. 11 and 12, we have the closing words of the Lord.

Ver. 11. “On account of the sufferings of His soul He seeth, He is satisfied; by His knowledge He, the Righteous One, my Servant, shall justify the many, and He shall bear their iniquities.”

The  $\text{וְעַל}$  in  $\text{לְמַאמַּר}$  is “on account of.” In ver. 10, to which the discourse of the Lord is, in the first instance, connected, the suffering likewise appears as the cause of the glorification. The Vulgate translates: “*Pro eo quod laboravit anima ejus;*” the LXX. rather feebly:  $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . With  $\text{הָאֵרִי}$  the object is omitted, and that purposely, in order that the words of God may be immediately connected with ver. 10. We must supply: the fruits and rewards of His sufferings announced there (just as, in a manner quite similar, in chap. 49:7, “they shall see,” refers to the preceding verse), specially that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper through His hand,—which, in the sequel, is enlarged upon. The words: “He is satisfied,” point out that the blissful consequences of the atoning suffering will take place in the highest fulness.  $\text{יִתְעַדֵּב}$  must, according to the accents, be connected with the subsequent words. The knowledge does not belong to the Servant of God, in so far as it dwells in Him, but as it concerns Him; just as the  $\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  in Luke 11:42, and in other passages does not mean the love which dwells in God, but the love which has God for its object. “By His knowledge” is thus equivalent to: by their knowing Him, getting acquainted with Him. This knowledge of the Servant of God according to His principal work, as it was described in what precedes, viz., mediatorial office, or *faith*, is the subjective condition of justification. As the efficient cause of it, the vicarious suffering of the Servant of God was represented in the preceding context. It is just this, which is subjectively appropriated by the knowledge of the Servant of God, and which must be conceived of as essential and living. Thus *J. H. Michaelis* says: *Per scientiam sui (Clericus: Cognitione sui), non qua ipse cognoscit, sed qua vera fide et fiducia ipse tanquam propitiator cognoscitur.* The explanation: “By His knowledge (in the sense of understanding) or wisdom,” gives a sense unsuitable to the context. In the whole prophecy, the Servant of God does not appear as a Teacher, but as a Redeemer; and the relation of  $\text{קִידֵּץ}$  to  $\text{קִידֵּצָה}$  shows that here, too, He is considered as such. To supply, as is done by some interpreters: “in which (knowledge) He perceived the only possible means of redemption and reconciliation, and gave practical effect to this knowledge,” is, after all, too unnatural; the discourse would in that case be so incomplete that we should have been shut up to conjectures. Others translate: “By His doctrine;” but  $\text{תְּעַדֵּב}$  never means “doctrine.” The explanation: “By His full, absolute knowledge of the divine counsel: (*Hävernick*), or, “by the absolute knowledge of God” (*Umbreit*), puts into the simple word, which only means “knowledge,” more than is implied in it. According to the parallelism with the subsequent words: “He shall bear their iniquities,” and according to the context (for, in the whole section, the Servant of God is not described as a *Teacher*, but as a *Priest*, as He who, in order to expiate our sin, has offered himself up as a sacrifice),  $\text{קִידֵּצָה}$  must not be translated “to convert,” but to “justify.” In favour of this translation is also the construction with  $\text{לְ}$ , which is to be accounted for from a modification of the signification: “to bring righteousness.” But it is specially the position of  $\text{קִידֵּץ}$  which is decisive in favour of it. It is for the justification only that the personal righteousness of the Servant of God has that significant meaning which is, in this manner, assigned to it. Moreover, in the *usus loquendi*, the meaning *to justify* only occurs. In it, the verb is used, chap. 5:23, 50:8; and there is no reason for deviating from it in the only passage which can be adduced in favour of the signification “to convert,” viz., Dan. 12:3: “And the wise,  $\text{מִלִּיכְשָׁם}$ , shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that *justify* many as the stars, for ever and ever.” In this passage, that is applied to believers which, in chap. 53, was ascribed to Christ. Even a certain strangeness in the style makes us suppose such a transference; and the fact, that Daniel had our passage specially in view, cannot be doubted, if we compare the  $\text{מִלִּיכְשָׁם}$  of Daniel with the  $\text{לִיכְשֵׁי}$ , with which the prophecy under consideration opens (chap. 52:13), and Daniel’s “justify many,” with

the passage before us. The justification, which in its full sense belongs to Christ the Head only, is by Daniel ascribed to the “wise,” because they are the instruments through whom many attain justification; *Calvin: Quia causa sunt ministerialis justitiae et salutis multorum*. Hävernicks refers, for a comparison, to 1 Tim. 4:16: “For, in doing this, thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee.” קידצ must not be immediately connected with דבע; for, in that case, it ought to have stood after it, and been qualified by the article. On the contrary, קידצ stands first, because it stands by itself and substantively: “The righteous One, My Servant.” A similar construction occurs, Jer. 3, 7:10: “And she does not turn unto me, the treacherous one, יהדיגב, her sister Judah.” By thus making קידצ prominent, and connecting it immediately with קידצה, it is intended to point out the close connection in which the righteousness of the Servant of God, who, although altogether innocent and sinless, ver. 9, yet suffered the punishment of sin, stands with the justification to be bestowed by Him. *Maurer* thus pertinently expresses this: “To many, for righteous is my Servant, shall He procure righteousness.” By these words thus the יהזי, in chap. 52:15, is explained; and the seal of the divine confirmation is impressed upon that which, in vers. 4-6, the believing Church had said, especially upon the words: “By His wounds we are healed,” ver. 5. The “many” points back to chap. 53:15, and forms the contrast not to *all* (*Stier*: “Because He cannot, overturning all laws, save all by coercion, or arbitrary will,”—a limitation which would in this context be out of place), but to *few*: The one, the many, Rom. 5:15.—“And He shall bear their iniquities;” the iniquities and their punishment, as a heavy burden which the Servant of God lifts off from those who are groaning under their weight, and takes upon himself. *Jerome* says: “And He himself shall bear the iniquities which they could not bear, and by the weight of which they were borne down.” *Calvin* expresses himself thus: “A wonderful change indeed! Christ justifies man by giving them righteousness, and in exchange, He takes upon Him their sins, that He may expiate them.” In opposition to those who translate: “He bore their iniquities,” (the Future might, in that case, be accounted for from the Prophet’s viewing the whole transaction as present), even *Gesenius* has remarked that the preceding and subsequent Futures all refer to the state of glorification. Even the parallelism with קידצי shows that we must translate as the LXX. do: καὶ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει. Moreover, the subject of discourse in the whole verse is not the *acquiring* of the righteousness, which was done in the state of humiliation, but the *communication* of it, as the subjective condition of which the knowledge of the Servant of God was mentioned in the preceding clause in the case of every one who, after the exaltation of the Servant of God, fulfils this condition, He takes upon Himself their sins, *i.e.*, He causes His vicarious suffering to be imputed to them, and grants them pardon. The expression: “He shall bear their iniquities” is, in point of fact, identical with: “He shall justify them.” The Servant of God has borne the sin once for all; by the power of His substitution, effected by the shedding of His blood, He takes upon himself the sins of every individual who *knows* Him. The “taking away” is implied in לבסו in so far only, as it is done by *bearing*. It was only because he was misled by his rationalistic tendencies, that *Gesenius* explains: “And He lightens the burden of their sins, *i.e.*, by His doctrine He shall correct them, and thereby procure to them pardon.” By such an explanation he contradicts himself, inasmuch as, in ver. 4, he referred the bearing of the diseases and pains to the vicarious satisfaction. It cannot, in any way, be said of the Teacher, that he takes upon himself iniquities.

Ver. 12. “Therefore will I give Him a portion in the many, and He shall divide the spoil with the strong, because He hath poured out His soul unto death and was numbered with

*the transgressors, and He beareth the sin of many, and for the transgressors He shall make intercession.*”

The first words are thus explained by many interpreters; “Therefore I will give Him mighty ones for His portion, and strong ones He shall divide as a spoil.” But קלח with ב cannot mean simply “to allot,” (although, indeed, this explanation is given by the LXX.: διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλούς; Vulg.: *ideo dispertiam ei plurimos*); it only signifies “to give a portion in,” Job 39:17. From the comparison with סיבר in ver. 11 and at the close of this verse, as well as from the reference to the *many nations* in the sketch, ver. 15, it is evident that סיבר here, too, cannot mean “mighty ones,” but “many.” Even elsewhere, the signification “great ones,” “mighty ones,” appears oftentimes to be only forced upon סיבר. In Job 35:9, the “many” are the many evil-doers; and in Job 32:9, the utterance: “Not the *many* are wise,” is explained from the circumstance, that the view given by Job’s friends was that of the great mass. The fact that the תא in the second clause is not the sign of the Accusative, but a Preposition, is probable even from the circumstance, that the former תא commonly stands before qualified nouns only; and, farther from the corresponding; “with the transgressors.” But what is conclusive is, that the phrase ללש קלח always means “to divide spoil,” never “to distribute as spoil,” and that the phrase תא ללש קלח “to divide spoil with the proud” occurs in Prov. 16:19. The reason of the use of this expression lies in the reference to ordinary victors and conquerors of the world, especially to Cyrus. By His sufferings and death, the Servant of God shall secure to himself the same successes as they do by sword and bow. Although participating in the government of the world, and dividing spoil are here ascribed to the Servant of God, yet the participation in worldly triumphs is not spoken of. On the contrary, behind the *equality* which has given rise to the secular-looking expression (the thought is merely this, that through Christ and His sacrificial death, the Kingdom of God enters into the rank of world-conquering powers), a contrast lies concealed,—as appears, 1. From what is stated, in the preceding verses, about the manner in which the Servant of God has attained to this glory. Worldly triumphs are not acquired by the deepest *humiliation*, by sufferings and death voluntarily undergone for the salvation of mankind. 2. From that which the Servant of God, in the state of glory, is to do to those who turn to Him. According to chap. 52:15, He is to sprinkle them with His blood; and this sprinkling is there expressly stated as the reason of the reverential homage of the Gentile world. He is to justify them and to bear their sins, ver. 11, and to make intercession for them, ver. 12. All that does not apply to a worldly conqueror and ruler.—The merits of the Servant of God are then once more pointed out,—the merits by which He has acquired so exalted and all-important a position to himself, and, at the same time, to the Kingdom of God, of which He is the Head. “Because He hath poured out His soul unto death.” הרע in the *Niphal*, “to be poured out,” means in *Piel* “to pour out,” Gen. 24:20, and Ps. 141:8, where it is said of the soul: “Do not pour out my soul,” just as here the *Hiphil* is used. The term has been transferred to the *soul* from the *bloody* in which is the soul, Gen. 9:4: “Flesh with its soul (namely with its blood) you shall not eat.” Ver. 5: “Your blood in which your souls.” הנמני, “He was numbered,” is here, according to the context, equivalent to: He caused himself to be numbered; for it is only that which was undergone voluntarily which can be stated as the reason of the *reward*. This voluntary undergoing, however, is not implied in the word itself, but only in the connection with: “He hath poured out His soul;” for that signifies a voluntary act. The מעשפ here, just as the מעש in ver. 9, are not sinners, but criminals. This appears from the connection in which the being “numbered with the transgressors” stands with the “pouring out of the soul unto death.”

We can hence think of executed criminals only. The pure, innocent One was not only numbered with sinners, such as all men are, but He was numbered with *criminals*. It is in this sense also that our Lord understands the words, in His quotation of them in Luke 22:37: λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι τι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τὸ καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει; compare Matt. 26:54, where the Lord strengthens His disciples against the offence of His being taken a prisoner, by saying, with a view to the passage before us: πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί, ὅτι οὕτω δεῖ γενέσθαι; ver. 56, where, after having reproached the guards for having numbered Him with criminals: ὡς ἐπὶ ληστήν ἐξήλθετε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων συλλαβεῖν με, He says to them: τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί τῶν προφητῶν. Mark, in chap. 15:28, designates the fact that two robbers were crucified with Christ, as the most perfect fulfilment of our prophecy. It was in this fact that it came out most palpably, that Christ had been made like criminals. The rulers of the people caused two common criminals to be crucified with Him, just that they might declare that they put Him altogether among their number.—“And He beareth the sin of many, and for the transgressors He shall make intercession.” By וְהוּא, it is indicated that the subsequent words are no more to be viewed as depending on עֲגִיבֵי תַחַת must not, as is done by the LXX., be referred to the state of humiliation; for the Future in the preceding verses has reference to the exaltation. The parallel וְשָׂא must therefore be viewed as a *Praeteritum propheticum*. It corresponds with לְבַסִּי in ver. 11, and, like it, does not designate something done but once by the Servant of God, but something which He does constantly. The intercession is here brought into close connection with the bearing of the sin, by which Christ represents himself as being the true *sin-offering* (comp. ver. 10, where He was designated as the true *trespass-offering*), and hence it is equivalent to: He will make intercession for sinners, by taking upon himself their sin,—of which the thief on the cross was the first instance. This close connection, and the deep meaning suggested by it, are overlooked and lost by those expositors who, in the intercession, think of *prayer* only. *The servant of God, on the contrary, makes intercession, by pleading before God His merit, as the ground of the acceptance of the transgressors, and of the pardon of their sins.* This is evident from the connection also in which: “For the transgressors He shall make intercession,” stands with: “He was numbered with the transgressors.” The vicarious suffering is thereby pointed out as the ground of the intercession. *Calvin* says: “Under the Old Testament dispensation, the High-priest, who never went in without blood, made intercession for the people. What was there foreshadowed has been fulfilled in Christ. For, in the first place, He offered up the sacrifice of His body, and shed His blood and thus suffered the punishment due to us. And, in the second place, in order that the expiation might profit us, He undertakes the office of an advocate, and makes intercession for all who, by faith, lay hold of this sacrifice.” Comp. Rom. 8:34: ὃς καὶ ἐντιγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; Hebr. 9:24, according to which passage Christ is entered into the holy places νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; 1 John 2:1: παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον.

-----

We have hitherto expounded the passage before us without any regard to the difference of the interpretation as to the whole, and have supposed the reference to Christ to be the correct one. But it is still incumbent upon us: I. to give the history of the interpretation; II. to refute the arguments against the Messianic interpretation; III. to state the arguments in favour of it; and IV. to show that the non-Messianic interpretation is untenable.

# I. HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION

## A. WITH THE JEWS

1. There cannot be any doubt that, in those earlier times, when the Jews were still more firmly attached to the tradition of their Fathers,—when the carnal disposition had not yet become so entirely prevalent among them,—and when controversy with the Christians had not made them so narrow-minded in their Exegesis, the Messianic explanation was pretty generally received, at least by the better portion of the people. This is admitted even by those later interpreters who pervert the prophecy, *e.g.*, *Abenezra*, *Jarchi*, *Abarbanel*, *Moses Nachmanides*. *Gesenius* also says: “It was only the later Jews who abandoned this interpretation,—no doubt, in consequence of their controversies with the Christians.” We shall here collect, from the existing Jewish writings, the principal passages in which this interpretation occurs. The whole translation of the Chaldee Paraphrast, *Jonathan*, notwithstanding the many perversions in which he indulges, refers the prophecy to Christ. He paraphrases the very first clause: הֲלָצִי אֵה אַחִישָׁמ יִדְבַע “behold my Servant Messiah shall prosper.” The *Medrash Tanchuma*, an old commentary on the Pentateuch (ed. Cracov. f. 53, c. 3, l. 7), remarks on the words: מַמְשָׁה וְגַבַּה מִן מַלְאֲכֵי (“this is the King Messiah who is high and lifted up, and very exalted, more exalted than Abraham, elevated above Moses, higher than the ministering angels”). This passage is remarkable for this reason also, that it contains the doctrine of the exaltation of the Messiah above all created beings, and even above the angels themselves, and, hence, the doctrine of His divinity,—a doctrine contested by the later Jews. Still more remarkable is a passage from the very old book *Pesikta*, cited in the treatise *Abkath Rokhel* (לְכוּר תְּקַבֵּא), printed separately at Venice in 1597, and reprinted in *Hulsii Theologia Judaica*, where this passage occurs p. 309): “When God created His world He stretched out His hand under the throne of His glory, and brought forth the soul of the Messiah. He said to Him: ‘Wilt thou heal and redeem my sons after 6000 years?’ He answered Him: ‘I will.’ Then God said to Him: ‘Wilt thou then also bear the punishment in order to blot out their sins, as it is written: ‘*But he bore our diseases*’ (chap. 53:4)? And He answered Him: I will joyfully bear them.” In this passage, as well as in several others which will be afterwards cited, the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings of the Messiah is contained, and derived from Is. 53, although the later Jews rejected this doctrine. In a similar manner, Rabbi *Moses Haddarshan* expresses himself on Gen. 1:3 (Latin in *Galatinus, De Arcanis Cath. ver.* p. 329; in the original in *Raimund Martini Pug. Fid.* fol. 333; comp. *Wolf, Bibl. Hebr.* i. p. 818): “Jehovah said: Messiah, thou my righteous One, those who are concealed with thee will be such that their sins will bring a heavy yoke upon thee.—The Messiah answered: Lord of the universe, I cheerfully take upon myself all those plagues and sufferings; and immediately the Messiah, out of love, took upon himself all those plagues and sufferings, as is written in Is. 53: He was abused and oppressed.” Compare another passage, in which ver. 5 is referred to the Messiah, in *Raim. Martin*, fol. iv. 30. In the Talmud (*Gemara, tract. Sanhedrin*, chap. xi.), it is said of the Messiah: “He sits before the gates of the city of Rome among the sick and the leprous” (according to ver. 3). To the question: What is the name of the Messiah, it is answered: He is called אַרְוִיחַ “*the leper*” and, in proof, ver. 4 is quoted according to the erroneous interpretation of עוֹנֵג by *leprosus*,—an interpretation which is met with in *Jerome* also.—In the work *Rabboth* (a commentary on

the Pentateuch and the five *Megilloth*, which, as to its principal portions, is very old, although much interpolated at later periods, and which, according to the statements of the Jews, was composed about the year of our Lord 300, comp. *Wolf*, I, c. II., p. 1423, sqq. in commentary on Ruth 2:14 [p. 46, ed. *Cracov.*]), the fifth verse is quoted, and referred to the sufferings of the Messiah.—In the *Medrash Tillim* (an allegorical commentary on the Psalms, printed ad Venice in 1546), it is said in Ps. 2:7, (fol. 4): “The things of King Messiah and His mysteries are announced in the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. In the Prophets, *e.g.*, in the passage Is. 52:13, and 42:1; in the Hagiographa, *e.g.*, Ps. 110 and Dan. 7:13.” In the book *Chasidim* (a collection of moral tales, printed at Venice and Basle in 1581) p. 60, the following story is to be found: “There was, among the Jews, a pious man, who in summer made his bed among fleas, and in winter put his feet into cold water; and when it froze, his feet froze at the same time. When asked why he did so, he answered, that he too must make some little expiation, since the Messiah bears the sin of Israel (לארשי תונוע לבוס חישמ).” The ancient explanation is, from among the later interpreters, assented to by *Rabbi Alschech* (his commentary on Is. 53 is given entire in *Hulsii Theologia Judaica*, p. 321 sqq.). He says: “Upon the testimony of tradition, our old Rabbins have unanimously admitted that King Messiah is here the subject of discourse. For the same reason, we, in harmony with them, conclude that King David, *i.e.*, the Messiah, must be considered as the subject of this prophecy,— a view which is indeed quite obvious.” We shall see, however, subsequently, that he adheres to the right explanation only in the first three verses, and afterwards abandons it. But passages especially remarkable are found in the cabbalistic book *Sohar*. It is true that the age of the book is very uncertain; but it cannot be proved to have been composed under Christian influence. We shall here quote only some of the principal passages. (*Sohar*, ed. Amstelod. p. ii. fol. 212; ed. *Solisbac*. p. ii. f. 85; *Sommeri theol. Sohar* p. 94.) “When the Messiah is told of the misery of Israel in their captivity, and that they are themselves the cause of it, because they had not cared for, nor sought after the knowledge of their Lord, He weeps aloud over their sins; and for this reason it is written in Scripture (Isa. 53:5): He was wounded for our transgressions, He was smitten for our iniquities.”—“In the garden of Eden there is an apartment which is called the sick chamber. The Messiah goes into this apartment, and summons all the diseases, all the pains, and all the chastisements of Israel to come upon Him, and they all come upon Him. And unless He would take them away from Israel, and lay them upon himself, no man would be able to bear the chastisements of Israel, which are inflicted upon them on account of the Law, as it is written: But He took upon himself our sicknesses,” &c. In another passage (*Sohar*, ed. Amstelod. p. iii, f. 218; *Solisbac*. iii. f. 88; *Sommeri theol. Sohar* p. 89; *Auszüge aus dem Buche Sohar, mit Deutscher Uebersetzung*, Berlin 52, S. 32), it is said: “When God wishes to give to the world a means of healing, He smites one of the pious among them, and for his sake He gives healing to the whole world. Where, in Scripture, do we find this confirmed? In Isa. 53:5, where it is said: He was wounded for our transgressions, He was crushed for our sins.”

What has been said will be a sufficient proof that the ancient Jews, following tradition, referred the passage to the Messiah; and, as it appears from the majority of the passages quoted, referred it indeed to the suffering Messiah. But it would really have been a strange phenomenon, if this interpretation had remained the prevailing one among the Jews. According to the declaration of the Apostle, the Cross of Christ is to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. The idea of a suffering and expiating Messiah was repugnant to the carnally minded Jews. And the reason why it was repugnant to them is, that they did not possess that which alone makes that doctrine

acceptable, viz., the knowledge of sin, and the consciousness of the need of salvation,—because, not knowing the holiness of God, and being ignorant of the import of the Law, they imagined that through their own strength, by the works of the Law, they could be justified before God. What they wished for was only an outward deliverance from their misery and their oppressors, not an internal deliverance from sin. For this reason, they looked exclusively to those passages of the Old Testament in which the Messiah in glory is announced; and those passages they interpreted in a carnal manner. In addition to this, there were other reasons which could not fail to render them averse to refer this passage to the suffering Messiah. As they could not compare the prophecy with the fulfilment,—the deep abasement of the Messiah which is here announced, the contempt which He endures, His violent death, appeared to them irreconcilable with those passages in which nothing of the kind is mentioned, but, on the contrary, the glorified Messiah only is foretold. They had too little knowledge of the nature of prophetic vision to enable them to perceive that the prophecies are connected with the circumstances of the time, and, therefore, exhibit of prophetic vision to enable them to perceive that the prophecies are connected with the circumstances of the time, and therefore, exhibit a one-sided character,—that they consist of separate fragments which must be put together in order that a complete representation of the subject may be obtained. They imagined that because, in some passages, the Messiah is at once brought before us in glory, just because He, in this way, represented Himself to the prophets, He must also appear at once in glory. And, lastly, by their controversy with Christians, they were led to seek for other explanations. As long as they understood the passage as referring to a suffering Messiah, they could not deny that there existed the closest agreement between the prophecy and the history of Christ. Now since the Christians, in their controversies with the Jews, always proceeded from the passages, which *Hulsius* is pertinently called a *carnificina Judacorum*, and always returned to it,—since they saw what impression was, in numerous cases, produced by the controversy of the Christians founded upon this passage, nothing was more natural, than that they should endeavour to discover an expedient for remedying this evil. And the discovery of such an expedient was the more easy to them, the more that, in general, they were destitute of a sense of truth, and especially of exegetical skill, so that they could not see any reason for rejecting an interpretation on the ground of its being forced and natural.

In proof of what we have said, we here briefly present the arguments with which *Abarbanel* opposes the explanation of a suffering and expiating divine Messiah. In the first place, by the absurd remark that the ancient teachers did not intend to give a literal, but an allegorical explanation, he seeks to invalidate the authority of the tradition on which the later Jewish interpreters laid so great a stress, whensoever and wheresoever it agrees with their own inclination; and, at the same time, he advances the assertion that they referred the first four verses only to the Messiah,—an assertion which the passages quoted by us show to be utterly erroneous. Then, after having combated the doctrine of original sin, he continues: “Suppose even that there exists such a thing as original sin,—when God, whose power is infinite, was willing to pardon, was His hand too short to redeem (Isa. 50:2), so that, on this account, He was obliged to take flesh, and to impose chastisements upon himself? And even although I were to grant that it was necessary that a single individual of the human race should bear this punishment, in order to make satisfaction for all, it would, at all events, have been at least more appropriate that some one from among ourselves, some wise man or prophet, had taken upon him the punishment, than that God himself should have done so. For, supposing even that He became incarnate, He would not be like one of us.—It is altogether impossible and self-

contradictory that God should assume a body; for God is the first cause, infinite, and omnipotent. He cannot, therefore, assume flesh, and subsist as a finite being, and take upon himself man's punishment, of which nothing whatsoever is written in Scripture.—If the prophecy referred to the Messiah, it must refer either to the Messiah ben Joseph, or the Messiah ben David (compare the Treatises at the close of this work). The former will perish in the beginning of his wars; neither that which is said of the exaltation, nor that which is said of the humiliation of the Servant of God applies to him; much less can the latter be intended.” (There then follows a quotation of several passages treating of the exalted Messiah.)

That it was nevertheless difficult for the carnally-minded among the Jews to reject the tradition, is seen from the paraphrase of *Jonathan*. This forms a middle link between the ancient interpretation—which was retained, even at a later period, by the better portion of the nation—and the recent interpretation. *Jonathan* (see his paraphrase, among others, in *Lowth's* comment, edited by *Koppe*, on the passage; and in *Hulsii Theol. Jadaica*) acknowledges the tradition, in so far, that he refers the whole prophecy to the Messiah. On the other hand, he endeavours to satisfy his repugnance to the doctrine of a suffering and expiating Messiah, by referring, through the most violent perversions and most arbitrary interpolations, to the state of glory, every thing which is here said of the state of humiliation. A trace of the right interpretation may yet perhaps be found in ver. 12, where *Jonathan* says that the Messiah will give *His* soul unto death; but it may be that thereby he understands merely the intrepid courage with which the Messiah will expose himself to all dangers, in the conflict with the enemies of the covenant-people.

This mode of dealing with the text, however, could satisfy only a few. They, therefore, went farther, and sought for an entirely different subject of the prophecy. How very little they were themselves convinced of the soundness of their interpretation, and satisfied with its results, may be seen from the example of *Abarbanel*, who advances two explanations which differ totally, viz., one referring it to the Jewish people, and the other to king Josiah, and then allows his readers to make their choice betwixt the two. It is in truth only, that there is unanimity and certainty; error is always accompanied by disagreement and uncertainty. This will appear from the following enumeration of the various interpretations of this passage, which, at a subsequent period, were current among the Jews. (The principal non-Messianic interpretations of this passage are found in the Rabbinical Bibles, and also in *Hulius, l.c.*, p. 339, both in the original and translation.) The interpreters may be divided into two main classes: 1. Those who by הוהי דבע understand some collective body; and, 2. Those who refer the prophecy to a single individual. The first class again falls into two subdivisions, (*a*), those who make the whole Jewish people the subject, in contrast to the Gentiles; and (*b*) those who make the better portion of the Jewish people the subject, in contrast to the ungodly portion. These views, and their supporters, we shall now proceed to submit to a closer examination.

1. (*a*.) Among the non-Messianic interpreters, the most prevalent opinion is, that the Jewish people are the subject of the prophecy. This opinion is found at an early period. At this we need not be surprised, as the cause which produced the deviation from the Messianic interpretation existed at a period equally early. When *Origen* was making use of this passage against some learned Jews, they answered: that “that which here was prophesied of one, referred to the whole people, was fulfilled by their dispersion.” This explanation is followed by *R. Salomo Jarchi*, *Abenezra*, *Kimchi*, *Abarbanel*, *Lipmann* (פס'ן רחצן רפס', fol. 131). The main features of this view the following: The prophecy is

supposed to describe the misery of the people in their present exile, the firmness with which they bear it for the glory of God, and resist every temptation to forsake His law and worship; and the prosperity, power, and glory which shall be bestowed upon them at the time of the redemption. In vers. 1-10, the Gentiles are supposed to be introduced as speaking, and making a humble and penitent confession that hitherto they had adopted an erroneous opinion of the people of God, and had unjustly despised them on account of their sufferings, inasmuch as their glory now shows, that it was not for the punishment of their sins that these sufferings were inflicted upon them. Some of these interpreters, *e.g.*, *Abenezra* and *Rabbi Lipmann*, understand, indeed, by the הוהי דבע, the pious portion only of the people who remained faithful to Jehovah; but this makes no material difference, inasmuch as they, too, contrast the הוהי דבע with the heathen nations, and not with the ungodly, or less righteous portion of the nation, as is done by the interpreters of the following class.

(*b.*) Others consider the appellation הוהי דבע as a collective designation of the pious, and find in this section the idea of a kind of vicarious satisfaction made by them for the ungodly. Those interpreters come nearer the true explanation, in so far as they do not, like those of the preceding class, set aside the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction, either by a figurative explanation, or, like *Kimchi*, by the absurd remark, that this doctrine is an error put into the mouth of the Gentiles. On the other hand, they depart from the true explanation, in so far that they generalize that which belongs to a definite subject, and that, flattering the pride of the natural man, they ascribe to mere man what belongs only to the God-man. Most distinctly was this view expressed by the Commentator on the book בקעי זיע or לארשי זיע which has been very frequently printed, and which contains all sorts of tales from the Talmud. He says: "It is right to suppose that the whole section contains a prophecy regarding the righteous ones who are visited by sufferings." He then makes two classes of righteous men:—those who in general must endure many sufferings and much misery: and those who are publicly executed, as *Rabbi Akiba* and others. He supposes that the Prophet shows the dignity of both of these classes of righteous men, to both of which the name of a Servant of God is justly due. A similar opinion is held by *Rabbi Alshech*. As we have already seen, he refers only chap. 52:13-15 to the Messiah, and to His great glory acquired by His great sufferings. Then the Prophet speaks, as he supposes, in the name of all Israel, approves of what God had said, and confesses that, by this declaration of God regarding the sufferings of the Messiah, they have received light regarding the sufferings of the godly in general. They perceive it to be erroneous and rash to infer guilt from suffering; and, hence forth, when they see a righteous man suffering, they will think of no other reason, than that he bears their diseases, and that his chastisements are for their salvation. The Servant of God is thus supposed to be as it were, a personification of the righteous ones.—A similar view probably lies at the foundation of those passages of the Talmud, where some portions of the prophecy under consideration are referred to Moses, and others to *Rabbi Akiba*, who is revered as a martyr by the Jews. It does not appear that the prophecy was confined to Moses or Akiba; but it was referred to them, only in so far as they belonged to the collective body which is supposed to be the subject of it.

2. That view which makes a single individual other than the Messiah the subject of the prophecy, has found, with the Jews, comparatively the fewest defenders. We have already seen, that, besides the explanation which makes the Jewish people the subject, *Abarbanel* advances still another, which refers it to king Josiah. *Rabbi Saadius Haggaoon* explained the whole section of Jeremiah.

Notwithstanding all these efforts, however, the Rabbins have not succeeded in entirely supplanting the right explanation, and in thus divesting the passage of all that is dangerous to their system. Among the Cabbalistical Jews, it is even still the prevailing one. In numerous cases, it was just this chapter which formed, to proselytes from Judaism, the first foundation of their conviction of the truth of Christianity.

## B. HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION WITH THE CHRISTIANS

Among Christians, the interpretation has taken nearly the same course as among the Jews. Similar causes have produced similar effects in both cases. By both, the true explanation was relinquished, when the prevailing tendencies had become opposed to its results. And if we descend to particulars, we shall find a great resemblance even between the modes of interpretation proposed by both.

1. Even *a priori*, we could not but suppose otherwise than that the Christian Church, as long as she possessed Christ, found Him here also, where He is so clearly and distinctly set before our eyes,—that as long as she in general still acknowledged the authority of Christ, and of the Apostles, she could not but, here too, follow their distinct, often-repeated testimony. And so, indeed, do we find it to be. With the exception of a certain Silesian, called *Seidel*—who, given up to total unbelief, asserted that the Messiah had never yet come, nor would ever come, (comp. *Jac. Martini l. 3, de tribus Elohim*, p. 592)—and of *Grotius*, both of whom supposed Jeremiah to be the subject, no one in the Christian Church has, for seventeen centuries, ventured to call in question the Messianic interpretation. On the contrary, this passage was always considered to be the most distinct and glorious of all the Messianic prophecies. Out of the great mass of testimonies, we shall quote a few. *Augustine, De Civitate Dei*, i. 18, c. 29, says: “Isaiah has not only reproved the people for their iniquity, and instructed them in righteousness, and foretold to the people calamities impending over them in the Future; but he has also a greater number of predictions, than the other prophets, concerning Christ and the Church, *i.e.*, concerning the King, and the Kingdom established by-Him; so that some interpreters would rather call him an Evangelist than a Prophet.” In proof of this assertion, he then quotes the passage under consideration, and closes with the words: “Surely that may suffice! There are in those words some things too which require explanation; but I think that things which are so clear should compel even enemies, against their will, to understand them.” In a similar manner he expresses himself in: *De consensu Evangelistarum* l. i. c. 31. *Theodoret* remarks on this passage (*opp. ed. Hal. t. ii. p. 358*): “The Prophet represents to us, in this passage, the whole course of His (Christ’s) humiliation unto death. Most wonderful is the power of the Holy Spirit For that which was to take place after many generations, He showed to the holy prophets in such a manner that they did not merely hear Him declare these things, but saw them.” In a similar manner, *Justin, Irenaeus, Cyril of Alexandria, and Jerome*, express themselves. From the Churches of the Reformation, we shall here quote the testimonies of two of their founders only. *Zwingli*, in *Annot. ad h. l.* (*opp. t. iii. Tur. 1544, fol. 292*) says: “That which now follows is so clear a testimony of Christ, that I do not know whether, anywhere in Scripture, there could be found anything more consistent, or that anything could be more distinctly said. For it is quite in vain that the obstinacy and perversity of the Jews have tried it from all sides.” *Luther* remarks on the passage: “And, no doubt, there is not, in all the Old Testament Scriptures, a clearer text or prophecy, both of the suffering and the resurrection of Christ, than in this chapter. Wherefore it is but right that it should be well known to all Christians, yea should be committed to memory, that

thereby we may strengthen our faith, and defend it, chiefly against the stiff-necked Jews who deny their only promised Christ, solely on account of the offence of His cross.”

It was reserved to the last quarter of the last century to be the first to reject the Messianic interpretation. *At a time when Naturalism exercised its sway, it could no longer be retained.*<sup>27</sup> For, if this passage contains a Messianic prophecy at all, its contents offer so striking an agreement with the history of Christ, that its origin cannot at all be accounted for in the natural way. Expedients were, therefore, sought for; and these were so much the more easily found, that the Jews had, in this matter, already opened up the way. All that was necessary, was only to appropriate their arguments and counter arguments, and to invest them with the semblance of solidity by means of a learned apparatus.

The non-Messianic interpretation among Christians, like those among the Jews, may be divided into two main classes: 1. Those which are founded upon the supposition that a collective body is the subject of the prophecy; and 2. those which, by the Servant of God, understand any other single individual except the Messiah. The first class, again, falls into several sub-divisions: (*a.*), those interpretations which refer the prophecy to the whole Jewish people; (*b.*), those which refer it to the Jewish people in the abstract; (*c.*), those which refer it to the pious portion of the Jewish people; (*d.*), those which refer it to the order of the priests; (*e.*), those which refer it to the order of the prophets.

1. (*a.*) Comparatively the greatest number of non-Messianic interpreters make the whole Jewish people the subject of the prophecy. This hypothesis is adopted, among others, by *Doederlein*, (in the preface and annotations, in the third edition of Isaiah, but in such a manner that he still wavers betwixt this and the Messianic interpretation, which formerly he had defended with great zeal); by *Schuster* (in a special treatise, Göttingen 1794); by *Stephani* (*Gedanken über die Entstehung u. Ansbildung der Idee von einem Messias*, Nürnberg 1787); by the author of the letters on Isaiah 53, in the 6th vol. of *Eichhorn's Bibliothek*; by *Eichhorn* (in his ex position of the Prophets); by *Rosenmüller* (in the second edition of his Commentary, leaving to others the interpretation which referred the prophecy to the prophetic order, although he himself had first recommended it), and many others. The last who defend it are *Hitzig*, *Hendewerk*, and *Köster* (*de Serv. Jeh.* Kiel, 38). Substantially, it has remained the same as we have seen it among the Jews. The only difference is, that these expositors understand, by the sufferings of the Servant of God, the sufferings of the Jewish people in the Babylonish captivity; while the Jewish interpreters understand thereby the sufferings of the Jewish people in their present exile. They, too, suppose that, from vers. 1 to 10, the Gentile nations are introduced as speaking, and make the penitent confession that they have formed an erroneous opinion of Israel, and now see that its sufferings are not the punishment of its own sins, but that it had suffered as a substitute for their sins.

(*b.*) The hypothesis which makes the Jewish people in the abstract—in antithesis to its single members—the subject of this prophecy, was discovered by *Eckermann*, *theol. Beiträge*, Bd. i. H. i. S. 192 ff. According to *Ewald*, the prophecy refers to “Israel according to its true idea.” According to *Bleek*, the Servant of God is a “designation of the whole people, but not of the people in its actual reality, but as it existed in the imagination of the author,—the ideal of the people.”

(*c.*) The hypothesis, that the pious portion of the Jewish people—in contrast to the ungodly—are the subject, has been defended especially by *Paulus* (*Memorabilien*, Bd. 3, S. 175-192, and *Clavis* on Isaiah). His view was adopted by *Amman* (*Christologie*, S. 108

ff.). The principal features of this view are the following:—It was not on account of their own sins that the godly portion of the nation were punished and carried into captivity along with the ungodly, but on account of the ungodly who, however, by apostatising from the religion of Jehovah, knew how to obtain a better fate. The ungodly drew from it the inference that the hope of the godly, that Jehovah would come to their help, had been in vain. But when the captivity came to an end, and the godly returned, they saw that they had been mistaken, and that the hope of the godly was well founded. They, therefore, full of repentance, deeply lament that they had not long ago repented of their sins. This view is adopted also by *von Cölln* in his *Biblishe Theologie*; by *Thenius* in *Wiener's Zeitschrift*, ii. 1; by *Maurer* and *Knobel*. The latter says: “Those who were zealous adherents of the Theocracy had a difficult position among their own people, and had to suffer most from foreign tyrants.” The true worshippers of Jehovah were given up to mockery and scorn, to persecution and the grossest abuse, and were in a miserable and horrible condition, unworthy of men and almost inhuman. The punishments for sin had to be endured chiefly by those who did not deserve them. Thus the view easily arose that the godly suffered in substitution for the whole people.

(d.) The hypothesis which makes the priestly order the subject, has been defended by the author of: *Ausführliche Erklärung der sämmtlichen Weissagungen des A. T.* 1801.

(e.) The hypothesis which makes the collective body of the prophets the subject, was first advanced by *Rosenmüller* in the treatise: *Leiden und Hoffnungen der Propheten Jehovas*, in *Gablers Neuestes theol. Journal*, vol. ii. S. 4, p. 333 ff. From him it came as a legacy to *De Wette* (*de morte Jes. Chr. expiatoria*, p. 28 sqq.), and to *Gesenius*. According to *Schenkel* (*Studien und Kritiken* 36) “the prophetic order was the quiet, hidden blossom, which early storms broke.” According to *Umbreit* the Servant of God is the collective body of the prophets, or the prophetic order, which is here plainly represented as the sacrificial beast (!) taking upon itself the sins of the people. He finds it “rather strange that the Prophet who, in chap. 66:3 (of course according to a false interpretation), plainly rejects sacrifice altogether, should speak of the shedding of the blood of a man, and, moreover, of a pure, sinless man, in the room of the guilty.” The manner in which *Umbreit* seeks to gain a transition to the Messianic interpretation, although not in the sense held by the Christian Church, has been pointed out by us on a former occasion, in the remarks on chap. 42 *Hofmann* (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1. S. 89 ff.) has got up a mixture composed of these explanations which refer the prophecy to the people, to the godly, to the prophetic order, and, if one will, of that also which refers it to the Messiah. He says: “The people as a people are called to be the servant of God; but they do not fulfil their vocation as a congregation of the faithful; and it is, therefore, the work of the prophets to restore that congregation, and hence also the fulfilment of its vocation.—Prophetism itself is represented not in its present condition only, when it exists in a number of messengers and witnesses of Jehovah, in the first instance in Isaiah himself, but also in the final result, into which the fulfilment of its vocation will lead, when the Servant of Jehovah unites in His person the offices of a proclaimer of the impending work of salvation, and of its Mediator, and, from the shame and suffering attached to His vocation as a witness, passes over into the glory of the salvation realised in Him.” In order to render such a mixture possible, everything is tried in order to remove the vicarious character of the sufferings of the Servant of God, since that character is peculiar to Christ, and excludes every comparison. “Of a priestly self-sacrifice of the Servant of God”—says *Hofmann*, S. 101, 2—“I cannot find anything. The assertion that the words *מִיּוֹג רִזִּי*, denote a priestly work, no longer requires a refutation. His vocation is to be the mediator of a revelation of

God in words; and although the fulfilment of this vocation brings death upon Him, without His endeavouring to escape, this is not a proof nor a part of His priestly vocation. In just the same case is the assertion that the Messiah appears here as a King also." As long as we proceed from the supposition that the Prophet predicts truth, we are, by that very supposition, forbidden to distribute the property of the one among the many; but that is thus violently set aside. The Rationalistic interpreters have in this respect an easier task. They allow the substitution to stand; but they consider it as a vain fancy. The fact that *Hofmann* does not recoil from even the most violent interpretations, in order to remove the exclusive reference to Christ, appears, *e.g.*, from his remark, S. 132, that "the chastisement of our peace" designates an actual chastisement, which convinces them of their sin, and of the earnestness of divine holiness, and thus serves for their salvation. Surely *Gesenius* and *Hitzig's* explanations are far more unbiassed.

2. Among the interpretations which refer the prophecy to a single individual other than the Messiah, scarcely any one has found another defender than its own author. They are of importance only in so far, as they show that most decidedly does the prophecy make the impression, that its subject is a real person, not a personification; and, farther, that it could not by any means be an exegetical interest which induced rationalism to reject the interpretation which referred it to Christ. The persons that have been guessed at are the following: King Uzziah, (*Augusti*), King Hezekiah, (*Konynenburg* and *Bahrdt*), the Prophet Isaiah himself, (*Stäudlin*), an unknown prophet supposed to have been killed by the Jews in the captivity (an anonymous author in *Henke's Magazin*, Bd. i. H. 2), the royal house of David, which suffered innocently when the children of the unhappy king Zedekiah were killed at the command of Nebuchadnezzar (*Bolten* on Acts 8:33), the Maccabees (an anonymous writer in the *Theologische Nachrichten*, 1821, S. 79 ff.) Even at this present time, this kind of explanation is not altogether obsolete. *Schenkel* thinks that "the chapter under consideration may, perhaps, belong to the period of the real Isaiah, whose language equals that of the description of the Servant of God now under consideration, in conciseness and harshness, and may have been originally a Psalm of consolation in sufferings, which was composed with a view to the hopeful progeny of some pious man or prophet innocently killed, and which was rewritten and interpreted by the author of the book, and embodied in it." *Ewald* (Proph. ii. S. 407) says: "Farther, the description of the Servant of God is here altogether very strange, especially 5:8 f., inasmuch as, notwithstanding all the liveliness with which the author of the book conceives of Him, He is nowhere else so much and so obviously viewed as an historical person, as a single individual of the Past. How little soever the author may have intended it, it was very obvious that the later generations imagined that they would here find the historical Messiah. We are therefore of opinion, that the author here inserted a passage, which appeared to him to be suitable, from an older book where really a single martyr was spoken of.—It is not likely that the modern controversy on chap. 53 will ever cease as long as this truth is not acknowledged;—a truth which quite spontaneously suggested itself, and impressed itself more and more strongly upon my mind." These are, no doubt, assertions which cannot be maintained, and are yet of interest, in so far as they show, how much even those who refuse to acknowledge it are annoyed by a two-fold truth, viz., that Isaiah is the author of the prophecy, and that it refers to a personal Messiah.

At all times, however, that explanation which refers the prophecy to Christ has found able defenders; and at no period has the anti-Messianic explanation obtained absolute sway. Among the authors of complete Commentaries on Isaiah, the Messianic explanation was defended by *Dathe*, *Doederlein* (who, however, wavers in the last edition of his

translation), *Hensler, Lowth, Kocher, Koppe, J. D. Michaelis, v. d. Palm, Schmieder*. In addition to these we may mention: *Storr, dissertatio qua Jes. liii. illustratur*. Tübingen, 1790; *Hansi Comment, in Jes. liii.*, Rostock 1791 (this work has considerably promoted the interpretation, although its author often shows himself to be biased by the views of the time, and especially, in the interest of Neology, seeks to do away with the doctrine of satisfaction); *Krüger, Comment, de Jes. liii., interpret*; *Jahn, Append. ad Hermen. fasc. ii.*; *Stuedel, Observ. ad Jes. liii.*, Tübingen 1825, 26; *Sack in the Apologetik: Reinke, exegesis in Jes, liii.*, Münster 1836; *Tholuck*, in his work: *Das A. T. im N. T.*; *Hävernicks*, in the lectures on the Theology of the Old Testament; *Stier*, in the Comment. on the second part of Isaiah.

-----

## II. THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION

The arguments against the Messianic interpretation cannot be designated in any other way than as *insignificant*. There is not one among them which could be of any weight to him who is able to judge. It is asserted that the Messiah is nowhere else designated as the Servant of God. Even if this were the fact, it would not prove anything. But this name is assigned to the Messiah in Zech. 3:8—a passage which interpreters are unanimous in referring to the Messiah—where the Lord calls the Messiah His Servant *Zemach*, and which the Chaldee Paraphrast explains by ילגתיו אהישמ *“Messiam et revelabitur;”* farther, in Ezek. 34:23, 24, not to mention Is. 42:1, 49:3, 6, 50:10.—It is farther asserted that in the Messianic interpretation everything is viewed as *future*; but that this is inadmissible for grammatical and philological reasons. The suffering, contempt, and death of the Servant of God are here, throughout, represented as past, since in chap. 53:1-10, all the verbs are in the Preterite. It is the glorification only which appears as future, and is expressed in the Future tense. The writer, therefore, occupies a position between the sufferings and the glorification, and the latter is still impending. But the stand-point of the Prophet is not an actual, but a supposed one,—not a real, but an ideal one. In order to distinguish between condition and consequence,—in order to put sufferings and glorification in the proper relation, he takes his stand between the sufferings and the glorification of the Servant of God, and from that position, that appears to him as being already past which, in reality, was still future. It is only an interpreter so thoroughly prosaic as *Knobel* who can advance the assertion: “No prophet occupies, in prophecy, another stand-point than that which in reality he occupies.” In this, *e.g.*, *Hitzig* does not by any means assent to him; for he (*Hitzig*) remarks on chap. 52:7: “Proceeding from the certainty of the salvation, the Prophet sees, in the Spirit, that already coming to pass which, in chap. 40:9, he called upon them to do.” And the same expositor farther remarks on Jer. 6:24-26: “This is a statement of how people would then speak, and, thereby, a description of the circumstances of that time.” But in our remarks on chap. 11 and in the introduction to the second part, we have already proved that the prophets very frequently occupy an ideal stand-point, and that such is the case here, the Prophet has himself expressly intimated. In some places, he has passed from the prophetic stand-point to the historical, and uses the Future even when he speaks of the sufferings—a thing which appears to have been done involuntarily, but which, in reality, is done intentionally. Thus there occurs חתפי in ver. 7, מישת in ver. 10, and, according to the explanations of *Gesenius* and others, also עיגפי in ver. 12 while, on the other hand, he sometimes speaks of the glorification in the Preterite.<sup>28</sup> Compare חקל in ver. 8, אשנ in ver. 12. This affords a sure proof that we are here altogether on an ideal territory. The ancient translators too

have not understood the Preterites as a designation of the real Past, and frequently render them by Futures. Thus the LXX. ver. 14: ἐκστήσονται—ἀδοξήσει; *Aqui.* and *Theod.*, ver. 2, ἀναβήσεται.—It is farther asserted, that the idea of a suffering and expiating Messiah is foreign to the Old Testament, and stands in contradiction even to its prevailing views of the Messiah. But this objection cannot be of any weight; nor can it prove anything, as long as, in the Church of Christ, the authority of Christ is still acknowledged, who Himself declares that His whole suffering had been fore told in the books of the Old Testament, and explained to His disciples the prophecies concerning it. Even the fact, that at the time when Christ appeared the knowledge of a suffering Messiah was undeniably possessed by the more enlightened, proves that the matter stands differently. This knowledge is shown not only by the Baptist, but also by Simeon, Luke 2:34, 35. An assertion to the contrary can proceed only from the erroneous opinion, that every single Messianic prophecy exhibits the whole view of the Messiah, whereas, indeed, the Messianic announcements bear throughout a fragmentary, incidental character,—a mode of representation which is generally prevalent in Scripture, and by which Scripture is distinguished from a system of doctrines. But even if there had existed an appearance of such a contradiction, it would long ago have been removed by the fulfilment. But even the appearance of a contradiction is here inadmissible, inasmuch as the Servant of God is here not only represented as suffering and expiating, but, at the same time, as an object of reverence to the whole Gentile world; and the *ground* of this reverence is His suffering and expiation. As regards the other passages of the Old Testament where a suffering Messiah is mentioned, we must distinguish between the Messiah simply suffering, and the Messiah suffering as a substitute. The latter, indeed, we meet with in this passage only. But to make up for this isolated mention, the representation here is so full and exhaustive, so entirely excludes all misunderstanding, except that which is bent upon misunderstanding, or which is the result of evil disposition, is so affecting and so indelibly impressive, is indeed so exactly in the tone of doctrinal theology, and therefore different from the ordinary treatment, which is always incidental, and requires to be supplemented from other passages, that this single isolated representation, which sounds through the whole of the New Testament, is quite sufficient for the Church. The suffering and dying Messiah, on the other hand, we meet with frequently in other passages of the Old Testament also, although, indeed, not so frequently as the Messiah in glory. In this light He is brought before us, *e.g.*, in chap. 49:50; in Dan. 9; in Zech. 9:9, 10, 11:12, 13. The fact that the humiliation of Christ would precede His exaltation is distinctly pointed out in the first part of Isaiah also, in chap. 11:1,—a passage which contains, in a germ, all that, in the second part, is more fully stated regarding the suffering Messiah, and which has many striking points of contact specially with chap. 53. And just so it is with Isaiah's contemporary, Micah, who, in chap. 5:1 (2), makes the Messiah proceed, not from Jerusalem, the seat of the Davidic family after it was raised to the royal dignity, but from Bethlehem, where Jesse, the ancestor, lived as a peasant,—as a proof that the Messiah would proceed from the family of David sunk back into the obscurity of private life. This knowledge, that the Messiah should proceed from the altogether abased house of David,—a knowledge which appears as early as in Amos, and which pervades the whole of prophecy—touches very closely upon the knowledge of His sufferings. Lowliness of origin, and exaltation of destination, can hardly be reconciled without severe conflicts. But it is *a priori* impossible, that the idea of the suffering Messiah should be wanting in the Old Testament. Since, in the Old Testament, throughout, righteousness and suffering in this world of sin are represented as being indissolubly connected, the Messiah, being κατ' ἔξοχὴν the Righteous One, must necessarily appear also as He who suffers in the highest degree. If that were not the case, the Messiah would be totally disconnected from

all His types, especially from David, who, through the severest sufferings, attained to glory, and who in his Psalms, everywhere considers this course as the normal one, both in the Psalms which refer to the suffering righteous in general, and in those which especially refer to his family reaching their highest elevation in the Messiah; compare my Commentary on the Psalms, Vol. iv., p. lxxx ff.

-----

### III. THE ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION

Even the fact that this is among the Jews the Original interpretation, which was given up from their evil disposition only, makes us favourably inclined towards it. The authority of tradition is here of so much the greater consequence, the more that the Messianic interpretation was opposed to the disposition of the people. How deeply rooted was this interpretation, appears even from the declaration of John the Baptist, John 1:29: ἰδε ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. There cannot be any doubt that, in this declaration, he points to the prophecy under consideration, inasmuch as this passage is the first in Holy Scripture in which the sin-bearing lamb is spoken of in a spiritual sense. *Bengel*, following the example of *Erasmus*, remarks, in reference to the article before ἄμνός: “The article looks back to the prophecy which was given concerning Him under this figure, in Is. 53:7. As regards Θεοῦ, compare ver. 10: “It pleased the Lord painfully to crush Him,” and ver. 2: “Before Him;” as regards ὁ αἴρων, &c. comp. ver. 4, rendered by the LXX.: οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει; comp. ver. 11.

An external argument of still greater weight is the testimony of the New Testament. Above all, it is the declarations of our Lord himself which here come into consideration. In Luke 22:37, He says that the prophecies concerning Him were drawing near their perfect fulfilment (τὰπερὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος χει), comp. Matt. 26:51, and that therefore the declaration: “And He was reckoned among the transgressors” must be fulfilled in Him. In Mark 9:12, the Lord asks: πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθη καὶ ἐξουδενωθῆ; with a reference to “from man,” and “from the sons of man” in 52:14,—to “He had no form nor comeliness” in ver. 2,—to “despised,” דַּבְּרָה, which, by *Symmachus* and *Theodotian* is rendered by ἐξουδενωμένος, in ver. 3. In the Gospel of John, the Lord emphatically and repeatedly points out, that the words: “When His soul hath given restitution,” are written concerning Him; compare remarks on ver. 10. After these distinct quotations and references, we shall be obliged to think chiefly of our passage, in Luke 24:25-27, 44-46 also. The opponents themselves grant that, if in any passage of the Old Testament the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah is contained, it is in the passage under review. The circumstance also, that the disciples of the Lord refer, on every occasion, and with such confidence, the passage to the Lord, likewise proves that Christ especially interpreted it of His sufferings and exaltation. Of Matt. 8:17, and Mark 15:28, we have already spoken. John, in chap. 12:37, 38, and Paul in Rom. 10:16, find a fulfilment of chap. 53:1 in the unbelief of the Jews. In Acts 8:28-35, Philip, on the question of the eunuch from Ethiopia, as to whom the Prophecy referred, explained it of Christ. After the example of *De Wette*, *Gesenius* lays special stress on the circumstance, that the passage was never quoted in reference to the atoning death of Christ. But Peter, when speaking of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, makes a literal use of the principal passages of the prophecy under consideration, 1 Pet. 2:21-25; and it is, in general, quite the usual way of the New Testament to support its statements by our passage, when soever the discourse falls upon this subject; compare e.g., besides the texts

quoted at ver. 10, Mark 9:12; Rom. 4:25; 1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 John 3:5; 1 Pet. 1:19; Rev. 5:6, 13:8. Even *Gesenius* himself acknowledges elsewhere, that we have here the text for the whole Apostolic preaching on the atoning death of Jesus. "Most Hebrew readers"—so he says, Th. iii, S. 191—"who were so familiar with the ideas of sacrifice and substitution, could not by any means understand the passage in any other way; and there is no doubt that the whole apostolic notion of the atoning death of Christ is chiefly based upon this passage." The circumstance, that the reference to this passage appears commonly only in the form of an allusion, and not of express quotation, proves only so much the more clearly, that its reference to the atoning death of Christ was a point absolutely settled in the ancient Church.

In favour of the Messianic interpretation are not only the passages from the second part, chap. 42, &c., but also, from the first part, the passage chap. 11:1, which so remarkably agrees with chap. 53:2, that both must be referred to the same subject.

To these external reasons, the internal must be added. The Christian Church—the best judge—has at all times recognised in this prophecy the faithful and wonderfully accurate image of her Lord and Saviour in His atoning sufferings and the glory following upon them, in His innocence and righteousness, in His meekness and silent patience (the New Testament, in speaking of them, frequently points back to our passage), and in the burial with a rich man, ver. 9. The most characteristic feature is the atoning character of the suffering the Servant of God, and of the shedding of His blood. Several interpreters have endeavoured to explain away this feature which they dislike. *Kimchi* says: "One must not imagine that the case really stands thus, that in Israel the captivity actually bears the sins and diseases of the heathens (for that would be opposed to the justice of God), but that the Gentiles at that time, when seeing the glorious deliverance of Israel, would thus judge concerning it." A futile evasion! It is not the Gentiles who speak in chap. 53:1-10, but the believing Church. Every sincere reader will at once feel, that it is not the foolish fancies of others which the Prophet communicates in these verses, but the divine truth made known to him. The doctrine of the substitution, the Prophet, moreover, states in his own name, by saying, "He shall sprinkle many nations;" and so likewise in the name of God, in chap. 53:11, 12. According to *Martini*, *De Wette*, and others, the expressions are to be understood figuratively, and the contents and substance to be this only, that those severe calamities which that divine minister would have to sustain would be useful and salutary to His compatriots. But the fact that the same doctrine constantly returns under the most varied expressions, is decidedly in favour of the literal interpretation. Thus, it is said in chap. 52:15, that the Servant of God should sprinkle many nations; in 53:4, that He bore our diseases and took upon Him our pains; in ver. 5, that He was pierced for our transgressions; in ver. 8, that He bore the punishment which the people ought to have borne; in ver. 10, that He offered his soul as a sin-offering; in ver. 11, that by His righteousness many should be justified; in ver. 12, that He bore the sins of many, and poured out His soul unto death, and that He could make intercession for transgressors, because He was numbered with them. To this it may still be added that in chap. 52:15 (מִשָּׂא) 53:10 (הִזִּי), and ver. 12: "He bears the sins of many," (compare Levit. 16:21, 22; *Michaelis*: "*Ut typice hircus pro Israëlitis*") the Servant of God appears as the antitype of the Old Testament sin-offerings in which, as has been proved (compare my pamphlet: *Die Opfer der heil. Schrift*, S. 12 ff.), the idea of substitution in the doctrine of the Old Testament finds its foundation. There cannot be the least doubt, that the Prophet could not express himself more clearly, strongly, and distinctly, if his intention was to state the doctrine of substitution: and those who undertake to explain it away, would not,

by so doing, have anything firm and certain in Scripture. *Rosenmüller* (*Gabler's Journal*, ii. S. 365), *Gesenius*, *Hitzig* have indeed candidly confessed that the passage contained the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction, after *Alshech* had, among the Jews, given the honour to truth.

-----

#### IV. EXAMINATION OF THE NON-MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION

Passing over mere whims, three explanations present themselves which require a closer examination, viz.— (1), that which makes the whole Jewish people the subject: (2), that which refers it to the godly portion of the Jewish people; and (3) that which refers it to the collective body of the Prophets. The following reasons militate against all the three interpretations simultaneously.

1. According to them, the contents of the section in question present themselves as a mere *fancy*; and its principal thought, the vicarious suffering of the Servant of God is an absurdity. According to them, the prophets can no longer be considered as godly men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and their name אִיבֹנָה, by which they claimed divine inspiration, is a mere pretence. And this reflection is, at the same time, cast upon the Lord, who, throughout, treats these visionaries as organs of immediate divine communications.
2. According to all the three explanations, the subject is not a real person, but an ideal one, a personified collective. But not one sure analogous instance can be quoted in favour of a personification carried on through a whole section, without the slightest intimation, that it is not a single individual who is spoken of. In ver. 3, the subject is called אִישׁ; in vers. 10 and 12 a soul is ascribed to Him; grave and death are used so as to imply a subject in the Singular. Scripture never leaves any thing to be guessed. If we had an allegory before us, distinct hints as to the interpretation would certainly not be wanting. It is, *e.g.* quite different in those passages where the Prophet designates Israel by the name of the Servant of the Lord. In them, all uncertainty is prevented by the addition of the names of Jacob and Israel, 41:8, 9; 44:1, 2, 21; 45:4; 48:20; and in them, moreover, the Prophet uses the Plural by the side of the Singular, to intimate that the Servant of the Lord is an ideal person, a collective, *e.g.*, 42:24, 25; 48:20, 21; 43:10-14.
3. The first condition of the vicarious satisfaction which, according to our prophecy, is to be performed by the Servant of God, is, according to ver. 9 (“Because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth”), but more especially still, according to ver. 11 (“He, the righteous one, my Servant, shall justify the many”) the absolute righteousness of the suffering subject. He who is himself sinful cannot undergo punishment for the sins of others. He is, on the contrary, visited for his own sins, both as a righteous retribution, and for sanctification. Of such an one that would indeed be true which, according to the second clause of ver. 4, was only erroneously supposed in reference to the Servant of God. All the three interpretations, however, are unable to prove that this condition existed. All the three interpretations move on the purely human territory; but on that, absolute righteousness is not to be found. At the very threshold of Holy Writ, in Gen. 2 and 3, comp. 5:3, the doctrine of the universal sinfulness of mankind meets us; and how deep a knowledge of sin pervades the Old Testament, is proved by passages such as Gen. 6:5, 8:21; Job 14:4, 15:14-16; Ps. 14, 51:7; Prov. 20:9. That is not a soil on which ideas of substitution could thrive.—The doctrine of a substitution by men

is indeed nowhere else found in the Old Testament; and *Gesenius*, who (1. c., S. 189) endeavoured to prove that "it is very general" has not adduced any arguments which are tenable or even plausible. The guilt of the fathers is visited upon the children, only when the latter walk in the steps of their fathers, and the latter are first punished; comp. *Genuineness and Authenticity of the Pentateuch*, Vol. ii. p. 446 ff. The same holds true in reference to 2 Sam. 21:1-14. The evil spirit which filled Saul, pervaded his family, at the same time, as we here see in the instance of Michal. It was probably in the interest of his family, and with their concurrence, that the wicked deed had been perpetrated. (*Michaelis* says: "In order that he might appropriate their goods to himself and to *his family*, under the pretext of pious zeal for Judah and Israel.") As Saul himself was already overtaken by the divine judgment, the crime was punished in the family who were accomplices. In 2 Sam. 24 the people do not suffer as substitutes for the sin, which David had committed in numbering the people; but the spirit of pride which had incited the king to number the people, was widely spread among them. But the fact, that the king himself was punished in his subjects, is brought out by his beseeching the Lord, in 2 Sam. 24:17, that He might rather visit the sin directly upon himself. The sin of David and Bathsheba is not atoned for by the death of the child (2 Sam. 12:15-18), for David had already obtained pardon, ver. 13. It is not the child which suffers, but David, whose repentance was to be deepened by this visitation. In the fact, that the whole army must suffer for what Achan has committed (Josh. 7:1), a distinct intimation is implied, that the criminal does not stand alone, but that, to a certain degree, the whole community was implicated in his guilt. Substitution is quite out of the question, inasmuch as Achan himself, with his whole family and posterity, was burnt. Least of all, finally, can Dan. 11:35 come into consideration. According to *Gesenius*, it is there said: "And they of understanding shall fall, in order to purge, purify, and make white those (the others)." But *הַבָּרִים* refers rather to the *מִלִּיכְשָׁם* themselves. Thus, nowhere in the Old Testament, is even the slightest trace found of a satisfaction to be accomplished by man for man; nor can it be found there, because, from its very commencement, Scripture most emphatically declares; *πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι*, Rom. 3:9.

The explanation, which makes the *Jewish people* the subject, has already been overthrown by the parallel passages, before arriving at the section under consideration. "Even so far back as chap. 42:1, difficulties are met with," remarks *Beck*. "How is it possible that the people who, in ver. 19 of that chapter, are described as blind and deaf, should here appear as being altogether penetrated by the Spirit, so as to become the teachers of the Gentiles?" "Chap. 49 is a true cross for the interpreters." "Finally, the section, chap. 50, *Hitzig* himself is obliged to explain as referring to the Prophet; and thus this interpretation forfeits the boast of most strictly holding fast the unity of this notion."

But still more decisively is the interpretation overthrown by the contents of the section under discussion. The Servant of God has, according to it, voluntarily taken upon Himself His sufferings (according to ver. 10, He offers himself as a sacrifice for sin; according to ver. 12, He is crowned with glory because He has poured out His soul unto death). Himself sinless, He bears the sins of others, vers. 4-6, 9. His sufferings are the means by which the justification of many is effected. He suffers quietly and patiently, ver. 7. Not one of these four signs can be vindicated for the people of Israel. (a). The Jews did not go voluntarily into the Babylonish exile, but were dragged into it by force, (b). The Jewish people were not without sin in suffering; but they suffered, in the captivity, the punishment of their own sins. Their being carried away had been foretold by Moses as a punitive judgment, Lev. 26:14 ff.; Deut. 28:15 ff., 29:19 ff., and as such it is announced

by all the prophets also. In the second part, Isaiah frequently reminds Judah that they shall be cast into captivity by divine justice, and be delivered from it by divine mercy only; comp. chaps. 56-59, especially chap. 59:2: "Your iniquities separate between you and your God, and your sins hide His face from you that He doth not hear. For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity, your-lips speak lies, and your tongue meditates perverseness. Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood, their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity, wasting and destruction are in their paths. The way of peace they know not, and there is no right in their paths; they pervert their paths; whosoever goeth therein doth not know peace. Apostasy and denying the Lord, and departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt, conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood." Compare chap. 42:24: "Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? Did not the Lord, He against whom we have sinned, and in whose ways they would not walk, neither were they obedient unto His law." Farther, chap. 43:26, 27, where the detailed proof that Israel's merits could not be the cause of their deliverance, inasmuch as they did not exist at all, is, by the Prophet, wound up by the words: "Put me in remembrance, let us plead together, declare then that thou mayest be justified. Thy first father hath sinned, and thy mediators have transgressed against me. Therefore I profane the princes of the sanctuary, and give Jacob to the destruction, and Israel to reproaches." It is solely to the mercy of God that, according to chap. 48:11, Israel owes deliverance from the severe suffering into which they fell in the way of their sins. One may confidently assert there is not a single page in the whole book, which does not offer a striking refutation of this view. And most miserable are the expedients to which, in the face of such facts, the defenders of this view betake themselves. *Rosenmüller* was of opinion, that the Prophet introduced those Gentiles only as speaking, who, by this flattery, wished to gain the favour of the Jews,—without considering that it is just in the words of the Lord, in ver. 11, that the absolute righteousness of the Servant of God is most strongly expressed. *Hitzig* is of opinion, that the people had indeed suffered for their sins; but that the punishment had been greater than their sins, and that by this surplus the Gentiles were benefited. But the Prophet expressly contradicts such a gross view. He repeatedly declares that the punishment was still mitigated by mercy; that, in the way of their works, Israel would have found total destruction. Thus, *e.g.*, chap. 48:9: "For my name's sake will I be long-suffering, and for my praise will I moderate mine anger unto thee, that I cut thee not off;" chap. 1:9: "Except the Lord of Hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom; we should have been like unto Gomorrah." In order to be fully convinced how much this view of Israel, enforced upon the godly men of the Old Testament, is in contradiction to their own view, the prayer of Ezra may still be compared in Neh. 9, especially ver. 20 ff.—(c.) The sufferings of the Jewish people cannot be vicarious, because they are destitute of the very first condition of substitution, *viz.*, sinlessness and righteousness. That even *Hitzig* does not venture to claim for them. But how can an ungodly man, even supposing that his punishment is too severe, justify others by a righteousness of his which does not exist? *Finally*—The fourth sign, patience, so little belongs to the Jewish people, that it is one of the main tasks of our Prophet himself to oppose their murmuring impatience; comp. *e.g.*, chap. 45:9 ff.

Against the hypothesis that the people are the subject of the prophecy, there is the circumstance that it carries along with it the unnatural supposition that, in chap. 53:1-10, the heathens are introduced as speaking. Decisive against this supposition are specially the designation *נַמְי* in ver. 8, and the most forced explanation to which it compels us, in some verses, especially ver. 2.

The interpretation which considers the godly portion of the people to be the subject of the prophecy, is overthrown by the fact that, according to the view of Scripture, even those who, in the ordinary sense, are righteous, are unable to render a vicarious satisfaction for others. For such, absolute righteousness is required. But the "righteous ones" are begotten by sinful seed (Ps. 51), and they have need daily to pray that God would pardon their secret sins, Ps. 19:13; they themselves live only by the pardoning mercy of God, and cannot think of atoning for others, Ps. 32. Even for believers, the captivity is, according to chap. 42, the merited punishment of their sins. In that passage, the greatness of the mercy of God is pointed out, who grants a twofold salvation for sins, while infinite punishment should be their natural consequence. It is not to a single portion of the people, but to the whole, that, in the passages formerly quoted, every share in effecting deliverance and salvation is denied. How little an absolute righteousness existed in the elect, sufficiently appears from the fact, that, in the second part, it forms a main object of the Prophet to oppose their want of courage, their despair and distrust of God. *Farther*—The ungodly could not by any means consider the sufferings of the righteous ones as a vicarious, because they themselves suffered as much; and as little could they despise the godly on account of their sufferings. It is a mere invention, destitute of every historical foundation, to assert that it was especially the God-fearing who had to suffer so grievously in the captivity. On the contrary, their fear of God gained for them the respect of the Gentiles; and among their own people also, whose sinful disposition was broken by the punishment, they occupied an honourable position. Ezekiel we commonly find surrounded by the elders of the people, listening to his words; and Daniel, Esther, and Mordecai, Ezra, and Nehemiah, richly furnished with the goods of this world, enjoyed high esteem in the Gen tile world. The fact that the supporters of this hypothesis are compelled to have recourse to such an unhistorical fiction, which has been carried to the extreme, especially by *Knobel*, sufficiently proves it to be untenable.

In opposition to the interpretation which refers the prophecy to the collective body of the Prophets, *Hitzig* very justly re marks: "The supposition that, by the Servant of God, the prophetic order is to be understood, is destitute of all foundation and probability." In commenting on chap. 42 we remarked, that there are no analogous cases at all in favour of such a personification of the prophetic order. Moreover, the defenders of this view commonly deny, at the same time, the genuineness of the second part. From this standpoint it becomes still more evident, how untenable this hypothesis is. A prophetic order can, least of all, be spoken of during the time of the Babylonish captivity. With the captivity, Prophetism began to die out. Jeremiah in Jerusalem, and Ezekiel among the exiled, already stood very much isolated. Jeremiah, during the last days of the Jewish state, stands out everywhere as a single individual, opposed to the whole mass of the false prophets. "There is no more any prophet," is, at the time of the destruction by the Chaldeans, the lamentation of the author of Ps. 74 in ver. 9. According to an unanimous tradition (comp. 1 Maccab. 9:27, 4:46, 14:41, and the passages from the Talmud and other Jewish writings in *Knibbe's* history of the Prophets, S. 347 ff., and in *Joh. Smithi Dissert de Prophetis*, in the Appendix to *Clericus' Commentary on the Prophets*, chap. xii.), Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi were the last of the prophets, and according to the historical books and their own prophecies, the only prophets of their time. How, now, were it possible that the Prophet should speak of a great corporation of the prophets, who become not only the founders and rulers of the new state, but who are to enlighten all the other nations of the earth with the light of the true religion, and incorporate them into the church of God? Of all that is characteristic of the vocation of the prophets, nothing is found here; while, on the other hand, almost everything which is said of the Servant of

God is in opposition to the vocation and destination of the prophets. That which here, above everything, comes into consideration is the *vicarious satisfaction*. Chap. 6, where the Prophet when, after having administered the prophetic office for several years, he beheld the Lord, exclaims: “Woe is unto me for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips,” is sufficient to show how far the thoughts of such a vicarious satisfaction were from the prophets. Such is surely not the ground from which the delusion of being substitutes for others can grow up. All those who entertained such a delusion, such as *Gichtel*, *Bourignon*, *Guyon*, were misled into it by proudly shutting their eyes to their own sinfulness, It would surely be abasing the prophets without any cause, if we were to assign to them that delusion. Moreover, the hopes which here, according to these interpreters, are uttered in reference to the prophetic order, contradict its idea and institution. A prophetic pride would here come out, such as is not equalled by priestly pride in all history. *Schenkel*, no doubt, is right in remarking against the interpretation which makes the Jewish people the subject of the prophecy,—an interpretation of which *Hitzig* is the representative: “Is it to be believed that the prophets, whose object all along it was to suppress the moral pride of the people, should wantonly have awakened it by such a thought?” But *Hitzig* is equally in the right when, in opposition to *Schenkel* and others who refer this prediction to the prophetic order, he remarks: “It is quite obvious, how very unsuitable it would be to limit the hitherto wretched condition and the future glory of the people to the prophets, as if they alone, as true κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων, constituted the people.” According to this hypothesis, the prophets are supposed to flatter themselves with the hope that they would be the rulers of the state again flourishing, and would celebrate worldly triumphs. Altogether apart from the folly of this hope, it was entirely opposed to the destiny of the prophetic order. By divine institution, the dominion in the Kingdom of God had for ever been given over to David and his family. By usurping it, the prophets would have rebelled against God, whose rights they were called to uphold.—*Farther*, As the principal sphere of the ministry of the Servant of God, the heathen world here appears. But with it, the prophets have, nowhere else, any thing to do; their mission is everywhere to Israel only.—The sufferings which the prophets had to endure during the captivity, were not different from those of the people. Every proof, yea, even every probability, is wanting that, during the time of the captivity, the prophets—and history mentions and knows only Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel—were pre-eminently afflicted. On the contrary, they occupy an honourable position. Jeremiah receives, after the capture of Jerusalem, proofs of esteem from Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel is entrusted with the highest public offices. Ezekiel is held in honour by his compatriots. How then could the people despise the prophets on account of their sufferings? How could they imagine that they had been smitten by God? How could they afterwards conceive the idea that the sufferings of the prophets had a vicarious character?—To what quarter soever we look, impossibilities present themselves; and if, moreover, we also look at the parallel passages, we must indeed wonder, that a hypothesis altogether so untenable should ever have been listened to.

## **CHAPTER 55:1-5**

The Lord exhorts those who are anxious to be saved, to appropriate the blessings of salvation which are so liberally offered, and which, although bestowed without money and price, can alone truly satisfy the soul, vers. 1 and 2. For He is to make with them a covenant of everlasting duration, in which the eternal mercy promised to the family of David is to be realized, ver. 3. David—such is the salvation in store for the Church—is to

be a witness, prince, and lawgiver of all the Gentiles who, with joyful readiness, shall unite themselves to Israel.

Ver. 1. "*Ho, all ye that thirsty come ye to the water, and ye that have no silver, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without silver and without price.*"

The discourse is addressed to the members of the Church pining away in misery. By the water, salvation is denoted, as is not unfrequently the case, comp. chap. 12:3: "And with joy ye shall draw water out of the wells of salvation," 44:3; Ps. 87:7, 89:7, 107:35. The thirsty one is he who stands in need of salvation. To the words: "Ho, all ye that thirst, come ye to the water," the Lord refers in John 7:37: ἂν τις διψῶ ἐρξέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω, where the πρὸς με had been added from ver. 3. It is to be observed that Christ there appropriates to himself what Jehovah is here speaking. *Michaelis* says: "Christ, in consequence of the highest identity, makes the words of the Father His own." There is an evident reference to the same words in Rev. 21:6 also: ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι δώσω ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς δωρεάν. Similarly in Rev. 22:17: καὶ ὁ διψῶν ἐρχέσθω, ὁ θέλων λαβέτω ὕδωρ ζωῆς δωρεάν. In a somewhat more distant relation to the words before us, but yet undeniably depending upon them, is John 4:10: σὺ ἂν ἤτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἅν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν. Vers. 13, 14: πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει πάλιν· ὃς δ' ἂν πίη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, οὐ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. And so does, in another aspect, Matt. 11:28: δεῦτε πρὸς με οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς, which, however, has still nearer points of resemblance to ver. 3; for δεῦτε πρὸς με corresponds to וכו' אֵלַי in that verse; the words κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς, to: "Your soul shall live" there, but yet in such a way that there is, at the same time, a reference to Jer. 6:16; the κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι are the thirsty ones in the verse before us. It is remarkable to see how important this unassuming declaration was to our Lord, and how much He had it at heart. We are thereby urgently called upon, by means of deep and earnest study and meditation, to arrive at the full meaning of the Old Testament, which is everywhere connected with the New Testament, not only by the strong and firm ties of express quotations, but also by the nicest and most tender threads of gentle allusions. Even Matt. 5:6: μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, comes into a close relation to our passage, as soon as it is recognized that δικαιοσύνην is not the subjective righteousness which is excluded from that context, but rather righteousness as a gift of God, the actual justification, such as takes place in the bestowal of salvation; so that, hence, the righteousness there corresponds with the *water* here. The subsequent "eat" furnishes the foundation for the fact, that the need of and desire for salvation, is designated by *hunger* also,—"*Come ye, buy and eat.*" רבש "to break," is used of the appeasing of thirst (comp. Ps. 104:11), and hunger (comp. Gen. 42:19); and corn is called רֶבֶשׁ for this reason that it breaks the hunger. The verb never means "to buy" in general, but only such a buying as affords the means of appeasing hunger and thirst. Nor does it, in itself, stand in any relation to corn, except in so far only as the latter is a chief means of appeasing hunger. This we see not only from Ps. 104:11, but also from that which here immediately follows, where it is used of the buying of wine and milk. The buying of necessary provisions is commonly designated by the *Kal*; the selling by the *Hiphil*. In Gen. 41:26, the selling too is designated by the *Kal*. He who causes that one can break or appease, may himself also be designated as he who breaks or appeases. This verb, so very peculiar, and the noun רֶבֶשׁ, occur in a certain accumulation, in the history of Joseph only; elsewhere, their occurrence is sporadic only. It is then to the hunger of Israel in ancient times, and to its being appeased by Joseph, that the double רבש alludes; and from this

circumstance also the fact is to be explained, that it is first used in reference to food; comp. *בש ולכאז ורבש* in our verse, with *לכא רבש* in Gen. 42:7-10. Christ is the true Joseph, who puts an end to the hunger and thirst of the people of God, by offering true food and true drink.—The word “eat” suggests substantial food, bread in contrast to the drink by which it is surrounded on both sides; comp. John 6:35: *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ (שבש) καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ πώποτε.* Ver. 55: *ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθῶς ἐστὶ βρῶσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθῶς ἐστὶ πόσις.* From the sequel (comp. vers. 6, 7), it appears that the thrice repeated *coming* and the *buying* are accomplished by true repentance, the *μετάνοια*, which is the indispensable condition of the participation in the salvation. In John 6:35, the words: *ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς με* are explained by: *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ.* Faith is the soul of repentance.—The circumstance that the buying is done without money, intimates that the blessings of salvation are a pure gift of divine grace. These blessings of salvation are first designated by water; after wards, by *wine* and *milk*,—thus approximating to those passages in which the blessings of the Kingdom of Christ appear under the image of a rich repast, to which the members of the Kingdom are invited as guests, Ps. 22:26-30; Matt. 8:11, 22:2; Luke 14:16; Rev. 19:9.—Some Rationalistic interpreters understand, by the offered blessings, the salutary admonitions of the Prophet; but decisive against these are vers. 3 and 11, according to which it is not present, but future blessings, not words, but real things which are spoken of, viz., the salvation which is to be brought through Christ. What that is which constitutes the substance of this salvation, we learn from chap. 53. It is the redemption and reconciliation by the Servant of God. Yet we must not, after the manner of several ancient interpreters, limit ourselves to the “evangelical righteousness.” On the contrary, the whole fulness of the salvation in Christ is comprehended in it; and according to vers. 4 and 5, this includes the dominion over the world by the Kingdom of God, —its dominion over the Gentile world, and the investiture of its members with the full liberty and glory of the children of God.

Ver. 2. *“Wherefore do ye weigh money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which satisfieth not? Hearken, hearken unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness.”*

From ver. 3, we see that it is not the Prophet, but the Lord who speaks. “That which is not bread,” and “that which satisfieth not,” is something which outwardly has the appearance of good and nutritious food, and to obtain which the hungry ones therefore strive, and exert themselves with all their might, but which afterwards shows itself to be food in appearance only, and which has not the power of satisfying. “That which is not bread,” is, in the first instance, the imagined salvation which they sought to obtain from idols for much money. This appears from the intentional literal reference to chap. 46:6, where the Prophet reproves the folly of those who, in the face of the living God, “lavish gold out of the bag, and weigh silver in the balance, and hire a goldsmith, that he make it a god, work also and fall down.” With perfect justice *Stier* remarks: “Notwithstanding the connection with, and allusion to, the circumstances of that time, the word of the Prophet is to be understood in a general, spiritual way, as a melancholy, bitter lamentation over the general misery, and man’s deep-rooted perverseness in running with effort and exertion, after that which is pernicious to the soul, and in serving some Baal better than Jehovah. “Fatness” occurs as a figurative designation of the glorious gifts of God, in Ps. 36:9 also.

Ver. 3. *“Incline your ears and come unto me, hear and your soul shall live, and I will grant to you an everlasting covenant, the constant mercies of David.”*

The introductory words allude, in a graceful manner, to two Messianic psalms, and remind us of the fact, that the prophecy before us moves on the same ground as these psalms. On “incline your ear, and come unto me, hear,” comp. Ps. 45:11: “Hear, O daughter, and see, and *incline thine ear* (from the fundamental passage, the Singular is here retained), and forget thy people and thy father’s house.” On “your soul shall live,” comp. Ps. 22:27: “The meek shall eat and be satisfied, they shall praise the Lord that seek Him, *your heart shall live for ever.*” Analogous are the references to Ps. 72 in chap. 11. The soul *dies* in care and grief. In the words: “I will grant to you,” &c., there follow the glad tidings which are to heal the dying hearts, הַיְרִיב הַרְבֵּה is used of God, even where no reciprocal agreement takes place, but where He simply confers grace; because every grace which He bestows imposes, at the same time, an obligation, and may hence be considered as a covenant. The onesidedness is, in such a case, indicated by the construction with לְ, comp. chap. 61:8: “And I give them their reward in truth, and I make (grant) to them an everlasting covenant,” Jer. 32:40; Ezek. 34:25; Ps. 89:4. Since *to make a covenant* is here identical with *granting mercy*, הַיְרִיב הַרְבֵּה may also be connected with the subsequent “the constant mercies of David,” and there is no necessity for supposing a Zeugma. The everlasting covenant here, is the new covenant in Jer. 31:31-34; for the words “I will make” show that, here too, a new covenant is spoken of. The substance of the covenant to be made is expressed in the words: “The constant mercies of David,” &c. By “David,” many interpreters here understand the descendant of David, the Messiah, who, in other passages also, e.g., Jer. 30:9, bears the name of His type. Even *Abenezra* refers to the fact that, in ver. 4, the Messiah is necessarily required as the subject. The *constant* mercies of David are, according to this view—in parallelism with the “everlasting covenant”—the mercies constantly continuing, in contrast to the merely transitory mercies, such as had been those of the first David. According to the opinion of other interpreters, David designates here, as in Hos. 3:5, the family of David who, in Ps. 18, and in a series of other psalms, speaks in the name of his whole family. As regards the sense, this explanation arrives at the same result. For, according to it, the Messiah is He in whom the Davidic house attains to its full destiny, the channel through which the mercies of David flow in upon the Church. For the latter interpretation, however, is decisive the evident reference to the divine promise to David, in 2 Sam. 7, especially vers. 15, 16: “And my mercy shall not depart from him (thy race) . . . and constant (נִצְחָנָה) is thine house, and thy kingdom for ever before thee, thy throne shall be firm for ever; compare Ps. 89:29: “My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant is constant in him.” Ps. 89:2, 50: “Lord, where are thy former mercies which thou swarest unto David in thy truth?” likewise suggest that, by David, not simply Christ is to be understood, but the Davidic family. The constant mercies of David are, accordingly, the mercies which have been sworn to the Davidic house as *constant*, which, therefore, can never rest until Christ has appeared with His everlasting Kingdom, in which they find their true and full realization. In the expectation of the Messiah from the house of David, the prophecy under consideration goes hand in hand with chap. 11:1, where the Messiah appears as a twig which proceeds from the cut-down tree of Jesse; and with chap. 9:6, according to which He sits on the throne of David. This passage alone is fully sufficient against those (*Ewald, Umbreit*, and others) who advance the strange assertion, that the Prophet had altogether given up the idea of a Messiah from the house of David, and had distributed His property between Cyrus and the prophetic order, or the pious portion of the people. It is of the greatest importance for the explanation of those passages which treat of the Servant of God, and forms a point of union for the Messianic passages of the first and second part. The passage before us is quoted in Acts 13:34: ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, οὕτως, εἶρηκεν· ὅτι δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ

ὄσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά. Ὅσια Δαυὶδ are the sacred, inviolable, inalienably guaranteed mercies and blessings which have been promised to the house of David. As certainly as these must be granted, so certainly Christ, who was to bring them, could not remain in the power of death.

Ver. 4. *“Behold, I give him for a witness to the people, for a prince and lawgiver of the people.”*

Here, and in ver. 5, we have the expansion of the mercies of David. Their greatness and glory appear from the circumstance that, around his scion, the whole heathen world, which hitherto was hostile and pernicious to the Church of God, will gather. The Suffix in וְיָתֵת can refer only to David, or the family of David. From the connection with chap. 53, it appears that it is in his descendant, the righteous One, to whom the heathen and their kings do homage, that David will attain to the dignity here announced. וְיָתֵת has no other signification than “witness.” Every true doctrine bears the character of a witness. The teacher sent by God does not teach on his own authority, ἃ μὲ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, but only witnesses what he has seen and heard. With a reference to, and in explanation of the passage before us, Christ says to Pilate, in John 18:37: “For this end was I born, and for this cause I came into the world, that I should bear *witness* unto the truth.” And the passages, Rev. 1:5: “And from Jesus Christ who is the faithful witness.” and Rev. 3:14: “These things says the Amen, the faithful and true witness,” likewise point back to the passage before us; compare farther, John 3:11, 32, 33. In John 18:37, Rev. 1:5, His being a witness is, just as in the passage before us, connected with His being a King; so that the reference to this passage cannot be at all doubtful. It is intentionally that וְיָתֵת is put at the head. It is intended to intimate that the future dominion of the Davidic dynasty over the heathen world shall be essentially different from that which, in former times, it exercised over some neighbouring people. It is not based upon the power of arms, but upon the power of truth. He in whom the Davidic dynasty is to centre shall connect the prophetic with the regal office; just as already, in the prophecy of the Shiloh, in Gen. 49:10, the prophetic office is concealed behind the royal. The contrast to the first David can the less be doubtful, that, while וְיָתֵת is never applied to him, it is just the subsequent וְיָתֵת which, in a series of passages, is ascribed to him. In 2 Sam. 6:21, David himself says that the Lord appointed him to be *ruler* over the people of the Lord, over Israel; in 2 Sam. 7:8, Nathan says: “I took thee from the sheep-cot to be *ruler* over my people, over Israel;” compare 1 Sam. 25:30; 2 Sam. 5:5. In those passages, however, David is always spoken of as a ruler over Israel; so that even as regards the וְיָתֵת, the second David, the prince of the *people*, is not only placed on a level with the first David, but is elevated above him. For the dominion by force which David exercised over some heathen nations, וְיָתֵת was the less appropriate designation, inasmuch as it designates the ruler as the chief of his people.

Ver. 5. *“Behold, thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of the Lord thy God, and of the Holy One of Israel, for He adorneth thee.”*

The words here are addressed to the true Israel, to the exclusion of those souls who are cut off from among their people, compare Ps. 73:1, where Israel and those that are of a clean heart go hand in hand,—and, in substance, they also were addressed in vers. 1 and 2. For the thirsty ones, who are there called upon to partake of the blessings so liberally offered by the Lord, are just the members of the Church. In connection with that glorification of David, the Church shall invite nations from a great distance, who were

hitherto unknown to it, to its communion; and those nations who hitherto scarcely knew by name the Church of God shall joyfully and willingly comply with the invitation; compare chap. 2:2. This great change proceeds from the Lord, the Almighty and Holy One, who, as the protector and Covenant-God of His Church, has resolved to glorify it; *for He adorneth thee*. This glorification consists, according to chap. 4:2, in the appearance of Christ, the immediate consequence of which is the conversion of the heathen world.

We must now review that exposition by which Rationalism has endeavoured to deprive our passage of its Messianic import,—an attempt in which *Grotius* led the way. *Gesenius*, whom *Hitzig*, *Maurer*, *Ewald*, and *Knobel* follow, translates in vers. 3 and 4: “That I may make with you an everlasting covenant, may show to you constant mercies, as once to David. Behold, I have made him a ruler of the nations, a prince and lawgiver of the nations,” and refers both of the verses to the first David. In ver. 5, then, the mercy is to follow which, in some future time, God will bestow upon the whole people, as gloriously as once upon the single David. But this explanation proves itself to be, in every aspect, untenable.<sup>29</sup>

We are the less entitled to put “mercies *like* David’s” instead of “the mercies of David,” that these mercies are, elsewhere also, mentioned in reference to the eternal dominion promised to David for his family; compare Ps. 89:2, 50. With the epithet, “constant,” these interpreters do not know what to do. Apart from the promise of the eternal dominion of his house, no constant mercies can, in the case of David, be pointed out which would be equally bestowed upon the people, and upon him. Moreover, **סִימָנוֹ** distinctly points back to 2 Sam. 7. Ver. 4 forms, according to this explanation, “a historical reminiscence, most unsuitable in the flow of a prophetic discourse” (*Umbreit*). But what in itself is quite conclusive is the circumstance, that the first David could not by any possibility be designated as the *witness* of the Gentile nations. It indeed sounds rather *naïve* that *Knobel*, after having endeavoured to explain **וְד** of the “opening up of the law,” feels himself obliged to add: “The word does not, however, occur anywhere else in this signification.” Nor could David, without farther limitation, be designated as “the prince and lawgiver of the *peoples*,” and that so much the more that, in ver. 5, there is an invitation to the Gentile world, and that, in ver. 4, too, the Gentile world, in the widest sense, is to be thought of.

After the promise, there follows, in vers. 6-13, the admonition to repentance based upon it. Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand, vers. 6, 7. Do not doubt that the Kingdom of heaven is at hand, because it does not seem probable to you. For the counsels of God go beyond all the thoughts of men; and, therefore, He and His work must not be judged by a human measure, vers. 8, 9. With Him, word and deed are inseparably connected, vers. 10, 11. This will be manifested in your redemption and glorification, vers. 12, 13.

### **THE PROPHECY, CHAP. 61:1-3**

As in chaps. 49 and 50, so here, the Servant of God is introduced as speaking, and announces to the Church what a glorious office the Lord had bestowed upon Him, namely, to deliver them from the misery in which they had hitherto been lying, and to work a wonderful change in their condition. In vers. 4-9, the Prophet takes the word, and

describes the salvation to be bestowed by the Servant of God. In vers. 10 and 11, the Church appears, and expresses her joy and gratitude.

According to the Jewish and Rationalistic interpreters, the Prophet himself is supposed to be speaking in vers. 1-3. That opinion was last expressed by *Knobel*: "The author places before his promises a remembrance of his vocation as a preacher of consolation." In favour of the Messianic interpretation, in which our Lord himself preceded His Church (Luke 4:17-19), are conclusive, not only the parallel passages, but also the contents of the prophecy itself, which go far beyond the prophetic territory, and the human territory generally. The speaker designates himself as He who is called, not merely to announce the highest blessings to the Church, but actually to grant them. He does not represent himself as a mere Evangelist, but rather as a Saviour.

Ver. 1. *"The Spirit, of the Lord Jehovah is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach glad tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and opening to them that are bound."*

On the words: "The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me," compare chap. 11:2, 42:1. **וְעַי** always means "because of." The whole succeeding clause stands instead of a noun, so that, in substance, "because of" is equivalent to "because;" but it never can mean "therefore." Nor would the latter signification afford a good sense. The verb **חַשַּׁמְ** must, in that case, be subjected to arbitrary explanations. The anointing, whether it occurs as a symbolical action really carried out, or as a mere figure, is always a designation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit; compare 1 Sam. 10:1, 16:13, 14, and remarks on Dan. 9:24. Since, then, the anointing is identical with the bestowal of the Spirit, the words: "because the Lord hath anointed me" must not be isolated, but must be understood in close connection with the subsequent words; so that the sense is: And He hath, for this reason, endowed me with His Spirit, in order that I may preach good tidings, &c. The **מְיוֹנָע** are the **πραεῖς** in Matt. 5:5; **וְנָע** and **וְנָע** are never confounded with one another. The LXX., whom Luke follows, have **πτωχοῖς**. This rendering does not differ so much from the original text as to make it appear expedient to give up the version at that time received. In the world of sin, the meek are, at the same time, those who are suffering; and the glad tidings which imply a contrast to their misery, show that, here especially, the meek are to be conceived of as sufferers. The **מְיוֹנָע**, in contrast to the wicked, appear, in chap. 11 also, as the people of the Messiah.—"The binding up"—*Stier* remarks—"already passes over into the actual bestowal of that which is announced." The term **רִוּרָא אֲרַק** is taken from the Jubilee year, which was a year of general deliverance for all those who, on account of debts, had become slaves; compare Lev. 25:10: "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout the land for all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubilee year unto you, and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family." Such a great year of liberty is both to be proclaimed and to be brought about by the Servant of God. For He does not announce any thing which He does not, at the same time, grant, as is clearly shown by ver. 3. His saying is based upon His being and nature; He delivers from the service of the world, and brings into the glorious liberty of the children of God.—Most of the modern interpreters agree with the ancient versions in declaring it to be wrong to divide the word **חֻקְחַקַּפ**, although this writing is found in most of the manuscripts. The word is, "by its form of reduplication, the most emphatic term for the most complete opening," and designates, "opening, unclosing of every kind, of the eyes, ears, and heart, of every barrier and tie from within, or from without." The LXX., proceeding upon the fact that **חַקַּפ** occurs, with especial

frequency, of the opening of the eyes, translate: καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. Luke does not wish to set aside this version, because it gives one feature of the sense; and partly also because of the close resemblance to the parallel passage, chap. 42:7, which, in this way, was brought in and connected with the passage under consideration. But since outward deliverance and redemption are, in the first instance, to be thought of, when opening to the captives is spoken of, he, in order to complete the sense, adds: ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει, borrowing the expression from the Alexand. Vers. itself in chap. 58:6.

Ver. 2. *“To proclaim a year of acceptance to the Lord, and a day of vengeance to our God, to comfort all that mourn.”* “A year . . . to the Lord” is a year when the Lord shows himself gracious and merciful to His people; compare chap. 49:8. The words farther still allude to the Jubilee year; and it is in consequence of this allusion, that we can account for its being a *year* instead of a *time*, indefinitely. In that year, a complete *restitutio in integrum* took place. It was, for all in misery, a year of mercy, a type of the times of refreshing (Acts 3:19) which the Lord grants to His Church, after it has been exercised by the Cross. Hand in hand with the year of mercy goes the day of vengeance. When the Lord shows mercy to the meek, and to them that mourn, this shall, at the same time, be accompanied by a manifestation of anger against the enemies of God, and of His Church. The one cannot be thought of without the other. The mercy of the Lord towards His people is, among other things also, manifested in His sitting in judgment upon His and their enemies, upon the proud world which afflicts and oppresses them. It is only in this respect, that the vengeance here comes into consideration; and it is for this reason also, that the first feature at once reappears in the third verse. The Lord, in quoting the verse, limits himself to the first clause, “His first coming into the world was in the form of meekness,” and, therefore, in the meantime, the bright side only is brought out.

Ver. 3. *“To put upon them that mourn in Zion,—to give them a crown for ashes, oil of joy for mourning, garment of praise for a spirit of heaviness; and they shall be called terebinths of righteousness, planting of the Lord for glorifying.”*

It is in this verse that it comes clearly out, that the speaker is not merely to announce the mercy of God, but, at the same time, to bestow it; that the announcement is not an empty one, but one which brings along with it that which is promised; that it is not a Prophet or Evangelist who speaks, but the Saviour. Such a change cannot be effected by merely *announcing* it. Everywhere, in the second part, it is brought about, not by words, but by deeds. How were it possible that by mere words, as long as the reality stood in glaring-contrast to them, the believers could become terebinths of righteousness, a glorious planting of the Lord?—The connection of the two verbs מוּשׁ and נָתַן is to be accounted for from the circumstance, that the pronoun suited the first noun only—the ornament for the head. It is only when מוּשׁ is understood in the sense, “to put upon,” or, “to put on,” that there is a sufficient reason for adding נָתַן; but that is not the case when it is taken in the signification “to grant,” “to appoint,” ראַפּ “crown,” and רַפּא “ashes,” are connected with one another, because mourners were accustomed to strew ashes on their heads. The expression “oil of joy,” which is to be explained from the custom of people anointing themselves with oil in cases of joy, is taken from Ps. 45:8. As the Messiah there appears as the possessor of the oil of joy, so, here, He appears as the bestower. In chap. 55:3, there is likewise an allusion to Ps. 145, and along with it, to Ps. 22. The “spirit of heaviness” refers to chap. 42:3. The fact that, instead of it, they receive “garments of praise,” intimates that they shall be altogether clothed with praise, songs of praise for the divine

goodness which manifested itself in them; on the garments as symbols of the condition, compare remarks on Rev. 7:14. The “righteousness” which is appropriate to the spiritual terebinths, is the actual signification, which the Lord grants to His people at the appearance of the Messiah. There is in it an allusion to the planting of paradise; God now prepares for himself a new paradisaical plantation, consisting of living trees.

## THE PROPHET ZEPHANIAH.

by the inscription, the Prophet’s origin is, in a way rather uncommon, traced back to his fourth ancestor, Hezekiah—no doubt the king. He appeared as a prophet under the reign of Josiah—before the time, however, at which the reforms of that king had attained their completion, which took place in the 18th year of his reign—and, hence, prophesied, like his predecessor Habakkuk, in the view of the Chaldean catastrophe. The prophecy begins with threatening judgment upon the sinners, and closes with announcing salvation to the believers,—a circumstance which proves that it forms one whole. The threatening is distinguished from that of Habakkuk by the circumstance, that it has more of a general comprehensive character, and does not, as is done in Habakkuk, view the Chaldean catastrophe as a particular historical event. It is not an incidental circumstance, that the Chaldeans are not expressly mentioned by Zephaniah, as is done by Habakkuk, and was done by Isaiah. The Prophet can, therefore, have had them in view as being, *in the first, instance* only, the instruments of Divine punishment.

The prophecy begins, in chap. 1:2, 3, with announcing the judgment impending over the whole world. Then, the Prophet shows how it manifests itself in Judah; first, in general outlines, vers. 4-7; then, in detail, vers. 8-18. In close connection, this is followed by a call to repent, in chap. 2:1-3. This call is founded on the fearful character of the impending judgment which, according to vers. 4-15, will be inflicted not only upon Judah, but also upon the world, and will especially bring destruction upon all the neighbouring nations: in the West, upon the Philistines; in the East, upon Ammon and Moab; in the South, on Cush; in the North, upon Niniveh, upon whose destruction the Prophet especially dwells, since, up to that time, it had been the bearer of the world’s power.

In chap. 3, in the first instance, the threatening against Judah is resumed. Apostate Jerusalem, corrupt in its head and members, irresistibly hastens on towards judgment. But, notwithstanding, “the afflicted and poor people of the land” shall not despair. On the contrary, as salvation cannot proceed from the midst of the people, they are to put their trust in the Lord. By His judgments (*viz.*, those declared in chap. 2, which at last shall bring forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness, compare Isa. 26:9: “For when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness”) will He break the pride of the Gentile world, and bring about their conversion,—and the converted Gentile world will bring back to Jerusalem the scattered Congregation. Being purified and justified, it will then enjoy the full mercy of the Lord.

The principal passage is chap. 3:8-13.

Ver. 8. *“Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey; for my right is (i.e., the exercise of my right consists in this) to gather the nations, and to assemble the kingdoms, to pour out upon them mine indignation, all the heat of*

*mine anger; for all the earth shall be devoured by the fire of my jealousy, Ver. 9. For then will I turn unto the nations a clean lip, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one shoulder. Ver. 10. From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia shall they bring my suppliants, the daughter of my dispersed for a meat offering to me. Ver. 11. In that day shalt thou not be ashamed for all thy doings wherein thou hast transgressed against me; for then will I take away out of the midst of thee them that proudly rejoice in thee, and thou shall no more be haughty on mine holy mountain. Ver. 12. And I leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they trust in the name of the Lord, Ver. 13. The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity nor speak lies; neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth; for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid.”*

Zephaniah, who opens the series of the prophets who are pre-eminently dependent upon other prophets, just as Habakkuk closes the series of those pre-eminently independent, leans, in this section, chiefly upon Isaiah; and it is from this circumstance that it appears, that the person of the Messiah, although not appearing here, stands in the background and forms the invisible centre.

“*Therefore,*” ver. 8: Since the salvation cannot proceed from the midst of the people, inasmuch as, in the way of their works, they receive nothing but destructive punishment. On the words: “Wait ye upon me,” compare Hab. 2:3. “The day that the Lord rises up to the prey” is the time when He will begin His great triumphal march against the Gentile world. With the words: “For my right,” &c., a new argument for the call “Wait ye upon me,” commences. But this does not by any means close with the 8th verse, but goes on to the end of ver. 10. First: Wait, for I will judge the nations. It is not without meaning that, as regards your hope, I refer you to the judgment upon the Gentiles; for, in consequence of this judgment, their conversion will take place, and a consequence of their conversion is, that they bring back to Zion her scattered members. In the thought, that the judgments upon the Gentile world will break their hardness of heart, and prepare them for their conversion, Zephaniah follows Isaiah, who, *e.g.* in chap. 19, exemplifies it in the case of Egypt, and in chap. 23 in that of Tyre. The bruised reed and the faintly burning wick is not merely a designation of the single individuals who have been endowed with the right disposition for the kingdom of God, but of whole nations. “The clean lip” in ver. 9 forms the contrast to the unclean lips, in Is. 6. With unclean lips they had, in the time of the long-suffering of God, invoked their idols, Ps. 16:4. On the words: “To serve Him with one shoulder,” comp. Is. 19:23: “And Egypt serves with Asshur.” The words: “From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia,” in ver. 10, rest on Is. 18:1. In both of the passages, Ethiopia is the type of the whole Gen tile world to be converted in future. In Is. 18. Ethiopia offers itself and all which it has to the Lord; here it brings the scattered members of the community of the Israelitish people to the Kingdom of God. *וְהָיָה* always means “to supplicate,” never “to burn incense.” Ezek. 8:11 must thus be translated: “Every man, his censer in his hand, and the *supplication* of the cloud of incense went up; compare remarks on Rev. 5:8. The dispersed members of the Church *supplicate* that the Lord would again receive them into His communion (compare Hos. 14:3; Jer. 31:9, 18; Zech. 12:10); and these supplications cannot remain without an answer, since they from whom they proceed stand in a close relation to the Lord. “The daughter of my dispersed” is the daughter or communion, consisting of the dispersed of the Lord, just as in the phrase “the daughter of the Chaldeans,” the Chaldeans themselves are the daughter or virgin. The designation, in itself, plainly suggests the dispersed members of the old Congregation, inasmuch as they only can be designated as the dispersed of the Lord. To this, moreover, must be added the

reference to Deut. 4:27: “And the Lord *disperses* you among the nations;” 28:64: “And the Lord *disperses* thee among all the nations from the one end of the earth even unto the other,”—an announcement which, at the time of Zephaniah, had already been fulfilled upon the ten tribes, and the fulfilment of which was soon to commence upon Judah. It is only when the members of the old Congregation are understood by the suppliants and dispersed, that the call, “Wait ye upon me” is here established and confirmed. The offering of the meat-offering signifies, in the symbolism of the Mosaic law, diligence in good works, such as is to be peculiar to the redeemed. A single manifestation of it is the missionary zeal which is here shown by the converted Gentiles.

In harmony with the Song of Solomon, Isaiah announces in several passages, that the converted Gentiles shall, at some future period, labour for the restoration of Israel; compare the remarks on Is. 11:12. Zephaniah here specially refers to the remarkable passage, Is. 66:18-21, which we must here subject to a somewhat closer examination: Ver. 18. “And I . . . their works and their thoughts; *the time cometh to gather* all Gentiles and tongues, and they come and *see* my glory.” The first hemistich still belongs to the threatening. The holy God and unholy men, the unholy members of the Church to which the Lord spake: “Ye shall be holy, for I am holy,” and their sinful thoughts and words are simply placed beside one another, and it is left to every one to draw from it the inference as to the fate awaiting them. “I and their works”—what an immense contrast, a contrast which must be adjusted by the judgment! With the threatening, the Prophet then connects, by a suitable contrast to the rejection of a great part of the covenant-people, the calling of the Gentiles. The glory of the Lord, which the Gentiles see, is His glory which, up to that time, was concealed, but is now manifested; compare Is. 40:5, 60:2, 52:10, 53:1. Ver. 19. “And I set a sign among them, and send from among them escaped ones unto the nations, to Tarshish, &c., to the isles afar off that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory, and they declare my glory among the Gentiles.”—The suffix in *סֵהֵב* can refer to those only from among the nations and tongues who have come and seen the glory of God. They are sent out to bring the message of the living God, the message of salvation to those also who hitherto have not come. By the demonstration of the Spirit and power, they are marked out as blessed of the Lord, as His servants, separated from the world given up to destruction. Just as the wicked, the servants of the prince of this world, have their *mark*, Gen. 4:50, so have the servants of God theirs also, which may be recognised by all who are well disposed. It is only by one’s own fault, and at one’s own risk, that the sign is not understood. That fact that “unto the nations” forms the beginning, and the “isles afar off”—isles in the sea of the world, kingdoms—the close, shows that the single names, Tarshish, &c., are only individualizations. In the following verse, too, all the heathens are spoken of. Ver. 20: “And they bring, out of all nations, your brethren for a meat-offering unto the Lord, upon horses, &c., to my holy mountain to Jerusalem, as the children of Israel bring the meat-offering in a clean vessel unto the house of the Lord.” It is in this verse that it clearly appears, that Zephaniah depends upon it; and it is by the offering of the spiritual meat offering that his dependence is recognized. The subject in “they bring” is the Gentiles, to whom the message of salvation has been brought. They, having themselves attained salvation, offer to the Lord, as a meat-offering, the former members of His Kingdom who were separated from it. It is they, not the Gentiles who have become believers, who in the second part of Isaiah, are throughout designated as the *brethren*. Salvation is first to pass from Israel to the Gentiles, and shall then, from them, return to Israel. The two verses before us thus contain a sanction for the mission among the heathens and among Israel. Vers. 18 and 19 divide the conversion of the Gentiles into two main stations; it is only when the Church has arrived at the second, that the

missionary work among Israel will fully thrive and prosper. To the *clean vessel* in which the outward sacrifice was offered, correspond the faith and love with which they, who were formerly heathens, offer the spiritual meat-offering. Ver. 21: "And of them also will I take for Levitical priests, saith the Lord." Of them, *i.e.*, of those who formerly were heathens; for it is to them that, in the words preceding, a priestly function, *viz.*, the offering of the meat-offering, is assigned. Of them *also*; not merely from among the old covenant-people, to whom, under the former dispensation, the priestly office was limited. The fact that the priests are designated as Levitical priests, is intended to keep out the thought that the point in question related only to priests in a lower sense, beside whom the Levitical priesthood, attached to natural descent, would continue to exist in full vigour. Priests with full dignities and rights are here so much the more required, that, according to what precedes, the point in question does not refer merely to a personal relation to the Lord, to immediate access to the throne of grace, but to the priestly office proper.

Vers. 11-13 describe the internal condition of the redeemed Church of the future,—a condition so different from the present one. The expression, "they that proudly rejoice in them," is from Is. 13:3. כ' in ver. 13 is to be accounted for from the fact, that wherever there exists the blessing promised by the Law of God (Lev. 26:6) to faithfulness, faithfulness itself must exist.

In ver. 14 ff., the Jerusalem of the future is addressed; compare the expression, "at that time," ver. 20.

## THE PROPHET JEREMIAH

### GENERAL PRELIMINARY REMARKS

In Malachi 3:1, the Lord promises that He would send His messenger who should prepare the way before *Him* who was to come to His temple, judging and punishing; vers. 23, 24 (4:5, 6): that before the coming of His great and dreadful day, before He smites the land with a curse, He would send another Elijah, who should bring back the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers. Even before this prophecy was expressed in words, it had *actually* been given in the existence of Jeremiah, who, during the whole long period of forty-one years, before the destruction, announced the judgments of the Lord,—who, with burning zeal and ardent love to the people, preached repentance,—and who, even after the destruction, sought the small remnant that had been left, and was anxious to secure it against the new day of the Lord, which, by its obstinate impenitence, it was drawing down upon itself. It is this typical relation of Jeremiah to John the Baptist and Christ, of which the Jewish tradition had an anticipation, although it misunderstood and expressed it in a gross, outward manner, by teaching that, at the end of days, Jeremiah would again appear on earth,—it is this, which invests with a peculiar charm the contemplation of his ministry, and the study of his prophecies.

The name of the Prophet is to be explained from Exod. 15:1, from which it is probably taken. It signifies "The Lord throws." He who bore it was consecrated to that God who with an almighty hand throws to the ground all His enemies. From chap. 1:10: "See, I set thee to-day over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant," it appears that it was by a dispensation of divine providence, that the Prophet bore this name with full right, and that the character of his mission is thereby designated. The judging and destructive activity which

the Prophet, as an instrument of God, is to exercise, is here not only placed at the commencement, but four appellations are also devoted to it, whilst only two are devoted to his healing and planting activity. As the object of the *throwing*, we have to conceive, not of the unfaithful covenant-people only. This appears from the mention of the *nations and kingdoms* here, and farther, from ver. 14, where the Lord says to the Prophet: “Out of the North the evil breaks forth upon all the inhabitants of the earth.” To be the herald of the judgment to be executed upon the whole world by the Chaldeans, was so much the destiny of the Prophet, that, in chap. 1:3, the eleventh year of Zedekiah, in which this judgment was brought to a close, as far as Judah was concerned, is mentioned as the closing point of his ministry. The Prophet, as is reported by the book itself, still continued his ministry even among the remnant of the people; but that is lost sight of. The “carrying away of Jerusalem” is treated as the great closing point; just as, in a manner altogether similar, it is, in the case of Daniel, in chap. 1:21, the year of Israel’s deliverance, although, according to chap. 10:1, his prophetic ministry extended beyond that period.

Jeremiah was called to his office when still a youth, in the 13th year of king Josiah, and hence one year after the first reformation of this king, who, as early as in the 16th year of his life, and the 8th of this reign, which lasted 31 years, began to seek the Lord. A king such as he, unto whom no king before him was like, who turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, (2 Kings 23:25), in the midst of an evil and adulterous generation, is a remarkable phenomenon, as little conceivable from natural causes as the existence of Melchizedec without father, without descent—isolated from all natural development—in the midst of the Canaanites who, with rapid strides and irresistibly, hastened on to the completion of their sin. His existence has the same root as that of Jeremiah,—a fact which becomes the more evident when we take into consideration the connection of the Regal and Prophetic offices in Christ for the salvation of the people hastening anew to its destruction, and the faithfulness of the Covenant-God, and His long-suffering which makes every effort to lead the apostate children to repentance. The zeal of both, of Josiah and Jeremiah,—although supported by manifold assistance from other quarters, as *e.g.* by the prophetess Huldah and the prophet Zephaniah—was unable to stem the tide of prevailing corruption, and, hence, to stop the tide of the divine judgments. The corruption was so deeply rooted, that only single individuals could be saved, like brands from the burning. It had made fearful progress under the protracted reign of Manasseh, whose disposition must be regarded as a product of the spirit of the time then prevailing, of which he must not be considered as the creator, but as the representative only, 2 Kings 23:26, 27, 24:3, 4. The scanty fruits of his late conversion had been again entirely consumed under the short reign of his wicked son Amon; it had indeed so little of a comprehensive or lasting influence, that the author of the Book of Kings thought himself entitled altogether to pass it over. It was even difficult to put limits to outward idolatry; and how imperfectly he succeeded in this, is seen from the prophecies of Jeremiah uttered after the reformation. And even where he was successful in his efforts; even where an emotion was manifested, a wish to return to the living fountain which they had forsaken, even there, the corruption soon broke forth again, only in a different form. With deep grief, Jeremiah reprovingly reminds the people of this, whose righteousness was like the morning dew, in chap. 3:4, 5: “Hast thou not but lately called me: My Father, friend of my youth, thou? Will He reserve His anger for ever, will He keep it to the end? Behold, thus thou spakest, and soon thou didst the evil, didst accomplish”—an *accomplishment* quite different from that of the ancestor, Gen. 32:29. Since the disease had not been healed, but had only been driven out from one part of the diseased organism, the foolish inclination to idolatry was followed by as foolish a

confidence in the miserable righteousness by works, in the divine election,—the offering up of sacrifices, &c., being considered as the sole condition of its validity. “Trust ye not in lying words”—so the Prophet is obliged to admonish them in chap. 7:4— “saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are they” (the people imagined that they could not be destroyed, because the Lord had, according to their opinion, for ever established His residence among them; compare 1 Cor. 3:17; 1 Tim. 3:15). “Thou sayest, I am innocent; His anger hath entirely turned from me; behold I plead with thee, because thou sayest: I have not sinned,” chap. 2:35. “To what purpose shall there come for me incense from Sheba, and sweet cane, the goodly, from a far country? Your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices pleasant unto me,” chap. 6:20. Towards the end of Josiah’s reign, the approaching judgment of God upon Judah became more perceptible. The former Asiatic dominion of the Assyrians passed over entirely to the Chaldeans, whose fresh and youthful strength so much the more threatened Judah with destruction, that from the Assyrians they had inherited the enmity to Egypt, on account of which Judah obtained great importance in their eyes. According to the announcement of the prophets generally, and of Jeremiah especially, who, at his very vocation, had it assigned to him as his main task to announce the calamity from the North, it was by the Chaldeans that the deadly stroke should be inflicted upon the people implicated in the conflicts of these hostile powers; but it was the Egyptians who inflicted upon them the first severe wound. Josiah fell in the battle with Pharaoh Necho. The people, conscious of guilt, were, by his death, filled with a fearful expectation of the things that were to come. They had forebodings that they were now standing at the boundary line where grace and anger separate (compare remarks on Zech. 12:11); and these forebodings were soon converted into bitter certainty by experience. Jehoiakim ascended the throne, after Jehoahaz or Shallum, had, after a short reign, been carried away by the Egyptians. He stood to his father Josiah in just the same relation as did the people to God, in reference to the mercy which He had offered to them in Josiah. A more glaring contrast (see its exhibition in chap. 22) can hardly be imagined. Throughout, Jehoiakim shows himself to be entirely destitute not only of love to God, but also of the fear of God; he furnishes the complete image of a king whom God had given in anger. He is a blood-thirsty tyrant, an exasperated enemy to truth. At the beginning of his reign, some influence of Josiah’s spirit is still seen. The priests and false prophets, rightly understanding the signs of the time, came forward with the manifestation of their long restrained hatred against Jeremiah, in whom they hate their own conscience. They bring against him a charge of life and death, because he had prophesied destruction to the city and temple; but the rulers of the people acquit him, chap. 26. This influence, however, soon ceased. The king became the centre around whom gathered all that was ungodly, which, under Josiah, had timorously withdrawn into concealment. Soon it became a power, a torrent over flowing the whole country; and that the more easily, the weaker were the dams which still existed from the time of Josiah. One of the first victims for truth who fell, was the prophet Urijah. The king, imagining that he was able to kill truth itself in those who proclaimed it, could not bear the thought that he was still living, although it was in distant Egypt, and caused him to be brought thence (see 1. c.). The fact that Jeremiah escaped every danger of death during the eleven years of this king’s reign, although he ever anew threatened death to the king and destruction to the people, was a constant miracle, a glorious fulfilment of the divine promise given to him when he was called (1:19): “They shall fight against thee, and they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee, saith *the Lord*, to deliver thee.” The threatened divine punishment advanced, under Jehoiakim, several steps towards its completion. In the fourth year of his reign, Jerusalem was, for the first time, taken by the Chaldeans (compare “*Dissertations*

*on the Genuineness of Daniel,*” p, 45ff.), after the power of the Egyptian Empire had been for ever broken by the battle at Carchemish on the Euphrates. The victor this time acted with tolerable mildness; the sin of the people was to appear in its full light by the circumstance, that God gave them time for repentance, and did not at once proceed to the utmost rigour, but advanced, step by step, in His judgments. But here too it was seen that crime, in its highest degree, becomes madness; the more nearly that people and king approached the abyss, the greater became the speed with which they hastened towards it. It is true that they did not remain altogether insensible when the threatening of the Prophet began to be fulfilled. This is seen from the day of fasting and repentance which was appointed in remembrance of the first capture by the Chaldeans (compare *“Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel”* p. 40); but fleeting emotions cannot stop the course of sin. Soon it became worse than it had been before; and therefore the divine judgments also reached a new station. Even political wisdom advised the king quietly to submit to dependence on the Chaldeans, which was, comparatively, little oppressive. It was obvious that, unsupported, he could effect nothing against the Chaldean power; and, to the *unprejudiced* eye, it was as obvious that the Egyptians could not help him; and even had it been possible, he would only have changed masters. But, according to the counsel of God, who takes away the understanding of the wise, these political reasons, obvious though they were, should not exercise any influence upon him, because his obdurate heart prevented him from listening to the religious arguments which Jeremiah brought before him. *Melanchthon* (opp. ii., p. 407 ff.) points it out as a remarkable circumstance that, while other prophets, e.g., Samuel, Elisha, Isaiah, exhort to a vigorous opposition to the enemies, and, in that case, promise divine assistance, yea that, to some extent, they even took an active part in the deliverance, Jeremiah, on the other hand, always preaches unconditional submission. The issue, which is as different as the advice, shows that this difference has not, by any means, its foundation in the persons, but in the state of things. The seventy years of Chaldean servitude were irrevocably decreed upon Judah; even the exact statement of years, which else is so uncommon in reference to the fate of the covenant-people, shows how firm and determined was that decree. They had altogether, and more fully than at any other time, given themselves over to the internal power of heathenism; according to a divine necessity, they must therefore also be given over to the external power of the heathen, both for punishment and reform. God himself could not change that decree, for it rested on His nature. Hence, it would be in vain though even the greatest intercessors, Moses and Samuel, should stand before Him, Jer. 15:1 ff. Intercessory prayer can be effectual, only if it be offered in the name of God. But if such were the case, how foolish was it to rebel against the Chaldean power; to attempt to remove the effect, while they allowed the cause to remain; to stop the brook, while the source still continued to send forth its waters. It would have been foolish, even if the relative power of the Jews and Chaldeans had been altogether reversed. For when the Lord sells a people, one can chase a thousand, and two can put ten thousand to flight (Deut. 32:30). But the shepherd of the people had become a fool, and did not enquire after the Lord. He could not, therefore, act wisely; and the whole flock was scattered, Jer. 10:21. Jehoiakim rebelled against the Chaldeans, and for some years he was allowed to continue in the delusion of having acted very wisely, for Nebuchadnezzar had more important things to mind and to settle. But then he went up against Jerusalem, and put an end to his reign and life, Jer. 22:1-12; 2 Kings 24:2; *“Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel,”* p. 49. As yet, the long-suffering of God, and, hence, the patience of the Chaldeans, were not at an end. Jehoiachin or Jeconiah was raised to the throne of his father. Even the short reign of three months gave to the youth sufficient occasion to manifest the wickedness of his heart, and his enmity to God. Suspicions against his

fidelity arose; a Chaldean army anew entered the city, and carried away the king, and, along with him, the great mass of the people. This was the first great deportation. In the providence of God it was so arranged that, among those who were carried away, there was the very flower of the nation. The apparent suffering was to them a blessing. They were, for their good, sent away from the place over which the storms of God's anger were soon to discharge themselves, into the land of the Chaldeans, and formed there the nucleus for the Kingdom of God, in its impending new form, Jer. 24. Nothing now seemed to stand in the way of the divine judgment upon the wicked mass that had been left behind, like bad figs that no one can eat for badness,—they whom the Lord had threatened that He would give them over to hurt and calamity in all the kingdoms of the earth, to reproach, and a proverb, and a taunt, and a curse, in all places whither He would drive them, Jer. 24:9. And still the Lord was waiting before He carried out this threatening, and smote the land to cursing, Mattaniah or Zedekiah, the son of Josiah, the uncle of Jehoiachin, who was given to them for a king, might, at least partially, have averted the evil. But he too had to learn that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. From various quarters, attempts have been made to exculpate him, on the plea that his fault was only weakness, which made him the tool of a corrupt party; but Scripture forms a different estimate of him, and he who looks deeper will find its judgment to be correct,—will be able to grant to him that preference only over Jehoiakim which *C. B. Michaelis* assigned of him in the words: “Jehoiakim was of an obdurate and wild disposition; Zedekiah had some fear of God, although it was a servile, hypocritical fear, but Jehoiakim had none at all.” And even this preference, when more narrowly examined, amounts to nothing, for it belongs to nature, and no to grace. Whether corruption manifests itself as weakness, or as a carnal, powerful opposition to divine truth, is accidental, and depends upon the diversity of mental and bodily organization. The fact that Zedekiah did not altogether put away from himself the truth and its messengers (*Dahler* remarks: “He respected the Prophet without having the power of following his advice; he even protected his life against his persecutors, but he did not venture to secure him against their vexation”) cannot be put down to his credit; *he was against his will, forced to do so*; and indeed he could not resist a powerful impression of any kind. In a man of Jehoiakim's character, the same measure of the fear of God would induce us to mitigate our opinion; for in such a one it could not exist without some support from within. Confiding in the help of the neighbouring nations, especially the Egyptians; persuaded by the false prophets and the nobles; himself seized by that spirit of giddiness and intoxication which, with irresistible power, carried away the people to the abyss, Zedekiah broke the holy oath which he had sworn to the Chaldeans, and, after an obstinate resistance, Jerusalem was taken and destroyed. As yet, the long suffering of God, and, hence, also that of man, was not *altogether* at an end. The conquerors left a comparatively small portion of the inhabitants in the land. The grace of God gave them Gedaliah, an excellent man, for their civil superior, and Jeremiah for their ecclesiastical superior. The latter preferred to remain in the smoking ruins, rather than follow the brilliant promises of the Chaldeans, and was willing to persevere to the last in the discharge of his duty, although he was by this time far advanced in life, and oppressed with deep grief. But it appears as if the people had been bent upon emptying, to the last drop, the cup of divine wrath, Gedaliah is assassinated. Even those who did not partake in the crime fled to Egypt, disregarding the word of the Lord through the Prophet, who announced a curse upon them if they fled, but a blessing if they remained.

What the Prophet had to suffer under such circumstances, one may easily imagine even without consulting history. Even although he had remained free from all personal

vexations and attacks, it could not but be an immeasurable grief to him to dwell in the midst of such a generation, to see their corruption increasing more and more, to see the abyss coming nearer and nearer, to find all his faithful warnings unheeded, and his whole ministry in vain, at least as far as the mass of the people were concerned. "O that they would give me in the wilderness a lodging-place for wayfaring men"—so he speaks as early as under Josiah, chap. 9:1 (2)—"and I would leave my people and go from them; for they are all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men." But from these personal vexations and attacks, he neither was, nor could be exempted. Mockery, hatred, calumny, ignominy, curses, imprisonment, bonds were his portion. To bear such a burden would have been difficult to any man, but most of all to a man of his disposition. "The more tender the heart, the deeper the smart." He was not a second Elijah; he had a soft disposition, a lively sensibility; his eyes were easily filled with tears. And he who would have liked so much to live in peace and love with all, having entered into the service of truth, was obliged to become a second Ishmael, his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him. He who so ardently loved his people, must see this love misconstrued and rejected; must see himself branded as a traitor to the people, by those men who were themselves traitors. All these things were to him the cause of violent struggles and conflicts, which he candidly lays before us in various passages, especially in chap. 12 and 20, because, by the victory, the Lord, who alone could give it, was glorified.

He was sustained by inward consolations, by wonderful deliverances, by the remarkable fulfilment of his prophecies which he himself lived to witness; but especially by the circumstance that the Lord caused him to behold His future salvation with the same clearness as His judgments; so that he could consider the latter only as transient, and, even by the most glaring contrast between the appearance and the idea, never lost the firm hope of the final victory of the former. This hope formed the centre of his whole life. For a long series of years, he is somewhat cautious in giving utterance to it; for, just as Hosea in the kingdom of the ten tribes, so he too has to do with secure and gross sinners, who must be terrified by the preaching of the Law, and the message of wrath. But, even here, single sunbeams everywhere constantly break through the dark clouds. But towards the close, when the total destruction is already at hand, and his commission to root out and destroy draws to an end, because now the Lord himself is to speak by deeds, he can, to the full desire of his heart, carry out the second part of his calling, viz., to plant and to build (compare chap. 1); and it is now, that his mouth is overflowing, that it is seen how full of it his heart had always been. The whole vocation of the Prophet, *Calvin* strikingly expresses in these words: "I say simply that Jeremiah was sent by God to announce to the people the last defeat, and, farther, to proclaim the future redemption, but in such a manner, that he always puts in the seventy years' exile." That, according to him, this redemption is not destined for Israel only, but that the Gentiles also partake in it, appears not incidentally only in the prophecies to his own people; but it is also prominently brought out in the prophecies against the foreign nations themselves, e.g., in the prophecy against Egypt, chap. 46:26; against Moab, chap. 48:47; against Ammon, 49:6.

In announcing the Messiah from the house of David (chap. 22:5, 30:9, 33:15), Jeremiah agrees with the former prophets. The Messianic features peculiar to him are the following: —The announcement of a revelation of God, which by far outshines the former one from above the Ark of the Covenant, and by which the Ark of the Covenant, with every thing attached to it, shall become antiquated, chap. 3:14-17; the announcement of a new covenant, distinguished from the former by greater richness in the forgiveness of

sins, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit: "I give my law in their inward parts, and I will write it in their hearts," chap. 31:31-34; the intimation of the impending realization of the promise of Moses: "Ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests," with which the abolition of the poor form of the priesthood hitherto is connected, chap. 33:14-26.

As regards the style of Jeremiah, *Cunaeus* (*de repub. Hebr.* i. 3, c. 7) pertinently remarks: "The whole majesty of Jeremiah lies in his negligent language; that rough diction becomes him exceedingly well." It is certainly very superficial in *Jerome* to seek the cause of that *humilitas dictionis* of the Prophet, whom he, at the same time, calls *in majestate sensuum profundissimum*, in his origin from the *viculus Anathoth*. It would be un natural if it were otherwise. The style of Jeremiah stands on the same ground as the hairy garment and leather girdle of Elijah. He who is sorrowful and afflicted in his heart, whose eyes fail with tears (*Lament.* 2:11), cannot adorn and decorate himself in his dress or speech.

From chap. 11:21, 12:5,6, several interpreters have inferred, that the Prophet first came forward in his native place Anathoth, and that, because they there said to him: "Thou shalt not prophecy in the name of the Lord, else thou shalt die by our hand," he then went to Jerusalem, But those passages rather refer to an experience which the Prophet made at an incidental visit in his native place, quite similar to what our Saviour experienced at Nazareth, according to *Luke* 4:24. For in chap. 25:3, Jeremiah says to "all the inhabitants of Jerusalem," that he had spoken to *them* since the thirteenth year of Josiah. As early as in chap. 2:2, at the beginning of a discourse which bears a general introductory character, and which immediately follows, and is connected with his vocation in chap. 1, he receives the command: "Go, and cry into the ears of Jerusalem." The opening speech itself cannot, according to its contents, have been spoken in some corner of the country, but in the metropolis only, in the temple more specially, the centre of the nation and its spiritual dwelling place. It was there that that must be delivered which was to be told to the whole people as such.

### **THE SECTION, CHAP. 3:14-17**

The whole Section, from chap. 3:6, to the end of chap. 6, forms one connected discourse, separated from the preceding context by the inscription in chap. 3:6, and from the subsequent context, by the inscription in chap. 7:1. This separation, however, is more external than internal. The contents and tone remain the same through the whole series of chapters which open the collection of the prophecies of Jeremiah, and that to such a degree, that we are compelled to doubt the correctness of the proceeding of those interpreters, who would determine the chronological order of the single portions, and fix the exact period in the reign of Josiah to which every single portion belongs. If such a proceeding were admissible, why should the Prophet have expressed himself, in the inscription of the Section before us, in terms so general as: "And the Lord said unto me in the days of Josiah the king?" Every thing on which these interpreters endeavour to found more accurate determinations in regard to the single Sections, disappears upon a closer consideration. Thus, *e.g.*, the twofold reference to the seeking of help from Egypt, in chap. 2:16 ff., 36, 37, on which *Eichhorn* and *Dahler* lay so much stress. We are not entitled here to suppose a reference to a definite historical event, which, moreover, cannot be historically pointed out in the whole time of Josiah, but can only be supposed on unsafe and unfounded conjectures. In both of the passages something future is spoken of, as is evident from vers. 16 and 19. The thought is this:—that Asshur, *i.e.*, the power on

the Euphrates (compare 2 Kings 23:29), which had for a long time opened its mouth to swallow up Judah, just as it had already swallowed up the kingdom of the ten tribes, would not be conciliated, and that Egypt could not grant help against him. This thought refers to historical circumstances which had already existed, and continued to exist for some centuries, and which, in reference to Israel, is given utterance to as early as by Hosea, compare Vol. i. p. 164 f. Our view is this: We have here before us, not so much a series of prophecies, each of which had literally been so uttered at some particular period in the reign of Josiah, as rather a *resume* of the whole prophetic ministry of Jeremiah under Josiah; a collection of all which, being independent of particular circumstances of that time, had, in general, the destiny to give an inward support to the outward reforming activity of Josiah, a specimen of the manner in which the Prophet discharged the divine commission which he had received a year after the first reformation of Josiah. Even the manner in which chap. 2 is connected with chap. 1 places this relation to his call beyond any doubt. We have thus before us here the same phenomenon which we have already perceived in several of the minor prophets; comp. *e.g.*, the introduction to Micah.

In the section before us, the Prophet is engaged with a twofold object,—first, with the proclamation of salvation for Israel, chap. 3:6-4:2; secondly, with the threatening for Judah, chap. 4:3, to the end of chap. 6. It is only incidentally, in chap. 3:18, that it is intimated that Judah also, after the threatening has been fulfilled upon them, shall partake in the salvation. It is self-evident that these two objects must not be considered as lying beside one another. According to the whole context, the announcement of salvation for Israel cannot have any other object than that of wounding Judah. This object even comes out distinctly in ver. 6-11, and the import of the discourse may, therefore, be thus stated: Israel does not continue to be rejected as Pharisaical Judah imagined; Judah does not continue to be spared.—When the Prophet entered upon his ministry, ninety-four years had already elapsed since the divine judgment had broken in upon Israel; every hope of restoration seemed to have vanished. Judah, instead of being thereby warned; instead of beholding, in the sin of others, the image of its own; instead of perceiving, in the destruction of the kingdom of its brethren, a prophecy of its own destruction, was, on the contrary, strengthened in its obduracy. The fact that it still existed, after Israel had, long ago, hopelessly perished, as they imagined, appeared to them as a seal which God impressed upon their ways. They rejoiced at Israel's calamity, because, in it, they thought that they saw a proof of their own excellency, just as, at the time of Christ, the blindness of the Jews was increased by the circumstance that they still considered themselves as the sole members of the Kingdom of God, and imagined the Gentiles to be excluded from it. The Saviour's announcement of the calling of the Gentiles stands in the same relation as the Prophet's announcement of the restoration of Israel.

-----

Ver. 14. *“Turn, O apostate children, saith the Lord, for I marry myself unto you, and I take one of a city, and two of a family, and bring you to Zion.”*

The question here is:—To whom is the discourse here addressed,—to the members of Israel, *i.e.*, the kingdom of the ten tribes, as most of the interpreters suppose (*Abarbanel*, *Calvin*, *Schmid*, and others), or, as others assume, to the inhabitants of Judea? The decision has considerable influence upon the exposition of the whole passage; but it must unhesitatingly and unconditionally be given in favour of the first view. There is not one word to indicate a transition; the very same phrase, “turn, O apostate children,” occurs, in ver. 22, of Israel. Apostate Israel is, in the preceding verses (6, 8, 11,) the standing

expression, while Judah is designated as treacherous, ver. 8-11. The measure of guilt is determined by the measure of grace. The relation of the Lord to Judah was closer, and hence, her apostacy was so much the more culpable. *Farther*—A detailed announcement of salvation for Judah would here not be suitable, inasmuch as no threatening preceded; and ver. 18 (“In those days, the house of Judah shall come by the side of [literally, “over”] the house of Israel,” according to which the return of Judah is, in the meantime, a subordinate point which has here been mentioned incidentally) clearly shows that that announcement of salvation, contained in vers. 14-17, refers to Israel. To Israel the Prophet immediately returns in ver. 19; for, from the contrast to the house of Judah in ver. 18, and to Judah and Jerusalem in chap. 4:3, it is evident that by the house of Israel in ver. 20, and by the sons of Israel in ver. 21, Israel, in the stricter sense, is to be understood. *Finally*—It will be seen from the exposition, that it is only on the supposition that Israel is addressed, that the contents of ver. 16, 17, become intelligible.—In our explanation of the words *יב יתלעב יכנא יכ*, we follow the precedent of the Vulgate (*quia ego vir vester*), of *Luther* (“I will marry you to me”), of *Calvin*, *Schmid*, and others. On the other hand, others, especially *Pococke*, *ad P.M.* p. 2, *Schultens* on Prov. 30:22, *Venema*, *Schnurrer*, *Gesenius*, *Winer*, *Bleek*, have made every endeavour to prove that *לעב* is used *sensu malo* here, as well as in chap. 31:32, where it occurs in a connexion altogether similar; so that the decision must be valid for both of the passages at the same time. This signification they seek to make out in a twofold way. Some altogether give up the derivation from the Hebrew *usus loquendi*, and refer solely to the Arabic, where *לעב* means *fastidire*. Others derive from the Hebrew signification, “to rule,” that of a tyrannical dominion, and support their right in so doing, by referring, with *Gesenius*, to other verbs in which the signification, *to subdue.*, *to be distinguished*, *to rule.*, has been changed into that of *looking down*, *despising*, and *contemning*. As regards the *first* derivation, even if the Arabic *usus loquendi* were proved, we could not from it make any certain inference as regards the Hebrew *usus loquendi*. But with respect to this Arabic *usus loquendi*, it is far from being proved and established. It is true that such would not be the case if there indeed occurred in Arabic the expression *fastidivit vir mulierem eamque expulit, s. repudiavit*; but it is only by a strange *quid pro quo* that interpreters, even *Schultens* among them, following the example of *Kimchi*, have saddled this expression upon the Arabic. The error lies in a hasty view of *Abul Walid*, who, instead of it, has *any one is embarrassed in his affair*. The signification *fastidire*, *rejicere*, is, in general, quite foreign to the Arabic. The verb denotes only: *mente turbatus, attonitus fuit, i.e., to be possessed, deprived of the use of one’s strength, to be embarrassed, not to know how to help one’s self*: compare the *Camus* in *Schultens* and *Freytag*. As soon as the plain connection of this signification with the ordinary one is perceived, it is seen at once, that it is here out of the question. As regards the second derivation, we must bring this objection against it, that the fundamental signification of *ruling*, from which that of *ruling tyrannically* is said to have arisen, is entirely foreign to the Hebrew. More clearly than by modern Lexicographers it was seen by *Cocceius*, that the fundamental, yea the only signification of *לעב*, is that of *possessing, occupying*. It may, indeed, be used also of rulers, as, *e.g.* Isa. 26:13, and 1 Chron. 4:22; but not in so far as they rule, but in so far as they possess. On the former passage: “Jehovah our God, *ייתלוז סינודא ונולעב*, Lords beside thee have dominion over us,” *Schultens*, it is true, remarks: “Every one here easily recognizes a severe and tyrannical dominion;” but it is rather the circumstance that the land of the Lord has at all foreign possessors, which is the real sting of the grief of those lamenting, and which so much occupies them, that they scarcely think of the way and manner of the possessing.—Passages such as Is. 54:1,<sup>30</sup> 62:4, compare Job 1:8, where a relation is spoken of, founded on most cordial love, show that the signification “*to marry*,” does not

by any means proceed from that of ruling, and is not to be explained from the absolute, slavish dependence of the wife in the East, but rather from the signification “to possess.” And this is farther proved by passages such as Deut. 21:10-13, 26:1, where the *copula carnalis* is pointed out as that by which the לעב is completed. And, finally, it is seen from the Arabic, where the wife is also called, הלעב, just as the husband is called לעב.—It is farther obvious that, in the frequent compositions of בעל with other nouns, in order, by way of paraphrasis, to form adjectives, the signification “lord” is far less suitable than that of “possessor,” e.g., תומלח לעב, *the dreamer*, היא לעב, *the angry one*, טפנ לעב, *the covetous one*, תומזמ לעב, *the deceitful one*, דיע ילעב *oppidani*, תירב ילעב, *the members of the covenant*, &c. We arrive at the same conclusion, if we look to the dialects. Here, too, the signification “to possess” appears as the proper and original signification. In the Ethiopic, the verb signifies *multum possedit, dives full*. In Arabic, the significations are more varied; but they may all be traced back to one root. Thus, e.g., according to the *Camus*, “a high and elevated land which requires only one annual rain; farther, a palm-tree, or any other tree or plant which is not watered, or which the sky alone irrigates,” i.e., a land, a tree, a plant which themselves possess, which do not require to borrow from others. This reason of the appellation clearly appears in *Dsheuhari* (compare *Schultens* 1. a); “It is used of the palm-tree, which, by its roots, provides for itself drink and sap, so that there is no need for watering it. In favour of the signification “to rule” in this verb, the following gloss from the *Camus* only can be quoted: “Both (the 1st and 10th conjugations) when construed with הילע *super ilium*, denote: he has taken possession of a thing, and behaved himself proudly towards it.” But the latter clause must be struck out; for it has flowed only from the false reading in *Schultens*, for which (compare *Preying*)<sup>21</sup> *noluit* must be read, לעב with לע accordingly signifies “to be the possessor of a thing, and, as such, not to be willing to give it up to another.” And thus every ground has been taken from those who, from the Hebrew *usus loquendi*, would interpret לעב in a bad sense.—

The same result, however, which we have reached upon philological grounds, we shall obtain also, when we look to the context. From it, they are most easily refuted, who, like *Schultens*, understand the whole verse as a threatening. That which precedes, as well as that which follows, breathes nothing but pure love to poor Israel. She is not terrified by threatenings, like Judah who has not yet drunk of the cup of God’s wrath, but allured by the call: “Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, for I will give you rest.” But they also labour under great difficulties who, after the example of *Kimchi* (“*ego fastidivi vos, eo scil. quod praeteriit tempore, ac jam colligam vos*”), refer the יכ not so much to יתלעב, as rather to יתחקל: “For I have, it is true, rejected you formerly, but now I take,” &c. This is the only shape in which this interpretation can still appear; for it is altogether arbitrary to explain יכ by “although,” an interpretation still found in *De Wette*.

If it had been the intention of the Prophet to express this sense, nothing surely was less admissible, than to omit just those words, upon which everything depended—the words *formerly* and *now*. יתחקל and יתלעב evidently stand here in the same relation; both together form the ground for the return to the Lord. To these reasons we may still add the circumstance that, according to our explanation, we obtain the beautiful parallelism with ver. 12: “Return thou, apostate Israel, saith the Lord; I will not cause mine anger to fall upon you; for I am merciful; I do not keep anger for ever,”—a circumstance which has already been pointed out by *Calvin*. Israel’s haughtiness is broken; but despondency now keeps them from returning to the Lord. He, therefore, ever anew repeats His invitation, ever anew finds it upon the fact, that He delights in showing mercy and love to those who have forsaken Him. The rejection of Israel had, in ver. 8, been represented under the image of divorce: “Because apostate Israel had committed adultery, I had put her away,

and given her the bill of divorce.” What, therefore, is more natural, than that her being received again, which was offered to her out of pure mercy, should appear under the image of a new marriage, and that so much the more, that the apostacy had, even in the preceding verse, been represented as adultery and whoredom? (“*Thou hast scattered thy ways,*” *i.e.*, thou hast been running about to various places after the manner of an impudent whore seeking lovers”—*Schmid*; compare ver. 6.) Farther to be compared is ver. 22: “Return ye apostate children, (for) I will heal your apostacy. Behold we come unto thee, *for* thou art the Lord our God.” The objection that לָעֵב, in the signification “to take in marriage” is construed with the Accusative only, is of no weight. In a manner altogether similar, רָכַז, which else is connected with the simple Accusative, is, in ver. 16, followed by the Preposition לָעֵב בּ. with בּ altogether corresponds to our “to join oneself in marriage;” and the construction has perhaps a certain emphasis, and indicates the close and indissoluble connection. Of still less weight is another objection, *viz.*, that, in that case, the *Suffix Plur.* is inadmissible. It is just the Israelites who are the wife; and this is so much the more evident that, in the preceding verses, and even still in ver. 13, they had been treated as such. Hence nothing remains but to determine the sense of our passage, as was done by *Calvin*: “Because despair might take hold of them, in such a manner that they might be afraid of approaching Him . . . . He saith that He would marry himself to them, and that He had not yet forgotten that union which He once had bestowed upon them.” This is the only correct view; and by thus determining the sense, we at the same time obtain the sure foundation for the exposition of chap. 31:32; just as, *vice versa*, the sense which will result from an independent consideration of that passage, will serve to confirm that which was here established.<sup>31</sup> In the right determination of the sense of the subsequent words, too, *Calvin* distinguishes himself advantageously from the earlier, and most of the later interpreters: “God shows that there was no reason why some should wait for others; and farther, although the very body of the people might be utterly corrupted in their sins, yet, if even a few were to return, He would show himself merciful to them. The covenant had been entered into with the *whole* people. The single individual might, therefore, have been disposed to imagine that his repentance was in vain. But in opposition to such fears, the Prophet says: ‘Although only one of a town should come to me, he shall find an open door; although only two of one tribe come to me, I will admit even them.’” After him *Loscanus* too (in his Dissertation on this passage, Frankf. 1720) has thus correctly stated the sense: “The small number shall not prevent God from carrying out His counsel.” Thus it is seen—and this is alone suitable in this context—that the apparent limitation of the promise is, in truth, an extension of it. How great must God’s love and mercy be to Israel, in how wide an extent must the declaration be true: ἀμεταμέλητα τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. 11:29, if even a single righteous Lot is by God delivered from the Sodom of Israel; if Joshua and Caleb, untouched by the punishment of the sins of the thousands, reach the Holy Land; if every penitent heart at once finds a gracious God! Thus it appears that this passage is not by any means in contradiction to other passages by which a complete restoration of Israel is promised. On the contrary, the ἐπιτυγχάνειν of the ἐκλογή (Rom. 11:7) announced here, is a pledge and guarantee for the more comprehensive and general mercy.—Expositors are at variance as to the historical reference of the prophecy. Some, *e.g. Theodoret, Grotius*, think exclusively of the return from the Babylonish captivity. Others (after the example of *Jerome* and the Jewish interpreters) think of the Messianic time. It need scarcely be remarked, that here, as in so many other passages, this alternative is out of place. The prophecy has just the very same extent as the matter itself, and, hence, refers to all eternity. It was a commencement, that, at the time of Cyrus, many from among the ten tribes, induced by true love to the God of Israel, joined themselves to the returning

Judeans, and were hence again engrafted by God into the olive-tree. It was a continuation of the fulfilment that, in later times, especially those of the Maccabees, this took place more and more frequently. It was a preparation and prelude of the complete fulfilment, although not the complete fulfilment itself, that, at the time of Christ, the blessings of God were poured upon the whole δωδεκάφυλον, Acts 26:7. The words: "I bring you to Zion," in the verse under consideration, and: "They shall come out of the land of the North to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto their fathers," in ver. 18, do not at all oblige us to limit ourselves to those feeble beginnings; the idea appears here only in that form, in which it must be realised, in so far as its realisation belonged to the time of the Old Testament. Zion and the Holy Land were, at that time, the seat of the Kingdom of God; so that the return to the latter was inseparable from the return to the former. Those from among Israel who were converted to the true God, either returned altogether to Judea, or, at least, there offered up their sacrifices. But Zion and the Holy Land likewise come into consideration as the seat of the Kingdom of God *only*; and, for that very reason, the course of the fulfilment goes on incessantly, even in those times when even the North has become Zion and Holy Land.—The circumstance that two are assigned to a family, while only one is assigned to a town, shows that we must here think of a larger family which occupied several towns; and the circumstance that the town is put together with the family, shows that it is cities of the land of Israel which are here spoken of, and not those which the exiled ones inhabited.

Ver. 15. *And I give you shepherds according to mine heart, and they feed you with, knowledge and understanding.*

The question is:—Who are here to be understood by the shepherds? *Calvin* thinks that it is especially the prophets and priests, inasmuch as it was just the bad condition of these which had been the principal cause of the ruin of the people; and that it is the greatest blessing for the Church, when God raises up true and sincere teachers. Similar is the opinion of *Vitringa* (*obs. lib. vi., p. 417*), who, in a lower sense, refers it to Ezra and the learned men of that time, and, in a higher sense, to Christ. Among the Fathers of the Church, *Jerome* remarked: "These are the apostolical men who did not feed the multitude of the believers with Jewish ceremonies, but with knowledge and doctrine." Others refer it to leaders of every kind; thus *Venema: Pastores sunt rectores, ductores*. Others, finally, limit themselves to rulers; thus *Kimchi (gubernatores Israelis cum rege Messia), Grotius, and Clericus*. The latter interpretation is, for the following reasons, to be unconditionally preferred. 1. The image of the shepherd and of feeding occurs sometimes, indeed, in a wider sense, but ordinarily of the ruler specially. Thus, in the fundamental passage, 2 Sam. 5:2, it occurs of David, compare Micah 5:3. Thus also in Jeremiah 2:8: "The *priests* said not, Where is the Lord, and they that handle the law knew me not, and the shepherds transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied in the name of Baal;" comp. ver. 26: "They, their kings, their princes, and their priests, and their prophets." 2. The word בָּלֵל contains an evident allusion to 1 Sam. 13:14, where it is said of David: "The Lord hath sought him, a man after His own heart, and the Lord hath appointed him to be a prince over His people." 3. All doubt is removed by the parallel passage, chap. 23:4: "And I raise shepherds over them, and they feed them, and they fear no more, nor are dismayed." That, by the shepherds, in this verse, only the rulers can be understood, is evident from the contrast to the bad rulers of the present, who were spoken of in chap. 22, no less than from the connection with ver. 5, where that which, in ver. 4, was expressed in general, is circumscribed within narrow limits, and the concentration of the fulfilment of the preceding promise is placed in the Messiah: "Behold, days come, saith the Lord, and I

raise unto David a righteous *Branch*, and He reigneth as a king and acteth wisely, and setteth up judgment and justice in the land.” This parallel passage is, in so far also, of importance, as it shews that the prophecy under consideration likewise had its final reference to the Messiah. The kingdom of the ten tribes was punished by bad kings for its apostasy from the Lord, and from His visible representative. In the whole long series of Israelitish kings, we do not find any one like Jehoshaphat, or Hezekiah, or Josiah. And that is very natural, for the foundation of the Israelitish throne was rebellion. But, with the cessation of sin, punishment too shall cease. Israel again turns to that family which is the medium and channel through which all the divine mercies flow upon the Church of the Lord; and so they receive again a share in them, and particularly in their richest fullness in the exalted scion of David, the Messiah. The passage under consideration is thus completely parallel to Hosea 3:5: “And they seek Jehovah their God, and David their king;” and that which we remarked on that passage is here more particularly applicable; compare also Ezek. 34:23: “And I raise over them one Shepherd, and He feedeth them, my servant David, he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd.” The antithesis to the words: “According to mine heart,” is formed by the words in Hos. 8:4: “They have set up kings not by me, princes whom I knew not,”—words which refer to the past history of Israel. Formerly, the rebellious chose for themselves kings according to the desires of their own hearts. Now, they choose Him whom God hath chosen, and who, according to the same necessity, must be an instrument of blessing, as the former were of cursing.—*הָדָעָה* and *הַשְׂכִּיל* stand adverbially. *שְׂכִילָה* “to act wisely” is, in appearance only, intransitive in *Hiphil*. The foundation of wisdom and knowledge is the living communion with the Lord, being according to His heart, walking after Him. The foolish counsels of the former rulers of Israel, by which they brought ruin upon their people, were a consequence of their apostasy from the Lord. The two fundamental passages are, Deut. 4:6: “And ye shall keep and do (the law); for this is your wisdom and understanding; 29:8 (9): “Ye shall keep the words of this covenant and do them, that ye may act wisely.” Besides the passage under consideration, the passages Josh. 1:7; 1 Sam. 18:14, 15; 1 Kings 2:3; Is. 3:13; Jer. 10:21, 23:5, are founded upon these two passages. If all these passages are compared with one another, and with the fundamental passages, one cannot but wonder at the arbitrariness of interpreters and lexicographers who, severing several of these passages from the others, have forced upon the verb *לִיכָשָׁה* the signification “to prosper,”—a signification altogether fanciful. *God’s* servants act wisely, because they look up to God; and he who acts wisely finds prosperity for himself and his people. Hence, it is a proof of the greatest mercy of God towards His people, when He gives them His *servants* for kings.

Ver. 16. “*And it cometh to pass, when ye be multiplied and fruitful in the land, in those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more: The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord! And it will not come into the heart, neither shall they remember it, nor miss it, nor shall it be made again.*”

First, we shall explain some particulars. The words: “When ye be,” &c. refer to Gen. 1:28. As it is God’s general providence which brings about the fruitfulness of all creatures, so it is His special providence which brings about the increase of His Church whose ranks have been thinned by His judgments; and it is thus that His promise to the patriarchs is carried on towards its fulfilment; compare remarks on Hos. 2:1. God’s future activity in this respect, has an analogy in His former activity in Egypt, Exod. 1:12. The words: “The Ark of the Covenant” must be viewed as an exclamation, in which an ellipsis, in consequence of the emotion, must be supposed, *q.d.* it is the aim of all our

desires, the object of all our longings. The mere mention of the object with which the whole heart is filled, is sufficient for the lively emotion. *Venema's* exposition; *Arca foederis Jehovae sc. est*, and that of *De Wette*: "They shall no more speak of the Ark of the Covenant of Jehovah," are both feeble and unphilological. How were it possible that אָרְכָה with the Accusative should mean "to speak of something?"—בִּלְלֵעַ הִלְעַ is, in a similar context, just as it is here, connected with רָכַז in Is. 65:17: "For behold I create a new heaven and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into the heart," comp. also Jer. 51:50, 7:31; 1 Cor. 2:9. רָכַז with בִּ does not simply stand instead of the usual connection with the Accusative; it signifies a remembering connected with affection, a recollection joined with ardent longings, דָּקַף is, by many interpreters, understood in the sense of "to visit," but the signification "to miss" (Is. 34:16; 1 Sam. 20:6-18, 25:15; 1 Kings 20:39) is recommended by the connection with the following clause: "Nor shall it be made again." This supposes that there shall come a time when the Ark of the Covenant shall no more exist, the time of the destruction of the temple, which was so frequently and emphatically announced by the prophets.<sup>32</sup> God, however, will grant so rich a compensation for that which is lost, that men will neither long for it, nor, urged on by this longing, make any attempt at again procuring it for themselves by their own efforts. The main question now arises:—In what respect does the Ark of the Covenant here come into consideration? The answer is suggested by ver. 17. The Ark of the Covenant is no more remembered, because Jerusalem has now, in a perfect sense, become the throne of God. The Ark of the Covenant comes into consideration, therefore, as the throne of God, in an imperfect sense. It can easily be proved that it was so, although there have been disputes as to the manner in which it was so. The current view was this, that God, as the Covenant God, had *constantly* manifested himself above the Cherubim on the Ark of the Covenant, in a visible symbol, in a cloud. The first important opposition to this view proceeded from *Vitringa* who, in the *Obs. sac. t. i. p. 169*, advances, among other arguments, the following: "It is not by any means necessary to maintain that, in the holy of holies, in the tabernacle or the temple of Solomon, there was constantly a cloud over the Ark; but it may be sufficient to say, that the Ark was the symbol of the divine habitation, and it was for this reason said that God was present in the place between the Cherubim, because from thence proceeded the relation of His will, and He thus proved to the Jews that He was present." But this view of *Vitringa*, that it was merely in an invisible manner that God was present over the Ark of the Covenant, met with strong opposition; and a note to the second edition shows, that he himself afterwards entertained doubts regarding it. By *Thalemann*, a pupil of *Ernesti*, it was afterwards advanced far more decidedly, and evidently with the intention of carrying it through, whether it was true or not, in the *Dissertatio de nube super arcam foederis* (Leipzig, 1756). He, too, declared, however, that he did not deny the matter, but only disputed the sign. He found a learned opponent in *John Eberhard Rau*, Professor at Herborn (*Ravius, de nube super arcam foederis*, Utrecht, 1760; it is a whole book, in which *Thalemann's* Treatise is reprinted). The matter is, indeed, very simple; both parties are right and wrong, and the truth lies between the two. From the principal passage, in Lev. 16:2, it is evident that, at the annual entry of the High Priest into the holy of holies, the invisible presence of God embodied itself in a cloud, as formerly it also did, on extraordinary occasions, during the journey through the wilderness, and at the dedication of the tabernacle and temple. In that passage, Aaron is exhorted not to enter the holy of holies at all times, for that would prove a want of reverence, but only once a year, "for in the cloud I shall appear over the lid of expiation," (this is the right explanation of אֲרָכָה, compare *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, p. 525 f.) The place where God manifests himself in so visible a manner when the High Priest enters into it, cannot fail to be a most holy place to him. It is true

that *Vitringa* (S. 171), and still more *Thalemann* (S. 39 in *Rau*), have endeavoured to remove this objection by their interpretation; but with so plain a violation of all the laws of interpretation, that it is scarcely worth while to enter farther upon this exposition, (compare the refutation in *Ratt*, S. 40 ff.) although *J. D. Michaelis*, *Vater*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Bähr*, (*Symbol. des Mos. Cultus*, i. S. 395), have approved of it.<sup>33</sup> On the other hand, there is nothing to favour the supposition of an ordinary and constant presence of the cloud in the holy of holies. With such a view, questions at once arise, such as: Whether it came also to the Philistines? All that *Rau* advances in favour of it, merely proves the invisible presence of God, which surely cannot be considered and called a merely imaginary thing, as is done by him, p. 35. For what, in that case, would be the Lord's presence in the hearts of believers, and in the Lord's supper? It is true that Ezekiel, in chap. 11:22, beholds the glory of the Lord over the cherubim as being lifted up, and forsaking the temple before its destruction; but how can we draw any reference, as to the actual state of things, from visions which, according to their nature, surround with a body all that is invisible? Still, as we already remarked, this whole controversy has reference to the *manner* only, and not to the *fact* of God's presence over the Ark of the Covenant; and the Ark of the Covenant stands here in a wider sense, and comprehends the cherubim, and "the glory of the Lord dwelling over them." From a vast number of passages, it can be proved that this glory of the Lord was constantly and really present over the Ark of the Covenant, although it was in extraordinary cases only that it manifested itself in an outward, visible form; compare, besides Lev. 16:2, Lev. 9:24, where, after Aaron's consecration to the priesthood, the glory of the Lord appeared to the whole people in confirmation of his office. To these passages belong all those in which God is designated as dwelling over the cherubim, such as 1 Chron. 13:6; Ps. 80:2; 1 Sam. 4:4. To it refers the designation of the ark of the covenant, in a narrower sense, as the footstool of God; compare 1 Chron. 28:2, where David says: "I had in mine heart to build an house of rest for the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, and for the footstool of our God;" Ps. 99:5, 132:7; Lam. 2:1. From this circumstance the fact is explained, that the prayer in distress, as well as the thanks for deliverance, were offered up before, or towards the Ark of the Covenant. After the defeat before Ai (Josh. 7:5 ff.), Joshua "rent his clothes, and fell to the earth upon his face, before the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, until the eventide, he and the elders of Israel, and put dust upon their heads, and Joshua said: Alas, O Lord God, wherefore hast thou at all brought this people over Jordan?" After the Lord had appeared to Solomon at Gibeah, and had given him the promise, he went before the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings, and thank-offerings, 1 Kings 3:15. In 2 Sam. 15:32, we are told that David went up the Mount of Olives very sorrowfully, and when he was come to the place, *where people were accustomed to worship God*, Hushai met him. According to that passage, it was the custom of the people, when on the top of the Mount of Olives, they gained, for the first or last time, a view of the sanctuary, to prostrate themselves before the God of Israel who dwelt there. To the Ark of the Covenant, all those passages refer in which it is said that God dwelleth in the midst of Israel; that He dwelleth in the temple; that He dwelleth at Zion or Jerusalem, compare *e.g.*, the promise in Exodus 29:45: "I dwell in the midst of the children of Israel," and farther, Ps. 9:12, 132:13, 14; 1 Kings 6:12, 13, where God promises to Solomon that if he should only walk in His commandments, and execute His judgments, then would He dwell among the children of Israel; and afterwards fulfils this promise by solemnly entering into his temple. Indissolubly connected with this, was the deep reverence in which the Ark of the Covenant was held in Israel. It was considered as the most precious jewel of the people, as the centre of their whole existence. Being the place where the glory of God dwelt (Ps. 26:8), where He manifested himself in His most

glorious revelation, it was called *the glory of Israel*, compare 1 Sam. 4:21, 22; Ps. 78:61. The High Priest Eli patiently and quietly heard all the other melancholy tidings—the defeat of Israel, and the death of his sons. But when he who had escaped added: “And the Ark of God is taken,” he fell from off the seat backward by the side of the gate; and his neck brake, and he died. When his daughter-in-law heard the tidings that the Ark of the Covenant was taken, she bowed herself and travailed; for her pains came upon her. And about the time of her death, the women that stood by her said unto her: Fear not, for thou hast borne a son. But she answered not, neither did she take it to heart, and she named the child Ichabod, and said, The glory is departed from Israel, because the Ark of the Covenant was taken, and said again: “The glory is departed from Israel, for the Ark of God is taken.” But in what manner may this dwelling of God over the Ark of the Covenant be conceived of? Should the Most High God, whom all the heavens, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain (1 Kings 8:27), whose throne is the heaven, and whose footstool is the earth (Is. 66:1), dwell in a temple made by the hands of men? (Acts 7:48 ff.) Evidently not in the manner in which men dwell in a place, who are *in* it only, not *out* of it. Nor in such a manner as the carnally minded suppose, who, to the warnings of the prophets, opposed their word: “Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us” (Micah 3:11), or: “Here is the temple of the Lord, here is the temple of the Lord, here is the temple of the Lord” (Jer. 7:4), imagining that God could not forsake the place which he had chosen, could not take away the free gift of His grace. The matter rather stands thus: That which constitutes the substance and centre of the whole relation of Israel to God, is that the God of the heavens and the earth became the God of Israel; that the Creator of heaven and earth became the Covenant-God, that His general providence in blessing and punishing became a special one. In order to make the relation familiar to the people, and thus to make it the object of their love and fear, God gave them a *praesens numen* in His sanctuary, as a prefiguration, and, at the same time, a prelude of the condescension with which He whom the whole universe cannot contain, rested in the womb of Mary. And in so doing, He gave them not a symbolical representation merely, but an embodiment of the idea, so that they who wished to seek Him as the God of Israel, could find Him in the temple, and over the Ark of the Covenant only. The circumstance that is was just there that He took His seat, shows the difference between this truly *praesens numen*, and that merely imaginary one of the Gentiles. There was in this no partial favour for Israel, nothing from which careless sinners could derive any comfort. God’s dwelling among Israel rested on His holy Law. According as the Covenant is kept or not, and the Law is observed or not, it manifests itself by increased blessing, or by severer punishment. If the Covenant be entirely broken, the consequence is that God leaves His dwelling, and it is only the curse which remains, and which is greater than the curse inflicted upon those among whom He never dwelt, and which, by its greatness, indicates the greatness of the former grace.—Now, if this be the case with the Ark of the Covenant; if it be the substance and centre of the whole former dispensation, what, and how much would not fall along with it, if it fell; and how infinitely great must the compensation be which was to be granted for it, if, in consequence of it, no desire and longing after it was to rise at all, if it was to be regarded as belonging to the  $\pi\tau\omega\chi\grave{\alpha}$   $\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha$ , and was to be forgotten as a mere image and shadow! The fact that the Ark of the Covenant was made before any thing else, sufficiently shows that every thing sacred under the Old Testament dispensation depended upon it. *Witsius Misc.* t. i. p. 439, very pertinently remarks: “The Ark of the Covenant being, as it were, the heart of the whole Israelitish religion, was made first of all.” Without Ark of the Covenant—no temple; for it became a sanctuary by the Ark of the Covenant only; for holy, so Solomon says in 2 Chron. 8:11, is the place whereunto the Ark of the Covenant hath come. Without Ark of

the Covenant, no priesthood; for what is the use of servants when there is no Lord present? Without temple and priesthood, no sacrifice. We have thus before us the announcement of the entire destruction of the previous form of the Kingdom of God, but such a destruction of the form as brings about, at the same time, the highest completion of the substance,—a perishing like that of the seed-corn, which dies only, in order to bring forth much fruit; like that of the body, which is sown in corruption, in order to be raised in incorruption. *Dahler* remarks: “Because a more sublime religion, a more glorious state of things will take the place of the Mosaic dispensation, there will be no cause for regretting the loss of the symbol of the preceding dispensation, and people will no more remember it.”—It is quite natural that the prophecy should give great offence, and prove a stumbling-block to Jewish interpreters. Its subject, its high dignity, just consists in the announcement that, at some future period, the shadow should give way to the substance; but it is just the confounding of the shadow with the substance, the rigid adherence to the former, which characterises Judaism, which considers even the Messiah as a minister of the old dispensation only, and views the great changes to be effected by Him, mainly as external ones. The embarrassment arising from this, is very clearly expressed in the following words of *Abarbanel*: “This promise is, then, bad, and uproots the whole Law. How is it then that Scripture mentions it as good?” Rabbi *Arama*, in his commentary on the Pentateuch, fol. 101. says, in reference to this prophecy, מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל לֵב וְכוּבֵב “all interpreters have been perplexed by it.” The interpretations by means of which they endeavour to rid themselves of this embarrassment (see the collection of them in *Frischmuth’s* dissertation on this passage, Jena; reprinted in the *Thes. Ant.*) are only calculated plainly to manifest it. *Kimchi* gives this explanation: “Although ye shall increase and be multiplied on the earth, yet the nations shall not envy you, nor wage war against you; and it shall no more be necessary for you to go to war with the Ark of the Covenant, as was usual in former times, when they took the Ark of the Covenant out to war. In that time, there will be no necessity for so doing, as they shall not have any war.” The weak points of this explanation are at once obvious. That which, in the verse under consideration, is, in a general way, said of the Ark of the Covenant, is, by it, referred to an altogether special use of it, a regard to which is excluded by the evident antithesis in ver. 17. *Abarbanel* rejects this explanation. He says: “For there is, in the text, no mention at all of war; and therefore I cannot approve of this exposition, although *Jonathan*, too, inclines towards it.” He himself brings out this sense: The Ark of the Covenant would then, indeed, still continue to exist, and be the seat of the Lord; but no more the exclusive one, no longer the sole sanctuary. “The whole of Jerusalem shall, as regards holiness and glory, equal the Ark of the Covenant. For there shall cease with them every evil thing, and every evil imagination; and there shall be such holiness in the land, that in the same manner as formerly the Ark was the holiest of all things, so at that time, Jerusalem shall be the throne of the Lord.” But, by this explanation, justice is not done to the text. For it is an entire doing away with the Ark of the Covenant which is spoken of in it, not a mere diminution of its dignity, produced by the circumstance, that that which formerly was low shall be exalted. This is particularly evident from the words: “They will not miss it, neither shall it be made again.” To this argument we may still add that, by this exposition, not even the object is gained for the sake of which it was advanced. The nature and substance of the Ark of the Covenant is destroyed, as soon as it is put on a level with anything else. It is then no more *the* throne of the Lord; and for this reason, the previous form can no longer continue to exist, and, along with it, the temple and priesthood too must fall. If every place in Jerusalem, if every inhabitant of it, be equally holy, how then can institutions still continue, which are based on the difference between holy and unholy?—Here a question still arises. There was no Ark of the Covenant in the second

temple. In what relation to the prophecy under consideration stands this absence of the Ark of the Covenant, the restoration of which the Jews expect at the end of the days? There cannot be any doubt that it was really wanting. Every proof of its existence is wanting. *Josephus*, in enumerating the catalogue of the *spolia Judaica*, borne before in the triumph, does not mention it. He says expressly (de Bell. Jud. v. 5, § 5), that the holy of holies had been altogether empty. Some of the Jewish writers assert that it had been carried away to Babylon; while most of them, following the account given in 2 Maccabees, tell us that Josiah or Jeremiah had concealed it; compare the Treatise by *Calmet*, Th. 6, S. 224-258, *Mosh*. In asking *why* such was the case, other analogous phenomena, the absence of the *Urim and Thummim*, the cessation of prophetism soon after the return from the captivity, must not be lost sight of. Every thing was intended to impress upon the people the conviction that their condition was provisional only. It was necessary that the Theocracy should sink beneath its former glory, in order that the future glory, which was far to outshine it, should so much the more be longed for. After having thus determined *why* it was that the Ark of the Covenant was wanting, at the second temple, it is easy to determine the relation of this absence to the prophecy under consideration. It was the beginning of its fulfilment. In the Kingdom of God, nothing perishes, without something new arising out of this decay. The extinction of the old was the guarantee, that something new was approaching. On the other hand, the absence of the Ark of the Covenant was, it is true, at the same time, a matter-of-fact prophecy of a sad character. To those who clung to the form, without having in a living manner laid hold of the substance, and who, therefore, were not able to partake in the more glorious display of the substance,—to these it announced that the time was approaching when the form, to which they had attached themselves with their whole existence, was to be broken. Since already one of the great privileges of the covenant-people, the  $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha$  (Rom. 9:4), had disappeared, surely all that might and would soon share the same fate, which existed only for the sake of it, and in it only had its significance. In this respect, the non-restoration of the Ark of the Covenant showed that the Chaldean destruction and that by the Romans were connected as commencement and completion; while, in the other aspect, it declared that, with the return from the captivity, the realization of God's great plan of salvation was being prepared. Inasmuch as the most complete *fuga vacui* is peculiar to the Covenant-God, the emptiness in that place where formerly the glory of God dwelt, proclaimed aloud the future fulness.—*Finally*, we have still to determine the special reference of our verse to Israel, *i.e.*, the former kingdom of the ten tribes. This reference is, by most interpreters, entirely lost sight of, and is very superficially and erroneously determined by those who, like *Calvin*, pay attention to it. In the preceding verse, it had been promised to Israel, that those blessings should again be bestowed upon them, which they had forfeited by their rebellion against the Davidic house, and that they should be restored to them with abundant interest. For David's house is to attain to its completion in its righteous Sprout. This Shepherd, who is, in the fullest sense, what His ancestor had only imperfectly been—a man according to the heart of God—shall feed them with knowledge and understanding. *Here*, a compensation is promised for the second, infinitely greater loss, which had, at all times, been acknowledged as such by the faithful in the kingdom of the ten tribes. The revelation of the Lord over the Ark of the Covenant was the magnet which constantly drew them to Jerusalem. Many sacrificed all their earthly possessions, and took up their abode in Judea. Others went on a pilgrimage from their natural to their spiritual home, to the “throne of the glory exalted from the beginning,” Jer. 17:12. In vain was every thing which the kings of Israel did in order to stifle their Indestructible longing. Every new event by which “the glory of Israel” manifested itself as such, kindled their ardour anew. But here also the great blessing and

privilege, which the believers missed with sorrow, the unbelievers without it, is to the returning ones given back, not in its previous form, but in a glorious completion. The whole people have now received eyes to recognise the value of the matter in its previous form; and yet this previous form is now looked upon by them as nothing, because the new, infinitely more glorious form of the same matter occupied their attention.

Ver. 17. *“At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered into it, because the name of the Lord is at Jerusalem; neither shall they walk any more after the wickedness of their evil heart.”*

Many interpreters, proceeding upon the supposition that the emphasis rests upon Jerusalem, have been led to give an altogether erroneous explanation. It is no more the Ark of the Covenant which will then be the throne of the Lord, but *all* Jerusalem. Thus, *e. g.*, after the example of *Jarchi* and *Abarbanel*, *Manasseh ben Israel*, *Conciliatory* p. 196: “If we keep in mind that, in the tabernacle or temple, the Ark was the place where the Lord dwelt (hence Ex. 25:22: ‘I will speak with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim’), we shall find that the Lord here says, that the Ark indeed had formerly been the dwelling-place of the Godhead, but that, at the time of Messiah, not some one part of the temple only would be filled with the Godhead, but that this glory should be given to all Jerusalem; so that whosoever would be in her would have the prophetic spirit.” If it had been the intention of the Prophet to convey this meaning, the word *all* could not have been omitted. The throne of the Lord, Jerusalem had been even formerly, in so far as she possessed in her midst the Ark of the Covenant, and hence was the residence of Jehovah, the city of the great King, Ps. 48:3. The words in the parallel member: “Because the name of the Lord is at Jerusalem,” show that Jerusalem is called the throne of the Lord, because there is now in her the true throne of the Lord, just as, formerly, the Ark of the Covenant. The antithesis to what precedes leads us to expect a gradation, not in point of quantity, but of quality. The emphasis rests rather on: “The throne of the Lord;” and these words receive from the antithesis the more definite qualification: the true throne of the Lord. Quite similarly, those who boasted that over the Cherubim was the throne of God, and that the Ark of the Covenant was His footstool, are told in Is. 66:1: “The heaven is my (true) throne, and the earth my (true) footstool;” compare the passages according to which the Ark of the Covenant is designated as the footstool of God, and, hence, the place over the Cherubim of the Ark of the Covenant as the throne of the Lord, p. 387; and farther, Is. 60:13; Ezra 1:26.—The highest prerogative of the covenant-people, their highest privilege over the world, is to have God in the midst of them; and this prerogative, this privilege, is now to be bestowed upon them in the most perfect manner; so that idea and reality shall coincide. Perfectly parallel in substance are such passages as Ezek. 43, in which the Shechinah which at the destruction of the temple had withdrawn, returns to the new temple, the Kingdom of God in its new and more glorious form. Ver. 2. “And behold the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the East; and its voice was like the voice of great waters, and the earth shone with its splendour.” Ver. 7. “And He said unto me, son of man, behold the place of *my throne*, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and the house of Israel shall no more defile my holy place.” Zech. 2:14 (10): “Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for, lo, I come and dwell in the midst of thee,” with an allusion to Exod. 29:45: “And I dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God.” The Prophet declares that the full realization of this promise is reserved for the future; but it could not be so, unless it had already been realised, throughout all past history, in God’s dwelling over the Ark of the Covenant; compare

Zech. 8:3: “Thus saith the Lord, I return unto Zion, and dwell in the midst of Jerusalem.”—If we enquire after the fulfilment, we are at once met by the words in John 1:14: καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατέρας; and that so much the more that these words contain an evident allusion to the former dwelling of God in the temple, of which the incarnation of the Logos is looked upon as the highest consummation. It is true that the dwelling of God among His people by means of the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ must not be separated from the personal manifestation of God in Christ, in whom dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily, σωματικῶς. The former stands to the latter in the same relation, as does the river to the fountain; it is the river of living water flowing forth from the body of Christ. Both together form the true tabernacle of God among men, the new true Ark of the Covenant; for the old things are the σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Col. 2:17; comp. Rev. 21:22: καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ· ὁ γὰρ Κύριος, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ, καὶ τὸ ἄρνιον. The typical import of the Ark of the Covenant is expressly declared in Heb. 9:4, 5, and that which was typified thereby is intimated in chap. 4:16: προσερχώμεθα δὲ μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, where Christ is designated as the true mercy-seat, as the true Ark of the Covenant. Just as, formerly, God could be found over the Ark of the Covenant only, by those from among his people who sought Him; so we have now, through Christ, boldness and access with confidence in God (Eph. 3:12); and it is only when offered in His name, in living union with Him, that our prayers are acceptable, John 16:23. A consequence of that highest realization of the idea of the kingdom of God, and, at the same time, a sign that it has taken place, and a measure of the blessings which Israel has to expect from its re-union with the Church of God, is the gathering of the Gentiles into it, such as, by way of type and prelude, took place even at the lower manifestations of the presence of God among the people; compare, *e. g.*, Josh. 9:9: “And they (the Gibeonites) said unto him: From a very far country thy servants are come, because of the name (שׁוּרֵי) of Jehovah thy God, for we have heard the fame of Him, and all that He did in Egypt, and all that He did to the two kings of the Amorites,” &c. In a manner quite similar it is, in Zech. 2:15 (11) also, connected with the Lord’s dwelling in Jerusalem: “And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day; and they shall be my people; and I dwell in the midst of thee.”—שׁוּרֵי הוּוּי must be literally translated: “On account of the name of the Lord (belonging) to Jerusalem,” for: because the name of the Lord belongs to Jerusalem—is there at home. The name of the Lord is the Lord himself, in so far as He reveals His invisible nature, manifests himself. In the name, His deeds are comprehended; and hence it forms a bridge betwixt existing and knowing. A God without a name is a θεὸς ἄγνωστος, Acts 18:23. There is an allusion to Deut. 12:5: “But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes *to put His name there*, to dwell in it, unto it ye shall seek, and thither ye shall come.” Formerly, when God put His name in an imperfect manner only, Israel only assembled themselves; but now, all the Gentiles.—The last words: “Neither shall they walk any more,” &c., are not by any means to refer to the Gentiles, but to the members of the kingdom of Israel, or also to the whole of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, to all the members of the Kingdom of God, including the subjects of the kingdom of Israel. This appears from a comparison of the fundamental passage of the Pentateuch, as well as of the parallel passages in Jeremiah. Where-ever תּוֹרִירֶשׁ occurs, the covenant-people are spoken of; everywhere the walking after תּוֹרִירֶשׁ of the heart is opposed to the walking after the revealed law of Jehovah, which Israel alone possessed, תּוֹרִירֶשׁ, which properly means “firmness,” is then used of hardness in sin, of wickedness.<sup>34</sup>

## CHAPTER 23:1-8

These verses form a portion only of a greater whole, to which, besides the whole of chap. 22, chap. 23:9-40 also belongs. For these verses contain a prophecy against the false prophets, and by the way also, against the degenerated priesthood (comp. ver. 11); and this prophecy easily unites itself with the preceding prophecy against the kings, so as to form one prophecy against the corrupt leaders of the people of God. But, for the exposition of the verses before us, it is only the connection with chap. 22 which is of importance, and that so much so that, without carefully attending to it, they cannot at all be thoroughly understood. For this reason, we shall confine ourselves to bring it out more clearly.

The Prophet reproveth and warns the kings of Judah, first, in general, announcing to them the judgments of the Lord upon them and their people,—the fulfilment of the threatenings, Deut. 29:22 ff.—if they are to continue in their hitherto ungodly course, chap. 22:1-9. In order to make a stronger impression, he then particularizes the general threatening, showing how God's recompensing justice manifests itself in the fate of the individual apostate kings. First, Jehoahaz is brought forward, the son and the immediate successor of Josiah, whom Pharaoh-Necho dethroned and carried with him to Egypt, vers. 10-12. The declaration concerning him forms a commentary on the name Shallum, *i.e.*, the recompensed one, he whom the Lord recompenses according to his deeds,—which name the Prophet gives to him instead of the meaningless name Jehoahaz, *i.e.*, God holds. His father, who met his death in the battle against the Egyptians, may be called happy when compared with him; for he never returns to his native land; he lives and dies in a foreign land. The next whom he brings forward is Jehoiakim, vers. 13-19. He is a despot who does every thing to ruin the people committed to him. There is, therefore, the most glaring contrast between his beautiful name and his miserable fate. The Lord, instead of raising him up, will cast him down to the lowest depth; not even an honourable burial is to be bestowed upon him. No one weeps or laments over him; like a trodden down carcass, he lies outside the gates of Jerusalem, the city of the great King, which he attempted to wrest from him, and make his own. Then follows a parenthetical digression, vers. 20-23. Apostate Judah is addressed. The judgment upon her kings is not one with which she has nothing to do, as little as their guilt belongs to them as individuals only. It is, at the same time a judgment upon the people which, by the Lord's anger which they have called forth by their wickedness, is thrown down into the depth, from the height on which the Lord's mercy had raised them.—Next follows Jehoiachin, vers. 24-30. In his name "The *Lord* will establish," the word *wilt* has no foundation; the Lord *wilt* reject him, cast him away, and break him in pieces like a worthless vessel. With his mother, he shall be carried away from his native land, and die in exile and captivity. Irrevocable is the Lord's decree, that none of his sons shall ascend the throne of David, so that he, having begotten children in vain, is to be esteemed as one who is childless.

At the commencement of the section under consideration (vers. 1 and 2), the contents of chap. 22 are comprehended into one sentence. "Woe to the shepherds that destroy and scatter the flock of the Lord." Woe, then, to those shepherds who have done so. With this is then, in vers. 3-8, connected the announcement of salvation for the poor scattered flock. For the same reason, that the Lord visits upon those who have hitherto been their shepherds, the wickedness of their doings—*viz.*, because of His being the chief Shepherd, or because of His covenant-faithfulness, He will in mercy remember them also, gather them from their dispersion, give, instead of the bad shepherds, a good one, *viz.*, the long

promised and longed for great descendant of David, who, being a *righteous* King, shall diffuse justice and righteousness in the land, and thus acquire for it righteousness and salvation from the Lord. So great shall the mercy of the Future be, that thereby the greatest mercy in the people's past history—their deliverance out of Egypt—shall be altogether cast into the shade.

There cannot be any doubt that the whole prophecy belongs to the reign of Jehoiakim; for the end of Jehoiakim and the fate of Jehoiachin are announced as future events.

*Eichhorn* asserts that this section was composed under Zedekiah; but he could do so only by proceeding from his erroneous fundamental view, that the prophecies are veiled descriptions of historical events. "When Jeremiah"—so he says—"delivered this discourse, Jehoiakim had not only already met his ignominious end (22:19), but Jeconiah also was, with his mother, already carried away captive to Babylon." It is matter of astonishment that *Dahler*, without holding the same fundamental view, could yet adopt its result. He specially refers to the circumstance that, in ver. 24, Jehoiachin is addressed as king,—a circumstance by which *Berkold* also supports his view, who, cutting the knot, advances the position that vers. 1-19 belong to the reign of Jehoiakim, but vers. 20-32:8 to the time when Jehoiachin was carried away to Babylon. (*Maurer* and *Hitzig* too suppose that vers. 20 ff. were added at a later period, under the reign of Jehoiachin). But what difficulty is there in supposing that the Prophet transfers himself into the time, when he who is now a hereditary prince will be king,—of which the address is then a simple consequence? It is undeniable that a connection with chap. 21 takes place, in which chapter Jeremiah announces to Zedekiah, threatened by the Chaldeans, the fall of the Davidic house, and the capture and destruction of the city. And this connection is to be accounted for by the fact that Jeremiah here connects with this announcement a former prophecy, in which, under the reign of Jehoiakim, he had foretold the fall of the Davidic house. The fate of the house of David is the subject common to both the discourses. *Küper* (*Jeremias, libror. Sacror. interpres*, p. 58), supposes that, in the message to Zedekiah, Jeremiah had, at that time, repeated his former announcement; but this supposition is opposed by the circumstance that, in chaps. 22, 23, there is no trace of a reference to Zedekiah and his embassy. *Ewald* asserts that Jeremiah here only puts together what "perhaps" he had formerly spoken regarding the three kings; but the words in chap. 22:1: "Go down into the house of the king of Judah and speak there this word," is conclusive against this assertion. For, according to these words, we have here not something put together, but a discourse which was delivered at a distinct, definite time; although nothing prevents us from supposing that the going down was done in the Spirit only.

We have here still to make an investigation concerning the names of the three kings occurring in chap. 22, the result of which is of importance for the exposition of ver. 5.—It cannot but appear strange that the same king who, in the Book of the Kings, is called Jehoahaz, is here called Shallum only; that the same who is there called Jehoiachin, has here the name of Jeconias, which is abbreviated into Conias. The current supposition is, that the two kings had two names each. But this supposition is unsatisfactory, because, by the context in which they stand, the names employed by Jeremiah too clearly appear as *nomina realia*, as new names given to them by which the contrast between the name and thing was to be removed, and hence are evidently of the same nature with the *nomen reale* of the good Shepherd in chap. 23:6, which, with quite the same right, could have been changed into a *nomen proprium* in the proper sense, as has, indeed, been done by the

LXX. The numerous passages in the prophets, where the name occurs as a designation of the nature and character, *e.g.*, Is. 9:5, 62:4; Jer. 33:16; Ezek. 48:35, plainly show that a name which has merely a prophetic warrant (and such an one alone takes place here, although the name Shallum occurs also in 1 Chron. 3:15 [in the historical representation itself, however, Jehoahaz is used in the Book of Kings, and 2 Chron. 36:1], and the name Jeconias likewise in 1 Chron. 3:16, while Jehoiakim is found not only in the Book of Kings, but also in Ezek. 1:2; for it is quite possible that those later writers may have drawn from Jeremiah), cannot simply be considered as a *nomen proprium*; but, on the contrary, that there is a strong probability that it is not so. And this probability becomes certainty when that name occurs, either *alone*, as *e.g.*, Shallum, or *first*, as Jeconiah, (which occurs again in chap. 24:1, 27:20: the abbreviated Coniah in 37:1, while, which is well to be observed, we have in the historical account, chap. 52:31, Jehoiachin) in a context, such as that under consideration; especially when this phenomenon occurs in a prophet such as Jeremiah, in whom, elsewhere also, many traces of holy wit, and even punning, can be pointed out.—With reference to the calamity which more and more threatened Judah, pious Josiah had given to his sons names, which announced salvation. According to his wish, these names should be as many actual prophecies, and would, indeed, have proved themselves to be such, unless they who bore them had made them of no avail by their apostasy from the Lord, and had thus brought about the most glaring contrast between idea and reality. That comes out first in the case of Jehoahaz. He whom the Lord should *hold*, was violently and irresistibly carried away to Egypt. The Prophet, therefore, calls him Shallum, *i.e.*, the *recompensed*,—not *retribution*, as *Hiller, Simonis, and Roediger* think, nor *retributor* according to *Fürst* (comp. *Ewald* § 154 d); the same who, in 1 Chron. 5:38, is called Shallum, is in 1 Chron. 9:11, called Meshullam—he upon whom the Lord has visited the wickedness of his deeds.—As regards the name Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin, we must, above all things, keep in view the relation of these names to the promise given to David. In 2 Sam. 7:12 it is said: “And I cause to rise up (יתמיקרו) thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish (יתניכרו) his kingdom.” This passage contains the ground of *both* names; and this is the more easily explained, since both of them have one author, Jehoiakim. Even his former name Eliakim had probably been given to him by his father Josiah with a view to the promise. When Pharaoh, however, desired him to change his name—as the name itself shows, we cannot but supply, in 2 Kings 23:31, such a request to a proposal which was afterwards approved of by Pharaoh—he performed that change in such a manner as to bring it into a still nearer relation to the promise, in which, not El, but Jehovah, is expressly mentioned as He who promised; and indeed the matter proceeded from Jehovah, the God of Israel. As, however, from the whole character of Jehoiakim, we cannot suppose that the twofold naming proceeded from true piety, nothing is more natural than to account for it from an opposition to the prophets. The centre of their announcements was formed by the impending calamity from the North, and the decline of the Davidic family. The promise given to David shall indeed be fulfilled in the Messiah; but not till after a previous deep abasement. Jehoiakim mocking at these threatenings, means to transfer the salvation from the future into the present. In his own name, and that of his son, he presented a standing protest to the prophetic announcement; and this protest could not but call forth a counter-protest, which we find expressed in the prophecy under consideration. The Prophet first overthrows the false interpretation: Jehoiakim is not Jehoialdm, and Jehoiachin is not Jehoiachin, chap. 22; he then restores the right interpretation: the true Jehoiakim is, and remains, the Messiah, chap. 23:5. As regards the first point, he, in the case of Jehoiakim, contents himself with the *actual* contrast, and omits to substitute a truly significant name for the usurped one, which may most easily be accounted for from the circumstance, that

he thought it to be unsuitable to exercise any kind of wit, even holy wit, against the then reigning king. But the case is different with regard to Jehoiachin. The first change of the name into Jeconiah has its cause not in itself; the two names have quite the same meaning; it had respect to the second change into Coniah only. In Jeconiah we have the Future; and this is put first, in order that, by cutting off the ך, the sign of the Future, he might cut off hope; a Jeconiah without the ך says only God establishes, but not that He *will* establish. In reference to these names, *Grotius* came near the truth; but he erred in the nearer determination, because he did not see the true state of the matter; so that, according to him, it amounts to a mere play: “The Jod,” he says, “with which the name begins, is taken away, to intimate that his head shall be diminished; and a Vav is added at the end as a sign of contempt, *q.d.* that Coniah!” *Lightfoot* comes nearer to the truth; yet even he was not able to gain assent to it (compare against him *Hiller* and *Simonis* who thought his views scarcely worth refuting), because he took an one-sided view. He remarks (*Harmon.* p. 275): “By taking away the first syllable, God intimated that He would not establish to the progeny of Solomon the uninterrupted government and royal dignity, as Jehoiakim, by giving that name to his son, seems to have expected.” Besides these two, compare farther, *Alting, de Cabbala sacra* § 73.

In conclusion, we must still direct attention to chap. 20:3. Who, indeed, could infer from that passage, that, by way of change, *Pashur*, was called also *Magor-Missabib*?

Chap. 23:1. “*Woe to shepherds that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord.*”

It must be well observed that רועים is here without the article, but, in ver. 2, with it.

*Venema* remarks on this: “A general woe upon bad shepherds is premised, which is soon applied to the shepherds of Judah, *q.d.*, since Jehovah has denounced a woe upon all bad shepherds, therefore ye bad shepherds,” &c. By the “shepherds,” several interpreters would understand only the false prophets and priests. Others would at least have them thought of, along with the kings. This view has exercised an injurious influence upon the understanding of the subsequent Messianic announcement, inasmuch as it occasioned the introduction into it of features which are altogether foreign to it. It is only when it is perceived, that the bad shepherds refer to the kings exclusively, that it is seen that, in the description, of the good Shepherd, that only is applicable which has reference to Him as a King. But the very circumstance that, according to a correct interpretation, nothing else is found in this description, is a sufficient proof that, by the bad shepherds, the kings only can be understood, But all doubt is removed when we consider the close connection of the verses under consideration with chap. 22. In commenting upon chap. 3:15, we saw that, ordinarily, rulers only are designated by the shepherds; compare, farther, chap. 25:34-36, and the imitation and first interpretation of the passage under review by Ezekiel, in chap. 34. Ps. 78:70, 71: “He chose David his servant, and took him from the sheep-folds. He took him from behind the ewes to feed Jacob, His people, and Israel, His inheritance,” shows that a typical interpretation of the former circumstances of David lies at the foundation of this *unus loquendi*; compare Ezek. 34:23, 24; “And I raise over them one Shepherd, and he feedeth them, my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd.”—What is to be understood by the destroying and scattering, must be determined partly from ver. 3 and vers. 13 ff. of the preceding chapter; partly from ver. 3 of the chapter before us. The former passages show that the acts of violence of the kings, their oppressions and extortions, come here into consideration (compare Ezek. 34:2, 3: “Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds

feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill them that are fed, &c., and with force and with cruelty ye rule them”), while the latter passage shows that it is chiefly the heaviest guilt of the kings which comes into consideration, viz., all that by which they became the cause of the people’s being carried away into captivity. To this belonged, besides their foolish political counsels, which were based upon ungodliness (comp. chap. 10:21), the negative (*Venema*: “It was their duty to take care that the true religion, the spiritual food of the people, was rightly and properly exercised”), and positive promotion of ungodliness, and of immorality proceeding from it, by which the divine judgments were forcibly drawn down. It is in this contrast of idea and reality (*Calvin*: “It is a contradiction that the shepherd should be a destroyer”), that the woe has its foundation, and that the more, that it is pointed out that the flock, which they destroy and scatter, is *God’s* flock. (*Calvin*: “God intimates that, by the unworthy scattering of the flock, an atrocious injury had been committed against himself.”) תִּיעָרַם אֶצְלִי must not be explained by: “the flock of my feeding,” i.e., which I feed. For, wherever תִּיעָרַם occurs by itself, it always has the signification “pasture,” but never the signification *pastio*, *pastus* commonly assigned to it. This signification, which is quite in agreement with the form of the word, must therefore be retained in those passages also where it occurs in connection with אֶצְלִי, when it always denotes the relation of Israel to God. Israel is called the flock of God’s pasture, because He has given to them the fertile Canaan as their possession, compare my remarks on Ps. 74:1. It is, at first sight, strange that a guilt of the rulers only is spoken of, and not a guilt of the people; for every more searching consideration shows that both are inseparable from one another; that bad rulers proceed from the development of the nation, and are, at the same time, a punishment of its wickedness sent by God. But the fact is easily accounted for, if only we keep in mind that the Prophet had here to do with kings only, and not with the people. To them it could not serve for an excuse that their wickedness was naturally connected with that of the people. This *natural* connection was not by any means a necessary one, as appears from the example of a Josiah, in whose case it was broken through by divine grace. Nor were they justified by the circumstance, that they were rods of chastisement in the hand of God. To this the Prophet himself alludes, by substituting, in ver. 3: “I have driven away,” for “you have driven away,” in ver. 2. All which they had to do, was to attend to their vocation and duty; the carrying out of God’s counsels belonged to Him alone. From what we have remarked, it plainly follows that we would altogether misunderstand the expression “flock of my pasture,” if we were to infer from it a contrast of the *innocent* people with the guilty kings. *Calvin* remarks: “In short, when God calls the Jews the flock of His pasture, He has no respect to their condition, or to what they have deserved, but rather commends His grace which He has bestowed upon the seed of Abraham.” The kings have nothing to do with the moral condition of the people; they have to look only to God’s covenant with them, which is for them a source of obligations so much the greater and more binding than the obligations of heathen kings, as Jehovah is more glorious than Elohim. The moral condition of the people does, to a certain degree, not even concern God; how bad soever it is, He looks to His covenant; and when more deeply viewed, even the outward scattering of the flock is a gathering.

Ver. 2. “*Therefore thus saith the Lord the God of Israel, against the shepherds that feed my people: Ye have scattered my flock and driven them away, and have not visited them; behold, I visit upon you the wickedness of your doings, saith the Lord.*”

In the designation of God as Jehovah the God of Israel, there is already implied that which afterwards is expressly said. Because God is Jehovah, the God of Israel, the crime

of the kings is, at the same time, a *sacrilegium*: they have desecrated God. It was just here that it was necessary prominently to point out the fact, that the people still continued to be God's people. In another very important aspect, they were indeed called *Lo-Ammi* (Hos. 1:9); but that aspect did not here come into consideration. *Calvin*: "They had estranged themselves from God; and He too had, in His decree, already renounced them. But, in one respect, God might consider them as aliens, while, in respect to His covenant, He still acknowledged them as His, and hence He calls them His people."—The words "that feed my people," render the idea still more prominent and emphatic than the simple "the shepherds" would have done, and hence serve to make more glaring the contrast presented by the reality. The words "you have not visited them," seem, at first sight, since graver charges have been mentioned before, to be feeble. But that which they did, appears in its whole heinousness only by that which they did not, but which, according to their vocation, they ought to have done. This reference to their destination imparts the greatest severity to the apparently mild reproof. Similar is Ezek. 34:3: "Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill them that are fed, and ye feed not the flock." The visiting forms the general foundation of every single activity of the shepherd, so that the *אל מתדקף* comprehends within itself all that which Ezekiel particularly mentions in chap. 34:4: "The weak ye strengthen not, and the sick ye heal not, and the wounded ye bind not up, and the scattered ye bring not back, and the perishing ye seek not."—The words: "the wickedness of your doings," look back to Deut. 28:20: "The Lord shall send upon thee curse, terror, and ruin in all thy undertakings, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly, *because of the wickedness of thy doings*, that thou hast forsaken me." The gentle allusion to that fearful threatening in that portion of the Pentateuch, which was the best known of all, was sufficient to make every one supplement from it that, which was there actually and expressly uttered. Such an allusion to that passage of Deuteronomy can be traced out, wherever the phrase *מיללעם ער* occurs, which, in later times, had become obsolete; compare chap. 4:4 and 21:12 (in both of these passages *ינפם*, too, is introduced); Is. 1:16; Ps. 28:4; Hos. 9:15.

Ver. 3. "*And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all the countries whither I have driven them away, and I bring them back again to their folds, and they are fruitful and increase.*"

Compare chap. 29:14, 31:8, 10; Ezek. 34:12, 13: "As a shepherd looketh after his flock in the day that he is in the midst of his flock, the scattered, so will I look after my flock, and I deliver them out of all the places, where they have been scattered in the day of clouds and of darkness. And I bring them out from the nations, and gather them from the countries, and bring them to their land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel, in the valleys, and in all the dwelling places of the land."—A spiritless clinging to the letter has, here too, led several interpreters to suppose, that the Prophet had here in view merely the return from the Babylonish captivity, and perhaps, also, the blessings of the times of the Maccabees, besides and in addition to it Altogether apart from the consideration that, in that case, the fulfilment would very little correspond to the promise,—for, to the returning ones, Canaan was too little the land of God to allow of our seeing, in this return, the whole fulfilment of God's promise—we can, from the context, easily demonstrate the opposite. With the gathering and bringing back appears, in ver. 4, closely connected the raising of the good shepherds; and according to ver. 5, that promise is to find, if not its sole fulfilment, at all events its substance and centre, in the raising of David's righteous Branch, the Messiah. And from vers. 7, 8, it appears that it is here altogether inadmissible to suppose that these events will take place, one after the other. The particle *וְכֵן* with

which these verses begin, and which refers to the whole sum and substance of the preceding promises, shows that the bringing back from the captivity, and the raising of the Messiah, cannot, by any means, be separated from one another; and to the same result we are led by the contents of the two verses also. How indeed could it be said of the bodily bringing back from the captivity, that it would far outshine the former deliverance from Egypt, and would cause it to be altogether forgotten? The correct view was stated as early as by *Calvin*, who says: “There is no doubt that the Prophet has in view, in the first instance, the free return of the people; but Christ must not be separated from this blessing of the deliverance, for, otherwise, it would be difficult to show the fulfilment of this prophecy.” The right of thus assuming a concurrent reference to Christ is afforded to us by the circumstance, that Canaan had such a high value for Israel, not because it was its fatherland in the lower sense, but because it was the land of God, the place where His glory dwelt. From this it follows that a bodily return was to the covenant-people of value, in so far only as God manifested himself as the God of the land. And since, before Christ, this was done in a manner very imperfect, as compared with what was implied in the idea, the value of such a return could not be otherwise than very subordinate. And in like manner, it follows from it, that the gathering and bringing back by Christ is included in the promise. For wherever God is, there is Canaan. Whether it be the old fold, or a new one, is surely of very little consequence, if only the good Shepherd be in the midst of His sheep. *As a rule*, such externalities lie without the compass of prophecy, which, having in view the substance, refers, as to the way of its manifestation, to history. Into what ridiculous assertions a false clinging to the letter may lead, appears from remarks such as those of *Grotius* on the second hemistich of the following verse: “They shall live in security under the powerful protection of the Persian kings. Protection by the world, and oppression by the world, differed very slightly only, in the case of the covenant-people. The circumstance that Gentiles ruled over them at all, was just that which grieved them; and this grief must therefore continue (compare Neh. 9:36, 37), although, by the grace of God, a mild rule had taken the place of the former severe one; for this grace of God had its proper value only as a prophecy and pledge of a future greater one. The circumstance that it is to the *remnant* only that the gathering is promised (compare Is. 10:22; Rom. 9:27), points to the truth, that the divine mercy will be accompanied with justice. *Calvin* remarks on this point: “The Prophet again confirms what I formerly said, viz., mercy shall not be exercised until He has cleansed His Church of filthiness, so great and so horrid, in which she at that time abounded.” One must beware of exchanging the Scriptural hope of a conversion of Israel on a large scale, in contrast to the small ἐκλογή at the time of Christ and the Apostles, for the hope of a *general* conversion in the strict sense. When considering the relation of God to the free human nature, the latter is absolutely impossible. When consistently carried out, it necessarily leads to the doctrine of universal restoration. It is beyond doubt, that God *will* that all men should be saved; and it would necessarily follow that all men could be saved, if all the members of one nation could be saved. There is no word of Scripture in favour of it, except the πᾶς in Paul, which must just be interpreted and qualified by the contrast to the *small* ἐκλογή, while there are opposed to it a number of declarations of Scripture,—especially all those passages of the prophets where, to the remnant, to the escaped ones of Israel only, salvation is promised. And besides the Word of God, there are opposed to it His deeds also,—especially the great typical prefiguration of things spiritual by things external at the deliverance of the people from Egypt, when the *remnant* only came to Canaan, while the bodies of thousands fell in the wilderness; and no less at the deliverance from Babylon, when by far the greatest number preferred the temporary delight in sin to delight in the Lord in His land.

Ver. 4. "And I raise shepherds over them, and they feed them; and they shall fear no more, nor be terrified, neither be lost, saith the Lord."

Even here, the reference to 2 Sam. 7:12, and to the name of Jehoiakim, is manifest, although, in the subsequent verse, it appears still more distinctly, compare p. 401. This reference also is a proof in favour of this prophecy's having been written under Jehoiakim. The reference was, at that time, easily understood by every one; even the slightest allusion was sufficient. This reference farther shows that *Venema*, and several others who preceded him in this view, are wrong in here thinking of the Maccabees. These are here quite out of the question, inasmuch as they were not descended from David. Besides the contrast between the people's apostasy and God's covenant-faithfulness, the Prophet evidently has still another in view, viz., that between the apostasy of the Davidic house, and God's faithfulness in the fulfilment of the promise given to David. The single apostate members of this family are destroyed, although, appropriating to themselves the promise, they, in their names, promise deliverance and salvation to themselves. But from the family itself, God's grace cannot depart; just because Jehovah is God, a true Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin must rise out of it. It thus appears that the Maccabees are here as little referred to as Ezra and Nehemiah, of whom *Grotius* thinks. Much stronger ground is there for thinking of Zerubbabel, for his appearance had really some reference to the promise to David, although as a weak type and prelude only of the true fulfilment, to which he occupies the same relation, as does the gathering from the Babylonish captivity to the gathering by Christ. If, after all, we wish to urge the Plural, we must not, by any means, sever our verse from ver. 5, and declare this to be the sense; *first* will I raise up to you shepherds; *then*, the Messiah. We must, in that case, following *C. B. Michaelis*, rather supplement: specially one, the Messiah. In *none* of Jeremiah's prophecies are there different stages and degrees in the salvation; everywhere he has in his view the whole in its completion. Where this is overlooked, the whole interpretation must necessarily take a wrong direction, as is most clearly seen in the case of *Venema*. But there is no reason at all for laying so much stress on the Plural. Every Plural may be used for designating the idea of the whole species; and this kind of designation was here so much the more obvious, that the bad species, with which the good is here contrasted, consisted of a series of individuals. With the bad pastoral office, the Prophet here *first* contrasts the good one; *then* he gives, in ver. 5, a more detailed description of the individual who is to represent the species, in whom the idea of the species is to be completely realised. The correctness of this interpretation is confirmed by the comparison of the parallel passage in chap. 33:15, which, almost *verbatim*, agrees with that under consideration, and in which only one descendant of David, viz., the Messiah, is spoken of. And that is quite natural; for, in that passage, there is no antithesis to the bad shepherds, which was the cause that here, at first, the species was made prominent. And another confirmation is afforded by Ezek. 34. With him, too, one good shepherd is mentioned in contrast with the bad shepherds.—The words: "And they feed them" stand in contrast to "Who feed my people," in ver. 2. "The shepherds mentioned in ver. 2 ought to feed the flock; but, instead of doing that, they feed themselves (compare Ezek. 34:2); the shepherds, however, mentioned in our verse, really feed. The former are shepherds in name only, but, in reality, wolves; the latter are shepherds, both in name and reality, דקפ must be taken in the signification "to be missing," "lacking." (Compare the Remarks on chap. 3:16.) There is an allusion to אל סתדקפ in ver. 2. Because the bad shepherd does not visit, the sheep are not sought, *q.d.*, they are lost; but those who did not visit, are now, in a very disagreeable manner, visited by God (סכילע דקפ); the good shepherd visits, and, therefore, the sheep need not be

sought. The clause: “They shall fear no more, nor be terrified,” receives its explanation from Ezek. 34:8: “Because my flock are a prey, and meat to every beast of the field, because they have no shepherd, and because my shepherds do not concern themselves with the flock.”

Ver. 5. “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, and I raise unto David a righteous Branch, and He ruleth as a King, and acteth wisely, and worketh justice and righteousness in the land.”

The expression: “Behold the days come,” according to the constant *usus loquendi* of Jeremiah, does not designate a progress in time, in reference to what precedes, but only directs attention to the greatness of that which is to be announced. It contains, at the same time, an allusion to the contrast presented by the visible state of things, which affords no ground for such a thing. How dark soever the present state of things may be, the time is *still* coming; although the heart may loudly say, *No*, the word of *God* must be more certain. Concerning צמח, compare Isa. 4:2, and the passages of Zechariah there quoted. צידק stands here in the same signification as in Zech. 9:9,—different from that which it has in Isa. 53:11. In the latter passage, where the Servant of God is described as the High Priest and sin-offering, His righteousness comes into consideration as the fundamental condition of justification; here, where He appears as King only,—as the cause of the diffusion of justice and righteousness in the land. That there is implied in this a contrast to the former kings, was pointed out as early as by *Abarbanel*: “He shall not be an unrighteous seed, such as Jehoiakim and his son, but a righteous one.” *Calvin* also points out “the obvious antithesis between Christ and so many false, and, as it were, adulterous sons. For we know for certain that He alone was the righteous seed of David; for although Hezekiah and Josiah were legitimate successors, yet, when we look to others, they were, as it were, monsters. Except three or four, all the rest were degenerate and covenant-breakers.” The words: “I raise unto David a righteous Branch” are here, as well as in chap. 33:15, not by any means equivalent to: a righteous Branch of David. On the contrary, David is designated as he to whom the act of raising belongs, for whose sake it is undertaken. God has promised to him the eternal dominion of his house. How much soever, therefore, the members of this family may sin against the Lord,—how unworthy soever the people may be to be governed by a righteous Branch of David, God, as surely as He is God, must raise Him for the sake of David. The word מלך must not be overlooked. It shows that מלך, which, standing by itself, may designate also another government than by a king, such as, *e.g.*, that of Zerubbabel, is to be taken in its full sense. And this qualification was so much the more necessary, that the deepest abasement of the house of David, announced by the Prophet in chap. 22, compare especially ver. 30, was approaching, and that thereby every hope of its rising to *complete* prosperity seemed to be set aside. Since, therefore, the faith in this event rested merely on the word, it was necessary that the word should be as distinct as possible, in order that no one might pervert, or explain it away. *Calvin* remarks: “He shall rule as a King, *i.e.*, He shall rule gloriously; so that there do not merely appear some relics of former glory, but that He flourish and be powerful as a King, and attain to a perfection, such as existed under David and Solomon; and even much more excellent.”—As regards ליכשה, we have already, in our remarks on chap. 3:15, proved that it never and nowhere means “to prosper,” “to be prosperous,” but always “to act wisely.” It has been shown by *Calvin*, that even the context here requires the latter signification. He says: “The Prophet seems here rather to speak of right judgment than of prosperity and success; for we must read this in connexion with one another: He shall act wisely, and then work justice and righteousness.

He shall be endowed with the spirit of wisdom, as well as of justice and righteousness; so that he shall perform all the offices and duties of a king.” Yet *Calvin* has not exhausted the arguments which may be derived from the context. The *whole* verse before us treats of the endowments of the King; the whole succeeding one, of the prosperity which, by these endowments, is imparted to the people. To this may still be added the evident contrast to the folly of the former shepherds, which was the consequence of their wickedness, and which, in the preceding chapter, had been described as the cause of their own, and the people’s destruction; compare chap. 10:21: “For the shepherds are become brutish, and do not seek the Lord; therefore they do not act wisely, and their whole flock is scattered.” But if here the signification “to act wisely” be established, then it is also in all those passages where לִיכְשָׁה is used of David; compare remarks on chap. 3. For the fact, that the Prophet has in view these passages, and that, according to him, the reign of David, in a more glorious manner, to be revived in his righteous Branch, appears from the circumstance that every thing else has its foundation in the description of David’s reign, in the books of Samuel. Thus the words: “And he ruleth as a king, and worketh justice and righteousness in the land,” refer back to 2 Sam. 8:15: “And David reigned over all Israel, and David wrought justice and righteousness unto all his people.” The foundation of the announcement of ver. 6 is formed by 2 Sam. 8:14 (compare ver. 6): “And the Lord gave prosperity (עֲשׂוּיָה) to David in all his ways.” But if לִיכְשָׁה wherever it occurs of David, must be taken in this sense, then the LXX. are right also in translating Is. 52:13 by συνήσει: for, in that passage, just as in the verse under consideration, David is referred to as the type of the Messiah. The phrase הקדצו טפשמ השע is by *De Wette* commonly translated: “to exercise justice and righteousness.” But the circumstance that, in Ps. 146:7, he is obliged to give up this translation, proves that it is wrong, השע must rather be explained by “to work,” “to establish.” טפשמ is here, as everywhere else, the objective right and justice; הקדצ, the subjective righteousness. The working of justice is the means by which righteousness is wrought. The forced dominion of justice is necessarily followed by the voluntary, just as the judgments of God, by means of which He is sanctified upon mankind, are, at the same time, the means by which He is sanctified in them. The high vocation of the King to work justice and righteousness rests upon His dignity, as the bearer of God’s image; comp. Ps. 146:7; chap. 9:23: “For I the Lord work love, justice, and righteousness in the land.” Chap. 22:15 is, moreover, to be compared, where it is said of Josiah, the true descendant of David, “he wrought justice and righteousness,” and chap. 22:3, where his spurious descendants are admonished: “Work justice and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, and do not oppress the stranger; the fatherless and the widow do not wrong, neither shed innocent blood in this place.” Farther, still, is the progress to be observed: the King is righteous, his righteousness passeth over from him to the subjects; then follows salvation and righteousness from the Lord.—To explanations, such as that of *Grotius*, who, by the righteous Branch, understands Zerubbabel, we here need the less to pay any attention, that the fact of his being in this without predecessors or followers palpably proves it to be erroneous. If, indeed, we could rely on *Theodoret’s* statement (“The blinded Jews endeavour, with great impudence, to refer this to Zerubbabel”—then follows the refutation), the older Jews must have led the way to this perverted interpretation. But we cannot implicitly rely on *Theodoret’s* statements of this kind. In the Jewish writings themselves, not the slightest trace of such an interpretation is to be found. The Chaldean Paraphrast is decidedly in favour of the Messianic interpretation: יו רמא נתא אימוי אה “Behold the days shall come, and I will raise up to David the righteous Messiah, (not איקדצד “the Messiah of the righteous,” as many absurdly read),

saith the Lord.” *Eusebius* (compare *Le Moyne, de Jehovah justitia nostra*, p. 23), it is true, refutes the interpretation which refers it to Joshua, the son of Josedech; but we are not entitled to infer from this circumstance, that this view found supporters in his time. His intention is merely to guard against the erroneous interpretation of Ἰωσεδέκ of the following verse in the Alexandrian version (καὶ τοῦτο τὸ νομα αὐτοῦ, ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν κύριος; Ἰωσεδέκ). It can scarcely be imagined that the translators themselves proceeded from this erroneous view. For Josedech, the father of Joshua the high-priest, is a person altogether obscure. All which they intended, by their retaining the Hebrew form, was certainly only the wish, to express that it was a *nomen proprium* which occurred here; and they were specially induced to act thus by the circumstance, that this name was, in their time, generally current, as one of the proper names of the Messiah.

Ver. 6. “*And in His days Judah is endowed with salvation, and Israel dwelleth safely; and this is the name whereby they shall call him: The Lord our righteousness.*”

It has already been pointed out that the first words here look back to David. That which Jeremiah here expresses by several words, Zechariah expresses more briefly, by calling the Sprout of David עֲשׂונו קִידָצ “righteous, and protected by God.” It makes no difference that, in that passage, the salvation, the inseparable concomitant of righteousness, is ascribed to the King, its possessor; while, here, it is ascribed to the people. For, in that passage, too, it is for his subjects that salvation is attributed to the King who comes for Zion, just as he is righteous for Zion also. Israel must here be taken either in the restricted sense, or in the widest, either as the ten tribes *alone*, or as the ten tribes along with Judah. It is a favourite thought of Jeremiah, which recurs in all his Messianic prophecies, that the ten tribes-are to partake in the future prosperity and salvation. He has a true tenderness for Israel; his bowels roar when he remembers them, who were already, for so long a time, forsaken and rejected. His lively hope for Israel is a great testimony of his lively faith. For, in the case of Israel, the visible state of things afforded still less ground for hope than in the case of Judah. There is here an allusion to Deut. 33:28: (“And He thrusteth out thine enemy from before thee, and saith: Destroy”) “And Israel dwelleth in safety (יָבִישׁוּן), alone, Jacob looketh upon a land of corn and wine, and his heavens drop dew.” There can be the less doubt of the existence of this allusion, that this expression occurs, besides in Deuteronomy, and in the verse under consideration, only once more, in chap. 33:16,—that a reference to the majestic close of the blessing of Moses, which certainly was in the hearts and mouths of all the pious, was very natural, and that the word עֲשׂונו has there its analogy in ver. 29: “Happy art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee, a people saved (נִשְׁעָה) by the Lord, the shield of thy help, thy proud sword; and thine enemies flatter thee, and thou treadest upon their high places.” This glorious destination of the covenant-people, which, hitherto, had been so imperfectly only realized (most perfectly under David, compare 2 Sam. 8:6, 14), shall, under the reign of the Messiah, be carried out in such a manner that idea and reality shall fully coincide. The covenant-people is to appear in its full dignity.—In the second hemistich of the verse, the reading requires first to be established. Instead of the reading יִקְרְאוּ which is found in the text, and which is the third pers. Sing, with the Suffix, several MSS. (compare *De Rossi*), have the third pers. Plur. יִקְרְאוּ. Several controversial writers, such as *Raim. Martini, Pug. Fid.* p. 517, and *Galatinus*, iii. 9, p. 126, (The Jews of our time assert that here Jeremiah did not say “they shall call,” יִקְרְאוּ, as we read it, but “he shall call him,” יִקְרֵא and they declare this to be the sense: “This is the name of Him who shall call him, viz., the Messiah: Our righteous God,”) declare the latter to be unconditionally correct, and assert that the other

had originated from an intentional Jewish corruption, got up for the purpose of setting aside the divinity of the Messiah, which, to them, was so offensive. This allegation, however, is certainly unfounded. It is true, that some Jewish interpreters availed themselves of the reading יְקָרְאוּ for the purpose stated. Thus *Rabbi Saadias Haggæon*, according to *Abenezra* and *Manasseh Ben Israel*, who explain: “And this is the name by which the Lord will call him: Our righteousness.” But it by no means follows from this, that they invented the reading; it may have existed, and they only connected their perversion with it. That the latter was indeed the case, appears from the circumstance that by far the greater number of Jewish interpreters and controversialists rejected this perversion, because it was in opposition to the accents (compare especially *Abenezra* and *Norzi* on the passage), and acknowledged הוּדַע הוּדַע to be the name of the Messiah. The reading יְקָרְאוּ must be unconditionally rejected, because it has by far the smallest external authority in its favour. It is true, that its supporters (comp. especially *Schulze*, *vollst. Kritik der gewöhnlichen Bibelausgaben*, S. 321) have endeavoured to make up for its deficiency in manuscript authority, by appealing to the authority of the ancient translators, all of whom, with the sole exception of the Alexandrian version, according to them, express it. But this assertion is entirely without foundation. The *vocabunt eum* of *Jonathan* and the Vulgate is the correct translation of יְקָרְאוּ. And when *Jerome*, in opposition to the Alex., remarks that, according to the Hebrew, the translation ought to be: *Nomen ejus vocabunt*, he does not contend against their use of the Singular *per se*, but only against their arbitrarily supplying “Jehovah” as the subject; against their explaining “The Lord shall call,” instead of “one” shall call. The manner in which the false reading יְקָרְאוּ first arose, is clearly seen from the reasons by which its later defenders endeavour to support it; compare especially *Schulze* l. c. The chief argument is the erroneous supposition that the third Plur. only could be used impersonally. To this was farther added the use of the rarer Suffix ו instead of the common הוּ— . But from internal reasons, too, the reading יְקָרְאוּ is objectionable; the designation of the object of calling cannot be omitted.—There cannot be any doubt that we are not allowed to refer the Suffix in יְקָרְאוּ to Israel (*Ewald*: “And this is their name by which they call them,”) but to the Messiah. For it is only in this case, that those who call, viz., Judah or Israel, the Members of the Church, are indirectly mentioned in the preceding words; and the Messiah is, in both verses, the chief person to whom all the other clauses refer. At all events, the *then* could not, in that case, have been omitted, as in this context every thing depends upon the connection of the salvation with the person of the King; and this connection must be clearly and distinctly expressed. We now come to הוּדַע הוּדַע. Great difference of opinion prevails as to the explanation of these words. The better portion of the Jewish interpreters, indeed, likewise consider them as names of the Messiah, but not in such a manner that He is called “Jehovah,” and then, in opposition to it, “Our righteousness,” but rather in such a manner that הוּדַע הוּדַע is an abbreviation of the whole sentence. Thus the Chaldean, who thus paraphrases: “And this is the name by which they shall call him: Righteousness will be bestowed upon us from the face of the Lord;” *Kimchi*, “Israel shall call the Messiah by this name: The Lord our righteousness, because at His time, the righteousness of the Lord will be to us firm, continuous, everlasting;” the מִרְקַע רַפֵּס (in *Le Moyne*, p. 20): “Scripture calls the name of the Messiah: The Lord our righteousness, because He is the Mediator of God, and we obtain the righteousness of God by His ministry.” Besides to chap. 33:16, they refer to passages such as Exod. 17:15, where Moses calls the altar “Jehovah my banner;” to Gen. 33:20, where Jacob calls it לְאֵלֵי יְהוָה לְאֵלֵי. *Grotius* follows these expositors, only that he dilutes the sense still more. The other Christian expositors, (the Vulgate excludes every other interpretation, even by its translation: *Dominvs justns*

*noster*) on the contrary, contend with all their might for the opinion, that the Messiah is here called Jehovah, and hence must be truly God. That which *Dassov* i. h. 1. remarks: "Since then the Messiah is called Jehovah, we have firm ground for inferring, that He is truly God, inasmuch as that name is peculiar and essential to the true God," is the argument common to all of them. *Le Moyne* wrote in defence of this explanation a whole book, which we have already quoted, but from which little is to be learned. Even *Calvin*, who elsewhere sometimes erred from an exaggerated dread of doctrinal prejudice, decidedly adopts it. He remarks: "Those who judge without prejudice and bitterness, easily see that that name belongs to Christ, in so far as He is God, just as the name of the Son of David is assigned to Him in reference to His human nature. To all those who are just and unprejudiced, it will be clear that Christ is here distinguished by a twofold attribute; so that the Prophet commends Him to us, both as regards the glory of His deity, and his true human nature." By righteousness he, too, understands justification through the merits of Christ, "for Christ is not righteous for himself, but received righteousness in order to communicate it to us" (1 Cor. 1:30). We have the following observations to make in reference to this exposition. 1. The principal mistake in it is this, that it has been overlooked that the Prophet here expresses the nature of the Messiah and of His time in the form of a *nomen proprium*. If the words were thus: "And this is Jehovah our righteousness," we should be fully entitled to take Jehovah as a personal designation of the Messiah. But in reference to a name, it is as common, as it is natural, to take from a whole sentence the principal words only, and to leave it to the reader or hearer to supply the rest. In the case of all *naming*, brevity is unavoidable, as is proved by the usual abbreviation of even those proper names which consist of one word only. The two cases mentioned by *Kimchi* will serve as instances. "Jehovah my Banner" is a concise expression for: "This altar is consecrated to Jehovah my Banner;" לאֱרֵשִׁי יְהוָה לֵאלֹהֵי for: "This altar belongs to the Almighty, the God of Israel." A number of other instances might easily be quoted; one need only compare, in *Hiller's* and *Simonis'* Onomastica, the names which are compounded with Jehovah. Thus, *e.g.*, Jehoshua, *i.e.*, Jehovah salvation, is a concise expression for: Jehovah will grant me salvation; Jehoram, *i.e.*, *Jehovah altus*, for: I am consecrated to the exalted God of Israel. Most perfectly analogous, however, is the name Zedekiah, *i.e.*, the righteousness of the Lord, for: He under whose reign the Lord will grant righteousness to His people. This name, moreover, seems to refer directly to the prophecy before us. Just as Eliakim, by changing his name into Jehoiakim, intended to represent himself as he in whom the prophecy in 2 Sam. 7 would be fulfilled; so he who was formerly called Mattaniah changed, at the instance of Nebuchadnezzar (who had, indeed, no other object in view than that, as a sign of his supremacy, his name should be different from that by which he was formerly called, and who left the choice of the name to Mattaniah himself), his name into Zedekiah, imagining that in a manner so easy, he would become the Jehovah Zidkenu announced by Jeremiah, and longed for by the people. 2. The preceding argument only showed that there is nothing opposed to the exposition: He by whom and under whom Jehovah will be our righteousness. A positive proof, however, in favour of it is offered by the parallel passage, chap. 33:15, 16: "In those days and at that time will I cause a righteous Branch to grow up unto David; and He worketh justice and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely, and this is the name which they shall give to *her*: Jehovah our righteousness." Here Jehovah Zidkenu by no means appears as the name of the Messiah, but as that of Jerusalem in the Messianic time. In vain are all the attempts which have been made to set aside this troublesome argument. They only serve to show, that it cannot be invalidated. *Le Moyne*, "in order that no way of escape may be left to the enemies," brings forward, p. 298 ff., five different expedients among which the reader

may choose. But their very difference is a plain sign of arbitrariness; and that appears still more clearly, when we begin to examine them individually. Several interpreters assume an *enallage generis* לֹא-יִקְרָא, “and thus shall they call *him*.” *Le Moyne* thinks that we need have no difficulty in assuming such an *enallage*. Others explain: “And he who shall call, *i.e.*, invite her, is Jehovah our righteousness.” A simple reference to the passage before us is decisive against it; the parallelism of the two passages is too close to admit of אֲרָקִי in the second passage being understood in a sense altogether different. By the same argument, the explanations by *Hottinger* (Thesaur. Philolog. p. 171), and *Dassov*: “This shall come to pass when the Lord, the Lord our righteousness, shall call her,” are also refuted, quite apart from the consideration, that רָשָׁא cannot by any means signify *when*.

The most recent defender of the old orthodox view, *Schmieder*, cuts the knot by simply severing our passage from chap. 33:16. 3. The ancient explanation, which refers וְנִקְדָּץ, “our righteousness,” to the remission of sins, does not even correctly understand this word. It is true that the remission of sins is often represented as one of the chief blessings of the Messianic time; but here it is out of place. According to the context, it is actual justification, *i.e.*, salvation according to another mode of viewing it, which is here spoken of (compare remarks on Mal. 3:20). Righteousness in this sense implies, of course, the forgiveness of sins; but, besides, the righteousness of life is comprehended in it. Righteousness stands here in parallelism with salvation, and the order and progress is this: righteousness of the king, righteousness of the subjects, then salvation and righteousness as a reward from God. To this argument may still be added the contrast to the former time. Connected with the unrighteousness of the kings was that of the people; and hence it was that the country was deprived of salvation, and smitten by the divine judgments. That which Jeremiah comprehends in the name *Jehovah Zidkenu*, Ezekiel, in the parallel passage, chap. 34:25-31, farther carries out and expands. The Lord enters into a covenant of peace with them; rich blessing is bestowed upon them; He breaks their yoke and delivers them from servitude, they do not become a prey to the Gentiles.—*Schmieder* has objected, that the name would be without meaning for the promised King, unless the name Jehovah belonged to him. But the King, by being called *Jehovah Zidkenu*, is designated as the channel, through which the divine blessings flow upon the Church, as the Mediator of Salvation, as the Saviour. We must not, however, omit to remark that this ancient explanation was wrong only in endeavouring to draw out from the word that which, no doubt, is contained in the matter itself. No one born of a woman is *righteous*, in the full sense of the word; and if there be anything wanting in the personal righteousness of the King, the working of justice and righteousness, too, will at once be deficient; and salvation and righteousness are not granted in their full extent from above. To no one among all the former kings did the attribute קִדְּצָא belong in a higher degree than to David; and yet in how imperfect a degree did even he possess it! The calamity which, by this imperfection, was inflicted upon the people, is, *e.g.*, seen in the numbering of the people. And it was not only the *will* to work justice and righteousness which was imperfect, but the power also was imperfect, and the knowledge limited. He only who truly rules as a king, and is truly wise (compare the words מֶלֶךְ וְהַשְׂכִּיל וְמֵלֵךְ can come up to, and realize the idea, after which David was striving in vain. All the three offices of Christ, the royal no less than the prophetic and priestly, imply His divinity; and the conviction that, in the way hitherto pursued, nothing was to be effected; that it was only by the divine entering into the earthly, that such splendid promises could be fulfilled,—this conviction surely must have been plain to a Jeremiah, whose fundamental sentiment is, “all flesh is grass,” and who lived at a time which, more than any other, was fitted to cure that Pelagianism which always seeks to gather grapes from thorns. If then, farther, we keep in mind that

Jeremiah had before him the clear announcements of the former prophets, as regards the divinity of the Messiah (compare remarks on Mic. 5:1; Is. 9:5), we can account for the fact, that he does not expressly speak of it, only because it was not suitable in this context, in which only the fact itself comes into consideration, but not the particular way.

Ver. 7. “Wherefore, behold days come, saith the Lord., that they shall no more say: As the Lord liveth who brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; ver. 8, but: As the Lord liveth, who brought up, and who led the seed of the house of Israel out of the North country, and from all the countries whither I have driven them; and they dwell in their land.”

The sense is this: The future prosperity and salvation shall by far outshine the greatest deliverance and salvation of the Past. *Calvin* remarks: “If the first deliverance be valued by itself, it will be worthy of everlasting remembrance; but if it be compared with the second deliverance, it will almost vanish;” compare, besides chap. 16:14, 15, where the verses now under consideration already occurred almost *verbatim* (Jeremiah is fond of such repetitions, which are any thing but vain repetitions; and this fondness forms one of his peculiarities); chap. 3:16, where, in the same sense, it is said of the Ark of the Covenant that it shall be forgotten in future; Is. 43:18,19, 65:17.—הוֹחִי־יָהּ “living (is) Jehovah,” for: “As Jehovah liveth.” It is quite natural that, when God is invoked as a witness and judge, He should be designated as the *living one*; and it is as natural that, on such an occasion, the greatest sign of life which He gave should be pointed to. But that, under the Old Testament dispensation, was the deliverance from Egypt, the strongest and most impressive of all those deeds by which the delusion was dissipated, that God was walking upon the vault of heaven, and did not judge through the clouds. In future, a still stronger manifestation of life is to take place. Hence the formula of the oath is altogether general; the deliverance from Egypt comes into consideration as a manifestation of life, and not as an act of grace. This was overlooked by *Calvin* when he remarked: “Whensoever they saw themselves so oppressed, that they did not see any other end to their evils than in the grace of God, they said that the same God, who, in former times, had been the deliverer of His people, was still living, and His power undiminished.”

## CHAPTER 31:31-40

The 30th and 31st chapters may rightly be called the grand hymn of Israel’s deliverance. They are connected into one whole, not only by a material, but also by a formal unity; so that we must indeed wonder at views such as those of *Venema* and *Rosenmüller*, who assume that the section is composed of fragments loosely connected, and written at different times; but still more at the views of *Movers* and *Hitzig*, who assert that a whole number of strange interpolations had been introduced into the text; compare *Küper*, *Jerem. S.* 170 ff.

With respect to the time of the composition, we must not allow ourselves to be deceived by the circumstance that, as a rule, Judah appears no less than Israel, already far away from the land of the Lord, in captivity. The Prophet, taking his stand in the time when the catastrophe has already taken place, speaks from an ideal Present. The fact that the destruction of Jerusalem was indeed imminent, and immediately in view, but had not yet taken place, becomes probable even from the inscriptions in chap. 32 and 33, according to which these two chapters, which are so closely related to the two before us, belong to the tenth year of Zedekiah, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Chaldeans. This is rendered

certain by chap. 30:5-7, where the final catastrophe upon the covenant-people, which belongs to the time of Jeremiah, is represented as still impending. Hitherto the threatening had prevailed in the predictions of the Prophet; but now, in the view of their fulfilment, when the thunders of the judgment were already heard from the heavens, the promise flows in full streams. The false prophets had prophesied prosperity and salvation, at a time when, to the human eye, there was no cause for fear; but Jeremiah just steps forth to announce salvation, at a time when all human hope had vanished.

The Prophet begins, in chap. 30, with the promise of salvation for *all* Israel; and after a detailed description, he comprehends and sums it up, in ver. 22, in the words, brief but infinitely rich and comprehensive: "And ye shall be my people and I will be your God."<sup>35</sup> The majestic close of the promise for the true Israel is, in vers. 23, 24, formed by the threatening against those who are Israel in appearance only,—analogous to the words of Isaiah: "There is no peace to the wicked." Let them not, in their foolish delusion, seize the promise for themselves. The time of the highest blessing for the godly, and for those who are willing to become godly, the *בְּיָמֵי תִרְחָא*, will be for them, at the same time, a time of the highest curse. The climax of the manifestation of grace has the climax of the manifestation of justice as its inseparable companion. "Behold the storm of the Lord, glowing fire, goeth forth, a *continuing* storm, on the head of the wicked it shall remain. The fierce anger of the Lord shall not return, until He have done, and until He have performed the intents of His heart; at the end of days ye shall consider it." Formerly, in chap. 23:19, 20, in a threatening prophecy which referred to the exile, the Prophet had uttered the same words. By their verbal repetition, he intimates that the matter was not by any means settled with the exile; that the latter must not be considered as the absolute and final punishment for the sins of the whole nation, but that, as truly as God is Jehovah, so surely His words will revive, as often as the circumstances again exist, to which they originally referred.

The more specific the consolation is, the more impressive is it, and the more does it reach the heart. After having announced salvation, therefore, to *all* Israel, the Prophet now proceeds to the consolation for the two divisions of Israel He begins with Israel in the restricted sense—the ten tribes (chap. 31:1-22), and with them he continues longest, because, when looking to the outward appearance, they seemed to be lost beyond all hope of recovery, to be for ever rejected by the Lord. The thought, that we have here an original and independent announcement of salvation for Israel, is set aside even by the relation of ver. 1 to ver. 22 of the preceding chapter. For it is to this verse that the Prophet immediately connects his discourse; vers. 23 and 24 are only a parenthetical remark, an *Odi profanum vulges et arceo*, addressed to those to whom the promise did not belong. Upon the words: "You shall be my people, and I will be your God," follow in an inverted order, the words: "At that time, saith the Lord, I will (specially) be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people." Rachel, the mother of Joseph and Benjamin, weeping over her sons, vers. 15-17, is so much the more suited to represent Israel, that the tribe of Benjamin also, as to its principal portion, belonged to the kingdom of the ten tribes; compare my commentary on Ps. 80. Upon Israel there follows, in vers. 23-26, Judah. The announcement closes in ver. 26 with the words so often misunderstood: "Upon this I awaked, and I beheld, and my sleep was sweet unto me." The Prophet has lost sight of the Present; like a sleeping man, he is not susceptible of its impressions, compare remarks on Zech. 4:1. Then he awakes for a moment from his sweet dream (an allusion to Prov. 3:24), which, however, is not, like ordinary dreams, without foundation. He looks around; every thing is dark, dreary, and cold; nowhere is there consolation for

the weary soul. “Ah,” he exclaims, “I have sweetly dreamed,”—and immediately the hand of the Lord again seizes him, and carries him away from the scenes of the Present.

There is not by any means a different salvation destined for Israel and Judah; it is one salvation to be partaken of by both, who are in future to be re-united into one covenant-people, into a nation of brethren. From the parts, therefore, the description returns, in vers. 27-40, to the whole from which it had proceeded, and is thus completely rounded off, especially by the circumstance that, just in this close, there is contained the crown of the promises, the substance and centre of the declaration recurring here in ver. 33: “And I will be their God, and they shall be my people.”

The whole description in both chapters is Messianic; and after what we have already had frequent occasion to remark, no farther proof is necessary to show how inadmissible is a proceeding like that of *Venema*, who cuts it all up into small pieces, and here assumes an exclusive reference to the return from the captivity; there, to the Maccabees, whom he almost raises to Saviours; in another place, to Christ and His Kingdom. We ought therefore, indeed, to give an exposition of the whole section; but, for external reasons, we are obliged to limit ourselves to an exposition of the principal portion, chap. 31:31-40.

It is chap. 31:22 only which we shall briefly explain, because that passage was, in former times, understood by many interpreters to contain a personal Messianic prophecy. “*How long wilt thou turn aside, O thou apostate daughter? for the Lord createth a new thing in the land, woman shall compass about man.*” The last words of the verse are, by the ancient interpreters, commonly explained as referring to Christ’s birth by a virgin. Thus, *e.g.*, *Cocceius*: “It could not be said more distinctly, at least not without ceasing to be enigmatical, unless he had said that a virgin has born Christ the Son of God.” But quite apart from other arguments, this explanation is opposed by the obvious consideration, in that case, just that would here be stated which, in the birth of Christ by a virgin, is *not* peculiar. For רבג and הבקנ are a designation of the sex; the fact that the woman brings forth the man (since רבג is asserted to designate *proles mascula*), is something altogether common; but the important feature is wanting, that the woman is to be a virgin, and the man, the Son of God. But certainly not a whit better than this explanation is that which modern interpreters (*Schnurrer*, *Gesenius*, *Rosenmüller*, *Maurer*), have advanced in its stead: “The woman shall protect the man, shall perform for him the *munus excubitoris circumeuntis*.” This, surely, is a “*ridiculus mus*”—an argument quite unique. We must fully agree with *Schnurrer*, who remarks: “This, surely, is something new, uncommon, unheard of;” but now every thing *new* is, for that reason, suitable for furnishing an effectual motive for conversion. The sense at which *Ewald* arrives: “A woman transforming herself into a man,” is surely not worthy of being entertained at the expense of a change in the reading. The correct view is the following:—The Prophet finds his exhortation to return to the Lord upon the most effectual argument possible, *viz.*, upon the fact that the Lord was to return to them, that the time of wrath was now over, that they might hasten back into the open arms of God’s love. Without hope of mercy, there cannot be a conversion. The perverse and desponding heart of man must, by His preventing love, be allured to come to God. How important and valuable the “new thing” is which the Lord is to create, the Prophet shows by the terms which he has selected. It is just the *nomina sexus* which here are suitable; the omission of the article also is intentional. The relation is represented in its general aspect; and thereby the look is more steadily directed to its fundamental nature and substance. “Woman shall compass about (Ps. 32:7, 10) man;” the strong will again take the weak and tender into His intimate communion, under

His protection and loving care. The woman art thou, O Israel, who hitherto hast sufficiently experienced, what a woman is without the man, how she is a reed exposed to, and a sport of, all winds. The man is the Lord. How foolish would it be on thy part, if thou wert to persevere any longer in thine independence and dissoluteness, and if thou didst refuse to return into the sweet relation of dependence and unconditional surrender, which alone, being the only natural relation, can be productive of happiness! In favour of this explanation is also the clear reference of *בבוסת* to *ויקמחתה*, and to *הבבושה*, which, in the case of the latter word, is even outwardly expressed by the alliteration. How foolish would it be still farther to *depart*, as now the time is at hand when the Lord is approaching.—It is obvious that, even according to our interpretation, the prophecy retains its Messianic character.

The contents of the section, vers. 31-40, are as follows:—The Lord is far from punishing with entire rejection the contempt of His former gifts and blessings. On the contrary, by increased grace, He will renew the bond between Him and the people, and render it for ever indissoluble. The foundation of this is formed by the remission of sins, of which the richer outpouring of the Spirit is a consequence; and it is now, when the Law no more comes to Israel as an outward letter, but is written in their hearts, that Israel attain their destination; they will truly be the people of God, and God will be truly their God, vers. 31-34. To the people conscious of their guilt, and still groaning under the judgments of God, such a manifestation of God's continuous grace appears incredible; but God most emphatically assures them, that this election is still in force, and must continue for ever, as truly as He is God, vers. 31-37. The city of God shall gloriously arise out of its ashes. While formerly the unholy abomination entered into her, the holy one, even into her innermost parts, she *now* shall extend her boundaries beyond the territory of the unholy; and the Lord, who is sanctified *within* her, will sanctify himself *upon* her also. There shall be no more destruction.

Ver. 31. "*Behold, days come, saith the Lord, and I make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah.*"

Ver. 32. "*Not as the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they brake; but I marry them to me, saith the Lord.*"

The first question which we have here to examine is: What is to be understood by the making of a covenant? We cannot here think of a formal transaction, of a mutual contract, such as the covenant made on Sinai. This appears from ver. 32, according to which the old covenant was concluded on the day when the Lord took Israel by the hand, in order to bring them out of Egypt; but at that time a covenant-transaction proper was not yet mentioned. Most interpreters erroneously suppose that by the words: "In the day," &c., the abode at Sinai is designated. But since the *day* of the deliverance from Egypt is commonly thus spoken of (comp. Exod. 12:51 ff.); since this *day* was, as such, marked out by the annually returning feast of the Passover, we must, here also, take or, "day," in its proper sense. And there is the less reason for abandoning this most obvious sense that, in Exod. 6:4; Ezek. 16:8; Hag. 2:5, a covenant with Israel is spoken of, which was not first concluded on Sinai, but was already concluded when they went out from Egypt. *Farther*—No obligation is spoken of in reference to the new covenant; blessing and gifts are mentioned, and nothing but these. But are we to adopt the opinion of *Frischmuth* (*de foedere nov.* in the *Thes. Ant.* i. p. 857), and of many other interpreters and

lexicographers, and say that תִּירַב “does not only signify a covenant entered upon by two or several parties, but also πρόθεσιν, *propositum Dei. ἐπαγγελίας*, His gratuitous and unconditional promises, as well as His constant ordinances?” That might after all be objectionable. תִּירַב תִּירַב cannot *signify* any thing but to make a covenant.<sup>36</sup> But the question is, whether the making of a covenant cannot be spoken of in passages, where there is no mention of transactions of a mutual agreement between two parties. The substance of the covenant evidently precedes the outward conclusion of the covenant, and forms the foundation of it. The conclusion of the covenant does not first form the relation, but is merely a solemn acknowledgment of the relation already existing. Thus it is ever in human relations; the contract, as a rule, only fixes and settles outwardly, a relation already existing. And that is still more the case in the relation between God and man. By every benefit from God, an obligation is imposed upon him who receives it, whether it may, in express words, have been stated by God, and have been outwardly acknowledged by the recipient or not. This is clearly seen in the case under consideration. At the giving of the Law on Sinai, the obligatory power of the commandments of God is founded upon the fact, that God brought Israel out of the land of Egypt, the house of bondage. Hence, it appears that the Sinaitic covenant existed, in substance, from the moment that the Lord led Israel out of Egypt. By apostatizing from the Lord, the people would have broken the covenant, even if it had not been solemnly confirmed on Sinai; just as their apostacy, in the time between their going out and the transactions on Sinai, was treated as a violation of the covenant. It would have been a breach of the covenant, if the people had answered, in the negative, the solemn questions of God, whether they would enter into a covenant with Him. This appears so much the more clearly, when we keep in mind, that the New Covenant was not at all sanctioned by such an external solemn act. But if, nevertheless, it is a covenant in the strictest sense; if, here, the relation is independent upon its acknowledgment,—then, under the Old Testament too, this acknowledgment must be a secondary element. The same is the case with all the other passages commonly quoted in proof, that תִּירַב תִּירַב may also be used of mere blessings and promises. Thus, *e.g.*, Gen. 9:9: “Behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you.” That which is here designated as a covenant is not the promise *per se*, that in future the course of nature should, on the whole, remain undisturbed, but in so far only, as it imposes upon them who receive it, the obligation to glorify, by their walk, the Lord of the order of nature. In part, this obligation is afterwards outwardly fixed in the commandments concerning murder, eating of blood, &c. Gen. 15:18: “In the same day God made a covenant with Abraham, saying: Unto thy seed I give this land.” In what precedes, a promise only is contained; but this promise itself is, at the same time, an obligation; and this obligation existed even then, although it was at a later period only, solemnly undertaken by receiving the sign of the covenant, circumcision. Exod. 34:10: “And He said: Behold I make a covenant; before all thy people I will do marvels such as have not been done in all the earth, nor in any nation; and all the people among whom thou art, shall see the work of the Lord; for it is a terrible thing that I will do with thee.” The covenant on Sinai is here already made; the making of the new covenant here spoken of consists in the mercies by which God will manifest himself to His people as their God. Every one of these mercies involves a new obligation for the people; every one is a question in deeds: This I do to thee, what doest thou to me?—It will now be possible to determine in what sense the Old Covenant is here contrasted with the New. The point in question cannot be a new and more perfect revelation of the Law of God; for that is common to both the dispensations. No jot or tittle of it can be lost under the New Testament, and as little can a jot or tittle be added. God’s law is based on His nature, and that is eternal and unchangeable, compare Mal. 3:22 (4:4). The revelation of the Law does

not belong to the going out from Egypt, to which the making of the former covenant is here attributed, but to Sinai. As little can the discourse be of the introduction of an entirely new relation, which is not founded at all upon the former one. On this subject, *David Kimchi's* remark is quite pertinent: "It will not be the newness of the covenant, but its stability." The covenant with Israel is an everlasting covenant. Jehovah would not be Jehovah, if an entirely new commencement could take place; λέγω δὲ—so the Apostle writes in Rom. 15:8—Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων· τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν. The sending of Christ with His gifts and blessings, the making of the New Covenant, is thus the consequence of the covenant-faithfulness of God. If then the Old and New Covenants are here contrasted, the former cannot designate the relation of God to Israel *per se*, and in its whole extent, but it must rather designate the former mode only, in which this relation was manifested,—that whereby the Lord had, up to the time of the Prophet, manifested himself as the God of Israel. With this former imperfect form the future more perfect form is here contrasted, under the name of the New Covenant. The New Covenant which is to take the place of the Old, when looking to the form (comp. Heb. 8:13: ἐν τῷ λέγειν Καινὴν, πεπαλαίωκε τὴν πρώτην· τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ), is, in substance, the realization of the Old. These remarks are in perfect harmony with that which was formerly said concerning the meaning of כרת ברית. We saw that this expression does not designate an act only once done, by which a covenant is solemnly sanctioned, but rather that it is used of every action, by which a covenant-relation is instituted or confirmed.—If, then, the Old Covenant is the former form of the covenant with Israel; and the New Covenant the future form of it, another question is: — Which among the manifold differences of those two forms are here specially regarded by the Prophet? The answer to this question is supplied by that which the Prophet declares concerning the New Covenant. For since it is *not* to be like the former covenant, the excellences of the New must be as many defects of the Old. These excellences, however, are all of a spiritual nature,—first, the forgiveness of sins, and then the writing of the Law in the heart. It follows from this, that the blessings of the Old Covenant were *pre-eminently* (for we shall afterwards see that an entire absence of these spiritual blessings cannot be spoken of, and that the difference between the Old and the New Covenant is, in this respect, a relative one only, not an absolute one) of an external nature; and this is also suggested by the circumstance, that it is represented as being concluded when the people were led out of Egypt; in which fact, all the later similar deliverances and blessings are comprehended. The Prophet, if any one, had learned that, in the way hitherto pursued, they could not successfully continue. The sinfulness of the people had, at his time, manifested itself in such fearful outbreaks, that, even when looking at the matter from a human point of view, he could not but feel most deeply that, with outward blessings and gifts, with an outward deliverance from servitude, the people were very little benefited. What is the use of a mercy which, according to divine necessity, must be immediately followed by a punishment so much the more severe? The necessary condition for the true and lasting bestowal of outward salvation, is the bestowal of the internal salvation; without the latter the former is only a mockery. It is this internal salvation, therefore, which is the highest aim of the Prophet's longings; to it he here points as the highest blessing of the Future; compare also chap. 32:40: "And I make an everlasting covenant with them, and I will no more turn away from them to do them good, and I will put my fear in their hearts that they shall not depart from me." —The closing words of ver. 32 are frequently misunderstood. The erroneous interpretation of אשׁר by "quia," which is found with most expositors, is of less consequence. אשׁר indicates, in

general, the connection with what precedes. “We may explain it either by: “which my covenant they brake,” as is done by *Ewald*; or, “since (Deut. 3:24) they brake my covenant,” in which latter case, אשׁר refers at the same time to “I marry them unto me.” “We have here farther carried out and detailed that which previously was said of the making of a new covenant; and the sense is: Although they have broken my former covenant, yet I marry them unto me, or make a new covenant with them. Of greater importance is the difference in the interpretation of יתלעב. By far the greater number of interpreters understand this *sensu malo*; the ancient interpreters in doing so refer to the words καγὼ ἡμέλησα αὐτῶν, (Heb. 8:9); but these can scarcely prove anything. For the author of that epistle, whose sole object it is to show that the new covenant stands higher than the old—the insufficiency of the latter was, as the Prophet’s expressions show, sufficiently felt even by those who lived under it—has, in these words, which do not stand in any relation to the object, which he has in view, followed the LXX. But it is a rather doubtful and suspicious circumstance that, in determining the sense, these interpreters greatly vary. Some, referring to the Arabic, explain לעב by “*fastidire*,” others, as they allege, from the Hebrew *usus loquendi*, by “to tyrannize.” Thus, *e.g.* *Buddens (de praerogat. fidelium N. T. in the Miscell. p. 106)*: “We may readily understand thereby every severe chastisement by the neighbouring nations, such as frequently happened: they did not remain in my covenant, therefore I made them to bear the yoke of others, ἡμέλησα αὐτῶν, *neglexi eos*.” But we have already seen (compare remarks on chap. 3:14), that for neither of these significations is there any foundation; and this has been felt by those also who, in order to bring out a bad signification, such as, according to their view, the text requires, undertook to change the reading, as *e.g.* *Cappellus*, who would read יתלעג, and *Grotius*, who would read יתלחב.<sup>37</sup> The signification “to betroth oneself,” “to view; for he translates יתיערתא “*cupio vos*,” “*detector vobis*.” And is there anything to indicate, that here the reason is to be stated, why the old covenant is abolished? That reason can be brought in only by very forced explanations (comp. *e.g. Maurer* and *Hitzig*); and it is, moreover, sufficiently expressed, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has shown. Even in the announcement of a new covenant, the declaration is implied that the old covenant was insufficient: εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ἄμεμπος, οὐκ ἂν δευτέρως ἐζητεῖτο τόπος (Heb. 8:7), as well as the reason why it was so, viz., on account of human sinfulness and hardness of heart, which are not helped and remedied by pre-eminently outward blessings and benefits, be they never so great. This their former greatness is indicated by the words: “When I took them by the hand,”—words which imply the most tender love. To this subjective cause of the insufficiency of the old covenant there is a reference in the words: μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοὺς λέγει, in Heb. 8:8, which by *De Wette* and *Bleek* are erroneously translated: “For reprovingly He says to them.” The Dative αὐτοῖς belongs to μεμφόμενος (comp. *Mathiae*, S. 705); if it were otherwise it would be redundant, and would the less be in its place, that the discourse is not addressed to the children of Israel. The reason why a better covenant was required, such a one ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται, Heb. 8:6, appears sufficiently from that which, in vers. 33, 34, is said of this new covenant in contrast to the old. Here, however, it is rather the infinite love of God, the greatness of His covenant-faithfulness which are pointed out; and this thought is, from among all others, best suited to the context. והמה and וכןא form an emphatic contrast. *They*, in wicked ingratitude, have broken the former covenant, have shaken off the obligations which God’s former mercies imposed upon them. God too—so it might be expected—ought now to annul the old covenant, and for ever withdraw from them the old mercies. But, instead of doing so, He grants the new covenant, the greater mercy. He anew takes in

marriage apostate Israel, and in such a manner that now the bond of love becomes firm and indestructible. *Bleek* objects to our interpretation: “The object is not the city of Jerusalem, or even the Congregation of Israel, but the single Israelites, who may indeed be designated as the children of Jehovah, but not as His spouse.” But, in such personifications, it is quite a common thing that the real plurality should take the place of the ideal unity. In *Exod.* 34:15, for instance, it is said: “And they go a whoring after their gods,”—instead of the congregation, to which the *whoring* properly belongs, (*comp.* *Is.* 57:7), the individual members are mentioned; *comp.* *Hos.* 2:1, 2 (1:10, 2:19).

*Ver.* 33. “*For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after these days, saith the Lord: I give my law in their inward parts, and will write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*”

כִּי is, by some interpreters, here supposed to mean “but;” so much, only however, is correct that “but” might *also* have been put; *for* is here quite in its place. The words: “Not as the covenant,” &c., in the preceding verse, are here vindicated, and expanded by a positive definition of the nature and substance of the New Covenant. It is just because it is of such a nature, that it is not like the former covenant, הַבְּרִיתָה does not, by any means, as is erroneously supposed by *Venema* and *Hitzig*, refer to the days mentioned in *ver.* 31, in which the New Covenant was to be made. “These days,” on the contrary, are a designation of the Present; “after these days,” equivalent to סִימָיָה תִּירָחֵאב “at the end of days.” The Prophet so repeatedly and emphatically points to the Future, because unbelief and weak faith imagined that, with the Present, the history of the covenant-people was finished, and that no Future was in store for them. *Calvin* pertinently remarks: “It is just as if the Prophet had said, that the grace of which he was prophesying could not be apprehended, unless they, believers, kept their minds composed, and patiently waited until the time of the promised salvation had come.” As regards the following enumeration of the blessings, in and by the bestowal of which the new covenant-relation is to be established, *Venema* very correctly remarks: “The blessings are distinguished into radical or causal ones, and subsequent or derived ones.” The second כִּי, in *ver.* 34: “*For I will forgive their sin,*” proves the correctness of this division, which is also pointed out by the *Athnach*.—הַרְוֹת is, by many interpreters, here understood to signify “doctrine.” Thus *Buddeus*: “By the word, הַרְוֹת, the whole New Testament doctrine is to be understood.” This interpretation, however, is objectionable, and destructive of the sense, הַרְוֹת never means “doctrine,” but always “law;” and the fact that it is only *the* law of God, the eternal expression of His nature, and common, therefore, to both the Old and New Covenants, which can be here spoken of, and not a new constitution for the latter, is seen from the reference in which the giving in the inward parts and the writing on the heart (the tables of the heart, *2 Cor.* 3:3), stand to the outward communication and the writing on the tables of stone on Sinai. The law is the same; the relation only is different in which God places it to man, (“*lex cum homine conciliatur quasi,*” *Michaelis*). One might easily infer from the passage before us a confirmation of the error, that the law under the Old Covenant was *only* an outward dead letter. Against this error *Buddeus* already contended, who, *S.* 117, acknowledges that it is a relative difference and contrast only, which are here spoken of. He says: “This, of course, was the case with the Old Testament believers also; here, however, God promises a richer fulness and higher degree of this blessing.” *Calvin* declares the opinion that, under the Old Testament dispensation, there did not exist any regeneration, to be absurd, and says: “we know that, under the Law, the grace of God was rare and dark; but that, under the Gospel, the gifts of the Spirit were *poured* out, and that God dealt much more liberally with His Church.” The idea of a purely outward

giving of the Law is indeed one which is quite inconceivable. God would, in that case, have done nothing else towards Israel than He did to the traitor Judas, in whose conscience He proclaimed His holy Law, without communicating to him strength for repentance. But such a proceeding can be conceived of, only where there is a subjective impossibility of ἀνακαινίξειν εἰς μετάνοιαν. Every outward manifestation of God must, according to the constitution of human nature, be accompanied by the inward manifestation, since it is inconceivable that He who knows our nature, should mock us by the semblance of a blessing. As soon as we know the outward fact of the deliverance from Egypt, we know, at the same time, that God has then powerfully touched the heart of Israel. As soon as it is established that the Law on Sinai was written on tables of stone by the finger of God, it is also established that He, at the same time, wrote it on the tables of Israel's heart. But that which is thus implied in the matter itself, is confirmed by the testimony of history. In the Law itself, circumcision is designated as the pledge and seal of the bestowal, not merely of outward blessings, but of the circumcision of the heart, of the removal of sin attaching to every one by birth: so that man can love God with all his heart, all his soul, and all his powers, Deut. 30:6. This circumcision of the heart which, in the outward circumcision, was at the same time *required* and promised by God (comp. Deut. 1. c. with 10:16), is not substantially different from the writing of the Law on the heart. *Farther*—If the Law of the Lord had, for Israel, been a mere outward letter, how could the animated praise of it in the Holy Scriptures, *e.g.*, in Ps. 19, be accounted for? Surely, a bridge must already have been formed between the Law and him who can speak of it as rejoicing the heart, as enlightening the eyes, as converting the soul, as sweeter than honey and the honeycomb. That is no more the Law in its isolation which worketh wrath, but it is the Law in its connection with the Spirit, whose commandments are not grievous; comp. my commentary on Ps. 19:8 ff. A *new* heart was created under the Old Testament also, Ps. 51:12; and not to know the nature of this creation was, for a teacher in Israel, the highest disgrace, John 3:10. Yea, that which is here promised for the Future, a pious member of the Old Covenant expresses, in Ps. 40:9, *in the same form*, as being already granted to him as his present spiritual condition: I delight to do thy will, O my God, and thy Law is in the midst of my bowels,—words which imply the same contrast to the Law as outward letter, as being written on tables of stone, comp. Prov. 3:1-3: “My son, forget not my law, and let thine heart keep my commandments . . . bind them about thy neck, write them upon the table of thine heart;” compare my commentary on Psalms, Vol. iii. p. lxxvii.—But how is it to be explained that the contrariety which, in itself, is relative, appears here under the form of the absolute contrariety,—the difference in degree, as a difference in kind? Evidently in the same manner as the same phenomenon must be explained elsewhere also, *e.g.* John 1:17, where it is said that the Law was given by Moses, but mercy and truth by Christ. By overlooking this fact, so many errors have been called forth. The blessings of the Old Covenant which, when considered in themselves, are so important and rich, appear, when compared with the much fuller and more important blessings of the New Covenant, to be so trifling that they vanish entirely out of sight. It is quite similar when, in chap. 3:16, the Prophet represents the highest sanctuary of the Old Covenant, the Ark of the Covenant, as sinking into entire oblivion in future; when, in chap. 23:7, 8, he describes the deliverance from Egypt as no longer worthy of being mentioned. Parallel to the passage under consideration is the promise of Joel of the pouring out of the Spirit, chap. 3:1, 2 (2:28, 29); so that that which we remarked on that passage, is applicable here also. But, in that passage, the relative nature of the promise appears more clearly than it does here, just because, in general, under the New Covenant, in its relation to the Old, there is nowhere an absolutely new beginning, but always a completion only (just in the same manner as, on the other hand, under the

New Covenant itself, it is in the relation of the *regnum gloriae* to the *regnum gratiae*). Joel, in reference to the communication of the Spirit, puts the abundance in the place of the scarcity; the many in the place of the few. Compare, moreover, chap. 24:7: "And I give them a heart to know me, that I am the Lord; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God;" 32:39: "And I give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them and of their children after them;" but especially Ezek. 11:19, 20, 36:26, 27.—The remarks of Jewish interpreters on the passage under consideration, in which they cannot avoid seeing that, in it, a purely moral revelation is prophesied, in contrast to a mere external one, clearly show how strongly the Old Testament is opposed to that carnal Jewish delusion of the condition of the Messianic Kingdom (as it is most glaringly expressed in the Talmudic passage *Massechet Sanhedrim*, fol. 119: "There is no other difference between the days of the Messiah and the present state of things, excepting only that the kingdoms shall be our slaves),"—a delusion which is quite analogous to the expectations which are entertained by revolutionists concerning the Future, and which flow from the same source. Thus Rabbi *Bechai* (see *Frischmuth*) remarks: "This means that every evil concupiscence shall be taken away, and every desire to covet any thing;" *Moses Nachmanides* (*ibid.* S. 861): "And this is nothing else than that every evil concupiscence shall be taken away, so that the heart, by an internal impulse, does what is right.—In the days of Messiah there will not exist any evil desire, but, from the impulse of his nature, man will do what is right. And there will, therefore, not be innocence and guilt, inasmuch as these depend upon concupiscence." But if once bent upon it, pre-conceived opinions will overcome every, even the strongest contradiction offered by the matter itself. This may be seen from the example of *Grotius*, who here explains: "I will cause that all of them keep my Law in memory,—in the first instance, by the multitude of synagogues which, at that time, were built, and in which the Law was taught thrice a-week." Thrice a-week! Surely that will produce first-rate men, viz., such as are described in Isa. 58:2. It is not without meaning, that the words: "And I will be their God," &c., follow upon: "And I give my Law in their inward parts," &c. The Law is the expression of God's nature; it is only by the Law being written in the heart that man can become a partaker of God's nature; that His name can be sanctified in him. And it is this participation in the nature of God, this sanctification of God's name, which forms the foundation of: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Without this, the relation cannot exist at all, as truly as God is not an idol, but the True and Holy One. These words express, as *Buddeus*, S. 94, rightly remarks: "That He will impart himself altogether to them." But how were it possible that God, with His blessings and gifts, should impart himself entirely and unconditionally to them who are not of His nature? Of all unnatural things, this would be the most unnatural. Here, however, likewise the relative character of the promise most clearly appears. As early as to Abraham, God had promised that He would be a God to *him*, and to his seed after him; and this promise he had afterwards repeated to the whole people, Lev. 26:12, compare Exod. 29:45: "And I dwell in the midst of the children of Israel and will be their God." In the consciousness that this promise was fulfilled in the time then present, David exclaims in Ps. 33:12: "Blessed is the nation whose God is Jehovah, the generation whom He hath chosen for His inheritance." Hence, here too, there is nothing absolutely new. If such were the subject of discourse, then the whole Kingdom of God under the Old Testament dispensation would be changed into a mere semblance and illusion. But the small measure of the condition—with which even God himself cannot dispense, but of which He may vouchsafe a larger measure, viz., the writing of the Law in the heart, whereby man becomes a copy of God, the personal Law—was necessarily accompanied by the small measure of the consequence. The perfect fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham and

Israel, to which the prophet here alludes, could, therefore, be expected from the future only.

Ver. 34. “*And they shall teach no more a man his neighbour, and a man his brother, saying: Know the Lord; for they all shall know me, small and great, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.*”

Even from ancient times, the first hemistich of the verse has created great embarrassment to interpreters, from which very few of them, not excepting even *Calvin*, manage to extricate themselves skilfully. The declaration that, because all will be taught by God, human instruction in things divine is to cease, has, at first sight, something fanatical in it, and, indeed, was made use of by Anabaptists and other enthusiasts in vindication of their delusion.<sup>38</sup> Many interpreters attempt an evasion, by referring the words to the future life; thus *Theodoret*, *Augustine*, (*de Spirit, et lit. c. 24*) and *Este*, who, in a manner almost *naive*, remarks: “This difficulty, it seems, is very simply avoided by those who refer this promise to the future world, where, no doubt, all care about teaching will cease.” But the matter is, indeed, not at all difficult. All that is necessary is to keep in mind that human instruction is here excluded, in so far only as it is opposed to divine instruction concerning God himself; that hence, that which is here spoken of, is *mere* human instruction, by which men are trained and drilled in religion, just as in every other branch of common knowledge,—a result of which is, that they may learn for ever without ever coming to the knowledge of the truth. Such an instruction may be productive of historical faith, of belief in human authority; but it is just by this, that the nature of religion will be altogether destroyed. Even the true God becomes an idol when He is not known through himself, when He himself does not prepare the heart as a place to dwell in. He is, and remains a mere idea that can impart no strength in the struggle against sin which is a real power, and no comfort in affliction. Now, such a condition was very frequent under the Old Testament dispensation. The mass of the people possessed only a knowledge of God, which was chiefly, although not exclusively, obtained through human instrumentality. By the New Covenant, richer gifts of the Spirit were to be bestowed, and along with them, the number of those was to be increased who were to partake in them, just as *Isaiah*, in chap. 7:16, represents believers under the Old Testament as being taught by the Lord, while in chap. 54:13, in reference to the Messianic time, he announces: “And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord.” Under the New Covenant, the antithesis of teaching by God, and teaching by man, is to cease. The teachers do not teach in their own strength, but as servants and instruments of the Lord, It is not they who speak, but the Holy Spirit in them. Those who are taught by them hear the word that comes to them through men, not as man’s word, but as God’s word; and they receive it, not because it satisfies their limited human reason, but because the Spirit testifies that the Spirit is truth. How this antithesis is done away with, and reconciled in a higher unity, is, among other passages, shown by 2 Cor. 3:3: “You are an epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God.” They are θεοδιδάκτοι, but through the ministry of the Apostle who, in so far as he performs this service, is not different from God, but only a conductor of His power, a channel through which the oil of the Holy Spirit flows to the Church of God; comp. remarks on *Zech. 4*. The same is taught in 1 John 2:20: Καὶ ὑμεῖς χρῖσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ οἴδατε πάντα. Οὐκ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλ’ ὅτι οἴδατε αὐτήν. Ver. 27: Καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸ χρῖσμα, ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, ἐν ὑμῖν, μένει καὶ οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε, ἵνα τις διδάσκη ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ’ ὡς τὸ αὐτοῦ χρῖσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων κ.τ.λ. The διδάσκειν here signifies the human teaching in contrast to that which is divine, such an one as undertakes by its own power to work knowledge in

him who is taught. Such a teaching cannot take place under the new covenant. A fundamental knowledge is already imparted to all its members; the παράκλητος, the Holy Ghost, alone teaches them, John 14:26; He leads them into all truth, John 16:13. But, just because this is the case, the teaching by means of those whom God has given, in His Church, as apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers (Eph. 4:11), to whom He has communicated His χάρισμα, is quite in its place. The apostle writes just *because* they know the truth. If it were otherwise, his efforts would be altogether in vain. Of what use is it to give instruction about colours to him who is blind? In things divine, the truth becomes truth to the single individual, only because his knowledge of God is founded on his being in God; and that can be accomplished only by his being connected to God through God. Being, life, and hence, also, real living knowledge, can proceed only from the fountain of all being and life. But in the case of those who are in God, who possess the fundamental knowledge, this knowledge must be developed, carried on, and brought to full consciousness through the instrumentality of those to whom God has granted the gifts for it. A glance into the deep meaning of our passage was obtained by the author of the book *Jelammedenu*, which is quoted by *Abarbanel* (in *Frischmuth*, S. 863); he says: "Under the present dispensation, Israel learns the Law from mortal men, and therefore forgets it; for as flesh and blood pass away (comp. Matt. 16:17, where the antithesis existing between a knowledge of divine things which rests on human ground, and that which rests on divine ground, is brought before us in its strictest form), so also its instruction passes away. But a time shall come when a man shall not learn from the mouth of a man, but from the mouth of the blessed God, for it is written; 'All thy children shall be taught by God.' In these words, it is implied that hitherto the knowledge of the Law was an artificial one obtained by mortal men. But for that reason, it cannot stand long, for the effect stands in proportion to its cause. At the time of the deliverance, however, the knowledge of the Law will be obtained in a miraculous manner." It is, however, quite obvious that this promise, too, must be understood relatively only. All the pious men of the Old Covenant were θεοδιδάκτοι; and under the New Covenant, the number of those is infinitely great who, through their own guilt, stand to truth in a relation which is entirely or preeminently mediate.—Instead of the "small," by way of individualization, servants and handmaids are mentioned in Joel 3:2 (2:29); compare remarks on Rev. 11:18.—We have already seen that in the last words of the verse, the fundamental blessing is promised. But whether כִּי be referred only to that which immediately precedes, or to every thing which goes before (*Venema: vocula כִּי non ad proxime praecedentia referenda, sed ad totum pericopam, qua bona foederis recensita sunt, extendenda*), amounts to nearly the same thing; for that which immediately precedes includes all the rest. We have before us nothing but designations of the same thing from various aspects; everything depends upon the richer bestowal of the gifts of the Spirit. This has the forgiveness of sins for its necessary foundation; for, before God can give, He must first take. The sins which separate the people and their God from one another, must first be taken away; it is then only that the inward means can be bestowed, so that the people may become truly God's people, and God's name may be sanctified in them. It is obvious that, here too, a relative difference only between the Old and New Covenant can be spoken of. A covenant-people without forgiveness of sins is no covenant-people; a God with whom there is not forgiveness, in order that He may be feared, who does not heal the bones which He has broken, who in this respect gives promises for the Future only, is no God, and no blessing. For if He does not grant this, He cannot grant any thing else, inasmuch as every thing else implies this, and is of no value without it. Forgiveness of sins is the essence of the Passover as the feast of the Covenant. On the Ark of the Covenant, it was represented by the *Capporeth* (see *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, Vol.

ii., p. 525 f.). Without it the sin-offerings appointed by God are a lie; without it, all that is untrue which God says of himself as the covenant-God, that He is gracious and merciful, Exod. 34:6. The holy Psalmists often acknowledge with praise and thanks that God *has* forgiven sins; comp. e.g. Ps. 85:3; “Thou hast taken away the iniquities of thy people, thou hast covered all their sins.” In the same manner they are loud in praising the high blessing bestowed upon the individual by the forgiveness of sins; compare Ps. 32:51. The consciousness that their sins are forgiven, forms the foundation of the disposition of heart which we perceive in the Psalmists; see Commentary on the Psalms, Vol. iii. p. lxxv. f. “What a πληροφορία”—so *Buddeus* remarks, p. 109—“what a confidence, what a joy of a tranquil and quiet conscience shines forth in the psalms and prayers of David!” We have thus before us merely a difference in degree. To the believers of that time, the sin of the covenant-people appeared to be too great to admit of its being forgiven. Driven away from the face of the Lord, so they imagined, it would close its miserable existence in the land of Nod; never would the καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως return. But, in opposition to such fears, the Prophet declares, in the name of the Lord, that they would not only return, but come, for the first time, in the true and full sense; that where they imagined to behold the end to the forgiveness of sins, there would be its real beginning; that where sin abounded, the grace of God should there so much the more abound. Only, they should not despair, and thus place a barrier in the way of God’s mercy. Your God is not a mere hard taskmaster; He himself will sow and then reap, as surely as He is God, the gracious and merciful One.

Ver. 35. “*Thus saith the Lord, giving the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, agitating the sea, and the waves thereof roar, the Lord of hosts is His name.*”

Ver. 36. “*If these ordinances will cease before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever.*”

Interpreters commonly assume that, already in ver. 35, the discourse is of the firm and immutable divine laws which every thing must obey. But opposed to this view are the words: “Agitating the sea, and the waves thereof roar,” in which no definite perceptible rule, no uninterrupted return takes place. To this argument may be added the comparison of the fundamental passage, Isa. 51:15, in which the omnipotence only of God is to be brought out: “And I am the Lord thy God, who agitates the sea, and its waves roar, the Lord of hosts is His name;” compare also Amos 9:5, 6. It thus appears that, in ver. 35, God’s omnipotence only is spoken of, which establishes that He is God and not man; and this forms the foundation for the declaration set forth in ver. 36, which is so full of comfort for the despairing covenant-people,—the proposition, namely, that, while all men are liars, He does not lie; that He can never repent of His covenant and promises. The “ordinances” (moon and stars are, in their regular return, themselves, as it were, embodied ordinances), are mentioned already in ver. 35, because just the circumstance that, according to eternal and inviolable laws, sun and moon must appear every day at a fixed time, and have done so for thousands and thousands of years, testifies more strongly for His omnipotence and absolute power, never liable to any foreign influence or interference, than if they at one time appeared, and, at another, failed to appear. God’s omnipotence, as it is testified by a look to nature (*Calvin*: “The Prophet contents himself with pointing out what even boys knew, viz., that the sun makes his daily circuit round the whole earth, that the moon does the same, and that the stars in their turn succeed, so that, as it were, the moon with the stars exercises dominion by night, and, afterwards, the sun reigns by day”), results from the fact that He is the pure, absolute, being (Jehovah His

name, comp. remarks on Mal. 3:6); and it is just because He is this, that His counsels, which He declared without any condition attached to them, must be unchangeable. To believe that He has for ever rejected Israel, is to degrade Him, to make Him an idol, a creature.—In ver. 36, the immutability of God’s counsel of grace is put on a level with the immutability of God’s order of nature; but this is done with a view to the weakness of the people, who receive, for a pledge of their election, that which is most firm among visible things; so that every rising of the sun and moon is to them a guarantee of it; compare Ps. 89:37, 38. But considered in itself, the counsel’s of God’s grace are *much firmer* than the order of nature. The heavens wax old as a garment, and as a vesture He changes them and they are changed (Ps. 102:27-29); heaven and earth shall pass away, but the word of God shall not pass away.—From chap. 33:24: “They despise my people (יִמְעִי) that they should be still a nation (גֹּי) before them” it appears why it is that גֹּי is here used, and not עַם. The covenant-people in their despair imagined that their national existence, which, in the Present, was destroyed, was gone for ever. If only their national existence was sure, then also was their existence as a covenant-people. For, just as their national existence had ceased, because they had ceased to be the covenant-people, so they could again obtain a national existence as the covenant-people only.

Ver. 37. *“Thus saith the Lord: If the heavens above be measured, and the foundations of the earth beneath be searched out, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel, for all that they have done, saith the Lord.”*

It is not without meaning that the Prophet so frequently repeats: Thus saith the Lord. This formed the A and Ω; His word was the *sole* ground of hope for Israel. Apart from it, despair was as reasonable, as now it was unreasonable. The measuring of heaven, and the searching out of the innermost parts of the earth, come here into consideration as things impossible. The words: “All the seed of Israel,” take from the hypocrites that consolation which they might be disposed to draw from these promises. It is as much in opposition to the nature of God that He should permit all the seed of Israel, the faithful with the unbelievers, to perish, as that He should save all the seed of Israel, unbelievers as well as believers. The promise, as well as the threatening, always leaves a remnant. All that the covenant grants is, that the whole cannot perish (the discourse is here, of course, of definite rejection); but it gives no security to the individual sinner. The words: “For all that they have done,” are added intentionally, because the greatness of the sins of the people was the *punctum saliens* in the believers’ despair of the mercy of God. Calvin says: “The Prophet here intentionally brings forward the sins of the people, in order that we may know that the grace of God is greater still, and that the multitude of so many wicked men would not be an obstacle to God’s granting pardon.”

Ver. 38. *“Behold, days, saith the Lord, and the city is built to the Lord from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner. Ver. 39. And the measuring line goeth yet farther over against it, over the hill Gareb (the leper), and turneth towards Goah (place of execution). Ver. 40. And the whole valley of the carcasses and of the ashes, and all the fields unto the brook of Kidron, and from thence unto the horsegate, towards the East, (all this is) holiness unto the Lord. No more shall it be destroyed, nor shall it be laid waste for ever.”*

This prophecy embraces two features: *first*, the restoration of the Kingdom of God, represented under the figure of a restoration of Jerusalem, which, under the Old Covenant, was its seat and centre (it is this aspect only which Zechariah, in resuming this

prophecy, has brought forward in chap. 14:10); and, *secondly*, the glorification of the Kingdom of God, which now is so strengthened and increased, that it can undertake to attack and assail the dark kingdom of evil, and subject it to itself, while formerly it was attacked and assailed by it, and often could not prevent the enemy from penetrating into the innermost heart of its territory. This thought the Prophet graphically clothes in a perceptible form, and in such a manner that he describes how the unholy places, by which Jerusalem, the holy city, was surrounded on all sides, are included in its circumference, and become holiness unto the Lord. In former times, the victory of the world over the Kingdom of God had been embodied in the fact, that the abominations of sin and idolatry had penetrated into the very temple; compare chap. 7:11: "Is then this house, which is called by the name of the Lord, a den of robbers, saith the Lord?" Other passages will be mentioned when we come to comment upon Dan. 9:27. This inward victory must, according to divine necessity, be followed by the outward one. The covenant-people which, inwardly, had submitted to the world, which, by its own guilt, had profaned itself, was, outwardly also, given up to the world, and was profaned in punishment. And this profanation, inflicted upon it as a punishment, again manifested itself just at that place, where the profanation by the guilt had chiefly manifested itself, viz., in the holy city, and in the holy temple. It is with a view to the former manifestation of the victory of the world over the Kingdom of God, that here the victory of the Kingdom of God over the world is described; and the imagery is just simple imagery. To the outward holiness of the city and of the temple, the outward unholiness of the places around Jerusalem is opposed. "While the victory of the world over the Kingdom of God had been manifested by the profanation of these places, the victory of the Kingdom of God now appears under the image of the sanctification of these formerly unholy places. By what means that great change had been brought about; by what means the Kingdom of God, which now lay so powerlessly prostrate, should again obtain powers which it had never before possessed; by what means the servant was to be changed into a lord, it was unnecessary for the Prophet here to point out; it had been already mentioned in vers. 32-34. The difference consists in this, that the New Covenant is not like the Old, but that it first furnishes the right weapons by which sin and the world can be overcome, viz., an infinitely richer measure of the forgiveness of sins, of the graces of the Spirit.—We must still premise a general remark concerning the determination of the boundaries of the New Jerusalem here given, because this must guide us in determining the single doubtful places which are here mentioned. The correct view has been already given by *Vitringa* in his Commentary on Isaiah 30:33: "The Prophet promises to the returning ones the restoration of the city of Jerusalem in its whole circumference; and he describes it in this way, that he begins from the Eastern wall, passes on thence, through the North side, to the West side, and thence, by the South side, returns to the East." For the Prophet begins with the tower of Hananeel which was situated at the East side of the town, near the sheep-gate; compare remarks on Zech. 14:10. Thence he proceeds to the corner-gate, which was situated in that corner where the North and East met (compare 1. c.), and hence comprehends the whole North side. He closes with the horse-gate, of which he expressly states that it was situated towards the East, and hence points out that he had again arrived at the place from which he set out. We have thus gained a firm foundation for determining those among the places mentioned, the situation of which is, in itself, doubtful.—Let us now proceed to the consideration of particulars. After *סִימָי*, the *Keri* inserts *סִיאָב*. It is true that this fuller expression is commonly used by the Prophet; but, for that very reason, the more concise one is to be preferred, which alone has the authority of the MSS. in its favour, while the *Keri* is nothing but a conjecture, perhaps not even that. The full expression having already occurred so frequently in the passage under consideration, the Prophet here, at the close,

and for a change, contents himself with the mere intimation. The Prophet says intentionally: "The city is built to the Lord," so that "to the Lord" must be connected with "is built;" not "the city of the Lord." The latter expression had become so much a *nomen proprium* of Jerusalem, that the full depth of its meaning was no more thought of. This new city is no more to be called simply the city of the Lord; it is truly to be built to the Lord, so that it belongs to Him.—In the first two points of the boundary, the tower of Hananeel and the Corner-gate, the second main idea of the passage does not yet come out so prominently. This is to be accounted for simply by the circumstance, that on the whole North side of the town there were not any unholy places. The Suffix in וּדְגַג refers to the Corner-gate; the measuring line, קֶנֶה according to the *Kethibh*, הַמְדָּה וּק, which is the common form, according to the *Keri*, goes yet farther over against it, &c. By the words "over against," it is intimated that it now goes beyond the former dimensions of the town, לְעַ "over" (*Hitzig* erroneously translates it "towards," or "by the side of it"), shows that the hill Gareb is included within the circumference of the new city. From the remarks formerly made, it appears that the hill Gareb, and Goah, places which are nowhere else mentioned, must have been situated on the West side; and, moreover, Gareb on the North-west side,<sup>39</sup> and Goah on the South-west side, בְּרַג has no other signification than "the leper;" and "the hill of the leper" can be the hill only, where the lepers had their abode. For, as early as in the second year after the Exodus from Egypt, these lepers were obliged to remain without the camp (comp. Numb. 5:3: "Without the camp shall ye send them, and not shall they defile their camp in the midst whereof I dwell"); and this law was so strictly enforced, that even Moses' sister was removed out of the camp. When they had come to Canaan, the provisions of the law in reference to the camp were transferred to the towns; compare farther Lev. 13:46: "All the days that he has the leprosy, he shall be defiled; he shall dwell alone, without the camp shall his habitation be;" Luke 17:12. Even Uzziah could not be released from it; he lived without the city in Beth Chofshith, 2 Kings 15:5, which is commonly translated "house of the sick," instead of "house of emancipation," viz., place where they lived, whom the Lord had manumitted, who no more belonged to His servants; compare remarks on Ps. 88:6. Even in the kingdom of Israel they were so strict in the execution of this Mosaic ordinance (one from among the numberless proofs which are opposed to the current views of the religious condition of this kingdom, and of its relation to the Law of Moses), that, even during the siege of Samaria, the lepers were not allowed to leave the place before the gate assigned to them, 2 Kings 7:3.—In order more fully to understand the meaning of our passage, it is indispensable that we should inquire into the causes of that regulation. *J. D. Michaelis* (Mos. Recht. iv. § 210) has his answer at once in readiness, and is so fully convinced of its being right and to the point, that he "does not think it worth while to mention any other view. Because *to him* the temporal objects and aims are the highest, he at once supposes them everywhere in the Law of the Holy God also. The ordinance is to him nothing but a sanitary measure intended to prevent contagion. But that would surely be a degree of severity against the sick which could the less be excused by a regard to the healthy, that leprosy, if contagious at all, is so, at all events, very slightly only, and is never propagated by a single touch. (*Michaelis* himself remarks: "Except in the case of cohabitation, one may be quite safe.") But this severity against the sick must appear in a still more glaring light, and the concern for the healthy becomes even ridiculous, when we take into consideration the other regulations concerning the lepers. They were obliged to go about in torn clothes, bare-headed, and with covered chin, and to cry out to every one that came near them, that they were unclean. Even *Michaelis* grants that those regulations could not be designed to guard against infection. He remarks: "But the leper should not cause disgust to any one by his really shocking appearance, or terror by an accidental,

unexpected touch.” But such a sentimental, unmerciful regard to the tender nerves is surely elsewhere not to be perceived in the Law, which regulates all the relations of man to his neighbour, by the principle: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. *Farther*—From mere sanitary or police considerations, the law in reference to the leprosy of the clothes and houses, which is closely connected with the law about the leprosy of men, cannot be accounted for. The reason which *Michaelis* advances for the law in reference to the clothes, is of such a nature, that not even the most refined politicians have ever yet thought of a similar one. The leprosy of the houses is, according to him, the dry-rot, which, although not contagious, was so hateful to Moses, that, out of concern for the health of the possessor, and for the goods kept in them, he ordered them to be altogether pulled down. If Moses had entertained the views on the power of the magistrates which lie at the foundation of this, he could not have been an ambassador of God,—even apart altogether from the absurdity of the measure. But the shallowness and untenableness of *Michaelis*’ view will appear still more strongly, when we state the positive argument for our view. It is this: Leprosy is the outward image of sin; that, therefore, which is done upon the leper, is, in reality, done upon the sinner. Every leper, therefore, was a living sermon, a loud admonition to keep unspotted from the world. The exclusion of the lepers from the camp, from the holy city, conveyed figuratively quite the same lesson, as is done in words by John, in Rev. 21:27: καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ποιῶν βδέλυγμα καὶ ψεῦδος, and by Paul, in Ephes. 5:5: τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης ... οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ; comp. Gal. 5:19, 21. Now it is clearly seen what is the Prophet’s meaning in including the hill of the lepers in the holy city. That which hitherto was unclean becomes clean; the Kingdom of God now does violence to the sinners, while, hitherto, the sinners had done violence to the Kingdom of God. It is only when we take this view of leprosy, that we account for the fact, that just this disease so frequently occurs as the theocratic punishment of sin. The image of sin is best suited for reflecting it; he who is a sinner before God, is represented as a sinner in the eyes of man also, by the circumstance that he must exhibit before men the image of sin. God took care that ordinarily the image and the thing itself were perfectly coincident; although, no doubt, there were exceptions,—cases where God, according to His wise and holy purposes, allowed that one relatively innocent (in the case of a perfectly innocent man, if such an one existed, that would not be possible, except in the case of Christ who bore *our* disease), had to bear the image of sin, *e.g.*, in the case of such as were in danger of self-righteousness. As a theocratic punishment, leprosy is found especially with such as had secretly sinned, or had surrounded their sin with a good appearance, which, in the eyes of men, prevents them from appearing as sinners, *e.g.*, in the case of Miriam, Uzziah, Gehazi, 2 Kings 5:27. In the Law, there are many warnings against it, *e.g.*, Deut. 24:8; and David wishes, 2 Sam. 3:29, that the threatening of the Law might be fulfilled upon the house of wicked Joab. The leprosy of houses, too, comes into consideration only as an image of spiritual leprosy, as is seen from the command in Lev. 14:49: “And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop; ver. 53: and make an atonement for the house, and it shall be clean.” The procedure here is quite the same as that which was applied in the case of sin and sinners; and since the house cannot sin, it follows that a symbolical action only can here be spoken of.—Goah, in this context, in the midst of unclean places, can hardly be anything else than some unclean place; and it is a very obvious supposition that this nature is expressed in the very name. This signification interpreters usually endeavour to obtain by deriving the word from גַּעַה “to roar,” of which it is properly the Partic. Fem., hence “the roaring one;” but it is more easily obtained by adopting the derivation from גַּחַ, just as גַּחַ is derived from גַּחַ, a derivation

which was first proposed by *Hitler*, S. 127. גֹּאֵךְ is used of a violent death, no less than of a natural death; thus Numb. 17:27, 28, of a death like that of the company of Koran, Dathan, and Abiram; compare Zech. 13:8. This derivation being assumed, Goah would denote “expiring,” “hill<sup>40</sup> of expiring,” which would be a very suitable name of the place for the execution of criminals. *Vitranga*, in commenting upon Is. 30:33, already expressed the conjecture that Goah, לִגְיֵהּ לִגְיֵהּ might perhaps be identical with Golgotha, but retracted it, because the Evangelists explain Golgotha by κρανίου τόπος. But this is no sufficient and conclusive reason. When the Aramean became the prevailing language, the name of the place may have received a new etymology, just as the Fathers of the Church derive πάσχα from πάσχειν, and many similar instances. It has already been observed that the appellation, place of “skulls,” is rather strange, inasmuch as the skulls did not remain in the place of execution.<sup>41</sup> The use of “skull” for “the place of skulls,” as well as the omission of the *L*, have been found strange. But all that is easily accounted for, if the new signification, which substantially agreed with the former, was merely transferred to the word. The identity of Goah and Golgotha cannot be disputed,—at least, not from the situation. From Heb. 13:12, it is certain that Golgotha, as an unclean place, was situated outside the city; that it was situated on the West side is, it is true, testified by tradition only; compare *Kraft*, S. 168ff.; *Ritter*, *Erdk.* xvi. 1, S. 422 ff.—We now come to the valley of carcasses and of ashes. Even from the position, it becomes probable that this is the valley of Hinnom. The North and West sides are already done, and hence the South and East sides only remain. But the valley of Hinnom was situated towards the South, or South-east of Jerusalem, comp. *Kraft*, S. 2; v. *Raumer*, S. 269. The valley of the carcasses is here brought into immediate connection with *all* the fields (*q. d.*, all the other fields), unto the brook Kidron, and is hence designated as a portion of the valley of Kidron. But the valley of Hinnom was the Southern, or South-eastern continuation of the valley of Kidron, which extended on the East side. To this it may be added that, in this context, we must necessarily expect the mention of the valley of Hinnom, but that otherwise it would be wanting. Among all the unclean places around Jerusalem, this was the most unclean. There could be no greater victory of the Kingdom of God over the world, than if this strictest antithesis to the holy city, this image of hell, was included within the Holy City. It is only with respect to the cause of the appellation, that some doubt may exist. מִירְגָפִים, רֵגֶפִים is a common designation of dead bodies, of carcasses. There is not one among the twenty-two passages in which it occurs, where it refers to deceased righteous ones. It is used of the dead bodies of animals, of idols, Lev. 26:30; of the dead bodies of those whom the Lord has smitten in His anger and wrath, Jer. 33:5; 1 Sam. 17:46; Amos 8:3; Neh. 3:3; Is. 66:24; of such as are, after death, treated like beasts, Jer. 1:49. Hence, opinions such as that of *Venema* fall to the ground, who supposes that the valley had that name, because it was the public burying-ground. But there is, nevertheless, scope for difference of opinion. One may understand by מִירְגָפִים the carcasses of animals;—the valley of Hinnom would, in that case, be the public flaying-ground. It is in itself probable, and it is generally held<sup>42</sup> that, after the defilement by Josiah (2 Kings 23:10), it received this designation. But there are not wanting evident traces that, even in former times, the valley served this purpose. In Is. 30:33, it is said in reference to the Assyrians: ‘Tor Tophet (*Gesenius* arbitrarily changes the *nomen proprium* into an *appellativum*, and translates: the place for burning) is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared, made deep and large; the pile thereof has fire and wood in abundance.’ This passage supposes that, even at that time, the valley of Hinnom, or Tophet (which properly is only a part of it, but is sometimes, however, used for the whole), had that destination; that piles were constantly burning in it, on which the carcasses of animals were burned. Such a place of execution and burial is already prepared for the carcasses of the Assyrians rebelling against God.

Even the existence of the name Tophet, i.e., *horror, abomination*, bears witness to the impure destination. The second passage is Is. 66:24. Outside the Holy City, the place where formerly the carcasses of the beasts were lying, there now lie the dead bodies of the transgressors. As the former were, in times past, food both for the worms and fire, so they are now. It is true, that *Vitringra's* objection, that it can scarcely be imagined that the idolators should have chosen a place so unclean, is very plausible. But how plausible soever such an argument may appear, it cannot invalidate distinct historical testimonies; and it might very well be set aside, although it would lead us too far away from our purpose, to do so here. But it may also be supposed that the Prophet looks back to his own declarations, chap. 7:31, and 19:4 ff.; and that by *סירגפ* here the corpses of transgressors are to be understood, who are destined to destruction, and therefore are to be buried in the flaying-ground. But this reference is, after all, too far-fetched; and it is more natural to say, that the nature of Tophet, as the flaying-ground, forms the foundation, which is common to those passages and that before us.—But, besides the arguments already advanced, there is still a grammatical reason, which shows that it is really the valley of Hinnom which is meant. The article in *קמעה* forbids us to view it as being in the *Stat. construct*, and connected with the following words. We must translate: “And the whole valley, (viz. the valley of) the carcasses and ashes.” The place is, hence, first designated as “the valley,” without any further qualification, and receives this qualification only afterwards. But it is just the valley of Hinnom which, in Jer. 2:23, is designated as the valley *κατ' ἔξοχήν* and the gate leading to it, as the gate of the valley, in Neh. 2:13, 15; comp. remarks on Zech. 11:13.—In reference to *אשן*, *Gousset Lex.* p. 368, remarks: “The words *אשן* and *אשן* are used only of the ashes of the sacrificial animals, and their removal.” This observation is confirmed by every careful examination of the passages in question. Never are *אשן* and *אשן* used otherwise than of the ashes of sacrificial animals; compare Lev. 1:16; 6:3, 4; 1 Kings 13:5; Numb. 4:13; Exod. 27:3. The derivation of the signification “ashes,” from the fundamental signification “fat,” as advanced by *Winer* and others (*cinis=pingue-factio agrorum*), is therefore wrong. On the contrary, even the burnt fat was still considered as fat; the ashes of the fat are the *אשירא*, the residuum of the fat. By this determination of the word, the explanation is very much facilitated. In Lev. 6:3, 11, it is said: “And he (the priest, after having offered up the burnt-offering) shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes without the camp into a clean place.” According to this regulation, the ashes of the sacrificial animals were considered as relatively unclean. The priest had to put off his holy garments, and to put on common garments, and to carry the ashes without the camp,—afterwards without the Holy City. Hence, in contrast to the sacrifices themselves, the ashes were considered as the impure residuum which is found in everything which men do in relation to God, as the image of sinful contamination attaching to all, even the best works, and to the holiest elevation of the heart. If, then, the place where the ashes are deposited is to be included within the boundaries of the Holy City; is, in holiness, to be equal to the place where the sacrifices themselves are offered,—what else can be signified thereby, than that the unholy is to be overpowered by the holy, the earthly by the divine, by means of a more glorious communication of the Holy Spirit? It is quite analogous, when Zechariah represents the horses as being in future adorned by the Lord with the symbol of holiness, which formerly the High-priest only wore; compare remarks on Zech. 14:20. This one argument might be brought forward against the explanation which we have given, viz., that we cannot well imagine that this was the destination of the valley of Hinnom, because, according to the Law, the ashes of the sacrifices were to be carried to a *clean* place; because that which once stood in connection with that which is most holy and pure,

although, in itself, it may be unclean, must not be mingled with that which is absolutely and constantly unclean. But in opposition to this we remark, that it was not this whole valley that was unclean, but only the place Tophet in it; and that if sometimes the whole is designated as unclean, it is only because it included this most unclean among all unclean places; compare chap. 7:31, 32:35; 2 Kings 23:10.—There cannot be any doubt that “the שְׂרָמוֹת unto the brook Kidron” are identical with the fields of Kidron, קִדְרוֹן שְׂרָמוֹת, mentioned in 2 Kings 23; but much to be doubted is the correctness of the common supposition (after the example of *Kuypers, ad varia V. T. loca, in the Syll. Dissert, sub praes. Schultens, et Schroederi, t. 1. p. 537*), that שְׂרָמוֹת is identical with שְׂדָמוֹת. If that were the case, we could not see why Jeremiah should have exchanged the common word for an uncommon one, which elsewhere does not occur. Jeremiah is fond of exchanging words of similar sounds, and especially words differing from one another merely by one letter, and especially by ד and ר; but these exchanges are always significant. (Compare *Küper, Jerem. p. xiv. and 43, and History of Balaam., p. 447 f.*) Although we cannot, with certainty, fix the meaning of תּוֹמְרָשׁ, yet so much seems to be sure, that this word was one which more accurately designated the nature of those places than the current *nomen proprium*, inasmuch as it would be absurd to substitute for it another name, if there had not been deeper reasons. One need only compare the תִּיהַשְׂמָה רָה itself which, in the simple historical prose, is used of the Mount of Olives, 2 Kings 23:13. The most simple and natural supposition is the following. All the significations of the verbs in Arabic run together in that of *cutting off*. שְׂרָמוֹת, the Plural of the Feminine of the Adjective שָׂרַם are, accordingly, *loca abscissa*, places which are cut off and excluded [from the Holy City] outwardly (Ag.: *πρόσσεια*), and, at the same time, inwardly. Thus we obtain a striking contrast between their present nature and future destination. What is now distinctly separated from the holy, then become holiness, שָׂדֵק. From 2 Kings 23 it appears, moreover, that the fields of Kidron were unclean. It was thither as to an unclean place, that Josiah caused all the abominations of idolatry to be carried, and to be burnt; compare ver. 4 (Josiah commanded all the vessels which had been made to Baal and Ashera to be brought forth out of the temple): “And he burned them *without Jerusalem* in the fields of Kidron.” Ver. 6: “And he brought out the Ashera out of the house of the Lord, *without Jerusalem*, unto the brook Kidron, and he burned them in the valley of Kidron . . . And cast the powder thereof upon the graves of the children of the people.” These last words (the children of the people = the mob, high and low, who had polluted themselves by idolatry, comp. 2 Chron. 34:4: “And he strewed the dust upon the graves of them that had sacrificed unto them”) enable us perhaps to conjecture the cause of the uncleanness of these fields. They served as a burying ground to the adherents of the worship of Moloch, who were anxious to rest in the neighbourhood of their idol, which dwelt in the neighbouring Tophet; and this is the more easily accounted for, that it is very probable that the sacrifices offered up to the idol were, in a great measure, sacrifices offered for the dead.—הוֹהִיל שָׂדֵק refers to every thing mentioned in the verse before us. As regards the last words, comp. remarks on Zech. 14:11.

## CHAPTER 33:14-26

Still before the destruction, but in the view of it, the Prophet, while in the outer court of the prison, was favoured with the revelation contained in chap. 32, and with that revelation of which our section forms a portion. It may appear strange that, in the introduction, the revelation of great things hitherto unknown to him is promised to the Prophet, and which he is told to seek by calling unto the Lord; while, after all, the

subsequent prophecy contains scarcely any prominent, peculiar feature. But this is easily explained, when we take into consideration that, throughout Scripture, dead knowledge is not regarded as knowledge; that the hope of restoration had, in the natural man, in the Prophet as well as in all believers, an enemy that strove to darken and extinguish it; that, therefore, the promise of restoration was ever new, and the word of God always great and exalted. In the first part of the revelation, after the destruction had been represented as unavoidable, and all human hope had been cut off, the restoration is described more in general terms. In the second part, the Lord meets a two-fold special grief of the believers. The time was approaching when the house of David was to be most deeply humbled, when every trace of its former glory was to be done away with. With it, the hopes of the people seem to be buried. God himself had declared this house to be the medium, through which all the mercies were to come, which He, as the King, had promised to bestow upon His people. But what was to become of the mercies, if the channel was destroyed, through which they were to be bestowed upon the people? The temple which, through the guilt of the people, had been changed into a den of robbers, was to be destroyed. But, with the existence of the temple, the existence of the Levitical priesthood was bound up, and if the latter was done away with, how was to be obtained forgiveness of sins, which, in the Law, had been connected with the mediation of the Levitical priesthood? These fears and cares the Lord now meets by declaring that, in both respects, the perishing would be an arising, that life should arise from death.

The genuineness of this section has been assailed by *Jahn* (*Vaticinia Mess.* iii. p. 112 ff.<sup>34</sup>), after the example of *J. D. Michaelis*, who, in the German translation of the Bible, inclosed it within brackets. For the present, we mention only the internal reason—deferring the refutation till we come to the exposition of particulars—because we require it in order to set aside the external reason. *Jahn*, p. 121, sums it up in these words: “The matter stands in opposition to all the prophecies of Jeremiah and all the other Prophets. For all of them limit themselves to the one David who was to come after the captivity, and do not mention any successor to him, far less such a multitude of descendants of David and of Levites, which is promised to the people under the name of a blessing, but which would, in reality, have been a very heavy burden to the people, at whose expense they were to be splendidly maintained.” The external reason is the omission of the section in the Alexandrian version. Proceeding upon the altogether gratuitous assumption of a double recension of the prophecies of Jeremiah, people imagine that, by the omission in the Alexandrian version, they are entitled to suppose that, in that recension which the LXX. followed, this section was not contained. But the arguments are most unsatisfactory, by which the attempt is made to establish that many portions, not translated by the LXX., were not found by them in their manuscripts. Where there notoriously prevail negligence, ignorance, arbitrariness, entire want of a clear conception of the task of a translator, those inferences are out of place which suppose just the opposite of all these (compare *e.g.*, the inferences in *Jahn*, S. 116 ff.) Although we cannot sometimes discover and state the reason which induced the LXX. to make any omission, in case that that which was omitted was really in the text, what is it that is thereby proved? Could we, *a priori*, expect anything else, since we are on the territory of accident and whim? It is quite sufficient that in a multitude of passages we can point out the most insufficient reasons which induced them to make omissions, alterations, transpositions; for it is just these which show that we are in the territory of accident and whim, where it is unreasonable every where to expect reasons. Now, to these passages, that before us likewise belongs; so that, even supposing that the ground of the deviation sometimes lies in a different recension, our passage cannot be regarded as belonging to this class; and,

hence, from its omission, nothing can be inferred against its genuineness. A twofold reason here presents itself, which may have induced them to the omission: 1. Important elements of the prophecy under consideration have already occurred, vers. 15, 16, almost *verbatim*, in chap. 23:3, 6; vers. 20-25, as regards the thought, altogether, and as regards the words, partly agree with chap. 31:35-37; and it is certain that the LXX. often omitted that which had occurred previously, because they were unable to perceive the deeper meaning of the repetition, and transferred their own ignorance to the Prophet. 2. In that which was peculiar to the passage before us, it was just the principal thought—the same which *J. D. Michaelis* and *Jahn* advance against the genuineness—which must have been most objectionable to the LXX., who were incapable of perceiving the deeper meaning. An increase of the Levites and of the family of David as the stars of the heavens and the sand of the sea, is a thought of which the Prophet must be freed, whether he entertained it or not. The omission in the Alexandrian version, therefore, does not prove any thing, except that even 2000 years before *J. D. Michaelis*, *John*, *Hitzig*, and *Movers*, there were men who were as little able to understand the text as these expositors.

Ver. 14. *“Behold days come, saith the Lord, and I perform the good word which I have spoken unto the house of Israel and concerning the house of Judah.”*

The “good word” may, in a more general way, be understood of all the gracious promises of God to Israel, in contrast to the evil word, the threatenings which hitherto had been fulfilled upon Israel; comp. 1 Kings 8:56, where Solomon, in the prayer at the consecration of the temple, says: “Blessed be the Lord, that has given rest unto His people Israel, according to all which He spoke; there has not failed (the opposite of סוּק) one word of all His good word which He spoke through Moses His servant.” In Deut. 28 the *good* word and the *evil* word are placed beside one another; and the former is blessed, from vers. 1-14; afterwards, the curse is declared. The centre and substance of this good word was the promise to David, through whose righteous Sprout all the promises to Israel should find their final fulfilment. But we may also suppose that, by the “good word,” the Prophet specially denotes this promise to David, which he had repeated in chap. 23:5, 6. This latter supposition is preferable, since, in vers. 15, 16, that repetition of it is quoted, and ver. 17 contains an allusion to the fundamental promise. The change of bit and by is significant; Judah is considered as the object of the proclamation of salvation, because salvation cometh from the Jews. The correctness of this view is proved by ver. 15, 16, where that only is spoken of, which, in the first instance, belongs to Judah; so that Israel is only received into the communion of the salvation, in the first instance, destined for Judah.

Ver. 15, 16. *“In those days and at that time will I cause a righteous Sprout to grow up unto David, and he worketh justice and righteousness in the land. In those days Judah is endowed with salvation, and Jerusalem dwelleth safely; and this is the name by which she shall be called: The Lord, our righteousness.”*

It is intentionally that the promise is here repeated in the former shape, in order to show that it still existed; that the glaring contrast presented by the present state of things was not able to annul it; that even in the view of the destruction, of the deepest abasement of the house of David, it still retained its right and power. Instead of יְתוּמִיקָה, the more suitable הִימָצֵא is here used, because the reference to Jehoiakim does not take place in this passage, as it did in the previous one. Instead of Israel, which is found there, we have here Jerusalem, because it was just the restoration of Jerusalem, which it was so difficult for

the faithful to believe, after its destruction had been described in ver. 4 ff. For the same reason, the Prophet here assigns the same name to Jerusalem which he did there to the Sprout of David. The same city, which as yet is groaning under the wrath of God, shall, in future, be endowed with righteousness by the Lord.

Ver. 17. *“For thus saith the Lord: There shall not be cut off from David a man sitting upon the throne of the house of Israel.”*

The connection with what precedes is pertinently brought out by *Calvin*: “The Prophet had spoken of the restoration of the Church; that doctrine he now confirms by promising, that both the kingly and priestly office should be perpetual; and it was just these two things which constituted the salvation of the people. For, without a king, they were just like a cut-off tree, or a mutilated body; without a priest they were in a state of dispersion. For the priest was the mediator between God and the people, but the king represented the person of God.” The expression *תרכי אל* “there shall not be cut off,” &c., is a simple repetition of the promise to David, in that form in which it had been quoted by David himself, shortly before his death, in his address to Solomon, 1 Kings 2:4, and afterwards twice by Solomon, I Kings 8:25, 9:5. It does not designate an uninterrupted succession, but forms the contrast only to a breaking off for ever. This appears even from the circumstance that, in the fundamental promise, God reserves to himself the punishment of the apostate members of the Davidic house, and that in Jeremiah the announcement of its utter abasement is so frequently repeated.

Ver. 18. *“And to the Levitical priests there shall not be cut off before me a man, offering burnt-offerings, and kindling meat-offerings, and doing sacrifice all days.”*

In order rightly to understand these words, it is necessary to go back to their cause; for it is from the grief only that the comfort receives its explanation. The Prophet has here not by any means to do with members of the tribe of Levi mourning over the loss of the prerogatives of their tribe. If such were the case, it would be necessary to hold fast by the letter, inasmuch as it is only when the letter is adhered to, that the promise can afford consolation for such grief. The Prophet’s consolations, on the contrary, are destined for all the believers, who were mourning over the destruction of the relation to God, which hitherto had existed through the mediation of the tribe of Levi. If only the relation remained, it was of little importance whether it was realised by the tribe of Levi, as heretofore, or in some other way. Just as the grief has respect to the substance only, so has the consolation also. Israel, in future too, shall retain free access to his reconciled God,—that is the fundamental thought; and every thing by which this thought was manifested and realised in history, in what form soever it might be, must be viewed as comprehended in it. We thus obtain a threefold fulfilment: 1. In the time after the return from the captivity, the consolation was realised in the form in which it is here expressed. The fact, that God admitted and promoted the rebuilding of the temple, was an actual declaration that the Levitical priesthood was reinstated in its mediatorial office. 2. In the highest degree the idea of the Levitical priesthood was realised through Christ, who, as a High-Priest and Mediator, bore the sins of His people, and made intercession for the transgressors, and in whom the Levitical priesthood ceased, just as the seed-corn disappears in the stalk. 3. Through Christ, the believers themselves became priests, and obtained free access to the Father.—The following reasons show that we have a right to maintain this independence of the thought upon the form: 1. The Prophet is so penetrated with the thought of the glory of the New Dispensation far outshining that of the Old, that,

*even a priori*, we could not suppose that, as regards the priesthood, he expected an eternal duration of its form, hitherto so poor. It is the substance only which, in his view, is permanent. One need only compare the section, chap. 31:31 ff. How intentionally does he here bring forward the idea that the New Covenant would not be like the Old; how does he point from the shadow to the substance! But it is especially chap. 3:16 which, in this respect, is to be regarded. In that passage, the ceasing of the former dignity of the Ark of the Covenant is announced repeatedly, and in the strongest terms; and we have already seen that, along with the Ark of the Covenant, the temple, the Levitical priesthood, the whole sacrificial service stands in the closest and most indissoluble connection; so that all this must fall along with it. 2. A very important proof is furnished by ver. 22, which must be regarded as a declaration, by the Prophet himself, as to the manner in which he wishes to be understood. Now, in that verse, it is promised that all the descendants of Abraham shall be changed into Levites; and this is declared to form a part of the eternal acceptance of the tribe of Levi, promised in the verse under consideration. This shows then, that, in the verse under review, the Levites come cannot into consideration as descendants of Levi after the flesh, but only as regards their destination and vocation. 3. As the most ancient and authentic interpreter of Jeremiah, Zechariah must be considered. He was most anxious to obviate the same fears which Jeremiah here meets; and, in him, the first two of the three features which Jeremiah comprehends in the unity of the idea, appear separated, but in such a manner that the connecting unity of the idea is not lost sight of. In Zech. 3, God assures the people that, notwithstanding the greatness of their sins, He would not only allow the office of High-priest to continue as heretofore, and accept his mediation, but that, at some future period, He would also send the true high-priest, who should make a complete and everlasting atonement. In ver. 8, the High-priest and his colleagues in the priestly office are designated as types of Christ who, putting most completely to shame the people's despair in God's mercy, should fully accomplish the expiation and atonement which the former had effected only imperfectly. In chap. 4 the priestly is, along with the royal order, designated as one of the two sons of the oil, the two anointed ones of the Lord, whose anointing remaineth for ever; and from chap. 6:13, where the Messiah appears as the true High-priest and King at the same time, it appears that, here too, the shadow only belongs to the Levitical priesthood, but the substance to Christ. 4. Elsewhere, too, plain examples are not wanting, in which the idea of the priesthood only is regarded, while the peculiar form of its manifestation under the Old Testament is lost sight of. Among those is Is. 61:6, where, in reference to all Israel, it is said: "And ye shall be named priests of Jehovah, ministers of our God shall they call you." Here the change of all Israel into the tribe of Levi is announced; and the objection which, perhaps, might be brought forward, that here only priests in general are spoken of, while Jeremiah speaks of Levitical priests, is met by the second passage, chap. 66:21: "And from them also will I take for *Levitical* priests saith the Lord." It makes no difference for our purpose whether "from them" be referred to the Gentiles (which is the correct view, compare p. 360), as is done by *Vitringa* and *Gesenius*, or to the Israelites living in exile. For, although the latter interpretation be received, yet so much is certain, that such shall be taken for Levitical priests as were not descendants of Levi: for, otherwise, 110 *taking*, no special divine mercy would have taken place. Even the Law already knows an *ideal* priesthood by the side of the ordinary one; and such an one meets us also in Ps. 99:6; compare my Commentary on that passage.—After having thus fixed the sense of the promise referring to the Levitical priesthood, it will not be difficult to discover the right view in reference to the family of David. Here, too, a threefold fulfilment takes place. 1. It was realized in the times immediately after the captivity, when Zerubbabel, a scion of the Davidic house, became the mediator of the mercies which God as King, vouchsafed to His people. To a

certain degree, that mercy too comes in here which, at a later period, God, in His capacity as King, bestowed upon the people by means of civil rulers, who were not from the house of David. For, since the dominion had been for ever transferred to the house of David, these rulers can be considered only as being engrafted into it, as representatives and vice-regents,—much in the same way as the blessing, which was bestowed upon the people by the priestly office of the non-priest Samuel, must be considered as being included in the promise in reference to the Aaronic priesthood. For all that God vouchsafed through those rulers, was for the sake of the Davidic house only, which for ever had been destined to be the channel of His regal blessings. If the kingdom of David had really been at an end, He would not have given to the people even those rulers, and the deliverance and prosperity granted to them,—as is clearly seen from a comparison of the times, after the great Hero of David's race ascended the throne, when every trace of the regal grace of God in raising other rulers ceased; for now, that the race of David itself rules again, and for ever, no representation of it can any more take place. But, in the passage under consideration, it would the less be suitable to separate everything which does not, in the strictest sense, belong to it, that here the promise to David is not viewed with reference to him and his house, but solely with reference to the people. Hence, the manifestation of the regal grace of God forms the centre; and the house of David comes into consideration, only in so far as it was destined to be the mediator of this grace. 2. It was fulfilled in Christ; and from vers. 15, 16, it appears that the Prophet had this fulfilment chiefly in view. These two fulfilments are connected with one another by Zechariah also, in chap. 4—3. It was realized by the raising of the whole true posterity of Abraham to the royal dignity, through Christ. This most striking antithesis to the despair—the despair saying: there is no king in Israel; the consolation: all Israel are kings—is expressly brought forward in ver. 22.—We still remark that we must not, by any means, as is commonly done, translate: “To the priests and Levites,” but, as also in Is. 66:21: To the Levitical priests; compare the arguments in proof in *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, p. 329 ff. The epithet “Levitical,” is added in order to prevent the thought that, perhaps, priests in another than the literal sense are spoken of, compare p. 360. It serves therefore the same purpose as the expression: “He ruleth as a king,” in chap. 33:5.—As regards the sacrifices, we must not by any means suppose, as is done by the ancient interpreters, that spiritual sacrifices are here simply spoken of. The correct view rather is, that the Prophet represents the substance under its present form, in and with which it would now soon be lost for a season; and as he has to do with the substance only, he does not say anything as to whether this substance would, in future, rise again in the same form, and whether it was to continue for ever in that form. History has answered the first in the affirmative, and the second in the negative; and from chap. 3:16, it appears that the Prophet, too, would, upon *inquiry*, have answered in the negative as regards the last point. Moreover, how well they knew, even under the Old Testament dispensation, to distinguish, in reference to the sacrifices, between the substance and the form, considering the latter as a thing merely accidental, is seen from passages such as Hosea 14:3 (2): “Take with you words, and turn to the Lord and say unto Him: *Take* all iniquity, and *give* good, and we will recompense to thee bulls, our lips.” Here the thanks are represented as the substance of the thank-offering, and, indeed, so perfectly, that the thank-offering, the bullocks, is *entirely* where only thanks, the lips, are. The outward sacrifice is the vessel only in which the gift is presented to God. *Farther*—Ps. 4:14, where, in contrast to the merely external sacrifices, it is said: “Offer unto God thanksgivings;” Mal. 1:11, and many other passages.

Vers. 19, 20. “*And the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying: Thus saith the Lord, If ye will make void my covenant, the day, and my covenant, the night, so that there shall be*

*no more day and night in their season; Ver. 21. Then also shall be void my covenant with David, my servant, that he shall not have one who reigns on his throne, and with the Levitical priests, my servants.”*

The word *ורפה* is very significant. *Calvin* says: “The Prophet indirectly reproves the wickedness of the people, because, as much as lay with them, they destroyed the covenant of God by their obstreperous cries. . . . This incredulity, therefore, the Prophet blames, and it is as if he were saying: To what are these complaints to lead? It is just as if you were trying to draw down sun and moon from heaven, and to do away with the difference between day and night, and overturn all the laws of nature, because it is I, the same God, whose will it was that the night should follow the day, who have also promised, &c.”—*סויה* and *הלילה* are appositions to: My covenant. The day and night in their regular succession are the covenant which is here spoken of. The phrase *הלילו סמוי*, which signifies “by day and night,” “daily and nightly,” stands here for: *tempus diurnum et nocturnum*, “The covenant,” *תירב*, does not by any means stand here in the signification *stabilis ordinatio*; nor is it to be considered as being entered into with the day and night; these, on the contrary, are the covenant-blessings. God, who vouchsafed *them*, and all that is connected with them, that the sun shines by day, and the moon by night, enters thereby, according to the explanation given on chap. 31:32, into a covenant with man. By the inviolable maintenance of the course of nature, He binds himself to the inviolable maintenance of the moral order. This clearly appears when we consider that, after the great flood, the covenant with nature is anew entered into, and its inviolability anew established; comp. Gen. 9:9: “Behold, I establish my covenant *with you*, and with your seed after you;” 8:22: “All the days of the earth, seed time and harvest, and heat and cold, and summer and autumn, and day and night shall not cease any more.” With these covenant-promises, covenant-laws and obligations are connected, which the covenant imposes. With this covenant of nature, which is common to all men, and which, at Noah’s time, was not made for the first time, but only renewed, the covenant of grace, which is peculiar to Israel only, stands on a level. To assert that the latter has become void, is nothing else than to attempt to pull sun and moon down from heaven. For it is one and the same God who has made both covenants.

Ver. 22. “*As the host of heaven is not numbered, and as the sand of the sea is not measured, so will I increase the seed of David, my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me.*”

Even considered in itself, the literal fulfilment of this verse involves an absurdity. Such an increase of the bodily descendants of David lies beyond the bounds of possibility; and even if this were not the case, yet this increase, just as the similar increase of the Levites, would not have the nature of a promise, but that of a threatening. At all events, the consolation would have no relation to, or connection with, the grief. For the latter did not refer to the number of the descendants of David, and that of the Levites, but to their acceptance with God, and, in them, to the acceptance of the people; but that acceptance has nothing to do with number. To this, another reason is still to be added. It cannot be denied that there is a verbal reference to the promise to Abraham in Gen. 15:5, 22:17. Since, then, these words, which originally referred to all Israel, are here transferred to the family of David, and to the Levites, it is thereby sufficiently intimated that all Israel shall be changed into the family of David, and into the tribe of Levi. This idea need not at all surprise us. It has its foundation in the Law itself. All that is announced here is, that the vocation and destination of the covenant-people, which is already expressed in the Law,

but which hitherto was realised only very imperfectly, is, at some future period, to be perfectly realised. In Exod. 19:6, God says of Israel: “Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests,<sup>44</sup> מִיְהוָה תִּכְלַמְּנֶם.” Hence, first a kingdom. The nature of a kingdom is, not to have any power over it other than the Divine power, and to have everything else under its authority. By this declaration, the dominion of the world was secured to the people of God. This high prerogative always remained with the covenant-people so long as they had not, by their guilt, spontaneously got under a moral servitude to the world. The outward servitude was always a reflection of the inward only. It never was inflicted upon the covenant-people as such, but always upon that covenant-people which had become like the world. And even when this *unnatural* condition took place, this high dignity was not forfeited by the single individuals who, knowing that they were purchased at a high price, had kept themselves inwardly free from the bondage of the world. Although in fetters and bonds, they yet remained inwardly free. World, sin, death, and hell, could do them no harm. Yea, notwithstanding all outward appearance of victory, those enemies were, in reality, ruled by them; and even their outward servitude was, when more deeply considered, a sign of their dominion. For the Law of the Lord of Hosts was in their inward parts; it was the living principle of their existence. It was according to this Law that the whole world was governed; and it was according to it that the servitude of their people also took place. They were thus co-regents with God, and, as such, ruled over their rulers.—All the single members of this kingdom, which consists entirely of kings, were, at the same time, to be priests. In these words it was already implied and declared, that the Levitical priesthood, which was instituted at a later period, could not have that importance which the priesthood had with other nations of antiquity, where priests and people stood in an absolute antithesis, which admitted of no mediation, and where it was the priests only who stood in an immediate relation to God. It was thereby implied and declared, that the priests, in one aspect, (in other respects, they were types and foreshadowings of Christ) possessed rights that were only transferred to them; that they were representatives of Christ, and that, hence, their mediation would, at some future period, disappear altogether. And in order that the people might always remain fully conscious of this; in order that they might know that they themselves were the real bearers of the priestly dignity, they retained, even after the institution of the Levitical priesthood, that priestly function which formed the root and foundation of all others, viz., the slaying of the covenant-sacrifice, of the paschal lamb, which formed the centre of all other sacrifices, inasmuch as the latter served only as a supplement to it. That, even under the Old Testament dispensation, this importance of the paschal rite was duly recognized, is seen from *Philo, de vita Mos.* (p. 686, Francf.): “In offering up the paschal lamb, the office of the laymen is by no means simply to bring the sacrificial animals to the altar, that they may be slain and offered up by the priests; but, according to the regulations of the Law, the whole people exercise priestly functions, inasmuch as every one in his own behalf offers up the prescribed sacrifice.”—We have thus here before us the highest completion of the comfort for the mourning covenant-people. They are not merely to receive back their king, their priests; nay, they are altogether to be changed into a kingly and priestly generation. It must not be overlooked that, in substance, this was already contained in the promise to Abraham. We have already proved in Vol. i. p. 211 ff., that this promise to Abraham does not refer to a great number of bodily descendants, *tales quales*, but that, on the contrary, it refers only to such sons of Abraham as are, at the same time, sons of God; hence, to a royal and priestly generation.—If now we look to the fulfilment, the passage which, above all, presents itself, is 1 Pet. 2:9: ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, κ.τ.λ. Here that passage of Exodus is represented as a prophecy which, in the present only, was fulfilled. Israel has now become that which,

according to its destiny, it ought always to have been, a host of royal priests,—who at the same time have a royal nature and character. That which now already exists perfectly in the germ, shall, at some future period, come forth in full development, according to Rev. 5:10: καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς, καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Believers, when sin has been extirpated in them, shall have the freest access to God. When His will shall have become theirs, and when, at the same time, His dominion over the whole world appears more visibly, they shall unconditionally rule with Him. How this dignity of theirs has its foundation in Christ, is seen from Rev. 1:5, 6, where the words: καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, stand in close connection to ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς, and καὶ λύσαντι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 23. *“And the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, saying; Ver. 24. Dost thou not see what this people are speaking, and say: The two families which the Lord hath chosen, He hath now rejected them, and my people they despise, that they should still be a people before them.”*

It is scarcely conceivable how modern interpreters can assert that by “this people,” not the Israelites, but Gentiles, the Egyptians or Chaldeans, or the “neighbours of the Jews on the Chaboras,” (*Hitzig*), or the Samaritans (*Movers*), are to be understood. In advancing such assertions, it is overlooked that the Prophet has here quite the same persons in view as in the whole remaining section, and as in these chapters throughout, viz., those among Israel—and to them more or less all belonged, even those most faithful—who, because they saw Israel prostrate, for ever despaired of its deliverance and salvation; and, indeed, for the most part, in such a manner as to give to this despair a good aspect, viz., that of humility. They imagined, and said that the people had sinned in such a manner against God, that He was free from all his obligations, and could not at all receive them again. To those the Prophet shows that such a thought is, notwithstanding the fair appearance, blasphemy. All despair abases God into an idol, into a creature. Faith holds fast by the word, by the promise. It says; Although sin abounds with us, the grace of God does much more abound. As truly as God always remains God, so surely His people will always remain His people. He indeed chastises them, but He does not give them over to death. One need only consider the תרפת in ver. 20.—The expression “this people,” is contemptuous, comp. Is. 8:11. The Prophet thereby intimates that those who use such language, cease thereby to be members of the people of God. The “two families” are Judah and Israel. These had, in the preceding verses, likewise been, in substance, the subject of discourse; for the election and rejection of the tribe of Levi, and of the house of David, had been treated of in so far only, as they stood in relation to the election or rejection of the people; so that here only the same thing is repeated in a different form, in consideration of the fact, that weak faith and despair are so slow to hear. The words: “He hath now rejected them,” were, in a certain sense, true; but not in the sense of the speakers. They, on the contrary, maintained, in opposition to the election, a rejection for ever, which was tantamount to: Jehovah, the eternal and unchangeable One, is no more Jehovah; He is a man that He lieth, and a son of man that He repenteth. As surely as God is Jehovah, so surely also ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. 11:29. The expression “my people,” directs attention to how God is now despised in Israel. On the contrast between “my people” and “a people,” compare remarks on chap. 31:36.

Ver. 25. *“Thus saith the Lord: If not my covenant daily and nightly, if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth;”—*

Compare ver. 20. The covenant daily and nightly, *i.e.*, the covenant which refers to the constant and regular alternation of day and night. The ordinances of heaven and earth denote the whole course of nature,—especially the relations of sun, moon, and stars, to the earth, compare chap. 31:35—in so far as it is regulated by God’s ordinance, and is, therefore, a lasting one.

Ver. 26. *“So will I also cast away the seed of Jacob, and of David, my servant, that I do not take farther from his seed rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For I will turn to their captivity, and have mercy upon them.”*

The casting away of the seed of Jacob, and that of the seed of David, are inseparably connected. For since, by the promise to David, the kingdom had been for ever bound together with his race, Israel was no more the people of God, and no more a people at all, if David was no more the servant of God. The Plural מִלְשָׁמָה is easily accounted for, from the circumstance that it was not the number, but only the *fact* that was here concerned (comp. remarks on chap. 23:4, and, at the same time, those on ver. 18); but it is beyond any doubt, that the Prophet has here in view the revival of the dominion of David in the Messiah,—has it, at least, chiefly in view. The enumeration of the three Patriarchs recalls to mind the whole series of the promises granted to them. The words: “I will turn to their captivity” (not: “I will turn their captivity,” compare remarks on Ps. 14:7; captivity is an image of misery), rest on Deut. 30:3.

END OF VOLUME SECOND.

1. " Vitranga: There are no predictions in reference to the temporal deliverance of the Jewish Church, in which the Prophet shews himself more than nose which relate to the downfall of the Babylonian Empire, and the deliverance of the people of God by Cyrus."
2. " Light is the image of salvation; to walk in the light is to enjoy a participation in it. Israel is not wantonly to wander away from the path of light which the Lord has opened up to them, into the dark desolation of misery. In the words וכל הכלנו וכל there is a clear reference to וכל הענו נכל of the Gentile nations in ver. 3. If the Gentiles apply with such zeal for a participation in the blessings of the Kingdom of God, how disgraceful would it be if you, the people of the covenant, the children of the Kingdom, should lose your glorious possession by your ungodly walk. In ver. 6-11 the Prophet states the grounds of his admonition to the people to walk in the light of the Lord which he had expressed in the preceding verse. This admonition implies there existed a danger of losing a participation in the light; and it is this danger which the Prophet here more particularly details. It is not without reason, so the words may be paraphrased, that I say: "Walk ye in the light of the Lord," for at present the Lord has forsaken the people on account of their sins, and with that, a participation in His light is incompatible. By being full of heathenish superstition, of false confidence in earthly things, yea, even the most disgraceful that can be imagined for Israel, viz., gross idolatry, they rather become more and more ripe for the divine judgment which will break in irresistibly upon them."
3. "So Gesenius also in the Thesaurus: "The whole earth shall be holy and shall more beautifully bloom and be adorned with plenty of fruits and corn for the benefit of those who have escaped those calamities." Gesenius'wavering clearly shows how little satisfaction the non-Messianic explanation affords to its own abettors. Besides the explanations of המצוה החדשה by "the new growth of the people," and "the rich produce of the country," he advances still a third one, viz., "a divinely favoured ruler,"—an explanation which has even the grammar against it, as we are at liberty to translate only: "The Sprout of the Lord;" and likewise the analogy of קראה ירפ, according to which the Genitive can have a reference to the origin only."
4. " Meyer, Blätter für höhere Wahrheit, iii. S. 101."
5. " Caspari very justly remarks: "Nothing can be clearer than that 2 Chron. 28:5 ff. comes in between 2 Kings 16:5 a. b.; that the author of the books of the Kings gives a report of the beginning and end; the author of the Chronicles, of the middle of the campaign." But we cannot agree with Caspari in his transferring to Idumea the victory of Rezin. According to Is. 7:2. Aram was encamped in Ephraim. According to 2 Kings 16:5, both of the kings came up to Jerusalem and besieged her. The expedition against Elath, 2 Kings 16:6, was secondary, and by the way only."
6. " The words: "In threescore and five years more Ephraim shall be broken and be no more a people," have, by rationalistic critics, without and against all external arguments, been declared to be spurious. The reasons which serve as fig leaves to cover their doctrinal tendency are the following: (1) "The time does not agree, inasmuch as the ten tribes sustained their first defeat very soon afterwards by Tiglath-pilezer; the second, nineteen to twenty-one years later, by Shalmanezzer, who, in the sixth year of Hezekiah, carried the inhabitants of the kingdom of the ten tribes away into captivity." But the question here is the complete destruction of the national existence of Israel; and that took place only under King Manasseh, when, by Azarhaddon, new Gentile colonists were brought into the land, who expelled from it the old inhabitants who had again gathered themselves together; comp. 2 Kings 17:24 with Ezra 4:2, 10. From that time, Israel amalgamated more and more with Judah, and

never returned to a national independence. This happened exactly sixty-five years after the announcement by the Prophet. Chap. 6:12 compared with ver. 13 shows how little the desolation of the country (ver. 16) is connected with the breaking up as a nation. It is, moreover, at least as much the interest of those who assert the spuriousness, as it is ours to remove the chronological difficulties; for how could it be imagined that the supposed author should have introduced a false chronological statement? His object surely could be none other than to procure authority for the Prophet, by putting into his mouth a prophecy so very evidently and manifestly fulfilled. (2) "The words contain an unsuitable consolation, as Ahaz could not be benefited by so late a destruction of his enemy." But immediately afterwards, he is even expressly assured that this enemy will not be able to do him any immediate harm. Chrysostom remarks: "The king, hearing that they should be destroyed after sixty-five years, might say within himself: What about that? Although they be then overthrown, of what use is it to us, if they now take us? In order that the king might not speak thus, the Prophet says: Be of good cheer even as to the present. At that time they shall be utterly destroyed; but even now, they shall not have any more than their own land, for "the head of Ephraim," &c. The preceding distinct announcement of the last end of his enemy, however, was exceedingly well fitted to break in Ahaz the opinion of his invincibility, and to strengthen his faith in the God of Israel, who, with a firm hand, directs the destinies of nations, and, no less, the faith in His servant whom he raises to be privy to His secrets—(3.) "The use of numbers so exact is against the analogy of all oracles." But immediately afterwards (ver. 15 comp. with chap. 8:4), the time or the defeat is as exactly fixed, although not in ciphers. In chap. 20 Isaiah announces that after three years the Egyptians and Ethiopians shall sustain a defeat; in chap. 23:15, that Tyre would flourish anew seventy years after its fall; in chap. 38:5, he announces to Hezekiah, sick unto death, that God would add fifteen years to his life. According to Jeremiah, the Babylonish captivity is to last seventy years; and the fulfilment has shown that this date is not to be understood as a round number. And farther, the year-weeks in Daniel.—But in opposition to this view, and positively in favour of the genuineness, are the following arguments: The words have not only, as is conceded by Ewald, "a true old-Hebrew colouring," but in their emphatic and solemn brevity ("he shall be broken from [being] a people") they do not at all bear the character of an interpolation. If we blot them out, then the Prophet says less than from present circumstances, from ver. 4, where he calls the kings "ends of smoking firebrands," in opposition to ver. 6, and from the analogy of ver. 9, where the threatening is much more severe, he was bound to say. His saying merely that they would not get any more, was not sufficient. He could make the right impression only when he reduced that declaration to its foundation—i.e., their own destruction and overthrow. Ver. 16, too, would go far beyond what would be announced here, if we remove this clause. He announces destruction to the kings themselves. Finally, the symmetrical parallelism would be destroyed by striking out these words. The words: "If ye believe not, ye shall not be established," would, in that case, be without the parallel member. They are connected with the clause under discussion so much the rather, that in them it is not specially Judah's deliverance from the Syrians and Ephraimites that is looked at, but its salvation in general."

7. " By a minute and trifling exposition of what is to be understood as a whole, and comprehensively, many misunderstandings have been introduced into this passage. The defeat of Asshur should take place very soon, but the devastation of the country had been so complete that a longer time would be required before the fields would be again completely cultivated."

8. " Gesenius mentions Pellicanus as the first defender of the Non-Messianic interpretation. But this statement seems to have proceeded from a cursory view of an annotation by Cramer on Richard Simon's *Kritische Schriften* i. S. 441, where the words: "this historical interpretation Pellicanus too has preferred," do not refer to Isaiah but to Daniel. Nor is there any more ground for the intimation that Theodorus a Mopsuesta rejected the Messianic interpretation."
9. " Their testimony is collected by Seb. Edzardi in the treatise: *Cap. xi. Esaiæ Christo vindicatum adversus Grotium et sectatores ejus, imprimos Hem. v. d. Hardt, Hamburg 1696.*"
10. " "The madness of the Jews is indeed to be lamented who refer this prophecy to Zerubbabel."
11. " Although Umbreit denies it, yet this is implied in the designation of the Messiah as a shoot from the roots. Moreover, the lowliness of the Messiah himself at His appearance is a necessary consequence of the lowliness of His family; and it is a bad middle course to acknowledge the latter and deny the former. To this may, moreover, be added the parallel passage *Is. 53:2.*"
12. " Notwithstanding the arguments which we stated in favour of our proposition, that the original form of the name is רצו, Ebrard, without even attempting to refute them, assumes, in favour of a far-fetched conjecture, that the name of the place was written תרזו (*Kritik der Ev. Geschichte* S, 843, 1st Ed.), and has introduced this opinion even into the text of the new edition of Olshausen's *Commentary*, edited by him. The circumstance that elsewhere commonly the Hebrew ר is, in Greek, rendered by ζ, ς by σ is, in this case, where the especial arguments in favour of רצו are so strong, of no consequence."
13. " Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung.*, II. S. 64) was the last who assumed that the Evangelist had generally in view those passages in which the lowliness, contempt, and rejection of Christ are spoken of, and that, in the Old Testament passages in question, the Ναζωραῖος was not contained according to the letter, but according to the spirit only. But this is opposed not only by the whole manner of quotation which is given as a literal one, but also by a whole series of analogies: Christ's birthplace in Bethlehem, His stay in Jerusalem, His ministry in Galilee, and especially in Capernaum, His entrance into Jerusalem,—all these are by Matthew traced back to prophetic declarations which have a special reference to these localities. Against the exposition given by us, Hofmann advances the assertion that neither רצו nor רטח have ever attached to them the idea of lowliness, of unassuming appearance. But even if a twig were not of itself something lowly and unassuming in appearance, yet, in the passage before us, that idea is, at all events, implied in the connection with the stump and roots, as well as by the contrast to הרפי (Heb)"
14. " The following passage, which we take from Raim. Martini Pug. Fid. III. 3, 19 p. 685, will fully illustrate that custom: R. Abba said: His name is יהוה, Lord, according to the word of Jerem. 23:6; R. Joshua ben Levy said: His name is Sprout, according to what is said in Zech. 6:12. Others say that His name will be Comforter, Son of the strength of God, as is declared in Lam. 1:16. Those from the School of R. Siloh said: His name will be Shiloh, as is written in Gen. 49:10: 'Until Shiloh come.' Those from the School of R. Chanina said: His name will be the gracious one, as Jerem. said in chap. 16:13. Those from the School of R. Jannai said: Jinnon shall be His name, according to Ps. 72:17, &c."
15. " Chap. 37:38, (comp. 2 Kings 19:37), describing apparently the murder of Sennacherib as belonging to the past, does not decide any thing as to the composition of this chapter by Isaiah, "inasmuch as the year which is assigned for Sennacherib's

death, B.C. 696, is not historically ascertained and certain. Nor can the supposition, that Isaiah lived until the time of Manasseh, and himself arranged and edited the collection of his prophecies on the eve of his life, be liable to any well-founded doubts" (Keil, Einleitung, S. 271). The inscription in chap. 1:1, only indicates that the collection does not contain any prophecies which go beyond the time of Hezekiah."

16. " To a certain degree analogous are those other passages of the Old Testament, in which the Past presents itself in the form of the Present, as the deliverance from Egypt in Ps. 66:6; 81:6. Faith, at the same time, makes all the old things new, fresh, and lively, and anticipates the Future."
17. " This embarrassment becomes still more obvious in the explanation of Vatke, who understands by the Servant of God, "the harmless ideal abstract of the people;" and that of Beck, who understands thereby "the notion of the people."
18. " The Hebrew word is משפט, which means "judgment," "right," "law." Dr. Hengstenberg has translated it by Recht, which is, as nearly as possible, expressed by the English word "right," (jus,) as including "law" and "statutes."—Tr."
19. " One needs only to consider passages such as this, to be enabled to distinguish between the ideal and real Present, and to be convinced of the utter futility of the chief argument against the genuineness of the second part, viz., that the Babylonish exile appears as present. "Proceeding from the certainty of deliverance"—so Hitzig remarks—"the Prophet here beholds in spirit that going on, to which, in chap. 40:9, he exhorts." If the Prophet beholds at all in the spirit, why should he not see in spirit the misery also?"
20. " Text: Simonis, Onom.: יהי, quem aspergat, i.e., purificet et expiet Dominus; Gesenius: quod vix aliter explicari potest quam: quem consperget, i.e., expiabit Jehova. Fürst gives a different derivation; but it at once shows itself to be untenable."
21. " In order to defend this explanation, interpreters have referred to the LXX: οὐτὼ θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ; but even Martini remarks: "From a dark passage, they have tried, by ingenious conjecturing, to bring out any sense whatsoever.""
22. " Thus Theodoret says: "For they who did not receive the prophetic promises and announcements, but served idols, shall, through the messengers of the truth, see the power of the promised One, and perceive His greatness." Jerome: "The rulers of the world, who had not the Law and the Prophets, and to whom no prophecies concerning Him were given, even they shall see and perceive. By the comparison with them, the hardness of the Jews is reprov'd, who, although they saw and heard, yet verified Isaiah's prophecy against them." Calvin: "The Jews had, through the Law and the Prophets, heard something of Christ, but to the Gentiles He was altogether unknown. Hence it follows that these words properly refer to the Gentiles.""
23. " According to Knobel, the author is supposed to speak, in chap. 53:1, in his own name and that of the other prophets; in vers. 2-6, in the name of the whole people; in vers. 7-10, in his own name. An explanation which is compelled to resort to such changes, without their being in any way clearly and distinctly intimated, pronounces its own condemnation."
24. " Gesenius: Neglecta aetatis notione saepe est genus hominum, in bonam partem—in malam partem;—and in reference to the passage under consideration: Genus ejus, Servi Jehovae, sunt homines qui iisdem cum illo studiis tenentur. In the same manner it is explained by Maurer, who refers to Ps. 14:5, 24:6."
25. " The double וּמַל in Deut. 33:2 refers to Israel, not to God. In reference to the וּמַל in Is. 44:15, J. H. Michaelis remarks: iis talibus diis, ver. 7. But the suffix rather refers to the trees, ver. 14; comp. מַהֲמָה ver. 15. If construed thus, the sense is much more expressive. In Job 22:2, לִיכֶשֶׁם is used collectively. In Ps. 11:7, the plural suffix is to

be explained from the richness and fulness of the Divine Being. These are all the passages which Ewald quotes in § 247 d."

26. " Thus Bähr, Symbolik, ii. S. 207, says: "It is not the material elements of the blood which make it a means of expiation, but it is the שפנ which is connected with it, which is in it, whose instrument and bearer it is, which gives to it atoning power. The שפנ is thus the centre around which, in the last instance, everything moves. This is especially confirmed by the circumstance, that the object of the expiation to be effected by the שפנ in the sacrificial blood, is, according to this passage, the שפנ of him who offers up the sacrifice."
27. " The author of the article: Ueber die Mess. Zeiten in Eichhorns Bibliothek d. bibl. Literatur, Bd. 6, p. 655, confesses quite candidly, that the Messianic interpretation would soon find general approbation among Bible expositors, had they not, in recent times, obtained the conviction, "that the prophets do not foretel any thing of future things, except what they know and anticipate without special divine inspiration.""
28. " The same thing occurs also in the parallel passages, chap. 49:9, on which Gesenius was constrained to remark: "As the deliverance was still impending, the Preterites cannot well be understood in any other way than as Futures.""
29. " Vitringa already remarked in opposition to it: "This exposition is rather far fetched, and is the weakest of all that can be advanced. I add, that the constancy of the promises given to David does not appear, if we exclude the Kingdom of the Messiah. But are any other promises of constant and eternal blessings, such as are here promised, to be thought of?""
30. " Vitringa very correctly remarks on this passage: "לעב, properly ὁ ἔχων he who has any thing in his possession is, by an ellipsis, applied to the husband who, in Exod. 21:3, is rightly called לעב השא לעב one who has a wife.""
31. " Against the explanation of Maurer: "For I am your Lord;" and that of Ewald: "I take you under my protection," it is decisive that לעב never means "to be Lord." far less "to take under protection." לעב, which properly means "to possess," is very commonly used of marriage;—as early as in the Decalogue , the wife appears as the noblest possession of the husband—so that a priori this signification is suggested and demanded."
32. " It is from the circumstance that modern Exegesis is unable to comprehend the prophetic anticipation of the Future, that the assertion has proceeded (Movers, Hitzig) that, even before the Chaldean destruction, the Ark "must have disappeared in a mysterious manner." In the view of the Chaldean destruction the Lord is, in Ps. 99:1 (comp. Ps. 80:2), designated as He who sitteth over the Cherubim. In 2 Chron. 35:3, we have a distinct historical witness for the existence of the Ark, so late as the 18th year of Josiah. The fable in 2 Maccab. 2:4, ff., supposes that the Ark was at its ordinary place, down to the time of the breaking in of the Chaldean catastrophe. One might as well infer from chap. 3:18, that, at the time when these words were spoken, Judah must already, "in a mysterious manner," have come into the land of the North."
33. " Bähr advances the assertion, "in a (the) cloud" is equivalent to: "in darkness." But the parallel passages, Exod. 40:34 ff., Numb. 9:15- 16, quoted by J. H. Michaelis, are quite sufficient to overthrow this assertion. And these parallel passages are so much the more to the point, that by the article the cloud is designated as being already known; compare Hofmann, Schriftbeweis ii. 1, S. 36. The cloud in ver. 13 is not identical with that in ver. 2, but is its necessary parallel. The cloud in ver. 2 symbolises the truth that the Lord is a consuming fire (compare my remarks on Rev. 1:7); that in ver. 13 is an embodied Kyrie eleison, compare remarks on Rev. 5:8. Cloud with cloud,—that is a noble advice for the Church when she is threatened by

the judgments of God. A thorough refutation of Bähr has been given by W. Neumann: Beiträge zur Symbolik des Mos. Cultus, Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol., 1851, i."

34. " In a certain sense, one may say בל תורירש is a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. It occurs independently in one single passage only, in Deut. 29:18; in the other passages (eight times in Jeremiah, and besides, in Ps. 81:13), it was evidently not taken from the living usus loquendi from which it had disappeared, but from the fundamental passage in the written code of law. This fact will, a priori, appear probable, when we keep in mind that, among all the books of the Pentateuch, Jeremiah has chiefly Deuteronomy before his eyes; and among all the chapters of Deuteronomy, none more than the 29th; and that Ps. 81 is pervaded by literal allusions to the Pentateuch. But it is put beyond all doubt, when we enter upon a comparison of the passage in Deuteronomy with the parallel passages. Here we must begin with Jer. 23:17, where the verbal agreement comes out most strongly, and then we shall, in the other passages also (7:24, 9:13, 11:8, 16:12, 18:12, and the passage under consideration), easily perceive that the word has been borrowed. From a comparison with the fundamental passage, it appears that it is the intention of the Prophet to convey here the promise of an eternal duration of the regained blessing, and to keep off the thought that possibly the people might again, as formerly, fall from grace. Of him who walks after the תורירש of his heart, it is said in Deut. 29:19 (20): "The Lord will not be willing to forgive him; for then the anger of the Lord and His jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall lie upon him, and the Lord blots out his name from under heaven.""
35. " The person of the Messiah meets us as the living centre of the salvation in ver. 9: "And they serve the Lord their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them;" on which words Jonathan remarks: "And the Messiah the Son of David;" and Abarbanel: "This is King Messiah, who is of the house of David, and is therefore called by his name." From the parallel passages, Hos. 3:5; Is. 55:3, our passage differs in this, that David here does not, as in those passages, designate the family of David which centres in Christ, but the person of the Messiah. The commentary is furnished by chap. 23:5: "I raise unto David a righteous Sprout." The circumstance, that it is not the Sprout of David, but David, that is spoken of here, is explained from a reference to the words which the ten tribes spoke at their rebellion, 1 Kings 12:16: "We have no portion in David, neither have we inheritance in the Son of Jesse. To your tents, O Israel." To the person of the Messiah the Prophet reverts once more towards the close also: "And their glorious one shall be out of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them (compare Mic. 5:1, 2, [2, 3]), and I cause him to draw near, and he approacheth unto me; for who is surety for his heart to approach unto me, saith the Lord?" God himself receives the King of the Future into the closest communion with Him,— "I and the Father are one"—a communion which no one can usurp by his own power, and which, in the case of the former kings, even in that of David, was frequently disturbed by their sinful weakness."
36. " Hofmann (Weiss, u. Erf, 1 S. 138) assigns to the phrase the meaning: "to make an arrangement." But decisive against this is not only the derivation, (comp. Gesenius Thesaurus) but the circumstance also, that it is almost exclusively and quite manifestly used of a relation resting on reciprocity, of the making of a covenant in the ordinary sense; and that the few instances where there is apparently a reference to one party, form an exception only to the rule."
37. " Even the most recent interpreters, who take לעב sensu malo, still greatly differ,—a proof that this interpretation has a very insufficient foundation on which to rest. Gesenius, De Wette, Bleek, (on Heb. 8:9), retain the expla- take in marriage," which

in that passage we vindicated for לעב with ב, is, here too, quite applicable; comp. Jer. 2:1. This signification the Chaldee Paraphrast too seems to have had innation by fastidire, rejicere; Maurer translates: dominarer, domini paries sustinerem, contrasting tyrannical dominion with a relation of love; Ewald: "Seeing that I am her master and protector;" Hitzig: "And I got possession of her." All these interpretations are opposed by the usus loquendi, according to which לעב has only the two significations: "to possess," and "to take for a wife," the latter being the ordinary and prevailing one."

38. " Not less than these, Hitzig too has allowed himself to be carried away by the appearance. He says: "Then, indeed the office of religious instructors must cease.""
39. " According to Krafft (zur Topographie Jerus. S. 158), it is only the hill Bezetha which, by the third wall of Agrippa, was added to the town, that can correspond to the situation of Gareb."
40. " Thenius, in the appendix to the Commentary on the Books of Kings, S. 24, remarks: "ל does not, in any of the dialects, denote the natural hill of rocks, but merely stones heaped up." Hence, the hill would be an artificial hill for the execution of criminals. (Compare the German word Babenstein, lit. "raven-stone," for: place of execution.)"
41. " This objection would be removed if, following Thenius and Kraft, S. 158, we were to explain the name from the form of the hill, which is that of a skull. But none of the Evangelists at least have advanced this explanation. The fact that three of them add the Greek explanation to the name (Matt. 27:33; Mark 15:22; John 19:17), and one translated it into Greek (Luke 23:33) shows that it stood in connection with the event in question. But this circumstance is quite decisive, that three Evangelists explain it by κρανίου τόπος, "place of a skull.""
42. " Compare the Book Kosri, p. 72. Buxtorff says: "Gehenna was a well-known place near Jerusalem, viz., a valley in which the fire was never extinguished, and where unclean bones, carcasses, and other unclean things, were burned.""
43. " They have been joined by Movers (de utriusque recens. Jerem. Indole), who declares ver. 18 and 21-24 to be a later interpolation (comp. against this view Küper, S. 173, and Wichelhaus, de Jerem. Vers. Alex., p. 170), and Hitzig, according to whom the whole portion, vers. 14-26, consists of "a series of single additions from a later period.""
44. " Compare the discussions on this passage in my Commentary on Rev. 1:6."

