

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

THE
PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH

VOL. II.

By the same Author.

An EXPOSITION of the PROPHECIES and
LAMENTATIONS of JEREMIAH. Forming
new volumes in THE PULPIT COMMENTARY.

[In preparation.]

LONDON : KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, & CO.

THE
PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH

A NEW TRANSLATION
WITH COMMENTARY AND APPENDICES

BY THE
REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A.

RECTOR OF TENDRING, ESSEX, AND MEMBER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY
LATE FELLOW AND LECTURER OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II.

SECOND EDITION
REVISED AND CORRECTED



LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, & CO., 1 PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1882

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved)

PREFACE

(REPRINTED IN PART, WITH ADDITIONS).

THE present volume supplies in a manner the key to its predecessor, and the author would fain bespeak for the series of essays which it contains a specially patient and candid perusal. They relate to subjects as well theological as critical; it is impossible to keep exegesis and criticism entirely apart from theology. There are points in the study of Old Testament history and literature at which the theological or anti-theological bias of the critic materially affects his results. The fault of English students generally has been that they allow too much play to this bias, and of orthodox students in particular that they unduly restrict the field of philological inquiry. It is a fault, no doubt, which can be explained and excused from the history of English theology, but it is one which urgently needs rectifying, and the present work is a conscientious endeavour to promote this object.

It is with some reluctance that the author has expressed himself so fully in one of the following essays on his own theological bias (a bias which has been rigorously confined within the narrowest possible area), but it seemed expedient to meet any possible suspicion

by a frank preliminary explanation. On the critical bearings of his exegetical results he has also afforded such information as was consistent with the limits originally marked out. He would gladly have had no limits to regard, gladly have communicated his present solution (which is not of yesterday) of the complicated critical problem ; but he has been held back, as has been explained elsewhere, by a wish to promote disinterested exegesis (the only safe basis of criticism), and by a conviction that the problem of Isaiah can only be definitely solved in connection with those of the prophetic literature as a whole. He hopes, nevertheless, that in more than one of the essays he has made some real, however small, contributions to that new theory which must, when thoroughly matured, take the place of both the prevalent views of the origin of Isaiah, and which, being just to all the facts revealed by an honest exegesis, cannot be inconsistent with a scientific orthodox theology. A single eye is what the author most desires for himself and his readers ; it is the talisman which opens that enchanted chamber, over which are written the words, ' Be not too bolde ' (' Faerie Queene,' iii. 12).

OXFORD: *November 7, 1880.*

A few supplementary words may be added with reference to this new edition. The principal changes in the second volume will be found at the close of the first essay, and in the ' Critical Notes ' and ' Last Words. ' Though chiefly concerned with points of detail, the genuine student is not likely to despise them, consider-

ing the varied interest of the questions raised by the prophetic writings, and the scanty material which we have for answering them. The change referred to in Essay I. consists in the addition of a reply to Mr. Robertson Smith's objections, in the 'Prophets of Israel,' to the view adopted in this work of an invasion of the kingdom of Judah by Sargon. A desire has also been expressed for the addition of two new essays, one to contain the author's own provisional explanation (provisional, because, as Goethe says, 'every solution of a problem involves a new problem') of the origin of the Book of Isaiah, and the other on the relation of the ideas of the Assyrian and Babylonian eras. To have yielded to this tempting request would, however, have defeated one of the author's main objects—viz., to promote the disinterested study of the exegetical data of criticism. The order of research ought surely to be, first the study of exegesis, then the comprehensive investigation of critical problems, and lastly the history both of the literature and of the outer and inner development of the people of Israel. All that can be said is, that the wishes of some readers have been partly gratified by the article 'Isaiah' in the eighth edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' to which those who have honestly worked at the exegesis of Isaiah (but only those) may be safely referred.

With regard to his treatment of the Hebrew text, the author is sensible that he has sometimes erred on the side of conservatism; he has occasionally defended readings which he now fears may be corrupt. Some instances of this are pointed out in the Addenda and Corrigenda in the present volume, which the author

trusts will not be overlooked. His principle, however, still seems to him sound—viz., to follow the received text as long as it can be plausibly defended (thus Selwyn's well-known correction of ix. 2 is not adopted, though highly plausible, whereas Secker's and Krochmal's of viii. 12 is).

To be complete, and omit no accessible fact or reference of importance for a book like Isaiah, is perhaps too high a goal. It has receded somewhat from the author, now that he is absent (not to use, to-day, the more natural and sincere word 'exiled') from his old university. Still there is only one notable omission of which he is conscious (and one both excusable in itself and only connected with a very small part of Isaiah), viz. with regard to Dr. Bickell's recent attempt to arrange the poetical passages of the Old Testament metrically. Hereafter he hopes to be able to take up a distinct attitude towards Dr. Bickell's most ingenious and instructive work. Another remarkable though mainly popular work, Dr. Kuenen's 'Hibbert Lectures,' came to hand too late to be referred to, except in a foot-note at the end of Essay XI. His too positive rejection of the new results as to Cyrus does not, however, seem to require a lengthened examination. M. de Harlez, a critic worthy to be heard on such a point, also maintains an attitude of opposition; but his reply to Mr. Sayce in *Le Muséon* (Louvain, 1882, pp. 557-570), well-written as it is, fails to upset the essential part of Mr. Sayce's argument, which has commended itself to some of the most competent judges.

In conclusion, the author would express the hope

that this new edition of his work may promote the sympathetic study of the Scriptures, not only as a record of revelation, but as a monument of Oriental antiquity. The Old Testament under the latter aspect is a fragment of the literature of a small nation wedged in between peoples far superior to it in age and civilization, and can only be fruitfully studied in close relation to the *sifted* results of Assyriology and Egyptology. M. Maspero complains that 'les hebraïsants rejettent systématiquement l'aide que pourrait leur offrir l'antiquité égyptienne et assyrienne ;'¹ the author is content to have laboured in earnest to roll away this reproach, especially with regard to illustrations from Assyriology. An accomplished Egyptological student has kindly contributed to this volume an excursus on the 'Seraph in Egypt' (see 'Last Words,' on Chapter VI.), which is well worthy of consideration. To the writer of this, the Rev. H. G. Tomkins, and also, for useful criticisms and suggestions, to Dr. H. L. Strack, of Berlin, the warm thanks of the author are due.

¹ From a letter printed in 'Biblical Proper Names,' &c., by Rev. H. G. Tomkins, author of *Studies on the Times of Abraham*. (London, 1882.)

TENDRING, *October 29, 1882.*

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA.

* * * The reader is earnestly requested to make the shorter and more necessary of these corrections with his pencil.

VOL. I.

- Page 22, l. 9, 10. *Read* (in accordance with crit. note, ii. 134), 'Happy is the righteous! Well!'
- „ 30. *After v. 10 place v. 17, rendering* 'And lambs shall feed upon their wilderness, and their ruined places kids shall devour.' In the arrangement of the verses I now follow Ewald, and in the correction of the text an anonymous writer in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, new series, vol. iv., pp. 328-343. The *codex primarius* appears to have had **הַרְבֵּה מִיָּהִים**—a combination of two readings (comp. crit. note on lx. 1); a scribe corrected (as he thought) **מִיָּהִים** into **מַחִים**. The two other emendations need no defence.
- „ 32. *Omit v. 17* (see above).
- „ 32, col. 1, l. 11. *For* 'complimentary' *read* 'complementary.'
- „ 32, „ l. 28. *For* 'rend.' *read* 'read.'
- „ 53. *Insert* as note * on 'take for me' (v. 2), 'so Sept., Pesh., Targ.'
- „ 60, col. 2, l. 19. To the passages cited, *add* xlili. 22 (see note).
- „ 76. *Omit* opening words of v. 3, which seem to have arisen out of the closing words of v. 2 written twice over. Suggested by Dr. Bickell (*Carmina Vet. Test. metricè*, p. 201).
- „ 76, col. 2, l. 6 from foot. *For* 'Avestor' *read* 'Avesta.'
- „ 86. *Insert* as note c on 'the castles thereof' (v. 22), 'so Pesh., Targ., Vulg., Lowth, Houbigant, De Rossi; text has 'their widows.'
- „ 97. (Note on 'the temple,' v. 2). *Add*, 'Lieut. Conder has discovered large groups of dolmens and menhirs on the east of the Jordan and of the Dead Sea, with one of which (at Mushbiyeh) he identifies Bamoth-Baal (*Palestine Fund Statement*, April 1882).'
- „ 112, note. *Add*, 'and Brugsch's translation in his *Geschichte Aegyptens*, pp. 682-707.'
- „ 113, l. 11. *For* 'twelve' *read* 'twenty.'
- „ 113, note 1. *Add* 'comp. *Records of the Past*, i. 61 (Annals of Assurbanipal).'
- „ 121, col. 1, l. 3. *For* 'Tertanu' *read* 'Turtanu' (as rightly printed in ed. 1). A possible meaning of the title is 'son of might;' see Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, i. 129.
- „ 124, l. 9. *For* 709 *read* 710.
- „ 124. Note 1 should close with the first sentence.
- „ 129, l. 2. *For* 'drawn sword' *read* 'whetted sword.' (Following Grätz, *Psalmen*, i. 124.)
- „ 133, col. 2, note on 'the old pool.' *Omit the words*, 'or more probably,' &c.
- „ 134, col. 1, l. 5. *Omit* 'xix. 28.'
- „ 176, col. 2, l. 5. *After* 'opened' *add* 'by an introductory religious ceremony.'
- „ 176, col. 2, l. 17 } *For* 'Sennacherib' *read* 'Sargon.'
- „ 178, col. 1, l. 17 }
- „ 178, col. 2, l. 2 }
- „ 205, col. 1, l. 6. *For* 'Rab-sairis' *read* 'Rab-saris.' Obs., no Assyrian title at all resembling this has yet been discovered, and I now think 'saris' may have been substituted by the Hebrew scribe for an obliterated word, which was really, like 'shakeh,' Hebrnised from Assyrian.

- Page 270. *Insert*, as note ^a on 'when he heard it, he sent' (v. 9), 'Sept. and 2 Kings
xix. 9, *read* 'he sent messengers again' (a better reading).
- .. 230, l. 15. *For* '751' *read* '731.'
- .. 234, col. 1, l. 3. *After* 'Sargon' *add* 'or Esar-haddon.'
- .. 266. *Insert*, as note ⁱ on the second 'blind' (v. 19), 'Deaf, Symmachus, 1 MS.
Kennicott, 1 De Rossi (*primâ manu*), Lowth, Grätz.'
- .. 283. *Insert*, as note on 'the produce of' (v. 19), 'Before, Grätz (reading לְמִנְיָ),
Psalmen, i. 122.'
- .. 303. *Insert*, as note on 'in their perfection' (v. 9), 'Suddenly, Sept., followed
by Pesh., Lowth, Grätz (an easy emendation).'
- VOL. II.
- .. 17, col. 1, l. 3 from foot. *For* 'lxvi. 3' *read* 'lxvi. 13.'
- .. 18, note k. *After* 'Babylonian MS.' *insert* '*primâ manu*.'
- .. 38, l. 2. *For* 'Zion' *read* 'his people.' The same error occurs in two of De
Rossi's MSS.
- .. 38. *Insert*, as note on 'Jerusalem' (end of v. 9), 'Israel, Lowth, adducing two
MSS. A probable correction. Ibn Jannah, according to Grätz, points
out that proper names of kindred meaning are sometimes confounded
by the scribes (comp. my own clerical error above).
- .. 40, col. 1, l. 11, 12. *For* 'v. 11 b' *read* 'liii. 11 b.'
- .. 46, col. 1, l. 7. *Insert* 'A still closer parallel is Job xx. 3, a reproof of my
shame = a reproof putting me to shame (Dr. H. L. Strack).'
- .. 71. *Insert*, as note on 'renewal of thy strength' (v. 10), 'Refreshing sufficient
for thee, Lagarde, Klostermann, Grätz (emendation).'
- .. 100, note ^a. *Add* 'marching on, Vulg., Lowth, Grätz (an easy and probable
emendation).'
- .. 121, col. 2, l. 15. *For* 'remains' *read* 'researches.'
- .. 137, l. 9. *After* 'like *virgo*,' *add* '(comp. Gen. xxiv. 55, where it is the Sept.
rendering of הַנְּעָרָה).'
- .. 138, note on x. 4. It should be mentioned, however, that Usir (Osiris) has been
found in one Phœnician, and in one Cyprio-Phœnician
proper name (see *Corpus Inscr. Semit.* i. 68, inscr. 46).
In the same note I have accidentally omitted the most
conspicuous instance of Hebraized Egyptian names, viz.,
Mos'eh (Moses) from *mesu* 'child' or 'son,' which was
often used as a name in Egypt under the Middle Empire.
- .. 145, l. 11. *Add* 'Another word illustrated by Assyr. *sakin* 'to place' is מַסְכְּנוֹת
'store-cities' (Ex. i. 11, &c.), usually but inaccurately connected
with Aram. כָּנַס 'to collect.'
- .. 154. Compare crit. note on li. 6 with *Last Words*, p. 298 (top).
- .. 158, l. 13. It should have been noted that עֵשׂוֹן does occur once, viz., in
Jer. xxii. 3.
- .. 160, l. 8. The note belongs to lxi. 1, not lix. 18. The solution proposed by
Dr. Neubauer, reminds us of a very probable explanation of the
famous δευτεροπρωτωφ in Luke vi. 1, as a combination of two
readings δευτερωφ and πρωτωφ.
- .. 161, l. 26. *After* 'Vulgate' *insert* 'and Septuagint, but not St. Jerome's own
Latin translation.'
- .. 189, note 1. *For* 'fourth' *read* 'fifth.'
- .. 224, l. 9 from foot. To the list of passages add lxiii. 11, lxiv. 3 b.
- .. 224, l. 6 from foot. *After* 'chap. ii.' *add* 'verses 10 and 11 of chap. iii.'
- .. 224, l. 4 from foot. *For* 'They' *read* 'The first and last of these.'

TABLE OF APPENDICES, ESSAYS, &c.

VOL. I.

	PAGES
ON 'JEHOVAH SABÁOTH'	11-13
ON THE SERAPHIM AND THE CHERUBIM	40-42
ON XLIV. 28, XLV. 4	286-287

VOL. II.

ON THE LAND OF SINIM	20-23
CRITICAL NOTES	133-162
ESSAYS :	
I. The Occasional Prophecies of Isaiah in the Light of History	165-174
II. The Arrangement of the Prophecies	174-179
III. The Christian Element in the Book of Isaiah	179-198
IV. The Royal Messiah in Genesis	198-203
V. The Servant of Jehovah	204-210
VI. The Present State of the Critical Controversy	210-220
VII. Correction of the Hebrew Text	221-226
VIII. The Critical Study of Parallel Passages	226-244
IX. Job and the Second Part of Isaiah : a Parallel	244-253
X. Isaiah and his Commentators	253-274
XI. II. Isaiah and the Inscriptions	274-280
Last Words on Isaiah	281-301
(See also Addenda)	xi, xii)

ISAIAH.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

Contents.—A recapitulation of the heads of the preceding discourses, from chap. xl. onwards, closing with a summons to flee from Babylon, and a solemn declaration excluding the ungodly from a share in the promises.

¹ Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, who are called by the name of Israel, and have come forth from the waters of Judah; who swear by the name of Jehovah, and celebrate the God of Israel (not in truth and not in righteousness); ² for they call

¹ **O house of Jacob . . .**] The prophet, in the name of Jehovah (see *v.* 3), first addresses the Jews by their natural and as it were secular designation 'the house of Jacob,' and then subjoins their spiritual or covenant-name of Israel. But as both these titles would strictly speaking include the ten tribes, and the prophet is specially addressing the Judæan exiles at Babylon, he adds, **and have come forth from the waters of Judah** (comp. Ps. lxxviii. 27, 'ye that are of the fountain of Israel,' and the analogous figure in Isa. li. 1).—

Who swear by the name . . .] One of the outward marks of an Israelite (Deut. vi. 13, x. 20). Both this and the next feature in the description are elsewhere characteristics of true believers (see *xl.* 23, *xliv.* 5). Here the prophet introduces them ironically. In the case of the majority of Israelites, they are disconnected from a living faith. Hence the qualifying words

at the close of the verse, **not in truth and not in righteousness.** 'Truth,' literally 'continuance,' i.e., unwavering fidelity (so in xxxviii. 3). 'Righteousness,' i.e. the strict performance of their part in the national covenant with Jehovah, especially of the moral duties which this involved.¹ (The root-meaning is 'to be stiff, tight.') The two qualities, 'truth' and 'righteousness,' are combined, as in Zech. viii. 8, 1 Kings iii. 6.

² **For they call themselves . . .**] There is a change of construction, but the tone and the tendency remain the same. In *v.* 1 the prophet seems to be full of praise, but the closing words make it but too manifest that the eulogy is ironical. So here. 'Who are called by the name of Israel' corresponds to 'for they call themselves of the holy city,' and 'not in truth and not in righteousness' is parallel to 'Jehovah Sabáoth is his name.' In *v.* 1 it is mainly formalism, in *v.* 2 a

¹ Neither here, nor anywhere in II. Isaiah, does *ç'dákîh* ever mean merely, 'truth'; nor can this meaning be proved for *çelek*.

themselves of the holy city, and on the God of Israel they lean—Jehovah Sabáoth is his name—³ The former things long ago I announced ; from my mouth they went forth, and I declared them ; suddenly I wrought, and they came to pass. ⁴ Because I knew that thou wast hard, and an iron band thy

narrow 'particularism' or nationalism, which is censured. Formalism is reprehended by pointing to the moral requirements of the religion of Jehovah ; nationalism by adducing that most comprehensive of the Divine titles, Jehovah Sabáoth (comp. vi. 3). In paraphrasing *v. 2*, we may, without injuring the sense, return to the construction of *v. 1*. It is equivalent to saying, 'who express the strongest regard for the city of the sanctuary, and attach the highest value to their hereditary religious privileges, not considering whom they have for a God, namely, Jehovah Sabáoth, who is thrice holy (vi. 3), and who 'is exalted in (or, through) judgment, and sheweth himself holy through righteousness' *v. 16*). [The 'for' at the beginning of the verse has been very variously explained. Some (e.g. Calv., Kay) regard it as explanatory of the preceding clause, 'not in truth' &c. ; as if the prophet would say, 'for they take a pride in the so-called holy city, but where is their holiness?' According to others (Alexander, Birks), it introduces Jehovah's self-justification for still continuing to plead with his people :—'however much individuals have fallen away, the national privileges are still unrevoked by God.' Others again (Vitr., Ew., Del.) take 'for' in the sense of in fact, *immo*, *profecto*, which *kī* so often has in Hebrew.]—**The holy city**] So lii. 1 ; comp. lxiv. 9. This title of Jerusalem only occurs elsewhere in the later books ; see Neh. xi. 1, 18, Dan. ix. 24, Matt. iv. 5, xxvii. 53.—**They lean**] Comp. x. 20, 'but shall rely (lit. stay themselves) upon Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, in truth.'

³ **The former things . . .**] The

appeal to prophecy is repeated for the seventh time.—To understand this and the two next verses, we must take them in connection with *vv. 6, 7* ; there is an evident contrast intended. 'The former things' (see on xli. 22) were predicted to Israel in order to prevent him from committing fresh sin through ascribing Jehovah's wonders to false gods ; it is an additional characteristic that they were foretold 'long since.' With regard to the 'new things,' it is stated that they have only been announced on the very eve of their accomplishment, for if they had been predicted centuries before, Israel would have forgotten the source of his knowledge, and would have said, 'It is a trite story, I know it already' (viz. through another than the true channel—either his idol-god, or his natural powers of calculating the future).—**Suddenly**] In both parts of Isaiah the unexpectedness of the events, in which prophecy finds its fulfilment, is emphatically referred to (comp. xxix. 5, xlvii. 9). Men hear the prophecy, but it takes no hold of them ; they do not practically believe in it. Still the prophecy has produced this negative result, that no one can ascribe the event predicted to any other agency but the true God.

⁴ **Hard**] i.e., hard of heart, slow of understanding (comp. 'obdurate,' xlvii. 12). It is, in fact, a prophetic doctrine that all actual rebellion against Jehovah is preceded by a loss of spiritual sensibility. Thus we read that 'the heart of Pharaoh grew stiff, and he did not hearken unto them' (Ex. vii. 13) ; that, before all hope of Israel's conversion is given up, Jehovah must 'make the heart of this people fat' (Isa. vi. 10) ;

neck, and thy forehead brass,⁵ therefore I announced it to thee long since, before it came to pass I showed it thee ; lest thou shouldst say, Mine idol hath wrought them, and my graven image, and my molten image, hath commanded them. ⁶ Thou hast heard it ; see it as a whole ; (and as for you—should ye not announce it ?) I declare to thee new things from this time, even hidden things, which thou knewest not. ⁷ They have been created now and not heretofore, and before to-day thou heardest them not, lest thou shouldst say, Behold, I knew

and that in Ezekiel's time 'all the house of Israel (were) stiff in the forehead, and hard of heart' (Ezek. iii. 7). The 'heart,' as usual in the Old Testament, is here the organ of the understanding and of the conscience.—**Thy forehead brass**] i.e., thou wast defiant and unapproachable ; comp. Ezek. iii. 8, 9. A similar figure in a good sense, l. 7.

⁵ **Therefore I announced it to thee**] Jehovah speaks as a loving father to his rebellious child. He takes the obstinacy of Israel very calmly ; it is a reason, not for casting him off, but for showing more kindness. He will at least prevent him from committing fresh sin by ascribing Jehovah's mighty deeds to false gods.—**Hath commanded them**] i.e., 'called them into being ;' comp. Ps. xxxiii. 9.

⁶ **See it as a whole**] Behold the prediction fully accomplished. Himpel makes the accusative here refer to the past history of Israel as witnessing to a God who fulfils His predictions.¹ This is surely inadmissible. 'Thou hast heard it &c.' can only mean 'See as a whole that which thou hast heard,' and the preceding verse shows that what the Jews had 'heard' was not their past history, but predictions relative to the achievements of Cyrus.—**And as for you . . .**] This is evidently addressed, not to the nation in general, but to the individuals actually around the prophet. It is thoroughly in the

style of Isaiah, and of the old prophets in general, who really uttered their prophecies before committing them to writing. On the whole, II. Isaiah is both in form and in style intensely literary ; it is the more remarkable that the writer should involuntarily fall into oratorical turns of expression.—

Should ye not announce it?] Ought ye not to make known such a striking proof of the unique divinity of Jehovah?—Hitzig, taking the word 'announce' in the sense of 'predict,' which it has in *v.* 5 and xli. 22, 23, explains, 'Will ye not predict something yourselves?' But the context seems rather to require an appeal to the conscience of the idolaters.—**New things**] See on xlii. 9.

⁷ **They have been created now**] i.e., they are now for the first time brought (or beginning to be brought) into actual existence—hitherto they have only had an ideal life, 'hid in God' (Eph. iii. 9), in the Divine counsels (comp. on xxii. 11). According to Naeg., however, (who does not mention that he is but following Kimchi), the word 'created' is equivalent to 'prophesied,' since a word of prophecy is in a sense creative (see on ix. 8), and converts the Divine counsel from a λόγος ἐνδιάθετος into a λόγος προφορικός. This is an unsuccessful attempt to preclude the inference which has been drawn from this passage in favour of a Babylonian origin of II. Isaiah.

¹ *Theologische Quartalschrift* (Rom. Cath.), Tübingen, 1878, pp. 306-7.

them. ⁸ Neither hast thou heard them, neither hast thou known them, neither did thine ear open heretofore; for I knew that thou wast indeed treacherous, and wast called **Rebellious** from the womb? ⁹ For my name's sake I defer mine anger, and for my praise I am temperate towards thee, not to cut thee off. ¹⁰ Behold, I have refined thee, but ^a not as silver ^a; I have ^b tested thee in the furnace of affliction.

^a Not for silver, Ew.; not obtained any silver, Ges.

^b So Pesh., Targ., Ges., Hitz., Ew., Henderson, Del., Naeg. (mentioned also by A.E. and Kimchi).—Chosen, Vulg., the Rabbis, Calv., Vitruv., Stier, Weir. (Rashi renders the clause, 'I chose for thee the furnace of affliction,' but against the parallelism.)

Dr. Rutgers, with the same object, attempts to show that there was nothing in the successes of Cyrus to justify such language in a prophet living at the close of the Exile. He refers to the (rather dubious) oracles which are said (e.g., by Dino, *Fragm.* 7, and by Herodotus, i. 53) to have announced the victories of Cyrus. Dr. Land replies, that it required an unusual intensity of faith to predict in such positive terms what we can now, perhaps, *à posteriori* see to be very natural. Was it not rather to be apprehended that the Jews would simply exchange a Chaldean oppressor for a Persian? ¹—**Lest thou shouldst say . . .**] See note on 'The former things' (v. 3).

⁸ **Neither did thine ear open**] A synonym for 'didst thou hear' (i.e., with the natural, not the spiritual organ); comp. xlii. 19 (where, however, the verb is different).—**For I knew . . .**] Here the same reason is given for the postponement of the prediction of the 'new things' which has been urged for the early date of the announcement of 'the former things' (v. 4). There is no inconsistency, however. It is the 'newness,' the unheard-of grandeur, of the second cycle of predicted events, which causes the difference in Jehovah's procedure. Israel was equally 'hard' at both periods of prophecy, but his guilt would have

been greatly increased by denying the Divine origin of these wondrously 'new' facts.—**That thou wast indeed treacherous**] It is difficult to realise the closeness of the relation felt by primitive races to exist between them and their gods. This, however, is the basis on which the Biblical doctrines of the relation between Jehovah and Israel, and between God and the Church, are established. See Mic. iv. 5, and comp. Hos. v. 7, vi. 7, Jer. iii. 7, 10, Mal. ii. 11.—**Rebellious**] The allusion is primarily to the provocations of the Israelites in the wilderness (comp. Ps. cvi. 7-33).—**From the womb**] The accents link this with 'Rebellious' (in this case render 'art called'); it gives a better sense, however, to connect it with the verb.

⁹ But some objector may ask, Why has not Jehovah taken summary vengeance on such an impious race?—**For my name's sake**, &c. gives the answer. Because it would have compromised Jehovah in the eyes of the heathen, who are, in His own good time, to become subjects of the Divine King. Comp. Ezek. xx. 9, xxxvi. 21-23.

¹⁰ **I have refined thee, but not as silver**] The precise meaning is obscure. We may, however, at once dismiss the explanation of Ewald ('my refining did not result

¹ Rutgers, *De echtheid*, enz., pp. 64-68; Land, 'Prof. Rutgers en de tweede Jesaïas' *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1867, p. 202.

¹¹ For mine own sake, for mine own sake will I do it; for how should it be desecrated? and my glory I will not give unto another.

¹² Hearken unto me, O Jacob; and Israel, my called one; I am He, I am the first, I also am the last. ¹³ It was my hand also that laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand that spread out the heavens; if I call unto them, they stand up together. ¹⁴ Assemble yourselves, all of you, and hear; who among ^cthem announced these things? He whom Jehovah hath loved shall perform his pleasure on

^c You, not a few Hebr. MSS., Pesh.

in the production of pure metal'), which is here 'purposeless' (Del.). (It is not the so-called *Beth pretii*, but the *Beth essentialis*, which we have here. For the latter, besides xl. 10, comp. Ezek. xx. 41, 'as a sweet savour I will accept you gladly.') But what does 'not as silver' mean? Not merely 'in a higher sense than the refining of silver' (Hitz., Del.), comp. xxix. 9; but rather 'not with such uncompromising severity as silver,' (so Calv., Vitr., Hengst.). To have tried Israel 'as silver,' which, as a psalmist says, is 'purified seven times' (Ps. xii. 6), would have been to 'cut off' the nation entirely (comp. *v.* 9); Jehovah, therefore, mindful of his covenant, 'reined in' or 'restrained' the anger due to its iniquity.—The beauty of the passage, thus explained, shines out the more by comparison with the application of the same figure in other prophecies; see i. 25, Ezek. xxii. 18–22, Mal. iii. 3; Zech. xiii. 9 is more nearly in harmony with it.—**In the furnace of affliction**] An allusion to the 'iron furnace' of the Egyptian bondage, Deut. iv. 20. The prophets regard Egypt as the type of all subsequent oppressors.

¹¹ **For how should it be desecrated?**] Understand 'my glory,' by a 'proleptic ellipsis'; comp. Judg. v. 20, 'They fought from heaven—the stars from their courses fought against Sisera.' So Ges., and formerly, Del. (in his

comment on Hab. i. 5). Or, though this is less obvious, supply my name from *v.* 9 (with Sept., Vitr., Hitz., Del., Naeg.). The verb will suit equally well with 'name' (comp. xxiii. 9), and 'glory' (comp. Lev. xviii. 21, xix. 12, Ezek. xx. 9, xxxvi. 22).—**Unto another**] i.e., to an idol-god. So xlii. 8.

¹²⁻¹³ A still more complete and more condensed summary of the chief contents of chaps. xl.–xlvii. The summons to attend to the new and grand revelation (comp. xlv. 1, xlv. 3). 'I am He,' (comp. xlii. 10, 13, 25, xli. 4, xlv. 4). 'The First and the Last' (xli. 4, xlv. 6). The Creator (comp. xl. 12, 22, 26, 28, xlii. 5, xlv. 24, xlv. 12, 18. Debate on prophecy (comp. xli. 1, 22–28, xliii. 9–12, xlv. 7, 8). Mission of Cyrus (xli. 2, 25, xlv. 28, xlv. 1–7, 13, xlv. 11).

¹⁴ **Assemble yourselves**] Addressed to the idolatrous nations (xliii. 9).—**He whom Jehovah hath loved**] Cyrus inherits the honour conferred on the child Solomon (comp. the Hebrew of 2 Sam. xii. 24, Del.). There is, it is true, no verbal parallel for such a phrase in the preceding discourses, but the personal regard of Jehovah for Cyrus has been clearly enough expressed (see xlv. 4).—**His arm**] The subject is uncertain. Is it Jehovah? is it Cyrus? Dr. Weir remarks, with perfect accuracy, that it is elsewhere God's arm which the prophet refers to. But

Babylon, and ^d his arm (shall be)^d on Chaldæa. ¹⁵ I, even I, have spoken; I have also called him; I have brought him, and his way shall be prosperous.

¹⁶ Draw near unto me, hear ye this; (from the beginning I have not spoken in secret, from the time that it came into being, there have I been: and now the Lord Jehovah hath

^d His arm, Hitz., Ew., Naeg.

surely he has not thereby debarred himself from speaking of the 'arm' of a human agent! ('Arm' = power; comp. Job xxxv. 9, 'they cry out by reason of the arm of the mighty.') The form of the phrase is no doubt peculiar. We should have expected something like 'and the lighting down of his arm shall be on Chaldæa' (comp. xxx. 30); whereas all that the text gives us is 'and his arm Chaldæa.' In spite of *v.* 9 (see Hebr.), it does not seem very natural to make the preposition in the preceding clause operate prospectively, and yet, as the text stands, there is no alternative. The rendering adopted above seems on the whole the best. Alt. rend. may indeed be supported by Ex. xiv. 31 ('the great hand which Jehovah did') but 'his arm' is not a satisfactory parallel to 'his pleasure' — it corresponds better (supplying 'shall be') to 'shall perform, &c.'

¹⁶ Here the recapitulation of the previous discourses is interrupted. The prophet, in the name of Jehovah, is about to put forth his good tidings in a more striking form than he has yet given them. But first he must prepare the minds of his readers by a pathetic appeal to their consciences.—**Draw near unto me**] Jehovah is still the speaker, but he addresses, no longer the heathen (as in *v.* 14), but the Israelites, especially those who are 'far from righteousness' (xlvi. 12). The main point of his address is in *v.* 18, 19. **From the beginning**] The passage thus introduced is open to various interpretations. The most probable seems to me to be this—that from the beginning of

the world (comp. xl. 21, xli. 4) Jehovah has 'raised up a succession of prophets, each bearing his own unambiguous message; "and now," as the prophetic writer subjoins, Jehovah has crowned his previous work with this grandest of revelations.'¹ Compare Calvin's note, 'Testatur Deum illum qui ab initio loquutus est, per ipsum loqui. Itaque sic habendam esse fidem iis quæ nunc Deus per ipsum loquitur, ac si palam adesset.'—The phrase 'from the beginning' may, however, also be taken as meaning 'from the beginning of that historical period to which the fall of Babylon belongs.' Jehovah certainly claims, according to the prophet, to have foretold the future from primeval times, but he also insists repeatedly on the early date of his predictions respecting Cyrus.—**I have not spoken in secret**] 'My revelations have not been obscure and ambiguous like the heathen oracles.'—**From the time that it came into being . . .**] The subject of the verb is doubtful. Most expositors think it to be Jehovah's purpose respecting Cyrus. In this case, the Divine speaker declares that not only had He foretold the Persian victories (comp. xli. 26), but from the time that these announcements 'came into being' (i.e., began to be fulfilled), 'there (was) He,' as the director and controller of events. But is this view quite consistent with the latter half of the verse, which so distinctly refers to prophecy? Is it not more natural, with Ewald, to take the words 'there (was) He' as referring to the succession of pro-

¹ *J. C. A.*, p. 175.

sent me and °his Spirit°:) ¹⁷ thus saith Jehovah, thy Goel, the Holy One of Israel, I am Jehovah thy God, he who teacheth thee to profit, who leadeth thee by the way thou

• His Word, Targ.

phetic messengers, and as the subject of the verb 'came into being' to understand 'the earth' (from *v.* 13)? 'From the beginning' will then mean 'from the beginning of the world.' It may be noticed in this connection that the word-group 'there I (have been)' occurs again in the description of the work of Wisdom at the creation (Prov. viii. 27). (For the ellipsis of 'the earth,' comp. viii. 21, Ps. lxxviii. 15 in the Hebr.)

—**And now the Lord Jehovah hath**] Here a fresh speaker is evidently introduced, though his speech only extends to the end of the verse. But who? According to Delitzsch, it is the servant of Jehovah, who has already been declared to be divinely 'sent,' and to be invested with the Divine Spirit. This is possible, but not, in my opinion, probable. A concise and incidental utterance of this kind seems hardly consistent with the dignity of this great personage, while an occasional brief reference to himself is characteristic of the prophetic writer (comp. xl. 6, xliv. 26, lvii. 21). So Targ., which interpolates 'the prophet saith.' There is a partly similar transition, pointed out by Del., from Jehovah as a speaker to the prophet in lxii. 6.—It is difficult to see how Hitzig, Knobel, and Naegelsbach can assign the whole verse to one person, and that person the prophet (in spite of xlv. 19). If the latter had only been sent 'now,' how could he have 'spoken from the beginning'?—**And his Spirit**] It has been much debated whether these words are the subject (with 'the Lord Jehovah') or the object of the verb, i.e., whether the Spirit is the sender or the sent. The Targ. (most probably), Sept. (see Dr. Kay's note), and Vulg., followed by the English and German versions and by Naeg., take the

former view; Calvin. Vitr., Del. and indeed most moderns, the latter. Grammatically, both renderings are equally admissible (comp. Origen, *Works*, ed. Lommatzsch, iii. 244), though the former is somewhat more obvious. But as there is no analogy in the O. T. for the Spirit's being the sender of a prophet (in 1 Kings xxii. 21, 22, 'The Spirit' of prophecy is himself sent), and as the Spirit is, elsewhere in II. Isaiah, distinctly subordinated to Jehovah (see xlv. 3, lxi. 1, lxiii. 10, 11) it seems to me safer to take the words 'and his Spirit' = 'with his Spirit' (for the idiom, see crit. note on vii. 1). Possibly this particular construction may have been chosen here to indicate the personality of the Spirit, for I cannot but think, with Kleinert (who, however, makes 'his Spirit' the subject), that we have both here and in Gen. i. 2 an early trace of what is known as the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. If a parallel for the claim here put forward by the prophet be required, comp. Hos. ix. 8, 'the man of the Spirit' = *ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος*. Sept. (The whole subject of the O. T. doctrine of the Spirit is well treated by Dr. Paul Kleinert, in *Fahrtbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1867, pp. 3-59.)

¹⁷⁻¹⁹ A tender complaint that Israel has not taken the straight road to peace and righteousness, but has obliged Jehovah to 'lead them round' (Ex. xiii. 18), as it were, by the rough road of chastisement.—**Who teacheth thee to profit**] Deep down in human nature lies the idea of a covenant between the worshipper and his god. In return for external service, the god gives help and protection. The prophets, with a generous freedom, retain so much of this

shouldest go. ¹⁸ O that thou 'hadst hearkened' unto my commandments! then would thy peace ^ε have been ^ε as the river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea; ¹⁹ and thy seed would have been as the sand, and the offspring of thy body as the ^h entrails thereof; his name would not be

^f Didst hearken, Hitz., Knob., Stier, Del.

^ε Be, Hitz., Knob., Stier, Del. (the letters leave the point of time uncertain).

^h So Rashi, A.E., Ges., Hitz., Naeg., Weir.—All the old versions agree substantially in rendering 'grains (of sand)'; so Vittr., Ew., Del.

primitive theory as matches with the truths revealed to them. Jehovah's protection is still conditional, but the conditions extend to the inner as well as the outer man. His terms are therefore more severe than those of the idol-gods, but the result justifies their acceptance. For the idol-gods are, as Jeremiah puts it (ii. 11), 'the not-profitable,' and similar statements occur in II. Isaiah (xliv. 9, 10, comp. xlv. 19). Jehovah, on the other hand, teaches only what is 'profitable' (i.e., in a moral sense, comp. Mic. vi. 8), and leads in the right way (Ps. xxiii. 3).

—**O that thou hadst hearkened** . . .] This is the literal rendering. Some critics, however, are of opinion that it does not suit the context, that it leads rather away from, than up to, the enlivening promise which underlies the concluding injunction. The same construction, they remind us, occurs in lxiv. 1, where all critics are agreed that the sense is a wish for the future, and not for the past, and that the perfect merely expresses the impatient eagerness of the wish. But, as Naeg. remarks, the two passages are not entirely parallel. The one refers to an action, the other to a state. A form of expression suitable enough in the one case would lead to ambiguity or worse in the other. It is safer to render as above, and the meaning, though more subtle, is not inappropriate.—There is a similar and an equally touching apostrophe in Ps. lxxx. 13-16, where, however, the construction is different, and we must certainly render, not as Auth. Vers. and (at least as regards *vv.*

13, 14) Vulg., 'had hearkened,' 'had walked,' 'should have subdued,' &c., but 'would hearken,' 'would walk,' 'would subdue,' &c.—**The river**] i.e., the Euphrates (so Targ.).—**Thy righteousness**] 'Righteousness' here, as so often in II. Isaiah, means, not rectitude, but prosperity, not however prosperity *per se*, but as the manifestation of Jehovah's righteousness or fidelity to His promises.

¹⁹ **As the sand**] Thus the ancient promises to Abraham and to Jacob (Gen. xxii. 17, xxxii. 12), and indeed those recent ones to Israel himself (xliv. 3, 4), would have been realised, as it were, naturally.—**As the entrails thereof**] i.e., the fishes, which have their name in Hebr. from swarming (comp. Gen. i. 20). The subject in Hebr. is not always the noun last mentioned; it must in this case be supplied from the preceding line. The word for 'entrails' is the feminine form of that rendered 'body'; masculine and feminine forms standing together as in iii. 1.—This rend. seems to me now safer than that of Ew. or of Del. (The phrase is Spenserian).—**His name would not be cut off**] Not only would these blessings have been attained, but Israel's name as a people would be secured against extinction for all time.—But is not this explanation against the spirit of Old Testament prophecy, which assumes, like St. Paul, that the *χαρίσματα* of God are irrevocable? Are we not therefore driven to Ewald's way of rendering the passage? No; for no people can be secured in existence beyond that

cut off, nor destroyed from before me. ²⁰ Go ye out from Babylon, flee ye from Chaldæa ; with a ringing cry announce ye this and show it ; cause it to go forth even to the end of the earth ; say ye, Jehovah hath redeemed his servant Jacob. ²¹ And they thirsted not in the deserts through which he led them : water from the rock he caused to flow down unto them ; he clave the rock, and water gushed out. ²² There is no peace, saith Jehovah, to the ungodly.

Day of Jehovah which marks off one 'age' (*'ōlām* or *alōv*) from another. It is only a moral bond of union which can so attach Israel to Jehovah that his existence becomes absolutely illimitable. For 'the coming age' (to adopt the late Jewish phrase) a special promise is required (see lxvi. 22). 'Before me,' i.e., under my care and protection. — See crit. note.

²⁰ The prophet, 'becoming in the Spirit' (Rev. i. 10), sees the destruction of Babylon in the act of accomplishment. — **Flee ye . . .**] 'Escape for thy life' (Gen. xix. 17). At a later period, the prophetic injunction took a different form : — 'ye shall not proceed in flight' (lii. 12). — **With a ringing cry**] The accents connect these words with 'announce, tell.' Vitringa, indeed, thinks this produces an improbable phrase — 'announce with the voice of song.' But *rinnah* is not properly 'song,' and if the message were to reach 'the end of the earth,' a 'ringing cry' would indeed be necessary. The contents of the message are the redemption and return of Israel. — **Jehovah hath redeemed**] Not the prophetic perfect (as in xliii. 1, xlv. 22), but the historical. The Israelites have now escaped from the fallen city, and not only so, but received 'the

earnest of their inheritance.' These great mercies they are to proclaim far and wide (comp. xii. 4). In fact, as we know from xlv. 22, 'all the ends of the earth' are vitally interested in the salvation of Israel.

²¹ **And they thirsted not . . .**] Literalists will remark (as David Kimchi long ago, with naïve astonishment, remarked) that no miracle of bringing water out of the rock is mentioned in the Book of Ezra. But the picture is of course symbolical. Similar figures occur in xli. 17–19, xliii. 19, 20, xlv. 3, 4, but here the emphasis is laid more on the refreshment vouchsafed during the homeward journey, than on the blessedness reserved for the true Israel after their resettlement. The prophet aims at showing that the restoration from Babylon was as great a Divine interposition as the deliverance from Egypt (comp. Ex. xvii. 6, Num. xx. 11). — The last words of the verse remind us of Ps. lxxviii. 20, cv. 41 (see Hebr.).

²² **There is no peace . . .**] 'Peace' (comp. v. 18) sums up all the promised blessings ; from these the 'ungodly,' those who do not belong to the spiritual Israel, are self-excluded. The same words occur, in the manner of a refrain, in lvii. 21.

CHAPTER XLIX.

WE now enter upon a new section of the prophecy. This is admitted even by those who, denying the unity, deny also the division of II. Isaiah into three symmetrical books. In it, we hear no more of the antithesis between Israel and heathenism, no more of Babylon, no more even of Cyrus. Israel himself, in all his contradictory characteristics, becomes the engrossing subject of the prophet's meditations. His restoration, still future, but indubitable, is celebrated in Chap. lx. by an ode somewhat similar to that on the fall of Babylon in the preceding part. But the nearer the great event arrives, and the more the prophet realises the ideal Israel of the future, the more he is depressed by the low spiritual condition of the actual Israel. Strange to say, this combination of apparently inconsistent data—the splendour of the future and the misery of the present—supplies the material for a specimen of dramatic description surpassing anything in the rest of the Old Testament.

The scene with which the section opens is a singularly striking one. The Servant of Jehovah, wearied, as it seems, with the infatuated opposition of the majority of the Israelites, turns to the 'countries' and 'peoples afar off,' and unfolds at length, although not as yet in all its fulness, his origin and his high mission.

It is true that here, as in the case of the parallel prophecy xlii. 1-7, many critics deny that 'the Servant' is the speaker, and assign the soliloquy either to the prophet or to the spiritual Israel. Of these two theories the former is the more plausible, as it does fuller justice to the individualising features of the description. It is also confirmed by Jer. i. 5, where it is said of Jeremiah, that before he came out of the womb he was 'known,' 'consecrated,' and 'ordained' of Jehovah. The drawback, however, to this comparison is that Jeremiah does not, like the speaker in xlix. 1, presume to state this of himself; it is 'the word of Jehovah' which 'came to him.' Besides, the greater part of what the speaker says is so grand and so self-assertive that no prophet, least of all such a reticent prophet as the author, can be imagined as uttering it. The latter theory has but one point in its favour—the second line of *v.* 3, and this no doubt is at first sight conclusive. It is opposed however by *vv.* 5, 6, which unmistakably refer to the spiritual Israel, and expressly distinguish it from the Servant of Jehovah. The only other theory worth mentioning is that which regards the speaker as that human yet superhuman personage to whom the latter appellation belongs. All the conflicting data at once fall into their proper places when we accept this explanation. Our only reasonable doubt will be connected with the surprising

statement in *v.* 2, 'Thou art my servant, (thou art) Israel with whom I will beautify myself.' How can this be? How can the speaker be destined to bring Israel back to Jehovah, &c., and at the same time himself be Israel?

One of the earliest as well as latest solutions is that the speaker is called Israel as being the noblest and truest representative of the people of Israel. So Ibn Ezra, though the speaker, according to him, is not the prophet but the Servant; so too Delitzsch, who considers the personal Servant to be as it were the apex of a pyramid, of which Israel in its entirety forms the basis, and the ideal or spiritual Israel the centre. So too Vitringa, Naegelsbach, and Birks, who explain *v.* 3^b as an allusion to Gen. xxxii. 29, and as meaning, in the words of the first-named writer, 'Tu es Israel, inter omnes veros Israelitas unus et solus, qui in te vere exhibiturus es characteres omnes patris tui Jacobi, qui cum Deo ipso luctatus vicit . . . hâc ipsâ de causâ meritis appellari Israel.' This is conceivable, but there is no other evidence that the first Israel was regarded as typical of the Messiah, like Adam and David. May not the true explanation be much simpler? To me it appears not impossible that the occurrence of 'Israel' in this passage is an inconsistency. The prophet seems to be passing gradually from a lower to a higher conception of his 'great argument.' Originally the Servant of Jehovah was the people of Israel—sometimes the natural, sometimes the spiritual Israel. Now, indeed, he has transcended all that is as yet in existence in the sphere of phenomena, but allows a vestige to remain of his earlier conception. Strictly speaking, therefore, the title Israel is inappropriate in this soliloquy. It is interesting, however, as supplying a link between two conceptions of the mysterious 'Servant.'¹

Contents.—The Servant's declaration concerning his intercourse with Jehovah, his functions, and his experience (*vv.* 1–13); Zion comforted in her despondency (*vv.* 14–26).

¹ Hearken, ye countries, unto me, and listen, ye far-off peoples: Jehovah hath called me from the womb, from my mother's lap hath he made mention of my name; ² and he

¹ **Hearken, ye countries, unto me . . .]** This is no mere rhetorical phrase. The 'countries' and the 'nations' fell within the scope of the Servant's original commission (xlii. 1, 4, 6).—**From the**

womb] i.e., I was predestinated to my missionary office. Comp. Jer. i. 5, Gal. i. 15, and note at end of chap. xlii.

² **He made my mouth . . .]** i.e., he endowed my word with his

¹ It is enough to chronicle the suggestion of Gesenius, in his note on *v.* 3, that the word 'Israel' may be an interpolation (like 'Israel' and 'Jacob' in the Sept. of xlii. 1). In the notes to his translation of Isaiah (2nd ed. 1829) he retracted this view.

made my mouth as a sharp sword, in the shadow of his hand he hid me ; and he made me a polished shaft, in his quiver he covered me : ³ and he said unto me, Thou art my servant ; (even) Israel, with whom I will beautify myself. ⁴ But I had said, I have laboured in vain, for nought and for a breath have I spent my strength ; but surely my right is

own omnipotence, so that it puts down all opposition, just as his word. So in li. 16, 'the word of the LORD, which is put into the mouth of the Servant, is so living and powerful, so borne by omnipotence, that thereby the heavens are planted, and the foundations of the earth are laid.' So too in xi. 4 (see note) it is said of the Messianic king that 'he shall smite the tyrant with the sceptre of his mouth.' Comp. also Heb. iv. 12, Eph. vi. 17, and the passages in Revelation (i. 16, xix. 15) based upon this imaginative description of the Servant.—**He hid me**] The incisive preaching of the Servant was displeasing to the natural man, who therefore sought to parry the sword of the Spirit by the arm of flesh. Hence not only the 'mouth,' but the entire person of the preacher needed the Divine protection.—**And he made me a polished shaft**] The whole soul of the prophet is absorbed in his message ; he is all mouth—a 'mouth of God' (Ex. iv. 16, comp. vii. 1). 'Polished,' so as to penetrate easily ; comp. Jer. li. 11.

³ **And he said . . .**] 'And' is explanatory. Jehovah tells His Servant why He watches over him with such solicitude. It is because he is His precious instrument, and because in and through him He designs to manifest His glory. The Servant will become the head of a regenerated and expanded Israel, which Jehovah will hold forth to the universe as His fairest prize (lxii. 3).—The phrase at the end of the verse is repeated from xliv. 23.

⁴ **But I had said . . .**] 'My thoughts were very different—ever ready to sink into dejection and

despair. And if I struggle against this, the utmost I can reach and rise to is to cast myself upon God's judgment, and to leave all in His hands.' So Dr. Weir. But this is far from doing justice to the firm faith of the closing words. The Servant of Jehovah may indeed give way to dejection, but only for a moment. His cry of pain and astonishment does but show that he is a man—a historical person, and is as consistent with a deeply-rooted faith as the 'Eli, Eli' of Ps. xxii. 1, Matt. xxvii. 46. Directly after relieving his feelings by the cry, 'I have laboured in vain,' he gives the lie, with a 'but surely,' to all delusive appearances, and with the bold declaration, 'my recompence is with my God,' appeals to the impending interposition of the Divine Judge (comp. xl. 10).—The scene of this seemingly resultless labour is evidently Israel, not the heathen world (see v. 6). In a subsequent chapter we find Zion giving utterance to a complaint corresponding to the exclamation of the Servant (see on li. 14).—**My right**] The expression reminds us of xl. 27, where Israel complains, 'My right has been let slip by my God.' There, however, the 'right' is clearly that of an oppressed nation as against its oppressors ; here it is the 'right' of an envoy from the King of Israel to be received with heartfelt submission. The work of the Servant is described under the same figure of a judicial pleading in l. 8.—**My recompence**] What this recompence is, will appear in liii. 10-12. (The mention of a 'recompence' of itself shows that 'servant' in the phrase 'the Servant

with Jehovah, and my recompence with my God. ⁵ And now Jehovah hath said, he who formed me from the womb to be a servant unto him, that I might bring back Jacob unto him, and that Israel might ^a unto him ^a be gathered, (for I am honoured in the eyes of Jehovah, and my God is become my strength,) ⁶ he hath said, It is too light a thing that thou art unto me a servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; so I appoint thee the light of the nations, ^b to be my salvation ^b unto the end of the earth.

⁷ Thus saith Jehovah, the Goel of Israel, and his Holy

^a So Heb. marg. some MSS., Aquila, Pesh., Targ., Lowth, Vittr., Ges., Ew., Del., Naeg., Weir.—Not, Heb. text, Vulg., Calv., Henderson, Hitz., Hengst., Alexander, Kay. (The following verb is variously rendered; see crit. note.)

^b So Sept., Vulg., Vittr., Hengstenberg, Del., Naeg., Weir.—That my salvation may be, Ges., Hitz., Ew. (Weir is uncertain).

(literally slave) of Jehovah' has a special meaning of its own. A slave can have no recompence.

⁵ **And now Jehovah hath said . . .**] 'And' is again explanatory. Jehovah rewards the Servant's recent exercise of faith by a fresh revelation. But before announcing it, the Servant joyfully repeats the facts which have ever lain deep down in his consciousness, though obscured for a moment by despondency, viz. that he is Jehovah's predestined instrument for the restoration of the Chosen People. 'To bring back' (i.e., that I may bring back) at any rate includes a spiritual reference. See on xlii. 7, and comp. the use of 'to return' in I. Isaiah (i. 27, vi. 10, x. 20-22, xxx. 15).—Alt. rend. entirely spoils the symmetry of the verse (analogous cases in ix. 2, lxiii. 9).—**For I am honoured . . .**] Lit. 'and, &c. '; the 'and' is explanatory of the circumstance that a new Divine revelation has been accorded to the Servant. He now feels that he is honoured (the imperfect tense may be chosen as being the tense of emotion) in the eyes of God if not in those of men, and consequently his despondency gives place to a sense of an indwelling Divine strength.

⁶ Comp. xlii. 6. **It is too light a thing . . .**] Even the restoration of Israel is a 'light thing' by comparison with the exalted privilege of bringing all mankind to the knowledge of the true God.—**The tribes of Jacob** (i.e., Israel)] The prophet retains the old-fashioned phrase, precisely as the New Testament writers (Matt. xix. 28, Rev. vii. 4). The parallel clause has simply **the preserved of Israel**, i.e., those who in I. Isaiah (e.g., x. 20) are called the 'remnant,' with reference to the great judgment upon Israel.—**To be my salvation**] i.e., the bearer of my salvation (as the Messiah is called 'peace,' i.e., 'the author of peace,' Mic. v. 5).—Alt. rend. is equally possible grammatically, and harmonizes better with the theory that the people of Israel is the speaker. But the parallelism favours the first rendering.

^{7,9} A further revelation of Jehovah, rewarding the revived faith of his Servant. It is a kind of prelude of chap. liii. Nowhere else, except in that famous chapter, are the humiliation and subsequent glorification of this great personage so emphatically dwelt upon.

⁷ **The Goel of Israel**] (See on xli. 14.) Israel and the greatest of

One, unto him who is ^cdespised ^dof souls,^d abhorred of ^ethe people,^e a servant of rulers: kings shall see and rise up;

^c Despicable, Calv., Del.

^d (a) Of persons, Targ. (virtually), Auth. Vers., Ges., Hengstenberg, Knobel. (β) In the soul, Calv., Vittr., Ew., Naeg., Weir. (γ) As to (his) soul, Hitz., Del. (see crit. note).

^e Peoples, Sept., Saadya, A. E., Kimchi, Luzzatto (as if a collective).

Israel's saplings (liii. 2) are indissolubly united. Is the 'Servant' reduced to low estate? So, too, is Israel. Is the 'Servant' appointed for a glorious issue? Those who are mystically joined to him shall share his prosperity.—**His Holy One**] 'Holiness' is closely related to the idea of strength, comp. xxix. 19.—**Who is despised of souls**] i.e., whom men heartily despise. The obscurity of this expression is chiefly owing to the circumstance that the Hebr. has, not 'souls,' but 'soul' (*něfesh*). 'Despised of soul' (if we interpret *něfesh* as a singular) may be explained in two ways (see β and γ in noted^d), of which the first seems to me the more plausible—comp. the phrase 'desire of soul' = 'deep desire' (xxvi. 8), and 'my enemies in soul' = 'my deadly enemies' (as A. V. Ps. xvii. 9). The soul is in Biblical language the seat of the deepest feelings and affections (the *Gemüth*), of pleasure and pain, desire and disgust, love and hate, admiration and contempt; contempt, in particular, is again connected with the soul in Ezek. xxxvi. 5, 'with the joy of a full heart, with despite of the soul.' On the other hand, the rend. of those who take *něfesh* collectively is recommended by its accordance with the parallel members of the verse ('. . . people . . . rulers'), and by the parallel passage in Ps. xxii. (a psalm so strikingly germane to this paragraph and to Isa. liii.), in which the pious sufferer is called a reproach of men and despised of people' (v. 6); while the rend. 'persons' is justified by the common phrase 'every soul' for 'every person,' and by Gen. xii. 5, xiv. 21, Ezek. xxvii. 13 (where the singular is used, as here, collectively). Still,

though the parallelism imperatively demands a collective reference, 'soul' in the sense of 'person' seems to me to belong specially to phases and formulæ (see instances in Lexicon), and to be altogether too mean a word for those who are in the position of tyrants. I therefore agree grammatically with Gesenius, and exegetically with Ewald.—The rend. of Hitz. and Del. means 'whose life is deemed of little or no value'—the opposite of Ps. lxxii. 14 b. (Obs. The commentators grouped together above do not always agree in their exegesis. Thus Knobel, while rendering as Gesenius, gives an exposition akin to my own, 'despised of men, who despise him in the soul, i.e., heartily.' Vitringa, too, though he translates as Ewald, explains substantially as I have done, 'Contempto fastiditque à cujusque desiderio; quem nemo concupiscit; quo nemo delectatur; qui cuique fastidio est.' Calvin, however, with the same version as Vittr. and Ew., gives a very different interpretation, 'Hoc autem miseriam populi auget,' he says (taking the promise to be addressed to the people), 'quod "in animâ" apud seipsum contemptibilem esse dicit.'—**The people**] Hebr. *gōy* (no article). The term is here used in its widest and primary meaning, 'a collection of people,' viz. all those with whom the Servant has to do, not merely Jews, and not merely Gentiles, but all mankind. Comp. the use of the synonym (*ām*) in xl. 7, xlii. 5, Ps. xviii. 28 (26), xxii. 7 (6), and perhaps lxii. 9 (8); also the phrase 'righteous people' (*gōy ṣaddiq*), Gen. xx. 4.—The rendering 'peoples' may be supported by Job xvii. 6, where

princes—they shall bow down ; because of Jehovah, in that he is faithful, and of the Holy One of Israel, in that he chose thee. ⁸ Thus saith Jehovah, In the season of favour do I answer thee, and in the day of salvation I help thee ; and I ^f keep thee and appoint thee for a covenant of the people, to raise up the land, to assign the desolate heritages, ⁹ saying to the bondsmen, Go forth, and to those who are in darkness, Show yourselves. They shall pasture ^g on the ways, and on

^f Form, Ew., Dcl.

^g In all, Sept., Ew.

Job, the typical righteous man, complains that he is become 'a byword of peoples' (plural, *not* collective). The sense is of course the same, but the rend. adopted is simpler.—**Of rulers**] Or, paraphrastically, 'of despots' (comp. xiv. 5), for the context shows that stern, irresponsible heathen lords are here intended. Obs. the skilful transition. He whom Jehovah has honoured with the title of 'Servant' and the authority of a vicegerent becomes the slave of Jehovah's enemies. Yet these very kings shall have to do obeisance to him whom they once 'heartily despised' (comp. *v.* 23, Ps. lxxii. 11).—**Because of Jehovah . . .**] These acts of reverence and homage are ultimately offered to Jehovah. It is Jehovah's promise and Jehovah's election which have been verified by his servant's glorification.

⁸ **Thus saith Jehovah . . .**] The prophecy takes up the thread which has been dropped in *v.* 7. The new revelation refers to the mediatorial position of the Servant and his spiritual activity. In the fulness of time, when the 'season' has arrived for proving to the world the truth of the declaration in xlii. 1 (instead of 'favour' we might render 'good pleasure'), the Servant of Jehovah shall himself be 'helped,' or 'saved,' and, like the sufferer in Ps. xxii. (*vv.* 23-27), become the source of help and salvation to others.—**I answer thee**] The tense is the prophetic perfect.—**And I . . . the people**] Re-

peated verbally from xlii. 6 (see notes). The person addressed is obviously the same, and is distinct, in some sense, from the people of Israel—distinct even from the 'spiritual Israel' which is to take the place of the unpurified race of the past.—**To raise up the land**] Comp. *v.* 19 'thy broken-down (or, ruined) land.'—**To assign**] viz. to the families to which the respective possessions belonged. Clearly this function belongs to a historical person, such as Joshua was in the past, and Zerubbabel was destined to be in the future. Here, as elsewhere, in his picture of the 'Messianic' future, the prophet combines events which the reality of history spreads over long stretches of time.

⁹ Obs. it is not the word of Cyrus (as in xlv. 28), but that of Jehovah through his servant, which is the efficient cause of deliverance.—**To the bondsmen**] The 'bondsmen' are the Jews, or, more properly, the Israelites (from whichever section of the nation). Contrast xlii. 7 (see note). This portion of the prophecy (*vv.* 7-12) belongs specially to Israel: notice the significant omission in *v.* 8 of the words 'a light of the nations' (found in xlii. 6).—**Shall pasture on the ways**] Here follows a digression suggested by the mention of deliverance. (Obs. the deliverance is taken for granted ; the Divine word 'Go forth' has a self-fulfilling power). The digression describes not merely the comfort

all bare hills there is pasture for them: ¹⁰they shall not hunger nor thirst, the ^h mirage and the sun shall not smite them, for he that hath compassion upon them shall lead them, and unto springs of water shall he guide them. ¹¹ And I will make all my mountains a road, and my highways shall be exalted. ¹² Behold, these come from afar; and behold, these from the north and from the ¹ south, and these from the land of Sinim. ¹³ Ring out, O heavens, and exult, O earth, and

^h Glowing heat, Lowth, Ges. (with the ancients).—But see xxxv. 7.

¹ West, Hebr. text.

of the return-journey (though this is not excluded), but also the blissful condition of the restored exiles (comp. on xl. 11). The latter are compared to a well-tended flock, which has no temptation to roam, as it finds pasture 'on the ways' (i.e., whichever way the sheep turn), and even on 'bare hills' (comp. xli. 18, Jer. xii. 12); in fact, no 'bare hills' are left.

¹⁰ The literal journey homeward, and the metaphorical journey of life, shall both be made easy to them. The misery of intense heat, and the phenomenon of the deluding *mirage* (see on xxxv. 7) which so often accompanies it, will be equally unknown in 'the coming age.' Neither the *mirage*, nor the sun, shall smite them. Comp. the parallel passage, Ps. cxxi. 6 (where, however, the zeugmatic use of the verb is not absolutely necessary).

¹¹⁻¹² The prophet is always hovering between the near and the distant future. But as these two verses clearly show, his conception even of the near future is modified by his vision of what is really far off. He is thinking here of the return of the exiles, but the language which he uses is by no means exhausted by the return of the Jews from Babylon, though this event was all that a Jew of ordinary foresight living at the close of the Exile could anticipate.

¹¹ **My mountains**] Not merely the mountains of Canaan (as xiv. 25), but those of the whole earth;

it is an assertion of Jehovah's universal lordship.—**My highways**] See on xl. 4.

¹² The return of the exiles. Comp. xliii. 5, 6 (with note), where however, the quarters are given in a different order. Jerusalem seems to be here regarded as the centre of the world (as Ezek. v. 5).—**Come from far**] The vagueness of this term, 'from far,' suggests that the writer did not originally intend a catalogue of the four quarters of the world. Taken in connection, however, with what follow, the 'far' region should be the west, which is favoured also by v. 12.—**From the south**] This rendering seems to be required by the context:—'from the north and from the west' would be an unnatural combination. And yet 'the sea,' which the Hebr. has instead of 'the south,' in definitions of place commonly means 'the west.' The same difficulty occurs in Ps. cvii. 3, where 'the redeemed' are said to be gathered 'from the east, and from the west, from the north, and from the sea':—here 'the sea' clearly cannot mean 'the west,' because that quarter has been already mentioned. Del. (on Ps. *l.c.*) thinks 'the sea' means the Mediterranean about Egypt, i.e., the south-west, but against the parallelism; Hitzig prefers the Erythrean, but against usage. For a justification of the rendering 'south,' see crit. note.—**Sinim**] See appendix to this chapter.

¹³ **Ring out, O heavens**] In

burst out, O mountains, into a ringing sound, for Jehovah doth comfort his people, and yearneth upon his afflicted ones.

¹⁴ And Zion said, Jehovah hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me! ¹⁵ Can a woman forget her suckling, so as not to yearn upon the son of her womb? Should even these forget, yet will I not forget thee! ¹⁶ Behold, I have portrayed thee upon the palms of the hands; thy walls are

ecstatic transport, the prophet calls upon heaven and earth to sympathise. His language reminds us of the poetry of art, but it is really the soberest truth (see on xliv. 23). Too soon, alas! he is recalled from anticipations of the future to the miseries of the present (or, more correctly, perhaps from the distant to the near future). Zion and the Servant stand over against each other, without having been able to form an intimate relation. Hence, the complaint of the Servant, 'I have laboured in vain' (xlix. 4), finds a responsive echo in the words of the personified Zion (*v.* 14).—**Jehovah hath forsaken me**] This is not an expression of absolute unbelief; it is the pain of seemingly unreturned affection which borrows the language of scepticism (comp. xl. 27). The highest act of faith is to see God with the heart when all outward tokens of His presence are removed. There are times when even the noblest of mankind are unequal to such an effort; even the 'Servant of Jehovah' gave way to dejection for a moment (see on xlix. 4).

¹⁵ **Can a woman . . .**] Jehovah meets this wounded heart, not with harsh censure, not even with a gentle remonstrance (comp. xl. 28), but with an assurance of uninterrupted affection. His loving-kindness surpasses that of a father (comp. on lxiii. 16); it is even more tender than that of a mother for her suckling (comp. lxvi. 3).—**Should even these forget**] For Lady Macbeth can say—

I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have plucked my nipple from his boneless gums,
And dashed the brains out.
(*Macbeth*, Act I. Sc. 7.)

¹⁶ **I have portrayed thee**] Sept. ἐξωγράφησά σε. It is of course implied that the portraiture is indelible, like the sacred marks of devotees (see on xliv. 5). With touching condescension, Jehovah inverts the usual order. A worshipper needs a consecrating mark to remind him at all times of his relation to his God. Zion's God, though not in need of such a reminder, has condescended, as it were, to 'grave Jerusalem on the palms of his hands.'—Dr. Weir compares Ex. xiii. 9, 16.—**Thy walls**] This might mean 'thy ruined walls,' but as it is the ideal Jerusalem (see on xl. 9) which is addressed, it seems better to take the walls to be those 'great and high' walls, which exist ideally in the heavenly Jerusalem.—No better commentary on this verse can be given than a passage from the Apocalypse of Baruch, cap. iv. Baruch complains of the ruin which has befallen God's city. The Lord replies, 'Anne putas, quod ista sit urbs de qua dixi: super volas manuum descripsi te? Non ista ædificatio nunc ædificata in medio vestrum, illa est quæ revelabitur apud me, quæ hic præparata fuit ex quo cogitavi ut facerem paradisum, et ostendi eam Adamo priusquam peccaret, cum vero abjecit mandatum, sublata est ab eo, ut etiam paradisus . . . Et nunc ecce custo-

continually before me. ¹⁷ Thy ^k sons make haste ; those who laid thee in ruins, and those who wasted thee, begin to depart out of thee. ¹⁸ Lift up thine eyes round about, and see ; they are all gathered together, and are come that they may be thine. As I live, (it is the oracle of Jehovah,) thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with ornaments, and bind them upon thee like a bride. ¹⁹ For thy ruined and desolate places, and thy broken-down land—yea, thou wilt now be too narrow for the inhabitants, and those who swallowed thee up will be far away. ²⁰ The children of thy bereavement shall yet say in thy ears, The place is too narrow for me ; make room for me that I may dwell. ²¹ And thou shalt say in thy heart, Who hath ^l borne me these, seeing I was bereaved and unfruitful, an exile and removed ? and these, who hath

^k Builders, Sept., Targ., Vulg., Saadya, ancient Babylonian MS., Lowth, Lagarde.—Ew., combining both readings (*bānāyik* and *bōnāyik*), has, Soon shall thy children become (?) thy builders. (There may at least be a play upon words.)

^l Begotten, Ges., Ew., Stier (taking the question as referring to the father).

dita est apud me, sicut est paradisus.' (Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test.*, p. 65.) See also 4 Ezra x. 50, &c.

¹⁷ **Thy sons make haste . . .**] The ideal Jerusalem is to be brought into the region of phenomena, not by descent from heaven (as in Rev. xxi.), but by the labours of her 'children.' First, Zion is told, in the verbal form appropriated to the objective statement of facts, that her children (comp. lx. 4), 'haste' (or 'have made haste') i.e., run swiftly to her side ; then, in the emotional or descriptive tense, that her destroyers 'go forth' (or 'begin to go forth') from her—as if they had been all those years engaged on the task, never able to sate their fury. The alternative reading, 'thy builders,' produces a good antithesis, and agrees well with *v.* 19, but not with *vv.* 20, 21.

¹⁸ **Lift up thine eyes]** The first half of the verse recurs in lx. 4.—**Thou shalt clothe thee . . .**] The new inhabitants are compared to ornaments on a dress (comp. Zech. ix. 16), and to the state-girdle worn by a bride over

her robe (Jer. ii. 32, where A.V. has wrongly 'attire').

¹⁹ The prophet seems to observe gestures of incredulity. In reply, he is far from underrating the intrinsic improbability of the change (note the triple reference to the low estate of Zion), and yet he emphatically maintains its certainty. The change is to be a Divine wonder. The desolate land of Canaan shall have such fertility restored to it as to support a teeming population.—**Will be far away]** The tense is the perfect of prophetic certitude.

²⁰ **The children of thy bereavement]** i.e., those born while Zion thought herself bereft of all her children. For the figure, comp. xlvii. 8.—The new inhabitants shall be heard to say, not to Jerusalem, as Naeg. strangely, but the one to the other, **The place is too narrow for me.** It is the complaint of an overpopulated country.—**Make room]** Lit., 'move further off ;' the same idiom as in Gen. xix. 9.

²¹ **Who hath borne me these?]** Supposing that the new children

brought them up? Behold, I was left alone; these, where have they been?

²² Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Behold, I will lift up mine hand towards the nations, and set up my banner towards the peoples, and they shall bring thy sons in the bosom, and thy daughters shall be carried on the shoulder. ²³ And kings shall become thy foster-fathers, and their queens thy nursing-mothers; with their face to the earth shall they bow down unto thee, and the dust of thy feet shall they lick; and thou shalt know that I am Jehovah, those that hope in whom shall not be ashamed. ²⁴ Can the prey be taken from the mighty one, or the ^m captives of the terrible one ^m escape? ²⁵ For

^m So read by Pesh., Vulg., Lowth, Ew., Knob., Weir.—Hebr. text is variously rendered. Captives of the righteous one, Vittr., Kay; or, of him who has the right (of possession), Stier.—Captive band of righteous ones, Hitz., Del.—Righteous captives, Naeg.—Booty (?) taken from the righteous one, Ges.

are applying to be adopted by her, Zion inquires who is their real mother (so Hitz., Del., Naeg.). Alt. rend. is in itself improbable, and is against the Hebrew usage (see Gen. xvi. 1).—**An exile and removed**] Here the prophet falls out of the figure. But he returns to it directly: 'I was left alone,' i.e., I was the sole survivor. The astonishment of Zion is caused by the vast multiplication of the comparatively few who had gone into exile.

²² The explanation of the mystery. At Jehovah's bidding, but with hearty compliance on the part of the Gentiles, the exiled Jews shall be restored to their homes. There is evidently an allusion to xi. 11, 12.

—**In the bosom**] The figure is suggested by v. 21, for it was the part of the foster-father to carry the child in the bosom (*sinus*) of his garment, Num. xi. 12 (where the word for 'bosom,' however, is different).

²³ **Thy foster-fathers**] 'Comp. Num. xi. 12, Esth. ii. 7, but especially 2 Kings x. 1, where we read of those who brought up the seventy sons of Ahab, which is explained at v. 6 by the statement that the king's sons were with the great men of the city who brought them

up. So in this passage Zion is described as a sovereign with a numerous progeny, giving out her children to such foster-fathers, and to nurses.' Dr. Weir.—**Their queens**] So *sārōth* should be rendered, as will be clear from comparing 1 Kings xi. 3 with Cant. vi. 8. *Sarrat* = 'queen' in Assyrian (and Sarah, the proper name, in Hebrew). By 'queens' the prophet means principal wives.

—**Shall they bow down**] It is the worship due to God and to the Church in which God dwells; comp. xlv. 14, Rev. iii. 9 *b*.—**Lick the dust**] i.e., lie down in the dust (see Ps. lxxii. 9, and especially Mic. vii. 17), as a token of submission.

²⁴ But incredulous hearers put the question, Can the tyrant be made to disgorge his prey?—**The captives of the terrible one**] 'Our present reading gives no good sense. Vittr. explains *çaddiq* by "sævus ferox," but it is never found in this sense. Ges. and others prefer [see above], but besides that *sh'bhî* cannot well be rendered "booty," the mention of the righteousness of Israel is altogether foreign to the scope of the passage However unwilling to alter the present text without manu-

thus saith Jehovah: Even the captives of the mighty one shall be taken, and the captives of the terrible one shall escape, for with him that contendeth with thee *I* will contend, and thy children *I* will save. ²⁶ And *I* will cause those that oppress thee to eat their own flesh, and with their own blood, as with new wine, shall they be drunken; and all flesh shall know that *I* Jehovah am thy saviour, and that thy Goel is the Hero of Jacob.

script authority, I must agree with those who read 'ārīç instead of çaddiq. There can be no doubt it was a very old reading. It is, besides, greatly favoured by the next verse' (Dr. Weir). The correction is also palæographically a natural one. Dr. Kay (see above) takes the 'righteous one' to be Jehovah, whose instrument Zion's captor was.

²⁵ This almost incredible thing shall indeed take place; Israel

shall be rescued.—*I will contend*] The pronoun is very emphatic. What hope could Zion have against the *gibbôr*, the 'ārīç, but in God'? (Dr. Weir).

²⁶ **To eat their own flesh**] Comp. 'they shall eat every one the flesh of his own arm' (ix. 20), a figure for disunion to the point of mutual hostility.—**The Hero of Jacob**] See on i. 24, where the same rare word ('*dbhîr*') occurs.

Appendix on 'The Land of Sinim' (Chap. xlix. v. 14).

From all the ends of the earth the scattered Israelites gather to their home. Among the centres of their dispersion is mentioned 'the land of Sinim (or, of the Sinim).' Who or what is Sinim? Referring for the views of the older commentators to a famous article by Gesenius,¹ and to the dictionaries of the Bible, I will simply state what seems to me the present state of the controversy.

It is probable, though not certain (considering the vagueness of the phrase 'from afar' in the first line), that the prophet intends to describe the Israelites as flocking from the four quarters of the earth. If so, the Sinim (for Sinim is obviously the name of a people) will represent the remote east or west, from the point of view of Babylonia. Hence we may at once dismiss the only people called Sinim elsewhere in the Old Testament, viz. the Phœnician Sinites of Gen. x. 17, for these (though westward of Babylonia) were too near at hand, as well as too unimportant a tribe, to be mentioned in this connection. The only claimants remaining (for the Pelusiot were not a nation, and are nowhere called Sinim) are the Chinese, who, though rejected with scorn by Vitringa, have, since the elaborate discussion by Gesenius, received the general adhesion of commentators. It must, however, be candidly admitted that the reasoning of Gesenius falls short of demonstration. His most plausible argument is based on the Chinese name Thsin, originally belonging to a powerful family

¹ *Thesaurus lingu. Hebr. et Chald. Vet. Test.* ed. II., tom. ii. (1840), s. v. Sinim.

which, from 246-206 B.C., united the various petty states of China under their sway, and then (as is supposed) further applied by foreign nations to the country which this family governed. This, however, as well as the inference which has been drawn from the similar names of other much more ancient local dynasties, and from the Chinas of the Sanskrit Laws of Manu and the Mahâbhârata, is now known to be valueless (Strauss; Richthofen). Still the case of the Chinese is not desperate. It is historically certain from the Chinese records that there were foreign merchants in China as early as the 10th cent. B.C., and Chinese merchants in foreign lands as early as the 12th, and it is probable that direct commercial relations existed between China and India, and consequently at any rate direct relations between China and Phœnicia, which will account for the presence of porcelain-ware with Chinese characters upon it in the Egyptian Thebes.¹

This is substantially the contention of Victor von Strauss-Torney.² Another eminent scholar, indeed, (Freiherr von Richthofen,) takes a somewhat different view. The theory of an early intercourse between the Chinese and the peoples of Western Asia does not commend itself to him as probable. If there was any such intercourse, he says, it must have been by sea, and not by land, for the vast highland of Tibet, with its wild nomadic population, put an effectual bar to all access from the west.³ A statement like this from such a competent authority puts an end to the hypothesis of Movers,⁴ that Chinese silk was imported to Babylon *by land* through Phœnician merchants. And yet is it not conceivable that roving Phœnician merchants may have reached China *in their coasting voyages*? That the Assyrians, at any rate, arrived in China by sea as far back as 2353 B.C., there is positive traditional evidence, if M. Pauthier's report may be trusted. In that year, he says, according to Chinese traditions, an envoy arrived from a far country bearing a wondrous gift. It was nothing less than 'a divine tortoise a thousand years old, on the back of which was an inscription in strange characters *like tadpoles*, comprising the history of the world from its origin.' A second embassy is said to have arrived in 1110 B.C., and the historians affirm that it took the envoys a whole year to return to their own country from Siam by the sea-coast. This, with the fact that they are called 'the people of the long trailing robes' (a description quite unsuitable to the costumes of the tropical countries south of

¹ Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, 1st series (Lond. 1837), iii. 106-109.

² Excursus on 'The Land of Sinim,' in Delitzsch's *Jesaja*, 2 Aufl., S. 712-715 (3 Aufl., S. 688-692).

³ Col. H. Yule's review of von Richthofen's *China*, in *Academy*, xiii. 339.

⁴ Movers, *Die Phönizier*, ii. 3, p. 255.

China), and above all the tadpole-characters (which at once suggests cuneiform writing), leads M. Pauthier to the conclusion, that the nation to which the envoy belonged was the Assyrian, or the Babylonian.¹ It is worth noticing that the king of Assyria in 1110 would be the warlike and enterprising Tiglath-Pileser I.

As for the name Sinim, it has been plausibly accounted for by the frequent use of *sjin* (nearly=*chin*), literally 'man,' to describe persons according to their qualities, occupation, country, or locality. Hearing the Chinese so often call themselves *sjin*, it was natural for foreigners to call them by this name. The form Sinim is accounted for by the absence of the soft g in Hebrew. With reference to Gesenius's opinion that the name Σιν, *ichin*, &c., spread over the East from India, it has been pointed out to me² that, according to Rémusat, the Chinese first entered India, not by a direct route, but from the north-west, and were therefore actually known at any rate to the peoples dwelling on that side of India before they were known to the Hindus themselves.

In conclusion, I may remark that it is not necessary to assume that Jewish exiles actually lived in China when the prophet wrote; enough that he knew of (or, as the case may be, foresaw) the existence of a numerous and extensive Diaspora. As a matter of fact, however, Jewish immigrants from Persia do appear to have entered China before the Christian era. This is generally recognised as one result of the intercourse with the 'unfortunate Jews at Kai-fung-foo.'³ Of the antiquity of this settlement there can be no doubt, and the inscribed marble tablets which were till lately accessible to all comers place the immigration at least as far back as the third century B.C. The synagogue with its tablets has disappeared, and the 'orphan colony' is in danger of passing away. Fortunately for us, we can appeal both to Roman Catholic and to Protestant testimony. The early Jesuit missionaries were the first discoverers of these Chinese Jews, and one of them, Father Gozani, took a copy of the inscriptions in the synagogue, which he sent to Rome. The very interesting *mémoire* of the Jesuits omits to give any direct account of the inscriptions; it contains, however, the following statement:—

Ces Juifs disent qu'ils entrèrent en Chine sous la dynastie des Han pendant le règne de Han-ming Ti, et qu'ils venaient de Si-yu, c'est-à-dire, du pays de l'Occident. Il paraît par tout ce qu'on a pu tirer d'eux que

¹ Pauthier, *Relations politiques de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales* (Paris, 1859), pp. 5-8. I am indebted for this reference, which I have of course verified, to the Rev. R. A. Armstrong, of Nottingham. M. Pauthier's authority as a critic has, I am aware, been challenged. His interpretation of the Chinese traditions seems to me very plausible, but is not absolutely essential to my argument.

² Mr. Armstrong will permit me again to mention his name.

³ Kai-fung-foo is the capital of Honan, the most central province of the Chinese Empire.

ce pays de l'Occident est la Perse, et qu'ils vinrent par le Corassan et Samarcande. Ils ont encore dans leur langue plusieurs mots persans, et ils ont conservé pendant longtemps de grands rapports avec cet état. Ils croient être les seuls que se soient établis dans ce vaste continent.¹

Mr. Finn's statement is in complete accordance with the Jesuit report of the tradition of the date of the settlement. He says, 'According to the inscribed marble tablets upon the walls, there may have been several immigrations of this people into China at different epochs:—(1) In the Chow dynasty, between A.C. 1122 and A.C. 249; (2) In the Han dynasty, between A.C. 205 and A.D. 220; (3) In the LXV. cycle (A.D. 1163), when they brought a tribute of cotton cloth to the emperor. There was also their own oral statement to the Jesuit missionaries, referring their arrival [i.e., that of the ancestors of the then existing families] to a period shortly after the Roman dispersion from Jerusalem.'²

See further Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, ii. 1029; L. Geiger, *Ursprung der Sprache*, p. 456; Egli, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, vi. 400, &c. (mainly a criticism upon Gesenius); and a paper by 'E. B.' (dated from Pekin), in *Ausland*, 1873, p. 267, &c. (this I only know through the third edition, lately published, of Delitzsch's *Jesaia*; it comes to the purely negative result that the name *Tschina* is not at all Chinese). It may be noticed here, that our form China comes to us from the Malays, as the wise and adventurous Marco Polo already knew (*The Book of Ser Marco Polo* ed. Yule, Book iii. chap. 4).

CHAPTER L.

Contents.—Israel has been self-rejected; Jehovah on his part, is willing and able to redeem, though no human champion answers to his call (*vv.* 1-3). Then the scene changes. The Servant describes his intimate relation to Jehovah, his gift of eloquence, his persecutions, and the steadfast faith with which he undergoes them (*vv.* 4-9). The chapter closes with a solemn contrast and warning (*vv.* 10, 11).

¹ Thus saith Jehovah, Where is your mother's bill of divorce with which I put her away? or which of my creditors

¹⁻³ Vitringa and Ewald regard these verses as an integral part of the discourse containing chap. xlix. As long as we confine our view to *v.* 1, this theory of theirs seems highly plausible, for *v.* 1 certainly looks like a second reply on the part of Jehovah to the complaint of Zion in xlix. 14. On the other hand, it should be observed (1)

¹ 'Mémoire sur les Juifs établis en Chine,' in *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses, écrites des missions étrangères*, tom. xxiv. (Toulouse, 1811), pp. 50, 51.

² Finn, *The Orphan Colony of Jews in China* (Lond. 1872), pp. 6, 7.

is it to whom I sold you? Behold, for your iniquities were ye sold, and for your rebellions was your mother put away.² Wherefore, now that I am come, is there no man? now that I have called, is there none that answereth? Is my hand too *short* to deliver? or have I no power to rescue? Behold, by

that chap. xlix falls into two equal parts, and that the conclusion of the second of these is, from its solemnity, perfectly adequate as a close to the entire prophecy, and (2) that *vv.* 2 and 3 are very different in tone and purport from all that precedes. Is it not the more probable view that *v.* 1 contains a thought suggested by xlix. 14, subsequently to the final redaction of the prophecy? Not being able to work it into chap. xlix., the prophet seems to have allowed himself to give it a new development (in *vv.* 2, 3) which would have been unsuitable to the original prophecy.—Obs. the Divine speaker here addresses the children of Zion; in xlix. 14-26, he confined himself to Zion the mother.—**Where is your mother's bill of divorce . . .**] In Jeremiah (iii. 8) it is said of the 'backsliding' kingdom of Samaria that Jehovah 'put her away, and gave her a bill of divorce,' though a hope is still held out of her ultimate restoration. Judah, however, may be still more easily restored to her full privileges, for—'where is her bill of divorce?' There is none; Jehovah in his mercy omitted this formality; consequently her dismissal has not the legal value of a divorce. Obs. marriage is here a figure of the mystic relation between the Deity and his worshippers (see Hos. ii. and my notes on i. 21, xlv. 11).—**Which of my creditors . . .**] Another figure condescendingly borrowed from the experience of human life. From 2 Kings iv. 1, Neh. v. 5, it appears that Hebrew parents, when hopelessly in debt, were accustomed to sell their children to their creditors. Such an unqualified surrender of a man's flesh and blood is

not expressly sanctioned in the Law (not even in Ex. xxi. 7), but it was a custom too strong to be eradicated. Jehovah admits *pro forma* that he may have creditors, but denies that, in pursuance of this old custom, he has sold the Jews to any of them:—consequently there is none but a moral bar to their restoration to his favour. Comp. lii. 3, 'Ye were sold for nought, and ye shall not be redeemed with money.—**For your iniquities were ye sold . . .**] Israel, then, (represented by Judah,) has really been 'sold,' has really been 'put away.' But this is not by Jehovah's will; the cause lies in Israel himself. It was a necessary punishment for Israel's sins, but only a temporary one, thanks to the 'unfailing loving-kindnesses of David' (lv. 3).

² Most commentators take the first part of this verse as mentioning some of the sins which had led to Israel's temporary rejection. But it rather expresses Jehovah's painful surprise that he is not seconded by any human champion.—**Now that I am come**] viz. with a call to repentance and an offer of deliverance. In what way, it may be asked, can Jehovah be said to have come? The Targum gives an answer, which has been largely adopted, by inserting the explanatory words 'in the prophets.' This view is not in itself inadmissible (comp. lxxv. 1, 2, Jer. xi. 7), but is very unsuitable to the context. For the same person who has 'come,' and who has 'called,' goes on to declare that he can dry up the sea and clothe the heavens in mourning:—surely then he can be none other than Jehovah in all the plenitude of his personality. Obs. it is Jehovah im-

my rebuke I can dry up the sea, I can make the rivers a wilderness, their fish stinking for lack of water and dying for thirst; ³I can clothe the heavens in mourning, and make sackcloth their covering.

⁴The Lord Jehovah hath given me the tongue of disciples, that I may know how to ^asustain (?) the weary by a word: he wakeneth morning by morning, wakeneth to me an

^a So Aquila, Vulg., Ges., Del., Naeg., Weir.—Moisten (?), i.e., bedew, refresh, Ew., Knob.

mediately who 'comes,' not as represented by his Servant (Del., Naeg.). The passage is precisely parallel to lix. 16 (comp. lxiii. 3, 5), where Jehovah is represented as wondering that there was no one morally qualified to be the national champion, and as throwing himself unassisted into the breach on behalf of his people. The rendering 'I have come' is preferable to 'I came,' because the interposition of Jehovah is still future, or at any rate incomplete.—**Behold**] The usual word for introducing the description of a Divine judgment.—**By my rebuke**] 'Rebuke' is the term for the opposite of the creative word. Instead of calling into existence, it sends into non-existence, or at least confines within bounds (see xvii. 13, li. 20, lxvi. 15, Nah. i. 4, Ps. ix. 5, xviii. 15, civ. 7, cvi. 9, Matt. viii. 26, Luke iv. 39).—**I can dry up the sea**] Some, e.g., Calv., Kay (rendering in the present tense, 'I dry up'), see in this and in the next verse a direct reference to miracles like the dividing of the Red Sea and the Jordan, the changing of the Nile-water into blood, and the darkening of the heavens (Ex. x. 21). As, however, we find similar phrases elsewhere in descriptions of Divine interpositions (see Ps. xviii. 15, Nah. i. 4, Hab. iii. 8, 11, Isa. xiii. 10), it is allowable to interpret these two verses symbolically. A secondary reference to the ancient miracles may of course reasonably be admitted, God's wonders in the past being regarded by the prophets as typical (see x. 26, xi. 16,

xl. 16, 17).—**The rivers a wilderness**] Imitated in Ps. cvii. 33.

³ **Sackcloth their covering**] Comp. Rev. vi. 12, 'the sun became black as sackcloth of hair' (the dress of mourners, Joel i. 8, &c.).

⁴ A fresh prophecy, chiefly in the form of a soliloquy. Its contents remind us of xlii. 1-4, xlix. 1-9 (see especially xlix. 2, 7), except that there is no reference here to the evangelisation of the heathen. If the subject of those two prophecies is the Servant of Jehovah, it follows of necessity that the same personage is the speaker here. It would be strange indeed to suppose that the prophet is the speaker, 'blown in as it were by a snow-storm' (Hengstenberg). The section would then stand quite solitary, without connection either with the preceding or the following discourses. (Ewald, however, thinks that Israel is the speaker; Seinecke, the pious kernel of the nation; Gesenius, Hitzig, Knobel, the prophet).—**The Lord Jehovah**] Notice the solemnity of the introduction; the same double name (*Adonai Yahveh*) occurs three times afterwards (vv. 5, 7, 9).—**The tongue of disciples**] i.e. a faculty like that of well-trained scholars (see viii. 16, liv. 13), full of their morning lesson, or, as Luther (ap. Naeg.) puts it, 'lingua discipulata, quæ nihil loquitur, nisi quod à Deo didicit.' From the occurrence of the plural ('disciples') Seinecke draws an argument in favour of his view mentioned above; he compares Job xix. 11, 'He accounteth

ear to hearken as disciples, ⁵ The Lord Jehovah hath opened to me an ear, and I have not been defiant; I have not turned back. ⁶ My back I have given to smiters, and my cheeks to those who plucked out the hair; my face I have not hidden

me as His enemies' (Job, according to Seinecke, being also a collective personification). It seems to me a sufficient reply that the picture which the prophet here gives us is that of a class of disciples, all with 'wakened ears,' and swift to reproduce their master's instruction, while in Job the hostility of God appears to the sufferer in his illusion great enough to be expended on a whole company of His enemies.—**The weary**] A comparison of lviii. 15 shows that here, as in Matt. xi. 28, it is an inward and spiritual as well as outward and physical weariness which is intended.

—**He wakeneth morning by morning**] The Servant does not receive revelations like ordinary prophets in ecstatic moments, in dreams and visions of the night, but in his waking hours, and not only so, but every morning—the spirit of prophecy abides constantly upon him (Del., Naeg.). The message is the same—peace and restoration, but it needs daily varying to meet daily needs. It is hardly necessary to point out the exquisite felicity of phrase in this verse. There are indeed similar expressions elsewhere (see 1 Sam. ix. 15, xx. 2, Job xxxiii. 16), but not equally poetical.—**An ear**] It is of course the inner ear which is meant, as in xlvi. 8.

⁵ **Hath opened to me an ear**] The supposed reference to Ex. xxi. 5, 6, Deut. xv. 16, 17, has been deservedly set aside by recent commentators. It is obviously a particular command which is referred to. The piercing of a slave's ears made all commands binding for the rest of his life; 'defiance' was excluded; moral conflict was out of the question. Besides, the meaning of the phrase 'to open the ear' is determined by v. 4 (comp. xlvi.

8, xlii. 18, 19). The Servant was not a mechanical organ of revelation, but had a spiritual sympathy with it, even when it told of suffering for himself.—**I have not been defiant**] I, weak and susceptible to pain and reproach as I am, have not stiffened my back in opposition to duty. (The root-meaning is *stringere*.) The declaration thus ascribed to the Servant is decisive against the 'collective' theory. It was the offence of Jonah, a type or symbol of Israel, that he pursued the very opposite line of conduct to that which is here described. Few even in the class of prophets could take up the words of the Servant. Jeremiah indeed does utter a like statement, but, both in his sufferings and in his deportment, Jeremiah was a striking type of the Servant of Jehovah. 'As for me,' he says, 'I have not withdrawn from following lovingly after thee' (Jer. xvii. 6). So, too, the Servant can declare, 'I have not been defiant, I have not turned back.' In both cases, the words are only appropriate in the mouth of an individual.

⁶ **My back I have given . . .**] He has patiently, willingly endured humiliation and scorn. So the type Jeremiah, 'I have been in derision continually, everyone mocking me' (Jer. xx. 7). So the pious sufferer, also (to say the least) a type, in Ps. xxii. 7, 'All they that see me laugh to scorn.' So the typical righteous man in the Book of Job (xxx. 10), 'They abhor me, they flee far from me, and withhold not spittle from my face.'—**To those who plucked out the hair**] Comp. Neh. xiii. 25, 'And I cursed them. . . and plucked the hair off them.' Of all such expressions in this section, as even Vitringa candidly admits, the primary sense not only may be, but must be, figu-

from confusion and spitting. ⁷ But the Lord Jehovah will help me ; therefore am I not confounded ; therefore have I made my face as flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed. ⁸ Near is he that justifieth me ; who will contend with me ? let us stand forth together. Who is mine adversary ? let him come near unto me. ⁹ Behold, the Lord Jehovah will help me ; who is he that can condemn me ? behold, they shall all fall to pieces like a garment ; the moth shall eat them. ¹⁰ Who is there among you that feareth Jehovah, that hearkeneth to the voice of his servant ? He that walketh in darkness, and hath no light, let him trust in the Name of Jehovah, and rely upon his God. ¹¹ Behold, all ye that kindle a fire

rative, since there is no one in the religious history of Israel to whom they can be literally applied.

⁷ 'Against the crowd of mockers he places Adonai Jehovah' (Dr. Weir).—**As flint**] The same figure is applied in a bad sense, Jer. v. 3, Zech. vii. 12 ; in a good, Ezek. iii. 9.—**I shall not be ashamed**] i.e., not disappointed (see on liv. 4).

⁸ **He that justifieth me**] 'To justify' in the O. T. almost always (see on liii. 11) means to pronounce a man righteous, or to prove him so in act :—Job xxvii. 5 is not fundamentally an exception. The Servant of Jehovah speaks of the final stage of his career in figurative language as a trial, in which God is the judge. This is a fresh point in which he resembles Job. But whereas Job, the type of a *righteous* man, shrinks in terror from the issue, the Servant, human and yet superhuman in nature, has no doubt as to a favourable result.

^{10, 11} A short speech, addressed first to those who fear and obey Jehovah, and then to those who resist his will. It is not quite clear what is the meaning of the words **his servant**. In xlv. 26, they are a designation of the prophetic writer himself, and they may perhaps be so here. This view, it is true, isolates vv. 10, 11 from the rest of the chapter, but there is nothing in these verses directly

referring to the preceding paragraph. There are some very abrupt transitions in the prophecy before us, and this may be one of them. Otherwise we may understand 'his servant' to mean the servant of Jehovah specially so called. I incline to the former theory. The speech of the Servant in vv. 4-9 is I think, a pure soliloquy, and belongs not to the present but to the future—it is given here by anticipation ; vv. 10, 11, on the other hand, are addressed to the Jews living in Babylon at the close of the Exile. V. 10 is spoken by the prophet (so Ibn Ezra), who, however, soon loses himself (see v. 11) in his Divine master.—**The Name of Jehovah**] No mere synonym for 'the Divine character,' but a symbolic expression for a special aspect, not to say 'Person,' of the Godhead ; see on xxx. 27.

¹¹ **All ye that kindle a fire**] The meaning of this figure is uncertain. I follow Hitz., Ew., Knob., Del., Naeg. in taking the 'fire' to represent either the rage of unrestrained passion (comp. ix. 18), or the destruction which the enemies of Jehovah prepare for his servants. Others (as Vitr., Lowth, Ges.) regard it as a figurative expression for rebellion against the oppressors of the Jews. Others again (as Calv., Hahn, Birks, Weir) suppose it to be a domestic fire (xlvi. 14) which

and ^b gird yourself with ^b ^c brands; get you into the flame of your fire, and into the brands that ye have kindled. From mine hand this befalleth you; in torture shall ye lie down.

^b Set a light to, Pesh., Secker, Hitz., Ew. (one letter different.)

^c Sparks, Kimchi, Calv., Hengst., Hahn, Weir.

is meant, and take this to be a figure for all merely human comforts and supports, corresponding to the figure of darkness for distress and perplexity in *v.* 10. The last-mentioned view has but a precarious existence, as it depends on the dubious rendering 'sparks'; the second strikes me as too narrow for the wide symbolism of prophecy. The first produces a striking and natural antithesis (comp. *xlii.* 16, 17).—**Gird yourselves** . . .] The 'firebrands' (if we care to press this detail) may be the calumnies and anathemas hurled at the servants of Jehovah (comp. James

iii. 6). 'Gird' = arm (see on *xlv.* 5). So 'facibus pubes accingitur,' Virg. —**Get you into the flame**] The destruction they have prepared for others shall overtake themselves. —**From mine hand**] Jehovah is evidently the speaker. —**In torture shall ye lie down**] Not merely 'ye shall die in pain' (as Ibn Ezra, comp. *i* Kings *ii.* 10, 'David lay down with his fathers'), but 'after death ye shall lie on a couch of torture.' Vitringa well compares Luke *xvi.* 24, 'I am tormented in this flame'; see further on *lxvi.* 24.

CHAPTER LI.

Contents.—Instruction for the spiritual Israel (*vv.* 1–8); appeal to the self-revealing might of Jehovah (*vv.* 9–11); Divine expostulation with Israel for his unbelief (*vv.* 12–15); address of Jehovah to the Servant (*v.* 16); encouragement for down-trodden Jerusalem, mingled with a pathetic picture of her troubles (*vv.* 17–23).

¹ Harken unto me, ye that pursue righteousness, that seek Jehovah; look unto the rock whence ye have been hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye have been dug.

² Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you, for by himself I called him, and I blessed him, and in-

¹ **Harken unto me** . . .] The prophet is drawing nearer and nearer to the great central revelation (chap. *liii.*), and summons to his side the spiritual Israel, for whom alone, as he has expressly said (see *xlvi.* 22), the future blessedness is reserved.—**Righteousness**] It is of course 'righteousness' in the objective sense of which he speaks—a way of life in accordance with the Divine commands, i.e., 'righteous dealing' (Rodwell).—**Look unto the rock** . . .] Unlikely as

the fulfilment of such 'exceeding great and precious promises' may seem, it is not more unlikely than the original wonder of a great nation being descended 'from one man, and him as good as dead' (Heb. *xi.* 12). The figure of the 'rock,' thus explained, is natural enough, without supposing a survival' of a myth like that of Pyrrha.

² **By himself**] Lit., '(as) one.' There are two remarkable verbal parallels in Ezek. *xxxiii.* 24 and

creased him. ³ For Jehovah doth comfort Zion, doth comfort all her ruined places, and maketh her wilderness as Eden, and her desert as the garden of Jehovah; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the sound of music. ⁴ Listen unto me, ^a my people,^a and ^b my nation,^b give ear unto me; for instruction shall go forth from me, and my law will I fix for the light of the peoples. ⁵ Near is my righteousness; gone forth is my salvation; and mine arms shall judge the peoples; for me the countries shall wait, and upon mine

^a Ye peoples, very few MSS., Pesh., Lowth, Ges.

^b Ye nations, few Hebr. MSS., Pesh., Lowth, Ges. (Sept. has, Ye kings.)

Mal. ii. 15. The latter indeed seems to me only a verbal one, but the former suggests one possible object of the prophet in adopting this form of words. It runs thus, 'Son of man, they that inhabit those ruined places on the soil of Israel say, Abraham was one, and he became possessor of the land: but we are many, the land hath been given to us for a possession'; i.e., 'if Abraham received the promise of Canaan, when he was but one, and when there were great nations already in possession, how much more shall we, who are many, and who are living on the land of our forefathers, retain a permanent and growing hold upon it!' No, the prophet replies; the true lesson of the solitariness of Abraham is different. The few genuine believers, who seek to do the will of God, are the representatives of Abraham, and the fresh starting-point for the promise.—**I blessed him, and increased him]** The two principal features of the promises to Abraham (Gen. xii. 2, 3, xxii. 17 &c.).

³ **Doth comfort]** Lit., 'hath comforted.' The perfect expresses the self-fulfilling power of the Divine word.—**As Eden . . . as the garden of Jehovah]** The occurrence of these phrases is worth noticing, as it supplies a subsidiary argument in controversies as to the date of certain books. 'The garden of Jehovah'

occurs only here and in Gen. xiii. 10; 'the garden of Elohim' (another synonym for 'the garden of Eden') in Ezek. xxviii. 13, xxxi. 8, 9. The garden of Eden itself is mentioned Gen. ii. 15, iii. 23, 24, Ezek. xxxvi. 35, Joel ii. 3; 'the trees of Eden,' Ezek. xxxi. 9, 16, 18.

⁴ **Listen unto me . . .]** Not 'listen unto the instruction which proceeds from me'; this would be opposed to *v.* 7 *a.* The prophet mentions a second attraction for Jehovah's true people. It is 'too light a thing' (xliv. 6) that Zion's wilderness shall be transformed; Jehovah, enthroned anew in Israel, shall send forth his light and his truth among the distant nations (comp. ii. 2). In xlii. 1-4 this function is ascribed to the personal Servant, in and by whom Jehovah works.

⁵ **My righteousness]** There is no occasion to paraphrase this into 'my grace' (Hitz.), or 'my salvation' (Ges.) Both expressions say too little. Jehovah's 'righteousness' means his consistent adherence to his revealed line of action, which involves deliverance to faithful or at least repentant Israel, and destruction to those who thwart his all-wise purposes. 'Mine arms shall judge the peoples' expresses, or at least includes, the darker side of Jehovah's righteousness.—**Shall wait]** Not 'wait' as Knobel; as if the judgment was simply to fall upon Babylon, and

arm shall they trust. ⁶ Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath ; for the heavens shall vanish like smoke, and the earth shall fall to pieces like a garment, and the dwellers therein shall die 'like gnats' ; but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be annulled. ⁷ Harken unto me, ye who know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my instruction ; fear ye not frail man's reproach, and at their revilings be ye not dismayed. ⁸ For as a garment shall the moth eat them, and as wool shall the worm eat them ; but my righteousness shall be for ever, and my salvation to successive generations.

⁹ Awake, awake, put on strength, O Arm of Jehovah ; awake, as in the days of antiquity, the generations of old. Art thou not it that hewed Rahab in pieces, that pierced

* So De Dieu, Vitruv., Lowth. Ges., Hitz., Ew., Weir.—Even so, Versions and Rabbis, Kay, Naeg.—Thus (with a gesture of contempt), Del.

the oppressed nations were already longing for its coming. The prophet has forgotten Cyrus and Babylon, and is absorbed by the thought of the Messianic age.—**My arm]** i.e., my help, my protection (comp. xxxiii. 2).

⁶ **The heavens . . . like a garment]** The same figure as in Ps. cii. 26. Elsewhere the order of the world is described as everlasting (Gen. viii. 21, 22, ix. 9-11, xlix. 26, Ps. cxlviii. 6).—**Like gnats]** A simile which appears ignoble to us, but did not so appear to the more simple-minded Semites. So, in the first of the Babylonian 'Izdubar' legends (in the Assyrian version). We hear of the gods of Uruk (Erech), during a siege of that city, being overpowered with fear, and turning themselves into flies (*Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* iv. 268); and the Korán declares (Sura xiii. 24), 'Verily God is not ashamed to set forth as well the instance of a gnat as of any nobler object.' Del.'s rendering (comp., besides the passages quoted by him, Am. iv. 12, Jer. v. 13) is unnatural in so highly-wrought and poetical a passage. Besides, as De Dieu long ago pointed out, we desiderate a third

simile to correspond to the smoke and the garment. Del.'s philological difficulty is obviated by Dr. Weir (see crit. note).

⁹ **A fresh turn in the discourse.—Awake, awake]** Who utters this splendid apostrophe!—Most commentators reply, Zion, or the prophet in Zion's name. There are two objections to this: (1) Wherever Zion or the Church is represented as uttering a cry, it is in the tone of complaint (see xlix. 14, lxiii. 11, &c., lxiv. 1), whereas this exclamation is in the language of the boldest faith; and (2) in v. 17, Jerusalem (which is here synonymous with Zion, see lii. 1) is represented as asleep. Two better theories are open to us. Looking at v. 9 alone, and comparing it with lii. 1, it seems natural to regard it, with Ges., as an exhortation of Jehovah to himself (comp. Judg. v. 12, 'Awake, awake, Deborah'), or, if we object to a rhetorical formula in so solemn a passage, as a fragment of a deliberation within the plurality of the Godhead (comp. Gen. i. 26, xi. 7). The latter is the form given to the theory by Prof. Birks, who supposes God the Son to be pleading with God the Father for the

through the dragon? ¹⁰ Art thou not it that dried up the sea, the waters of the great flood, that made the depths of the sea a way for the released to pass over? ¹¹ And the freed ones of Jehovah shall return and come to Zion with a ringing sound, and everlasting joy shall be upon their head; they shall overtake gladness and joy, sorrow and sighing shall flee away.^d

^d Omitted by Ew. (See below.)

renewal of His mighty works. This, however, is not only expressed in too theological a way, but is contrary to the analogy of Scripture; it is God the Son (if I may follow Prof. Birks on theological ground), and not God the Father, who corresponds to the Arm (as also to the Name and to the Face) of Jehovah, but a glance at *vv.* 9 *b*, 10, suggests another theory in preference. The solemn appeal which we there find to God's wonders of old time is certainly more appropriate to one who is not a Divine being; in lxiii. 11 a very similar form of words is put into the mouth of the people. Vitringa assigns the apostrophe to a chorus of doctors (prophets?) and saints, 'cœtui doctorum sive choro sanctorum illustrium, ardentium zelo divinæ gloriæ et salutis ecclesiæ.' I should almost prefer regarding it as a specimen of the intercession of the angels called, in lxii. 6, Jehovah's 'remembrancers.' The interest of the celestial beings in the fortunes of Zion has been already repeatedly manifested (see on xl. 3).—**O Arm of Jehovah**] See on xl. 10.—**That hewed Rahab in pieces . . .**] Comp. Ps. lxxxix. 10, 'Thou hast broken Rahab in pieces as one that is slain; thou hast scattered thine enemies with thy strong arm.' In both these passages, the exegetical tradition from the Targum onwards has taken Rahab (with which the 'dragon' of the parallel line is

clearly synonymous) as a symbolic expression for Egypt. It has been pointed out (in note on xxvii. 1) that the phrase has a substratum in mythology. The great enemy of Jehovah on earth was described in expressions coined originally for the constantly recurring 'war in heaven' between the powers of light and darkness. In confirmation of this, see chap. xv. of the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* (Birch's transl. in Bunsen's *Egypt*, vol. vi.), where the sun-god Ra is addressed thus:

'Hail! thou who hast cut in pieces the Scorer and strangled the Apophis' (i.e., the evil serpent).

This suggests the possibility that in the passage before us the prophet alludes not only to the fate of the earthly but to that of the heavenly Rahab (see on xxvii. 1). The strife between light and darkness, sunshine and storm, is always recommencing; in mythic language the sky-dragon, though killed, returns to life.¹ The Hebrew is not opposed to such a reference; it may equally well be rendered 'that heweth,' 'that pierceth' (comp. on xliii. 16). The next verse, however, shows that if there was this reference, it lay quite in the background of the prophet's mind.²

¹¹ **And the freed ones . . .**] The verse occurs with one very slight variation in xxxv. 10. Here it is clearly not original. Either it is a quotation by the author, or an interpolation from the margin. It

¹ Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 299.

² Steinthal, in his essay on Samson, remarks, 'It is clear how the prophet's consciousness passed imperceptibly from the myth into the legend, or, if you prefer to call it so' [and doubtless the prophet at least would have preferred this], 'history.' (Martineau's translation, appended to Goldziher's *Mythology among the Hebrews*, p. 425.)

¹² I, even I, am your comforter: who art thou that thou fearest frail man that dieth, and the son of the earth-born who is given up as grass; ¹³ and hast forgotten Jehovah thy maker, who stretched out the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth, and hast been trembling continually all the day for the fury of the oppressor, according as he hath taken aim to destroy? and where is the fury of the oppressor? ¹⁴ He that was bent down is quickly released; he shall not die unto the pit, neither shall his bread fail, ¹⁵ seeing that I Jehovah am thy God, who stirreth up the sea, so that its waves roar, whose

seems to have been suggested by the closing word of *v.* 10 in the Hebrew, 'the released.' Such suggestions were more congenial to a copyist than to a prophet.

¹² **I, even I, am your comforter]**

This is not, I venture to think, the answer of Jehovah to the appeal in *v.* 9, but a fresh starting point in the prophecy. The fault which the Divine speaker reprehends is unbelief, whereas *vv.* 9, 10 shine by the brightness of their faith.—'Your comforter' alludes to *v.* 3. Jehovah first of all addresses Israel in the plural, as an aggregate of individuals (2 plur. masc.), then in the singular as a living organism (the fem. gender in *v.* 12*b* personifies Zion as a matron, the masc. in *v.* 13 indicates Israel as Jehovah's son).—**Who art thou . . .]** 'Why wilt thou pay more respect to the futile menaces of man than to the promises of thy God?' Jehovah chides this unbelief as disobedience, but with what tenderness 'das freundlichste Schelten der Liebe,' Stier)!—**Given up]** viz., into the hand of the mower, Death.

¹³ **Thy maker]** With reference to the nation, comp. xliii. 1.—**According as he hath taken aim . . .]** The Jews are always on the tenter-hooks of expectation. When the 'aiming' seems to fail, their spirits rise; when it promises to succeed, they fall; instead of which they ought simply to 'rest in Jehovah.'—**Where is the fury . . .]** Anticipating the sudden destruction

of Babylon. Hence in the next verse we have the perfect of prophetic certitude. It seems strange to read of the 'fury' of the Babylonians; see, however, on xlvi. 6.

¹⁴ **He that was bent down]** i.e., by the weight of his fetters, or by confinement in the stocks (Jer. xx. 2, xxix. 26). Comp. on xlii. 22.—**Unto the pit]** i.e., so as to be cast into the pit or grave.

¹⁵ **Who stirreth up . . . is Jehovah Sabáoth)** The same description is found in Jer. xxxi. 35.—Taking the opening words in connection with *v.* 9 and with Job xxvi. 12, 13 (see on Isa. xxvii. 1), it is tempting to suppose a primary reference to the upper ocean, the 'waters above the expanse,' which were the scene of the contest between Jehovah and the leviathan (or, sky-dragon). But the mention of the 'roaring' of the sea (which does not occur in Job *l.c.*) favours the ordinary view that it is the lower earthly ocean. Comp. Nah. i. 4, where this, among other signs of the theophany, is given, that 'he rebuketh the sea . . . and drieth up all the rivers.' The figure in lvii. 20 points in the same direction. The meaning will therefore be that He who raiseth storms, alike in the world of nature and of history, is able to still them, and that His friends have no cause to fear. The name 'Jehovah Sabáoth' enforces the same lesson. Israel's God has at his command all the forces, the potencies, the 'hosts,' of heaven and earth.

name is Jehovah Sabáoth.—¹⁶ And I put my words in thy mouth, and in the shadow of my hand I covered thee, to plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth, and to say unto Zion, Thou art my people.

¹⁷ Wake thee up, wake thee up, arise, O Jerusalem, who hast drunk at the hand of Jehovah the cup of his fury; the goblet-cup of reeling hast thou drunken and wrung out.

¹⁸ There was no guide for her of all the sons that she had borne, and none taking hold of her hand of all the sons that she had brought up. ¹⁹ Two are the things which befell thee: who is there to condole with thee? desolation and destruction, famine and the sword: ^e who is there to comfort thee?^e

^e So Böttcher (virtually), Lagarde (see crit. note).—In what guise (or, character) shall I comfort thee? Hebr. text (?).

¹⁶ **And I put my words . . .]** It is difficult to make out the connection here. The preceding verses are addressed to Zion or Israel, but this verse can hardly be so, on account of the closing words. Look at the passage by itself, however, and all the difficulty vanishes. 'I put my words in thy mouth' is precisely parallel to the speech of the Servant, 'he made my mouth as a sharp sword' (viz. by giving me his own self-realising words), and the next clause, 'in the shadow of my hand I covered thee,' is even verbally almost identical with the Servant's declaration, 'in the shadow of his hand he hid me' (xlix. 2). The Servant of Jehovah, then, must be the person addressed. The sudden change of object is no doubt surprising, and has to be accounted for. My conjecture is that the verse originally stood in some other context, and that the paragraph closed—very suitably, as it seems to me—with *v.* 15.—**To plant the heavens]** i.e., either 'that I may plant,' &c. (so Jerome, Ew., Del.), or 'that thou mayest plant' (Calv., Vit., Hengst., Naeg.). The analogy of xlix. 8^b favours the second alternative, which is also more suitable both to the preceding and to the following statement, 'I put my words into thy mouth . . . to say unto Zion, &c.' The 'heavens' and the 'earth' are the

new ones spoken of in lxxv. 17, lxxvi. 22; certainly not 'the Israelitish state' (as Ges., following Ibn Ezra). The production of this new world depends on the words of Jehovah committed to the Servant (comp. Jer. i. 9, 10).—For the use of the verb 'to plant,' comp. Dan. xi. 45. The figure is that of a tent with its stakes set firmly in the ground (comp. xl. 22).

¹⁷ **Wake thee up, wake thee up . . .]** The prophet, or the chorus of prophets (comp. on xl. 1), or of angelic 'remembrancers,' salutes Jerusalem with a cheering cry. In form it is parallel to the invocation in *v.* 9. With delicate thoughtfulness, the consolation is prefixed to the piteous description of Jerusalem's calamity ('Wake thee . . . hast drunken . . . hast drained').

—**The goblet-cup . . . wrung out]** The combination 'goblet-cup' is not a pleonasm; it vividly represents the fulness of the measure of Jerusalem's punishment (comp. xl. 2). 'Reeling' means the horror and bewilderment caused by a great catastrophe (comp. Ps. lx. 3, Zech. xii. 2). Note the cadence of the two closing words in the Hebrew. The whole passage finds a parallel in Ezek. xxiii. 32–34, comp. Ps. lxxxv. 8 (9).

¹⁸ Notice the elegiac rhythm in the Hebrew.

¹⁹ **Two are the things . . .]**

²⁰ Thy sons are in a swoon ; they lie at the corners of all the streets, like an antelope in a net, full as they are of the fury of Jehovah, the rebuke of thy God. ²¹ Therefore hear now this, thou afflicted one, and drunken, but not with wine, ²² Thus saith thy Lord Jehovah, and thy God who is the advocate of his people, Behold, I take out of thy hand the cup of reeling ; the goblet-cup of my fury, thou shalt not drink it again ; ²³ and I put it into the hand of those who tormented thee, who said to thy soul, Bow down, that we may pass over ; and thou madest thy back as the ground, and as the street for those that passed over.

i.e., two kinds of evils (comp. xlvii. 9), viz., desolation for the land, and death for the people. These are expanded into four, to express their depth of meaning ('and' = with—the Vāv of association, see crit. note on vii. 1.) Or, we may explain with Stier, 'desolation without, and breaking (so literally) within—hunger within, and the sword without' (comp. Ezek. vii. 15). The elegiac passage which follows should be compared with Lam. ii. 11-13, 19, 21 (see also Jer. xv. 5). Jerusalem is represented as a mother, its inhabitants as sons : comp. xlix. 17, l. 1.

²⁰ **Like an antelope in a net]** A noble though a tragic figure, Israel, the mountain-people, is likened to a gazelle, which all its swiftness and grace has not saved

from the hunter's snare. — **The fury of Jehovah]** What hope, when 'Jehovah thy God' is 'furious' against thee? Comp. Rev. vi. 16 'the wrath of the Lamb' (Dr. Weir).

²¹ **Therefore]** Here, as often elsewhere (e.g., x. 24, xxvii. 9, xxx. 18) the transition from threatening to promise is marked by 'therefore.' Jehovah cannot bear to see his people suffer any longer than is necessary; 'therefore' he will interpose to help them. **Drunken, but not with wine]** So xxix. 9. See crit. note.

²³ **Who said to thy soul . . .]** A figurative application of a real custom (Josh. x. 24). There is a similar but still stronger image in Ps. cxxix. 3, 'ploughed upon my back.'

CHAPTER LII.

Contents.—Jerusalem can and must be redeemed (*vv.* 1-6); a dramatic picture of the redemption itself (*vv.* 7-12).

(The chapter should have been ended at *v.* 12).

¹ Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion! put on thy robes of adornment, O Jerusalem, holy city! for no more

¹ **Awake, awake]** Another bracing summons from the Divine representatives (see on li. 17). The first was merely, Stand up; the second is, Put on thy strength

and thy robes.—**Thy strength]** Strength returns to Zion when the Arm of Jehovah is mighty within her (see li. 9).—**Thy robes of adornment]** i.e., those which be-

shall there come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean.

² Shake thyself from the dust ; arise and sit down, O Jerusalem :

^a loose thyself from the bonds of thy neck,^a O captive daughter

of Zion ! ³ For thus saith Jehovah, For nought were ye sold,

and not for money shall ye be redeemed. ⁴ For thus saith

the Lord, Jehovah, To Egypt my people went down at the first to sojourn there, and Assyria oppressed him without

^a So Hebr. marg. and most critics.—The bonds of thy neck are unloosed, Hebr. text, Targ., Kay, Næg. (This form of the text would have to be put in a parenthesis.)

long to the holy, priestly city. Dr. Kay aptly quotes the description of Aaron's robes, Ex. xxviii. 2.—**No more shall there come into thee . . .**] 'Then shall Jerusalem be holiness, and no strangers shall pass through her any more' (Joel iii. 17). 'Strangers' here = 'enemies,' those who do not acknowledge Jehovah for their king. The thronging of foreigners announced in chap. lx. is of quite a different kind.—Comp. xxxv. 8, Rev. xxi. 27.

² **Shake thyself . . . sit down**] A striking contrast to Babylon, xlvi. 1.

³ It might seem as if Jehovah willed the perpetual captivity of his people. Not so. They may complain that they have been 'sold.' Jehovah accepts the word, but so qualifies it as to give it quite a new meaning.—**For nought** (*gratis*, Vulg.) **were ye sold**] Jehovah has received no equivalent for his property. It is therefore not a sale, but only a temporary transfer. Jehovah has accepted no other nation as his treasure, his *peculium* (Ex. xix. 3), his Servant, his agent in his world-wide purposes of grace. Your successive captivities have been a lamentable interruption in the progress of his work. But at least they do not prevent him from receiving you back to your old place. He took nothing for you from your so-called 'buyers,' and of his own free will he can renew your covenant. Thus the passage is a further development of l. 1. The verbally parallel passage Ps. xlv. 12 has quite a different meaning (see Del. *ad loc.*).

⁴ **To Egypt my people . . .**]

This verse seems to give, though only allusively, a historical explanation of the general statement in v. 3. Israel went down to Egypt 'to sojourn there' by invitation, but the sacred right of hospitality was basely violated (we must supply this from the second half-verse).

—**Assyria oppressed him**] Alluding not merely to the payment of tribute (Hitz.), but to the captivities of Israel, and the desolating invasions (comp. chap. i. xxxvii. 30) of Judah by Sargon and Sennacherib. This seems the natural meaning ; the expressions used in v. 5 make it plain that a new captivity is there intended. Vitr., however, thinks 'Assyria' includes Babylonia and the Syro-Macedonian kingdom, referring for the former to 2 Kings xxiii. 29, and for the latter to Zech. x. 11 (?). The literal interpretation of 'Assyria,' he says, renders it impossible to explain the next verse, and destroys the coherence of the paragraph with the following context (see, however, on next verse). Dr. Weir, too, is of the same opinion, so far as Babylonia is concerned, on the ground that 'history mentions no deliverance from Assyria, which can be at all compared with the deliverance from Egypt.' This statement, however, comes into direct collision with the prophecy in x. 26 ; and even were it not so, the question is of oppressions rather than of deliverances. Besides, it is contrary to the custom of this prophecy to use the name 'Assyria' in the comprehensive way supposed by Dr. Weir.—

cause. ⁵ And now what have I (to do) here? is the oracle of Jehovah; for my people have been taken away for nought; those who rule over him howl (the oracle of Jehovah); and continually, all the day my name is reviled. ⁶ Therefore my people shall know my name: therefore (he shall know) in that day ^b that I am he that speaketh, 'Here am I.' ^b

^b For I, the same that promised, am here, Ges.

Without cause] Lit., 'for nothing.' This might mean 'without paying a price' (Knob., Naeg.), but the connection would be obscured.

⁵ **And now . . .**] The third great captivity was the Babylonian. Jehovah is represented, in anthropomorphic language, as enquiring what it was fitting for him, as the God of Israel, to do at Babylon; **here** implies that he had come down to see (as Gen. xviii. 21, Ex. iii. 8, Isa. xxxi. 4). The reply to his enquiry is involved in lii. 8, 12, 'Jehovah returneth,' 'Jehovah goeth before you.'—It is only fair to mention some divergent expositions of this important passage. 'What have I to do here?' might mean 'What sufficient cause is there for my remaining inactive in heaven?' So Hitzig, whom it is not fair to answer with a charge of paganizing (so Del.) in the face of Gen. xviii. 21, &c. It might also be taken in the same sense as *v.* 3. The Babylonians had paid no price to Jehovah for his people; of what is he the possessor 'here,' i.e., in *Jerusalem*, except a heap of stones and prowling wild beasts? So Naegelsbach. The same view of the meaning of 'here' is advocated by Himpel, who writes to this effect. ¹ 'The words, What have I here? cannot possibly refer to the Babylonian Exile. God could not be said to be present with the Jews in the Exile; the misery of their condition lay precisely in their sense of the Divine alienation. They refer rather to Jerusalem, which indeed forms the centre of the

description. God must return to Jerusalem, otherwise his gracious purposes would be frustrated, but in its present state He cannot do so; therefore Jerusalem must rise from its humiliation.'² True, these words cannot refer to the Exile, but they can refer, as remarked above, to a (symbolic) descent of Jehovah to judgment. Still the question might possibly bear Naeg.'s interpretation, if the continuation of the sentence were, 'for Zion is despoiled of her children'; but as the words stand, Jehovah must, I think, be supposed to be in the place whither (or, where) his people had been 'taken away,' i.e., in *Babylonia*.—**Taken away**] viz., as a booty (so constantly); or it may mean 'destroyed' (see on liii. 8).—**For nought**] i.e., undeservedly. The same word as in *v.* 3, but in a different sense.—**Howl**] i.e., triumph brutally (it is the oppressors who are spoken of—see Del.'s note).

⁶ **Therefore**] i.e., because my people is oppressed, and because my name is reviled.—**Shall know my name**] i.e., shall know by experience the meaning of my name Jehovah (comp. on xlii. 8). 'The allusion to the Egyptian deliverance is still kept up. Then God revealed Himself most gloriously as Jehovah (Ex. iii. 15, &c.); now He will again do so' (Dr. Weir).—**He that speaketh, Here am I**] i.e., He who answereth their cry by coming in person to help them. Dr. Weir compares lviii. 9, 'Then . . . thou shalt cry, and he shall say, Here I am.'

¹ *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1878, p. 309. Dr. Himpel is a member of the Roman Catholic Theological faculty at Tübingen.

² Though the idiom 'what have I,' 'what hast thou,' is elsewhere a formula of disapproval (Gesenius on xvii. 1). See especially xxii. 16.

⁷ How comely upon the mountains are the feet of the bringer of tidings, the proclaimer of peace, the bringer of good tidings, the proclaimer of salvation, who saith unto Zion, Thy God hath become king! ⁸ Hark, thy watchers! they lift up the voice; they ring out a cry together; for they behold eye to eye ^a the return of Jehovah to Zion. ^c ⁹ Burst out into

^c So Targ. ('bringeth back his Shekinah to Zion'), Kimchi, Hitz., Ew., Luzzatto, Kay, Naeg.—How Jehovah bringeth back Zion, Vulg., Pesh., Vitr., Ges., Stier, Del., Weir.

⁷ The prophet here passes into an ecstasy. What he sees with the inner eye, he expresses pictorially. He has told us already of the ideal Zion ascending a high mountain, and acting as herald of the Divine deliverer. Now he varies the picture. It is Zion to whom the herald is seen to come—bounding over the mountains 'like a roe or a young hart,' Cant. ii. 8, comp. 2 Sam. xviii. 24-27 Hebr. 'The feet already give a greeting of peace, before the mouth utters it' (Stier). The prophet's fondness for the mountains reminds us of Ezekiel's (see Ezek. vi. 1 and parallel passages).—**How comely . . . are the feet** of the messenger means 'how welcome is his arrival' (Lowth), or better still, 'his rapid approach' (Dr. Weir). Nahum, announcing the fall of Nineveh, has the same image in nearly the same words, 'Behold upon the mountains the feet of the bringer of tidings, the proclaimer of peace,' i. 15 (ii. 1 Hebr.). The one passage, or the other, is clearly an imitation. Comp. also Rom. x. 15, where the passage of Isaiah is applied dogmatically, and Eph. vi. 15, where it is alluded to with true poetic feeling.—**Who saith unto Zion . . .**] His tidings are that Zion's God has resumed the crown which he had laid aside (see on xxiv. 23).

⁸ **Hark, thy watchers!**] Because the prophets are sometimes called 'watchmen' (Ivi. 10), Jer. vi. 17, Ezek. iii. 17, xxxiii. 7), it has been supposed by Ges., Ew., Hitz., Knob., Del. that the prophets, i.e., those of the Exile (see on xl. 1), are

here referred to. But (1) this greatly 'mars the unity and beauty of the scene presented' (Alexander), and (2) the prophets in question were (as few but Seinecke will doubt) in Babylonia, and not in Palestine (Naeg.). The 'watchers' are ideal, supersensible beings, like those whose voice has been already repeatedly heard (see on xl. 3), and will shortly be again in lii. 11, 12; they are also referred to in lxii. 6, 7 as Jehovah's 'remembrancers.' So too the Zion who is addressed is not the ruined and deserted Jerusalem, but belongs to the ideal, supersensible world; it is the Zion whose walls are 'continually before' Jehovah (xliv. 16, comp. on xl. 9). Faith has brought down the new Jerusalem to earth—**Ring out a cry together**] i.e., lift up a 'long-toned cry,' like an Arab watchman of our day (Thomson).—**Eye to eye**] If Jehovah can be said to have 'eyes' (e.g. Zech. iv. 10, Prov. v. 21, xv. 3), why not the heavenly host? These friendly 'watchers' note every advance of the kingdom of God (comp. Luke xv. 10); they see it all 'eye to eye,' as a man looks into the eye of his friend—so near are the two worlds of sight and of faith. Comp. Num. xiv. 14, Ex. xxxiii. 11.—**The return of Jehovah to Zion**] This rend. is most favoured by the context, which speaks of the return of the exiles (vv. 11, 12), and not of Zion (see v. 1). Jehovah is the leader of the exile-band (v. 12); without Him, what profit would there be in a change of abode? It is the spiritual banishment of which II. Isaiah so pathetically complains. Comp. lxiii.

a ringing cry together, ye ruined places of Jerusalem ; for Jehovah hath comforted Zion, he hath redeemed Jerusalem. ¹⁰ Jehovah hath bared his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations ; and all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God. ¹¹ Away ! away ! go ye out thence, touch not an unclean thing ; go ye out of the midst of her ; purify yourselves, ye ^d armour-bearers of Jehovah ! ¹² For not in trembling haste shall ye go out, and not in flight shall ye proceed ; for there proceedeth before you Jehovah, and your rear-guard is the God of Israel.

^d So A. E., Kimchi, Luzzatto, Bunsen.—Most, That bear the vessels of.

17, 'Return, for thy servants' sake.' Alt. rend. is perfectly possible grammatically (comp. Ps. lxxxv. 5 Hebr.), but, with an eye to the context, seems to me only admissible if 'bringeth back Zion' be taken as shortened from 'bringeth back the prosperity of Zion' (see crit. note).

⁹ **Burst out . . .**] The Hebr. has two imperatives, 'a combination which occurs elsewhere only in Ps. xcvi. 4' (Alexander). Coincidences with Ps. xcvi. (see *vv.* 2, 3) are also found in the second half of *v.* 10; the author of that psalm must indeed have known II. Isaiah 'by heart.'

¹⁰ **Hath bared his holy arm**] viz., for action (comp. Ezek. iv. 7, Ps. lxxiv. 11); alluding to the sleeveless Eastern dress.

¹¹ **Away ! away ! . . .**] Almost the same language recurs in Lam. iv. 15, but the parallel is purely verbal—**Thence**] Because in this section (*vv.* 7-12) the prophet places himself in spirit at Jerusalem—**Purify yourselves . . .**] With a view to the re-establishment of the religion of Jehovah, the returning exiles must become legally 'pure' (comp. Ps. cx. 3, if the text there be correct), for which—see next verse—they will have ample time.

By a striking poetic figure they are called **armour-bearers of Jehovah**—this is the meaning which the Hebrew phrase *constantly* has. A 'man of war' (and Jehovah is represented as such in *v.* 12) could not support his dignity without an armour-bearer, and a king, upon solemn occasions, appears to have had a troop of armour-bearers (1 Kings xiv. 28). Much more must Jehovah unto whom, as a Psalmist tells us, the shields of the whole earth belong (Ps. xlvii. 10), have a multitude of armour-bearers. So elsewhere (lxvi. 15, note) He is said to have (many) chariots. Still, alt. rend. is perfectly tenable; 'vessels of Jehovah' may exceptionably be used for 'vessels of the house of Jehovah' (Ezra i. 7). The 'bearers' will then be the Levites.

¹² The Exodus from Babylon was to resemble the first Exodus only in its nobler circumstances. Jehovah was again to be the guide and protector of his people (Ex. xii. 51, xiii. 21, 22), but that **trembling haste** (Ex. xii. 11) in which the first Israelites departed was to be exchanged for a solemn deliberateness. The prophet thus modifies the earlier injunction, 'Flee ye from Chaldæa' (xlviii. 20).

CHAPTERS LII. 13—LIII.

WE have already seen (notes on xlii. 1-7, xlix. 1-9) that the author of II. Isaiah in his moments of highest inspiration conceived of the Servant

of Jehovah as an individual, and that he ascribes to Him a nature which is (to judge from His acts) at once human and superhuman, though he has, of course, given no hint of anything like a theory to account for this. But no passage which we have as yet met with is so strongly individualising¹ in its account of the Servant as the famous chapter on which we are about to enter. So deep is the impression which it produced on Ewald that he felt compelled to assign it in its original form to an age of persecution (he thought of the reign of Manasseh), and to suppose that it described the martyrdom² of one of the leading champions of true or theistic religion (comp. on lvii. 1). The hypothesis possesses a high degree of plausibility; it is recommended, not only by the peculiarity of the contents, but by the singular linguistic phenomena. The style of II. Isaiah is in general full and flowing; and the style of this chapter is 'hard, obscure, and awkward' (Delitzsch), and reminds us in this respect of another famous disputed passage, lvi. 9—lvii. 11 *a*, (which indeed Ewald ascribes to the same author). It is not within my present scope to discuss critical questions of this sort; the ordinary view which accepts the continuity of the composition is not to be too hastily rejected (comp. introduction to lvi. 9, &c.). The Servant of Jehovah, according to Bleek, is here described in essentially the same terms both with regard to his past and to his future, as in xlii. 1—7, xlix. 1—9. At any rate, it seems highly probable that chap. liii. existed in some form or other in the time of the author of the Book of Job, who apparently alludes to it (see below on *v*. 9).

The importance of this chapter justifies a somewhat fuller commentary than usual. The ideas are well fitted to arrest the attention, especially that of Vicarious Atonement, which some have laboured hard to expel from the prophecy, but which still forces itself on the unbiassed reader: of this I shall have to speak in a subsequent essay. The style is obscure, but is sometimes relieved by an exquisite elegiac cadence, faintly perceptible even in the poorest translation. To elegance my own version makes no pretence; only to fidelity. One word as to the tenses. We ought clearly to carry either the perfect or the future (the latter would express the ideality, the prophetic imaginativeness, of the point of view) throughout *vv*. 2—10 *a*. The inconsistent future of the Auth. Vers. in *v*. 2 comes from the Vulgate (though in *v*. 2 *b* this version has the perfect). The Septuagint mostly has aorists (presents twice in *v*. 4, twice in *v*. 7, once in *v*. 10). Both Sept. and Vulg. strangely give the future in *v*. 9.

The New Lectionary has familiarised many English readers with the fact that lii. 13—15 belongs together with chap. liii. The traditional arrangement is a 'divulsiō' (as Calvin well calls it), which leads the untutored reader astray. It separates the theme from its commentary, and

¹ I agree with Oehler (see my crit. notes on liii. 8, 9) that 'the supposed traces of a collective meaning disappear when they are correctly interpreted,' (*Old Testament Theology*, ii. 426).

² Saadya thought of Jeremiah, 'and this interpretation is attractive,' remarks Ibn Ezra, whose development of the comparison is worth reading (see Neubauer and Driver, *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah*, &c., pp. 43—44). Grotius (note on liii. 1) remarks, 'Hæ notæ in Ieremiam quidem congruunt priùs, sed potius sublimisque. sæpe et magis κατὰ λέξιν, in Christum.' Bunsen unreservedly adopts the same hypothesis in his *Bibelwerk*. But of what martyr, be he a Jeremiah or an Ignatius, could it be said that he was 'a guilt-offering' (liii. 10)?

above all prevents the student from getting the right point of view from which to examine the sequel (see below on *vv.* 13-16).

Of monographs on this chapter, six have a claim to be mentioned:—

Chr. Dav. Ant. Martini, *Commentatio philologico-critica in locum Jesaiæ*, lii. 13-13iii. 12; Rostochiæ, 1791.

Franz Delitzsch, 'Die Stellung der Weissagung Jes. lii. 13-13iii.' u.s.w. in *Zeitschr. für luth. Theologie*, 1850, pp. 29-42 (an able defence, since retracted, of the view that the subject of the chapter is the spiritual Israel).

Friedrich Bleek, 'Auslegung des Abschnittes Jes. lii. 13 ff.' in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1861, pp. 171-218.

Paul Kleinert, 'Ueber das Subject der Weissagung Jes. lii. 12-13iii. 12,' in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1862, pp. 699-752.

William Urwick, *The Servant of Jehovah. A Commentary, Grammatical and Critical, upon Isaiah lii. 13-13iii. 12.* Edinburgh, 1877.

The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters. Vol. I. Text. By Ad. Neubauer. Vol. II. Translations. By Ad. Neubauer and S. R. Driver. With an Introduction to the Translations, by E. B. Pusey, Regius Prof. of Hebrew. Oxford, 1877.

vv. 13-15. Jehovah delivers a short but comprehensive oracle on the wonderful course of his Servant. The predominant idea is that of his complete success in his mission, arising from that 'calm, deep wisdom' which willingly accepted the vast but inevitable sufferings which lay on his road to glory. A prospect is held out at the close of the admission of the Gentiles to a share in his mediatorial gains.

¹³ Behold, my servant shall ^a deal wisely ^a; he shall be high and exalted, and lofty exceedingly. ¹⁴ According as

^a Prosper, Targ., Lowth, Vit., Ges., Hitz.

¹³ **Shall deal wisely**] We might add 'and prosperously,' for this idea is connoted; in Josh. i. 8, Jer. x. 21, it even predominates over the original idea of wisdom. Ewald, not amiss, 'wird geschick haben.' The rend. 'shall prosper' is, however, a mistake; the Divine wisdom of the Servant is the source of his world-conquering faith, and the secret of his success (comp. *v.* 11 *b*, and note the connection between xlii. 1 *b* and 4). The same verb is applied to the 'righteous Branch' (i.e., probably, the Messiah) in Jer. xxiii. 5. We cannot, however, infer from this the identity of the two personages. The description 'he shall deal wisely' belongs to any who are endued with the Divine Spirit for practical

ends.—**He shall be high . . .**] Notice the accumulation of kindred verbs. No single expression seemed strong enough, for Jehovah had decreed to 'super-exalt' him (Phil. ii. 9). This suggests another parallel with the Messiah, of whom Jehovah says, 'I also will make him Firstborn, supreme above the kings of the earth' (Ps. lxxxix. 27, Weir). The first and second verbs occur in combination again in ii. 12, 13, vi. 1, lvii. 15; the second and third in lvii. 7 (all passages relating to God or to worship).

^{14, 15} The exaltation of the Servant is proportionate to his humiliation.—**Were appalled**] The word expresses a stupefied surprise, as of one who beholds a strange reverse of fortune (1 Kings ix. 8,

many were appalled at thee, (so disfigured was his visage from that of a man, and his form from that of the sons of men,) ¹⁵ ^b so shall he ✕ many nations ^b; kings shall shut their mouths because of him; for that which had not been told

^b So shall many nations marvel (exult, Ges.; start up, Ew.) at him, Sept.—Aquila and Theodotion, Vulg., A. E., Calv., Vitruv., Hengst., Kay, Pusey, Weir, render the doubtful verb, 'sprinkle'; Pesh., 'purify'; Symmachus, 'fling away'; Targ., Saadya, Rashi, 'scatter'; Hitz., Del., Naeg., 'make to start up.'

Lev. xxvi. 32). Here, however, as the following parenthesis shows, the comparison of the spectators is not between what the Servant was and what he is, but between the ordinary aspect of a man and the degraded appearance of the Servant. Who the spectators are, will be seen from liii. 1-4.—**So disfigured . . .**] The phrase is a compound one. 'To such a degree was his appearance disfigured; it was in fact removed thereby from being that of a man, and his form from being that of the sons of men.' The parenthesis contains a remark of the prophet's; hence the change of person (comp. xlii. 20), which continues naturally, though illogically, in the next verse. For striking parallels see l. 6, Ps. xxii. 6 a, Job ii. 12 (Job being a type of the righteous sufferer).

¹⁵ **So shall he ✕ many nations**] A most difficult passage. The received text has 'So shall he sprinkle, &c.' which, with due regard to Hebrew usage, can only have the meaning which is thus expressed by a Rabbi¹ '(So shall he) expel and scatter them from his land, like a man sprinkling water, without one drop touching another.' But a reference to the dispossessing of the Gentiles by the Israelites (comp. perhaps liv. 3) is not at all in harmony with the context. I see no resource left but to alter the text, which is at any rate sounder policy than to impose unphilological meanings on the traditional

reading. Two courses are open to us: to supply words which may have fallen out, or to emend the untranslatable verb. If after 'sprinkle' and before 'many nations' we might insert the words 'pure water upon,' or 'his blood upon' (alluding to the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering—see on liii. 10), we should obtain a really fine sense, viz., either that the Servant of Jehovah by a sacerdotal act of purification (Pesh. even renders the text 'he shall purify') should remove the distinction between the true Israel and the Gentiles (comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 25), or else that he should, by the offering of himself, make atonement for the sins of 'many nations.' (Compare Jerome, below.²) The context, however, is decidedly against this view of the sense; for it contains nothing to suggest that the Servant is invested with sacerdotal functions. If the text must be altered, it is more natural to suppose that the verb between 'so' and 'many nations' became partly obliterated, and was then (as such half-effaced words often were) misread and miscopied. It seems clear to me that we require a word (such as *yattēr*) expressing the shock of joyful surprise with which the nations shall greet the turn in the Servant's fortunes, as an antithesis to the shock of horror in v. 14. (See further crit. note.)—**Kings shall shut their mouths . . .**] in reverential acknowledgment of his superior

¹ R. Y'sha'yah ben Mali, translated in *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters*, by Neubauer and Driver, vol. ii. p. 75. Similarly R. Yoseph Qara (p. 41), the older Nizzakhon (p. 90), and R. Mosheh Kohen (p. 105).

² Jerome: 'ipse asperget gentes multas, mundans eas sanguine suo, et in baptisinate Dei consecrans servituti.'

them shall they see, and that which they had not heard shall they perceive.

dignity (see Job xxix. 9, xl. 4).
Parallel passage, xlix. 7.—**That**
which had not been told them

. . .] i.e., events such as it had
never entered the heart of man to
conceive, much less to talk about.

(CHAPTER LIII.)

Iv. 1-3. The expansion of the preceding sketch begins. 'The commentary upon "they were appalled" is given in *v.* 1: a large portion of the Jews do not believe in the salvation which has appeared. The enlargement of "so disfigured" &c., is given in *vv.* 2, 3. The cause of the unbelief is, that the glory of the Servant of God is concealed behind humiliation, misery, and shame' (Hengstenberg). The paragraph has this peculiarity that in each verse one word of the first half is repeated in the second 'who'—'and not'—'despised').

¹ Who believed ° that which we heard °? and the Arm of

° Our preaching, Luther, Del.—Our prophecy, Ew.—Most, Our tidings; or, Our message.

¹ **Who believed]** Before completing his portrait-sketch of the Servant, the prophet expresses his painful sense of the incredulity with which his revelation will be received. He does not, however, say, 'Quis credet auditui nostro?' as Calvin represents him, but 'Quis creditit?' He takes his stand among the Israelites of a later age (not among the Gentiles, as Rosenmüller, following the Rabbis), and hears their penitent musings on the national rejection of the prophecies respecting the Servant, all of which were in course of coming true. The Gentiles believed as soon as they had heard (lii. 15): Israel had heard the voice of prophecy, but 'who believed?' Hitzig, indeed, objects that on this view of the passage we should expect, not 'Who believed,' but 'Which of us believed,' but the reference is clear enough from the pronoun in 'that which we heard.' He would explain the clause, 'Who, whether Jew or Gentile, believed that which we, the prophets, heard

(and announced) from God?' Nothing, however, has been said about the prophets in the context, and this explanation compels us to ascribe a different meaning to the pronoun 'we' in successive verses. On the other hand, the view adopted suits the context, and is favoured by the analogy of xlii. 24, lxiv. 5, both passages embodying the confessions of the people. The 'we,' as I understand it, is dramatic.—The confession, involves, of course, an unconscious exaggeration (comp. Ps. xiv. 3, quoted by Hengst.). St. Paul well interprets, 'Not all hearkened to the good tidings' (Rom. x. 16), '*mitissima interpretatio, menti prophetae conformis*' (Vitr.). —**That which we heard]** Lit., 'our hearsay,' or 'our tidings.' The noun is occasionally used technically for a prophetic revelation (xxviii. 9, 19, Ob. *v.* 1, Jer. xlix. 14); we might therefore render 'our revelation,' i.e., either, 'the revelation communicated to us by the prophet,' or 'the revelation respecting us, the Israelites' (comp. xxiii. 5,

Jehovah, unto whom did it become manifest? ² For he grew up ^d before us ^d as a sapling, and as a root out of a parched ground; he had no form nor majesty, ^e and if we looked at him, there was ^e no sightliness that we should delight in him.

^d So Ew.—Before him, Hebr. text.

* That we should look at him, and . . . Symmachus, Iowth, Vit., Ges., Hitz., Fw.

2 Sam. iv. 4). In either case the speakers refer to the prophecies relating to the Servant. [The other possible explanation, 'that which we, the prophets heard,' has been rejected above. It has been adopted, indeed, by Calv., Vit., Ges., Stier, Urwick, but not by Hengst., Ew., Del., Naeg.].—**The Arm of Jehovah**] For a commentary, see lii. 10 (and comp. note on xl. 10).—**Unto whom**] Lit., 'over whom.' The 'Arm' must be 'made bare' in heaven (comp. xxxiv. 5), and only a few have eyes to see such supramundane sights, when nothing on earth seems to suggest them.

² The explanation of this unbelief.—**For he grew up . . .**] Lit., And . . . ('and' is here, as often, explanatory). The tense is the perfect of prophetic certitude; all has been finished 'before the foundation of the world' in the Divine counsels. The metaphors of *v.* 2 are often explained of the pious kernel of the Jewish nation, called 'the poor' and 'the needy' in the Book of Psalms (e.g., xxxvii. 14), and it is clear enough from II. Isaiah (whatever be its date), that the faithful were reduced to great straits among their unbelieving neighbours. Still the prophecy as a whole is far from favourable to this view—it refers not to the type (the pious kernel of the nation), but to the antitype (the personal Servant).—**Before us**] 'We had the evidence of our senses to justify our contempt of his person.' The traditional reading does not at all suit the context. In *vv.* 2, 3 we have a picture of the unfavourable impression made by the appearance of the Servant upon his contemporaries. The suggestion of a contrast between Jehovah's constant

good pleasure in His representative and the people's misapprehension of him produces a strangely inconsistent feature in the picture, and the more so if we understand 'before him' in the sense which the phrase usually has elsewhere (see Gen. xvii. 18, Hos. vi. 2, Jer. xxx. 20), viz., 'under the fostering and prospering care of Jehovah.' In fact, we have only to paraphrase the sentence to see how impossible it is—'he grew up in contempt under the fostering care of Jehovah.' Feeling this more or less distinctly, Lowth, Henderson, Alexander, and Hahn explain 'him' in the received reading, of the Jewish people collectively. This, however, is extremely harsh.—**As a sapling**] For the implied figure, comp. Ps. lxxx. 8, 14, 16, 'Thou didst bring a vine out of Egypt . . . Behold and visit this vine . . . It is burned with fire, it is cut down.' But from the root or stock of this outraged vine (the people), a slender, unattractive plant grew up.—**A root**] i.e., a sprout from the root, as xi. 10. Those who understand the Servant to be the Jewish nation compare xxvii. 6, 'Hereafter Jacob shall take root; Israel shall blossom and bud.' The same metaphor is used of the Messiah in chap. xi., but we must not be too hasty in our deductions from this coincidence.—**No form nor majesty**] None of that winning grace or imposing majesty which we should have expected in a representative of Jehovah. The context implies that the Servant made claims which his contemporaries rejected.—**And if we looked at him**] 'If we vouchsafed him a glance, our eye found nothing to tempt us to cultivate his society.' For the rend. 'looked at

³ Despised, and ¹ deserted of men, ¹ a man of pains and familiar with sickness! and ⁶ as one from whom there is a hiding of the face ⁶! despised, and we regarded him not! ⁴ But surely

¹ Ceasing to be of men, Symmachus, Vulg., A. E., Kay, Naeg.

⁶ As one that hid his face from us, Sept., Vulg., Rashi, Lowth, Hengst.

him, Dr. Weir well compares Prov. xxiii. 31. (Against alt. rend., consider (1) the word-play in the Hebr. in *nir'ehū* and *mar'eh*, as if 'when we sighted him, there was no sightliness,' and (2) the apt remark of Hengstenberg, 'How could they have such views of the condition of the Servant of God, if they overlooked him?')

³ A series of short clauses in the style of exclamations. **Despised**] See on xlix. 7.—**Deserted of men**] More literally, 'one from whom men held themselves aloof. The Book of Job (a fund of parallels for II. Isaiah) supplies us with the best justification of this rendering. Job, who partly represents the same conception as the Servant, mentions this as the crown of his troubles, 'My intimates hold themselves aloof' (Job xix. 14; the verbal root is the same). See crit. note.—Obs. Job's troubles are given as those of a historical person; the presumption is that the similar sufferings of the Servant are described with the same intention.—**A man of pains**] i.e., a man of many pains (comp. 'a man of reproofs,' i.e., 'one often reproved,' Prov. xxix. 1). Auth. Vers. has, 'a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,' for which comp. Ex. iii. 7 'For I know their sorrows' (lit. pains), Eccles. vi. 2 'this is vanity and a sore grief,' lit. sickness). But it seems better here to keep the literal rendering, on account of the next verse (and so, too, in Lam. i.

13, where Jerusalem exclaims, 'Consider and see if there be pain like my pain'). Our translators were probably influenced by Jewish objections to the received Christian application, such as those of Abarbanel (see Neubauer and Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 159, 160). 'Sickness,' no doubt, includes 'sorrow,' but it means something more, viz., the punishment of sin, just as outward as well as inward sufferings are implied in Ps. xxxviii. 3-7.—**Familiar with sickness**] Here, again, the Book of Job and a psalm of cognate purport supply our best commentary: 'Lover and friend hast thou put far from me; mine acquaintance—(they are) darkness,' Ps. lxxxviii. 18: comp. Job xvii. 14.—**As one from whom there is a hiding of the face**] Men avoided him with as much disgust as if he had a disease like the leprosy. Comp. Job's complaint, 'They abhor me, they flee far from me,' Job xxx. 10 (see also xix. 13-19); and the lamentation of the Jewish exiles, 'Men cried unto them, Go aside! unclean! go aside! go aside!' (Lam. iv. 15); also the parallel from Wisdom, in *Last Words* (on lii. 13, &c.) Against alt. rend., besides the philological objection urged by Del., consider that it directly contradicts a passage in the parallel description of the Servant's sufferings (l. 6 b).—**Despised**] A pathetic repetition in the manner of Isaiah (Delitzsch, *Isaiah*, ii. 134). Comp. v. 7.

vv. 4-6. 'The second subdivision furnishes us with the key to the sufferings of the Servant of God described previously, by pointing to their vicarious character' (Hengstenberg). Note the significant emphasis on the pronouns 'he' and 'we,' and the elegiac rhythm in the Hebrew.

⁴ **But surely**] Hebr., 'ākēn; at once affirmative and adversative (see xlix. 4).—**Our sicknesses he bore**] (The meaning of 'sick-

our sicknesses *he* bore, and as for our pains, he carried them, and *we* regarded him as stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

⁵ But *he* was pierced because of our rebellions, crushed be-

nesses' has been explained above, on 'a man of pains.') The meaning is, first of all, that the consequences of the sins of his people fell upon him the innocent (comp. Lam. v. 7, 'Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne (*sābhal*) their iniquities'); but next and chiefly, that he bore his undeserved sufferings as a sacrifice on behalf of his people (see *v.* 5 *b* 'the punishment which was for our welfare'; *v.* 10 *b*, 'if he were to lay down his soul as an offering for guilt'; *v.* 12 *b*, 'and for the rebellious made intercession') The pronoun 'he' is expressed not merely to point the contrast between the Servant's deserts and his fate, but to draw attention to his person, as in the cases of Jehovah (xli. 4) and 'Branch' (Zech. vi. 13).—This is the first of twelve distinct assertions in this one chapter of the vicarious character of the sufferings of the Servant. The verb (*nāsā*) may also be rendered 'he took away' (as Mic. ii. 2), and Del. thinks this meaning is included here, but the parallel verb (*sābhal*), which is quite unambiguous, is against this view. That the primary meaning is 'he took up, bore,' Del. himself admits, the verb *nāsā* (but not the verb *sābhal*) being a technical term in the Law for bearing the penalty of sin. There is apparently an allusion to this passage in John i. 29, where *ὁ αἰῶν* should probably be rendered 'that taketh up (and expiath) the sin of the world.'¹

—**Stricken, smitten of God**]

The phrases evidently allude to the disease of leprosy, which was called pre-eminently a 'stroke' (Auth. Vers. 'plague,' e.g., Lev. xiii. 3, 9, 20), and regarded as a punishment for grievous sin (Num. xii. 9, 10, 2 Kings xv. 5). An Arabic phrase for a leper is *mukātal-ullah* 'antagonist

of Allah.' (See Wetzstein's note in Delitzsch's *Job*, E. T., i. 347.) Here we are again reminded of the typical sufferer Job; only the account of Job's leprosy is meant to be taken literally, whereas here leprosy is a figure for the sufferings entailed by sin. In Ps. li. 7, leprosy is a type of sin itself.—**Of God**] belongs logically to all three participles.

⁵ **But he . . .**] In emphatic contrast to 'and we' in *v.* 4, which again is the antithesis to 'he' in 'he bare':—a regular chain of contrasts.—**Pierced . . . crushed**] Both words are passive participles, and imply that the sufferings voluntarily undergone by the Servant ended in death. Literal wounds are not necessarily referred to. The same verbs are used by psalmists in quite a general sense: Ps. lxi. 27 (26), xciv. 5, comp. also Isa. i. 5. The meaning of the statement, 'He was pierced . . . for our transgressions,' is perfectly clear if the Servant is a person who devoted his life 'for the many.' If, however, he be only a personification of the pious kernel of the people of Israel, we must make the rather far-fetched supposition that the violent deaths of some individuals were imputed, as it were, to the whole of the believing community, and that they operated towards the conversion of the rest of the nation. Whilst, if 'the Servant' be interpreted to mean the whole of the people of Israel, no rational explanation of this passage seems possible (see Don Isaac Abarbanel's comment in Neubauer and Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 177).—**The punishment**] Alt. rend. is decidedly to be rejected, for though Hebrew cannot distinguish clearly between *τιμωρία* and *κόλασις* (Arist. *Rhet.*, i. 10), the notion of punish-

¹ I am glad to notice that Bishop Lightfoot has given his high authority to this view (*On Revision*, &c., pp. 141-2).

cause of our iniquities; the ^hpunishment of our peace was upon him, and through his stripes *we* have been healed. ⁶All we like a flock did go astray, we turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah made to light upon him the iniquity of us all.

^h So Vittr., Hitz., Hävernicks, Del., Naeg. (note).—Most, chastisement; Vulg., disciplina.

ment is the primary one in this word (*mūsār*); in its synonym (*toká-khath*) it is only secondary.—**Of our peace**] i.e., which led to our 'peace' (or welfare); comp. 'the reproof of life,' i.e., tending to life (Prov. xv. 31, Del.).—**We have been healed**] Jerome: 'suo vulnera vulnera nostra curavit.' Vitringa: 'venustissimum ὀξύμωρον.'

⁶ **All we . . .**] Consequently 'the Servant' can hardly be a mere personification either of the whole people of Israel, or of its pious kernel, or even of the body of prophets.—**Did go astray**] The figure is used by Ezekiel of the Babylonian Exile (chap. xxxiv.), but here (as in Ps. cxix. 176) it is the wilderness of sin into which the whole nation has 'strayed.'—**Made to light upon him . . .**]

Symmachus: *καταντῆσαι ἐποίησεν*. As the avenger of blood pursues the murderer, so punishment by an inner necessity overtakes the sinner (Ps. xl. 12, Num. xxxii. 23, comp. Deut. xxvii. 15); and inasmuch as the Servant, by Jehovah's will, has made himself the substitute of the Jewish nation, it follows that the punishment of the latter must fall upon him. We have no right, with Mr. Urwick (p. 191), to find a reference to the imposition of hands on the Sin-offering.—**The iniquity**] Observe the singular; it is the collective iniquity of the people. We might also render the 'punishment,' since the Hebr. *ʿavōn* includes both sin and punishment (see Lam. iv. 6, Zech. xiv. 19).

vv. 7-9. The cruel treatment of the Servant, and his patient endurance of it, form the contrast of this paragraph. Meantime his persecutors 'know not what they do.' Comp. the striking parallel in l. 5-9, which is like a prelude of our prophecy.—Obs., *v. 7* and *v. 9* each close with the words 'and not . . . in his mouth'; it is a mark of artistic composition.

⁷ He was treated rigorously, but *he* let himself be humbled, and opened not his mouth; as the sheep that is led to the

⁷ **Treated rigorously**] Treated as slave-drivers (Ex. iii. 7, Job iii. 18), or petulant upstarts (iii. 12), or hypocritical religionists (lviii. 3), treat those who have the misfortune to be under them.—**Let himself be humbled**] i.e., suffered willingly; see crit. note.—**And opened not his mouth**] So in two psalms of cognate purport it is said of one who, like the Servant, sums up and yet transcends the finest qualities of Israel's charac-

ter, '(I was) as a dumb man that openeth not his mouth' (Ps. xxxviii. 14), 'I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it' (Ps. xxxix. 9).—**As the sheep**] 'But I was like a tame lamb (*agnus mansuetus*, Vulg.) that is led to the slaughter.' So Jeremiah speaks of himself (xi. 19), though he adds (which militates against Saadya's and Bunsen's view that *he* is the subject of Isa. liii.), 'and I knew not that they had devised devices against me.' There

slaughter, and as an ewe that before her shearers is dumb; and opened not his mouth. ⁸¹ Through oppression and through a judgment he was taken away, and ^k as for his generation who considered that ^k 'he was cut off out of the land of

¹ Out of, Vitr., Ges. (in his note, but not his translation), Ew., Hengst., Del. Naeg.

^k So substantially Ges., Ew., Del.—Who considereth his life-time, Calv., Vitr., Kay, Weir; or, his dwelling, Knob.—Who can think out his generation, Hengst., Seinecke, Riehm, Naeg.

is nothing to indicate an allusion to the paschal lamb (a premature introduction of the typical point of view).—Delitzsch remarks that 'everything that is said of the Lamb of God in the New Testament has its origin in this prophecy.'—**And opened not . . .**] Repetition, as in *v.* 3.

⁸ A continuation of the description of the Servant's sufferings. He drank his cup to the dregs. No ignominy was spared. The forms of justice were indeed observed, but the judgment or sentence was really an act of oppression.—**Through oppression and through a judgment**] i.e., through a judgment accompanied with oppression, through an oppressive judgment (the *Vāv* is that of association). So Job iv. 16 'stillness and a voice' = a still voice, Jer. xxix. 11 'a future and a hope' = a hopeful future.—'Through' (as in *v.* 5), not 'out of,' which fails to emphasize the sufferings sufficiently. 'Oppression,' lit., 'restraint'—the shutting up of the forces of life. The same Hebr. word occurs again in Ps. cvii. 39, 'And they were diminished and bowed down through the oppression of calamity and (through) misery.' 'Judgment' = sentence, as in 'judgment of death,' Deut. xxi. 22.—**He was taken away**] i.e., by a violent death; parallel to 'cut off' in the second half-verse. Comp. 'If the sword come, and take him away' (Ezek. xxxiii. 4). Or, 'taken away' might mean 'released' (Jerome, Rashi, A. E., Kimchi, Calv., Vitr., Stier, Hengst., Ges. (Commentary, but not The-saurus). But in many of these

cases the rendering seems dictated by a preconceived notion respecting 'the Servant.'—**And as for his generation . . .**] A difficult passage. First, with regard to the concluding words, To whom does the pronoun in 'my people' refer? The same pronoun occurs thrice again in this prophecy, viz., lii. 13, liii. 11, 12. In these verses the speaker is clearly Jehovah. They contain respectively the promise which strengthens the Servant for his trying mission (lii. 13), and the promise which rewards its successful accomplishment (liii. 11, 12). The intermediate portion is the soliloquy either of the people, or of some individual Israelite, whether the prophet or another. Which of these is the speaker in *v.* 8? According to some (e.g., Knob. and Naeg.) the prophet; according to Del., any one of the contemporaries of the Servant. The latter view seems preferable. The absoluteness of the self-condemnation of the Israelites is confirmed by the statement that not one of the Servant's generation 'meditated' on the truth that that Divine envoy's thread of life was cut short, and that the 'stroke' of God came upon him, for the sins of 'my people' (i.e., of the people to which the supposed speaker belongs). The same frivolous inconsiderateness is pointed to in a subsequent chapter (lvii. 1 *b*, see note) as marking the height which the national depravity had reached. In each case, it is noticed with surprise that, in looking back upon the career of the early deceased righteous, men did not perceive the lesson of these

the living, for the rebellion of my people ¹ *he* was stricken ?' ⁹ And one appointed his grave with the ungodly, and with the

¹ They were stricken, (virtually) Targ., Ges., Hitz., Knob.—(And) for the stroke due unto them, Ew., Kleinert.—To whom a stroke was due, Martini, Hengst.

premature removals. The lesson, it is true, is different; here it is this—that such a visitation (the awfulness of which the Servant's contemporaries do not underrate, as they call it 'a stroke' from Jehovah's hand) cannot have been caused by the sins of the Servant himself, but must have had a mystic reference to the wickedness of the people. It is one result of the general inconsiderateness that, as the next verse tells us, the grave of this benefactor of Israel was assigned among the most profligate of men. (For the rend. 'generation,' compare, with Del., Jer. ii. 31, 'O (men of) this generation! observe ye the word of Jehovah.') The latest explanation—'Who can think out and declare the nature and sort of his posterity?'—is supported (Naeg.) by Ps. xxii. 30 (31), 'A seed (=posterity) shall serve him, it shall be recounted of the Lord to the (next) generation,' also by a similar passage in Ps. lxxi. 18, and by Lev. xxiii. 21, 'throughout your (successive) generations.' Obs. however, that in the Psalm-passages there is no pronoun prefixed to 'generation,' and in Leviticus the word is in the plural. See further crit. note.—**For the rebellion of my people**] The people, then, is distinct from the suffering Servant. The only way to avoid this inference is to read 'peoples' for 'my people' (comp. on xlix. 1), with Luzzatto, and render 'for the rebellion of the peoples (to whom the stroke was due).' Four places, it is true, are mentioned in the Massora in which the proposed substitution is possible, but this passage is not one of them.—**He was stricken**] Of the alternative renderings, that of Ges. is grammatically the easiest, but it is against the context. It may be said, indeed, that the prophet forgets himself for once, and

writes as if the Servant were merely an aggregate of individuals, but this is not very plausible. Throughout this chapter the individuality of the sufferer is rigidly adhered to; is it likely that there should be one exception to the rule? (See crit. note.)

⁹ **And one appointed his grave . . .**] i.e., 'and his grave was appointed' (see Del.'s note). Even 'after his death' (for these words qualify both members of the first half-verse) the people pursued its benefactor with insults (comp. Jer. xxvi. 23). He was buried, not with his family, but with the open deniers of God, and with the rich. Why 'with the rich'? Dr. Weir points out in reply, that the verse consists of four clauses, of which the first and third correspond, and the second and fourth. It might be read thus, 'And they assigned him his grave with the wicked | though he had done no violence | And with the rich in his death | though there was no guile in his mouth. ||' He concludes, therefore, that by 'the rich' we are to understand 'those who acquired wealth by guile and other unlawful means,' and reminds us that 'the poor' and 'the humble' not unfrequently in the Psalms stand for 'the righteous' and 'the upright.'—This, in fact, seems to have become the traditional interpretation of the verse, it being assumed that, according to the experience of the Old Testament writers, riches and wickedness, poverty and piety, most commonly went together. But the interpretation is not, perhaps, quite satisfactory. The use of 'the poor' synonymously with 'the righteous' is no doubt established by passages like Ps. xiv. 5, 6, cxl. 12, 13. But no such passages can, I think, be adduced to prove the synonymy of riches and wickedness. In Job xxvii. 13-19, the description of the

"rich" after his death," although he had done no injustice, and there was no deceit in his mouth. ¹⁰ But it pleased Jehovah to

^m Oppressor, Ew. (a slight emendation), Rodwell.

ⁿ His grave-mound (lit., 'his mounds'), 3 Hebr. MSS., Zwingli, Lowth, Martini, Ges. (both in Thesaurus and in Transl. of Isaiah), Ew., Böttcher, Rodwell. (A. E. also mentions the rendering, which only involves an alteration of a vowel-point).

wicked man (as such) which is clearly misplaced in our present text) has a special reference to Job's case; and the parallelism of 'the noble' and 'the wicked' in Job xxi. 28 has no doubt a similar ground. The difficulty may, it is true, be removed by supposing that 'the rich' here referred to are the Babylonians among whom the personified people of Israel dwelt during the Exile. 'By the rich,' says Yefeth ben 'Ali the Karaite, 'are meant the powerful men among the Gentiles who are rich, while Israel in exile is spoken of as poor and needy' (Neubauer and Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 27). But, on the hypothesis adopted above, this account of the Servant has reference to his treatment by his own people, and not by the Gentiles, who, indeed, as lii. 15 shows, were ignorant of him until his exaltation. I see no alternative, but either (with Ewald) to suppose a corruption in the text, or to conclude that the prophet had been led to form a more ascetic view of life (if the phrase may be used) than the other Old Testament writers, a view reminding us of one or two passages which have as peculiar a note in the sayings of Christ; see Luke vi. 24, Matt. xix. 23. (Knobel thinks there is an implied contrast between the

rich Babylonians and the poor Jewish exiles; Ibn Ezra had preceded him in this suggestion. This implies the theory that the Servant = the pious kernel of the Jewish people, which cannot hold in face of v. 6; besides, were the Jewish exiles literally *poor*? Gesenius points out that there is an assonance in *rāshā'*, ungodly, and *'āshir*, rich. This does not explain the difficulty, but is at any rate against Ewald's emendation.)—**After his death**] lit., 'in his deaths.' Comp., with Hengst., Lev. xi. 31, 1 Kings xiii. 31. The plural 'deaths' is commonly supposed to be intensive = a violent death, or to express the state of death, as 'lives' for 'the state of life.' This, however, is, to say the least, doubtful. On the reading, see crit. note.—**Although he had done no injustice**] So Job xvi. 17, 'Although there is no injustice in my hands'; Job vi. 30 (comp. xxvii. 4), 'Is there iniquity in my tongue?' It is of some slight importance for ascertaining the date of Isa. liii. that Job xvi. 17 contains (probably) an allusion to this passage, and consequently that it was written later:— at any rate the words in Isa. liii. 9 flow more easily and naturally than in Job xvi. 17.

vv. 10-12. The Divine purpose in permitting these sufferings of the innocent Servant, and the Divine decree concerning his recompense.—The three verses of this paragraph are very skilfully connected. First, each of them has the word 'his soul' in the first half-verse. Next, *vv.* 10 and 11 have each of them the word 'he shall see' immediately after 'his soul.' Finally, both *v.* 11 and *v.* 12 enforce the limitation implied in 'the many.' There is a further connection both in contents and in phraseology between this and the second paragraph, which the student can work out for himself.

¹⁰ **It pleased Jehovah . . .**] This was the thought with which

the second paragraph closed. It was no mere accident, but the de

crush him—° he dealt grievously °: P if he were to lay down his soul P as an offering for guilt, he would see a seed, he

° So Bleek. Hofmann.—Most, He made (him) sick; or, To make (him) sick.

° So Vulg., Ew. (changing one letter).—Thou (O Jehovah!) wert, &c., Auth. Vers., De Dieu, Hitz. (substantially), Hofmann, Naeg., Weir.—Most, His soul were to make an offering for guilt. (The verb in received text may be either 2 masc. or 3 fem.)

liberate will of God that the Servant should suffer innocently. (Comp. Ps. xxii. 15 b, 'Thou placest me in the dust of death.')

The deepest wisdom underlay this apparent contradiction. 'If he were thus to suffer for the guilty, he would become the author of a new and better race.' v. 10 is not a continuation of the soliloquy of the people, but a reflection of the prophet's. See *Last Words*, at end of this vol.—**If he were to lay down his soul . . .**] (The phrase parallel to *τιθέναι τὴν ψυχὴν*, John x. 11.) The passage cannot merely mean that Jehovah would spare the people of Israel for the sake of its few pious members (though this is in itself an unobjectionable idea; comp. Gen. xviii. 24, Jer. v. 1, Ezek. xxii. 30). The Servant is a person, not a personification of the pious kernel of Israel. His sufferings are vicarious and voluntary. Hence he who offers the Servant's 'soul,' or 'life,' as a sacrifice, must be the Servant himself, and not Jehovah, as the common reading (see note^a) implies. Jehovah sends the Servant, and the Servant joyfully accepts the mission. He smites, and the Servant bends willingly to the blow, 'pours out his soul unto death,' 'lays it down as an offering for guilt.' But why is it added, 'as an offering for guilt'? Dr. Ritschl, in his great work on the doctrine of Justification,¹ finds it hard to say. Yet may it not be one object of the prophet to show that in the death of the Servant various forms of sacrifice find their highest fulfil-

ment? 'As in verse 5 the Divine Servant is represented as a *sin-offering*, His death being an *expiation*, so here He is described as a *guilt-offering*, His death being a *satisfaction*.² Guilt-offerings, or trespass-offerings (as Auth. Vers. calls them), 'were enjoined in all cases where the sins which had been committed allowed of restitution in kind'³; in other words, in infractions of the rights of property. The people of Israel was theoretically 'holy,' i.e., dedicated to God, but in fact was altogether unholy. It had therefore fallen under the Divine displeasure, and its life was legally forfeited. But, in wrath remembering mercy, Jehovah sent the Servant, who offered his own life as a restitution in kind, and a 'satisfaction' for the broken covenant of holiness. There is, however, a difficulty in the statement that the servant became a guilt-offering, which ought to be mentioned. According to the Law, the guilt-offering was only an atonement for the individual presenting it, never for other people (Luzzatto): the sin-offering, of course, might be offered for others (on the Day of Atonement). This can only be met by the hypothesis that the Servant is in some mystic and yet real sense identified with Israel; that he embodies all that is high and noble in the Israelitish character, and yet transcends it. The prophet himself, too, gives us a plain hint that his language is symbolic, and that more is meant than meets the ear. For he proceeds to tell us that the

¹ *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und der Versöhnung*, ii. 64.

² Urwick, *The Servant of Jehovah*, p. 151.

³ Cave, *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*, p. 478. (On the subject of the 'ashām, or guilt-offering, see especially Kalisch, *Leviticus*, ii. 272-5; Ewald, *Antiquities of Israel*, pp. 55-66; Riehm, 'Ueber das Schuldopfer,' in *Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1854, p. 93 &c.; Oehler, *Old Testament Theology*, ii. 28-34; Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 75-77.)

would prolong days, and the pleasure of Jehovah would prosper in his hand ; ¹¹ ^a after the travail of his soul he would see

^a On account of, Vit., Del., Bleek, Urwick ; free from, Ges., Hitz.

Servant shall live long and receive a glorious reward. (It would be a still simpler solution to suppose that the distinction between sin-offering and guilt-offering was not very clearly drawn when the prophet wrote ; but this would require us to adopt the Grafian hypothesis as to the date of the Levitical legislation. It would be unfair to import the huge difficulties which beset this question into the comparatively simple subject of the exegesis of Isaiah. See further *Last Words*.)

—**He would see a seed . . .**] It is said in a psalm closely allied to our prophecy, that, after the deliverance of the Sufferer, 'A seed shall serve him' (viz., Jehovah), Ps. xxii. 30. In this case, the 'seed' means the children of the converts from heathenism mentioned in the preceding verse (see Hupfeld *ad loc.*). Our prophet too evidently uses 'seed' in a spiritual sense of those who are mystically united to the Servant (or, more prosaically, his disciples).¹ Obs., the Servant is not merely to leave a seed behind him, but to 'see it,' which harmonizes admirably with the next clause.—**He would prolong days**] i.e., he would live long. This again is of course not to be taken quite literally. 'Length of days' is no doubt frequently mentioned as a reward of piety (Deut. vi. 2, Ps. xci. 16, Prov. iii. 2), but as the Servant has already passed through death once without injury to his personality, we may presume that, like the Messiah in ix. 6 (see note), 'death hath no more dominion over him.'—**The pleasure of Jehovah . . .**] The Servant is not to retire henceforth

from the scene of his sufferings ; he has a work to do in and for his spiritual posterity and for mankind in general, and the appellation given to it supplies a good example of the interlacing of the parts of this prophecy, 'pleasure in the sense of 'purpose' occurring no less than eight times in II. Isaiah.

¹¹ **After the travail of his soul**] It is not easy to choose between the different meanings of the preposition. I have rendered 'after' on the analogy of Ps. lxxiii. 20, 'As a dream, after one hath awaked,' but the local meaning 'away from' (Num. xv. 24), and the causal 'on account of,' 'in consequence of' (*v.* 5), are both grammatically possible. To adopt the last, however, seems to involve an anticipation of the 'therefore' in *v.* 12. 'The travail of his soul' = the pain which he felt in his inmost soul, his spiritual agony.—**He would see satisfyingly**] i.e., would enjoy a satisfying, refreshing view of the progress of the Divine work of salvation (Del.). So in Ps. xvii. 15 we find 'to see God's face' and 'to be satisfied,' in parallel lines.—**By his knowledge**] There is a doubt (which Calvin himself recognises) as to whether this means 'by the knowledge of him' or 'by the knowledge which he possesses.' Vit., Hengst., Stier, Naeg., adopt the former ; Ges., Ew., Hitz., Bleek, Del., Kay, Birks, Urwick, the latter. Of course, 'knowledge' (in the deep Biblical sense of the word) was necessary for the 'justified' persons spoken of (comp. Jer. xxxi. 34), but it is more obvious, considering the prophetic functions assigned to the Servant (comp. xlii.

¹ David Kimchi alludes to this interpretation as current among the Christians in his time, but rejects it because 'his (Jesus') disciples are nowhere spoken of as either sons or seeds' (Neubauer and Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 55) ; Mosheh Kohen (*ibid.*, p. 123) with at last an attempt at philology, on the ground that 'seed is only used (in the Old Testament) in its literal and primary signification.' But, as Dr. Pusey remarks (*ibid.*, p. lviii.), 'Isaiah himself uses the word in a bad sense' (he quotes i. 4, lvii. 4).

satisfyingly; by 'his knowledge' would the righteous one, my servant, make the many righteous, and of their iniquities *he* would take up the load. ¹² Therefore will I give him ^a a

^r The knowledge of him, Vittr., Hengst., Stier, Naeg.

^s So Ew., Hitz., Del. As a portion the many, Sept., Targ., Vulg., Vittr., Lowth, Hengst., Bleek, Kay, Naeg., Weir, Urwick, Rodwell.

1, xlix. 6, l. 4), to suppose that 'knowledge' means his insight into the dealings and purposes of Jehovah. It is clear, too, from other passages (referred to by Del.), that 'knowledge,' in this sense was reckoned as essential for the national regeneration (see Mal. ii. 7, 'The priest's lips should keep knowledge; Dan. xii. 3, where faithful teachers are described as 'making righteous (or, justifying) the many'; and Isa. xi. 2, where among the seven spirits bestowed on the Messiah we find 'the spirit of knowledge'). The contents of the Servant's knowledge are, no doubt, the purpose of God to **make the many righteous** by his means. There are two possible meanings of the phrase 'to make righteous,' the forensic one of acquittal (*v.* 23, Ex. xxiii. 7) and the ethical one of imparting or producing righteousness. The latter is the less common one, the only other passage which Ges. quotes for it being Dan. xii. 3. There, however, the meaning is quite certain, for the 'understanding ones' who 'make the many righteous' are in Dan. xi. 33 said to 'instruct the many.' In the passage before us, too, the sense of 'making righteous' or 'turning to righteousness' (the felicitous rendering of Auth. Vers. in Dan. xii. 3) seems the only suitable one, for the Servant is not himself a judge, but a sin-bearer and intercessor (*v.* 12). He is called 'the righteous one,' as a guarantee of his ability for 'making righteous.'—**The many**] It is not absolutely certain whether this phrase (emphatically repeated in *v.* 12) points to the Jews or to the heathen. As the foregoing prophecy refers to the Jews, and as the same phrase is used of the Jews in Dan. ix. 27, xi. 33, xii. 3, it is safer to

interpret it so here. This will not exclude the incorporation of more or fewer of the Gentiles among the true Israelites (see on xlv. 3-5), and in fact an enlargement of the limits of Israel seems required by the magnificent language of *v.* 12 *a*. Besides, was not the Servant to be 'the light of the nations' as well as 'a covenant of the people' (xlii. 6)? The phrase 'the many' seems intended to imply that not the whole of the community is benefited by the saving work of the Servant. Comp. the use of 'many' in similar contexts in Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28, Heb. ix. 28.—**And of their iniquities . . .**] This cannot mean (for the explanation involves New Testament presuppositions) that the Servant should continue to be a sin-bearer after his sacrifice of himself. It is rather an emphatic reassertion of the vicarious atonement as the foundation of his righteous-making work.

¹² Jehovah himself holds out the victor's crown with the words—**Therefore will I give him a portion among the great**] This is clearly metaphorical, and as such is not to be pressed too far. For who can be 'great' or 'powerful' enough to share spoil with Jehovah's Well-beloved? It is impossible to think of the persons just described as 'made righteous' through the Servant, for this 'making righteous,' together with the preceding atonement, was the very fight which the Servant fought and won. The idea is, no doubt, this, that, without striking a blow, the Servant of Jehovah has reached the same results which others (e.g., Cyrus) have reached by sword and bow; that, 'through his sacrificial death, the kingdom of God enters into the rank of world-conquering

portion among the great,³ and with the powerful shall he divide spoil, because he poured out his soul unto death, and let himself be numbered with the rebellious, but *he* had borne the sin of many, and for the rebellious made intercession.

powers' (Hengst.). Thus the Servant of Jehovah becomes at last practically identical with the Messianic king.—Alt. rend. is opposed by the parallel line; otherwise it would not be unacceptable (comp. lii. 15, xlix. 7).—**Poured out his soul** i.e., his life-blood (comp. Ps. cxli. 8). The prophet again emphasises the voluntary nature of the Servant's sufferings. **Made intercession**] Or, 'kept making

intercession' (but as the preceding and synchronising verb expresses a single past act, the rend. 'made intercession' seems preferable); certainly not 'shall make intercession' (Hengst.), which is against syntax. The participle of the same verb occurs in a different context in lix. 16. Notice the emphatic repetition of 'the rebellious,' those who had merited death by their apostasy.

CHAPTER LIV.

A RECENT critic (Wellhausen, *Gesch. Israels*, i. 417 note) has stated that liv. 1–liv. 8 is 'to some extent a sermon on the text lii. 13–liii. 12;' but he obviously does so in the interests of a theory—viz., that chap. liii. does not refer to an individual. It is more natural to suppose that chap. liii. (including lii. 13–15) was inserted by an afterthought, chap. liv. being the natural sequel of xlix. 17–lii. 12 (just as xlix. 13 follows upon the prediction of the return of the exiles in xlix. 12). It cannot be shown that any of the characteristic ideas of chap. liii. are clearly referred to in chap. liv. The connection seems the closest with chap. xlix. (see xlix. 6, 8, 18–20, 21, comp. also l. 1), though there is a phraseological parallel in lii. 9, and the use of the term 'righteousness' in v. 17 accords with its use in xlv. 24, 25, l. 8, but not at all with the sense of 'righteous' and 'make righteous' in liii. 11.—The person addressed is, not the ruined city of Jerusalem, but the ideal Zion (see on xlix. 14), who is practically identical with the ideal or spiritual Israel. In v. 17 the promises made to Zion are expressly confirmed to the 'servants of Jehovah,' just as in chap. li. the prophet addresses alternately the aggregate of believers and the transcendental person called Zion.

¹ Ring out, O barren, thou that hast not borne; burst forth into a ringing shout, and cry aloud, thou that hast not travailed; for more are the children of the desolate than the children of

¹ **O barren, thou that hast not borne**] It is like a continuation of xlix. 21.—**More are the children . . .**] Parallel passage, 1 Sam. ii. 5. The 'children' referred to are, mainly at any rate, the restored

exiles (as xlix. 17). These were at once children of Zion and not children. They were physically and to some extent spiritually Israelites, but as long as they were on a foreign soil, and un-

the married woman, saith Jehovah. ² Widen the place of thy tent, and the curtains of thy habitation let them stretch forth—hinder it not; lengthen thy cords, and thy tent-pins make strong. ³ For on the right and on the left shalt thou break through; and thy seed shall ^a take possession of ^a nations, and make desolate cities to be inhabited. ⁴ Fear not, for thou needest not be ashamed: neither be confounded, for thou needest not blush; nay, thou shalt forget the shame of thy maidenhood, and the reproach of thy widowhood thou shalt remember no more. ⁵ For thy husband is thy maker—Jehovah Sabáoth is his name; and thy Goel is the Holy One of

^a Dispossess, Ges., Hitz.

baptized with the Spirit (xliv. 3), their union with the ideal Zion could not be regarded as complete. After their restoration, the spiritual and the literal Zion or Israel became identical.—**The curtains**] i.e., the tent-covering. **Lengthen thy cords** . . .] The same figure is applied to the literal Jerusalem, xxxiii. 20. The point of both passages is that the 'tent' should no longer be moved about, but become a permanent habitation. Dr. Weir well compares Jer. x. 20, 'My tent is destroyed, and all my tent-pins are plucked up; my children are gone away from me, and are not; and there is none to spread out my tent any more, or to set up my tent-curtains.'

³ **On the right and on the left**] Not merely = 'on the south and on the north' (Targ.), but 'on all hands'; comp. the parallel passage in the promise to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 14.—**Take possession of nations**] i.e., take possession of their land. There is no occasion, with Knobel, to restrict the reference to the heathen colonists who had replaced the Israelites. On the other hand, I doubt whether it is equivalent to 'inherit the earth' (so Del.). Comparing xlix. 19, 20, I suppose it to mean that the area covered by the Jewish race shall be much larger than of yore, and that the former lords of the soil (or their survivors, see next note) shall

(of their own free-will—see lxi. 4) descend to the rank of subjects.—**Desolate cities**] Primarily those of Palestine, comp. xlix. 8, lviii. 12, lxi. 4, but possibly including cities outside Palestine, which had suffered from the Babylonian invasions (comp. x. 7, Hab. i. 17), and been converted into 'heaps' (xiv. 21, corrected text).

⁴ **Needest not**] Or, 'oughtest not.' It is the potential imperfect in the Hebrew.—**Be ashamed**] viz., of thy faith in thy God; comp. xlv. 16, 17.—**Thy maidenhood**] i.e., the time before the Sinaitic covenant, by which Israel became the 'bride' of Jehovah, Jer. ii. 2. The **shame** of this period will be the Egyptian bondage; the **reproach** in the next line, the Babylonian captivity.

⁵ **Thy maker**] The Hebr. has the plural form, 'thy makers,' on the analogy of Elohim for the one God (similarly in x. 15; comp. Job xxxv. 10, Ps. cxlix. 2).—**Thy Goel**] i.e., the vindicator of thy family-rights (see on xli. 14). Zion being of the family of Jehovah (comp. Eph. ii. 19), her nearest kinsman (viz., her husband) must interpose for her rescue.—**The Holy One of Israel**] Comp. on xlix. 7. **God of the whole earth** . . .] 'Jehovah Sabáoth,' according to our prophet, means not only the God of the heavenly hosts, but the God whose glory fills all crea-

Israel, God of the whole earth is he called. ⁶ For as an outcast and downcast woman Jehovah hath recalled thee, and a wife of youth—^b can she be rejected ^b? saith thy God. ⁷ For a little moment did I cast thee out, but with great compassion will I gather thee; ⁸ in a gush of wrath I hid my face a moment from thee, but with everlasting loving-kindness will I have compassion upon thee, saith thy Goel, Jehovah. ⁹ For a Noah's flood ^c is this unto me; whereas I sware that Noah's flood should no more pass over the earth, so I swear that I will not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. ¹⁰ For though the mountains should remove, and the hills should totter, my

^b So Kimchi, Ew., Luzzatto.—When she is (or, has been) rejected, Targ., Vittr., Ges., Del., &c.

^c As in the days of Noah, Pesh., Targ., Vulg., some Hebr. MSS., Lowth.

tion, including the earth (comp. appendix to chap. i.). Hence the name is a warrant for the restoration of Zion, Jehovah Sabáoth's bride.

⁶ **For as an outcast and downcast woman . . .**] (There is a characteristic assonance in the Hebrew.) Zion is not only Jehovah's bride (Jer. iii. 14), but in one sense 'a wife of youth;' see Jer. ii. 2. Even many an earthly husband (how much more, then, Jehovah!) cannot bear to see the misery of his divorced wife, and therefore, at length recalls her; 'and when his wife is one who has been wooed and won in youth (comp. Mal. ii. 14), how impossible is it for her to be absolutely dismissed?' The second line is hard, but such appears to be its meaning. So interpreted, it involves a break in the parallelism, but only formally, not logically. (It is equivalent to 'cannot be rejected,' and is therefore parallel to 'hath recalled thee'). There is a very similar way of expressing incredulity with regard to the absolute rejection of Israel in Lam. v. 22, 'Except [which is impossible] thou hast indeed rejected us, and art wroth against us very exceedingly!' For the idea of such declarations, see note on lv. 2 (end). Alt. rend.

would be grammatically easier, if the tense were the perfect (which indeed, the Targum substitutes).

⁷ **For a little moment**] The same phrase in xxvi. 20, comp. Ps. xxx. 5, and Isa. lxi. 2 (note).—**Gather thee**] i.e., the persons of thy 'storm-tost' members (*v.* 11).

⁸ **In a gush of wrath**] It was a 'gush,' not a flood, for this takes time to rise and fall; a momentary 'gush,' in contrast to the sea-like (Ps. xxxvi. 6) righteousness; one side of which is God's 'everlasting loving-kindness' for his people. The assonance in the Heb. phrase is here inimitable.

⁹ **For**] Justifying the promise just given. Yes, it is indeed true, for the 'calamity' which is 'overpast' *is* in one sense a flood to its Divine author,—a **Noah's flood**, inasmuch as He has sworn that neither the type nor the antitype shall be repeated.—Critics have been unnecessarily perplexed because neither the Elohistic nor the Jehovistic portion of the narrative of the Flood mentions an oath.¹ But, as Del. on Ps. lxxxix. 31–38 well points out, there is no oath recorded in 2 Sam. vii. 12–16, yet no one doubts that the oath mentioned in *v.* 35 means the promises therein contained. I conclude therefore that the prophet refers

¹ See Gen. viii. 21, 22 (Jehovistic), and ix. 11 (Elohistic).

loving-kindness from thee shall not remove, neither shall my covenant of peace totter, saith he that hath compassion upon thee, Jehovah.

¹¹ Thou afflicted, storm-tost, comfortless one! behold, I will set thy stones in antimony, and will found thee with sapphires; ¹² and I will make thy battlements rubies, and thy gates to be carbuncles, and all thy border to be precious stones; ¹³ and all thy children shall be disciples of Jehovah, and great shall be the peace of thy children. ¹⁴ Through righteousness shalt thou be established; be far from ^d oppres-

^d Anxiety, Ges., Hitz., Ew., Del.

either to Gen. viii. 21, or to ix. 11, and not to a lost portion of the Jehovistic record, as Kayser conjectures.¹

¹⁰ **Though the mountains . . .** Mountains are elsewhere the emblem of the unchangeable, Ps. xxxvi. 6, lxx. 6. Job, however, knows of the uncommon phenomenon of a mountain falling and crumbling away (Job xiv. 18), and our prophet has already applied a similar contradiction of ordinary experience to glorify the immutable love of God (xlix. 15). Stier thinks there is an allusion to the final destruction of the earth (li. 6); but is not the image more forcible as explained above? The striking parallels, Ps. xlvii. 3, Jer. xxxi. 36, 37 (quoted by Dr. Weir), point in the same direction.—**My covenant of peace**] 'Peace' is a very comprehensive expression (see on liiii. 5), though, when in conjunction with 'covenant,' its primary meaning seems to be 'friendship'; comp. Ps. xli. 9, 'the man of my peace' (Auth. Vers. 'mine own familiar friend'). The phrase 'my covenant of peace' occurs again in Num. xxv. 12 (comp. Mal. ii. 5), Ezek. xxxiv. 25, xxxvii. 26.—**Saith . . . Jehovah**] A fourth emphatic assertion of the Divine origin of the revelation.

^{11, 12} The glory of the new Jerusalem. Comp. Tobit xiii. 16, 17, Rev. xxi. 18-21.

¹¹ **Thy stones in antimony**] A dark cement would set off the brilliant stones mentioned directly afterwards. Antimony (Hebr. *pūh*) was the black mineral powder with which the Jewish women painted the edges of the eyelids. See 2 Kings ix. 30, Jer. iv. 30, 1 Chron. xxix. 2 (*Q. P. B.*), and comp. Qerhappūk (i.e., 'horn of eye-paint'), Job xlii. 14. There is a *puyāku* or *puka* mentioned in Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions as a product of the land of Canaan. M. Chabas, it is true, says it meant, in the Egyptian text, articles of furniture made of carved wood²; but there is no doubt, I believe, of its meaning antimony in Assyrian.³

¹² **Border**] i.e., either 'domain' (Del.), or 'outer wall' (Knob.). The latter seems more probable, as we have had the battlements and the gates mentioned.

¹³ The spiritual glory of which these costly buildings are the symbol.—**Disciples of Jehovah**] i.e., prophets in the wider sense (comp. l. 4). The same idea as in Num. xi. 29, Joel ii. 28, 29.

¹⁴ Jerusalem will then be impregnable.—**Through righteousness**] i.e., through fidelity to thy covenant with thy God; comp. i. 27.—**Shalt thou be established**] A return to the figure of building, comp. Prov. xxiv. 3, Num. xxi. 27 (Weir).—**Be far**] i.e., either 'be far even in thy thoughts,

¹ Kayser, *Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels* (Strassburg, 1874), p. 168.

² Chabas, *Études sur l'antiquité historique*, p. 274.

³ Sayce, *Records of the Past*, v. 42; Oppert, *Expédition on Mésopotamie*, ii. 349.

sion, for thou neededst not fear, and from ^e destruction, for it shall not come nigh thee. ¹⁵ Behold, should (any) 'stir up strife,' (it is) not of me, whosoever ^g stirreth up strife ^g against thee, shall ^h fall because of ^h thee. ¹⁶ Behold, it is I that created the smith, who bloweth upon the fire of coals, and produceth a weapon ⁱ for its work ⁱ; and I that created the waster to destroy. ¹⁷ No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise against thee for the judgment shalt thou show to be guilty. This is the inheritance of the servants of Jehovah, and their righteousness given by me; the oracle of Jehovah.

^e So virtually, Knobel.—Terror, Ges., Ew., Del., &c.

^f So Ew., Kay (as an alt. rend.).—Gather together. A. E., Kimchi, Vitr., Ges., Del., Naeg.

^g Gathereth together, A. E., &c.

^h So Knob., Del., Naeg.—Fall away unto thee, Sept., Vulg., Ges., Hitz., Ew.

ⁱ As his work, Ew., Weir.—According to his work (or, craft), Vitr., Ges., Hitz., Del., Naeg.

comp. xlvi. 12 'ye who are far from (the thought of Jehovah's) righteousness'; or = 'thou shalt be far,' the imperative for the future (see on xxxiii. 20).—**Oppression**] This is the sense of the word '*ôsheq*' everywhere else, and also as I believe, of the feminine form '*âsh'qah*' (xxxvii. 14, see note), generally quoted for the sense of 'anxiety.' It also suits the parallel line best.—**Destruction**] The well-known sense of *m'khittah* in Proverbs (e.g., x. 14); see also Jer. xvii. 17. The ordinary rend. 'terror' does not agree well with 'come to thee.'

¹⁵ **Should (any) stir up strife** . . .] 'Should any one presume to molest God's people, he shall be like a blind traveller, who falls headlong over an obstacle.' See crit. note.

¹⁶ The secret of Israel's invincibility; all things are the creatures of Jehovah, and dependent upon him.—**That created the smith**] Similarly Sirach says (xxxviii. 1) of the physician, 'The Lord hath created him.'—**For its work**] viz., destruction. This rend. is grammatically as good as any other, and suits the parallel line best (comp. 'to destroy').—**The waster**] i.e., each of the great con-

quering kings, of Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, &c. In the same spirit of unreserved faith, Job says (xii. 16), 'He that erreth and he that causeth to err are Jehovah's.'

¹⁷ **Every tongue . . . shalt thou show to be guilty**] War is here viewed as a 'judgment of God'; comp. xli. 11 *b*. I doubt if 1 Sam. xiv. 47 is parallel; we should probably read, 'he was delivered' (i.e., was victorious), with Sept., Ewald, &c. (see *Q. P. B.*).—**This is the inheritance . . .**] 'This,' viz., all the blessings which have been assured to Zion. The form of this second half of the verse is evidently designed to close the prophecy.—**The servants of Jehovah**] The members of the spiritual Israel have now been fully baptized into the Spirit of their Head. Each of them is now an Israel in miniature, and can claim the promise-laden title of 'Servant of Jehovah.' (See above, opening remarks.)—**Their righteousness**] i.e., primarily, as the context shows, their justification in the eyes of the world, their success (comp. xlv. 24, 25, l. 8, lviii. 8, lxii. 1, 2), though it is also implied that this outward success is due to Jehovah's 'righteousness.'

CHAPTER LV.

Contents.—An affectionate invitation to the Messianic blessings (v. 1-5); an exhortation to put aside all inward obstacles to their enjoyment (v. 6, 7); and a renewed confident assurance of the indescribable glory and felicity which awaits the true Israel (v. 8-13).

¹ Ah! every one that thirsteth—come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money! come ye, buy and eat, yea, come, buy wine and milk for that which is not money and for that which is not a price. ² Why will ye spend money for that which is not bread, and your earnings for that which cannot satisfy? Harken, harken unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. ³ Incline your ear,

¹ **Ah! every one that thirsteth** . . .] A cry of pity (see on xvii. 12) wrung from Jehovah by the indifference of his people to the promised blessings. Dry as they are, they are indisposed to come to the only source from which their thirst can be quenched. In this respect they differ from the 'thirsty one' of xlv. 3, who opposes no inward bar to the relief of his necessity. The prophet's invitation is addressed to all who are conscious of their need.—**Buy wine and milk**] 'Wine and milk' are not to be understood merely in a material sense, as representatives of temporal blessings (Ges., Hitz., Knob.); this is altogether against the context, as the following notes will show. At present it may be enough to point out the very peculiar word for 'buy' (*shābhar*), which, alike by etymology and by usage, can in strict propriety only be used of 'corn.' Its use here shows that the food referred to can be called equally well 'bread' and 'wine and milk,' i.e., that it belongs to the supernatural order of things.—It was this passage which led to the custom of the Latin churches (but not the African) of giving wine and milk to the newly baptized (Jerome, *ad loc.*). See note on xxv. 6, and comp. Jer. xxi. 12, Ps. xxxvi. 8, John vii. 37-39, 1 Pet. ii. 2, Rev. xxi.

6, xxii. 17.—**For that which is not money** . . .] To guard against a literalism similar to that of the disciples in Matt. xvi. 7. Jehovah being not merely (as some of the Jews probably supposed) a magnified man, his blessings can only be obtained for 'that which is not (i.e., which is different in kind from) money.' Comp. xxxi. 8, where Jehovah is called 'one who is not (i.e., who is specifically different from) a man.' This 'not-money' is, as v. 3 instructs us, the hearing of the inner ear.

² **Not bread**] i.e., even less satisfying than bread. Among other oxymora, comp. Deut. xxxii. 21, where Auth. Vers. rightly has, 'that which is not God . . . those which are not a people,' i.e., which is (are) conspicuously unworthy of the name.—**Eat ye**] i.e., ye shall eat.—**Delight itself**] i.e., luxuriate; comp. lxvi. 11, Ps. xxxvii. 4, 11 (same word), and see on lvii. 4.

³ **And I will make an everlasting covenant with you**] The new 'covenant' between Jehovah and Israel is referred to no less than seven times in II. Isaiah: nowhere, expressly at least, in the rest of the book, and nowhere in the works of Isaiah's contemporaries, Amos and Hosea. The idea of the original covenant, broken by Israel, and renewed by Jehovah, is

and come unto me ; hear, and your soul shall revive : and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, the loving-kind-

specially characteristic of Jeremiah. In the pre-Jeremian period, it seems as if the phrase 'covenant of Jehovah' had been avoided by the great author-prophets on account of its associations with heathenism, for the Canaanites used the phrase largely (comp. 'Baal-b'rith,' Judg. viii. 33, ix. 4 ; 'El-b'rith,' Judg. ix. 46). The occurrence of the phrase in Isa. xl.-lxvi. is certainly difficult to explain on the assumption that Isaiah was the author of these chapters. Can we venture to suppose that Isaiah foresaw that a time would come when the phrase 'the covenant of Jehovah' would lose its original mythic flavour? It would seem a rather forced hypothesis. — 'An everlasting covenant' occurs again in lxi. 8, and in a different sense in xxiv. 5 ; also in Jer. xxxii. 40, l. 5, Ezek. xvi. 60. It is of course the 'new covenant' of Jer. xxxi. 31-33 that is intended, that 'covenant' which Jehovah promised to 'put in Israel's inward parts,' and to 'write it in their hearts.' — **The loving-kindnesses of David**] Not the *mercies* of David' (Auth. Vers.), for David, representing the Davidic race, is not a 'stranger and foreigner,' but a member of Jehovah's household, his own 'son' (2 Sam. vii. 14, Ps. ii. 7, lxxix. 26). 'Of David' means 'promised to David ;' 'the loving-kindnesses of Jehovah' is the more natural phrase, comp. lxiii. 7, Ps. lxxxix. 49, cvii. 43, Lam. iii. 22 ('the loving-kindnesses of David' occurs elsewhere only in 2 Chron. vi. 42). It is not necessary to suppose a zeugma, though a Pauline speech in the Acts (xiii. 24), in quoting the passage, inserts the words—not found in Sept.—*δώσω ὑμῖν (τὰ ὅσια Δαυεὶδ τὰ πιστά)* ; the 'covenant' consists in the 'loving-kindnesses.' — **Of David**] In what sense can Jehovah's 'loving-kindnesses' be said to belong to David? Three

answers may be given : (1) The most obvious explanation (Ewald, Delitzsch) is, to understand by 'David' the founder of the Davidic family. The only difficulty is that the statements of the following verse are incongruous with the character of the historical David. (2) Not a few interpreters, both ancient and modern (among the latter are Rosenmüller, Stier, G. F. Oehler, and Dr. Kay) interpret the phrase of the Messianic king, who is mentioned in Jer. xxx. 9, Ezek. xxxiv. 24, 25 (Hos. iii. 5?) under the name of David. This, however, seems to be contradicted (a) by the parallel passage, Ps. lxxxix. 49 (which clearly refers to the 'oath' to the historical David in 2 Sam. vii.), and (b) by the perfect tenses in v. 4, which (considering that futures follow in v. 5) ought not to be interpreted as 'prophetic perfects.' (3) According to Hengstenberg (*Christology*, iii. 346), David here means the family of David, 'who, in Ps. xviii., and in a series of other psalms, speaks in the name of his whole family.' Hengstenberg thus admits that the historical covenant with David is primarily referred to, but, as the covenant extended to David's seed, he maintains that it only attained complete fulfilment in the Messiah. Our choice lies, I think, between this and the first theory. Only, if we adopt the view that David means the founder of the Davidic family, we must assume that it is not of the historical David that the prophet is thinking, so much as of an idealized David radiant with the reflected light and spirituality of the Messianic age. This assumption (which, considering the phenomena of the Book of Psalms, we have a perfect right to make) seems to be required by the statements made respecting 'David' in the next verse. The attempt of Del. to apply them literally to the David

nesses of David—the unfailing ones. ⁴ Behold, for a witness to the peoples I appointed him, a ruler and commander of the peoples. ⁵ Behold, people that thou knowest not shalt thou call, and people that have not known thee shall run unto thee, because of Jehovah thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel, inasmuch as he hath glorified thee.

⁶ Seek ye Jehovah, while he may be found ; call ye upon

of history is most unsatisfactory. On the whole, however, I prefer Hengstenberg's view. There seems to me to be an evident allusion to 2 Sam. vii. 12–16, where the promises apply equally to David and to his posterity (*v.* 13, which interrupts the context, is probably a later insertion). The same point of view is still more clearly adopted in Ps. lxxxix., of which Köster (ap. Stier, p. 548) says, 'Fere commentarii instar est ad locum nostrum—similitudo tanta est, ut prophetam nostrum psalmi hujus auctorem esse conjicere liceat.'—

The unfailing ones] See Ps. lxxxix. 28, 'My loving-kindness will I keep for him for ever, and my covenant shall be unfailing (or, faithful) with him ;' and *v.* 33, 'Nevertheless my loving-kindness will I not annul (and take) from him; neither will I be untrue to my faithfulness ;' and comp. in the Hebr. 2 Sam. vii. 16. And why thus faithful, thus unfailing? 1. Because Jehovah's word cannot be broken (*v.* 11), and 2. because, whereas vengeance for sin ends at the fourth generation, the recompense of piety extends to a man's latest posterity (Ex. xx. 5, 6).

⁴ **For a witness to the peoples I appointed him**] 'I appointed him' is a historical perfect ; we have no right (note the difference of tense) to regard *vv.* 4, 5, as 'a looking forward to the enlargement and completion of the Church through [the] Christ' (Stier). Of course, it was not in any high degree true of David that he was 'a witness to the peoples,' i.e., a

preacher of the true religion. *That* was the proper work, first of the personal Servant of Jehovah, and then through him (liiii. 11) of Jehovah's national Servant, the regenerate Israel (xliiii. 10). But David, and far more Hezekiah and Josiah, at any rate made a beginning, even though at the best it was a 'day of small things.' And the peculiarity of II. Isaiah is that the promises, so imperfectly realised hitherto, are transferred from the Messianic king to what we may call the Messianic people, not indeed to the people working in its own strength, but in conjunction with and in dependence on a personal representative of Jehovah, who unites in himself the leading characteristics of king, high priest, and prophet.¹—There seems to be an allusion to our passage in Rev. i. 5 (comp. iii. 14), 'from Jesus Christ the faithful witness'; Hengst. compares John xviii. 37, where, precisely as here, 'witnessing' is mentioned as the principal function of Israel's King.—**A ruler**] Lit., 'a leader' (*nāgīd*, the same word as in 2 Sam. vi. 21, Dan. ix. 25).

⁵ **People that thou knowest not . . .**] Almost the same words are put into the mouth of a personage who embodies a very similar conception to the Servant of Jehovah, in Ps. xviii. 43 (45 Hebr.).—**Because of Jehovah . . .**] Repeated almost word for word in lx. 9.

⁶ The prophet returns to the more neutral-tinted present, and urges his people to make sure that they are of the true Israel.—

¹ Comp. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy* (Lond. 1876), pp. 130, 131, who however rashly denies the personal character of the Servant in the most important passages.

him, while he is near. ⁷ Let the ungodly forsake his way, and the man of iniquity his thoughts; and let him return unto Jehovah, and he will have compassion upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. ⁸ For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, is Jehovah's oracle. ⁹ For (as) the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. ¹⁰ For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and thither returneth not, except it hath watered the earth, and made it bring forth and sprout, and given seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; ¹¹ so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me empty, except it hath accomplished that which I please, and made to prosper the thing for which I sent it. ¹² For with joy shall ye go forth, and with peace shall ye be led, the mountains and the hills shall burst out before you into a ringing sound, and all the trees of the field shall clap the hand. ¹³ Instead of the thorn-bush shall come

While he may be found] Comp. Ps. xxxii. 6. For the 'day of Jehovah' will be a bitter one for those who are outwardly or inwardly his foes (lxv. 6, 7).—**Call ye upon him]** First for pardon, and then for a share in the promises; comp. Jer. xix. 12-14.

⁷ **His way]** The 'way' and the 'thoughts,' or purposes, of the ungodly, mean the polytheism and immorality which marked a large section of the Jewish exiles. Such 'ways' and 'thoughts' tend only to destruction, but those of Jehovah (as *vv.* 8, 9 suggest) to a blessedness passing the finite understanding (comp. Ps. xxxvi. 5, 6). 'For I know the thoughts which I have towards you, saith Jehovah, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you a future and a hope' (Jer. xxix. 11).

¹⁰ But can such a high ideal as Jehovah's be realised? Surely. For God's purposes whether for inanimate nature or for man fulfil themselves. The new figure is suggested by 'the heavens' in *v.* 9.—**Thither returneth not]** i.e., as vapour (Gen. ii. 6, Job xxxvi. 27 Del.).

Obs. rain and snow are treated as God's angels (similarly Ps. cxlviii. 8, civ. 4), and so Jehovah's 'word' in *v.* 11 (see on ix. 8).

¹¹ **It shall not . . .]** A mixture of two statements—'it shall not return empty,' and 'it shall not return till it has done its work.'

^{12, 13} **For]** is explanatory (= 'in fact').—**Shall ye go forth . . .]** The passage is generally taken as a description of the Exodus from Babylon. But there is no reason for so limiting the meaning, and the analogy of chap. xxxv., xl. 11, and xli. 18, points in another direction. It is the glorious condition of Israel after the Return which is here described (see on chap. xxxv.) The change is compared to the transition from the wilderness (i.e., the misery of the Exile) with its monotonous dwarf-shrubs to a park of beautiful trees (comp. xli. 18, 19), in the midst of which Israel is to walk 'in solemn troops and sweet societies' (as in xxxv. 9). Who the leaders are to be, is not stated. Perhaps the priests, or perhaps Jehovah's angels (Ps. xci. 11).

¹³ This sympathy of nature

up the fir-tree, and instead of the nettle shall come up the myrtle-tree ; and it shall be unto Jehovah for a monument, for an everlasting sign which shall not be cut off.

(comp. xxxv. 1, 2. xlv. 23) is no mere poetical figure, for the prophet continues, **And it shall be unto Jehovah . . . for an everlasting**

sign : all poetical figures, like Virgil's 'Ipsi lætitiâ voces ad sidera jactant Intonsi montes,' are presentiments of the Messianic reality.

CHAPTER LVI.

Vv. 1-8. These eight verses form a prophecy in themselves, directed against the Jewish pride of race. They are primarily addressed to certain foreign converts and (probably) Israelitish eunuchs, who are warmly commended for their observance of the Sabbath, and promised an appropriate reward. The prophecy stands out by its practical tone ; as a rule, II. Isaiah confines itself to correcting the general tone and spirit of the Jews. The writer of this section presupposes the circumstances of a period long subsequent to the age of Hezekiah. The Sabbath was not indeed (as some have supposed) a late adoption from Babylonia, but it certainly did become much more strictly observed in the Babylonian and Persian periods—comp. Jer. xvii. 19-27 (with Graf's note), Ezek. xx. 11-21, xxii. 8, 26, Neh. xiii. 15-22, and contrast the narrative in 2 Kings xi. 1-16, with that in 1 Macc. ii. 32-38. This growing strictness evidently marks a fresh stage in the religious history of the Israelites. As the sense of the value of prayer increased, it was natural that the Sabbath should rise in the estimation of the pious, and that the highest title they could give to the temple should be 'the house of prayer.' The latter phrase is unique, and reminds us of the later *proseuchai*, which existed wherever Jews were to be found in the Roman empire.

¹ Thus saith Jehovah, keep the law, and practise righteousness ; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness

¹ **Keep the law**] 'The law,' i.e., the objective rule of life, the law of Jehovah (as in xlii. 1 *b*). The other possible rendering, 'justice,' seems unsuitable here, as the moral duties specified in *v.* 2 have a much wider range than mere 'justice,' and in fact cover both the tables of the Decalogue. The verb, too, with which the noun is here joined (*shimrû mishpât*) is usually followed, as Dr. Weir remarks, by 'statutes,' 'testimony,' 'covenant,' &c. — **Righteousness**] i.e., objectively, whatever God commands.

—**My salvation . . . my righteousness**] Comp. li. 5. 'This passage makes it quite evident that "righteousness" in connection with "salvation" still retains its proper force of righteousness. God's salvation is righteous, not indiscriminate. And the grounds on which he distinguishes His people from His enemies are not external, but internal. It is the Israel within Israel, the spiritual circumcision, the "holy seed," that He acknowledges, vindicates, rescues, glorifies . . . "There is no peace to the

to become manifest. ² Happy the mortal who practises this, and the son of man who taketh hold thereon; who keepeth the Sabbath so as not to pollute it, and keepeth his hand, that it do no evil! ³ And let not the foreigner, who hath joined himself to Jehovah, speak, saying, Surely Jehovah will separate me from his people; and let not the eunuch say,

ungodly." (Dr. Weir.) See also note on xli. 2. Sept. here has *τὸ ἐλεός μου*.—**To become manifest**] God's gifts are 'reserved in heaven' till at the fit moment the veil of partition is rent in twain. The same verb as in liii. 1.—

This . . . thereon] i.e., 'the law,' and 'righteousness,' a further explanation of which follows.—**The Sabbath**] The Sabbath is the representative of the duties of 'the first table' (as in Ezek. xx. 11–21). Contrary to etymology (see Del.'s note), and contrary to popular usage (who does not remember Heine's *Prinzessin Sabbath*?), the prophet treats 'Sabbath' as if it were of the masc. gender.—**Keepeth his hand . . .**] A negative description, suggested by the parallelism of the Sabbath-observance. It reminds us of xxxiii. 15, only that there a positive description precedes, which has here to be supplied mentally.

³ The prophet now devotes himself to remove a misunderstanding. He insists that the Beatitude of the preceding verse is universally applicable to those who keep God's commandments.—**And let not the foreigner . . .**] The anxiety of these proselytes seems rather unreasonable, if we remember only the moderation of the law in Deut. xxiii. 4–7. It becomes less so, if we take into consideration the severe spirit of the restored exiles (comp. Neh. xiii.), which doubtless began to show itself during the Captivity. The foreigners seem to have apprehended (such is the point of view at which the prophet places himself) that in consequence of this severity the Deuteronomic

law would be so altered as to exclude many who were formerly admissible into the community. With the glories of the Messianic age in prospect, it must have been miserable indeed for these earnest converts to feel themselves in danger of exclusion.—**And let not the eunuch say . . .**] The complaint of the eunuch is different from that of the proselyte; it is that he is 'a dry tree,' i.e., that he is without that hope of a quasi-immortality in offspring, which had, it would seem, not yet given way to the brighter hope of personal continuance. Apparently he takes his exclusion from the religious community as a matter of course; the law in Deut. xxiii. 2 was clear, and there seemed no probability of its being mitigated. But an answer is vouchsafed to his silent as well as to his spoken complaint. (I infer from the omission of the clause, found in v. 3, respecting voluntary adhesion to Jehovah that the prophet alludes to Israelitish eunuchs, made such against their will by heathen tyrants—'eunuchs were generally foreigners,'¹ as Dr. Weir remarks.) The case of the eunuchs is dealt with first. The decision is: 1. that they shall be admitted to religious communion, and 2. that, as a compensation for their childlessness, they shall receive an extraordinary **trophy and monument** in the temple itself. What sort of distinction is intended by this? Some (e.g., Knobel) suppose that it is a material record. We might think either of a memorial column, or of a tablet such as in very ancient synagogues commemorated the

¹ Comp. xxxix. 7, Jer. xxxviii. 7, Acts viii. 27 (Dr. Weir thinks the Ethiopian eunuch in the last passage may have been a Jew; comp. Acts xi. 20).

Behold, I am a dry tree. ⁴ For thus saith Jehovah of the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things which please me, and take hold on my covenant,—⁵ I give unto them in my house and within my walls a trophy and a monument better than sons and daughters, I will give to each an everlasting monument, which shall not be cut off. ⁶ And as for the foreigners that have joined themselves unto Jehovah, to minister unto him, and to love the name of Jehovah, becoming his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath so as not to pollute it, and taketh hold on my covenant: ⁷ I will bring them to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be acceptable upon mine altar; for my house shall be

munificence of individuals.¹ But there is a swing about the passage which rather commends the view that the memorial is a spiritual one (as in Rev. iii. 12). The prophet's real meaning is probably closely analogous to that of another evangelical passage (Matt. xxvi. 13), 'Whosoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her.'

⁴ **Take hold on my covenant]** Whether circumcision or Sabbath-observance is the outward sign of this 'taking hold,' cannot be absolutely determined. Here, as in Ezek. xx. 12, the Sabbath *seems* to have stepped into the place of circumcision; yet in lii. 1 Ezek. xlv. 9, circumcision is again referred to with honour.—**An everlasting monument . . .]** Closely parallel to xlv. 13 *b*.

⁶ **And as for the foreigners]** The proselytes too shall not be left outside in heathendom; the joy of the Shekinah shall be theirs. Comp. 1 Kings viii. 41-43, where Solomon prays that God would 'do according to all that the stranger calleth to thee for,' and Ps. cxxxv. 19, 20 (where, after the house of Israel, of Aaron, and of Levi, 'those that fear Jehovah'—i.e., the proselytes—are called upon to bless him).—**To**

minister unto him] Hitz. and Knobel think servile ministrations are referred to, such as were performed by the Nethinim slaves (comp. Ezra ii. 43). Usage, however, confines the verb to honourable functions, especially those of the priests and Levites; comp. lxi. 6. Dr. Weir appositely refers to lxvi. 21, where the addition of some of the Gentiles to the number of the priests is spoken of.—**His servants]** A lower term than 'ministers,' but joyfully accepted by the proselytes out of 'love' to the 'name of Jehovah.'

⁷ **Make them joyful]** A hint perhaps of the feast described in xxv. 6.—**In my house of prayer]** Sacrifices continue, but prayer takes the precedence of them as the distinctive purpose of the temple. Parallel passage, 1 Kings viii. 29, comp. 43, 60.

⁸ **The oracle of the Lord, Jehovah]** It is not common to place such a phrase at the beginning of a sentence; see, however, i. 24, Ps. cx. 1, Zech. xii. 1, where this or an almost identical expression is used as an introduction. The combination 'the Lord (Hebr. Adonai) Jehovah' prepares us to expect some great and new revelation. The addition of Gentile members to the community of

¹ See Löw's *Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde* (Leipz. 1870, 71, i. 28).

called a house of prayer for all the peoples. ⁸ The oracle of the Lord, Jehovah, who gathereth the outcasts of Israel: Yet more will I gather unto him, besides his own gathered ones.

the true Israel is, however, though a great, not by any means a new announcement (see xlv. 5., lv. 5). This, along with other peculiarities, has to be taken into consideration in the discussion of the unity of chaps. xl.—lxvi. — **Who gathereth the outcasts of Israel**] The phraseology reminds us of xi. 12. Comp. also xlix. 5, 6. — **Yet more will I gather . . .**] Those who are to be gathered are evidently Gentiles, of whom the proselytes mentioned in

the preceding verses are the first-fruits—'other sheep which are not of this flock' (John x. 16). Del. compares Ps. xlvii. 9 (10), which, if the text-reading be correct, is even strikingly parallel. The reading of Sept. and Pesh. ('with the people'), however, strikes me as intrinsically more probable; in this case the passage should be compared with Isa. xix. 24. — **Unto him**] viz., unto Israel.

CHAPTER LVI. 9—LVII.

A SUDDEN change in the style warns us that we are about to enter on a new prophecy, complete in itself, and with no connection (at any rate in the mind of the original writer of lvi. 9 &c.) with the preceding discourse. Hengstenberg,¹ indeed, has tried to evolve a connection ('gathering'—see lvi. 8—must, he remarks, be preceded by 'scattering'), but few writers will regard his attempt as satisfactory. 'It is absolutely incredible,' in the opinion of Bleek, 'that the prophet, after the promises that no evil of any kind should again hurt the people (ch. lv.), that the time of salvation was quite near, in which even the foreigners among the people should partake (ch. lvi. 1), should now suddenly summon up foreign nations to devour his people.'

The new prophecy falls into two parts. In the first half (lvi. 9—lvii. 2) the writer chastises the neglect of duty for profane and extravagant luxury on the part of Israel's spiritual 'shepherds,' while no one observes how the righteous are one by one gathered in from a generation fast ripening for a Divine judgment. In the second half (lvii. 3—21) he turns to the mass of the people, who mock at the few servants of Jehovah in their midst. He draws a vivid and appalling sketch of the sombre and licentious idolatry into which they and their fathers, the *pre-Exile* Israelites, have fallen:—on the state of religion among the exiles in Babylon he preserves a deep silence. At v. 11 a change in the prophet's tone is observable. In the name of Jehovah, he remonstrates with his people, and even partly excuses it. He promises a Divine interposition in its behalf; and then it will be seen whether the idols can deliver in the judgment which will overtake all but true believers. The prophecy closes with that honied rhetoric of which only Hosea and the writer of II. Isaiah possess the secret.

¹ *Christology of the Old Testament*, ii. 176.

According to Ewald¹ and Bleek² the whole of this discourse, down to lvii. 11 *a*, is a quotation from an older prophet of the time of Manasseh, or soon after. The strikingly Palestinian character of the scenery in lvii. 5, 6, the presumed reference to persecution in lvii. 1, and the correspondence of the sins imputed to the people with pre-Exile circumstances, give a strong plausibility to this hypothesis. Even Luzzatto³ (who ascribes all the rest of the book to Isaiah) considers the author of this section to have lived during the reign of Manasseh—*vv.* 1, 2 he considers to be a funeral song in memory of Isaiah, who, according to the legend, was sawn asunder by order of Manasseh.

In my former work (*J. C. A.*, p. 201) I attempted to diminish the force of Ewald's reasoning, and I may now add (1) that it seems to me rather doubtful (see below) whether lvii. 1 refers to a violent death by persecution, (2) that the persecution of Manasseh is not directly affirmed in the Old Testament—it is an inference from a combination of passages, (3) that, even granting its historical reality, Manasseh's is not the only persecution which might be alluded to—Gesenius refers to the narratives of Daniel and his three friends (*Dan.* iii. vi.). But it does not fall within the scope of this work to decide questions relative to the higher criticism; and I merely mention these conjectures because they embody impressions which have been felt by most students of Isaiah, whatever be their attitude towards the tradition of the Synagogue. The style of the former part of the prophecy by its 'harshness and lapidary brevity' reminds Delitzsch of that other most peculiar and isolated passage, lii. 13–liii. It is doubly remarkable following upon the facile oratory of chaps lv. lvi. 1–8, and not less surprising is the sudden change in the latter part to rhythmic simplicity and ease.

⁹ All ye wild beasts of the field, come to devour; all ye wild beasts in the forest! ¹⁰ His watchmen are blind, they are all of them undiscerning; they are all of them dumb

⁹ **All ye wild beasts]** 'My flock became food for every wild beast of the field, because there was no shepherd' (*Ezek.* xxxiv. 8, comp. xxxix. 4). 'Thy prophets, O Israel, are become like the foxes in the deserts' (*Ezek.* xiii. 4). A closer verbal parallel is *Jer.* xii. 9 (comp. *v.* 7): 'Assemble ye all the wild beasts of the field; bring them hither to devour.' Comp., too, the imitation in *Rev.* xix. 17, 18.—The 'wild beasts' are evidently the enemy, and Israel is the flock. The prophet adopts the strongest

way of expressing that Israel, utterly bereft of his natural defenders, lies at the mercy of the great heathen empire (Assyria or Babylonia).

¹⁰ **His watchmen are blind . . .]** i.e., the leaders of the people generally, but especially the prophets (*Ezek.* iii. 17, comp. *Isa.* xxi. 11—different word), who are compared to 'dumb dogs,' as opposed to the faithful shepherd's dogs (*Job* xxx. 1). We must suppose that the prophets referred to were no better than the ancient soothsayers, who

¹ *Die Propheten*, iii. 102, 103; comp. Ewald's account of the persecution of Manasseh in *History of Israel*, iv. 211, 212.

² *Introduction to the Old Testament*, ii. 48.

³ *Il profeta Isaia* (Padova, 1867), p. 573.

dogs, they cannot bark, ^a raving, lying down, ^a loving to slumber. ¹¹ But the dogs are greedy, they know not how to be satisfied, and these, ^b the pastors, ^b know not understanding; they all of them turn their own way, each after his gain, without exception. ¹² 'Come ye, let me fetch wine, and let us carouse with strong drink; and to-morrow shall be as this day, beyond all measure great.'

LVII. ¹ The righteous perisheth, and no man taketh it to heart, and pious men are gathered, none considering that ^c be-

^a Seers that lie down, some MSS., Symmachus, Vulg. (?), Kohut (another reading).

^b Shepherds, Hebr. text.

^c Before, Del.—Out of the way of, Kay.

gave oracles respecting the difficulties of every-day life, but were silent on the great moral questions. Besides their 'dumbness,' three other points are mentioned to the discredit of the writer's fellow-'watchmen':—1, they are not 'seers' (*khōzīm*), but 'ravers' or 'dreamers' (*hōzīm*)—they depend on a mere natural, and sometimes fallacious, faculty (Jer. xxiii. 25-28); 2, they keep up the old custom, rejected by the higher prophets as an abuse, of taking fees, Num. xxii. 7, 1 Sam. ix. 7, Neh. vi. 12, comp. Mic. iii. 3, Ezek. xiii. 19, xxii. 25; and, 3, they spend their gains in revelry, comp. xxviii. 7, Mic. ii. 11.—Obs., no inference can be safely drawn from this passage as to the date of the prophecy, since prophets and elders continued to exist during the Exile, see Jer. xxix., Ezek. viii. 1, xiv. 1, xx. 1, xxxiii. 1-9.

¹¹ **These, the pastors**] Or, 'these, pastors as they are.' Some, rendering 'shepherds,' think we have here a second figure; but this would come in limpingly after the highly developed simile of the dogs. It is better to render 'pastors,' and regard it as an official title of the rulers of the people (comp. Assyrian *ri'u* 'shepherd,' 'prince').—**Without exception**] On the rend., see De Dieu on Ezek. xxxiii. 2. Same idiom in Gen. xix. 4.

¹² **Come ye . . .**] A speech of one of the self-indulgent 'pastors,'

who invites his fellows to a two days' banquet. Comp. v. 11, 12, and especially xxviii. 1, 3, 7, which, by the similarity of its details, somewhat confirms the theory of Ewald and Bleek.

¹ **The righteous perisheth**] A concise and vigorous expression, fitted to stimulate thought. That the bad pastors should live long and see good days, while the righteous (especially among the pastors or prophets) are prematurely cut off, is a contradiction peculiarly great from the Old Testament point of view (comp. Eccles. vii. 15). 'The righteous,' in the singular, indicates the fewness and isolation of these Abdiels. 'Perisheth'—whether by natural or by violent means, the word does not expressly state. 'To perish' (Hebr. *'ābhādū*) properly means 'to lose oneself,' in other words, 'to pass out of sight'; every one remembers Ps. cxix. 176, where 'lost' = Hebr. *'ābhādū*. The same vague expression is used in the parallel passage, Mic. vii. 2 (comp. Ps. xii. 1).—**Pious men**] Lit., 'men of piety.' The Hebr. word here rendered 'piety' (*khēsedū*) includes both love to God and love to man; the context must decide whether 'piety' or 'mercy' is the better English equivalent. Here the parallel word 'the righteous' is decisive, in spite of the fact (which warns us against a mechanical use of the Concordance) that in the only other place

cause of^e the evil the righteous is gathered. ² He entereth into Peace; they rest upon their beds, whosoever hath walked straight before him. ³ But as for you, approach hither, ye

where the precise Hebrew phrase occurs (Prov. xi. 17, in the singular) it means, not 'the pious,' but 'the merciful.'—**Are gathered**] Again a *vox media*, which includes the notions of taking away (comp. xvi. 10) and gathering in (as Jacob 'was gathered to his kinsmen,' Gen. xlix. 33). It is difficult to decide which of these two notions is predominant here. A comparison of liii. 8 seems to suggest the former; it is natural that the 'servants of Jehovah' (liv. 17) should suffer with the Servant, the members with the Head. There might conceivably be an allusion to a religious persecution, such as that of Manasseh (see introduction, above). But the context seems to me to favour the notion of 'gathering in.' How could the ungodly, if the deaths of the righteous were owing to them, be expected to 'consider' the Divine purpose in permitting their evil deeds? and does not the tender, elegiac tone of *v.* 2 suit a natural better than a violent death?

—**None considering that**] The form of expression reminds us of liii. 8. In both passages, the rend. 'for' seems awkward (see, however, Naeg.).—**Because of the evil**] This premature removal of the righteous seemed but an ill reward for such faithful service; and yet it was dictated by mercy—as well towards the godly as towards the wicked. It delivered the former (1) from the sights of horror which 'vexed' and might have polluted their 'righteous souls,' comp. Wisd. iv. 14, Dante, *Purgat.* xiv. 111–113, and (2) from sharing in the retributive calamities impending over the nation (comp. Gen. xv. 15, 2 Kings xxii. 20). It warned the latter that their wickedness was great to be so punished (for even a few righteous

men can save a city, Gen. xviii. 23–32), and that a still more severe punishment was at the door. (Thus 'evil' has a double meaning).—For the Hebr. idiom, comp. x. 27, Jer. xlii. 17, li. 64.¹

² The prophet continues in a lyric strain. **He entereth into Peace**] The grave, or rather the Underworld, is here styled Peace, as elsewhere Stillness (Ps. xciv. 17, cxv. 17). Comp. Job iii. 17. We might also render 'into a state of peace' (comp. on xlv. 16). There is a contrast to the awful troubles which the survivors have to encounter (Hengst.).—**Upon their beds**] i.e., primarily their graves; comp. the Phœnician inscription of King Eshmunazar (ed. Schlottmann, iv. 1 &c.), 'the lid of this bed' (i.e., sarcophagus); the word is the same as here. See also Job xvii. 13 (a different word for bed), and especially Ezek. xxxii. 25. The phraseology of the latter passage implies a popular notion of a duplicate grave in the Underworld, corresponding to the double quasi-consciousness of the dead body and the soul or shade (respecting this see note on lxvi. 24). It may be the 'beds' in the Underworld to which the prophet refers, and which (whatever the popular belief was) he, at any rate, would hardly make contingent on the possession by these righteous confessors of separate graves. Such an honour was not always granted to faithful prophets (Jer. xxvi. 23).—**Straight before him**] A phrase quite in the style of the Book of Proverbs (comp. Prov. iv. 25–27).

³ **Approach hither**] viz., to hear your sentence.—**Ye sons of a sorceress . . .**] i.e., having an innate inclination (comp. Ps. li. 5) to

¹ Comp. Dr. Land's discussion of this clause in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1867, p. 203. To support the Isaianic authorship of this chapter Dr. Rutgers had rendered 'before the calamity'; against this, Dr. Land refers to the above-mentioned passages.

sons of a sorceress! seed ^d of an adulterer, and thou who (thyself) committest whoredom.^d ⁴ Of whom do ye make sport? Against whom do ye draw a wide mouth, do ye make a long tongue? Are ye not children of rebellion, a seed of falsehood? ^e Ye who inflame yourselves ^e by the terebinths,^e under every green tree; who slay the children in the torrent-valleys under the rents of the crags! ⁶ In the smooth stones of the valley are thy portion; they, they are

^d So Piscator, Cocceius, Stier, Hahn, — . . . and of her who committeth whoredom, Vulg. and most moderns.—Of an adulteress and a harlot, Klostermann (emendation).

^e With gods, Sept., Pesh., Targ., Vulg., Vit., Stier.

break the mystic marriage-tie between Jehovah and his people. Comp. Ezek. xvi. 44, 45.—**And thou who (thyself)** . . .] The construction is abruptly changed, with a striking effect. That innate tendency of thine has passed into act; comp. Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4, 'adulterous generation.' The rend. of Vulg. &c. is awkward; Klostermann's correction is plausible, but unnecessary.

⁴ **Of whom do ye make sport?** . . .] 'Who are they that ye find a luxurious pleasure in tormenting? Men of whom "the world is not worthy"! Judge if ye are not yourselves fitter objects of scorn.' 'Make sport' is an unexampled rendering (see lv. 2, lviii. 14, lxvi. 11), but is required by the context.

⁵ **Ye who inflame yourselves** . . .] Referring to the orgiastic cults in the sacred groves of Palestinian heathenism¹ (i. 29, Ezek. vi. 13). We must not, however, press the details of the description which follows too far; there is an 'adultery' of the heart (see on i. 21).—**Terebinths**] Comp. Hos. iv. 13, '(They sacrifice) under oaks and poplars and terebinths, because the shade thereof is good.' For the rend. see *Notes and Criticisms*, p. 38.—**Under every green tree**]

A common formula in the later books (see 1 Kings xiv. 23, 2 Kings xvi. 4, xvii. 10, Jer. ii. 20, iii. 6, 13, Ezek. vi. 13), also once in the disputed Book of Deuteronomy (xii. 2).—**Who slay the children**] 'Slay' here = 'sacrifice,' as Ezek. xvi. 21 (in a similar context).—**In the torrent-valleys**] The dry channels of winter-torrents (*wādys*), especially that of Hinnom, were the scenes of the child-sacrifices to the 'devouring' Fire-god, Moloch.² The wildness of the landscape perhaps suited such stern acts, and the action of the torrents produced an abundance of large rounded stones (such as are so often in Ezekiel contemptuously called *gillūlim*, 'lumps,' i.e. shapeless masses) for Moloch's altars.—Conservative critics have with much reason pointed out that the topographical references in this verse suggest that the prophecy was written in Palestine rather than in Babylonia. 'I need scarcely say,' observes Dr. Payne Smith, 'that as there are no torrents, but only canals, in the flat alluvial soil of Babylonia, so there are no torrent-beds there, but that these form a common feature of the landscape in Palestine and all mountainous countries.'³ See, however, note on xli. 19.

⁶ **The smooth stones**] The

¹ See Graf von Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Heft II., Abhandlung 2.

² On these child-sacrifices, see Kalisch's *Leviticus*, i. 365-7.

³ Payne Smith, *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*, p. 319; comp. Rutgers, *De echtheid*, enz. p. 90.

thy lot; even to them hast thou poured out drink-offerings, offered meal-offerings. Should I quiet myself in spite of these things?

⁷ Upon a mountain lofty and raised up hast thou placed thy bed: even thither hast thou gone up to offer sacrifice. ⁸ And behind the door and the post hast thou placed thy memorial, for apart from me hast thou uncovered, and gone

large smooth stones referred to above were the fetishes of the primitive Semitic races, and anointed with oil, according to a widely-spread custom (comp. *λίθοι λιπαροί lapides uncti, lubricati*). It was such a stone which Jacob took for a pillow, and afterwards consecrated by pouring oil upon it (Gen. xxviii. 11, 18). The early Semites and reactionary, idolatrous Israelites called such stones Bethels (*βαί-τυλοι, βατίλια*, is the Phœnician form of Bethel with a Greek termination), i.e., houses of El (the early Semitic word for God); the 'Jehovist' in Gen. *l. c.* implies that Jacob transferred the name from the stone to the place where the Divine being appeared to him. In spite of the efforts of the 'Jehovist,' who desired to convert these ancient fetishes into memorials of patriarchal history (comp. Gen. xxxi. 45-52), the old heathenish use of them seems to have continued, especially in secluded places (comp. Kuenen's fact-full appendix, *Religion of Israel*, i. 390-395).—**Thy portion**] Here we begin to meet with the 2nd pers. fem., Israel being regarded as the bride of her God, but at the same time as having a right of property over him (it is the idea of the 'covenant' under another form). With deep irony, the speaker unfolds how Israel has exchanged her property in the Almighty for smooth, polished blocks of stone. 'Portion,' see Jer. x. 16, Ps. xvi. 5, lxxiii. 26, cxix. 57, cxlii. 5 (in all these passages the term is used of Jeho-

vah), and comp. Deut. xxix. 26 (25), 'gods whom they had not known, and whom he had not *apportioned* unto them.'—**Hast thou poured out . . .**] Here begins a survey of Jewish idolatry before the Exile.—**Should I quiet myself . . .?**] It is an outbreak of Jehovah's grieved love or 'jealousy.' Comp. Jer. v. 2 (similar phrase in similar context).

⁷ The heights as well as the depths are profaned by debasing rites: the country is 'wholly given to idolatry.' Beware of taking the description too literally. It is not so much the licentious character of some of the heathen rites which is referred to, as the debased moral and spiritual condition connected with idolatry.—**Upon a mountain**] Shrines were erected by preference upon hills; comp. 2 Kings xvi. 4, Hos. iv. 13, Jer. ii. 20, Ezek. vi. 13. The extent of the ancient hill-religion may be estimated by the number of *mazārs* or tomb-houses, which surmount almost every conspicuous hill in Palestine. They are generally shaded by a great tree, which, like the *mazār* itself, is held sacred; 'rags and threads hang from its branches as votive offerings, and the name of a saint or prophet is often connected with the spot.'¹—**Thy bed**] Comp. Jer. iii. 2, Ezek. xvi., xxiii.

⁸ **And behind the door . . . thy memorial**] The expressions are dark. Most recent commentators (except Ewald) take 'memorial' to be the formula 'Jehovah is our

¹ Conder, *Quarterly Statements of Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1875, p. 39; Gan-neau, *La Palestine inconnue* (Paris, 1876), pp. 49-52.

up; thou hast enlarged thy bed, and obtained a contract from them (?); thou hast loved their bed; 'thou hast beheld the phallus.'^f ⁹ And thou hast travelled to the king with oil, and hast multiplied thy perfumes, and hast sent thy messengers afar off, and humbled thyself even to Sheól. ¹⁰ With the length of thy journey thou hast wearied thyself; yet thou hast not said, It is without result: thou didst get renewal of thy

^f (Wherever) thou hast beheld an (idolatrous) monument, Vitr.—Thou hast chosen a place, Pesh., Targ., Kiinchi, Lowth, Ges.

God, Jehovah is one,' which, according to Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20, was to be written on the posts of the house and on the gates; comp. the use of 'memorial' in Hos. xii. 5. Putting this 'memorial' *behind* the door is thought to have been a sign of contempt. But surely this is very doubtful: the new position of this object would make it all the more conspicuous to the inmates of the house. Besides, is it quite certain that the direction in Deuteronomy was so carefully carried out, or even perhaps intended to be literally carried out? (I waive questions of date.) It is safer to return to the view of the Targum and of Jerome, viz., that 'memorial' = idol (or rather idolatrous symbol—the phallus). So too Vitr., Lowth, Ewald, Grätz (comparing the Hebr. of Ezek. xvi. 17.—**Hast beheld the phallus**] i.e., 'didst look at it with pleasure' (see Del.'s note). The first alt. rend. will bear the same meaning (comp. 'thy memorial' in the first verse-half).

⁹ **And thou hast travelled to the king**] There is the same point in dispute as in viii. 21, xxx. 23, viz., whether 'king' designates the heavenly or the earthly ruler. Dr. Payne Smith (*Bampton Lectures for 1869*, p. 323) would settle the question by reading *ʾmōlek*, 'to Molech (or Moloch),' but the phrase 'travelling to Molech' has no parallel, and a comparison of v. 11, where it is certainly the fear of

man which is rebuked, and of Ezek. xxiii. 40, where we read of a messenger being sent for men from afar, favours the view that 'king' here means king of Assyria. It is that coquetting with heathen powers which is here, as so often elsewhere, denounced.—**With oil**] So Hos. xii. 1 (2).—**Thy messengers afar off**] Comp. the negotiations with Egypt denounced by Isaiah and Hosea, the Assyrian alliance of Ahaz, and the coalition formed by Azariah against Tiglath-Pileser.¹—**Hast humbled thyself even to Sheól**] 'No servility was too great for thee.' Sheól is here used metaphorically, as in vii. 11 b (see note). A reference to the infernal deities (Ew.) seems less appropriate.

¹⁰ **With the length of thy journey**] i.e., not merely 'with the long journey to Assyria,' but 'with thy ceaseless quest for help and protection,' including of course embassies to foreign kings, but also every other specimen of untheocratic 'policy.—**It is without result**] Lit., 'it is desperate.' Sept. *πᾶσομα*. The word is the same as in Jer. ii. 25, xviii. 12, but in a different context.—**Renewal of thy strength**] Vulg., 'vitam manūs tuæ.' The Hebr. idiom is similar to that in Gen. xviii. 10, 14, 'when this season liveth (again),' i.e., a year hence.—**Thou feltest not weak**] Dathe (ap. Stier), 'non sentis morbum tuum.' So Jer. v. 3,

¹ See Smith, *Assyrian Eponym Canon*, pp. 117–8, Schrader, *K. A. T.*, pp. 114–120, and especially the same writer's *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung* (Giessen, 1878), pp. 395–421.

strength, therefore thou feltest not weak. ¹¹ And at whom hast thou been alarmed so as to fear, that thou hast played the traitor, and me has not remembered, neither hast taken it to thy heart? Surely I have been silent, and ⁸ that for long,⁸ and therefore thou fearest not me. ¹² I will make known ^h my righteousness, and as for thy works—they cannot profit

⁸ Hiding myself, Sept., Vulg., Lowth (omitting one letter, and pointing differently).

^h So Pesh., Lowth, Weir.—Thy, Hebr. text.

‘Thou hast smitten them, and they did not feel weak.’

¹¹ **And at whom hast thou been alarmed . . .**] The verse is not ironical, as De Dieu and others (misled by the text-reading of *v. 12a*), but contains a kindly remonstrance (comp. li. 12, 13). ‘Who is there so strong and so terrible as to justify thee in thy infidelity towards Jehovah? No one. But is there no excuse for the behaviour of the Jews? There is, viz., Jehovah’s long “silence” (comp. xlii. 14), the cessation of his interpositions in behalf of his people.’ This seems to me the easiest way to explain the connection, which is certainly rather loose, between the two halves of the verse. Jehovah admits,¹ in other words, that the calamities of the Israelites have increased their alienation from him (comp. lxiii. 17, lxiv. 5). In the next verse he announces that he will try a new argument with these walkers ‘by sight’ and not ‘by faith.’—Ewald thinks the prophet here resumes in his own language, dropping that of the more ancient writer to whom he ascribes lvi. 9–lvii. 11 *a*. There is at any rate a very noticeable change in the prophet’s tone, which all at once becomes soft and encouraging.—**Surely I have been silent . . .**] ‘Surely it is because I have been silent, that thou accordest me no fear.’ Notice the prominent position of ‘me’ in the Hebrew, corresponding to the emphatic (because otherwise unnecessary) mention of the pronoun ‘I’ in this and the next verse. ‘Surely,’

lit., ‘have not . . .’ (prefixed to whole sentence as xxviii. 25). ‘I have been silent,’ &c.; comp. xlii. 14 (note). The participial clause in the Hebr. is causal.

¹² **I will make known . . .**] Jehovah will try a fresh argument. If ‘silence’ has taught no lessons, the speech of mingled mercy and judgment may work more effectually on the heart. Precisely so, in xlvi. 13, the same Divine speaker says to those who are ‘far from righteousness,’ ‘I bring near my righteousness.’ (Dr. Weir compares Ps. xxii. 31, xcvi. 2).—Those who retain the text-reading generally explain it as a piece of irony—‘I will show thy righteousness in its true colours—as “filthy rags”’ (lxiv. 6, Auth. Vers.). I doubt if this can be shown to suit the context; in the next chapter, which expressly deals with the self-righteous, it might perhaps pass, but the persons addressed here are not even acknowledged as worshippers of Jehovah. Add to this, that the word rendered ‘will make known’ is constantly used in II. Isaiah of the prophetic revelation of the deliverance of Israel. Rashi, Hitzig, and Knobel avoid a part of the objections to the text-reading by taking the words literally—‘I will show thee how to obtain righteousness,’ Rashi supposing internal righteousness to be intended, the other two external righteousness, i.e., deliverance, success in the sight of men (comp. liv. 17). But Rashi’s view presupposes a misinterpretation of

¹ Per questo la Scrittura condiscende | A vostra facultate, ecc. Dante, *Paradiso*, iv.

thee. ¹³ When thou criest, let thy ¹ medley of gods ¹ deliver thee! but the whole of them the wind shall carry off, a breath shall take away, while he that taketh refuge in me shall inherit the land, and take my holy mountain in possession. ¹⁴ And one said, Cast up, cast up, prepare the way; take up the stumbling-block out of the way of my people.

¹⁵ For thus saith the high and exalted One, who dwelleth for ever, whose name is Holy One: I dwell in the high and holy

¹ Abominations, Weir (emendation).

'thy works' in the second verse-half, while Hitzig's and Knobel's is not quite suitable in this connection, for, as *v.* 13 shows, there must be a great sifting of Israel before Jehovah's righteousness can become Israel's. Even in *liv.* 17 (which Hitz., Knob. ought to have compared), it is only of 'the servants of Jehovah' that the phrase 'their righteousness' i.e., their 'outward justification' is used, and it is immediately qualified by the addition ' (which is) of me.'—**Thy works**] i.e., thy idols (*xli.* 29, *comp. i.* 31).—**They cannot profit thee**] A phrase specially belonging to idols (see on *xliv.* 10).

¹³ **When thou criest**] Under the rod of chastisement. The speaker does not mean to emphasize the terrors of the judgment, but, assuming its near approach, shows that no help but Jehovah's will be of any avail.—**Thy medley of gods**] The idea is not merely that of number (*comp. Jer. ii.* 28), but of variety. Jehovah says ironically that the Jews had 'set up a kind of Pantheon, open to all religions. *Comp. Mic. i.* 7, 'she heaped them (viz., the idols) together out of the hire of a harlot.' The Hebr. is peculiar, but not so peculiar as to necessitate Dr. Weir's ingenious correction.—**Shall inherit the land**] viz., Judah (*xlix.* 8). The familiar promise attached sometimes to fulfilment of the Law (*Deut. iv.* 1, *comp. 40, v.* 33), sometimes to moral qualities, such as humility (*Ps. xxxvii.* 11), righteous-

ness (*Ps. xxxvii.* 29), and, as here, trust in Jehovah (*Ps. xxxvii.* 9). *Comp. lvi.* 7.

¹⁴ **And one said . . .**] Another of those mysterious voices which fill the air round about the prophet. It conveys a summons to prepare the way for the people of Jehovah (*comp. xl.* 3, *lxii.* 10), and to remove the 'stumbling-blocks' which Jehovah himself (*Jer. vi.* 21 Weir) had placed in Israel's path. *Comp. xxvi.* 7.

¹⁵ Here a new paragraph begins—the concluding one of the section. The ground of Israel's hope of salvation is the combined highness and humbleness (*anāvāh Ps. xviii.* 36) of Jehovah (*comp. lxvi.* 2, *Ps. cxxxviii.* 6). As an old Jewish writer says, 'Wherever the Scripture bears witness to the Divine mightiness, it brings out side by side with it the Divine humbleness, e.g., *Deut. x.* 17, *comp. 18*; *Isa. lvii.* 15 *a*, *comp. 15 b*; *Ps. lxxviii.* 4, 5.'¹ Jehovah cannot direct the affairs of his people from without; he desires to be enthroned in their hearts. When they turn away from him, he punishes them; but by gentle, spiritual means he moves them to return to him as penitent sinners.—**Who dwelleth for ever**] i.e., the eternal, the unchangeable (like 'the First and the Last,' *xliv.* 6).—**Whose name is Holy One**] i.e. who reveal myself as the Holy One. See on *xl.* 25.—**The high and holy place**] i.e., the heavenly temple (*vi.* 1).—**With him also that is crushed . . .**]

¹ *Megilla*, 31 *a*, quoted by Del. on *Ps. xviii.* 3^b

place, with him also that is crushed and lowly in spirit, to revive the spirit of the lowly, and to revive the heart of those who are crushed. ¹⁶ For I will not contend for ever, nor will I be wrathful continually, for the spirit would faint before me, and the souls which I have made. ¹⁷ For his unjust gain I was wrathful and smote him; I hid my face, and was wrathful, because he went on perversely in the way of his own

'With,' i.e., in close proximity to. The prophet implicitly contradicts the Epicureans of his day, who denied what the psalmist (above) calls the 'humbleness' of God, and said, 'Is not God in the height of heaven? how can he perceive?' (Job xxii. 12, 13). 'Crushed,' not 'contrite' (Auth. Vers. after Vulg.), which is a misleading rendering. 'Crushed in spirit' is almost synonymous with lowly, hills being the emblem of pride, and level land of humility; it implies, in addition, that the lowly state of mind has been produced by affliction—in the present case, the affliction of Zion; comp. lxi. 1, 2, lxxv. 14, lxxvi. 2, Ps. xxxiv. 18 (19), cxlvii. 2, 3.

¹⁶ Jehovah is 'a wise and faithful Creator.'—**For I will not contend . . .**] To 'contend' = to send adversity, to punish (as xxvii. 8). The idea of this verse is very characteristic of the tender-hearted author; see xlii. 3, and comp. Ps. ciii. 9, lxxviii. 38, 39 (post-Exile psalms).—**The souls which I have made**] The expression is noteworthy, as implying the separate personality of man (comp. Zech. xii. 1, Jer. xxxviii. 16); the Old Testament writers are not always equally explicit (see Ps. civ. 29, Job xxxiv. 14). The choice of the word for 'soul' (*nēshāmāh*, lit., 'breath' is itself significant; it means the principle of life breathed immediately by God into the human body (Gen. ii. 7), the self-conscious personal spirit.

¹⁷ **For his unjust gain**] Lit., 'for the iniquity of his gain.' Del. renders 'for the guilt of his self-seeking,' i.e., for his desire for worldly possessions. I doubt if we

have a right to introduce such a paraphrase into the text; the more so, as it is perhaps not strictly accurate. The fact is, that 'unjust gain' is used by the prophets and psalmists, precisely in the same way as 'bloodshed,' as a representative of the besetting sins of the Jews. Jeremiah, for instance, says (vi. 13), 'For from the least unto the greatest of them every one gaineth unjust gain': elsewhere (v. 1) he even denies that there is a single man of probity and justice left. Similarly, Ezekiel says (xxxiii. 31), 'Their heart goeth after their unjust gain,' and the typical righteous man in Ps. cxix. (z. 36) prays, 'Incline my heart to thy testimonies and not to unjust gain,' and the very prophecy before us singles out the passion for money as the chief sin of the spiritual shepherds of the Jews. It is just the same with the sin of murder (including doubtless judicial murder), which is laid at the door of the Jews with a really surprising persistency; comp. i. 15, v. 7, xxxiii. 15, lix. 3, Jer. ii. 34, Ezek. vii. 23, Hos. iv. 2, Mic. iii. 10, vii. 2, Prov. i. 11. We are, therefore, abundantly justified in supposing that where a prophet or a psalmist seems to lay a disproportionate emphasis on a single sin, such as murder or unjust gain, he means to include all the other besetting sins of the Jews under this head, especially, of course, those sins of violence, to which the upper classes (chiefly addressed by the prophets) were peculiarly prone. Only thus can we understand a passage like the present, which seems to ascribe the Exile to simple 'covetousness,'

heart. ¹⁸ His ways have I seen, ^k and I will heal him ; and I will lead him, and give a requital of comfort to him and to his mournful ones. ¹⁹ He createth ^l the fruit of the lips ; ' Peace, peace to the far off and to the near,' saith Jehovah, ' for I will heal him.' ²⁰ But the wicked are like the sea that is tost

^k But, Ges., Naeg.

^l So Kay.—I create, Rashi, Kimchi, Calv., Vittr.—I have created, Vulg.—He who createth, Naeg. ; or, created, Ew.—Creating, Sept., Ges., Hitz., Del.—I who created, Targ. (connected with *v.* 18 ; so also Ges.).

and like Ps. li. 14, where the typical Israelite, who makes no other individualising reference, and elsewhere lays the chief stress on his sinful nature, prays, ' Deliver me from (the guilt of) bloodshed . . . and my tongue shall sing aloud of thy righteousness.' I may add, that there is perhaps a special reason here for the selection of ' unjust gain' as a representative sin in the Divine law of the correspondence of punishment to guilt. Land being the object of a high-born Jew's covetousness, expulsion from his land was to be his punishment ; see *v.* 8, 9, Jer. vi. 12, 13.

¹⁸ **His ways have I seen**] Jehovah has seen the thorny ways in which His people has been wandering ; He will heal his wounds (*xxx.* 26), and guide him by an easier path (*lviii.* 11), or, as Ew., ' I have seen the amendment of his ways.'

—**A requital of comfort**] As a compensation for his long sufferings (comp. on *xl.* 2).—**And to his mournful ones**] ('And' = namely). So *lxi.* 2, 3 ; comp. the fuller phrase in *lxvi.* 10.

¹⁹ **He createth . . .**] It is an exclamation of the prophet (Kay) ; a participial clause, as in *xl.* 22, 23.

—**The fruit of the lips**] This may mean (1) praise and thanksgiving (as Ges., Ew., Del., Kay) ; comp. *Hos.* *xiv.* 2, *Heb.* *xiii.* 15. On this view of the passage, it contains a second argument (the first being drawn from Jehovah's mercifulness) for the 'healing' or restoration of Israel, viz. that praise is one of God's 'creations' or appointments, and that Israel, having been 'formed' to 'tell out His praise'

(*xliiii.* 21), must not be hindered from his mission. Or (2) with Jerome, the Rabbis, Calv., Hitz., Henderson, we may take 'the fruit of the lips' to refer to the word of Jehovah which follows. In any case it is not ordinary speech which is thus described, but some happy and happy-making communication, worthy to be called a 'fruit' (as in *Prov.* *x.* 31), comp. Mohammed's saying of the garden of Eden, 'No vain discourse shall they hear therein, but only "peace"' (*Korán, Sur.* *xix.* 63). But the first way is surely the preferable one. Hitherto the lips of faithful Israelites ('his mournful ones') have been sealed by sorrow ; now Jehovah, by his creative word, causes them to blossom with praise.—**Peace, peace**] i.e., perfect peace (as *xxvi.* 3).—**To the far off and to the near**] i.e., either 'to the Gentile and to the Jew' (Stier, Naeg., after *Eph.* *ii.* 17, comp. *xlii.* 6), or, which suits the context better, 'to him who is far from Jerusalem and to him who is near to it' (Kimchi, Calv., Ew., Del.), see *Dan.* *ix.* 7, and comp. *xliii.* 5-7, *xlix.* 12. No degree of remoteness was to disqualify true Israelites for the enjoyment of the promise.

^{20, 21} A moving contrast. **The ungodly**] those who are, whether only inwardly or also outwardly, in a state of alienation from Jehovah, shall never 'enter into peace.' For the figure, comp. *Jude* 13, 'wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame.' This closing sentence of the second portion of prophecy agrees with *xlvi.* 22, except that 'my God' comp. *vii.* 13) is substi-

up, for it cannot rest, and its waters toss up mire and mud.

²¹ There is no peace, saith ^m my God, ^m to the ungodly.

^m Jehovah, many Hebr. MSS.—God, Sept. (Vatican MS.), Targ.—Jehovah my God, a very few Hebr. MSS.—The Lord [Jehovah] Elohim, Sept. (Alex. MS.), Vulg.

tuted for 'Jehovah,' as if the speaker would thus put his seal to the Divine oracle. The phrase is self-assertive; the prophet magnifies

his office. Jehovah *is* in a special sense the God of 'his servants the prophets' (Am. iii. 7).

CHAPTER LVIII.

Contents.—The Jewish nation is first rebuked for its formal religion, shown especially in its unspiritual mode of fasting, which deprives its prayers for deliverance of all efficacy (*vv.* 1-4); then the true mode of fasting is held up for imitation (*vv.* 5-12); finally, the duty of Sabbath-observance is inculcated, and a promise of 'inheriting the land' attached to it. The practical tone here adopted reminds us of lvi. 1-8 (see introductory remarks).

¹ Call with the throat, hold not back; like a trumpet raise thy voice, and declare unto my people their rebellion, and unto the house of Jacob their sins. ² And (yet) me they consult daily, and to know my ways they desire: as a nation that hath done righteousness, and hath not forsaken the law of its God, they ask of me judgments of righteousness, ^a the approach of God they desire.^a ³ Wherefore have we fasted,

^a So most moderns.—In approaching to God they delight, Sept., Pesh., Targ., Vulg., Calv., Vit., Kay.

¹ **Call with the throat]** Not merely with the lips, i.e., softly (1 Sam. i. 13), but 'à plein gosier,' as Calvin puts it. Comp. Ps. cxlix. 16, 'High praises of God in their throat.'—**Declare unto my people . . .]** A reminiscence of Mic. iii. 8. Obs., the priests are not mentioned in this homily; the laity alone are addressed.

² **And (yet) . . .]** Rebellious and sinful as they are. Or else understand, 'For they deem themselves to be righteous,' and continue 'and (= consequently) they consult me,' &c.—**Me they consult]** 'Me' is put emphatically at the beginning of the verse—'me, the All-holy and the All-just.' 'Consult'

is the usual word for applying to an oracle or a prophet, and no doubt consultations of the prophet are included (see Ezek. xx. 1), but direct prayer to God is also meant (see *v.* 4 and comp. lv. 6).—**My ways]** i.e., my dealings with my people.—**The law]** Hebr. *mishpāt* (see on xlii. 1).—**Judgments of righteousness]** i.e., manifestations in act of Jehovah's fidelity to his covenant-engagements with Israel. Comp. on lix. 9.—**The approach of God]** i.e., his approach to judgment. Alt. rend. spoils the parallelism.

³ **Wherefore have we fasted]** The reproofs in this part of the prophecy remind us of Zech. vii. 5,

and thou seest not—humbled our soul, and thou takest no notice? Behold, in your fasting ye pursue business, and all your ^b tasks ye exact.^b ⁴ Behold, it is for strife and contention ye fast, and to smite with the fist of wickedness: ye do not so fast at this time as to make your voice to be heard in the height. ⁵ Can such be the fast that I choose, the day when a man humbleth his soul? Is it to bow down one's head like a bulrush, and to make sackcloth and ashes his couch? Wilt thou call this a fast, and a day acceptable to

^b So Ges. (Thesaurus), Hitz., Naeg., Weir.—Workmen ye drive, Ges. (Commentary), Ew., Del.

6 (comp. viii. 19), Joel ii. 12, 13. Fasting, both public and private, appears to have become more and more prevalent in and after the Babylonian period; the passage before us may refer equally to special private fasts and to those required by the ecclesiastical authorities (comp. Matt. ix. 14, Luke xviii. 12). The effect of the prophetic exhortations was peculiar (see on *v.* 7); it was not till after the last siege of Jerusalem that the evil of formal fasting began to be at all generally felt. That great calamity, however, did open the eyes of the Jewish people. The short homily on the fasting of the heart, which, according to *Taanith*, ii. 1, was pronounced at public fasts, is quite in the spirit of the prophetic exhortations; comp. also quotations from Talmud (*Nedarim babli*, p. 10 *a*, *Kiddushin jerush.*, end), in Gratz's *Kohélet*, pp. 33, 34.—**Humbled our soul**] A characteristic phrase of the Levitical legislation, which almost (I must not say 'entirely,' for in Ps. xxxv. 13, the two forms of expression are combined) supplanted the word 'to fast;' see Lev. xvi. 29, 31, xxiii. 27, 32, Num. xxix. 7, xxx. 13. It was evidently a well-known technical phrase when our prophet wrote, for in *v.* 5 he uses it as such, simply deepening its meaning.—**Ye pursue business**] (The rend. 'business' seems absolutely necessary here, as also in Ecclesiastes, where Sept. renders *τρᾶγμα*. It is doubtful, however, in spite of Ges.,

whether this meaning can be established elsewhere.) Unlike the Sabbath, the fast-days (except the great Day of Atonement) appear not to have involved the cessation of business. Hence the prophet continues, **All your tasks ye exact**] Ye are specially anxious at such times that the service of God should not interfere with that of mammon. Ye 'exact' the full tale of works, like slave-drivers (the participle of the verb has this meaning, see Ex. v. 6, Job iii. 18). 'The prophet paints throughout from the life,' observes Delitzsch in his first edition, 'and we cannot be persuaded by Stier's false zeal for Isaiah's authorship to give up the opinion that we have here a figure drawn from the experience of the exiles in Babylon!' That the prophet paints from the life is certain, but no more than this.

⁴ **Behold, it is for strife . . .**] The only result of this formal fasting is strife and violence.—**Ye do not so fast . . .**] This glaring inconsistency prevents your prayers for a Divine interposition (*v.* 2) from rising to the pure 'height,' where Jehovah dwelleth (lvii. 15 Hebr.). Comp. Lam. iii. 44, 'Thou hast covered thyself with clouds, so that prayer may not pass through.'—**When a man humbleth his soul**] viz., according to the intention of the legislator.—**Like a bulrush**] 'With a merely physical inclination of the head' (Kay).—**Wilt thou call**] From this point

Jehovah? ⁶ Is not this the fast that I choose—to loose the bands of wickedness, to untie the thongs of the yoke, and to set them that are crushed at liberty, and that ye burst in sunder every yoke? ⁷ Is it not to break thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring miserable outcasts to their home? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and hide not thyself from thine own flesh? ⁸ Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, thy new flesh shall quickly shoot forth, and thy righteousness shall go before thee, and the glory of Jehovah shall be thy rearward. ⁹ Then shalt thou call, and Jehovah shall answer; thou shalt cry, and he shall say, Here I am. If thou remove from the midst of thee the yoke, the stretching out of the finger, and speaking wickedness, ¹⁰ and minister thy

the prophet addresses personified Israel (see *v.* 14).

⁶ **To untie the thongs of the yoke**] Metaphorically, of course. The elaborate and merciful legislation for the protection of Hebrew slaves (Ex. xxi. 2 &c., Deut. xv. 12 &c., Lev. xxv. 39 &c.) appears to have been long a dead letter (see Jer. xxxiv. 8–22)—a warning, be it observed, not to attach too much importance to the *argumentum e silentio* with regard to the date of Hebrew laws.—As to the Jewish yoke, see Del.'s note on x. 27.—**To set them that are crushed** . . .] In the spirit of him who cherishes the 'crushed reed' (xlii. 3, same word).

⁷ The same duties are enforced by the great Exile-prophet Ezekiel (xviii. 7, 16). These and similar exhortations seem to have had great effect in the post-Exile period; in fact, a new formalism appears to have arisen out of them (Matt. vi. 1–4). Comp. the LXX. rendering of i. 27 *b*, and the Rabbinic use of 'righteousness' (צ'דקָה) for alms-giving—a fore-announcement of which is found as early as Dan. iv. 27, 'redeem thy sins by beneficence' (lit., righteousness; see *Q.P.B.*).—**To break thy bread**] Alluding to the oval cakes which formed the Jewish bread.—**Miserable outcasts**] Referring probably to Jews in foreign slavery; comp. Joel iii. 2–

8, and especially Neh. v. 8.—**To their home**] i.e., to their native land (as xiv. 17).—**Hide not thyself**]=turn not coldly away (Deut. xxii. 1).—**Thine own flesh**] not merely thine own kindred (Gen. xxix. 14, xxxvii. 27), but, more broadly, thine own countrymen; see the close parallel in Neh. v. 5.

⁸⁻¹⁴ A series of glorious promises to the obedient.—**Thy righteousness**] i.e., thy justification in the eyes of all the world (liv. 17); or, perhaps more suitably, thy inward, personal righteousness (i. 27, xxxiii. 5, 6).—**The glory of Jehovah** . . .] Almost word for word as in lii. 12.

⁹ **Then shalt thou call** . . .] A contrast to the unacceptable and unanswered prayers of the past (*vv.* 2, 4).—**The stretching out of the finger**] The middle finger, the 'infamis digitus,' Pers. ii. 33. The objects of contempt are not mentioned, but can be easily supplied from the context. I doubt if we have a right to compare lvii. 4, lxvi. 5:—there is no mention in this chapter of a party entirely hostile to belief in Jehovah.—**Speaking wickedness**] i.e., as the context shows, plotting evil against others.

¹⁰ **And minister thy sustenance** . . .] Surely not 'thy dainties' (as Knob.). The noun literally means 'thy soul,' i.e., that in

sustenance to the hungry, and satisfy the humbled soul ; then shall thy light rise in darkness, and thy thick darkness be as the noon, ¹¹ and Jehovah shall lead thee continually, and satisfy thy soul in dry places, and thy bones shall he make supple ; and thou shalt be like a well-watered garden, and like a fountain whose waters disappoint not. ¹² And ^e thy children shall build up ^e the ancient ruins ; thou shalt raise up the foundations of past generations, and men shall call thee Repairer of the breach, Restorer of roads for habitation.

¹³ If thou turn thy foot from the Sabbath, so as not to do thy business on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy thing of Jehovah honourable, and honour it, so as not to do after thy wont, nor pursue thy business, nor speak

^e So Weir (emendation).—Through thee shall be built up, Sept., Vulg., Ew., Böttcher, (so too *nonnulli*, mentioned by Calvin).—(They that shall spring) from thee shall build up, Hebr. text, according to most.

which thy life consisteth (Deut. xxiv. 6), not 'dainties,' but bread. [This verse shows how unsafe is the common argument that such and such a Hebrew word must have a particular meaning, because it has this meaning somewhere else in the same section. Here is 'soul' used in two senses close together.] —**The humbled soul**] 'Humbled,' not by formal fasting, but by misery.

¹¹ **Shall lead thee continually**] For it was not enough to be guided (or to have been guided back) to Palestine : see on xl. 11.—**In dry places**] The Messianic age seems to have receded for a time into the dim distance. There are still 'dry places' to apprehend, but a foretaste of the expected blessings shall be granted to the faithful.—**Like a well-watered garden**] So Jer. xxxi. 12 (nowhere else) ; for the idea, comp. xlv. 3, 4.

¹² **Shall build up . . .**] Closely parallel with lxi. 4.—**The anotent ruins**] Lit., the ruins of antiquity ; by 'antiquity' is meant the long period of the Exile (comp. xlii. 14, [vii. 11 Hebr.]).—**The breach**] i.e., the broken down walls.—**Roads for habitation**] We should

have expected 'roads for travelling,' but Job xxiv. 13 proves that 'to inhabit roads' is an idiomatic Hebrew phrase. It seems to have come from a time when a large part of the country was uninhabitable, because devoid of roads.

^{13, 14} The prophet evidently regards the fast-days as mere forms without authority or significance. All the more strict is his view of the claims of the Sabbath.—**Turn thy foot from the Sabbath**] As if it were holy ground (Ex. iii. 5). A similar phrase in Prov. iv. 27.—**Thy wont**] Lit., thy ways, i.e., thy wonted round of occupations.—**Nor speak words**] Not that either now or at any later time absolute silence was a part of the unwritten Sabbath-law (see Del.'s note), but that 'in the multitude of words there wanteth not transgression' (Prov. x. 19, comp. Eccles. v. 3). So 'a man of tongue' = a malicious speaker, Ps. cxl. 11 (comp. v. 9 above). The phrase will also cover false or unfounded statements (Hos. x. 4, Job xv. 13?) 'words of the lips' (xxxvi. 5). Observe the emphasis laid on *words*, both human and divine, as well in the Old as in the New Test. (comp. on ix. 8).

words ; ¹⁴ then shalt thou delight thyself in Jehovah, and I will make thee to ride over the heights of the land, and to eat the inheritance of Jacob thy father ; for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it.

¹⁴ **Then shalt thou delight thyself . . .**] The condition being, 'If thou call the Sabbath a delight,' we should expect the apodosis to run 'Then shall Jehovah delight himself in thee,' and this is evidently the meaning.—**To ride**

over . . .] i.e., to take triumphal possession of Palestine with its hills and fortresses (Deut. xxxii. 13, comp. xxxiii. 29). Comp. for the idea lxxv. 9 ; also Ezek. xxxiv. 13, 14, xxxvi. 1-12 (obs. Ezekiel's passion for 'the mountains of Israel').

CHAPTER LIX.

Contents.—This chapter continues the subject of chap. lviii. With all its observance of the outward forms of religion, the prophet's contemporaries (unless we suppose his point of view to be ideal, that is, prophetically imaginative, and not historical) are guilty of open violations of the moral law (*vv.* 1-8). But soon the prophet assumes that his admonitions have borne fruit. The Jews penitently confess their sins, and their breach of the covenant with Jehovah ; they lament their unhappy state, and own that they have no claim upon their God for assistance (*vv.* 9-15 *a*). Then follows a splendid theophany. As there is no other champion, Jehovah interposes. The last verse communicates a special word of promise to the true Israel.—The first part of the chapter presents affinities to Proverbs (see especially on *vv.* 7, 8), and to Ps. lviii. (see Kay, *The Book of Psalms*, p. 181).

¹ Behold, the hand of Jehovah is not too short to deliver, nor his ear too heavy to hear ; ² but your iniquities have been separating between you and your God, and your sins have hidden the Face from you, so that he heareth not. ³ For your

¹ The prophet meets some implied objections of the Jews.—**The hand of Jehovah . . .**] Comp. l. 2, Num. xi. 23.

² **Your iniquities . . .**] 'For a long time past your acts have been belying your professions, and precluding an answer to your prayers' (lviii. 2-4).—**Have hidden the Face . . .**] 'The Face' means much the same as 'the Name of

Jehovah,' i.e., the self-manifesting side of the Divine nature (see on lxiii. 9, i. 12, xl. 10). Notice the absence both of article and of suffix (in the Hebrew) 'Face' (*pānim*) has almost become a proper name.¹

³ **Your hands**] 'The very hands ye stretch out in prayer, i. 15' (Dr. Weir).—**Are defiled with blood**] On this accusation, the strangeness

¹ The only other passages in which *hstir* ('to hide') and *pānim* ('face') without a suffix occur together are, according to Dr. Weir, liii. 3, Job xxxiv. 29. In the former passage there is no occasion for a suffix ; in the latter, it is 'the Face' of Jehovah, as here, which is spoken of.

hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity ; your lips speak lies, and your tongue muttereth depravity. ⁴None ^apreferreth his suit ^awith truthfulness, and none pleadeth with honesty ; they trust in chaos, and speak emptiness ; they conceive trouble, and bring forth iniquity. ⁵Basillisks' eggs they hatch, and spiders' webs they weave ; he that eateth of their eggs will die, and, if one be crushed, it breaketh out into a viper. ⁶Their webs will not serve for clothing, neither can men cover themselves with their works ; their works are works of mischief, and the deed of violence is in their hands. ⁷Their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed innocent blood ; their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity ; desolation and destruction are in their highways. ⁸The way of

^a Similarly Lowth, Ges., Knob., Naeg., Weir.—Speaketh in public, Hitz., Ew., Del.

of which is only not felt because of its frequency, see notes on i. 15, lvii. 17. I entirely coincide with Dr. Weir, that 'the description in this and the following verses can scarcely [cannot possibly] apply to Israel in exile.'

⁴ **None preferreth his suit**] In *vv.* 1-3 grace was seeking and pleading ; hence the second person. At this point the remonstrance passes into a denunciation—The sense 'to prefer a suit' (= *in jus vocare*, καλεῖν ἐπὶ δίκην), is justified by Job ix. 16, xiii. 22 ; it accords well with *vv.* 14, 15. Dr. Weir remarks, 'Perhaps *qōrē* is here the person who appeals to the judge for vindication and assistance. If so, he will be *qōrē* in relation to the judge, *nishpāt* in relation to his adversary.' A different view was taken in *I. C. A.*, p. 210.—**They trust in chaos**] The basis of society (if it can be said to have one) is, not faith in God and goodness, but falsehood and deceit, in other words, a lifeless, unproductive chaos (see on xl. 17).—**Emptiness**] That which has no moral content.—**Conceive trouble . . .**] The same image in Job xv. 35, Ps. vii. 14 (15), comp. Isa. xxxiii. 11.

⁵ **Basillisks' eggs they hatch**] They brood over purposes as per-

nicious as the eggs of basilisks (see on xiv. 29), and as unprofitable to others as spiders' webs. So the figures are explained in the sequel, though the application of the second strikes a Western reader as far-fetched (see on v. 6).—**He that eateth . . .**] When any of their plans are opposed, they take a cunning and malicious revenge. For the mixture of images in the last clause, comp. Deut. xxxii. 32, 33.

⁶ **Their webs . . . for clothing**] Here the prophet gives a fresh turn to the figure. The Jews themselves are now the weavers, not of any useful object, but of works of violence.

⁷ **Their feet run . . . in their highways**] The first half of the verse occurs again in Prov. i. 16 (except that 'innocent' is wanting) ; the second reminds us of Prov. xvi. 17, 'The highway of the upright is to avoid evil' (i.e., he bestows as much care on avoiding evil as the pioneer does on constructing a road). These demoralised Jews, however, build up their highways with 'desolation and destruction' (an assonance in the original).

⁸ Note the four words for 'way' in this and the preceding verse, all found in the Book of Proverbs. In v. 7 we have the laboriously

peace they know not, and there is no justice in their tracks; their paths they have made for themselves crooked; whosoever treadeth thereon knoweth not peace.

⁹ Therefore hath justice been far from us, and righteousness doth not overtake us; we wait for light, but behold darkness, for gleams of light, but we walk in thick darkness. ¹⁰ We grope like blind men along the wall; and as eyeless men we grope; we have stumbled at noonday as in the twilight; amidst ^b those full of life (?) ^b as dead men. ¹¹ We growl, all of us, like bears, and mourn sore like doves; we

^b So Ew., Del., Naeg.—Dark places, Targ., Vulg., D. Kimchi, Rödiger, Knob.

constructed 'highway': in *v.* 8, first, the most general word for 'way,' next, the waggon-tracks, and lastly, the paths made by the constant treading of wayfarers.—**For themselves**] i.e., in their interest.—**Crooked**] reminds us of Prov. *x.* 9, xxviii. 18, ii. 15.—**Knoweth not peace**] Note the suggestive variation on the opening clause of the verse.

⁹⁻¹⁵ ^a Here the prophet speaks in the name of his penitent people. Contrast the self-righteous language of lviii. 3.—**Therefore**] i.e., because of our sins; not because Jehovah cannot or will not help us (comp. *v.* 12).—**Hath justice been far from us**] 'Justice' or 'judgment'—either rendering is admissible. 'Judgment' would mean a judicial interposition of Jehovah on behalf of his people; this would suit the immediate context, including *v.* 11, but would not fit *v.* 14, and hardly *v.* 15. 'Justice' or 'right' will suit all the passages; only we must distinguish (with Naeg.) between theocratic and civil 'justice.' The theocratic covenant entitled Israel to expect the help of Jehovah in time of need. Israel, however, complained (as xl. 27) or at least lamented (as here) that its 'right' was withheld, and the claims of 'justice' disallowed. There is no essential difference between the two renderings; it is on account of *v.* 15 that I prefer 'justice.' In *v.* 14 it is of course civil 'justice'

which is meant; it is implied that the absence of theocratic is conditioned by that of civil 'justice.' The former is called, in the parallel line, 'righteousness,' still alluding to the covenant between Jehovah and Israel.—Knobel suggests that the despondency of the Jews may have arisen from Cyrus's temporary transference of the seat of war from Babylonia to Asia Minor (he quotes Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 2 9, Justin i. 7); and Delitzsch too thinks that this is conceivably right. I doubt it greatly: it is Jehovah, and not Cyrus, or any human champion, of whom the Jews here complain. All that is certain is that the prophet is painting from the life; it is no rhetorical phrasemonger that we have before us. But the historical reference of the section is wrapt in obscurity.

¹⁰ **We grope like blind men** . . .] Comp. Deut. xxviii. 29: it is not clear at first sight which passage is the original, and which the imitation.—**Amidst those full of life**] On Knobel's theory, this will refer to the arrogance of the Babylonians, who, according to the story, ventured to hold a revel at the very height of the siege of Babylon. But reading, rendering, and interpretation are perhaps all rather doubtful.

¹¹ **Like bears . . . like doves**] The 'dove' is a well-known symbol of lamentation (comp. xxxviii. 14, Ezek. vii. 16, Nah. ii. 7); Horace and Ovid (quoted by Bochart), but

wait for justice, but there is none, for deliverance, but it is far from us. ¹² For our rebellions are manifold before thee, and our sins each testify against us ; for our rebellions are with us ; and as for our iniquities, we know them,—¹³ treason and unfaithfulness to Jehovah, and drawing back from after our God, speaking ° perverseness and transgression, conceiving and uttering from the heart lying words. ¹⁴ And justice hath been driven back, and righteousness standeth afar off ; for truth hath stumbled in the broad place, and rectitude cannot

° So Graetz (see on xxx. 12).—Oppression, Hebr. text.

no other Biblical writer, speak of the bear as ‘groaning’ (*gemere, gemitus*).

¹² **Before thee**] implying that they are well known to Jehovah ; comp. Ps. xc. 8, Prov. xv. 11.—**With us**] i.e., in our consciousness ; so, in the Hebr., Job xii. 3 (*’eth*), xv. 9 (*’imi*).

¹³ A threefold description of apostasy opens the verse.—**Treason** (lit., ‘diruptio’ *sc. fœderis*), **unfaithfulness** (lit., ‘belying,’ i.e., atheism, Jer. v. 12), and **drawing back** (i.e., the overt act of apostasy). Evidently the prophet refers to a paganising movement of special intensity, of which we would gladly have received more ample information.—Then follow sins of the lips (comp. on vi. 5).—**Transgression**] Lit., ‘deviation’ Hebr. *sārāh*). Naeg. remarks that this phrase (‘speaking deviation’) is elsewhere used only of the false teaching of ‘pseudo-prophets’ Deut. xiii. 5 = Hebr. 6, Jer. xxviii. 16, xxix. 32), and that the writer is probably alluding to the seductive discourses of such persons. This is possible indeed, but far from certain, as sins of the lips are ascribed to the whole nation in v. 3, and ‘deviation’ from moral and spiritual truth was not peculiar to prophets (comp. i. 5, Hebr.).

¹⁴ The confession passes on to public sins, especially the crying Jewish sin of injustice.—**Justice hath been driven back**] If this

passage refers to the Babylonian exiles (which is in my opinion very doubtful), it supplies a valuable confirmation of the continuance of Jewish institutions during the Captivity (comp. Ezek. viii. 1, &c.).—

Hath stumbled in the broad place] ‘Broad places’ was a name specially given to the recesses on each side of the city-gate, ‘used as places of assembly during the day, and as places of rest for guests [say rather for strangers, Judg. xix. 20] during the night.’¹ Here, during the continuance of the Jewish state, the ‘elders’ and ‘princes’ sat and judged (comp. Jer. v. 1, Zech. viii. 16, 2 Chron. xxxii. 6). The question cannot be avoided, Has the prophet in view the circumstances of the pre-Exile period? or may we venture to conjecture that the Babylonian cities, like those of mediæval Europe, contained separate ‘Jewries’ or Jewish quarters, each with its own ‘broad place’ or ‘forum’?

—**For truth . . .**] Justice has perished, because truth and rectitude, its essential presuppositions, have previously been overthrown.

—**Cannot enter**] i.e., cannot find admittance to the tribunal, to give evidence for the right.—**Hath been left behind**] Or (for the phrase leaves it open whether the absence spoken of is self-caused or due to others), ‘hath become an absentee’—‘*terras Astræa reliquit.*’—**Maketh himself a prey**] So excellently Auth. Vers. ; ‘muss Je-

¹ Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 57.

enter; ¹⁵ and truth hath been left behind, and he that avoideth evil, maketh himself a prey.

And Jehovah saw it, and it was evil in his eyes that there was no justice; ¹⁶ and he saw that there was no man, and was stupefied that there was none to interpose; therefore his own arm brought deliverance unto him, and his own righteousness upheld him. ¹⁷ And he put on righteousness as a coat of

dermanns Raub sein,' Luther. The word sums up *vv.* 3-7. Comp. Ps. lxxvi. 6 *a* (same verb in Hebr.).

^{15b} Here a new verse ought to begin. This mistake of our present arrangement of the verses is specially unfortunate, as the words which follow evidently introduce a new stanza or strophe of the prophecy. For other instances of faulty verse-division, see i. 16; lxiii. 19 Hebr.; lxvi. 3; Gen. xlix. 24; 1 Kings ii. 46-iii. 1; iii. 4, 5; Jer. ii. 23; Neh. vii. 73; xii. 23. (Comp. *Last Words.*)—**And Jehovah saw it**]. . .] But had not Jehovah seen it from the first? Yes (comp. xviii. 4, Ps. x. 14); but he had not shown this in act. It was Israel's penitent confession which drew forth the Divine love-tokens. It was a genuine 'fast' (contrast lviii. 2-4), 'a rending of the heart and not [merely] the garments' (Joel ii. 13), the germs of a new life.—The tenses in *vv.* 15 *b*-17 are at first sight difficult to explain. Del. thinks that they are historical perfects; that Jehovah has already equipped himself for judgment, and seen with surprise that no man takes his side, but not as yet obtained satisfaction for his dishonoured holiness. To me it appears that to divide the description of the theophany between the past and the future seriously injures its poetical effect, nor can I see that it is necessary to do so. The case seems to me to be analogous to that of Joel ii. 18, 19. The Jews in the time of Joel were in great trouble, and had been called to repentance. The prophet foresees that Jehovah will pity and grant relief, and describes this in prophetic perfects

('Then was Jehovah jealous . . . pitied . . . answered and said'). Precisely so here. All is still future, though described as past in the language of prophetic certitude.—**That there was no man**] The apparent parallelism of Jer. v. 1 is delusive; 'no man' does not here mean 'no man of honesty and integrity,' but 'no champion.' It corresponds to the phrase in the next line, 'none to interpose.' Comp. Ezek. xxii. 30, 'And I sought for a man among them who should make up the fence . . . but I found none.' In the parallel passage, lxiii. 5, we find 'none to help,' and 'none to uphold.' It is only the necessities of parallelism which have separated the substantive from its participial adjective.—**Was stupefied**] 'Durius est metaphora de Deo usurpata, quæ, nisi fallor, alibi non occurrit. Sed Jesaias passim valde est *ἐνεργής* in omni suâ dictione, et figuras orationis ex alto petit. In re ipsâ significat summum ejus rei de quâ agitur *παράδοξον*. A parte Dei ipsius docet metaphora, Deum instar stupentis aliquamdiu tacitum expectasse, hoc est, moram aliquam traxisse antequam ecclesiæ laboranti succurreret' Vitringa, comparing Ps. l. 21, 'These things thou doest, and I am silent.' If the precise word 'was stupefied' is not again applied to Jehovah (except in lxiii. 5), an equally forcible one is in Jer. xiv. 9, 'Why shouldst thou be as a man *in consternation* (*nidhâm*), as a mighty man that cannot deliver?' The painful astonishment spoken of here is apparently inconsistent with other passages, in which deliverance from trouble is ascribed to God alone.

mail, and the helmet of deliverance upon his head; and he put on garments of vengeance for clothing, and clad himself with jealousy as a mantle. ¹⁸ According to their deserts, accordingly he will repay, wrath to his adversaries, retribution to his enemies; to the countries he will repay retribution. ¹⁹ And they shall fear the Name of Jehovah from the sun's setting, and his glory from the sun's rising; ^d for he shall come like a rushing stream,^{d e} which the breath of Jehovah driveth,^e ²⁰ but as a Goel shall he come to Zion, and unto

^d So Sept., Vulg., Symmachus, Saadya, Ew., Knob.—For . . . like a straitened (i.e., dammed-up stream, Lowth, Ges., Del., Naeg.—For adversity shall come in like a stream, Hitz.—When the adversary (or, adversity, Targ.) shall come in like the (or a) river, Hebr. accents, Targ., Pesh., Calv., Vittr., Henderson, Kay.

^e So Vulg., Lowth, Ges., Hitz., Ew., Knob., Del., Naeg.—The Spirit of Jehovah shall lift up a banner against him, Targ., Vittr., Henderson, Kay.

But we have no right to strain a bold, poetical phrase in a dogmatic interest.—**None to interpose**] viz., in battle; elsewhere in prayer (liii. 12).—**Therefore his own arm . . .**] Sword and bow are unnecessary; 'with battles of swinging will he fight against them' (xxx. 32).—The words recur in lxiii. 5, with the changes of 'my' and 'me' for 'his' and 'him,' and 'fury' for 'righteousness'; comp. Job xl. 14, Ps. xcvi. 1.—**Deliverance**] Here and in v. 17 in the common sense of victory (as I Sam. xiv. 45).

¹⁸ **To the countries he will repay retribution**] The fate of the rebel Israelites is merged in that of the heathen. By 'the countries,' the prophet means, not merely the peoples of Asia Minor who, under the leadership of Cræsus, had helped the Babylonians against Cyrus (Knob.), but all the nations of the heathen world, banded together for a final struggle against Jehovah. It is as an act in the great drama of the world-judgment that the prophet regards the impending deliverance of the Jews (comp. on chap. xxiv.).

¹⁹ Those Gentiles who are spared are imagined as hastening from their distant abodes in tremulous anxiety to meet Jehovah.—**Fear the Name of Jehovah**] A striking amplification of the common phrase 'fear Jehovah,' found also in Deut.

xxviii. 58, Mic. vi. 9 (probably: see *Q. P. B.*), Neh. i. 11, Ps. lxxxvi. 11, and especially cii. 15 (which is clearly a quotation from our passage). 'Name'; see on xxx. 27, lxiii. 9.—**He shall come**] i.e., Jehovah, or, more correctly, the Name of Jehovah. Comp. '(the Face) heareth,' lix. 2; the Name of Jehovah cometh,' xxx. 27.—**Like a rushing stream . . . driveth**] So, in xxx. 27, 28, after mentioning the coming of the Name of Jehovah, the prophet continues, 'And his breath is as an overflowing stream.' Alt. rend. is in itself noble and poetical; comp. Jer. xlvi. 7, 8, where the hostile movement of Egypt is compared to a flood. It has been vigorously supported by Dr. Kay, but is contrary to the connection, which requires a continuous description of the theophany. I feel uncertain, however, whether the words rendered 'rushing' and 'driveth' are not corrupt.

²⁰ **But as a Goel shall he come**] This prediction differs rather in tone from xli. 14, xlili. 1, and similar passages in which Jehovah is referred to as Israel's Goel. It wants the usual setting of kindly encouragement, and reminds us rather of less evangelical prophecies, such as chap. i.—**To Zion**] i.e., to the remnant of Israel—'those that have turned from rebellion' (comp. i. 27), as the parallel line tells us. This

those that have turned from rebellion in Jacob: the oracle of Jehovah. ²¹ And I—this is my covenant with them, saith Jehovah, My spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not withdraw from thy mouth, nor from the mouth of thy seed, nor from the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith Jehovah, from henceforth even for ever.

limitation is one which English students of the prophecies would do well to remember: it shows that the Messianic promises to Israel are only meant for a converted and regenerate people.

²¹ **And I—this is my covenant with them]** There are several remarkable points about this closing verse, (1) its change of number and person ('with them . . . upon thee'); (2) its tone of promise and encouragement; (3) the difficulty of connecting it with the preceding verses. The first point is slight; a change almost as striking occurs in i. 29. The plural doubtless refers, not to the converts spoken of in v. 20 (as V. F. Oehler), but to the person addressed in the second person together with his descendants. The second and third points seem to me to indicate that the verse has been removed hither from some other position. The recipient of the 'covenant' (or, appointment, see footnote on xlii.

7) is the spiritual Israel, to whom a similar promise has already been given in xlv. 3. Klostermann indeed has a strange theory that the recipient is the prophetic writer, and that his prophetic gifts are to descend to his sons and grandsons. But the promise is too high for an ordinary man, and its validity is not confined to 'sons and grandsons'; it is to last 'from henceforth even for ever.'¹ To whom can such words apply, but to the imperishable people of Jehovah? Israel, according to II. Isaiah, is destined to be the religious centre, from which the words of truth radiate in all directions.—**My words . . . in thy mouth]** The 'words' referred to are not the message of the true God which Israel is to carry to the Gentiles (Knob.), but all God's revelations, whether declaratory of his character or predictive of the future of the world, of all which Israel is the depository (comp. li. 16?).

CHAPTER LX.

Contents.—Song upon glorified Zion, in five stanzas—I. vv. 1-4; II. vv. 5-9; III. vv. 10-14; IV. vv. 15-18; V. vv. 19-22. The leading idea of the first stanza is the return of the exiles; of the second, the rebuilding of the temple; of the third, the glory of the new Jerusalem; of the fourth, the prosperity of the state; while the fifth and last exhausts the powers of language in describing the favour which Jehovah will extend to his righteous people.

The song looks as if it were a designed counterpart to the magnificent ode in chap. xlvii. The one described Babylon's fall; the other glorifies Jerusalem's rising again. It further resembles its lyric predecessor in the

¹ Klostermann supposes the author of this verse to be a student of Isaiah, who has assumed his master's mantle (*Zeitschr. f. luther. Theologie*, 1876, p. 46).

looseness of its connection with the prophecies among which it is inserted, and it is not an unreasonable conjecture that both songs originally existed in a separate form.

¹ Arise, be lightsome, for thy light hath come, and the glory of Jehovah hath dawned upon thee. ² For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and a deep gloom the nations, but upon thee shall Jehovah dawn, and his glory shall appear upon thee; ³ and nations shall set forth unto thy light, and kings to the brilliance of thy dawning. ⁴ Lift up thine eyes round about and see: they are all gathered together and come unto thee; thy sons come from far, and thy daughters are supported on the side. ⁵ Then shalt thou ^a see and be radiant; and thy heart shall ^b throb and be enlarged; for the abundance of the sea shall turn unto thee, the riches of the nations shall come unto thee. ⁶ A swarm of camels shall

^a Fear. Many Hebr. MSS., Lowth, Vittr., Ges. (another reading).

^b Tremble. Some MSS., Sept. (another reading).

^{1 2} The ideal Zion (see on xl. 9) is personified as a woman lying on the ground in mental and bodily prostration—it is the same figure as in li. 23, lii. 1. Thick darkness enfolds the earth, the darkness which typifies alienation from God. But Jehovah has begun to reveal himself anew—not as yet to the whole earth, but to its central, one may almost say its mediatorial people, Israel. As ‘the children of Israel had light in their dwellings,’ when there was ‘thick darkness in all the land of Egypt,’ so now there are beaming over Israel the first rays of a newly risen sun (comp. ix. 2). Zion however is still held by the stupor of captivity; she is therefore bidden to arise and drink in the transfiguring brightness. Contrast the summons to Babylon in xlvi. 1.

¹ **The glory of Jehovah]** Jehovah is a ‘sun’ as well as a ‘shield’ (Ps. lxxxiv. 11), the ‘sun of righteousness’ (Mal. iv. 2). The same figure is implied in Ps. xviii. 12 (13), Hab. iii. 4, where the same word (*nōgah*, ‘brilliance’) is used for the appearance of the Divine glory as in *v.* 3.

⁴ **Lift up . . . and come unto thee]** Repeated from xlix. 18.—

Thy sons . . . thy daughters]

See on xlix. 22.—**Supported on the side]** i.e., on the hip (so lxvi. 12), the arm of the mother ‘supporting’ the child’s back, a custom still kept up both in the Semitic and the non-Semitic East. Older children would be carried on the shoulder (xlix. 22).

⁵ **Then shalt thou see]** If the former summons had been neglected, then (when the prophecy has been fulfilled) thou shalt perforce take notice. Alt. reading involves a tautology.—**Be radiant]** viz., with joy; the same word occurs in Ps. xxxiv. 6 (5).—**Shall throb]** ‘As a man shudders at an unexpected deliverance’ (Ibn Ezra). Comp. Jer. xxxiii. 9, ‘They shall fear and shudder (the same word as here) for all the goodness,’ &c.—**Be enlarged]** i.e., have a sense of freedom and happiness (so Ps. cxix. 32). The opposite is ‘to be straitened’ (so Lam. i. 20, comp. Jer. iv. 19, *Q. P. B.*).—**The abundance of the sea]** i.e., the wealth of the maritime countries of the West (in Hebrew, ‘the sea’).

^{6, 7} This passage has perhaps a bearing on the question as to the date of II. Isaiah. As Prof. A. S.

cover thee—young camels of Midian and Ephah, from Sheba shall they all come, bearing gold and incense, and heralding the praises of Jehovah. ⁷ All the flocks of Kedar shall gather unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall go up mine altar acceptably, and my glorious house will I glorify. ⁸ Who are these which fly as the clouds, and as doves to their lattices? ⁹ Yea, 'for me the countries wait' and the ships of Tarshish are the foremost, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, to the name of Jehovah thy God, and to the Holy one of Israel, inasmuch as he hath glorified thee.

¹⁰ And strangers shall build thy walls, and their kings

^c Unto me the countries shall assemble, Luzzatto, Geiger (changing vowel-points).

Wilkins remarks, 'the country with which the historic Isaiah was especially familiar would lie somewhat out of the direct line of this commerce.'¹ Still the tradition connecting these nations with Abraham (comp. Gen. xxv. 2-4, 13) can hardly have been unknown to Isaiah, and this will sufficiently account for his giving them so honourable a mention. On the other hand, it is extremely doubtful whether the names Kedar and Nebaioth (in *v.* 7) were still tribal appellations in the time of the Exile. If therefore we assign a Babylonian origin to II. Isaiah, we must probably assume that the names in question are used with poetical liberty.—On the commerce of Arabia, see Alexander's notes, and comp. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, ii. 3, p. 293.

⁶ **Ephah**] A 'son' of Midian (Gen. xxv. 4); mentioned (under the form Khayappa) in an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser II. in company with Massa and Tema, tribes of N. Arabia.²—**Sheba**] The caravans of the Midianites, especially those of Ephah (Gen. xxv. 4), appear to have gone to Sheba (or Yemen) for gold and spices.—**The praises**] i.e., the praiseworthy deeds (as lxiii. 7).

⁷ **Kedar . . . Nebaioth**] On the locality of the tribes thus indicated, see Sprenger, *Journal of Royal Asiatic Soc.*, 1872, p. 8.

⁸ **Who are these . . .**] The predictive tone gives place for a moment to the descriptive. It is a vision of the sea which we have before us—of the sea covered by ships which with their outspread sails resemble the clouds, or flights of home-sick doves (comp. Hos. xi. 11).

⁹ **The countries wait**] The 'countries' (i.e., the 'far-off peoples,' xlix. 1) 'wait' in believing expectancy for the blessings, which belong to them too, at least in the second rank. This is one motive for their haste. Another is regard for the children of Zion, who are impatient to be restored to their home.—**Ships of Tarshish**] Or, 'Tarshish-ships' (ships of the first class, suitable for long voyages, comp. 1 Kings x. 22.—**Their silver**] i.e., the silver of the Gentiles (*vv.* 6, 11, not of the Israelites.—**To the name**] i.e., to the place of the name (xviii. 7). The clause is almost a verbal repetition of *lv.* 5 *b.*

¹⁰ **And strangers . . .**] 'The walls of Zion are raised with the willing co-operation of converted foreigners (*lvi.* 6, 7),' thinks De-

¹ Wilkins, *Phœnicia and Israel* (Lond. 1871), p. 110.

² Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, pp. 261-2; comp. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies* § p. 304.

shall minister unto thee, for in my wrath I smote thee, and in my favour I will have compassion upon thee: ¹¹ and thy gates shall stand open continually, day nor night they shall not be shut, that men may bring unto thee the riches of the nations, and their kings led along: ¹² for the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, and those nations shall surely be laid waste. ¹³ The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir and the plane and the sherbir together, that I may glorify the place of my sanctuary, and make the place of my feet honourable. ¹⁴ And the sons of them that afflicted thee shall go unto thee crouching, and all they that spurned thee shall bow down to the soles of thy feet, and they shall call thee, City of Jehovah, Zion of the Holy One of Israel.

¹⁵ Instead of thy being forsaken and hated, and with none passing through, I will make thee an everlasting pride, the

litzsch. But does not the context (see *vv.* 11, 12, 14) point rather to the mass of the heathen world than to willing proselytes? Is not the submission of these foreigners rather a consequence of the recent judgment (comp. *lix.* 19 *a*) than the result of spiritual affinities? See *lxi.* 5, 6, where the assignment of menial services to 'strangers' is evidently intended as a retribution (comp. *xiv.* 2). This passage illustrates *lxi.* 4 (see note).

¹¹ **Thy gates shall stand open]** Because there will be 'no night there' (comp. *v.* 20, *Rev.* *xxi.* 25), and no foes seeking entrance, but an endless stream of caravans.—**And their kings led along]** i.e., not 'accompanied by a large retinue' (Kimchi, *Vitr.*, *Lowth*, *Ges.* in *Commentary*), but (as the verb always means) 'led captive' (same word in *xx.* 4), or at least 'led against their will.' All eager to minister to Israel, the 'far-off nations' force their reluctant chiefs to join them. The reason is given in the next verse.

¹² The prosperity of Gentile nations shall depend on their relations to Israel (comp. *Zech.* *xiv.* 17, 18).—**Nations . . . laid waste]** 'Nation' and 'territory' being con-

vertible terms in Hebrew, whatever is predicted of the one may also be predicted of the other (comp. *xxxvii.* 18, 2 *Kings* *iii.* 23, *Hebr.*).

¹³ The barren hills of Jerusalem shall henceforth be decked with the most beautiful forest-trees (comp. *xli.* 19).—**The place of my sanctuary]** What sanctuary? It is natural to think first of the temple. The trees which have been mentioned might be required, either, if felled, for the temple-buildings (so *Vitr.*), or, if unfelled, for decorating the temple-courts, comp. *Ps.* *lii.* 8, *xcii.* 13 (so *Cel.*). But the *Shekinah* is no longer confined to a single house: all Jerusalem has become the 'sanctuary' of Jehovah (so too perhaps *iv.* 5).

¹⁴ **The sons of them that afflicted thee]** 'The sons,' apparently because the 'afflictors' themselves will have perished in the Divine judgment.—**Zion of the Holy One . . .]** A combination like 'Bethlehem (of) Judah.'

¹⁵ **Forsaken and hated]** Zion is again imagined as Jehovah's bride (comp. *l.* 1, *liv.* 6). But the figure is not carried out consistently.—The word 'hated' is used in *Gen.* *xxix.* 31, *Deut.* *xxi.* 15, of a less beloved wife.

delight of successive generations. ¹⁶ And thou shalt suck the milk of nations, and the breast of kings shalt thou suck, and thou shalt know that I Jehovah am thy saviour, and that thy Goel is the Hero of Jacob. ¹⁷ Instead of copper I will bring gold, and instead of iron I will bring silver, and instead of wood copper, and instead of stones iron; and I will make ^d peace thy government, and righteousness thy magistrates ^d. ¹⁸ Violence shall no more be heard of in thy land, desolation nor destruction in thy borders; and thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise.

¹⁹ No more shalt thou have the sun for a light by day, and as for brightness, the moon shall not enlighten thee; but thou shalt have Jehovah for an everlasting light, and thy God for thy glory. ²⁰ No more shall thy sun go down, and thy

^d Thy government peace (i.e., peace-loving) . . . Sept., Saad., Hitz., Knob., Henderson.

¹⁶ **And thou shalt suck . . .**] Perhaps a reminiscence of Deut. xxxiii. 19, 'They shall suck the abundance of the seas.'—**The breast of kings.**] 'Of kings;' perhaps to exclude a realistic interpretation. The phrase strikingly indicates the new feeling of tenderness towards Zion which shall animate the kings of the earth, (comp. xlix. 23).—**That I Jehovah . . .**] Repeated from xlix. 26 b.

¹⁷ **Instead of copper . . .**] Evidently an allusion to the account of Solomon in 1 Kings x. 21, 27. The language is of course figurative, and means that the new Jerusalem shall be at the height of splendour and security (metal taking the place of stone).—**Will make peace thy government**] For the prosopopeia, comp. xxxii. 16, 17, lix. 14.—It has been questioned whether 'peace' and 'righteousness' are accusatives of the object or of the predicate. But, as Naeg. well remarks, it would be comparatively little to say that Jerusalem's governors should be men of peace and righteousness, for this would not exclude much unhappiness and unrighteousness among the governed.

But if Peace and Righteousness themselves are the governors, it is as much as to say that government in the ordinary sense has become superfluous.—This passage evidently implies that those for whom our prophet wrote only had the Messianic belief in its wider sense, Jehovah alone being Israel's king.

¹⁸ **Shalt call thy walls Salvation . . .**] There is the same doubt as to whether the abstract nouns are objects or predicates as in *v.* 17. Such names as 'Salvation' and 'Praise' would not be impossible; Naeg. (on xxvi. 1) reminds us that the walls of Babylon were named.¹ But it is more forcible to take 'Salvation' and 'Praise' as accusatives of the object. The meaning of the passage will then be, 'Thou shalt need no walls nor gates, for Jehovah shall be a constant source of salvation, and of a renown which shall keep all foes at a distance.' Comp. xxvi. 1, xxxiii. 21. We need not mind the obvious inconsistency with *vv.* 10, 11, for we are in the region of symbol and metaphor.

¹⁹ **The sun for a light**] See note on xxx. 26.

²⁰ **Go down**] Lit., 'go in,' viz.

¹ See *Records of the Past*, v. 124; Schrader, *K. A. T.*, p. 88.

moon shall not withdraw itself, for thou shalt have Jehovah for an everlasting light, and thy days of mourning are fulfilled. ²¹ And thy people shall be all righteous, they shall possess the land for ever; the shoots of my plantation, the work of my hands, for showing myself glorious. ²² The smallest shall become a thousand, and the least a great nation; I Jehovah in its time will hasten it.

into his chamber (Ps. xix. 5).—**Itself**] Lit. 'himself.' Both sun and moon are masc. in the Semitic languages, and have male divinities corresponding to them.

²¹ **Thy people . . . for ever**] Now that Israel is righteous, there will be no reason for the stern discipline of exile; comp. lix. 13, 14.

—**The shoots of my plantation**] and therefore flourishing; comp. Ps. lxxx. 9, 10.

²² **The smallest**] i.e., he who has few or no children.—**A thousand**, i.e., probably, a chiliad, or part of a tribe (so Del.); comp. Mic. v. 2 (Hebr. 1), which makes a fine contrast with 'nation' in the next line.

CHAPTER LXI.

A SOLILOQUY of the Servant¹ concerning the message of grace, comfort, and prosperity committed to him for Zion by Jehovah.—But is it really 'the Servant' who is the speaker? The title itself does not occur once throughout the soliloquy. Hence it is not surprising that several modern critics (Hitz., Ew., Knob., Diestel) question this view, and assign the speech to the prophet who writes these chapters; the Targum, too, dogmatically asserts, '(Thus) saith the prophet.' Our conclusion will depend mainly on that which we have adopted with regard to l. 4-9—a passage in some respects closely parallel to the present. There, as well as here, the title of the speaker is withheld; there, as well as here, the opening verse declares the mission of the speaker to be pre-eminently one of consolation. It is true that in l. 5 the speaker suddenly turns aside to describe his patience under persecution; but this is all the more reason why in the present chapter he should compensate us for our disappointment by resuming the strain so abruptly cut short. Diestel² urges two objections against assigning this soliloquy to the Servant, viz., 1. that the personification of the Servant ceases with chap. liii., and 2. that as the prophet is himself a member of the organism of the Servant, whatever can be predicated of the one both can and must be true of the other. The answer to 1. is, that it is an assumption based on a too exclusive view of chaps. liv., lv., and the very loosely connected discourses which follow; to 2., that precisely as in xliv. 26 we find the prophetic writer

¹ So Hengst., Stier, Del., Seinecke, Kay, Naeg., and so *I. C. A.*, p. 216. Delitzsch, therefore, is not so comparatively isolated as he supposes. (*Jesaja*, 3te Ausg. p. 620.)

² *Der Prophet Jesaja*, erklärt von Dr. A. Knobel. Vierte Auflage, herausgeg. von Dr. L. Diestel, p. 487.

described as 'his (Jehovah's) servant,' without precluding the higher acceptation of the term in lii. 13, so the occurrence of the phrase 'the servants of Jehovah' in liv. 17 does not destroy the superior right of Him who is pre-eminently the Servant of Jehovah. True, the speaker in chap. lxi. does not expressly assume the title; but is it necessary that he should? Having been introduced as the Servant in xlii. 1-4, why should he not sometimes speak in his own name? It may safely be affirmed that, but for the absence of the title 'the Servant,' no one could fail to be struck by the appropriateness of *vv.* 1-3 (especially) to the personal Servant of Jehovah:—the great things which the speaker volunteers to do are so far beyond the range of a mere prophet like our author. This need not, however, hinder us from admitting that *vv.* 4-9 have nothing to mark them out as belonging to the Servant. Just as here and there in St. John's Gospel the speeches of our Lord suddenly pass into reflexions of the Evangelist, so it may here be that the prophet for a time takes the place of the Servant; comp. l. 10, 11.

¹ The Spirit of ^a the Lord ^a Jehovah is upon me, because Jehovah hath anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted, hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and ^b opening (of the prison) ^b to the bound; ² to proclaim an acceptable year of Jehovah,

^a Omitted in Sept., Vulg., one MS. (Kennicott), two early editions.

^b Opening (of the eyes), Hebr. text (see crit. note).

¹ **The Spirit . . . is upon me]** Precisely the same statement is made respecting the Servant in xlii. 1.—**Hath anointed me]** Anointing was the rite with which both priests (Ex. xxix. 7, Lev. vii. 36) and kings (1 Sam. ix. 16, x. 1, xvi. 13) were consecrated. But the phrase 'to anoint' seems to be also used metaphorically for 'to appoint to a sacred office.' Thus in 1 Kings xix. 16 Elijah is directed to 'anoint' Elisha, though as the sequel shows, Elisha was never actually anointed. So, too, in xlv. 1 Cyrus is called 'Jehovah's Anointed One,' i.e., His chosen instrument; and in 1 John ii. 20 (comp. *v.* 27) the 'unction from the Holy One' is also clearly metaphorical.—**To bring good tidings]** Hebr. *lbhasser*, happily rendered by Sept. *εὐαγγελισαῖν* (similarly throughout II. Isaiah, where verb and participle occur

five times, except xli. 27).—**To proclaim liberty . . .]** The phrase is peculiar, and is probably taken from the Law of Jubilee (Lev. xxv. 10, comp. Ezek. xlvi. 17, Jer. xxxiv. 8), but is applied with poetical freedom; the Law of Jubilee says nothing about the release of prisoners or the remission of debts.¹—**To the captives]** See on xlii. 7.

² **An acceptable year]** Obs. the antithesis between the 'year' of grace and the 'day of vengeance' (so lxiii. 4, whereas xxxiv. 8 is only partly parallel). It reminds us of the contrast in Ex. xx. 5, 6 (comp. Deut. vii. 9), where retribution is declared to descend to the third and fourth generation, but mercy to the thousandth; comp. also liv. 8 (note). 'Year' is of course used rhetorically, though, strange to say, this passage gave rise to the theory of some of the Christian Fathers

¹ Mr. Fenton has explained the institution of the Jubilee as a relic of the 'Village Community' system of land-tenure (*Hebrew Social Life*, 1880).

and a day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all mournful ones ; ³ to set upon the mournful ones of Zion—to give them a coronet instead of ashes, oil of joy for mourning, a mantle of renown for a failing spirit, so that men shall call them oaks of righteousness, the plantation of Jehovah for showing himself glorious. ⁴ And they shall build up the ruins of antiquity, the desolations of the forefathers shall they raise up, and shall renew the ruined cities, the desolations of past generations. ⁵ And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and aliens shall be your ploughmen and your vinedressers, ⁶ but ye—

that the public ministry of our Lord lasted but a single year.—

All mournful ones] Zion occupies the foreground of the speaker's thoughts (comp. next verse and lvii. 18 *b*), but the marks of susceptibility of the Divine promises are in the two opening verses perhaps designedly left free from national limitations (comp. lvii. 15). See above, on 'to the captives,' and below on 'a failing spirit.'

³ **To set . . . to give]** It seems as if the speaker corrected himself. The verb 'to set' is appropriate for the 'coronet,' but a more general word is required for the 'oil of joy' and the 'mantle of renown.'—**A coronet instead of ashes]** In *v.* 10 we read of the bridegroom's 'coronet;' by using the same word here the prophet may imply that the penitents were newly espoused to their Divine Lord. The Hebrew expresses the change in their state by a striking assonance (*pe'er takhath 'efer*), which Ewald strives to represent by 'schmuck statt schmutz.' 'Ashes,' i.e., ashes strewn upon the head, were a sign of mourning; comp. 2 Sam. xiii. 19.—**Oil of joy]** The phrase only occurs again in Ps. xlv. (*v.* 7 = Hebr. 8), the royal nuptial song.—**A failing spirit]** The word is the same as in xlii. 3, 'a dimly burning wick' (comp. xlii. 4, and Ezek. xxi. 7 = Hebr. 12), a phrase which, be it remarked, refers at any rate partly to the Gentiles.—**Oaks of righteousness]** i.e., strong and enduring, because 'rooted and grounded in right-

eousness. Whose righteousness? we may ask; that of man or of God? The former, is certainly the most natural reply; 'righteousness' in a phrase of this construction ought to mean an intrinsic quality of the 'oaks'; comp. liv. 14. It is no counter-argument that in *v.* 10 'righteousness' means God's righteousness as exhibited in the prosperity of his own, for we have the two senses of righteousness equally close together in liv. 14, 17. The next words, **the plantation of Jehovah, &c.**, are repeated almost verbally from lx. 21 *b*.

⁴ **And they shall build up . . .]** The implied subject is 'strangers' (see *v.* 5). We have thus a variation from the parallel passage lviii. 12. Obs., the speaker's attention is concentrated on the first act of the great drama of Israel's regeneration. He presently passes on to the more splendid second act, which he describes as if it synchronised with the first. The first act is the return of the exiles and the rebuilding of the desolate cities of Judah; the second, the union of Jews and Gentiles in one great and glorious religious community.

⁵ **Shall stand and feed]** The description is still true to life. (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, p. 599).—**Your ploughmen . . .]** No brilliant prospect for the 'aliens,' if the peasants of the Messianic period were to be as miserable and downtrodden a race as the Fellahs of Palestine are now! But we must evidently

the priests of Jehovah shall ye be called ; men shall name you the ministers of our God ; the riches of the nation shall ye eat, and ° of their glory shall ye make your boast. ° 7 Instead of your shame ye shall have double, and (instead of) reproach they shall exult for their portion ; therefore in their land they shall possess double, everlasting joy shall be unto them. 8 For I Jehovah love justice, I hate things torn away unjustly, and I will give them their recompence faithfully, and an everlasting

° To their glory shall ye succeed, Saadya, Rashi, Ges. (Thesaurus), Hitz., Ew., Knob.

suppose that all classes in the 'coming age' were to partake in their several degrees of the Messianic blessing. A relative difference between classes would remain, but it would be accepted thankfully even by those lowest in the scale (comp. xlv. 14). The highest place would naturally be reserved for the Israelites. These would be called **the priests of Jehovah**, for they would have realised the ideal set forth in Ex. xix. 6, and be able to dispense with a separate sacerdotal order (see, however, lxvi. 21). The priests, as Hermann Schultz justly remarks,¹ were only an official representation of Israel's national idea, viz. that those, with whom their God had entered into covenant-relations, should be both outwardly and inwardly worthy of their high position. The existence of the priesthood did not by any means imply that the rest of the people were profane ; it was only provisional. But when the Israelites had become a 'kingdom of priests' (Ex. l. c.), who were to occupy the place out of which the faithful portion of the people had just been raised? The Gentile world (comp. Zech. viii. 23). This 'natural and surely not unlovely touch of national complacency' was never quite lost by any of the old Testament writers. — **Shall ye make your boast.** It is a strong argument for this reading that the same verb in the same conjugation occurs in this

sense in Ps. xciv. 4, which forms part of the deutero-Isaianic section of the Psalter (Ps. xci.-c).²

7 **Ye shall have double**] i.e., double compensation. Comp. Zech. ix. 12, 'Yea, to-day do I foretell that I will recompense double unto thee'; also Jer. xvi. 14-18, 'where the unparalleled grandeur of the second restoration of the Jews is justified by the extreme severity of their previous chastisement.'³ It is not, however, double compensation in honour which is intended (Naeg., and partly Knob.), for this would not be concrete enough for the prophets. 'The land' was the one blessing which included all others. Hence the prophecy continues, **therefore** (i.e., the result will be that—see on xxvi. 14) **in their land they shall possess double**, i.e., their ancient land (= 'their portion' in the former half of the verse) shall be restored in more than its old fertility and with extended boundaries. Thus the idea of this passage is the counterpart of that in xl. 2 ; the peculiarity of Jer. xvi. 14-18 is that it unites both ideas (see above).

8 **For I Jehovah love justice . . .**] The speaker quotes a confirmatory utterance of Jehovah. The 'right' of the Israelites has been violently 'torn away' (comp. x. 2, same word) : Jehovah, who hates injustice, will compensate them for their sufferings. Klostermann's interpretation is over-

¹ *Alltestamentliche Theologie*, 1st ed., i. 183-4.

² See Canon Elliott's comparative list of passages in the *Speaker's Commentary*, iv. 506, &c.

³ *I. C. A.*, p. 147.

covenant will I make with them ; ⁹ so that their seed shall be known among the nations, and their offspring in the midst of the peoples—all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are a seed which Jehovah hath blessed.

¹⁰ I will greatly rejoice in Jehovah ; let my soul exult in my God, for he hath clothed me with garments of salvation, in a robe of righteousness hath he arrayed me, like a bridegroom that maketh his coronet priestly, and like a bride that putteth on her jewels. ¹¹ For like the earth which bringeth forth its sprouting, and like a garden which causeth the things sown in it to sprout, so [the Lord] Jehovah shall cause righteousness to sprout, even renown before all the nations.

subtle¹: 'the Israelites shall not return as conquerors, as their ancestors entered Canaan, by the right of the strongest, but with the free-will of their former enemies.'

—**Their recompense**] i.e., compensation for their sufferings (comp. on v. 7).—**Faithfully**] i.e., without curtailment, in exact accordance with his promise.—**An everlasting covenant**] See on lv. 3.

⁹ **Known**] i.e., renowned.

¹⁰ **I will greatly rejoice . . .**] According to the Targum, Jerusalem is here the speaker, appropriating and rejoicing in the foregoing promises. This is certainly plausible, for the speaker clearly implies that he looks forward to a share in the promised blessings, and how can the Servant, himself the mediator of these blessings, feel this longing?—How? by his sympathy; for though he has not literally shared in the sin of his people, he has 'taken it upon him' (liii. 4, 11) out of sympathy, and must be both able and desirous, through the same fellow-feeling, to share in the coming blessedness. It is the Servant of Jehovah, then, who continues to speak.—**Garments of salvation**] The figure reminds us of lix. 17.—**Righteousness**] i.e., the prosperity which a righteous God will give (comp. on liv. 17).—**Like a bridegroom . . .**] The simile is very loosely attached, but

it is evidently the Servant and not Jehovah, who is the subject of comparison. The Israelitish bridegroom appears, from Cant. iii. 11, to have been crowned 'on the day of his espousals,' and so at least in later times was the bride. A well-known passage in the Mishna (*Sota*, ix. 14) states that during the war of Vespasian bridegrooms were forbidden to wear crowns ('*atârôth*), and that during that of Titus (Grätz corrects 'Quietus') the prohibition was extended to brides—a sign of the passionate grief of the Jews at the ruin of the nation. The promise of Jehovah, realised by faith, is compared by the Servant to such a headdress. From the expression 'maketh priestly,' it would seem that the style of this headdress resembled that of the priests' tiara (Ex. xxix. 9, comp. Jos. *Ant.* iii. 7, 3). To suppose that this resemblance was symbolical of the priestly character of the head of the household, seems to me farfetched. It is well known that archaic forms and fashions linger longest in ritual and ceremonial observances.

¹¹ **Cause . . . to sprout**] Another allusion (comp. xlii. 9, xliii. 19, lviii. 8) to the self-fulfilling power of the Divine word.—**Renown**] Lit., 'praise.' The prophet means events stirring up men to praise Israel and Israel's God.

¹ It is, however, accepted, I see, by Delitzsch, in his third edition.

CHAPTER LXII.

Contents.—A continuation of the bright promises of the last chapter, concluding with the welcome summons to depart from Babylon.—Most modern critics regard this chapter as the soliloquy of the prophet; Vit. alone gives it to a chorus of prophets and other servants of God, while Henderson, Stier, Kay, Naeg., assign it to the Servant of Jehovah or the Messiah. If there is nothing in the chapter specially suggestive of the Servant, and as the opening words 'I will not be silent' are elsewhere uttered by Jehovah, it is safer to follow Targ., Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, Luzzatto, Del., and suppose Jehovah himself to be the speaker. See also note on *v.* 6.

¹ For Zion's sake I will not be silent, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until her righteousness go forth as the shining light, even her salvation as a torch that burneth. ² And the nations shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory, and men shall call thee by a new name which the mouth of Jehovah shall appoint; ³ and thou shalt be a crown of adorning in the hand of Jehovah, and a diadem of royalty

¹ But will these great promises be realised? Will Jehovah indeed 'cause righteousness to sprout'? The 'deep gloom' with which Zion as well as the other nations is still oppressed may well excuse a moment of despondency. But Jehovah will not let such despondency pass unchecked.—**I will not be silent**, he says, I will not for ever hold back that restoring and reviving word for which my people are longing. Comp. xlii. 14, lvii. 11, lxiv. 12, lxv. 6.—**The shining light**] Lit., 'the brilliance'; Ewald has 'der Sonnenstrahl.' The word is used of the dawn (the *Eastern dawn*) in lx. 3, Dan. vi. 20, and especially Prov. iv. 18. Luzzatto is alone in thinking of the planet Venus.

² **By a new name**] So in lxv. 15, 'he shall call his servants by another name.' It is a title of honour which is meant, such for instance as that in Jer. xxxiii. 16, 'Jehovah (is) our righteousness.' This prophet however goes beyond Jeremiah, for he speaks of a 'new

name,' one past human imagining, and which, like the new heaven and the new earth, depends upon the appointment of the Creator; compare Rev. ii. 17, iii. 12 (in the Greek).

³ **A crown of adorning**] Not 'the crown;' Jehovah has 'many crowns.' The regeneration of Israel constitutes a fresh claim on the part of Jehovah to the reverence and admiration of the universe (comp. *v.* 2*a*); this appears to be the meaning of the prophecy. Knobel, indeed, supposes the expression to be a figurative description of the situation of Jerusalem (comp. on xxviii. 1), and the following phrase, 'in the hand,' to be a metaphor = 'under the Divine protection' (comp. xlix. 2). But this is farfetched, nor is there any allusion in the context to the dangers of the new Jerusalem. Jehovah is pictured as holding the crown in his hand to exhibit it to the admiring world (Ew., Del.).—**In the open hand**] Comp. Bonomi, *Nineveh*, p. 191,

in the open hand of thy God. ⁴ No more shalt thou be named Forsaken, neither shall thy land any more be named Desolation; for thou shalt be called ^a Well-pleasing, and thy land Married; for Jehovah delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married. ⁵ For (as) a young man marrieth a virgin, thy sons shall marry thee, and with the joy of the bridegroom over the bride shall thy God joy over thee.

⁶ Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have set watchers; all day and all night they are never silent: ye that are Jehovah's remembrancers, take ye no rest; ⁷ and give no rest to him, until he establish and until he make Jerusalem a renown in

^a Most render, My delight (is) in her; comp., however, Oholibah, 'there is a tent in her,' Ezek. xxiii. 4, and Smend, *ad loc.*

where the guests at a banquet hold their drinking-vessels in the deeply hollowed palms of their hands.

⁴ For the present Jehovah reserves the mystic name of the new Jerusalem to himself. But the prophet is allowed to mention two inferior, every-day names which may appropriately be used, the one for Jerusalem, the other for the land of Israel. By an odd coincidence, the name which is now repudiated for Jerusalem—**Forsaken** (Hebr. *Azubah*)—is also the name of the mother of the pious Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii. 42), while that which is adopted in its place—**Well-pleasing** (Hebr. *Hephzibah*)—is that of the mother of the idolatrous Manasseh (2 Kings xxi. 1).

⁵ **For as a young man . . .]** An explanation of the new names in *v.* 4. As a young man marries a virgin, so shall the restored Jewish exiles take possession of their territory; and as a bridegroom rejoices over his bride, so shall Jehovah rejoice over his erring but repentant people (comp. l. 1). The expression, **thy sons shall marry thee**, is less strange in Hebrew than in English, the word for 'to marry' being properly 'to be lord over.'

⁶ **Upon thy walls]** The walls are those of which we have heard in *xlix.* 16 as being 'continually before' Jehovah; the Jerusalem is

the ideal or supersensible one (not the less real because ideal)—see on *xl.* 9. The 'watchers' therefore are not prophets (Knob., Del.), but angelic beings (Targ., Ew., Hahn, Seinecke). Their function is to 'remind' Jehovah, not of human sin (1 Kings xvii. 18) and infirmity (Job i. 11, ii. 5), but of his covenant-promise to protect his people, and we have perhaps a sample of their intercession in *li.* 9, 10 (see note on 'Awake, awake'). They are thus analogous to that 'angel of Jehovah' in *Zech.* i. 12, who intercedes for mercy for Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, and perhaps to the friendly angel-mediator in *Job xxxiii.* 23. We have met with these 'watchers' before (a synonymous word is used) in *lii.* 8 (see note), where they give notice of the approach of Jehovah with the returning exiles. In *Daniel*, too (e.g., *iv.* 13), and in *Enoch* (e.g., *i.* 5), the angels are called 'watchers' (Hebr.) *'irim*, Æthiop. *ʿgūhān*, i.e., *vigiles*), and there is a special class of angels called *εγγήγοροι* in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. More distant, but not the less genuine, is the relation of the phrase to the *παράκλητος* of the Johannine Gospel.—But who is it that declares, **I have set watchers?** Surely not the prophet, even granting that the 'watchers' themselves are prophets (Knob.). Who but

the earth. ⁸ Sworn hath Jehovah by his right hand, and by his strong arm, Surely I will no more give thy corn for food to thy enemies, and strangers shall not drink thy grapes, for which thou hast laboured; ⁹ for they who have garnered it shall eat it and praise Jehovah, and they that gathered it together shall drink it in my holy courts.

¹⁰ Pass ye, pass ye through the gates; clear ye the way of the people; cast ye up, cast ye up the highway; take ye out the stones; lift ye up a banner over the peoples. ¹¹ Behold, Jehovah causeth it to be heard unto the end of the earth; say ye unto the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy Salvation cometh; behold, his wage is with him, and his recompence before him. ¹² And men shall call them, The holy people, Jehovah's released ones; and thou shalt be called Sought out, City not forsaken.

Jehovah could commission either angelic or prophetic watchers? (So Del.)

^{8, 9} Perhaps Jehovah's reply to the intercession of the 'remembrancers'; at the same time a special supplement to the promise in *vv.* 2-5. The tone corresponds to the circumstances of a very primitive period, when the harvest and the vintage were liable to be pillaged by nomadic hordes (comp. Judg. vi. 4, 11, Isa. xvi. 9).

⁸ **In my holy courts**] Lowth and Ges. see here a reference to the rules about the tithes and firstfruits, which were to be eaten 'before Jehovah' (Deut. xii. 17, 18, xiv. 23-26). But the whole of the harvest *could not* be eaten in the courts of the temple! The expression is figurative, like 'to dwell, to worship, in Jehovah's house' (Ps. v. 7, xv. 1, &c.), for 'to hold communion with Jehovah,' and simply means 'shall eat and drink praising Jehovah,' which indeed is the very phrase used in the parallel line. (So Diestel.)

¹⁰⁻¹² The prophet returns to the exiles in Babylon, and urges them not to delay their homeward march. It is the same call which sounded in the two former divisions of the prophecy (xlvi. 20, lii. 11).—**Clear ye the way**] An imaginative direc-

tion to Jehovah's invisible servants (so xl. 3, lvii. 14). It is tantamount to a prophecy such as xi. 16.—**Over the peoples**] i.e., high above them, so as to be seen far and wide. The 'peoples' are the Gentiles who are to escort the Jewish exiles, comp. xlix. 22, xi. 10, 12.

¹¹ **Causeth it to be heard**] viz., as appears from the sequel, the news of the imminent deliverance of Israel (as xlvi. 20).—**Say ye . . .**] This is a fresh summons, and is not to be included in the utterance to 'the end of the earth'—for what object could there be in enlisting the most remote nations in the service of Zion? No; the 'daughter of Zion' is in captivity in Babylonia. Her heralds are either supersensible beings (comp. lii. 7, 8) or the prophets addressed in xl. 1. The misunderstanding of the critics is caused by the crowding of thoughts in the prophet's joyfully excited mind.—**Behold, his wage . . .**] Repeated from xl. 10.—**The holy** (i.e. consecrated) **people**] Such they were destined to be (Ex. xix. 6), though the ideal was but most imperfectly realised. But now the real and the ideal are one.—**Sought out**] i.e., eagerly cared for. A contrast to Jer. xxx. 17, 'She is Zion; no man seeketh her out.'

CHAPTER LXIII. 1-6.

THESE six verses are entirely detached both from the foregoing and from the following prophecy, and ought to have formed a chapter by themselves. They contain a lyrico-dramatic dialogue (which reminds us of that in Ps. xxiv. 7-10) between the prophet as a bystander and a victorious warrior (i.e. Jehovah) returning from the field of battle in Idumæa.

'This highly dramatic description,' according to Ewald,¹ 'unites depth of emotion with artistic perfection, and reproduces a genuine prophetic vision.' Certainly there is a wonderful forcefulness of phrase, and pictorial power, in this brief prophecy, though it is impossible to read it without shuddering (with reverence be it said) at the vehement indignation which it expresses. No wonder that it drew the attention of the seer of Patmos, who interwove some of its striking phrases in one of the sublimest but most awful passages of the Apocalypse (xix. 13, 15). Ewald then goes on to state one of his bold critical conjectures, viz., that lxiii. 1-6, together with chap. lviii. and lix. 1-20, is the work of a fresh writer, distinct from the prophet who composed the greater part of II. Isaiah. I do not here discuss this view as a critical hypothesis, and merely mention it as a symbol of the striking impression made upon Ewald by the literary affinities of these prophecies, especially lxiii. 1-6 and the imaginative description in lix. 15 b-20.² These affinities exist, and are of some importance to exegesis, as it follows from them—1. that at any rate chap. lix. and lxiii. 1-6 were occasioned by the same contemporary circumstances, and 2. that the subject of the latter prophecy is the same as that of the description in lix. 15 b-20, viz., a theophany, i.e., a divinely ordained turn in the fortunes of Israel. When, therefore, Mr. Row (refining upon the well-known patristic interpretation) supposes³ that the mysterious warrior in lxiii. 1-6 is Israel—not indeed Israel as he is, but idealised into a being of a nature chiefly divine but partly human, he can be at once refuted by pointing to lix. 15, where the warrior is expressly affirmed to be Jehovah. Mr. Row's mistake is probably caused by his blind following of the division into chapters. For in the first six verses Israel is completely in the background; it is only at v. 7 that the hopes and fears of God's covenant-people begin to find expression. It may not be superfluous to add, that there is this marked difference between Jehovah, as described in the prophecies, and Jehovah's Servant, that the one can employ violent means, when he thinks it necessary or expedient, while the other is throughout represented as employing moral means, and as being rewarded by Jehovah for his self-sacrifice.

Modern critics in general, both Roman Catholic⁴ and Protestant,

¹ *Die Propheten*, iii. 119.

² Observe that one verse is almost identical in both prophecies (comp. lxiii. 5 with lix. 16).

³ *The Jesus of the Evangelists*, p. 163.

⁴ E.g., the two recent Rom. Cath. commentators, Rohling and Neteler (see Naeg.'s introduction to lxiii. 1-6).

deny at any rate that the primary reference of the prophecy is to the personal Servant of Jehovah. Calvin long ago put this view with a clearness and a force which leave nothing to be desired; he calls the traditional Christian interpretation a violent wresting of the prophecy, which simply declares in figurative terms that God will interpose for His people. The only doubt is whether Edom is to be taken literally or symbolically; whether, that is, the calamity described means only the general judgment upon the world, or a special visitation of Edom; or whether, again, we may combine these views. Our conclusion upon this point will depend on the opinion we have formed of the parallel prophecy in chap. xxxiv.

It is certainly a strange phenomenon, this reference to a great battlefield in Edom, when the grand object of II. Isaiah is to help the Jews to realise their coming deliverance from Babylon. It creates a serious difficulty for those who maintain that II. Isaiah was written at one time and under one set of impressions. The complications of the problems of Biblical criticism are only beginning to be adequately realised.

1 'Who is this that cometh from Edom, in bright-red garments from Bozrah? this that is splendid in his raiment, that ^atosseth (his head) ^a in the fulness of his strength?' 'I am

^a So Ges., Naeg.—Bending to and fro, Del.—Stretching himself out, Ew.

¹ **That cometh from Edom]** From this it would appear that the battle which chiefly excites the writer's interest has been in Edom. In *vv.* 3, 6, however, a subsequent encounter is referred to, in which 'the peoples' (or 'peoples,' for the article is not expressed), i.e., the mass of the Gentile world, feel the weight of the mighty warrior's hand. They are cursed, like Meroz (*Judg.* v. 23), because 'they came not to the help of Jehovah.' Thus the national judgment upon Edom is presented as an earlier stage of the great world-judgment (see *introd.* to chaps. xxiv.-xxvii.).—**In bright-red garments]** There is a doubt whether red is mentioned as the proper colour of a soldier's dress (*comp.* *Nah.* ii. 3), or as indicating the slaughter in which the hero has been engaged (*v.* 3). Some have felt that there would be an incongruity in the description if a blood-stained robe were called 'splendid.' Yet the second is the more natural view (*comp.* *Rev.* xix.

13). It represents the warrior as 'con signo di vittoria incoronato,' as Dante has it in a partly parallel passage;¹ and the stress laid upon the shedding of blood in *v.* 3 suggests that the writer himself saw nothing discreditable in the circumstances.—**That tosseth (his head)]** I cannot agree with Dr. Weir that Del.'s explanation is absurd; the emotional expressions of more primitive races may appear strange, but we ought to take account of them in interpreting ancient writers. The *rend.* adopted, however, is equally possible, and comes home more to our feelings. The tone of this passage reminds us of *xlii.* 13, 14; *comp.* also *Ps.* lxxiv. 3, 'Lift up thy steps (O Jehovah!) to the everlasting ruins,' i.e., advance in long, swift steps.—**I am one that speak . . .]** The warrior himself answers with far-echoing voice (for he is seen at a distance, as Del. subtly remarks). 'Speaking' is mentioned, to recall the numerous prophecies which had

¹ *Inferno*, iv. 54.

one that speak in righteousness, that am mighty to save.'
 2 'Why is there red on thy raiment, and thy garments like his that treadeth in the wine-press?' 3 'The wine-trough I have trodden alone, and of the peoples there was no man with me; so I^b trode them in mine anger, and trampled them in my fury; and their life-stream besprinkled^b my garments, and all my raiment have I defiled. 4 For a day of vengeance was in my heart, and^c my year of release^c was come. 5 And I looked, but there was no helper, and was stupefied, but there

^b Will tread . . . will trample . . . shall besprinkle, Vowel-points, Targ., Calv., Auth. Vers., Kay, Naeg. (see crit. note).

^c So Sept. (omitting 'my'), Pesh., Vulg., Ges., Hitz., Del., Naeg.—The year of my released ones, Ew., &c. (But see lxi. 2.)

announced this great display of righteous wrath and equally righteous love: Jehovah is as mighty in word as in act. 'Righteousness' is not synonymous with 'truth,' 'veracity,' but, as elsewhere in II. Isaiah, the fidelity of God to His revealed principles of action.—**Why is there red . . .**] The speaker is evidently surprised at this red appearance; it is accidental, and not the proper colour of the dress (see above). The Hebr. word for 'red' (*'ādōm*) suggests the thought of Edom, and from the sequel we may infer an ideal association of the name of Bozrah with the vintage (*baḥār*), the names of countries or cities being regarded as emblematic of their fortunes.

³ **The wine-trough I have trodden**] The warrior accepts the metaphor, which indeed is a standing equivalent for the carnage of battle (Joel iii. 13, Lam. i. 15, Rev. xiv. 18-20).—**Of the peoples there was no man . . .**] The nations of the world (at any rate, those in the neighbourhood of Israel) are regarded as a single body; they are in fact united by a common fear and hatred of Jehovah (Ps. ii. 2). Hence 'no man.'—**So I trode them . . .**] The 'wine-trough' was meant for Jehovah's enemies and those of his faithful people; but there was no fatal decree binding the Gentile nations to persist in their hostility.

Any one of them might have separated itself from the rest. But, as no such separation occurred, the Divine warrior took summary vengeance upon them all.—**Their life-stream**] Lit., 'their juice' (Kimchi, less suitably, 'their vigour'). Comp. Ps. xxxii. 4, 'my sap (a synonymous word) was turned into the drought of summer.'—Obs., it is his enemies' blood, and not his own, with which the dress of the hero is stained. For it is 'a more than man' (*lō'ish*, xxxi. 8) who goes to war, and a heavenly sword (xxxiv. 5) which cuts down the foe.

⁴ **A day of vengeance . . . my year of release**] Comp. on lxi. 2. 'Vengeance'; as lix. 17, xxxv. 4.—**Was in my heart**] i.e., was in my intention (as x. 7).—Obs., *v.* 4 places us at the moment preceding the act of vengeance; *v.* 5 describes the internal debate of the hero; *v.* 6, the deed which followed, contemporaneous evidently with *v.* 3. 'Release' suggests the object of the Divine intervention; it was to procure the release of Jehovah's people. Alt. rend. is equally admissible, and in fact more obvious, but does not make such a good parallel to 'a year of vengeance.'

⁵ **And I looked . . .**] See note on l. 2. The first part of the verse is a free variation on lix. 16 *a*, Ezek. xxii. 30; the second is a repetition of lix. 16 *b*, with the change of

was no supporter; therefore mine arm wrought salvation for me, and my fury—it supported me; ⁶ and I ^d stamped upon the peoples in mine anger, and ^e broke them to pieces ^e in my fury, and ^f spilled their life-stream on the ground.^f

^d Will stamp, Vowel-points, Targ., Calv., &c.—Stamp, Ew.

^e So Cappel, Lowth, Hitz., Knob.—Will break them in pieces, Many Hebr. MSS. Targ.—Break them in pieces, Ew.—Will make them drunk, Received text, Calv., &c.—Made them drunk, Sept. Vulg. Vit., Ges., Luzatto, Del. (The letters, which alone properly form the text, leave the tense of the rendering open).

^f Will spill, Vowel-points, Targ., Calv., &c.

'righteousness' into 'fury,' and the third into the first person.

⁶ **I stamped**] Auth. Vers., 'I will tread down.' But the verb is different from either of those used in *v.* 2. There is the less wonder,

then, that in the next verb, **broke them to pieces**, the figure of the vintages is altogether deserted. The common reading, 'will make (or made) drunk,' is against the parallelism.

CHAPTERS LXIII. 7–LXIV.

Contents.—A thanksgiving, confession of sin, and supplication, which 'the prophet puts into the mouth of the Church of the Exile, or rather prays out of their heart' (Del.), for he thoroughly identifies himself with his people.—The chapter (for such it virtually is—see on lxiv. 1) falls naturally into a number of short paragraphs. In the first (lxiii. 7–9), the tone is that of thanksgiving, in accordance with the beautiful custom of the Psalmists to interlace supplication and praise; in the second (*vv.* 10–14) the prophet turns to Israel's ingratitude and rebellion, but forgets not to record his people's 'remembrance' of Jehovah's past mercies, a remembrance which is the first step to the recovery of prosperity (on this characteristic retrospect see note on *v.* 11); in the third (*vv.* 15–19) the Church supplicates Jehovah, as being still the 'father' of his people, to 'look upon' its distress; in the fourth (lxiv. 1–5 *a*) it ventures further, and utters a deep longing for a theophany, nothing short of which will touch the root of its misery; in the fifth and last (*vv.* 5 *b*–11) it puts forth a humble confession of its utter unworthiness, and again bases its plea for help on the fatherly relation of Jehovah, and on the desolate condition of his chosen land and habitation. The manner is that of a liturgical psalm; the prophet, as it were, leads the devotions of the assembled Church. The tone reminds us strongly of the Lamentations; the desolation of the temple and of the Jewish cities (lxiii. 18, lxiv. 10, 11) are described with all the emotion of a contemporary. Shall we refer this to the mighty force of an ecstatic vision? Or is the prophet a contemporary of the Jewish exiles? And if so, when and where did he write? Such are the difficult questions which meet the interpreter, but which, as interpreter, it is not his function to answer. He has indeed difficulties enough of his own in this chapter, the style of which is unusually abrupt, and the text not always handed down with perfect accuracy.

⁷ Jehovah's loving-kindnesses will I celebrate, Jehovah's deeds of renown, according to that which is due for all that Jehovah hath bestowed upon us, and the abundant goodness toward the house of Israel, which he hath bestowed upon them, according to his compassion and according to his abundant loving-kindnesses. ⁸ He said, Surely they are my people, sons that will not play the liar, and he became unto them a saviour. ⁹ In all their distress ^a *he* was distressed ^a, and the angel of his Face saved them; in his love and in his clemency he himself released them; and he took them up and carried them all the days of old. ¹⁰ But *they* defied and grieved his Spirit of

^a So Hebr. marg. and most moderns.—There was no (real) affliction, Ges.; he was not an adversary, Dathe, Kay (both possible renderings of the text-reading).—The versions agree with the Hebr. text in reading the negative particle.

⁷ **Loving-kindnesses]** See on lv. 3.—**Deeds of renown]** Lit., 'renowns'; as in v. 15, 'mights' = 'acts of might (or, of heroism)', and, in lxiv. 6 'righteousnesses' = 'righteous deeds.'

⁸ **He said . . .]** The retrospect of the prophet or the Church begins with the original covenant between Jehovah and Israel, and the first great deliverance from Egypt (comp. Ex. ii. 24, iii. 7).—**Sons]** Reminding us of i. 2, 4.

⁹ **In all their distress]** The wanderings in the desert are referred to.—**He was distressed** i.e., he himself sympathised with them. Comp. Judg. x. 16, 'His (Jehovah's) soul was impatient for the misery of Israel. Against the alternative reading (which is difficult to construe), see Ps. cvi. 44, 'He regarded (them) in their distress.' Occurring as this does in a context closely related to II. Isaiah, it may not unfairly be viewed in the light of an interpretation. The early critics seem (as in ix. 3) to have stumbled at the somewhat unusual position of *lō* (regarded as a preposition and suffix).—**The angel of his Face]** No doubt this is a synonymous phrase for 'the angel of Jehovah,' and there may be an allusion to the promise in Ex. xxiii. 20-23, 'Behold, I send an angel

before thee,' &c. But the novelty of the phrase invites further inquiry. Ewald¹ considers it to be a metaphorical equivalent for the angel constantly in waiting for the commands of the heavenly King. But it seems to be certain that the expression 'the Face (or, the Name) of God' is not merely metaphorical, but a common mythic phrase of the early Semites for the self-manifesting aspect of the Divine nature (comp. on xxx. 27, lix. 19), and that when the later Old Testament writers discarded mythic phraseology, they gave a similar content to the term 'angel.' In the phrase, 'the angel of his Face,' we seem to have a confusion of two forms of expression incident to a midway stage of revelation.—**His clemency]** Indicating that Jehovah had much to forgive.—**He took them up]** Comp. xl. 11, xlvi. 3, 4 (note).

¹⁰ **But they defied and grieved . . .]** The contrast involved in the pronouns 'he' and 'they' reminds us of the similar antithesis in chap. liii.—It is probably the religious and political decline of Israel, as represented in the Book of Judges, to which the prophet refers in this clause:—comp. the familiar phrase, 'And the children of Israel again did evil in the eyes of Jehovah' (Judg. ii. 11, iii. 7, &c.). The same

¹ *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, ii. 289.

holiness; so he changed for them into an enemy, he himself fought against them. ¹¹ Then ^b he remembered the days of

^b His people remembered the ancient days of Moses, Saadya, Rashi, Ges., Hitz., Ew., Del., Naeg.—He (Israel) remembered the days of old (and) the deliverer of his people (viz. Jehovah), Horst, Stier. (This rend. is mentioned by A. E., and approved, though not adopted, by Ges.)

combination of verbs ('defied' and 'grieved' occurs again in Ps. lxxviii. 40; and the former of these verbs, in conjunction with 'his Spirit' (i.e., the Spirit of Jehovah, not that of Moses), in Ps. cvi. 33 (comp. *v.* 43).—**His Spirit of holiness**] It would be dangerous to attempt a 'Theology of II. Isaiah,' but there is evidently a tendency in this book to hypostatise the Divine Spirit (which it mentions no less than seven times) with special distinctness. The author has already claimed to have been sent in personal union with the Spirit of Jehovah (see on xlvi. 16), he now employs another phrase (comp. *v.* 14) which could not have been used, except of a person. From the connection of this verse with the preceding we may, I think, infer that 'his Spirit (of holiness)' is virtually equivalent to 'the Angel' or 'the Face' of Jehovah; and the same conclusion may be reached (see below) by comparing the last clause of the next verse with Ex. xxxiii. 14. Another slight coincidence may confirm this view. The word in Ex. xxiii. 21 rendered in Auth. Vers. 'provoke' is cognate with the word here rendered 'defied,' and the accusative to the verb in Ex. *l. c.* is the 'Angel' of whom it is said, 'My Name (= Face) is in him.' Comp. also iii. 8 'to defy the eyes of his glory' (= 'to defy his Face').—The phrase 'Spirit of holiness' is particularly appropriate here, as the 'defiance' of the Jews consisted in their transgressing that religious covenant, fidelity to which constituted Israel's 'holiness.' In fact, the phrase was not improbably coined for *vv.* 10, 11, as it only occurs again in Ps. li. (see *v.* 11, or in the Hebr. 12), a psalm probably written by one already acquainted

with II. Isaiah.—**So he changed** . . .] For 'his name is Jealous,' Ex. xxxiv. 14.—**He himself**] Although their Father, full of 'love and clemency.'

¹¹ The pressure of a calamity excites a longing for the return of the good old days.—**He remembered**] viz. the people; comp. 'within him.' This 'remembering' is a characteristic feature of the later Psalms; see Ps. lxxviii. 35, lxxvii. 11, cv. 5, cxliii. 5 (and so Deut. xxxii. 7). When man 'remembers,' a corresponding 'change of mind' seems, to human experience, to be wrought in God; comp. Ps. lxxviii. 39, cvi. 45 (and the parallel in Lev. xxvi. 45). It may also be remarked that the point of view of edification predominates in Hebrew historical literature from the time of the Captivity onwards; in their studies as well as in their prayers these earnest Jewish believers 'remembered.'—*Of the text-reading* it seems to me impossible to give a natural translation. I must still, however, agree with Gesenius (in a note appended to his translation of Isaiah, and very generally overlooked) that 'if the text is correct, the explanation of Horst (1823) deserves particular attention, according to which *mōsheh* is taken appellatively' (see above). In this case there is perhaps an allusion to the Hebrew etymology of Moses (Ex. ii. 10), and we might render (as in *J. C. A.*, p. 221), 'the (true) Moses of his people.' I confess, however, that this now appears to me too abstruse an expression and too subtle a thought for such a context. In his Commentary, Gesenius suggests that 'Moses' (*mōsheh*) is a marginal gloss which has intruded into the text. But this is not an adequate

old^b; 'Where is he that^c brought them up out of the sea with the shepherds^c of his flock? where is he that placed within him his Spirit of holiness?' ¹² He that caused his Arm of splendour to go forward at the right hand of Moses, that cleft the waters before them, to make unto himself an everlasting monument? ¹³ He that made them to go through the deeps, like horses through the prairie, without stumbling?

^c So, many Hebr. MSS. and editions, Vulg., Kimchi, Vitr. Del.—Brought them up . . . with the shepherd, Received text.—Brought up out of the sea the shepherd, Sept., Pesh., three Hebr. MSS. (two of some importance), Naeg.

remedy; we have still to account for the unnatural position of 'his people' (*ammō*). The Sept. *omits both words*, and Dr. Weir remarks, 'It would almost seem as if they were a marginal gloss, afterwards introduced into the text, "Moses" perhaps explanatory of "shepherd of his flock," and "his people" of "his flock" or "within him"' [or, perhaps still better, as a subject to the verb 'remembered'].—**Where is he . . .**] Here begins a series of questions, reminding us of those in li. 9, 10.—**With the shepherds of his flock**] ('With' = 'under the conduct of'). These additional words seem to follow rather awkwardly, and I can understand Naeg.'s preference for a simpler reading (see above). Still the parallel of Ps. lxxvii. 20, 'who leddest thy people like sheep by the hand of Moses and Aaron,' seems to justify an adherence to the received text (comp. also Num. xxxiii. 1). From Mic. vi. 4 it may perhaps be inferred that popular tradition gave a place to Miriam (called 'the prophetess,' Ex. xv. 20) among the divinely appointed chiefs.—**Where is he that placed . . . his Spirit . . .**] That the Spirit of Jehovah was specially present among the Israelites in their wanderings, was the constant belief of the Biblical writers. But what is more particularly involved in this belief? A Levitical prayer in Neh. ix. (see *v.* 20) represents the operations of the Spirit as didactic, but the aim of the speaker or writer is here evidently; not truthfulness of historic

colouring, but edification. Providential guidance and sagacious government seem to be the benefits primarily associated with the presence of the Spirit, or, as we may also say (see above), the Face of Jehovah. Hence we read in *v.* 14 'the Spirit of Jehovah brought them to rest,' followed by 'so didst thou lead thy people'; hence Jehovah declares to Moses, 'My Face shall go (with thee), and I will give thee rest' (Ex. xxxiii. 14, comp. Hag. ii. 4, 5, *Q. P. B.*); and hence the narrative in Num. xi. 10–30 ascribes the endowment of the seventy elders with the Spirit of Jehovah to the inadequate provision for the functions of government. The qualifying term 'of holiness' is neither otiose nor vague. It recalls to mind (see on the same phrase in *v.* 10) that the external prosperity of the Israelites was due to the fidelity of their God, and implies a rebuke for their own infidelity.—**Within him**] viz., Israel, not merely Moses (as Ges.), see last note.

¹² **His Arm of splendour**] Another symbolic phrase nearly equivalent to 'the Face of Jehovah' (see on xl. 10).—**To go forward at the right hand of Moses**] Ready to grasp him when he stumbled, xli. 13 (Dr. Weir).—**Who cleft the waters . . .**] Referring still, not to the Jordan, nor to the rock in Horeb, but to the Red Sea; comp. Ps. cvi. 9, lxxvii. 16 (17), where 'the deeps' are mentioned, as in *v.* 13.—**The prairie**] i.e., not the barren 'wilderness' (as Auth. Vers.), but the uncultivated

¹⁴ Like the beast that goeth down into the highland plain, the Spirit of Jehovah ^d brought them to rest ^d; thus didst thou guide thy people, to make unto thyself a monument of glory.

¹⁵ Look from heaven and behold, from thy height of holiness and splendour. Where are thy jealousy and thine acts of might? the sounding of thy bowels and thy compassions restrain themselves towards me. ¹⁶ For thou art our Father, for Abraham taketh no notice of us, and Israel doth not re-

^d Led them, Sept., Pesh., Vulg., Targ., Lowth, Ew. (another reading).

pasture-land, or (to adopt a word from Messrs. Jennings and Lowe's notes on the Psalms), the prairie.

¹³ **That goeth down]** viz., from the bare mountain-side.—**Brought them to rest]** 'Rest' is a favourite phrase for the state of the Israelites in the land of Canaan after their weary wanderings; comp. Ex. xxxiii. 14, Deut. iii. 20, xii. 9, Josh. i. 13, xxii. 4, Ps. xcv. 11, and the applications in Jer. xxxi. 2 (*Q.P.B.*), Heb. iv. 1, 3, 9.—**Thus]** Summing up the several stages of the history.

¹⁵ Here, strictly speaking, chap. lxiv. ought to begin: *vv.* 15-19 are parallel to lxiv. 1-3.—It is difficult to overrate the spiritual beauty of the prayer contained in the former passage. We may admit that the most prominent motive urged by the speaker has a nationalistic air, but behind this, and strengthening it, is his sense of the infiniteness of the Divine mercy, and of the strong vitality of the union between Jehovah and his people.—**Look from heaven]** As if Jehovah had given up caring for his people, and withdrawn into his heavenly palace. This bold apostrophe reminds us of a similar outburst of the prophet-poet of the middle ages:—

E se licito m' è, o sommo Giove,

Che fosti in terra per noi crucifisso,

Son li giusti occhi tuoi rivolti altrove?

The peculiar Hebr. original occurs again in Ps. lxxx. 15 (A. V. 14), and nowhere else. Dr. Weir adds, that the whole of the psalm may be compared with this section of the

prophecy.—**From thy height]** It is not *mārôm*, the usual word for 'height,' but *šbhūl*. The rendering seems to be established from the Assyrian (see crit. note).—**Where (is) thy jealousy]** Jehovah seems to have become callous to his people's need; his 'jealousy' (see on ix. 7 *b*) slumbers, and needs to be 'stirred up' (xl. 13, where, as in this passage, it is combined with the expression 'heroism' or 'manifestation of might').—**The sounding of thy bowels . . .]** A figure for 'sympathy'; comp. xvi. 11 (note), Jer. xxxi. 20, xlvi. 36.

¹⁶ Here the prophet gives place as speaker to the Church.—**For thou (only) art our Father]** 'Our father,' as in lxiv. 8, and perhaps I Chron. xxix. 10.—Not in the wide, spiritual sense of the New Testament, but as the founder and preserver of the Israelitish nation (see Deut. xxxii. 6), which henceforth (carrying out primitive legal conceptions) is under the *patria potestas*. This is the constant meaning of the title 'Father' as applied to Jehovah; see e.g. Ex. iv. 22, Hos. xi. 1, Isa. i. 2, Jer. iii. 4, 19, xxxi. 9, 20, Mal. i. 6, ii. 10. The first example of the individualising use of the term is in Sirach xlii. 1-4, 'O Lord, Father and Governor of my whole life . . . O Lord, Father and God of my life.' ¹)—**For Abraham taketh no notice of us . . .]** Two explanations are open to us: I. 'Abraham and Jacob, fathers according to the flesh, are long since dead, and

¹ Comp. Wittichen, *Die Idee Gottes als des Vaters*, Göttingen, 1865.

cognise us ; thou, O Jehovah, art our Father ; ' our Goel ' hath

know us no more, and cannot help us. But Jehovah is the everlasting Father and Redeemer of his people.' So Dr. Weir, expressing (I believe) the general view of commentators. But let the reader ask himself, Does this really explain the passage? Why should Abraham and Israel be introduced in this connection? Is it not a platitude to say that the remote ancestors of the Jews cannot help them, unless—and this is the second of our theories—there was some chance, from the popular point of view (and obs., *the prophet is speaking in the name of the people*), that they might both sympathise and powerfully co-operate with their descendants—unless, in short, they were regarded somewhat as demigods (comp. the Homeric poems), or patron-saints, or the angelic 'holy ones' in a speech of Eliphaz the Temanite (Job v. 1)¹? It was Ewald who first pointed out some traces of such a popular belief in the Old Testament writings, though he does not call attention to it in the present passage. The instances which he quotes (not all of them, I think, of equal value) are Jer. xxxi. 15 ('Rachel weeping for her children'), Hos. xii. 4, 5 (A. V. 3, 4), Isa. xxix. 22, 23, Luke i. 54, 55, 73, xvi. 22.² Of these the first and the last are the most striking ; the passage from Hosea seems merely to embody a typical interpretation of the history of Jacob, and instead of 'with us' we should perhaps follow Nöldeke and read 'with him' ; on Isa. xxix. 22, 23, I may refer to my own note ; Luke i. 54 probably alludes to Isa. xlv. 2, while *vv.* 55, 73, expressly refer to the past. But if there are only a few passages alluding to this popular belief, we need hardly be surprised ; it was

not the object of the sacred writers to preserve material for archæologists. These few passages, however, seem to me sufficiently conclusive. They enable us moreover to account for some remarkable statements in later Jewish writings—statements, be it said in passing, which render it *a priori* probable that germs of the belief expressed in them would be found in the earlier literature. Among these may be mentioned the vision of Jeremiah 'who prayeth much for the dead' (2 Macc. xv. 13, 14), and the Talmudic assumption that the Messianic redemption would be the recompense of the merits of the patriarchs (especially Jacob and Joseph), or of the prayers of 'ancient Rachel.'³ I trust no reader will suppose that there is anything derogatory to the prophet in this view of his meaning. The fearless security with which the sacred writers employ popular language is only adverse to a mechanical theory of inspiration, and adds greatly to the interest of Biblical studies. [The above stands, with slight alterations, as it was written several years ago. Since then Dr. Goldziher has arrived independently at a similar view.⁴ His opinion, however, is that the prophet aims at overthrowing the popular belief. This seems to me an arbitrary conjecture. No evidence in support of it can be gained from the passage itself. The prophet speaks in the name of the people, and the analogy of passages (see above) in which a controversial intention cannot be supposed, seems to me to be unfavourable to Dr. Goldziher's view. Indeed, on re-considering my note, it appears to me that the prophet is not merely speaking dramatically for the people, but expressing his own

¹ Of course it was only the patriarchs and great men who were expected thus to sympathise across the gulf of death. The popular belief as to the relation of the common dead to their descendants is shown in Job xiv. 21, 22 (see Dillmann's note).

² *History of Israel*, i. 296. We might add Mic. vii. 20.

³ See Rashi on lxii. 6 and comp. Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, pp. 184-5. See also below, on v. 17 b, and quotation from Targum, at end of note on lxiv. 5.

⁴ *Hebrew Mythology*, translated by Russell Martineau, p. 229.

been thy name from of old. ¹⁷ Why dost thou make us to stray, O Jehovah, from thy ways, and harden our hearts so as not to fear thee? Return, for thy servants' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance. ¹⁸ For (but) a little while have they had

* ('Mountain' is the reading of Sept., Lowth, Klostermann.) For a little while have thy holy people possessed (the land, Vittr., Del., &c., or, thy sanctuary, Hitz., Knob.), Hebr. text, according to most.—They have been within a little (?) of dispossessing thy holy people, Hebr. text, according to Luther, Luzzatto, Seinecke, Riehm.—For a little while have they (viz., thy servants, or, the enemies of Israel) had possession of thy holy city, Weir (emendation).

beliefs. See *Last Words* on this passage.]—**Israel**] Sometimes used as a synonym for 'Jacob' in the more solemn style; see 1 Kings xviii. 36 'God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel.'—**Our Goel . . . from of old**] The history of Israel presented a continual succession of 'captivities' and deliverances (see on xli. 14).

¹⁷ **Why dost thou make us to stray . . .]** (Comp. lxiv. 5, 7.) It is as if the Jews would throw the responsibility of their errors upon Jehovah; and this in spite of the encouraging invitations contained in this very book. They speak as if it is not they who need to return to Jehovah (lv. 7), but Jehovah who is reluctant to return to them; as if, instead of 'feeding his flock like a shepherd' (xl. 11), he has driven it out of the safe fold into the 'howling wilderness.' But it is only a temporary gloom which has settled upon the Jewish believers. Depressed by melancholy, they give way for the moment to those human 'thoughts' which are not as 'My thoughts' (lv. 8). Their question is a bold one, and in other lips would be even blasphemous. But an ardent affection to their God underlies it. It is because the Divine power and helpfulness has been so often proved of old (v. 16), that Israel's present degradation seems so unintelligible. The sense of sin, too, has deepened during the Exile, and with it has

arisen a painful feeling of the inconsistency of evil with the beneficent character of the Deity.¹ Fundamentally opposed to Dualism, the Jewish believers are involved in a speculative problem which, from the side of the intellect, they are utterly powerless to explain (comp. Rom. ix. 17-22). How can Jehovah have rejected his people?—this was their first difficulty, and that which beset even the less religious minds among the exiles. How can God be the author of sin?—this is the added sting to true believers.—**From thy ways**] i.e., from thy righteous rules of life (lxiv. 5).—**And harden our hearts**] See on vi. 10.—**Return**] Jehovah had turned away in displeasure; comp. Ps. lxxx. 14 (quoted by Dr. Weir).—**For thy servants' sake**] 'Thy servants' are not Israel's 'fathers' or forefathers (Ibn Ezra and Kimchi, following the Targum,² in the face of v. 16), but those Jews who are still worthy of the title of 'Jehovah's servants' and are therefore competent to receive the promised blessings. In the parallel line they are called **the tribes of thine inheritance**. This is not merely a consecrated phrase, but the language of faith. Jehovah knows his own, however widely the tribes of Israel may be dispersed.

¹⁸ **For (but) a little while**] It is a 'pathetic fallacy.' The tediousness of the Exile (see on xlii. 14)

¹ Comp. *I. C. A.*, p. 224.

² It is a favourite idea of the Targum (see Ps. lx. 6, 7, lxxxiv. 11), and of the Talmud, that the redemption of Israel will be accorded to the merits of 'the fathers' (see above, on v. 16). Vitringa compares the first of the eighteen Benedictions, but *khassid* there means, not 'pious deeds' (of the fathers), but 'promises' (as lv. 3 b).

possession of thy holy mountain^e: our adversaries have trampled upon thy sanctuary. ¹⁹ ^f We are become (like) those over whom thou hast never ruled, upon whom thy name hath never been called.^f

LXIV. ¹ Oh that thou didst rend the heavens, that thou didst come down, that the mountains ^g shook at thy presence, ² as when fire kindleth brushwood, (as when) fire causeth water to boil, to make thy name known to thine adversaries, so that

^f We are become as of old, when thou ruledst not over us, neither was thy name called upon us, Sept., Vulg.—We were of old, before thou ruledst over them, &c. Pesh.—We are thy people from of old, &c., Targ. (Dr. Weir doubtfully suggests that these renderings approach the truth).

^g Flowed, Sept., Vulg., Ew., Stier, Weir., Naeg.

made the preceding period of national independence seem but too short.—**Thy holy mountain**] (Same phrase in lvii. 13.) This phrase considerably diminishes the harshness of the received text, as it provides the verb in the first line with an accusative. (The subject of the verb is, of course, 'thy servants,' *v.* 17). Alt. rend., it is true, does even more than this, for it brings the verb in the first line into parallelism with that in the second. But the rend. 'within a little' has no analogy, and besides it is difficult to think of the pre-Exile Israelites as a 'holy people,' which would seem to be a title specially reserved for the regenerate Israel (lxii. 12, comp. iv. 3).

¹⁹ **We have become (like) those . . .**] The meaning of this half-verse is very uncertain. The omission of 'like' constitutes a serious difficulty in the ordinary rendering.—**Thou hast never ruled**] (Comp. the complaint of the Church in xxvi. 13 *a.*) The theocratic covenant was regarded as a pledge of the indestructibility of the Jewish state. Other nations may have Baal, Chemosh, Asshur, for their king; Israel alone can say 'Jehovah is our King' xxxiii. 22). The prophets admit the justice of the popular belief; only they emphasise the moral conditions on which alone security and deliverance can be enjoyed.—**Thy name**] The 'calling' of the 'name'

of Jehovah upon Israel gave a mystic union to the two parties; comp. xliii. 7, lxv. 1, Deut. xxviii. 10, Jer. xiv. 9.

¹⁻³ These verses are parallel to lxiii. 15, but grander and bolder. There the prophet in the name of the Church petitioned that Jehovah would look down on the misery of his people. Here, a look is felt to be sufficient, so widely yawns the gulf between Israel and his God. A revelation on the largest possible scale is necessary to smite down unbelief and annihilate opposition; God Himself must appear (Naeg.).—In the modern editions of the Hebrew Bible, the verse which, in the printed editions of the ancient as well as in the modern versions, stands as lxiv. 1, forms the second half of lxiii. 19. The context is obviously against separating this verse from the two following (our lxiv. 2, 3), but the arrangement in the Hebrew Bible may also perhaps be taken as an unconscious protest against the interruption of a prophecy which is really a connected whole (lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12).—**That thou didst rend the heavens**] God seems, in time of trouble, to be separated by thick clouds (Job xxii. 13, 14). But the Church firmly believes that He will show Himself again, and only wishes that this most certain event had already taken place. Hence the perfect tense, 'O that thou hadst rent . . . hadst come down' (so

nations trembled before thee, ³ while thou didst terrible things which we hoped not for: [that thou didst come down, that the mountains ⁵ shook at thy presence;] ⁴ yea, from of old men have not heard, nor perceived with the ear, (and) eye hath not seen, a God beside thee, who will do gloriously for him that waiteth for him! ^{5h} Thou meetest ^h him who joyfully worketh righteousness; in thy ways they remember thee. Behold, thou wast wroth, ¹ and we sinned ¹; * * * * ¹ and we went astray ¹. ⁶ And we all became as one who is unclean, and all our righteous deeds as a menstruous garment, and we all faded away as the leaves, and our iniquities like

² O that thou wouldst meet, Ew. (similarly Stier).

¹ So Hitz., Ew., Knob., Naeg.—And we stood forth as sinners, Del.

^h Therein (i.e., in our sins, or, in the tokens of thine anger) [have we been] a long time, Ges., Del.—(Thou wast wroth) with them (i.e., the people) a long time, Vitr., Ew.

¹ So Ew.—We fell away, Lowth (both Ew. and Lowth follow Sept.).—Hebr. text, And shall we be delivered? Hitz., Del., Naeg.

literally).—**Mountains shook**] A frequent feature in the Biblical theophanies; comp. Judg. v. 5, Mic. i. 4, Hab. iii. 6, and especially Ex. xix. 18.—**As when fire . . .**] To emphasise the foregoing statement. Solid as the mountains seem, they shall be as powerless as so much brushwood or water to resist the destructive influences of Jehovah.—**To make thy name known . . .**] Name is not merely character, but one special aspect of the Deity (see on xxx. 27).

³ **Terrible things**] A standing phrase (see Deut. x. 21, 2 Sam. vii. 23, Ps. cvi. 22) for the wonders of the Exodus, to which later deliverances are compared.—**Which we hoped not for**] Exceeding our wildest dreams, although, as the next verse says, we had a right to expect great things, on account of the mighty exploits of Jehovah in the past. The concluding words are probably, as Mr. Robertson Smith has pointed out, repeated by accident from v. 1; the passage gains greatly by their removal.

⁴ **From of old men have not heard . . .**] The only living God who, from the beginning of the world, has proved himself to be such by acts, is Jehovah.—**Do gloriously**] Lit., 'do,' in a pregnant sense (as xliv. 23).

⁵ **Thou meetest**] 'Meetest' in such a way as to leave no doubt of a Divine visit (etymologically, strikest against).—**Behold, thou wast wroth . . .**] Instead of this desired harmony, Jehovah has manifested his displeasure, and the only consequence has been (comp. v. 7 end, and lxiii. 17 a) that we sinned (or, perhaps, went on sinning). For Del.'s rend., comp. Gen. xliii. 9 Hebr.; 'and' = 'so that,' the 'vāv consecutive' here expressing the sequence of fact, and not of logic) . . . **and we went astray**] This portion of the verse is difficult in the extreme (see crit. note), Del.'s rend. is grammatically the safest, but it is harsh, and interrupts the parallelism. The paraphrase of the Targum is interesting, as illustrative of the Jewish doctrine of merit, referred to on lxiii. 16. It runs, 'because of the works of our righteous fathers which have been from of old, we are delivered.'

⁶ **And we all became**] With an emphasis on 'all,' even more marked in the Hebr. than in liii. 6.—**As one who is unclean**] Like the leper, who is excluded from society (Lev. xiii. 44-46). The people is personified as one man (as i. 6).—**Our iniquities**] The word ('*āvōn*') includes the idea of punishment (see on liii. 6 b).—

the wind have carried us away : ⁷and there is none that calleth on thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee ; for thou hast hid thy face from us, and hast ^mdelivered us ^minto the hand of our iniquities.

⁸And now, Jehovah, thou art our father ; we are the clay, and thou our fashioner, and the work of thy hands are we all. ⁹Be not wroth, Jehovah, to the uttermost, and remember not iniquity for ever : lo, do but look, we are all thy people. ¹⁰Thy holy cities have become a desert ; Zion hath become a desert, Jerusalem a desolation. ¹¹Our house of holiness and splendour, where our fathers praised thee, is burned up with fire, and all our delectable things are laid waste. ¹²Wilt thou,

^m So Sept., Pesh., Targ., Lowth, Ew., Knob.—Made us to melt away (by means of, or, into the hand of), Hebr. text, Vulg., &c. (unusual transitive use of the verb).

Have carried us away] Into a region where Jehovah's presence is not felt.

⁷ **Who stirreth up himself]** From the lethargy of the conscience (same word in li. 17).—

Hast delivered us] The low ebb of religion being ascribed (comp. *v.* 5 and xliii. 17) to Jehovah's withdrawal of his felt presence.—

Hand] i.e., 'power,' 'sins' being personified as a tyrant seeking to destroy. Comp. the whole passage with Ezek. xxxiii. 10, 'Thus ye speak, saying, If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine in them, how should we then live?'

⁸ The Church, in the boldness of faith, has held up the mirror to Jehovah. She has pointed out the disastrous consequences of his present inactivity, and sums up all her longings in the pleading ejaculation, **And now** (bad as our state is), **Jehovah, thou art our father ;** this is the hope, which will bear the full weight of our reliance. The Church had indeed already expressed this great truth (lxiii. 16). She now couples with it an appeal to Jehovah's reasonableness. Will the potter lightly break a vessel on which he has lavished his utmost skill?—The same combination of figures occurs in xlv. 9 (note).—

We all] Unworthy as we are (see *vv.* 6, 9).

¹⁰ Another motive for Jehovah's interference.—**Thy holy cities]** The phrase is remarkable ; elsewhere Jerusalem is 'the holy city' (xlvi. 2, lii. 1) : Sept. and Vulg. read 'thy holy city.' We find however 'his holy border' (Ps. lxxviii. 54), and 'the holy land' (Zech. ii. 12, Hebr. 16).

¹¹ **Our house of holiness . . .]** 'Our house,' i.e., that of which we are so proud (comp. Matt. xxiii. 38). Not 'the house of our holiness, &c., for the 'holiness' and the 'splendour' are Jehovah's (lvii. 15, lx. 7, comp. lxiii. 15).—**All our delectable things]** The parallelism shows that this is to be taken in a religious sense (comp. xlv. 9), and the phrase 'are laid waste,' or 'are laid low in ruin' (*l'khorbâh*, elsewhere only in Jer., Ezek., and Lev. xxvi. 31, 33), suggests that buildings are meant—probably the temple and its contents (hence 'all . . .'). This is confirmed by Joel iii. 5 ('my goodly delectable things' parallel to 'my silver and my gold'). In 2 Chron. xxxvi. 19 the phrase is used, in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, of all artistic or precious objects, sacred or otherwise.—To illustrate this verse, see introd. to chap. lxvi.

in spite of these things, restrain thyself, Jehovah, keeping silence, and afflicting us to the uttermost?

¹² **Restrain thyself**] See lxiii. 15, xlii. 14 (note).

CHAPTER LXV.

Contents.—Alternate threatening and promise, the one addressed to a polytheistic party, the other to true believers.

Most commentators regard this prophecy as the answer of Jehovah to the foregoing prayer of the Church. This view is certainly plausible; such deep penitence and such earnest though struggling faith ought surely to strike a responsive chord in the divine-human heart. Unfortunately, it will not stand a critical examination; at least, there are objections to it, which have not yet been answered. The most serious one is this—that the Divine speaker not only makes no recognition of the advances of his penitent servants, but passes by without notice the grave religious problem by which they were harassed. The Church had complained that Israel's continuance in sin was itself a consequence of the withdrawal of the Divine favour (see on lxiv. 5). It is difficult to understand that the only reply of Jehovah should be that he had always been ready to renew his intercourse with his people (lxv. 1). It would appear to follow from this inconsistency that chap. lxv. was not originally intended to be the sequel of chaps. lxiii., lxiv. There are also some other difficulties in the way of admitting the ordinary view of commentators, though they touch too closely on the domain of 'the higher criticism' to receive a thorough treatment here. They are such as these—that, while some passages appear to presuppose the Exile as past, others refer to circumstances characteristic of Jewish life in Canaan. The former are to be found in vv. 11–25, 'But as for you . . . that forsake my holy mountain' (v. 11), and 'They shall not build, and another inhabit,' &c. (v. 22); the latter in vv. 3–5, 11, where some at least of the sins referred to belong distinctly to Palestinian idolatry, and in v. 8, which appears to contain a quotation from a vintage-song. It is for criticism to say how these apparently conflicting phenomena are to be accounted for; but exegesis has a right to point out that a chapter with such pronounced Palestinian features can hardly have been intended as the sequel of lxiii. 7–lxiv., of which the real or assumed standing-point is in the Babylonian exile.¹

¹ I have offered answers to those who have not asked; I have been at hand to those who have not sought me: I have

¹ **I have offered answers**] Lit., (same idiom as in liii. 7, on which 'I allowed myself to be consulted' see crit. note). The expression is

¹ I feel that this argument, though not without weight, is not so strong as the foregoing one.

said; Here I am, here I am, unto a nation which hath not ^a called upon ^a my name. ² I have spread out my hands all the day unto an unruly people, who walk in a way which is not good, after their own thoughts. ³ The people who irritate me to my face continually, who sacrifice ^b in the gardens ^b, and burn incense upon the bricks; ⁴ who tarry in the graves

^a So Sept., Pesh., Targ., Vulg., Lowth, Ew., Diestel.—Been called by, Vowel-points, Ges., Del., &c. (unusual use of the conjugation).

^b On (?) the roofs, Ew.

vague, and may mean either that Jehovah was actually consulted (it is the word for consulting an oracle), or merely that He might have been. The vowel-points (which are no part of the text, but embody an ancient interpretation) in the second half of the verse imply that the Gentiles are the people referred to, and consequently favour the former view of the meaning. St. Paul, too, following perhaps the tradition of Gamaliel, applies the passage to the conversion of the Gentiles (Rom. x. 20), and most Christian commentators have done the same. The context, however, is very decidedly against such a reference. There is no indication that the prospects of the Gentiles occupied the mind of the prophet at this time. The sins of the Jews, committed against light and knowledge, must bring down upon them a proportionately heavy punishment—this is the burden of the section.—**Hath not called upon my name**] Comp. lxiv. 7, xliii. 22. The difficulties of alt. rend. are well brought out by Del. (who however adheres to it).

² **I have spread out my hands**] The gesture of prayer—what a condescension!—**Who walk**] The nation is not here personified—it is the plural number in the Hebrew.

³ **Who sacrifice in the gardens**] This was a characteristic sin of the pre-Exile period (lvii. 5, i. 29). Ew.'s correction (*baggag-gôth* for *baggannôth*), anticipated but rejected by Vittr., is against Hebr. usage, which requires the

preposition '*al.*—**Upon the bricks**] i.e., upon the tilings of the houses (2 Kings xxiii. 12, Zeph. i. 5, Jer. xix. 13). Or, upon altars made of bricks, which were contrary to the Law (Ex. xx. 24, 25); but this seems rather less probable, 1. because it implies an ellipsis, and 2. because it points to Babylonia or Egypt as the scene of the transgression. The former view, implying Palestine as the locality, is more in harmony with the context.

⁴ **In the graves**] The rock-graves of Palestine with their distinct chambers, supplied, and still supply,¹ a comfortable resting-place on emergencies. Of course, to lodge in the houses of the dead involved ceremonial impurity, but the context shows that the persons spoken of had cut themselves adrift from the religion of Jehovah.—What was the object of these visits to the graves? Vittr. and Ges. think of propitiatory sacrifices to the dead, but the parallel passages (viii. 19, xxix. 4) rather suggest necromancy. Sept. already adopts this view, inserting the words *διὰ ἐνύπνια* (the revelations being expected in dreams). But the graves were, in popular estimation, not only the abodes of the dead, but those of demons, or infernal deities or demigods (comp. Matt. viii. 28, Mark v. 3). The revelations might therefore be looked for from these, and the offence against Jehovah would be the greater. So Jerome, who renders the next line, 'et in delubris (?) idolorum dormiunt,' commenting

¹ E. von Orelli, *Durch's Heilige Land* (Basel, 1870), p. 178.

and 'in secret places' take up their lodging, who eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominations is in their vessels; ^a who say, Keep by thyself, do not come near me, for I 'am holy unto thee'^d! These are a smoke in my nose, a fire burning all the day

^c In the caves, Sept.

^d Make thee holy, Geiger.

thus, 'ubi stratis pellibus hostiarum incubare soliti erant, ut somniis futura cognoscerant. Quod in fano Æsculapii usque hodie error celebrat ethnicorum multorumque aliorum.' Comp. Virg. *Æn.* vii. 87, &c.—**Who eat swine's flesh**] That is, in sacrificial meals, as the context shows (comp. lxvi. 17). The flesh of the swine was forbidden by the Law (Deut. xiv. 8, Lev. xi. 7), not merely for dietetic reasons, but presumably from its connection with the myth of Adonis, who was said to have been killed by a wild boar in the forests of Lebanon; an additional reason for the prophet's indignation is mentioned in the note on lxvi. 3. How loathsome swine's flesh was to pious Jews may be seen from the narratives in 2 Macc. vi., vii. The charge of eating it points on the whole to Palestine rather than to Babylonia as the country of the offenders, for not even an allusion to the swine has yet been found in the cuneiform inscriptions. It is true that, as Bochart remarks,¹ 'there were no swine in Judæa, as long as the commonwealth of the Jews stood: it was in a 'far country' that the prodigal son was sent into the fields to feed swine (Luke xv. 13-15). But we know that there were swine in Galilee in our Lord's time (Matt. viii. 30), and that some at least of the Phœnicians sacrificed swine (Lucian, *de deb. Syriâ*, c. 54). Ewald points to the mention of eating swine as confirming his view that these chapters were written in Egypt; but though the swine does appear to have been sacrificed in Egypt (Herod. ii. 47, 48), its flesh

was 'forbidden to all initiated in the mysteries, and only allowed to others once a year.'²—**Broth of abominations**] i.e., broth made of the unclean animals offered to heathen deities. 'Abominations' (*shiqqûcim*) occurs only in this and the next chapter (lxvi. 3, comp. v. 17) in Isaiah; it is specially characteristic of Jeremiah and the writers who followed him. We find it however once in Hosea (ix. 10), once in the disputed Book of Deuteronomy (xxix. 17, Hebr. 16), and often in the disputed Book of Leviticus. For the construction of the phrase of which these words form part, comp. v. 12a.

³ **Who say, Keep by thyself**] An allusion to some heathen mysteries, into which the Jewish renegades had been initiated (comp. lxvi. 17). Idolatry was bad enough itself, but that idolaters should assume a superiority over Jehovah's 'holy ones' (comp. lxvi. 5) was still worse.—**I am holy unto thee**] i.e., by implication, unapproachable, tabooed, *sacrosanctus* (comp. on iv. 3). So of the priests it is said, 'Thou shalt sanctify him therefore, for the food of thy God doth he present: he shall be holy unto thee' (Lev. xxi. 8, quoted by Baudissin). Geiger's reading is plausible (comp. Ezek. xlv. 19 end, Hag. ii. 12, 13).³ But a warning not to run the risk of becoming 'sanctified' (and therefore disqualified for ordinary work) by contact, does not sufficiently bring out the pride of these pagan 'Pharisees.'—**These are**] i.e., these supply the material of. **A smoke in my nose**] The indignation of the

¹ *Hierozoicon*, i. 696.

² Sir Gardner Wilkinson, note on *Herod.* ii. 47 (Rawlinson).

³ See Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, pp. 56, 172, 493.

long. ⁶ Behold, it is written before me ; I will not keep silence, except I have requited, and requited into their bosom. ⁷ Your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith Jehovah, who burned incense upon the mountains, and reproached me upon the hills! And I will measure their recompence first into their bosom.

⁸ Thus saith Jehovah, As when grapes are found in the cluster, and one saith, 'Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it,' so will I do for my servants' sake, that I destroy not the whole: ⁹ and I will bring out from Jacob a seed, and from Judah possessors of my mountains, and my chosen ones shall take it in possession, and my servants shall dwell there. ¹⁰ And Sharon shall become a pasture for flocks, and the valley of Achor a place for oxen to lie down in, for my people who have enquired of me.

speaker makes his breath issue forth like smoke. Comp. *nasus proflat iras*.

⁶ **It is written before me**] The subject may be either the sin of the Jews (Calv., Hitz., Knob., Del.), which is 'written,' as Jeremiah says (xvii. 1), 'with a pen of iron,' or the Divine decree for its punishment (Vitr., Ges., Stier, Naeg., Kay). The fortunes of men, past, present, and future, are all noted in the heavenly books or registers (iv. 3, Ps. lvi. 8, Dan. vii. 10), but in this passage it is rather the past than the future which is recorded, as appears from the emphatic 'before me.' Comp. Mal. iii. 16, 'Jehovah hearkened and heard it, and a book of remembrance was *written before him*.'

⁷ **Your iniquities . . .**] Some take this as the accusative to the verb at the end of the last verse. But the change of pronoun is harsh in the extreme, and it is more natural to suppose that *v. 7 a* has been left imperfect (the verb 'I will requite' being omitted), owing to the excitement of the speaker—that it is, in fact, an exclamation.—**Upon the mountains**] Again a Palestinian feature; comp. lvii. 7, Hos. iv. 13.—**And I will measure . . .**] The most pressing act which Jeho-

vah as Judge has to perform is to punish these evil-doers, both fathers and sons. See the parallel, Jer. xvi. 18 (which passage is the original?).

⁸ Transition from threatening to promise marked by a figure from the vintage. Jehovah will not reject all Israel because of its many bad members. His dealings will be like those of vintagers, who, if they find even a few good grapes on a cluster, say to each other, **Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it** ('A blessing' = a source of blessing, as xix. 24, Gen. xii. 2). Perhaps, as Mr. Samuel Sharpe and Professor Robertson Smith have independently conjectured, these are the opening words of a vintage-song. This would account for the words 'Destroy not' (*Al tashketh*) at the head of Ps. lvii.-lix. Each of these three psalms was probably sung to the air of this favourite song.

⁹ **My mountains**] This is one of Isaiah's striking phrases, though not confined to him (see on xiv. 24),—**Sharon . . . Achor**] i.e., the whole land from east to west; see on xxxiii. 9, and Josh. vii. 24-26. The same prominence is given to agriculture in an earlier ideal picture of the future (xxx. 23, 24).

¹¹ And as for you that forsake Jehovah, that forget² my holy mountain, that set in order a table for Gad, and fill up mixed drink for M'ní—¹² I destine you for the sword, and

¹¹ The tone of threatening is resumed (as so often).—**That forget my holy mountain**] This need not, as most commentators suppose, imply that the persons addressed are the Jewish exiles in Babylon. It may simply mean, 'that keep aloof from the rites and ceremonies of the temple.' A similar phrase, 'to forget Jerusalem,' occurs in Ps. cxxxvii, which all will probably admit to be a post-Exile work.—**That set in order a table**] Alluding to the 'lectisternia,' or meals prepared for divine beings. This feature will suit Babylonia as well as (probably) Palestine. See the second calendar translated by Sayce in *Records of the Past*, vii. 159-168 (every day of the month Ebul is marked by a royal offering); and comp. Herod. i. 181, Bel and Drag. v. 11, Ep. of Jude vv. 26, 27. The only other allusions to 'lectisternia' in the canonical books are Jer. vii. 18, li. 44. It is a remarkable fact that a similar practice *in honour of Gad* survived in certain Jewish families even down to the time of Rashi (11th cent.)¹—**For Gad**] i.e., for Good Fortune; Sept., τῷ δαίμονιω. Gad is probably the star-god Jupiter (called by the Arabs 'the greater fortune'). His cultus exemplifies the closeness with which polytheistic rites cling to their native soil. Its origin (see, however, below) was Canaanitish; comp. Baal-gad (i.e., Baal in the character of the god of good fortune), the name of a place to the south of Hermon, mentioned in Josh. xi. 17, xii. 7. Some have also traced the name of Gad in the proper name Azgad

(which occurs four times in Ezra and Nehemiah), but this is rather the Aramaic *izgad* 'a messenger.' In Phœnician inscriptions we find the names Gad-astoreth and Gad-moloch (de Vogüé). The prevalence of the worship of the deity called Gad in Syria has been abundantly shown by Mordtmann,² who quotes *inter alia* a remarkable passage from the Christian writer, Jacob of Serug: 'Henceforth, on the summit of the mountains, they build monasteries, instead of Beith-gadé' (*gadé*, the plural of *gad* in Syriac, means generally both 'the good fortunes, viz. Jupiter and Venus, though in the Peshito version of our passage it is the equivalent of Gad and M'ní conjointly). [It is possible, however, that Gad has a Babylonian origin. 'Jupiter,' according to Mr. Sayce,³ 'was properly termed Lubat-Guttav; possibly this Gad (in Isa. lxx. 11) is derived from Guttav, with a change of the dental to assimilate the word to the Semitic *gad*, luck.' Of course, the existence of a Babylonian analogue would not prove that the worshippers spoken of lived in Babylonia. The analogy might go back (as in other cases) to a remote antiquity.]—**For M'ní**] i.e., for Destiny; Sept. τῇ τύχῃ. M'ní is probably Venus, called in Arabic 'the lesser fortune.' M'ní, like Gad, was a Syrian deity, though the evidence for this only belongs to the post-Exile period. De Luynes and Levy have found the name in compound proper names on Aramæan coins of the Achæmenidæ; the latter has also found it on a Sinaitic inscription.⁴ Delitzsch

¹ See the Talmudic and Rabbinic authorities in Chwolson, *Die Ssabier*, ii. 226. The Arabic writer en-Nadim also mentions lectisternia in honour of 'the lord of fortune' (i.e., Jupiter); these were given by the heathen population of Harrân (Chwolson, *op. cit.* 32).

² *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morg. Ges.*, xxxi. 90-101.

³ *Transactions of Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology*, iii. 170-1.

⁴ Levy, *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morg. Ges.*, xiv. 410; Rödiger, in Addenda to Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, p. 97.

ye all to the slaughter shall bow down, because I called and ye did not answer, I spoke, and ye did not hearken, but did that which was evil in mine eyes, and that in which I had no pleasure ye chose. ¹³ Therefore thus saith the Lord, Jehovah: Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall hunger; behold my servants shall drink, but ye shall thirst; behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed; ¹⁴ behold, my servants shall sing aloud for gladness of heart, but ye shall cry out for anguish of heart, and for breaking of spirit shall ye howl. ¹⁵ And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen ones—'Then may the Lord Jehovah slay thee', but his servants shall he call by another name, ¹⁶ so that he who blesseth himself on earth shall bless himself by the God

• So Ew.—Most, And the Lord Jehovah shall slay thee.

remarks that there is no Babylonian analogue for M'ní. Finzi and Lenormant, however, have both found a Babylonian god of the second order called 'great Manu.'¹ M'ní may very possibly be a Semitised form of Manu.—M'ní appears to be a masculine form; we know that among the Babylonians at least there was a masculine as well as a feminine Venus (see on xiv. 12). It seems probable that the Arabic Manât represents a collateral feminine form of the name.² If so, we have an interesting link between Syrian and pre-Mohammedan Arabian religion, Manât being the name of one of the three chief deities of Arabia, who were recognised for a time by Mohammed as mediators with Allah (*Korán*, Sur. liii. 19–23).

¹⁵ **For a curse**] i.e., as the centre of a formula of imprecation. Comp. Num. v. 21, Zech. viii. 13, Ps. cii. 8 (*Q. P. B.*), and especially Jer. xxix. 22, 'And from thee shall be taken a curse . . . saying, Jehovah make thee like Zedekiah and like Ahab, whom the king of Babylon wasted in the fire.' The formula is quoted imperfectly, like the first words of a song. Alt. rend. seems to me to interrupt the flow

of the sentence, and involves a harsh change of number. Del., who, on supposed grammatical grounds (see crit. note), adopts it, yet assumes that 'the prophet has in his mind the words of this imprecatory formula (hence the singular ". . . kill thee"), though he does not express them.'—**By another name**] It is implied that the name 'Israel' has become debased by the lapse of so many of the Israelites. Comp. the 'new name' in lxii. 2b.

¹⁶ **Shall bless himself by**] i.e., shall wish himself the blessings which proceed from. So Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, Jer. iv. 2, Ps. lxxii. 17.—**The God of the Amen**] Comp. Rev. iii. 14, 'The Amen, the faithful and truthful witness.' The expression is generally derived from the custom of saying Amen (i.e., 'It is sure') in a solemn covenant (comp. Deut. xxvii. 15 &c.): Targ. renders 'the God of the oath'—at any rate a plausible paraphrase. I confess, however, that I can hardly believe that our prophet would have coined such a phrase, which seems to me to belong to a more liturgical age, when 'Amen' had become a common formula in the temple-services. One is tempted to alter

¹ They refer to the Brit. Mus. collection of cuneiform inscriptions, iii. 66.

² Comp. Sprenger, *Leben Mohammads*, ii. 16.

of 'the Amen'; and he who sweareth on earth shall swear by the God of 'the Amen'; because the former distresses are forgotten, and because they are hidden from mine eyes.

¹⁷ For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former things shall not be remembered, nor come up into the mind. ¹⁸ Rejoice ye rather, and exult for ever on account of that which I create; for behold, I create Jerusalem (anew) as exultation and her people as joy; ¹⁹ and I will exult in Jerusalem, and rejoice in my people, and no more shall there be heard in her the sound of weeping, nor the sound of a cry. ²⁰ And no more shall there proceed thence an infant of (a few) days, nor an old man who cannot fill up his days; for the youth shall die when a hundred years old, and the sinner,

† Faithfulness, Weir (see below).

the vowel points, and read 'ōmen or 'ēmūn 'faithfulness' (xxv. 1) instead of 'āmēn; comp. Sept., τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν. [Similarly, I observe, Dr. Weir.]—**Hidden from mine eyes**] One chapter of the heavenly book (see on v. 6) is cancelled; its contents are as though they had never been. The continuity of Israel's development is restored.

¹⁷⁻²⁵ The new creation. Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 81) quotes these verses as a prediction of the millennium.

¹⁷ **I create new heavens and a new earth . . .**] This is no mere poetical figure for the return of prosperity (as, e.g., Albert Barnes would have it). The prophet does his utmost to exclude this view by his twofold emphatic statement—'new heavens shall be *created*, and the old shall pass away.' The fundamental idea is that nature itself must be transformed to be in harmony with regenerate Israel; we have met with it in more than the germ already (see xi. 6-9 with note xxx. 26, xliii. 19, li. 16). The supposition of Dr. Kohut,¹ that we have here a loan from Zoroastrianism is altogether gratuitous, i. because such a conception arises

naturally out of the fundamental Biblical idea of the perpetual creatorship of God (comp. John v. 17), and 2. because the regeneration of nature expected by the prophet differs from that taught in the Bundeshesh in several essential particulars—e.g., he looks forward to the continuance of births and deaths (*vv.* 20, 22) and of the ordinary process of nourishment (*v.* 21), and he makes no mention of the resurrection of the dead (comp. on xxvi. 19.²—**The former things**] Some understand by this phrase 'the former troubles' (comp. liv. 4); others 'the former heaven and earth' (comp. Jer. iii. 16). But why may we not, as Naeg. suggests, combine both references?

¹⁸ **On account of . . .**] Lit., in respect of . . . (comp. xxxi. 6 Hebr.).—**I create Jerusalem**] The 'new creation' will still have its Jerusalem! It is not a creation *de nihilo*, but a transformation.—**As exultation**] i.e., with an abounding sense of joy as the basis of the new nature (like 'I am prayer,' Ps. cix. 4).

²⁰ **The youth shall die . . .**] i.e., he who dies at the age of a hundred shall be regarded as early lost, and even the wicked, suppos-

¹ *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morg. Ges.*, xxx. 716, 717.

² Matthes, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1877, p. 585.

when a hundred years old, shall come under the curse. ²¹ And they shall build houses, and inhabit them, and shall plant vineyards, and eat their fruit: ²² they shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat; for as the days of [§] a tree [§] shall be the days of my people, and the work of their hands mine elect shall use to the full. ²³ They shall not labour for vanity, nor bring forth for sudden trouble, for they are a seed of the blessed of Jehovah, and their offspring (shall remain) with them. ²⁴ And it shall come to pass that before they call, I will answer; while they are yet speaking, I will hear. ²⁵ The wolf and the lamb shall graze to-

§ The tree of Life, Sept., Targ. (Gloss.)

ing such to exist, shall not be cut off by the curse which pursues them before their hundredth year. Our prophet has not so glorious a view of the future as that which is embodied in xxv. 8. It is not eternal life which he here anticipates, but patriarchal longevity (as Zech. viii. 4). Comp. the picture in the apocryphal Book of Enoch (v. 9), 'And they shall not be punished all their life long, neither shall they die by plagues and judgments; but the number of their days shall they complete, and they shall grow old in peace, and the years of their happiness shall be many, in everlasting bliss and peace, their whole life long.' (This reminds us of the Paradise of the Avesta, in which a year was equal to a day, *Vendidad*, ii. 133.)

²¹ **And they shall build houses . . .**] Alluding perhaps to the curse in Deut. xxviii. 30, the exact opposite of which forms the basis of the promise. Comp. also lxii. 8, 9, Am. ix. 14.

²² **As the days of a tree**] Instances enough of long-lived trees can be found in Palestine, without referring to the boabab-tree of Senegal! Comp. in lxi. 3 'oaks of righteousness,' and Ps. xcii. 14, 'They shall still shoot forth in old age.'—**Shall use to the full**] Lit., wear out. Comp. Job xxi. 13, 'They

wear out their days (i.e., live out their full term) in prosperity.'

²³ **Nor bring forth . . .**] i.e., their children shall not perish by any of God's 'four sore judgments.' Comp. Ps. lxxviii. 33, 'and (he consumed) their years by a sudden trouble.'—**(Shall remain) with them**] It is a part of the 'blessing' that their children grow up and enjoy life with them. Comp. Job xxi. 8.

²⁵ The picture of the new creation is completed by a reference to the animal world. It would be inconsistent to leave the lower animals with untransformed natures. But it is only a single feature which is given, and that in the form, mainly, of a condensed quotation from xi. 6-9. One original clause, however, is added, **And the serpent—dust shall be his food**] i.e., the serpent shall content himself with the food assigned him in the primeval Divine decree (there is a manifest allusion to Gen. iii. 14). This, if I am not mistaken, is meant literally; 'much dust' is the food of the shades in the Assyrio-Babylonian Hades.¹—**They shall not harm . . .**] The subject is, of course, the wild animals mentioned in the original passage, xi. 6, 7. Hence a strong presumption (whatever be the date of chap. lxv.) in favour of interpreting xi. 9 (see note) literally, and not allegorically.

¹ Legend of Ishtar, line 8 (back side). All the translations agree.

gether, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox ; and the serpent—dust shall be his food : they shall not harm nor destroy in all my holy mountain, hath Jehovah said.

CHAPTER LXVI.

Contents.—A declaration by Jehovah that he requires no earthly habitation, and is displeased with the service of unspiritual worshippers ; this is followed by a solemn antithesis between the fate of the persecutors and the persecuted (*vv.* 1-5). Next, a renewal of the alternate threats and promises of chap. lxxv. (*vv.* 6-24). The former are mainly addressed to the hostile Gentiles, but partly also to the idolatrous Jews, and the idolatrous practices denounced (*v.* 17) are the same as those mentioned in lxxv. 4, 5, viz. initiation into heathen mysteries, and eating 'unclean' food. The prophecy closes gloomily with an awful glance at the punishment of the guilty souls (*v.* 24).

In deference to custom, I have treated these two parts as rightly united in a single chapter, though not entirely convinced that this view is correct. The most obvious interpretation of *vv.* 1-3 is that, at the real or assumed standing-point of the writer, the temple was no longer standing, and that the Divine speaker reprobates any attempt to rebuild it and to restore the sacrificial system. On the other hand, *v.* 6, and perhaps also *vv.* 20, 21, seem at least as clearly to imply that the temple is in existence. I have endeavoured to remove this apparent inconsistency in my note on *v.* 1 *b* ; still I cannot think it *a priori* probable that passages apparently so inconsistent should have been intended to form part of one and the same chapter.

¹ Thus saith Jehovah, The heavens are my throne, and the earth is my footstool ; what manner of house would ye build

¹ **The heavens are my throne** . . .] For parallels, see Ps. xi. 4, ciii. 19 ; comp. also the words of Jesus in Matt. v. 34, xxiii. 22.—**What manner of house . . .**] Many consider this to be a reprobation of a plan for rebuilding the temple, whether, with Hitzig, we suppose this to have proceeded from the Jews who remained behind in Chaldæa (the reprobation applying, according to him, to a Chaldæan and not to a Judæan temple), or whether, with Lowth and Vitranga, we assume a reference to the temple of Herod the Great.

The words need not, however, be more than an emphatic declaration that Jehovah 'dwelleth not in houses made with hands.' It may, in fact, be another example of 'the Gospel before the Gospel' (see Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24), for a similar statement of equal distinctness will be looked for in vain in the Old Testament. The 'Light which lighteth every man' in this instance shone earlier on the banks of the Nile. An Egyptian hymn to the Nile, dating from the 19th dynasty (14th cent. B.C.), contains these words, 'His abode is not

for me? and what manner of place for my rest? ² For all these things did my hand make; [^a I spoke ^a,] and all these came into being (the oracle of Jehovah); but this is the man upon whom I look, even he who is afflicted, and crushed in spirit, and trembleth on account of my word. ³ He that slaughtereth an ox is a man-slayer; he that sacrificeth a sheep, breaketh a dog's neck; he that bringeth a meal-offering

▪ So Grätz, *Monatschrift*, 1878, p. 293.

known: no shrine is found with painted figures: there is no building that can contain him.¹ It is also a Persian sentiment; comp. Herod. i. 131, 'They have no images of the gods, no temples,' &c.

² **All these things**] viz., heaven and earth, and all things therein; comp. xl. 26, Job xii. 9.—**I spoke**] These words seem necessary to complete the clause; comp. Ps. xxxiii. 6, 'By a word of Jehovah were the heavens made,' and v. 9, 'He spake, and it came into being' (also Gen. i. 3).—**This is the man upon whom . . .**] Comp. lvii. 15.—**Trembleth on account of my word**] Not in alarm, but in a filial awe, which does not exclude the transports of delight (comp. Ps. cxix. 161 with v. 111). The 'word' is that delivered in the name of Jehovah by the prophets. The phrase is only found again in Ezra (ix. 4, x. 3).

³ **He that slaughtereth . . .**] i.e., he that would slaughter . . . The sacrifice (contemptuously called the slaughter) of an ox, when offered by unspiritual worshippers, is as displeasing to God as the sin of murder (comp. i. 11-15). It is tempting to compare lxx. 3-5, but though the several parts of the prophetic book beginning at chap. xl. have many points of connection, we must be on our guard against illusory affinities. The persons spoken of here are evidently worshippers of Jehovah, and are therefore distinct from those in lxx. 3-5.

—**Breaketh a dog's neck**] Why this feature? It seems far-fetched to suppose a covert polemical reference to the religious reverence for the dog in Persia and Egypt (comp. Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, i. 691-2), and better to explain the expression from the uncleanness and despicableness of this animal among the Jews. Taking this passage, however, in connection with v. 17, and with lxx. 4, one feels that some very peculiar sin of the contemporaries of the prophet is referred to, and the remains of a Scottish scholar have thrown an unexpected light upon it. In short, it is totem-worship (see above, on xv. 6) against which the prophet lifts up his voice; the unclean animals referred to were, most probably, the totems, or animal-fetiches, of certain Jewish families. The survival of this low form of religion (if the word may be used in this connection), is presupposed even more certainly by a passage in Ezekiel (viii. 10, 11), hitherto wrapt in obscurity, where 'we find seventy of the elders of Israel—that is, the heads of houses—worshipping in a chamber which had on its walls the figures of all manner of unclean creeping things and quadrupeds, "even all the idols of the house of Israel," and in the midst of the worshippers Jaazaniah, the son of Shaphan, i.e., the son of the rock-badger (the 'coney' of Auth. Vers.), which is one of the unclean quadrupeds, according to Deut. xiv. 7, Lev. xi. 5. In fact, the proper

¹ Canon Cook's translation, *Records of the Past*, iv. 109. The hymn has also been translated by M. Maspero (1868).

—(it is) swine's blood ; he that maketh a memorial of incense, blesseth an idol. As *they* have chosen their own ways, and their soul hath pleasure in their abominations, ⁴ so will I choose freaks of fortune for them, and their terrors will I bring unto them, because I called, and there was none that answered, I spoke, and they did not hearken, but did that which was evil in mine eyes, and that in which I had no pleasure they chose. ⁵ Hear the word of Jehovah, ye that tremble at his word : Your brethren that hate you, that put you away for my name's sake, say, 'Let Jehovah show himself glorious, that we may look upon your joy,' but as for them, they shall be ashamed.

⁶ A sound of uproar from the city, a sound from the temple ; the sound of Jehovah who rendereth their deserts to his

names of the Israelites give evidence which is, I think, conclusive to a philological eye, in favour of the survival of this archaic worship. In Isa. lrv., lrv., the swine, the dog, and the mouse are specially mentioned in connection with an illegal cultus, and all of them are found in the Old Testament as names of persons—the swine (Auth. Vers., Hezer, rather *khēzir*) in 1 Chron. xxiv. 15, Neh. x. 21 ; the dog (Caleb = *kalib* = Arab *kalb* or Hebr. *keleb*) in Num. xiii. 6, &c.—hence the dog-tribe (Hebr. *kālībī*) to which Nabal belonged, 1 Sam. xxv. 3 ; the mouse (Achbor) in Gen. xxxvi. 38, 2 Kings xxii. 12, 14, Jer. xxvi. 22, xxxvi. 12. (A panther-totem is presupposed in Isa. xv. 6 ; see above.) Of course the prophet regarded this worship as a superstition dishonouring to the one true God. The tenacity with which a section (probably a large section) of the Israelites clung to it throws a bright light on the repeated assertions of the prophets that their people was not chosen by Jehovah for any merits of its own. On this whole subject, see 'Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Arabs and in the Old Testament,' by Mr. Robertson Smith, in *Journal of Philology*, where abundant parallels to the

totemism of the Israelites are adduced from Arabia.—**Swine's blood**] See on lrv. 4.—**That maketh a memorial . . .**] 'Memorial' is a technical term in the sacrificial ritual for the burning of a part of the *minkhāh* or meal-offering with incense upon the altar (see Lev. ii. 2, *Q. B. P.*).—**Blesseth**] i.e., worshippeth.

⁴ **So will I choose . . .**] 'The Orientals are fond of such antithesis,' remarks Gesenius. It is, however, more than a verbal antithesis which we have here ; it is Jehovah's fundamental law of retribution (see on v. 8). So in the Korán (as Gesenius points out), ' . . . they say, We are with you, we have only mocked at them : God shall mock at them' (Sur. ii. 13, 14) ; 'The hypocrites would deceive God, but he will deceive them' (Sur. iv. 141).—**Freaks of fortune**] The word is very peculiar : it represents calamity under the figure of a petulant child (comp. iii. 4 Hebr.).

⁵ The prophet turns abruptly to those who in holy reverence wait upon Jehovah. They have suffered for Jehovah, and He will work mightily for them.—**That put you away**] i.e., that refuse to associate with you (comp. lrv. 5). In later Hebr. the word (*niddāh*) is

enemies! ⁷ 'Before she travailed, she brought forth; before pangs came unto her, she was delivered of a man-child. ⁸ Who hath heard such a thing? Who hath seen things like these? Can a country be travailed with in a day, or a nation be brought forth at once? for Zion hath travailed, and also brought forth her sons.' ⁹ Should I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth, saith Jehovah? or should I, who cause to bring forth, restrain it? saith thy God.

¹⁰ Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and dance for joy because of her, all ye who love her; exult together with her, all ye who

used of 'putting out of the synagogue' (comp. the use of ἀφορίζω in Luke vi. 22); *niddūy* is the lightest of the three grades of excommunication. — **Let Jehovah show himself glorious . . .**] An ironical speech, reminding us of v. 19. Dr. Kay renders the verb ' . . . be glorious'; but 'become glorious' seems better, or the equivalent given above. (Kal. is used, as in Mal. i. 5, though we should expect Nifal.)

^{6,24} Alternate threats and promises; the glorious return of the believing Jews contrasting with the terrible and endless punishment of their enemies.

⁶ **A sound of uproar . . .**] The form of the verse reminds us of xiii. 4, There, however, the 'uproar is caused by the assembling of Jehovah's human agents; here it is that symbolic thunder which marks a theophany. There the primary object is the destruction of Babylon; here the sole end is the last act of the drama of the judgment, in which all Jehovah's enemies bear a passive part. The catastrophe is to take place before Jerusalem (as in Joel and Zechariah); hence it is added, **From the city . . . from the temple**] No doubt the latter words come in rather strangely after the seeming disparagement of temples in v. 1. But the inconsistency is probably merely superficial (see above). The precise meaning, however, of the words 'from the temple' will depend on our view of the origin

of this prophecy. If written from the point of view of the Babylonian Exile, we must suppose Jehovah to have (in a sense) taken up his abode again on the site of the destroyed and for a long time God-forsaken temple. If from the point of view of the restored exiles, then we may suppose that the temple has been rebuilt, and that Jehovah (in a sense) issues from it to take vengeance on his own and Israel's enemies. However this may be, vv. 7, 8 are written from a new point of view. They represent the other side of the doctrine of the judgment (comp. a similar transition in lxxv. 8). Israel has been restored and an imaginary spectator bursts out into a wondering exclamation. The subject of v. 6 is resumed in v. 15.

⁷ **Before she travailed . . .**] The same figure has been used before (see xlix. 17-21, liv. 1), but with less drastic energy. A child is born, a man-child, but swiftly and without pain. The 'child' is the Israel of the latter days, the concluding stages of Israel's history being fused in the dim prophetic light. Grotius (who had philological instincts) explained of the achievements of Judas Maccabeus. He rightly felt that the age of Zerubbabel presented no fulfilment of the prophet's burning words.—The mention of a 'man-child' is significant. 'Sweeter than the birth of a boy,' says an Arabic proverb quoted by Gesenius. Till Mohammed in-

mourned inwardly over her ; ¹¹ that ye may suck, and be satisfied, from the breast of her consolations ; that ye may press out, and delight yourselves, from the bosom of her glory. ¹² For thus saith Jehovah, Behold, I will direct peace unto her like a river, and the glory of the nations like an overflowing torrent, and ye shall suck therefrom ; upon the side shall ye be borne, and upon the knees shall ye be caressed. ¹³ As a man whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you ; yea, in Jerusalem shall ye be comforted. ¹⁴ And ye shall behold, and your heart shall exult, and your bones shall spring up like young grass, and the hand of Jehovah shall make himself known towards his servants, but he shall deal indignation to his enemies.

¹⁵ For behold, Jehovah shall come in fire, and his chariots are like the whirlwind, to return his anger in fury, and his rebuke in flames of fire. ¹⁶ For by fire will Jehovah hold judgment, and by his sword with all flesh, and many shall be the slain of Jehovah. ¹⁷ Those that consecrate and purify

terfered, the Arabs had a cruel custom of burying female infants alive.

⁹ **Should I bring to the birth . . .**] 'Should I arrange all the preliminary circumstances for the restoration of my people, and stop there?' 'Restrain it' implies that the expansiveness of Zion is such that naught but Omnipotence will be able to check it, and as Omnipotence has no motive for checking it, Zion has nothing to fear either in heaven or on earth.

^{10, 11} The prospect is so near that the friends of Jerusalem should at once give expression to their joy, if they wish to be rewarded by a share in her bliss.—**Mourned inwardly**] For the rend., see 1 Sam. xv. 35 Hebr.

¹¹ **That ye may suck . . .**] The blessings which Jerusalem has received are compared to a mother's milk. Comp. a different use of the figure in *v.* 12 and *lx.* 16.

¹² **I will direct peace**] So Gen. xxxix. 21 '(Jehovah) directed kindness unto him.'—**Upon the side**] See on *lx.* 4. Obs., those who 'bear' and 'caress' are the Gentiles.

¹³ **As a man . . .**] As a mother comforts, not merely her child, but her grown-up son.

¹⁴ **Your bones shall spring up . . .**] The body is likened to a tree of which the bones are the branches (Job xviii. 13 Hebr.). During the anger of Jehovah, the latter had been dried up and sapless (comp. Ps. xxxii. 4).—**The hand of Jehovah**] No mere figure of speech (Ges. renders, 'Jehovah's might'), but God under His self-revealing aspect (see on viii. 11).

¹⁵ The theophany. There is no occasion, with Dr. Kohut, to connect this with the Zoroastrian doctrine of the end of the world by fire, even if this doctrine be really ancient, and not rather due to Semitic influences. 'He cometh with fire' is the natural description of a theophany in Biblical language ; comp. xxix. 6 (note), xxx. 27, 28.—**His chariots**] In Ps. xviii. 10 Jehovah rides upon 'a cherub' ; here, as in Hab. iii. 8, the single chariot is multiplied, to symbolise the 'hosts' of natural and supernatural forces at his command.

themselves for the gardens [^b after One in the midst^b], that eat swine's flesh, and the abominations, and the mouse, to-

^b So Hebr. text ('One' is masc.).—Behind one (viz., one image of a goddess, 'one' being fem.), Hebr. marg., Vulg. (see Del.'s note).—One after the other, Pesh., Targ., Symmachus, Theodotion. Sept. omits the words.

¹⁶ **His sword**] See on xxxiv. 5, 6. —**All flesh**] See on v. 18.

¹⁷ A fresh denunciation of the sins mentioned in lxx. 3, 4 (see notes). Those Jews who are guilty of them will share the punishment of the hostile Gentiles.—**That consecrate and purify themselves**] As a preparation for the heathen mysteries in the gardens (i. 29, lxx. 3).—**After One in the midst**] An obscure, enigmatical phrase, and possibly corrupt. The prevalent explanation (*a*) is (Ges., Hitz., Knob., Del., Naeg., Baudissin) that it describes the way in which the rites of the mysteries were performed, viz., standing behind, or perhaps rather with close adherence to ('after' = 'according to') the directions of the hierophant or leader (who would naturally stand in the centre of the ring of celebrants). This is no doubt plausible, but requires a great deal to be supplied, unless (*per impossibile*) we suppose that the initial rite of purification was so complicated that it needed a special superintendent even more than the mysteries themselves. It is surprising that those critics who, one after another, have adopted it, have not felt obliged to go further, and put a blank space in their translation between the words 'garden' and 'after,' to indicate that some words have fallen out. This is at any rate a possible solution. (*b*) An-

other view of the meaning is embodied in alt. read., but is adaptable to the ordinary reading. Early Jewish critics felt that some reference was required to the deity in whose honour the mysteries were celebrated, and appear to have thought of the Syrian goddess Asherah, whose licentious rites were doubtless performed in groves. Hence their conjectural emendation (for such alt. read. most certainly is), 'akhath for 'ekhādh (the feminine for the masculine). Their general view seems confirmed by the common use of 'after' in technical religious phrases, e.g., 'to walk after other gods' (Jer. vii. 9), 'to walk after Jehovah' (Hos. xi. 10), 'to lament after Jehovah' (1 Sam. vii. 2), 'to fulfil after (= wholly to follow) Jehovah' (Deut. i. 36). But the mention of swine's flesh just afterwards suggests the worship of Adonis (the Tammuz of Ezek. viii. 14) rather than of Asherah, and the reference to 'the gardens' suits this equally well (see on xvii. 10). This view was the prevalent one among the post-Reformation scholars,¹ and has been advocated with much force by Prof. de Lagarde (in spite of a faulty inference from a passage in Macrobius).² It may now be confirmed from the cuneiform account of the Assyrian or Babylonian festival of Istar and Tammuz (strictly, Dum-zi or Tam-zi), on which occasion we are told that

¹ Scaliger, Seldenus, Drusius, Vossius, Grotius, Bochartus, Marshamus, magna in literis nomina et appellari digna, huic conjecturæ faverunt; estque summè probabiliis. Vitringa.

² *Hieronimi questiones hebraicae*, &c., ed. Lagarde, p. 12r. The words of Macrobius referred to are—'(Assyrii) deo quem summum maximumque venerantur Adad nomen dederunt' (*Saturni*. i. 23). Lagarde conjectures that Macrobius found in his Greek authority Α Δ Δ miswritten for Α Α Δ (= Hebr. 'ekhādh). But no such name of a deity as 'ekhādh has yet been found. Macrobius evidently uses 'Assyrians' synonymously with 'Syrians,' and wrongly derives the Syrian divine name Hadad (he calls it Adad) from the Syriac *khadhkhad* (lit., 'unus unus,' but in usage 'unusquisque'). Lagarde's appeal to the Old Test. phrase, 'mourning for an (or, the) only-begotten son' (Am. viii. 10, Jer. vi. 26, Zech. xii. 10) is more plausible (see the writer's obser-

gether shall they be consumed—the oracle of Jehovah. ¹⁸ But I [°will punish°] their words and their thoughts; [behold the time] is come that I gather all nations and tongues, and they shall come and see my glory. ¹⁹ And I will work a sign upon

° So Maurer, Del.—I know, Pesh., Targ., some MSS. and early editions of Sept., Saadya, Auth. Vers., Vitruv., Ges.—I have seen, Grätz.

‘the figure of the goddess is carried in procession, adorned with jewels and robes of rich material, attended by her maids of honour, *Samkhat* or Pleasure, and *Harimatu* or Lust; and they go in procession to meet the mourners bearing the body of the dead Tammuz.’¹ But why should Adonis be called ‘One’? Prof. de Lagarde would apparently take *’ekhād̄h* (here rendered ‘One’) in the sense of *yākhīdh* ‘unique’ (as Job xxiii. 13), for he compares the remarkable phrase, ‘mourning for an only-begotten son’ (*’ēkhel yākhīdh*). But this seems hazardous (see note²). The only alternative is to take the word in question as a contemptuous or evasive appellation. Maurer comments thus: ‘Hebr. *’ekhād̄h*, nescio quis, per contemptum.’ It is rather more natural to regard it as a piously evasive phrase, somewhat like that employed by the Rajah of Burdwan, in speaking to Weitbrecht the missionary, ‘O yes, I have no objection, if you do not mention *one name*’ (meaning the name of Jesus).¹ (c) And yet, plausible as both the above views are, especially the latter, the combination of letters which the received text presents, impresses me by a family-likeness to other passages of indubitable corruptness. May it not be a mutilated fragment of a clause parallel to, though somewhat shorter than, ‘those that consecrate themselves,

&c.?’ The conjecture seems to be confirmed by the evident defectiveness of a part of the next verse. —**The abominations**] A technical expression in Leviticus, used synonymously with ‘swarming things.’ Among ‘the uncleanest’ of these animals are mentioned (Lev. xi. 29) the lizard, the snail, and **the mouse**, or rather, perhaps, the jerboa, which is still eaten by the Arabs.

¹⁸ In this verse the prophet resumes the subject opened in v. 6, viz., the overthrow of Jehovah’s enemies. Comp. the striking parallels in Joel iii. 2, Zeph. iii. 8, Zech. xiv. 2. —**But I (will punish)**] Some word or words have evidently dropped out of the text; an aposiopesis is not at all probable, as there is no trace of passion or excitement in the context, and a parallel to the Virgilian *Quos ego*—³ is not adducible in Hebrew. Maurer’s suggestion, adopted above, is at any rate forcible. —**(Behold, the time) is come**] It is not absolutely necessary to suppose that the bracketed words have dropped out of the text (see Ezek. xxxix. 8), but the lacuna in the opening words makes it a not unreasonable conjecture. Otherwise, we must assume an ellipsis. —**All nations**] This must be understood with a limitation (see next verse). —**And tongues**] This supplement is remarkable. Though not inconsi-

vations in *Academy*, x. 524 note), but our text reads *’ekhād̄h* ‘one,’ not *yākhīdh* ‘only-begotten.’ See further Vitringa’s *Comment.*, ii. 941, note A; E. Meyer, *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morg. Ges.*, 1877, p. 734; and Baudissin, *Studien zur semit. Religionsgeschichte*, i. 315.

¹ St. Chad Boscawen, in *Academy*, xiv. 91 (July 27, 1878). The basis of the festival is demonstrably a nature-myth, leading up to the union of the new moon (Istar) and the summer sun (Tam-zi or Tammuz).

² *Memoir of the Rev. John James Weitbrecht*, p. 543.

³ Quoted by Del. in his first and second editions but not in his third. He now agrees with Naeg. that the passage is probably corrupt.

them, and will send the escaped of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, ^d Put and Lud, ^e that draw the bow^e, to Tubal and

^d So Sept., Knob., Grätz, Stade. (Del. inclines to this reading; as to Hitz. and Ew., see note below.)—Pun, Wetzstein.—Pul, Hebr. text.

^e To Meshech, Sept., Stade. (Lowth approves in his note.)

tent with the authorship of Isaiah, it agrees still better with a Captivity-date, and reminds us forcibly of the frequent references in Daniel to 'peoples, nations, and tongues' (Dan. iii. 4, 7, 29, iv. 1, v. 19, vi. 25, vii. 14). The same use of the word 'tongue' occurs in Zech. viii. 23 (of post-Captivity origin), and in *vv.* 5, 20, 31 of Gen. x. (based probably on a Phœnician document).—**My glory**] as displayed in judicial rewards and punishments.

¹⁹ **Work a sign upon them**] viz., upon the assembled Gentile hosts. The precise meaning of 'work a sign' is obscure. It is an emphatic phrase (*sūm*—not *nāthan* or *āsāh 'ōth*); a strict rendering would be 'set a sign,' i.e., as a permanent memorial. Elsewhere we find it used of wonders which, by a modern distinction, we call supernatural (Ex. x. 2, Ps. lxxviii. 43, cv. 27), but 'sign' has a wide meaning in the Old Test., and can be used of any markedly providential occurrence (see 1 Sam. x. 7 with the context). Hence it may here mean the wonderful escape of some of the Gentile host (Ew., Del.), or the all but total destruction of Jehovah's enemies ('it is a vague but suggestive expression, and well calculated to prepare the mind of the reader for the awful description with which the prophetic volume closes').¹ The latter was my first view, but the eschatological parallel in Zech. xiv. seems to me now to suggest some mysterious event, which the prophet leaves his awestruck readers to imagine.—**Unto the nations**] The nations which have had no relation to Israel, nor, consciously at least, to Jehovah,

form a kind of outer world, with which Jehovah has no controversy. —**Put and Lud**] Put is either the Egyptian Put (nasalised into Punt), i.e., according to Brugsch, the Somali country on the east coast of Africa, opposite to Arabia, or it comes from the Egyptian Puti, another name for the people commonly called Thehennu, i.e., the Marmaridæ, who lived west of the Delta.² Pul, the reading of the received text occurs *nowhere else as an ethnic name*; Put, however, occurs in combination with Lud in Ezek. xxvii. 10, xxx. 5 (comp. Jer. xlvi. 9). Hence Hitz. and Ew. suppose Pul to be a collateral form of Put, but the interchange of *teth* and *lamedh* does not seem to be established. It is better therefore to adopt the read. of Sept. Wetzstein's correction, however, is on several accounts plausible. The letters *l* and *n* (*lamedh* and *nun*) might be easily confounded in the Hebrew writing. Pun and Lud, Punians (Carthaginians) and Lydians, might naturally be mentioned together in 'the period subsequent to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, in which this part of Isaiah places us.'³ The Lydians, too, are actually called Ludi in Assyrian inscriptions of the reign of Assurbanipal. The objection, raised in my first ed., 'that the Lydians had already learned by experience the might of Jehovah,' is only of weight if chaps. ltv., ltv. were written with an eye to the same circumstances as chap. xl. &c. Lud (as is shown by the reference to it in Ezek. xxx., comp. Gen. x. 13) must be a N.-African people, though one may hesitate to adopt Ebers' combination of Lud and

¹ *I. C. A.*, p. 234.

² So Brugsch-Bey, *History of Egypt*, second ed., ii. 404.

³ Wetzstein, as reported by Delitzsch, *Jesaja*, third ed., p. 720.

Javan, to the distant countries which have not heard the report of me, nor seen my glory, and they shall make known my glory among the nations. ²⁰ And they shall bring all your brethren out of all the nations as an offering unto Jehovah upon horses and in chariots and in litters, and upon mules and dromedaries, to my holy mountain, to Jerusalem, saith Jehovah, as the children of Israel bring [or, used to bring] the meal-offering in a clean vessel to the house of Jehovah; ²¹ and some of them also will I take unto the priests

Rut (the name for the native-born Egyptians in the hieroglyphic inscriptions).¹ See further *Last Words*.—**That draw the bow**] A similar characterisation of the Ludim in Jer. xlv. 9. The reading of Sept. has the air of a conjectural emendation, and is unnecessary, but certainly plausible. Meshech and Tubal are several times mentioned together; the Muskai of the Assyrian inscriptions lived to the north-east of the Tablai.—**Tubal**] The Tablai of the inscriptions dwelt to the west of the northern arm of the Euphrates, in a part of Armenia Minor.² They are mentioned in the table of nations (Gen. x. 2), also in Ezekiel (three times).—**Javan**] Javan, like Tubal and Meshech, was famous for its traffic in slaves (Ezek. xxvii. 13). It is obviously the same as Ἰάφοι-ες, and was successively applied to the countries where Ionian Greeks dwelt, as they became known to the Phœnicians, and even (Zech. ix. 13, Dan. viii. 21, x. 20) to Greece in general. Here, however, it certainly designates some particular nation, and most probably the Ionians on the west coast of Asia Minor, though Mr. Sayce prefers to identify it with Cyprus, which he thinks suits the geographical order better. Cyprus certainly bears a name in the Assyrian inscriptions which is simply Javan without the 'digamma.' Most cuneiform scholars have read this name Yatnan, but it is rather Yānan

(one of the Assyrian characters having the value *ā* as well as *at* or *ad*). **The distant countries**] i.e., the coast-lands and islands of the Mediterranean Sea.

²⁰ **And they shall bring . . .**] Not only shall the Gentiles 'stream' to the holy city themselves (ii. 2, lx. 4), but they shall escort the Israelitish exiles to Jerusalem with the tender care and reverence belonging to holy things and persons (comp. Zeph. iii. 10 with Keil's note). Note the emphasis on 'all your brethren,' &c.—**As an offering**] Or, 'as a present' (comp. xxxix. 1). Probably, however, the Hebr. word (*minkhāh*) is here used in its technical sense. Without absolutely denying the acceptableness of the ordinary meal-offering, the prophet asserts that the honour thus shown to the chosen people will be fully equal to that paid to the traditional *minkhāh*. Comp. Rom. xv. 16, ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν, where the genitive is that of apposition.—**Upon horses . . . mules and dromedaries**] The variety in the mode of transport corresponds to the wide extent of the Jewish dispersion. A similar catalogue is given in Zech. xiv. 15, to indicate the multitude of hostile nations assembled round Jerusalem.—**Litters**] The word only occurs elsewhere in Num. vii. 3 (in Lev. xi. 29 it is the name of an animal).—**Bring**] Whether we render in the present or the imperfect tense (to keep the familiar terms)

¹ *Ägypten und die Bücher Moses*, i. 96-98.

² Schrader, *K. G. F.*, p. 156.

‘and unto the Levites’, saith Jehovah. ²² For like as the new heavens and the new earth, which I make, stand perpetually before me (the oracle of Jehovah), so shall your seed and your name stand. ²³ And it shall come to pass: from new moon to new moon, and from sabbath to sabbath, all flesh shall come to worship before me, saith Jehovah. ²⁴ And they

‘¹ So many Hebr. MSS. (including almost all the oldest), and all the versions (see Curtiss, *The Levitical Priests*, pp. 205-213, and comp. Del.’s note, *Jesaja*, 3rd ed., p. 684).—Unto the Levites, Received Hebr. text.

depends on our view of the date of the prophecy. If we think that it was written during the Babylonian Exile, we shall adopt the latter tense; if otherwise, the former.

²¹ **And some of them also . . .]** The language used leaves it quite uncertain whether the Gentiles are referred to (so Vittr., Ges., Ew., Alexander, Del., Kay, Naeg.), or the Jews of the dispersion (so Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, Hitz., Herzfeld, Knob., Henderson, Seinecke, H. Schultz). The advocates of the latter view refer to lvi. 6, 7 as showing the utmost hopes held out to the Gentile proselytes; to lxi. 6, where the restored Jews are distinguished from the Gentiles by the title ‘priests of Jehovah;’ and to lxvi. 22, where the permanence of the Jewish race appears to be guaranteed. On the other hand, it may fairly be urged that a special privilege granted to a select few does not affect the general inferiority of the Gentile to the Jew. The spirit of the context points decidedly to a throwing open of the gates as widely as possible. When the Gentiles are converted, a larger number of temple-officers will become necessary, and the same divine mercy which accepted the converts will select those of them who are suitable to minister in holy things, even at the cost of breaking through the exclusive Levitical system. This seems to be confirmed by the parallel passage at the end of Zechariah. See also on lxi. 6.—**And unto the Levites]**

Both this and alt. read. presuppose that a distinction in rank between the Aaronite priests and the ordinary Levites continues; this is marked by the repeated preposition in the Hebr. (comp. Deut. xviii. 1, Jer. xxxiii. 18, where the preposition is not repeated). The prophet in this respect occupies the point of view of the Levitical legislation.

²² **I make]** Strictly, ‘I am about to make.’—**Your name]** Perhaps alluding to the ‘new name’ which was to supersede Israel (lxii. 2, lxv. 15).

²³ **From new moon to new moon]** The old forms of worship have been reduced to the utmost; new moons and sabbaths alone remain. ‘All flesh’ attends in the temple on these hallowed occasions (comp. the similar anticipation in Zech. xiv. 16).—Is all this to be taken literally? Does the prophet mean that the old conditions of time and space will have ceased? Or is the language figurative? The latter view is certainly nearer the truth than the former. ‘It is already the revelation which our Lord makes to the Samaritan woman (John iv. 21). The literal meaning was physically impossible; and so it was plain that he (Isaiah) spoke of a worship other than that at any given place’ (Dr. Pusey!). Still the prophet has but a confused vision of this great spiritual change. He cannot give up the idea of the religious supremacy of Jerusalem; at the same time, he cannot exclude any from communion with

¹ *Prophecy of Jesus*, &c., a sermon (1879), p. 39.

shall go out and look upon the carcasses of the men who

God merely on the ground of their local distance from the temple. Hence the strange inconsistencies in his picture.

²⁴ **And they shall go out**] viz., to the hills and valleys around Jerusalem, where the Divine judgment has taken place. It is, of course, the old and not the new Jerusalem of which the prophet is thinking.—**And look upon**] i.e., look with awful interest upon. (Comp. Ps. xci. 8, and for the idiom, Isa. lxxvi. 5, Gen. xxi. 16, xlv. 34).—

For their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched]

Three questions arise in considering this passage: 1. Is it the world of men or of souls which is the scene of the torments; 2. if the latter, how far are we to interpret the description in a material sense; and 3. in what sense is everlastingness here predicated of the fire and the worm? 1. As to the scene of the torments. The context naturally leads us to suppose that the reference is to the bodies of the slain, lying unburied upon the ground; and this view is partly confirmed by the parallel passage in Zechariah (xiv. 12). On the other hand, the details of the description suggest, by their obvious inconsistency, that the terms are symbolic of the tortures of the souls in Hades. This is the view embodied in the Targum, which renders the second half of the verse thus: 'Because their souls shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched, and the ungodly shall be judged in Gehenna, until the righteous say concerning them, 'We have seen enough;'' it also underlies the solemn warning of Jesus, 'It is better for thee to enter into Life maimed, than having two hands to go into Gehenna, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire

is not quenched' (Mark ix. 43, 44, comp. 45-48).¹ Both views being so strongly supported, we must, I think, endeavour to combine them, and the study of primitive beliefs may suggest a way. The eschatology of the Bible is symbolic, and its symbols are borrowed (with that large-hearted tolerance which we have so often had to notice) from the popular forms of belief respecting the unseen world. Now it is one of the most primitive and most tenacious of these forms of belief that the soul itself has a kind of body, without which indeed those phantom-visions in which all races have believed would be impossibilities. As soon as men begin to reflect, however rudely, upon this belief, the theory arises that there are different kinds of spirit, or soul. Some primitive races say that man has three souls; some, that he has four; but a simpler and more natural idea is that he has two. This is said to be the belief of the Algonquins, a tribe of North American Indians;² it also appears to have been current upon the banks of the Nile and of the Jordan. The Egyptian priests, who were never ashamed of the archaic basis of their theology, taught this doctrine—that after the separation of soul and body in death, the soul went through a series of trials in Amenti or Hades, not however as a pure spirit, but accompanied by an *eidolon* of the cast-off body; meantime the body remained in the upper world, seemingly inanimate, but really still possessing a kind of soul, the pale reflection of the soul in Amenti. The Book of Job, so full of references to popular beliefs, and so abundant in illustrations of II. Isaiah, contains a passage which presupposes a closely analogous belief among the Jews. After expressing an earnest desire for a

¹ Gehenna, according to Jesus (see Matt. x. 28) as well as according to the Targum, is a place where both soul and body undergo punishment.

² Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 392.

rebelled against me, for their worm shall not die, and their fire

second life upon earth, the suffering patriarch falls back into despondency, as he recalls to mind the melancholy consequences of death. 'Thou overpowerest him for ever, and he goeth; changing his face, and thou sendest him away. His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; they become mean, and he observeth them not. Nevertheless, his flesh upon him feeleth pain, and his soul upon him mourneth' (xiv. 22). So, too, in another of his speeches Job expresses a degree of painful doubt whether his body (his not entirely unconscious body) will share the rest which his soul (his not absolutely bodiless soul) will enjoy in the underworld (Job xvii. 16, *Q. P. B.*). In the Book of Isaiah itself we have met with one doubtful trace of the belief in a duplicate body (see on lvii. 2), and the Book of Ezekiel has, in a highly imaginative passage, a sufficiently distinct reference to it (Ezek. xxxii. 25). A kindred belief is presupposed in the passage before us. The delivered Israelites are represented as going out to behold a signal instance of righteous retribution. What they see can be only the corpses of their enemies. But the prophet continues in terms which properly can only belong to the souls in Hades. How is this? It is because of the supposed double consciousness of soul and body. Just as, according to primitive belief, 'the mutilation of the body will have a corresponding effect upon the soul,'¹ so the tortures of the soul in Hades will be felt in some degree by the corpse on earth. The emphasis in the prophetic statement is of course not on the sympathy of soul and body, but on the sense of punishment which the personalities of the guilty ones shall never lose (comp. l. 11 end). 2. As to the materiality of the torments of the guilty souls.

By the inconsistency of the description, the prophet clearly warns us not to understand it literally. The Egyptian authors of the Book of the Dead would have equally deprecated a literal interpretation of the torments of the condemned. The eschatology of the Bible, as has been already stated, is symbolic; the prophet, like the other men of God, speaks in figures. His symbols are borrowed partly from the valley of Hinnom, which had formerly been the scene of the burnt sacrifices to Moloch (comp. on lvii. 5), and afterwards became the receptacle of the filth of Jerusalem, and partly (as we have seen) from the popular imaginations respecting the soul. We must be on our guard, however, against supposing that the kernel of his symbols is a mere abstraction. This would be high treason against his Semitic origin and his prophetic calling. There is no reasonable doubt that material torments form a very definite part of his eschatology. In one essential point, however, our prophet is distinguished from later non-prophetic writers, viz., his self-restraint in referring to the unseen world. 3. As to the everlastingness of the torments. Did the prophet merely mean 'that nothing should put the fire out, while any portion of the carcases remained to be devoured—that it should be unquenchable *until* it had done its work, and all was entirely consumed?' And in the application of the figure to the soul, that pangs of conscience should continue to afflict the guilty ones until they were purified thereby? This at any rate does not seem to have been the interpretation of the early readers of the prophecy. Not to quote again the words of our Lord, the proverbial use of the fire and the worm in Sirach vii. 17, Judith xvi. 17,² would hardly have

¹ *Ibid.* i. 407.

² Mr. E. White is carried too far by his controversial bias, when he accuses the

shall not be quenched, and they shall be an abomination unto all flesh.

arisen, if the Jewish people had given the phrases so mild a meaning. But the theory mentioned may I think be refuted out of the Book of Isaiah itself, where we read (~~xxxiv. 10~~) respecting the fire with which guilty Edom is threatened, that it shall be quenchless, and that its smoke shall go up for ever, so that 'none shall pass through' Edom 'for ever and ever.' There is no *arrière pensée* here; the everlastingness spoken of is absolute and without qualification. The phrase 'perpetual burnings' (xxxiii. 14, see note) has quite another reference.—**An abomination**] The Hebr. word (*dērāōn*) only occurs again in Dan. xii. 2

(which, from the context, appears to be an allusion to our passage).—Such is the awful picture with which the Book of Israel's Consolation closes. Is there not an incongruity in this? The early Jewish critics appear to have thought so. They directed that when this chapter (or the last chapter of the Minor Prophets, the Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes) was read, the last verse but one should be repeated to correct the sad impression of the last. One cannot but sympathise with them. But how should there not be a difference between the Old Testament and the New?

post-Christian writer of Judith of 'going beyond prophecy, and yielding to the influence of a philosophical doctrine of an immortality learned from Greece and Egypt, and not found in his national Scriptures' (*Life in Christ*, 3rd ed., p. 170).

CRITICAL NOTES.

1. 7. זרים, the reading of the text, may be either the gen. of the subject or of the object. If of the subject, the whole phrase will mean 'like a subversion in which strangers (or, enemies) are the agents.' If of the object, 'like a subversion of strangers' land.' The former meaning is natural in itself, but there are three objections to it: (a) that a gen. standing alone after an infinitive or a noun used infinitivally, according to usage, a gen. of the object (see Deut. xxix. 22, Jer. xlix. 18), (b) that מרהפכה is the standing term for the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah (which is also an objection to Dr. Neubauer's suggestion זרים), and (c) that the context shows that Sodom is in the mind of Isaiah here. The latter meaning has only one argument against it, viz. that it is forced, and requires us to take זרים in different senses in two successive lines. It is better therefore to suppose that זרים was written either carelessly (the word having occurred just before) or by design, from a patriotic motive, instead of סרום. Against Lowth's conjecture זורם, see my *Notes and Criticisms, ad loc.* (Ibn Ezra supposed זרים to be a collateral form of זרם.) Mr. Robertson Smith also accepts סרום.

1. 9. במעט. To attach this word to the first half of the verse makes this disproportionately long. Geiger¹ has shown that the old Jewish students of Scripture (represented by the Versions) were startled by some of the hard things said of Israel, and substituted milder expressions. He even thinks that the text was sometimes gently touched from the same patriotic motive. Certainly in this verse, if anywhere, we may assume a softening interpolation; that the judges should be called 'judges of Sodom' might be tolerated, but that the entire people should, even in a hypothesis, be likened to Sodom, was too great a shock. Three of the versions (Sept., Pesh., Vulg.) omit the word, and the fourth (Targ.) gives a rendering which clearly reveals a dissatisfaction with the text, even in its mitigated form: the offence remained, to the author of this rendering, even after the insertion of the gloss. It seems to me possible that a similar feeling of national complacency dictated the change of סרום into זרים in v. 7.

1. 12. לראות פני. Read לראות פ', and see note in *I.C.A.*, p. 39.

¹ *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 346, &c.

Geiger¹ has shown by a number of passages that the authors of the points and the early translators took great offence at the expression 'to see God.' Hence, they frequently modify this phrase; but as where one modifies it another sometimes does not, we are now and then able to produce documentary evidence that the original reading has been changed. It was enough (or seemed enough) to change the vowels; the letters of the text were allowed to remain. Yet it is doubtful whether the reading of the points in the present case is even grammatically admissible, not so much on account of the assumed syncope of ה, which Böttcher and Stade in their grammars call in question (for even if the Massoretic pointing in the four other supposed cases of syncopated infin. Nifal be erroneous, yet the principle of such a syncope is assured by the admitted examples of syncopated Hifil—see, e.g., iii. 8, xxiii. 11), as because of the prepositional use of פני, which only occurs elsewhere in two passages precisely analogous to the present (Ex. xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 20). Del. in his 3rd ed. admits the plausibility of this argument ('vielleicht aber eben nur vielleicht richtig').—The same offence at the anthropomorphism, 'to see God,' dictated the Sept. version of xxxviii. 11 (see vol. i., p. 224, note^b).

I. 13 ב. און ועצרה. The rendering adopted has been objected to as giving the Vâv a kind of sarcastic value. But the Vâv of association, though commoner in Arabic, is not unknown in Hebrew (see below on vii. 1). Auth. Vers. is grammatically less probable. For the principle of the Hebrew idiom, see Driver (*Hebrew Tenses*, § 197, obs. 2), who compares Jer. xiii. 27.

II. 16. שכינות חממה. ש is evidently the same as משכינות, which occurs in Num. xxxiii. 52 (comp. Lev. xxvi. 1), in the sense of 'carved idolatrous obelisks,' and in Prov. xxv. 11 of 'chased (silver) vessels.' The (Aramaic) root is שכה 'to pierce through,' 'to distinguish,' and hence 'to look at.' The Vulgate and Saadya have understood the phrase to mean all kinds of ornaments; but the usage of the word משכינת (comp. also Ezek. viii. 12) favours the view that some sort of imagery was represented on the foreign works of art referred to. The wider meaning 'objects which attract the gaze' is, however, amply defensible on the analogy of the Aramaic *khezvo* and Assyrian *tamartu*, both used of costly things, and both from roots meaning 'to see.' Ewald's 'watch-towers of pleasure' is derived from the Peshito, and confirmed by the Aramaic סכות 'watch-tower,' but has the Hebrew usage against it, and is scarcely suitable at the close of the catalogue.

III. 10. אמרו. The present reading is no doubt grammatically defensible (cf. Gen. i. 4, vi. 2), but it is weak. Should we not read אשרי, thus completing the parallelism between v. 10 and v. 11? (Lowth has a similar suggestion).

¹ *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 337-9.

III. 12. ננשיו here without connoting oppression; comp. lx. 17, Zech. x. 4. The plural is to be explained as a construction *κατὰ σύνεσιν*. The thought of the prophet was, 'My people's governors are a petulant child and the court women.' He began to write this down and then broke up the clause into two, to produce a rhythmic parallelism (comp. xli. 27, Zeph. iii. 10).

III. 25. מתיים is a poetic archaism (see *Notes and Criticisms, ad loc.*). In usage it always implies dependence or weakness (the former even in Job xix. 19, Job being described as a kind of emir). It does not appear to connote fewness; else there would be no occasion for the familiar compound phrase מתי מספר (Gen. xxxiv. 30, &c.). Hence in xli. 14, we should render 'petty folk' (Sept. wrongly *δολογιστός*). 'Dependents' would probably be the best general rendering; this will include warriors (implied here) and household servants (see Job xxxi. 31).

v. 1. שירת דודי. For the objection to the ordinary view, see my note *ad loc.* The phrase should probably be explained, on the analogy of משקב דודים 'bed of love' (Ezek. xxiii. 17), 'a song of love,' i.e. 'a lovely song.' Two ways of explaining the דודי of the text are open to us. (a) It may be an example of the popular apocopated plural (*i* for *im*), recognised by Ewald in 2 Sam. xxii. 44 (Ps. cxliv. 2), Lam. iii. 14, Cant. viii. 2, and perhaps Ps. xlv. 9 (*Lehrbuch*, § 177 a). If Ewald (*Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, ii. 425) may be followed, we have another instance of דודי for דודים in Cant. vii. 10, but this is very doubtful. But although the Himyaritic plural of tens is formed by *i* without the *n* which should follow, I question whether the second mode of explanation (b) is not better, not only for Isa. v. 1 (which is *not* included by Ewald in his instances of the apocopated plural), but for the other passages quoted above. Bishop Lowth writes, '[There is in all such cases] a mistake of the transcribers, by not observing a small stroke, which in many MSS. is made to supply the ם of the plural, thus דודי.' See below, on liii. 8.

v. 13. For מתי read מוי, with Hitz. &c.; comp. Deut. xxxii. 24. An error of the ear rather than of the eye.

vi. 6. רצפה. Ges., Hitz., Knob., Luzzatto, render 'hot stone' (*Glühstein, pietra infuocata*), and refer to the Eastern custom of cooking food on stones heated in a fire (comp. 1 Kings xix. 6, רצף). But רצפה is not necessarily a 'hot stone,' see Esth. i. 6, &c., and for post-Biblical Hebrew, *Joma*, i. 7.¹ (Vulg. rightly, *calculus*; Ewald, *Stückstein*.)

vii. 1. ולא יכל. The singular is used, because Pekah is only an appendage to his more powerful neighbour. The Vâv before his name is that of association (= 'together with'); see i. 13 b, xiii. 9,

¹ Siegfried, review of *I.C.A.*, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1872, p. 179.

xlii. 5, xlvi. 16 *b*, li. 19, and, for other examples, Ewald, *Lehrbuch d. h. Spr.*, § 339 *a* (or see Kennedy's transl. of Ewald's Syntax).

On vii. 8, 9. (See end of note.) The corruption of אַסְנַפֶּר (Asnapper) from אַסְרַבְנַפֶּל (Assurbanipal) is easy. Two letters only had become effaced in the manuscript from which Ezra iv. 9, 10 was copied. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 329, in adopting this identification, remarks that Assurbanipal was the conqueror of Susa, and that the Susanchites are among the nations which Asnapper transported to N. Israel (Ezra iv. 9, 10).

vii. 14. הַעֲלָמָה.—Dr. Pusey has published his view of the rendering and etymology of עֲלָמָה in a learned note to a university sermon. See *Prophecy of Jesus*, &c., Oxford, 1879, pp. 48–51. With characteristic independence, he boldly defends the rendering 'virgin,' and the connection of עֲלָמָה with עָלַם 'to hide.' His arguments are drawn partly from the Biblical usage of עֲלָמָה, partly from the superior suitability which he attributes to the native Hebrew root. He remarks incidentally that the rendering 'young woman' deprives the prophecy of its emphasis—a criticism which I do not understand, for would not the article prefixed render any noun emphatic? On the latter, he is really suggestive; at any rate, one or two of the facts which he has adduced from the Arabic lexicon throw some valuable light on the *synonymik* of the Semitic languages. For instance, *bint* in Arabic (like בַּת in Hebrew) is used in the sense of 'girl;' and a synonym for *bint* is *ḥabāt*, evidently derived from the root *ḥabaa*, 'to hide,' and meaning 'a girl kept in the tent,' *i.e.* 'not yet married' (Lane, pp. 692–3). Dr. Pusey, however, does not go so far as to include *ḥabaa* among the four roots from which, he remarks, as many distinct groups of words signifying 'virginity' are derived; and he will hardly deny that the Arabic *ḡulām*, 'a young man, youth, boy, or male child' (Lane), is derived from the root *ḡalima*, commonly rendered 'coëundi cupidus esse,' but more accurately (for the Arabic lexicon only gives the coarsened Arabic usage, not the fundamental meaning) 'maturus esse.' Dr. Pusey infers that עֲלָמָה might have the same meaning as *ḥabāt*; I follow the majority in inferring that it might be synonymous with *ḡulāmat* (fem. of *ḡulām*). There would be no objection to his theory of the etymology, if עֲלָמָה stood alone in the Semitic vocabulary, if עָלַם and עֲלָמָה, and the analogues of עָלַם and עֲלָמָה in Arabic and Aramaic, were non-existent—if, that is, עֲלָמָה were not a member of a widely-spread family of words which require to be accounted for in the same way. When it can be shown that Aramaic and Arabic had a root עָלַם 'to hide,' Dr. Pusey's argument will gain greatly in cogency. I admit, of course, that the etymology does not necessarily agree with the usage of a word (Dr. Pusey well refers to the Arabic *bikr*, 'a virgin,' but etymologically only 'a young woman'), but I urge that in the case of

עֲלֹמִים and עֲלָם it does so agree, and that the context of Isa. vii. 14 does not compel us to decide that הַעֲלָמָה has any but the etymologically correct rendering 'the young woman.' May I, in conclusion, suggest that the *nuance* which *galima* has acquired in Arabic should not be confounded with the fundamental meaning? It seems to me as if Dr. Pusey's natural aversion to Arabian coarseness has impeded him in the critical use of the Arabic vocabulary.

On the Septuagint rendering ἡ παρθένος I have no new suggestion to propound. It may of course be used loosely like *virgo*. The ἀπόκρυφος of Aquila, Gen. xxiv. 4, may be safely disregarded. Critical etymologies were not the *forte* of the Hellenistic Jews. Delitzsch remarks, with laconic positiveness, 'The assertion of Jerome, *Hebraicum nunquam nisi de virgine scribitur, significat enim puellam virginem absconditam*, defended by Vercellone in a lengthy lecture, is untenable' (*Jesaja*, ed. 3, p. 115, note 3).

VII. 25. לֹא־תִבּוֹא שִׁמָּה יִרְאֵת וְנֹי. The rendering of Vit. and Ew. is variously explained (according to Ew., 'there is not even the fear of thorns, for they are allowed to grow up anywhere undisturbed'; which is very unnatural); but in any case the contrast between the present renunciation of agriculture and the past careful pursuance of it is entirely lost. The construction preferred is not indeed free from awkwardness (קִירָאת would have been simpler); but it is the fault, not of Isaiah, but of the early editor of chap. vii. (see vol. i. p. 43).

VIII. 9. וַחֲתוֹ has been repeated accidentally from the second verse-half (Grätz.)

VIII. 15. בָּם. Most critics render בָּם 'among them,' which is weak in itself, and leaves the verse rather isolated. I prefer, with Ges. and Hitz., to attach the word to the verb (comp. Jer. vi. 21, xlvi. 12). The plural is however less natural than the singular (for the 'stone' and the 'rock' are but one), and I therefore adopt Prof. de Goeje's suggestion (*Revue critique*, May 8, 1875) to point בָּם, and explain on the analogy of liii. 8 (see below), *ēm* being in all probability a Phœnicio-Hebrew pronominal suffix form for the 3rd pers. masc. sing.

VIII. 19. Sept. renders the last clause of this verse, τί ἐκζητοῦσι περὶ τῶν ζώντων τοὺς νεκρούς; Did Sept. read מֵהֵי יִרְדָּשׁ? or are the first two words simply an interpolation?

VIII. 21, 22. The transposition of these verses is made (on the analogy of many similar cases in ancient texts) in order to soften the transition to ix. 1. The mere difficulty of the proleptic ellipsis of the noun to which the pronoun in בָּהּ refers, is not great; comp. (with Del. on Hab. i. 5) xiii. 2, לְמַקְרָשִׁי = לָהֶם; Job vi. 29, בָּהּ = בְּלִשׁוֹנִי; Ps. ix. 13, אֹתָם, viz. עֲנוּיִם.

On VIII. 22, ix. 1-7 comp. Selwyn's *Horæ Hebraicæ* (Cambr. 1860), pp. 5-130.

ix. 2. Selwyn's conjecture, alluded to in vol. i. p. 60, is הַגִּיל (for הַגִּיל לַא), Roorda's גִּילוֹ, Reifmann's הַגִּילָה.

ix. 4. ברעש. Most render 'in the tumult (of battle),' but the parallelism leads us to expect a qualification, and this produces a grander description.

ix. 6. לַמְרָבָה. Lagarde (*Semitica*, i. 17) regards the לַמ as a fragment of a half-illegible word in the MS. from which the scribe was copying. Why should it not be a case of *διπλογραφία*, שְׁלֹמֹם having been first of all written 'defectively' שְׁלֹמֹם? The verse would then run more smoothly. 'Increased (pointing, רִבְּהָ) is the government, and peace hath no end,' &c. (So Grätz, *Geschichte*, ii. 1, p. 223.) (So מְרָבָה is no doubt an Isaianic word, see xxxiii. 23, but we have to account for the מַ *clausum*.)

ix. 8. מִדְּבָר might also be taken in the sense of 'a thing' (as 1 Sam. xiv. 12), *i.e.*, in this case, an evil thing. So Nestle (*Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1878).

ix. 10. צָרֵי. Hitzig (on Job xxx. 13) conjectures עֲזָרֵי 'helpers.'

ix. 16. Read לֹא יִפְסַח with Lagarde. פִּסַּח is an Isaianic word (xxxii. 5). True, the litotes in the text may be supported by Eccles.

iv. 16. But it gives a poor parallel to לֹא יִרְחַם.

x. 4. Prof. de Lagarde (letter in *Academy*, Dec. 15, 1870) proposes to read בְּלִתֵּי כִרְעַת חַת אֲסִיר 'Beltis stoops, Osiris is confounded;' comp. xlv. 1, Jer. l. 2. Lagarde thinks that Beltis (בעלתי) and Osiris were worshipped by some of the Judahites. There is, it is true, abundant evidence¹ of the worship of Beltis in Syria at a later time; but early testimony seems to be wholly wanting, unless with Geiger we point לְבִלְתֵּי in 2 Kings xxiii. 10 (comp. v. 7 בתים לאשרה).² The form again is doubtful. If the deity intended be the Babylonian Bilit, the form (as Mr. Sayce points out to me) should be בִּלְתֵּי. In later Phœnician, the form was certainly בעלת (see de Vogüé's *Stèle de Yehawmelek*, p. 8), and the Græcised Βααλτίς is from בעלת, not בעלתי (Schlottmann; Schröder). Still less if possible, is there any evidence that Osiris was a popular deity in Palestine. It may perhaps be that Assir, in Ex. vi. 24, should be Osir (comp. Hur, Ex. xvii. 10, probably=Horus), and that Amon, the son of King Manasseh, is the same as the Egyptian Amen (=Ra, the sun-god). Pinehas may be 'the negro' (so Lowth and Brugsch), and Putiel, in Ex. vi. 25, may be half-Egyptian, like the Pet-Baal mentioned by Brugsch;³ but the general result of Old Testament study is to reduce Egyptian influence on the Israelites within very

¹ See Lagarde's note in *Semitica*, Heft 1; Payne Smith, *Thesaurus*, p. 519 (Bilati or Belati = the planet Venus in Syriac).

² *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, ii. 259. This view is very questionable; Jer. xxxii. 35 entitles us to expect Baal and not Beltis.

³ This and other interesting new comparisons are due to Mr. Tomkins, author of *Studies on the Times of Abraham*. See 'Biblical Proper Names Illustrated,' &c., *Victoria Institute Transactions*, vol. xvi. 1882. [Mr. R. S. Poole well suggests Ahi-ra.]

narrow dimensions. A sporadic reverence for either Osiris or Beltis would surely not have been referred to in this context and in these terms.—The case is not much improved if with Geiger¹ we take the Beltis in Lagarde's proposed reading as a symbol of Babylon, and Osiris of Egypt. The fugitive Judahites would never think of taking refuge in Assyria, when the Assyrians had but just ravaged Gilead and Naphtali (ix. 1, 2 Kings xv. 29).² Prof. de Lagarde's ingenious conjecture must therefore on various grounds be decidedly rejected. Gladly would we learn more of the popular religion of Palestine, but we must not read our own fancies into the scanty records at our disposal. (Sept. seems to have had a mutilated Hebrew text; it renders by guess τοῦ μὲν ἑμπεσεῖν εἰς ἀπαγορεύου.)

x. 5 *b*. There is no various reading of moment in the MSS., but Sept. appears to be based on a text which omitted מטה הוא. Hitzig, Ewald (1st ed.), and Diestel omit הוא בידם as an intrusive marginal note, suggested (Diestel) by *v*. 24. But the omission of these words seems to leave the clause too short. Secker (ap. Lowth) simply corrects בידם into ביום.

x. 13. וְאֹרִיר . . וְאִסִּיר. Hitzig and Dr. Kay regard this as the imperfect of habit ('I am wont to . . .'), but this hardly suits the context; Ewald (so Mr. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, §§ 83, 84), as a vivid way of representing past events as in course of happening, but yet without implying at the same time the idea of sequence or causation. The 'tense' is singularly appropriate here, as it is the one which the Assyrian kings, for the same reason as Isaiah here, habitually use in their inscriptions. Comp. on xii. 1.

x. 18. בְּמִסֵּס נָקַם. A singular phrase; can it be correct? מִסֵּס occurs nowhere else in Kal, and though נָקַם and הִתְנַקַּם are found in three other places (lix. 19, Zech. ix. 16, Ps. lx. 6), none of them seem to illustrate our passage. 'It is easier,' as Dr. Weir remarks, 'to find objections to all the various renderings which have been proposed, than to say which is the true one. The ancient versions give very little assistance.' He suggests, however (in which I do not agree), that some light is thrown upon the passage by xxxi. 8, 9.

x. 25. Luzzatto reads וְעַל-תִּבְלִיתָם; but, as Diestel remarks, the next stage was to be, not the cessation of Jehovah's anger, but its manifestation on a larger scale.

x. 27 (last clause). Probably corrupt (see note, vol. i. p. 71). For the rendering by 'reason of,' comp. Ps. lxxviii. 3, (Hebr.), and see note on lvii. 1.

x. 33. מְאֹרָה. Gesenius's explanation, adopted in my translation and also by Del., 'foliage, lit. glory,' seems not to suit the passages (six in Ezekiel), in which פְּאֹרָה occurs in the plural. The several

¹ *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, ix. 119.

² Hitzig in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, xv. 228.

branches would not naturally each be called the 'glory' of a tree. Better, therefore, to derive the word from the root *par* 'to break forth,' and render 'bough' (see Ezek. xvii. 6), or collectively 'boughs.'

XI. 3. והריחו ב'. The phrase is without a parallel, and was evidently suggested by the four רוח of the preceding verse. Alt. rend. would run more literally, 'And he shall smell delightedly at the fear of Jehovah.' I cannot reconcile myself to such an expression, the object of the 'smelling' having no reference (as in Am. v. 21, Lev. xxxvi. 31) to ceremonial observances. הריח, 'to make רויה'='to breathe,' as האזין 'to make ears'='to hear,' הלשין 'to make tongue'='to slander' (quoted by Naeg.).

XI. 4. For the second ארץ read ערין with Lagarde (see vol. i. p. 76).

XI. 8. ירו הרה. Render, 'lay down his hand.' See Wetzstein's second excursus in third ed. of Delitzsch's *Jesaja*. (The original meaning of the root is shown from the Arabic to be probably *demitere*, rather than *tendere*.)

XI. 15. בעים. Read בעים with Gesenius (in *Thesaurus*) and Luzatto, י and צ being easily confounded in the earlier stages of the alphabetic characters. So perhaps Sept., Pesh., Vulg., though their renderings may be mere guesswork (comp. Kimchi). To call in the aid of the Arabic in this exceedingly plain piece of Hebrew seems very dubious.

XII. 1. ישב . . ותנחמני. My friend Mr. Driver suggests¹ that this may be taken as a prayer ('May thine anger turn,' &c.), comp. Ps. lxxxv. 5 with 2-4, and cxxvi. 4 with 1-3. To me this does not seem natural, as the next verse is entirely in the strain of thanksgiving. I would not, however, assert that י is to be understood, but rather that the construction with the imperfect, in poetic Hebrew as in epigraphic Assyrian, is a vivid, emotional way of representing even past events as in course of happening (comp. on x. 13). Whether another imperfect with simple Vâv follows, makes no difference (see on the other hand Delitzsch, whose references, however, scarcely prove his case).

XII. 2. וזכרת יה יהוה. The termination ת, is not, as is generally supposed, a poetic or archaic form instead of ה, . . . but an apocopated flexional form of the feminine ה, . . . It comes either from התי, or from the accusative (?) תה, as may in all cases be satisfactorily shown' (Hupfeld on Ps. xvi. 6). In the present instance certainly the former alternative is the more obvious one (it assumes an Aramaizing apocope of the suffix); but Hupfeld's comment must be supplemented by that of Geiger,² who appears to have shown the reason why, at least in Ex. xv. 2, Isa. xii. 2, and Ps. cxviii. 14, the apocopated form

¹ *The Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, § 84 (a).

² *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, pp. 274-8.

was adopted. It is well known that the later Jews (even in the times of the Septuagint) scrupled to pronounce the Tetragrammaton. יהי, it is true, is only half of the Tetragrammaton, but it is natural that the same scruple (I speak of pre-Massoretic times) should have prevented the pronunciation even of this half. How could this be avoided? By connecting the syllable יהי (wherever the sense appeared to allow it) so closely with the preceding word, that the hearer was not conscious of hearing the Divine name. Hence in Ex. xv. 2, the Samaritan Pentateuch reads וזמרתיה as one word, and Sept. translates or paraphrases there βοηθός και σκεπαστής ἐγένετο. The later versions, however, express the יהי, and it is in accordance with this later abatement of scrupulousness that the Massoretic text of Isa. xii. 2 introduces יהוה. It was apparently still the custom among some public readers of the Scriptures to let the יהי be absorbed in the preceding word, and to make the true sense quite clear the Massoretic critics inserted the full name יהוה (only here however, not in Ex. xv. 2, nor in Ps. cxviii. 14). (The case is much stronger than can be shown in this condensed note. Nor can inconsistencies on the part of the Massorettes be pleaded against Geiger's view; perfect consistency is not a virtue even of these careful critics.)

XIII. 6. In his lectures on *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 423, Mr. Robertson Smith developes more fully his view of the origin of Shaddai 'the rain-giver.' He thinks that the derivation from שרר is discredited by the fact of its having been suggested by the punctuation, which was itself determined by a faulty traditional etymology (from the relative ש and רי). I agree that the Aramaic affinity pointed out by him and Gesenius is plausible, though I desiderate a good Assyrian cognate; but I am not convinced that the derivation from שרר (already present to the mind of our prophet) stands or falls with the Jewish traditional etymology. If you had שרי (unpointed) before you as the name of a god, you might quite well form the hypothesis that it was connected with שרר.

XIII. 21. ציים 'wild cats.' See my *Notes and Criticisms*, p. 23. אהים. This corresponds to the Assyrian *akhu* (singular), which is given as the equivalent of the Accadian *lig-bar-ra*, i.e. 'striped beast (dog).' Houghton, *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, V. 328.

XIV. 6. Read קררת (ף and ת confounded, as in 2 Kings x. 32, where read, with Targ., Hitz., לקצוף).

XIV. 21. ערים. To the question, 'Why should cities be denounced so unqualifiedly?' (vol. i. p. 93), Dr. Weir replies by referring to the view of the antitheistic origin of Babylon given in Gen. xi.; how ingenious, but how far-fetched! Ibn Ezra, adopting Targ.'s rendering 'enemies,' compares 1 Sam. xxviii. 16, where, however, Sept.'s reading is now generally adopted. (See *Q. P. B.*) Read ערים; a similar correction is necessary in xxiv. 15, Ps. lxxii. 9, Jer. xlix. 3. (For other slight errors in this section, see xiii. 22, xiv. 4. 6.)

xiv. 22. נין. Comp. Assyrian *ninu* 'family' (Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, i. 20).

xiv. 30. בכורי. Hupfeld, on Ps. xxxvii. 20, suggests בְּכָרִי, comp. הָרִי, v. 25. כר is an Isaianic word (see xxx. 23).

יהרנ. 'Shall he slay.' From a Semitic point of view, a verb is never used impersonally. If there is no other subject, the 'nomen agentis' of the verb is always either expressed or, as here, implied. But who is 'the slayer' in this passage? Not Jehovah. for he is the speaker, but the enemy who is Jehovah's 'rod' (x. 5). (Comp. Hos. vi. 11, and Wünsche's note, to which I am indebted.)

xiv. 32. גוי. Read גוים, with Sept., Pesh., Targ., Grätz.

xv. 1. ליל. If the pointing is correct, this must be a collateral form of לַיִל (it occurs again in xxi. 11, but in pause). It is interesting that it should occur in a *Moabite* inscription (on the stele of Meshah, l. 15, we have בללה *ballēlah*). Comp. on xxiii. 11.

xv. 5. Read ירָעוּ with Lagarde and some earlier scholars (see Ges.). Why suppose a unique verbal form, when transposition is so natural?

xvi. 1. Grätz (*Geschichte*, ii. 1. 258), reads אשכר מושלי. He excises v. 2, and connects vv. 1 and 3.

xvi. 4. Lagarde's edition of Targ. reads נרחים=מטלמליא; but this is probably not the original reading—see Geiger's *Urschrift*, p. 300 note. I therefore adhere to the statement in vol. i. p. 100, note ^b. Comp. the mispointing in Gen. xlix. 26.

xvii. 1. Omit מעי with Lagarde. The scribe had מעיר in his head, and began to write it over again. He would not spoil his manuscript by excising it, and so it remained a non-word. See on xxviii. 25, xliii. 12, and *Q. P. B.* (2nd ed.) on Zech. ii. 2, Mal. ii. 11.

xvii. 9. חחרש והאמיר. Sept. renders (ὁν τρόπον κατέλιπον) οἱ Ἀμορῆται καὶ οἱ Εὐαῖοι. The reading implied is plausible; only 'Amorites' and 'Hivites' must be transposed. As Lagarde points out (*Semitica*, i. p. 31) רש and וי look very similar in Phœnician and old Hebrew characters, and might easily be confounded by a scribe. Still the received text gives a very appropriate sense (see Commentary); the only doubt is whether אמיר would have been used in the sense of 'the summit of a hill' so near to v. 6, where it means 'the top of a tree.' Vulg. has '(derelictæ) sicut aratra et segetes' (comp. חרש to 'plough,' and עמיר 'sheaf'); Pesh., Theodotion, Saadya take Horesh and Amir to be names of places; and so Aquila and Symmachus understand Amir. Hitzig strangely adopts this view, comparing Harosheth (Judg. iv. 2). Surely a resource of despair! In conclusion, it is worth suggesting that the strange story in Procopius and in the Jerusalem Talmud of Jewish fugitives in Africa (see Ewald, *History*, ii. 229, 230), may perhaps have some connexion with this passage of Isaiah.

xviii. 1. צלצל כ'. See my *Notes and Criticisms*, p. 20 (where

on line 23, for 'day' I should have said 'year'); see also Stade's discussion of the phrase, *De Isaiaë Vaticiniis Æthiopicis*, pp. 89-94, where he comes to the same conclusion as that here adopted. In צלצל comp. Arabic *şarşaru*, the 'creaking' insect (Lane), also found in Assyrian ('the cricket,' Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Studien*, i. 26).

xviii. 2. Read with Stade גִּנְקוּ. The Metheg of the received text no doubt indicates that they understood the word (or words) somewhat as M'Gill or Delitzsch, against whom see commentary. קוּקוּ might be an adjective (like ערער), but is more probably a substantive meaning 'great strength'; comp. Arab. *kuwwat*, 1. robur, 2. pars quædam funis.

xviii. 7. Read מעם (comp. parallel clause), with Sept., Targ., Vulg., Lowth, Knobel, Stade. Ges. renders as I have done, but thinks the second מ is retroactive. This, however, is not proved by Job xxxiii. 17, where a מ has dropped out of the text (see Dillmann, *ad loc.*). Ewald reads עם עם. I observe that Del., in his 3rd ed., thinks the text-reading is established by 'parallels like Zeph. iii. 10.' But עתרי, there, should be taken in the sense of 'sweet odours' (comp. Ezek. viii. 11), parallel to מנחתי; for the form of the sentence, comp. on iii. 12.

xix. 7. על-פי יאור. Del. (on Prov. viii. 29) denies that פה ever means the shore, whether of the sea, or of a river, and in the third edition of his *Jesaia* renders the above words 'at the mouth (*Mündung*) of the Nile,' *i.e.* where the stream approaches the sea. But the ordinary view seems more appropriate. Dr. Weir has "'by the brink of the river," *i.e.* where the last vestige of green might be sure to be found.'

xix. 10. והיו שתתיה ונוי. There are several difficulties in both halves of this verse, which have not been adequately recognised by most commentators. Philologically I see no objection to my rendering (which is the common one) of the first half; but I am not quite sure of the ordinary exposition, partly because the meaning of the second half is so uncertain, and partly because the preceding verses are full of minute special features. In the second half there are two difficulties: 1. that אנם everywhere else (even Jer. li. 32) means 'pond,' 'marsh'—see especially Ex. vii. 19, viii. 1, where it is used in this sense in connection with the Nile; and 2. that עשי שצר is a strange way of expressing 'hired workmen'—after עשי we naturally expect מלאכה (Dr. Weir), and there is no apparent reason for passing over the usual form שבירים. I do not object to the text because it is not quite plain (the variations of the versions make it probable that there was from the first some uncommon expression in it), but because the actual reading, as commonly understood, is so difficult to justify. The שצר read by Sept., Pesh. is plausible (Dr. Weir compares xxiv. 9); these versions suppose an allusion to the barley-wine of Egypt

(Herod. ii. 77). But this hardly suits the context. I lean myself to the view of Targ., Saad., Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Grätz (*Monatsschrift*, 1877, p. 376), that שָׁנַר meant 'dams,' comp. סָכַר 'to stop up,' Arab. *sakara* 'to dam up a river.' This harmonises admirably with the preceding verses, but not so well with the first half of this verse. Either, therefore, the text of the first verse-half must be corrupt, or the 'pillars' have an obscure reference to the 'dams,' or at any rate to the Nile.

xix. 18. עֵיר הַהָרִים. So most MSS. and editions, the Massora (see however Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 79), and the Peshito. The other reading עֵיר הַהָרִים is supported by 15 MSS. in the text and one in the margin (Kennicott and de Rossi); also by Symmachus, the Vulgate, Saadya, the Talmud ('*Menachoth*, 110 a'), Rashi, Vit., Ges. (*Thesaurus*, but not *Commentary*), Hitz., Naeg. Aquila and Theodotion have Ἄρες, which leaves the reading doubtful. Sept. has πάλις ἀσέδῃς, i.e., עֵיר הַצֹּרֶק, which Geiger (as above) boldly maintains to be the true reading, הָרִים (deliberately altered, he thinks, into הָרִים by the Egyptian Jews) being a disparaging corruption of this. To me the Sept. reading looks more like a retort upon the Palestinian Jews for expounding עֵיר הַהָרִים in a manner complimentary to Onias.

xxi. 11, 12. The Greek versions referred to in vol. i. p. 127 (note c), translate as if they read הַפְּלִיטִים מִשְׁעִיר, which Dozy accordingly proposes to read (*De Israëliten te Mekka*, p. 72). For a complete restoration of the text, however, Grätz's is perhaps more satisfactory (*Geschichte der Juden*, ii. 1, p. 485). The translation of it runs thus:—

The fugitives (הַנִּזְרָדִים) call unto me from Seir;
 'Watchman, what of the night?
 Watchman, what of the night of distress?'
 The watchman saith,
 'The morning cometh, the night fleeth ('וַיִּשְׁאֵל הַלְּ);
 O that ye would ask! Ask ye;
 Return, come.'

The supposition is that the Simeonites in mount Seir (1 Chr. iv. 42, 43) applied for restoration to the privileges of citizenship.

xxii. 3. מִקֶּשֶׁת 'without the bows being strung' either on their side or the enemy's.

xxii. 5. שׁוֹעַ. The word stands so close to Elam, that it seems inevitable to take it as the name of the tribe referred to in the commentary. Added to this, the other שׁוֹעַ means, not 'a cry of despair' (which the ordinary rendering presupposes), but 'a cry for help.' The remark is Luzzatto's.

xxii. 14. For the construction לְכַפֵּר לְ, Riehm (*Der Begriff der Sühne im A. T.*, p. 9) well compares Ezek. xvi. 63.

xxii. 15. סָכַן. *Saknu* in Assyrian means 'a high officer,' from *sakin* 'to set up, place, make;' *saknu* and סָכַן alike descend from the period of 'undivided' Semitic speech. As a rule, no doubt,

organic *s* in Assyrian remains so in the corresponding word in Hebrew; but there are exceptions, e.g. *bistu* = פסל, *isid* = יסר. At a later time, the Babylonian form of this word (*sagru*) became the Hebrew *s'agan* (see comm. on xli. 25). In this case, the sibilant is just what we should expect, since Assyrian proper names, when transferred into Hebrew, usually change their sibilants, e.g. Sarrukin becomes סרְגִּין, and S'amirina שְׁמִרִין. Obviously, the Jews were not conscious that they already had the same word under the form סָגָן. M. Ganneau has found the title 'the סָגָן of Qarthadachat' applied to a person dedicating a vase to Baal-Lebanon in a Phœnician inscription (*Athenæum*, Apr. 17, 1880, pp. 502-4).

xxiii. 7. הוֹאֵחַ לָכֶם עֲלֵיזָה. Del. (see vol. i. p. 134) regards ע' as the vocative, remarking that 'the omission of the article is not surprising (xxii. 2, Ewald § 327 a), whereas, on the other view, though possible (see xxxii. 13), it is still harsh (comp. xiv. 16).' The phrase is harshly constructed, on any view of it; but עֲלֵיזָה as epexegetical of לָכֶם seems to me peculiarly harsh, and considering that a plurality of persons (viz. the Phœnicians in general) has been addressed just before (v. 6), it is rather unlikely that a fresh company (viz. the Tyrians) should be referred to now.

xxiii. 11. מַעֲזוּיָה. Possibly an intentional Phœnicism; comp. the Moabitism in the prophecy on Moab (see above on xv. 1). At any rate, there is an affinity with Phœnician in the suffix with נ (comp. on liii. 8). See Euting, *Sechs phöniz. Inschriften aus Idalion*, p. 15, (also referred to, I see, by Del. in his 3rd ed.).

xxiii. 13. אֶרֶץ כְּנַעֲנִים. Ewald's conjecture אֶרֶץ כְּנַעֲנִים, which formerly attracted me, still deserves chronicling. Kuenen's objections to it are: 1. that usage requires אֶרֶץ הַכְּנַעֲנִי; and 2. that it is natural to expect a reference to a fresh people rather than to the Phœnicians, who have been addressed all along (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1871, pp. 74, 75). The first is not very important; the phrase quoted by Dr. Kuenen only occurs in catalogues of nations. We can as well say אֶרֶץ כְּנַעֲנִים as אֶרֶץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים. The second is really strong. (See further my *Notes and Criticisms*.)

xxiv. 15. בְּאָרִים. 'May it not be בְּאָרִים יִכְבְּרוּ, somewhat as xxv. 3? Comp. Esth. x. 1, the only other passage, except xi. 11, in which הים is found.' Dr. Weir.

xxiv. 19. 'For רָעָה read רָעָה, inf. abs. with ה being without example, and the ה being taken from next word: so read אֶרֶץ (ה repeated from last word).' Dr. Weir after Maurer, Hitzig, Knobel.

xxiv. 22. Dr. Weir reads אֶסְפֵּי הָאֶסְפִּיר; comp. אֶסְפֵּי הָחַסִּיל xxxiii. 4.

xxvi. 4. Ges. suggests that יהוה may be a gloss on the uncommon יה; so too Knobel. But though Aquila already has ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ κύριος, it is possible that the text is imperfect.

xxvii. 6. Has not הימים fallen out (comp. Eccles. ii. 16)? There is a similar doubt in lxvi. 18.

xxviii. 11. לעני. See Hupfeld or Perowne on Ps. xxxv. 16.

xxviii. 16. The construction 'I am he that have founded' is most unnatural; read יקר. (I am glad to find myself supported by Dr. Weir, who also suggests מִיִּקָּר, and by Stade, *Hebr. Grammatik*, § 214 b.) יִקָּר is not a genuine parallel. There is no occasion to take it as 3 s. m. imperf. Hif.; it can equally well be partic. Kal (comp. Arab. *qātil*).

Read יָמִישׁ; I forget to whom the suggestion is due. The Hifil is used absolutely, as Nah. iii. 1. The letters ט and ח are easily confounded in the square character. The Sept. translator either reads יבליש, or (since Targ. has an equivalent rend.) falls into paraphrase. Pesh. follows Sept., Targ.

xxviii. 18. וְנָכַר. This is the only passage in which the Pual of כָּפַר is used in the sense of 'cancelling.' But the meaning is in accordance with the root-meaning (whether we adopt the Hebrew or Arabic sense of 'covering,' comp. Gen. vi. 14, or the Aramaic of 'wiping out'). Hence the conjecture וְנָתַר (comp. Jer. xxxiii. 21) is unnecessary, though supported, not merely by Hupfeld, to whom Del. refers, but by Targ., Secker, Lowth, Houbigant, and Dr. Weir.

xxviii. 25. The difficult words שורה and נסמון are simply miswritten for שַׁעֲרָה and כַּסְּמֹת. The scribe did not like to spoil his manuscript by excising the faulty letters (as in xvii. 1, xliii. 12, see notes): Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 409 (the conjecture had already been made, so far as שורה is concerned).

xxviii. 29. הפלא... תושיה. Comp. Job xi. 6, where read with Mr. Robertson Smith and (partly) Merx, בני פלאים לתושיה. Another sign of the gnomic affinities of this paragraph.

xxix. 1. אריאל. Del. and Hitzig (*Jesaja*, but not *Gesch. d. V. Israel*) explain, 'God's hearth;' comp. Ezek. xliii. 15, 16. But this meaning is very dubious, even in Ezekiel (see *Notes and Criticisms*, pp. 31, 32, and comp. Smend on Ezek. *l. c.*), whereas that adopted has the support of usage, and suits the context.

xxix. 9. Read התסהי. See the parallel passage Hab. i. 5, and comp. for the form of the phrase Zeph. ii. 1 (where read התבוששו וְנָרְשָׁנוּ for the unintelligible הַתְּחָק).

xxix. 22. אשר פדה את־אברהם. Wellhausen regards these words as a gloss based on the late legend of the deliverance of Abraham from the furnace of the Chaldeans (*Geschichte Israels*, i. 373, note ¹). But is not the expression too forcible for a mere gloss, and may not Abraham's deliverance from his idolatrous kinsmen (see my note, vol. i., p. 166) be typical of the deliverance of the faithful Israel from the tyrant, the scorner, and the unrighteous (xxix. 20)? I admit, however, that the clause comes in very unexpectedly; it does not

fall in quite naturally with the context ; and if we approach the passage with the presuppositions (*a*) that Abraham is a legendary or mythical personage, and (*b*) that this personage only attained importance at a late period of Hebrew literature compared with Isaac ('Abraham first appears in Isa. xl.-lxvi.' [xli. 8, li. 2], says Wellhausen), it becomes natural to excise the words, as this talented though hypercritical scholar has proposed. My objection to admitting his view is not that he supposes a gloss to have intruded into the received text. Considering the large number of glosses which intruded into the Hebrew text reproduced by the Sept., it would be no wonder if, with all the care bestowed by the Palestinian Jewish critics, a fair number of glosses should have lingered in the Masoretic text. It is rather this : that in the present position of inquiry a commentator on the prophets, whether of orthodox or rationalistic leanings, cannot allow himself to take the mythical theory of the early Jewish narratives into account. I have thought it, however, only fair to warn the student of the rocks which may be hidden even in a passage so simple grammatically as the present. No book of the Bible can be fully understood by itself ; a future commentator on Isaiah will be able to assume positive critical results which are yet far from having been attained.

xxx. 18. ירום. This, the text-reading, does not give a suitable sense. רום with a gerund following can only mean 'to arise for action' (so Ges. in *Thesaurus*) ; we have no right to import the meaning of 'desire' from the Arabic. Rashi indeed explains by יתרחק, and similarly Delitzsch ('God will withdraw Himself from Israel's history to His royal and judicial throne in heaven'). But how forced a view, and how opposed to the context ! Yet the view of Ges., though supported by the usage of the Psalms (see Ps. xviii. 47, xxi. 14, &c.), does not suit the parallelism. לִּי חכה means 'to expect with longing' (as may also be urged against Del.'s rendering) ; ירום ought, it would seem, to have a similar meaning. It is best therefore to adopt the reading of two MSS. ירום, not in the artificial sense 'stirreth not' given to it by Ewald, 'but in that which it undoubtedly bears in Ps. xxxvii. 7,'¹ (where note the parallelism). The difficulty of the passage partly arises from the fusion of two distinct prophecies (see Commentary).

xxx. 32. Read בָּם, with Q'rî, Targ., Vulg., and many MSS., including the Babylonian Codex ;² so Naegelsbach. Chap. xxiii. 13 must not be quoted in favour of בָּה, for there both land and people of Chaldæa are referred to—here only the Assyrian army.

¹ *Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah* (Macmillan, 1868), pp. 32, 33.

² By this title I designate a Codex of the prophets (*i.e.* the so-called later prophets), with the Babylonian punctuation, dated A.D. 916-17, and now preserved at St. Petersburg. It was edited for the Russian Government in a superb photo-lithographic facsimile by Dr. Hermann Strack in 1876.

On xxx. 33. תַּפְתָּה. From תַּפַּח, 1. an object spat upon ; 2. the 'abominable' place where children were sacrificed to Baal as Moloch, comes תַּפְתָּה (as אִשָּׁה from אִשׁ). The word is masculine ; and the feminine suffixes at the end of the verse are to be referred (as Del. points out) to the בִּמְצָה, or 'high place' on which any sacrifice had to be offered. The Jewish derivation from תַּף 'a drum,' has only an imaginative, 'Haggadic' value ; though in Egypt, as well as, according to the legend, in Palestine, the tambourine was possibly associated with Baal-worship. (So Mr. Tomkins, referring to *Revue Egyptienne*, i. 43.)

xxx. 8. Sept., Vulg., and the Babylonian Codex read לָא for לוֹ ; comp. xxii. 3 (see above).

xxxii. 1. Read וְשָׂרִים. The scribe began to write לְמִשְׁפַּח, which the parallel line led him to expect here. A similar error in Ps. lxxiv. 14 (end).

xxxiii. 1. Read כְּכִלְוֹתָךְ ; the argument of Ges. (in *Thesaurus*, s. v. נִלָּה) is conclusive. נ and כ confounded, as Ex. xvii. 16, Josh. viii. 13 (comp. v. 9 וַיִּלֵּן).

xxxiii. 11. Notice the rhyme. Assonance and even rhyme are more frequently and deliberately employed in Hebrew poetry than is observed at first sight.—'The last clause, remarks Dr. Weir, 'is difficult. The present reading seems to have been that of the copy from which Sept. was translated ; so of the other old versions, except Pesh., which puts כ before רוּחְכֶם, and joins it to the preceding clause (as Sept. also does), and the Targ. which gives, "My word shall destroy you as the whirlwind chaff." A conjectural reading is רוּחִי כִמוֹת רוּחְכֶם, which seems borne out by other passages of Isaiah, as iv. 4, xi. 4, and especially xxx. 27, 28.' The conjecture is that of Secker and Lowth.

xxxiii. 14 b. Dr. Weir proposes to render, 'Who will abide for us the devouring fire?' *i.e.*, on our behalf, for the salvation of the people.

xxxiii. 23. בְּלִיחֻקוֹ כִּתְרָנָם. A hard passage. The subject of the verb is clearly the ropes which have just been mentioned (not the sailors, as A. E., Kimchi, Drechsler) ; hence 'their mast,' *i.e.* the mast which it is their function (according to the ancient Greek and doubtless also the Phœnicio-Hebrew system) to bind to the ἱστοπέδη (a piece of wood set in the keel). Now arises a difficulty with כָּן. To render, with most since Cocceius, 'the stand' (*i.e.* the ἱστον.) seems to contradict these primitive naval arrangements ; so that I have preferred, with Luzzatto, the Jewish commentator, and Naegelsbach, to recur to the original sense of 'firm,' or rather 'upright.' It is true (as remarked in the review of vol. i. in the *Dublin*) that כָּן does not occur as an adjective elsewhere in the sense of physical, but only in that of moral uprightness, but there is no reason whatever why the

physical sense (guaranteed by the use of **בֵּן** the substantive for 'pedestal') should not occur—comp. **עֲרֵק** (1) straightness, (2) righteousness. On the whole passage, comp. the beautiful ode of Horace: 'O navis, referent' (i. 14).

xxxiv. 12. Read **חרי המלוכה יקראו ואין שם** with Dr. Weir; comp. xli. 12, l. 2.

xxxv. 1. **יששום מרבר**. The final **ו** of the verb is assimilated to the following **מ**; comp. **פְּרִיּוּם**, Num. iii. 49 (Ibn Ezra). Apparent orthographical errors may now and then indicate phonetic laws. So Ezek. xxxiii. 26, **עשיתן ת'** (*m* before *t* becomes *n*).

xxxv. 7. **רבעה**. The suffix has not yet been explained. Del. thinks of the female jackal, comp. Lam. iv. 3, but how strangely! Nor is it easy to see why reeds and rushes should be endowed with an enclosure. Pesh. has **נִיז**, in Vulg. *oriatur*, whence Knobel conjectures **יָצַח**. Or might we read **ינאה** (comp. Job viii. 11)?

xxxv. 8. That **למו והוא** can be construed, no one doubts; and ingenuity can always devise a point of connection with the context. Mr. Wordsworth suggests that 'for them' may refer to the blind, deaf, and lame of *vs.* 5, 6 (*Bampton Lectures*, 1881). The difficulty of the words **למו הוא** is increased by their vicinity to **הלך ררך**, which Ewald, with great plausibility, connects with the two preceding words. If some one of the current readings must be chosen, that of Ewald seems preferable; though I am not convinced of its correctness.

xxxv. 10. Read as in *lv.* 11, and see Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, § 14 γ note¹.

xxxvii. 16. **ישב הברכים**. It is debated whether this should be rendered 'who sitteth between,' or, 'upon the cherubim.' It is best to adhere to the undeniable usage, and render 'who inhabiteth the cherubim.' So Ewald, who does not, however, mean anything substantially different from the alternative rendering (see his Commentary on Ps. xxii. 4). Riehm, however (rendering, like Ewald, 'inhabitest'), thinks the Hebrew phrase meant that Jehovah in the temple was altogether inclosed by the cherubs and their wings.

xxxvii. 24. Elsewhere Lebanon is opposed to **כרמל** (*xxix.* 17). But as **כ** means properly a plantation of noble growths, the cedars of Lebanon may conceivably be honoured with this appellation.

xxxvii. 28. **לפני קציר** is probably a corruption of **לפני קמך**; see Commentary. So Wellhausen, 4th ed. of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 257, note¹.

xxxviii. 8. Read **השמש** for the sake of simplicity and 'concord.'

xxxviii. 11. The Babylonian Codex is among those which read **חלך**.

xxxviii. 12. **דורי** 'my dwelling.' Kimchi well compares Ps. lxxxiv. 11, where the verb **דור** occurs in this sense. But I must still maintain that it is an Aramaism, and 'not part of the proper Hebrew

vocabulary; in the Targums it is the constant rendering of גור' (*Notes and Criticisms*, p. 37). Compare Assyrian *duru* and Arabic *dāru*, 'dwelling.'

xxxviii. 12. קפרתִי. Fürst emends קפרתִי; and so my *Notes and Criticisms*, p. 37: it is not a conjecture for פקרתִי, as Del. supposes (in both his 2nd and his 3rd ed.). The rendering of A. V. follows the Chaldee usage.

xxxviii. 16. עליהם יהיו ונו'. Grätz (*Geschichte*, ii. 1, p. 478) conjectures this to be a prayer of the king that his life might be spared for his people's sake. Comp. Lam. iv. 20, 'The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of Jehovah.' The sense would then be, 'O Lord! [mayest thou recover me] for their sakes, that they may live; indeed, for every one of them is the breath of my life.'

xxxix. 1. וישמע. Read כִּי שָׁמַע (after 2 Kings xx. 12). So Sept., Pesh. For instances of the confusion of ו and כ see Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, § 75 a, note.

xl. 21. מוסדות. We may either supply the prep. from מראש, comp. xlviii. 9 (see however Commentary), or read ממ', and suppose that the first מ dropped out, owing to the מ preceding and the מ following. Vit. thinks that the Massorites accented off הארץ to show that it was the common object of all the three verbs. More probably they assumed an ellipsis of מ.

xl. 24. אף אין בל. The phrase only occurs here. But we find אף אין repeated three times in xli. 26, and אף repeated without a negative in xli. 10, xlv. 15, xlv. 11; for the repetition of בל comp. xxxiii. 20. There is, therefore, no occasion for Dr. Weir's conjecture אך הבל.

— גָּטַעוּ . . . זָרְעוּ. Sept., Pesh., גָּטַעוּ . . . זָרְעוּ. 'A good deal may be said in favour of this reading. (1) גָּטַעוּ is not found elsewhere in Nifal, nor זָרַע in Piel or Pual. (2) The meaning is good (comp. xvii. 10, 11). "Before they have planted or sown, *i.e.* propagated themselves in any way; nay, before they have themselves taken root. זָרַע may be used of the plant, Gen. i. 29, and perhaps גָּטַע may also of the זָרַע, for "to shoot forth fresh plants." Dr. Weir.

xl. 31. יעלו אבר. My own rend. is that of Sept., Targ., Pesh., Vulg., Saadya, Bochart, Lowth, Ewald, Naegelsbach. It seems to be required by the parallelism with החליף (for which word Dr. Pusey compares Arab. *akhlafa*, to put forth fresh feathers after moulting'). Hitz. indeed objects (1) that though עלה = 'to grow up' in v. 6, there is no instance of such a sense of העלה, and (2) that instead of אבר we should, on the view opposed to his own, expect נוצה. But as to (1), the observation, though adopted by Del., seems incorrect; for in Ezek. xxxvii. 6, העלה is used of bringing flesh upon the bones. And with regard to (2), let me simply ask, Why? Are not the pinion-feathers renewed?—As to the form אברה, it is, strictly speaking, a

nomen unitatis (see Ewald, *Gramm. arab.*, § 295, *Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, § 176a), but the distinction is not always present to the Hebrew writers.

XL1. 8. אהבי. Dr. Weir, while admitting that the pronominal suffix of אהב elsewhere always denotes the object ('my lover' = 'he who loveth, or loved, me') thinks that in this passage it marks the subject, and renders 'whom I have loved' (comp. Deut. iv. 37). Comp. Vitringa.

XL1. 10. אמצתיך. For the sense adopted, comp. Ruth i. 18 (partic. Hithp. = 'steadfastly purposing,') and especially Ps. lxxx. 16, 18 (Piel used precisely as here); also (with Naeg.) Matt. xii. 18, where the אמתך of Isa. xlii. 1 is rendered ἡπέρωσα.

XL1. 25. Read יבס with Clericus, Secker, Lowth (besides those mentioned already).

XL1. 27. רישון receives a colour from the parallel word מבשר, precisely as אחרון in the famous passage Job xix. 25 is coloured by the corresponding word גאלי (as if 'the future defender of my right').

XLII. 2. ישא. Reifmann's conjecture ישאנ (Del., *Jesaia*, p. 440) is very plausible. It brings out with much force the contrast between the old and the new dispensation; comp. Am. i. 2, iii. 8.

XLII. 6. ואתחזק. The presence of the jussive is a great difficulty. I cannot bring myself, with my friend Mr. Driver, to render 'that I may take hold' (*Hebrew Tenses*, § 176 *Obs.*), and would rather suppose a laxity of pronunciation, which has found expression here and there in the punctuation. What the sense requires seems to me clearly ת.

XLII. 15. איים. This passage is strongly against the view that איים can mean 'islands.' The sense required and established by etymology (it is cognate with Arab. *awâv*, 'he sojourned') is 'habitable land.' Hence elsewhere 'countries' (see Commentary on xl. 15).

XLII. 21. Note the construction, which, though thoroughly Hebrew (Job xxxii. 22, Lam. iv. 14, Ewald), reminds us still more of Arabic.

XLII. 25. חמה. The adverbial accusative is doubtless used for the sake of the assonance with מלחמה (Del.).

XLIII. 9. נקצו. Of the three ways of understanding this word—(1) as an ordinary perfect, (2) as a precative perfect, and (3) as an imperative—the second and third are alone suitable to the context. A precative perfect, however, seems too much of an Arabism to be easily admitted, especially as the evidence for it in Hebrew is not by any means strong (see Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, § 20). There is no choice, therefore, but to accept the form as an imperative. One can hardly suppose a corruption of the text, for the same form occurs in a similar context in Joel iv. 11; comp. נלוו Jer. l. 5.

XLIII. 12. והושעתי. The view proposed in my commentary is supported by the parallel of xxviii. 25 (see above).

XLIII. 22. On the force of **כי** here, see Ewald, *Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache*, § 354 *b* (= *Hebrew Syntax*, by Kennedy, p. 269).

XLIII. 28. Sept., Pesh., also render in the past tense.

XLIV. 5. Read **יכתב בידי** with Klostermann. A repeated letter here, as so often, was dropped. **כָּתַב** 'to write upon,' as Neh. vii. 5, viii. 14, xiii. 1. 'Write with his hand' is surely a very harsh expression, though I see it has the authority of Dr. Kay.

XLIV. 12. 'Unstreitig ist ein Wort ausgefallen' (Del.). Read, as the first word of the verse, with Sept., Pesh., either **הָדַר** (Del.), or **הָדָר** (comp. Prov. xxvii. 17), which would easily fall out, owing to the preceding **יָדָר**. Mr. Driver (*Hebrew Tenses*, § 123 β), prefers **יָדָר** (jussive form) or **יָדַר**; but the analogy of *v.* 13 favours the perfect.

XLIV. 14. **לָבַרַת**. Read **וּבָרַת**. **ו** or **י** and **ל** might possibly be confounded in the square character; but more probably the first **ל** is produced by the vicinity of another word beginning with **ל**. This seems to me much more natural than to suppose a 'periphrastic future,' the instances of which given by Del. on Hab. i. 10 may perhaps require sifting. The three other supposed instances in Isaiah all seem to me very doubtful. In xxi. 1, the construction is rather gerundial; in xxxvii. 26, the phrase is **לְהִיָּה** 'to serve for'; and in xxxviii. 20, though there is no **הִיָּה** expressed, the **ל** is still that of tendency (see translation).

XLIV. 15. **לְמוֹ**. It is not very natural in this individualising description (contrast xlii. 17, where it is a *class* of persons who say **אִתָּם** to regard this as a collective. The suffix is amply defensible as a singular (see on liii. 8). Sept., however, (not Pesh.) takes it as a plural.

XLIV. 23. **תַּחֲתֵי אָרֶץ**. This and similar phrases always have an at least implied reference to Sheól. It is Sheól, as the context shows, which is called **אָרֶץ תַּחֲתֵי** in Ezek. xxx. 14, 16, 18, **אָרֶץ תַּחֲתֵי** in Ezek. xxvi. 20, xxxii. 18, 24; **בֹּר תַּחֲתֵי** in Ps. lxxxviii. 7, Lam. iii. 55, and, more explicitly still, **שְׂאוֹל תַּחֲתֵי** in Ps. lxxxvi. 13 (comp. **שְׂאוֹל מִתַּחַת**, Isa. xiv. 9). In Ps. cxxxix. 15 the context is obscure, but even there we have no right, I think, to depart from the universal meaning of the phrase elsewhere. Possibly, as Hupfeld suggests, Sheól is there used as an image of an utterly dark, mysterious place.

XLV. 11. 'Or should we not read **תִּשְׂאוּ**?' (Pencil note of Dr. Weir's). See Commentary.

XLV. 24. **לִי אִמֵּר**. Read **יִאָמֵר** with Luzzatto. The **ל** probably arose out of the mark put by the scribe to separate the name of God from the following word. Comp. the use of P'siq in the Massoretic text of Ex. xvii. 15, Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16. For a parallel to such an interruption of the speech, see lvii. 19.

XLVI. 4. **עֲשִׂיתִי**. Klostermann would read **עֲמַסְתִּי** (*Zeitschr. f. luther. Theologie*, 1876, p. 18). But the received text gives a finer meaning: 'I have made,' or begotten; paternal love impels me to 'carry.'

XLVI. 8. Read התכששו (א and ב may be confounded in several older forms of the characters). Comp. above on xxix. 9. The commentaries cite the Vulgate as reading 'confundamini'; but the Codex Amiatinus has 'fundamini' (Heyse), and this is the rendering of St. Jerome in his Commentary ('imò fundamini, ne rursum subitus idolatriæ vos turbo subvertat'). In any case, 'fundamini' and not 'fundemini,' seems to be established.

XLVII. 7. ער 'for ever.' See Commentary, and compare the form of v. 6. Hitzig goes so far as to deny that ער ever means 'usque' or 'adeo ut,' and certainly the passages generally quoted require revision. In 1 Sam. ii. 5, ער may very well = 'for ever,' as here; in 1 Sam. xx. 41, it probably has the prepositional meaning 'unto' (see Sept.); in Job viii. 21, Ewald, Dillmann, Merx, and Hitzig point ער, and the connexion seems to require this; in Job xiv. 6, 'until' yields a perfectly satisfactory sense. In Josh. xvii. 14 (where what Ges. calls the fuller form ער אשר stands at present) we should probably rather read על אשר—notice that a second ער follows; and Grätz proposes to read על 'because' in our passage (*Monatsschrift*, 1881, p. 228).

XLVII. 11. שחרה. Not 'its dawn' (Dr. Weir remarks that שחר occurs nowhere else with a suffix), but 'to charm away.' How does the word obtain this meaning? Through the root-meaning of 'darkness.' שחר is properly 'to be dark' (whence שחר 'the morning-grey'. To 'charm' is to bring something about by dark, mysterious means (see Wünsche on Hos. vi. 3); comp. our own phrase 'the black art.' It is not therefore (as might be supposed by the oft-repeated reference to the Arabic *sahara*) a sense not thoroughly native to Hebrew.

XLVIII. 6. בצרות. Very possibly we should read בצרות 'ardua intellectu,' as in the parallel passage, Jer. xxxiii. 3.

XLVIII. 18, 19. Ewald's view of the construction, alluded to in the Commentary, is peculiar. He puts 'O that thou hadst' down to 'as the *grains* thereof' into a parenthesis, and continues 'his (Israel's name shall not be cut off nor destroyed before me,' thus making the last clause a categorical affirmation of Israel's indestructibility. Against this see my note. The slight change in the construction is simply due to the fact that the consequence expressed in לא ייכרת is still future. On ויהי see Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, §§ 127 γ, 140. His alternative rendering is one of those subtleties in which able grammarians delight, but which the exegete is obliged regretfully, but decidedly, to reject. The version of Hitz., Del. (see above, p. 8, note 8) seems almost to require ויהי (comp. Deut. xxxii. 29) or יהיה (as Mic. ii. 11), as Del. himself frankly admits; comp. also Ps. lxxxi. 14-16 (אכניע).

XLIX. 5. לא יאסף (Q'ri, לו). The reading of the text is harder than

that of the margin, but is not on that account (comp. ix. 2) to be preferred. The latter is evidently required by the context. The division among the ancient interpreters was partly occasioned by their party prejudices. Thus St. Jerome objects to the rendering of Sept., because it gives up 'a very strong testimony against the perfidy of the Jews.' He himself renders 'et Israel non congregabitur' (the exact opposite of Aquila).

XLIX. 7. **גָּזָה**. Most explain this as either an infinitival substantive or an uncommon adjective. But it is more natural (comp. next phrase) either to point **גָּזָה** (Aram. partic. Piel) with Luzzatto, or (as this would be unique in Hebr.) to read **נבזה** (comp. liii. 3) with Lagarde.

————— **מְחַעֵב**. According to Ew., Hitz., Del., a participial substantive in Piel = 'object of abhorrence' (Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 160 e, compares **מְחַחֵר** in liii. 3). Ges., however, remarks that the easiest explanation is to take the Piel as 'poetically intransitive' = **מְחַעֵב**. But how much more natural to read **מְחַעֵב** with Luzzatto (pointing, however, **מְחַעֵב**)! It really seems as if the authors of the points made a desperate, though partial, attempt to efface a meaning which was offensive to the national pride.

XLIX. 8. Ewald would insert **לאור נויים** from Sept., and supports this by Just. Mart. *c. Tryph. c. 122* (but wrongly, for Justin quotes from chap. xlii.). Against this, see Commentary.

XLIX. 12. **מִיָּם**. Clericus and Hupfeld (on Ps. cvii. 3) conjecture **מִיָּמִין** for the Psalm-passage, and this seems to be absolutely necessary there, since the West has been already mentioned in the parallel line.¹ It is, I think, but little less necessary here. It is clear from the mistakes of Sept. that abbreviations were of frequent occurrence in the most ancient Hebrew MSS. See the instances in Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, pp. 214-6 (a notable one is **εἰς θάνατον** = **לָמוּת**, as if this were abbreviated from **לְמִנּוּת**, liii. 8; see also Jer. iii. 19, Judg. xix. 18).

L. 4. **לְעוֹת**. If it is undesirable in any case to appeal solely to the superabundant Arabic vocabulary, it is specially so in a section so plain and natural in its phraseology. I incline to agree with Klostermann, that both **לְעוֹת** and **לְרַעַת** are only variants for the one true reading **לְרַעוֹת**. Comp. the use of **רָצָה** for 'to teach' in Prov. x. 21. Perhaps 'to edify' (suggested by Del. on Prov.) would be the best rendering.

LI. 6. **כְּמִוְכַן יִם**. Del. objects to a singular **כֶּן** to the plural **כְּנִיָּם** 'gnats,' as Talmudic (which has probably preserved a good many fragments of the Ancient Hebrew vocabulary) gives the singular as **כְּנִיָּה**. A friend suggests that **כֶּן** in Num. xiii. 33 may perhaps mean

¹ Auth. Vers., too, boldly renders in Ps. *l.c.* 'from the south,' though perhaps by a guess; see Poole, *Synopsis ad loc.*

'a gnat,' or collectively 'gnats' (parallel to כחנבים); but it seems safer and more natural in that place (the particle of comparison being wanting) to explain בָּן, on the analogy of the passages referred to in my note, as 'thus miserably.' An easy and, I think, self-evident correction of li. 6 is suggested by Dr. Weir. 'Is not,' he asks, 'the right reading כָּנִים, the next word beginning with יָמִ?'

LI. 19. מִי אֲנַחֲמֶךָ. I doubt if this text is translatable. The commentators quote Am. vii. 2, 5, but there מִי = 'in what plight,' a meaning which will not suit here. Probably there is an error of the ear, and we should read יִנְחֶמְךָ (*Notes and Criticisms*, p. 32; so afterwards Lagarde). Comp. the false reading כָּאֵר for כִּיאֵר, Am. viii. 8; אֵשׁ for יֵשׁ, 2 Sam. xiv. 9, וַיֵּאמֶר for וַיִּאמֶר, Zech. iv. 2, &c., הַיְצִיר for הַיְצִיר, Zech. xi. 13.

LI. 5. מְנַאֵץ. As Del. (3rd ed.) remarks, the pointing is very strange; we should expect the Pual partic., or, if a reflexive at all (which, however, seems out of place), Hithpoel and not Hithpoal. Luzzatto's view is very plausible, and in harmony with the phenomena brought out so fully (perhaps too fully) by Geiger in his *Urschrift*. He would point מְנַאֵץ, and accounts for the actual pointing from an aversion on the part of the Massorites to speak of Jehovah's name as 'reviled.' All that they succeeded in doing, however, was to shroud the passage in obscurity.

LI. 8 (end). On the view of the text adopted, Del. thinks we should expect לְצִיּוֹן; but the *accus. loci* is amply justified (see 2 Sam. xv. 34). At the end of my note (p. 37), I have suggested that שׁוֹב might be taken as the short for שְׁבוּת שְׁבוּת; comp. Ps. lxxxv. 5, where שְׁבוּתֵינוּ corresponds to שְׁבֹת יַעֲקֹב, v. 2 (Q'ri). One of the best discussions of שְׁבוּת is by Dr. Kuenen, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1873, pp. 520-21. *A priori*, it certainly seems probable that שְׁבוּת and שׁוֹב should be of cognate origin (comp. 'to rejoice with a great joy,' &c.); and, as a matter of fact, the meaning 'to restore the restoration of' suits all the passages in which the phrase occurs, whereas the alternative meaning does not. שְׁבוּת from שׁוֹב, as רְמוּת from רוּם (Ezek. xxxii. 5), לְזוּת from לוּז=לוֹץ (Prov. iv. 24).

LI. 15. יָזָה. No word in the whole of the Old Testament so forcibly exemplifies the necessity for keeping the philological department in exegesis separate from the theological (see Preface to Vol. i. p. xi.). Through a failure in this respect, even Dr. Pusey is unable (be it said with all respect) to state the facts of Hebrew usage accurately.¹ The truth is, as Mr. Taylor remarks, that 'הַזָּה does not mean *besprinkle* (a person *with* a liquid), but *sprinkle* (a liquid *upon* a person)';² Mr. Urwick wholly misses the point when, after Reinke,

¹ *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Translators*, Introduction to the English Translation, by Rev. E. B. Pusey, p. xxxviii.

² Review of *The Fifty-Third Chapter*, &c., in the *Academy*, May 19. 1877. p. 441.

he quotes Lev. iv. 6, 17, in favour of the old rendering.¹ In one point, I entirely agree with Dr. Pusey, viz. that the reference of many of the moderns to the Arabic *nazâ*, 'to leap,' is out of place. The case is parallel to that of עוֹת in l. 6. There are so many undoubtedly Hebrew words both for 'to help' and 'to leap,' that it is quite unnecessary to resort to the Arabic Lexicon. It is also worth noticing (though the objection is not absolutely fatal) that *nazâ* is rare in grave and classical literature, being used properly of animals, and mostly in an obscene sense.² If a conjecture is to be ventured upon (for Mr. Taylor's new interpretation of ייה—see note on Essay X.—seems the effort of despair), I would suggest יִחַר (if no one has offered it before). The word occurs in Hab. iii. 6 (comp. Job xxxvii. 1) with an implication of fear; but in another context it might be used differently. A reference to Stade's comparative table of the forms of the Hebrew characters will show that the confusion between יחַר and ייה might easily have occurred.

Dr. Weir's comment on this word and its context is peculiar. He sees no difficulty in the omission of עַל or אַל after יִיָּהּ, which he regards as a justifiable poetical licence (as if a licence of this kind were credible, when so much depended on intelligibility—consider the position of this prophecy!); nor yet in the context, which he considers to be in perfect harmony with the meaning sprinkle. He explains the connection thus:—'As many shrank back in horror from him, as one unclean or accursed . . . so shall he sprinkle many. Many who looked upon him as unclean, and avoided and loathed him as such, shall themselves be cleansed by him.' But where is the Servant said to be a priest?

LIII. 3. חָרַל אִישִׁים. Dr. Kay explains, 'ceasing to be of men'; or so mean appearance that He 'was no longer reckoned with men' (A. Ezra). But Job xix. 14, and the analogy of the Arabic *khaḍilu* 'abstaining from aiding' or 'holding back from going with' (Lane), justifies the rendering adopted (so Del.).

LIII. 4. Many MSS., Pesh., Vulg., insert הוּא before שְׂבַלִּים. This adds force, and Lowth and Bleek incline to accept it.

LIII. 5. שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ. 32 MSS. read שְׁלוֹמֵינוּ, and Dr. Weir suggests שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ 'our retribution.'

LIII. 7. נִעְנָה. *Nifal tolerativum*; comp. v. 12, lv. 6, lxx. 1, Ps. ii. 10, Gen. xiii. 16. We need not therefore quote Ex. x. 3 (with Del.); the syncope of ה in Nifal is questionable (see on i. 12). On the syntax of the clause, see Del.'s note in his 3rd ed.

LIII. 8. וְאֶת־דִּירוֹ וְגו'. For the view of the construction, see Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 277 d (= *Hebr. Syntax*, by Kennedy, p. 38), where Ew. compares, not indeed our passage, but lvii. 15, Ezek.

¹ Urwick, *The Servant of Jehovah*, p. 102.

² See Tayler Lewis, 'The Purifying Messiah; Interpretation of Isa. liii. 13'; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1873, pp. 166-177.

xvii. 21, xliv. 3, Neh. ix. 19, and refers to the demonstrative force of **אָנ** in the Hebrew of the Mishna.—To revert to the exegesis. Dr. Weir thinks that liii. 8a is precisely parallel to xxxviii. 12, 'my age (*i.e.* my full life-circle, my life-time) is cut off like a weaver's web'; but the meaning thus ascribed to **דָּוִר** is arbitrary. **דָּוִר** can only have one of these three meanings—(a) 'his contemporaries', (b) 'those like-minded with him' (**דָּוִר** = a class of characters,¹ comp. Ps. xii. 8, xiv. 5, cxii. 2, Prov. xxx. 11–14), or (c) 'his dwelling,' *i.e.* his grave (comp. xxxviii. 12). Both (b) and (c) anticipate unnaturally the statements of subsequent verses; Seinecke (approved by Riehm) thinks that (b) is supported by the plural suffix in **לָמוּ**, but see next note. (a) is favoured by the parallel passage, lvii. 1.

LIII. 8. **לָמוּ**. I had already, in 1870, explained this mysterious form (*I. C. A.*, p. 192) by a reference to the Phœnician suffix *ê* or *êm* for the 3rd pers. sing., following Schröder (*Die Phönizische Sprache*, p. 153), and Bickell (*Theologisches Literaturblatt*, Bonn, 1869, p. 366).² Dr. Pusey, in 1877, notices the same linguistic fact (*Jewish Interpreters*, &c. p. liii.), but overlooks his English predecessor. The suffix *ê* reminds us of course of Aramaic; the appended *m* is doubtless 'a remnant of the primitive Semitic "nunnation" or "mim-dation"; in other words, the pronoun of the third person singular, like the noun, was terminated by *n* or *m*.' The same explanation in all probability applies to the suffix in *em* in viii. 15 (see note above), and those in *āmō* or *ēmō* in xliv. 15, Job xx. 23, xxii. 2, xxvii. 23, Ps. xi. 7, but not to Gen. ix. 26, 27, Ps. xxviii. 8,³ lxxiii. 10 (where the reference is collective). The *o* in the Hebrew form seems to point to a marginal note, to the effect that *ō* or *āv* was to be read, and not *āmō* or *ēmō*. The correct pronunciation would therefore seem to be *bēm*, *lēm*, *pānēm*, &c.—It is quite true, as my late friend, Dr. Diestel observed,⁴ that the above merely proves the possibility that **לָמוּ** may be singular, but when the remainder of this paragraph (putting aside the dubious **בַּמַּחֲיוֹ**) is so strikingly individualising in its phraseology, have we not a right to demand that of two possible meanings that one should be chosen which harmonises with this cast of phraseology? Dr. Diestel certainly misses the mark when he maintains that my view is against the usage of II. Isaiah, referring to **לָמוּ** in xliv. 15, as 'also collective.' It is noteworthy that both Pesh. and Vulg. understand the suffix to be singular; Targ., however, to be plural.

LIII. 9. **עָשִׂיר**. To the difficulty urged in my note (p. 48), I may add that to use **עָשִׂיר** synonymously with **חָסִיד** or **צָדִיק** is quite

¹ Or, as Del. untranslatablely expresses it, 'Einem Zeitgeist huldigende Zeitgenossenschaft' (on Ps. xii. 8).

² See also Stade in *Morgenländische Forschungen* (1875), p. 202, &c.; *Lehrbuch der hebr. Gramm.* (1879), p. 205.

³ But here we should probably read, with Sept., **לָעִמּוֹ**.

⁴ Knobel's *Jesaja*, 4te Aufl., von Dr. L. Diestel (1872), p. 444.

natural, for עני is etymologically 'humble,' and 'humility' is the fundamental note of Biblical piety. But עשיר has not the parallel root-meaning of 'proud.' It is therefore not without some reason that Del. has abandoned the view which he held as lately as 1864 (*Hibb.* 1st Ausg., note on xxi. 28), viz. that 'rich' here = ungodly,' and now maintains that there is an antithesis between the first clause and the second—'He was appointed to be buried with deceased malefactors, but when dead he was appointed to lie in a rich man's grave.' It seems to me as if Delitzsch had here *for once* confounded philological and Christian exegesis.—Ewald (and so *I. C. A.*) conjectures עשוק. Against this it is urged by Del. that the word (which he wrongly quotes as עשוק) occurs nowhere else. This, however, is not decisive; both בָּנוּר and בָּחוּן are ἀπαξ λεγόμενα.

LIII. 9. בַּמָּתוֹ. There is no evidence that מָתוּם was used for 'the state of death,' on the analogy of חַיִּים; nor yet for 'violent death,' which is rather מָוֹתוֹת, Ezek. xxviii. 8 (which determines the reading of *v.* 10), and even מָוֹתוֹת is only used in construction with a *collective* noun. The alternatives are either to read בַּמָּתוֹ or בַּמָּתוֹ. The former, which is the reading of three of de Rossi's MSS.,¹ is rendered either 'his tombs' or 'his tomb,' according as we suppose the subject of the prophecy to be a collective term for a real person: in the latter case, the plural will be honorific (comp. מַשְׁכָּנֹת, Isa. liv. 2, Ps. cxxxii. 5). I much doubt, however, whether בַּמָּתוֹ will bear the rendering 'tomb.' It is true, there is the analogy of בָּמָתוֹ in Job xxi. 32, but the very definite use of בַּמָּתוֹ, both in Biblical and in Rabbinic Hebrew, for 'high place' or 'altar,' makes this wider use highly improbable. Ezek. xliii. 7 has been quoted in its favour, but in that passage we ought, with the Babylonian Codex, to point בַּמָּתוֹתָם. On the whole, I prefer בַּמָּתוֹ; an intrusive ' is no novelty in the O. T. text. 'In his death' = after his death (Lev. xi. 31, &c.); Shakspeare's 'Speak me fair in death.'

LIII. 10. הַחֵלִי. I understand this as referring to דַּכְאוֹ (comp. Mic. vi. 13, Nah. iii. 19), but not as grammatically in combination with it. This seems the most natural view.

— תַּשִּׁים. The difficulty of rendering the text-reading *naturally* is obvious, whether we prefer to make יְהוָה or נַפְשׁוֹ the subject. A similar error in Ps. xlix. 19.

LIII. 12. רַב־בָּיִם. The rendering adopted is the only one fully in harmony with the parallel line. The alternative is to take the preposition distributively, as serving to specialise the contents of the הַלֵּק; comp. e.g. Gen. xxiii. 18 (Job xxxix. 17, often referred to, is an unfortunate example, for it would suggest that the הַלֵּק only included a part, and not the whole, of the רַב־בָּיִם). Del.'s note on

¹ Ibn Ezra keeps the reading בַּמָּתוֹ, but gives 'ב' the sense of 'tomb,' and says that it has two construct forms of the plural, like סָרִיס.

this passage is obscurely expressed, and *seems* inconsistent with his translation.

LIV. 9. The Babylonian Codex has **בְּיָמָיו**.

LIV. 15. **יָגֵר**. The renderings 'sojourn,' 'congregate,' do not suit the context. As Ewald rightly holds, **יָגֵר** borrows its meaning here from **גָּרָה** (comp. **יָגֵר—צוּר**, **בָּנוּ—בָּנוּ**, **יָגֵר—בָּנוּ**), as in Ps. cxl. 3.

—— **עָלֶיךָ יִפּוֹל**. Alt. rend., which brings before us Israel's moral conquest of his enemies, is not in harmony with the context, which speaks only of the failure of their hostile enterprises. Besides, as Dr. Kay points out, the preposition here precedes the verb; where the phrase **עַל נִפַּל** or **לְ נִפַּל** means 'to join the opposite party,' the preposition follows. Perhaps, however, this is too subtle a distinction.

LIV. 17. **תִּרְשִׁיעַ**. Comp. Syriac *khōb* 'to be defeated,' *z'kā* 'to conquer.'

LV. 13. **שָׂם**. This is one of the passages which seem to require the rendering 'monument' (note **אֹזֶת** in the parallel clause). See also especially lvi. 5, Ps. cxxxviii. 2 (observe **כָּל**, which hardly suits the rend. 'name'), (2 Sam. iii. 13, Gen. xi. 4). In fact, if Ges.'s etymology be accepted, this should be the primary meaning of the word.

LVI. 11. Read **הִקְמָה הַרְעִים**.

LVII. 3 end. Klostermann reads **מִנְאִפֶּת יִזְנֶה**, simplifying the construction at the expense of a tautology.

LVII. 13. **קְבוּצִיךָ**. Sept. **ἐν ἧ ἑλίψει σου**, 'probably reading **קְבוּצִיךָ** or **בְּצוּקְתֶךָ**, an indication that there was some different arrangement of the letters of the text, and apparently favouring 'שְׁקוּצִיךָ.' Dr. Weir.

LVIII. 6. 'The ancient versions seem to have had a different text.' Dr. Weir.

LVIII. 7. **מְרִירִים**. Read **מְרִירִים**. An accidental transposition, as in 2 Kings xi. 2, where the k'thibh is, by an obvious error, **מְרִירִים**. Ewald apparently supposes a peculiarity of pronunciation in both cases (*Lehrbuch*, § 131 d); but surely this is improbable. Del. assumes a secondary formation from **רִיר** viz. **מְרִיר**, of which the form in the text would be a passive participle.

On LVIII. 11. **יְחַלֵּץ**. The ancient versions stumbled at this word, and it is possible that we have here a very ancient corruption of **יְחַלֵּץ**, 'he shall renew.' But we need not in this case read **עֲצָמְתֶךָ**, 'thy strength' (as Secker and Lowth); Hupfeld (on Ps. vi. 3) well compares Ps. xxxii. 3, 'my bones waxed old.'

LVIII. 12. **מִמֶּךָ**. 'Should we not read **בְּבִנְיָךָ**?' Dr. Weir. The text-reading is, of course, not untranslatable, but there is no obvious reason here for such a construction. The case is different in Ps. lxxviii. 27, Job xviii. 15.

LIX. 3. **נִגְאָלִי**. The same form (the passive of the Arabic

seventh verbal stem) occurs in Lam. iv. 14. It is odd that it should only occur as a derivation of גאל. Luzzatto suspects that the authors of the points wished to avoid a confusion with נגאלו from גאל 'to redeem.'

LIX. 18. בעל. The versions seem to have found this grammatical anomaly unintelligible; so too Bp. Lowth, who adopts בעל for בעל from Targ. (see his note).

———— The difficulty of the closing words lies in the fact that פקח is elsewhere only used of the eyes or (once, viz., xlii. 20) of the ears. We should therefore expect, ולעורים פקחוקח. It is tempting to suppose that we have in the Massoretic text a combination of two readings—one, that just quoted (favoured by Sept.), and the other ולאסורים פתחתהו (favoured by Pesh., Vulg.). This is the view of Dr. Neubauer, who remarks that a combination of this sort, where manuscript authorities were equally divided, would be quite in the spirit of the Massoretic critics (*Academy*, June 11, 1870).

LXIII. 3. ואורכם. Point this, and the corresponding verbs in this and the following verses, according to the rule of 'vāv consecutive.' So Luzzatto. It is only those who are unaware of the numerous instances in which, from exegetical or theological peculiarities, or from some obscure causes, the Massoretic punctuation is entirely or probably erroneous, who will accuse such a proceeding of uncritical rashness. Here the cause of the wrong pointing is patent—it is the theory, embalmed in that other record (the Massoretic punctuation being also one) of early Jewish exegetical traditions, the Targum, that this section of prophecy relates to the future (comp. on xliii. 28.) It is singular that in v. 5 the authors of the points should have allowed themselves to write וחישיש mechanically following lix. 16). This is one of those inconsistencies which occasionally puzzle us in the Massoretic punctuation.—Comp. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, § 84 a, 176 Obs. 1, (he inclines to agree as to וחישי).

———— אגאלתי. The initial א is miswritten by an Aramaism for ה; comp. Jer. xxv. 3, and perhaps Mic. vii. 15.

LXIII. 9. Dr. Kay objects that לו צר can only mean, 'he was reduced to a strait,' 'which, of course, is not suitable here.' But it is as suitable as any other anthropomorphic expression (see, e.g., lix. 16).

LXIII. 11. The reason why the accents unite עמו משה appears from Targ., which paraphrases 'the mighty deeds which he had done through Moses to his people.'

———— The Babylonian Codex has רעי; Baer, too, adopts this as the Massoretic reading. This determines the subject of בקרבו.

LXIII. 15. The meaning 'habitation' has been generally acquiesced in, but seems very uncertain, and has no philological foundation. The verb זבל is found only in Gen. xxx. 20, where it is commonly rendered 'dwell (with me),' not to suit the context, but

in obedience to a prejudice as to the meaning of זבול. The writer himself seems to have felt that the root זבל was unfamiliar to his readers, and he therefore selects an alternative root זבר to illustrate זבלון. We are evidently justified in expecting some light from the allied languages, especially from Assyrian. In Chaldee, זבל, and the cognate words have no connection with the idea of 'dwelling,' but with that of 'manure.' In Arabic, too, according to Lane, *zabala* means—1. to dung, manure; 2. to bear, carry. The latter meaning is important for us, for M. Stanislas Guyard has lately pointed out¹ that Assyrian also possesses the root *zabal*, in the sense of 'bearing' (whence *zabil kudurri*,² 'crown-bearer' = Arab. *wazir* [vizier], a title of the kings tributary to Assyria), and hence of 'elevating.' My friend Mr. Sayce corroborates the meaning of 'elevation' for *zabal* by a reference to bilingual tablets (see, e.g., the *British Museum Inscriptions*, vol. ii. p. 15, l. 45), where the Accadian *sagil* (lit. 'high head')³ is explained by the Assyrian *zabal*. It cannot be denied that several passages of the Old Testament gain in force if we explain זבל on the analogy of *zabal*. How suitably, for instance, does Solomon, after alluding to Jehovah's dwelling in 'thick clouds,' refer to the newly built temple as a בֵּית זָבַל 'a house of height' (1 Kings xii. 12, 13, comp. ix. 8a), a house which by its elevation pointed men upwards to the heavenly temple (comp. Isa. vi. 1)! How opposite is the same sense of 'elevation' in a description of the sun and moon (Hab. iii. 11)! We cannot exactly see this of Ps. xlix. 15, but the decided meaning of 'glory' (already hit upon by the Vulgate) is at any rate as suitable to that obscure and perhaps corrupt passage as any other. In Gen. xxx. 20, where the verb occurs, the same decided meaning of 'honour' is appropriate, and, as M. Guyard remarks, avoids the necessity of understanding a preposition. In the passage of Isaiah before us, the gain in force by substituting 'height' for 'habitation' is obvious. Of course, a vague sense like 'habitation' may just suffice for the passages in which זבול occurs. But what *greater* claim has it than 'elevation'? The supposed tradition in its favour seems really to be based on a guess.

———— We might take the second part of the verse as a question, with Dr. Grätz, who also reads אֵלֵינוּ (comp. Sept.)

LXIII. 19. The versions (see p. 109) certainly favour the supposition of corruptness, though II. Isaiah does contain rather extreme cases of constructions in which the logical syntax is not expressed, e.g. xli. 2 a, 24, xlvi. 14 b. Mr. Driver compares Gen. xxxi. 40, Job xii. 4.

¹ 'Remarques sur le mot assyrien *zabal*, &c. ; *Journal asiatique*, août-sept., 1878, pp. 220-5. A part of M. Guyard's evidence, however, seems doubtful.

² Mr. Norris, with exemplary self-restraint, leaves this title untranslated (*Assyrian Dictionary*, i. 310).

³ Comp. 130 and 227a in the Syllabary in Sayce's *Elementary Assyrian Grammar*.

LXIV. 4 (5). אַתָּה. Grätz (*Monatsschrift*, 1880, p. 52) reads עַתָּה; 'formerly thou wast favourable, but *now* thou art wroth.' But there is an emphasis in the אַתָּה (how often the personal pronoun is used when Jehovah speaks!). 'It was because *thou*, whose nature is to be gracious, became angry,' &c.

—— וְנַחֲמָא. The rend. adopted seems called for (as against Del.'s) by the statement at the end of *v.* 6 (7).

—— בְּהֵם עוֹלָם. To illustrate Ew.'s view of the passage, comp. iii. 12 (note above). It is against it, however, that קִצְף is never elsewhere constructed with בְּ. (Del. takes בְּהֵם in a neuter sense (so St. Jerome, 'in ipsis,' sc. peccatis); comp. xxx. 6, xxxviii. 16, xlv. 15, Ezek. xxxiii. 18. Possible; but probable here?)

LXV. 15. וְהִמִּיתְךָ וְנֹו. The suffix seems to me to prove that this is a fragment of a formula of imprecation. Not, however, the opening words. Hence the perfect need not be the precative, the existence of which is doubtful (see on xliii. 9), nor need we be surprised by the omission of בְּהֵם or בְּאֵלֶיהָ.

. The reader is requested to take notice of a few Addenda to these Notes at the beginning of this volume.

ESSAYS
ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE COMMENTARY
ON ISAIAH.

I. THE OCCASIONAL PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY.

I.

THE editor of a modern classic of the interest and importance of the Book of Isaiah would naturally preface his illustrations with a life of his author. But of Isaiah what has the editor to tell? Later legend, indeed, hovered busily about the prophet;¹ but, except as giving evidence of his posthumous influence, its imaginative creations are of no interest to the student of Isaiah. The prophet is not, however, a mere name, *vox et præterea nihil*, for his works are the monuments of a widely-reaching activity; and through his teaching, and probably through a scanty but enthusiastic band of disciples,² he was the means of beginning, or at any rate of greatly strengthening, that remarkable phase of belief which we may call, in the literal sense of the word, the Messianic. Of the latter I shall say more in a subsequent essay; my immediate subject is the place of Isaiah in the history of his times, and the chronological arrangement of his extant³ prophecies.

By thus limiting my subject, I do not intend to deny that Isaiah, by some of his prophecies, was an important factor in the history of later times—that he foretold, and by foretelling contributed to bring about (for such is the Biblical doctrine of prophecy⁴), events long subsequent to his own age; but I am equally far from affirming it. Either course would require me to carry my researches into the domain of the 'higher criticism,' whereas at present, in the interests of the student, I have limited myself to the functions of an exegete, and only pretend to set before the reader the facts (sometimes the conflicting facts) supplied by the text itself.

¹ One Rabbinic authority makes Amoz, the father of Isaiah, a brother of King Amaziah, and there is a general agreement that Isaiah himself was martyred by being sawn asunder at the order of Manasseh. (See references in Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaja*, i. 3-15.) The former story is evidently based on an etymological fancy; the latter may have been occasioned by Isa. lii. 13-14. 12. (So Fürst, *Geschichte der biblischen Literatur*, ii. 393).

² Comp. viii. 12-16, xxviii. 23-29; both passages presuppose such a band of disciples.

³ For of course we have no reason to assume that all Isaiah's prophetic writings have been preserved.

⁴ Comp. notes on ix. 8, lv. 11. This doctrine of the self-fulfilling power of prophecy explains the imprisonments of Micaiah and Jeremiah, and a similar belief is presupposed in the narrative of Balaam (Num. xxii. 6).

The prophecies with which I am now concerned are the occasional ones—that is, those which were called forth by passing events. A difference of opinion in specifying these is hardly possible, except in the case of xxi. 1–10, but critics are very much divided as to the time when the prophecies were composed. Nor can this be greatly wondered at. In the first place, Israelitish history has only come down to us in fragments. If even the plays of Aristophanes contain numerous obscure allusions, though the author lived subsequently to the rise of history (*ιστορίη*), how much more should we expect this to be the case with the religious literature of a nation with no gift for scientific research! In the second place, it is evident from the form of not a few prophecies that they are summaries of discourses delivered at various times, and even when it is not so, the cultivated style of the oracles sufficiently proves that they have been much altered since the time of delivery; we cannot, therefore, be sure that they give an absolutely faithful picture of the prophet's original feelings and circumstances. Hence a distinction must be drawn between two entirely separate objects of enquiry—viz. 1. the date of Isaiah's original discourse or discourses, and 2. that of the final editing of the discourse or summarising of the discourses.¹

But it may be asked, Have we not already in the Book of Isaiah itself an authoritative chronological arrangement? This is the view of Hengstenberg. 'In the first six chapters,' remarks this celebrated critic, 'we obtain a survey of the prophet's ministry under Uzziah and Jotham. Chap. vii. to x. 4 belongs to the time of Ahaz. From x. 4 to the end of chap. xxxv. everything 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. xxxvi.–xxxix., 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.'² The faults of this theory are, 1. that it implies the infallibility of the later Jewish editors of Isaiah, and 2. that it regards the prophecies of Isaiah, or at any rate those in the first part, as if they had been sent out into the world singly, whereas internal evidence strongly favours the view that underlying our present book there are several partial collections, made either by Isaiah, or by Isaiah's dis-

¹ See *I. C. A.*, introduction, p. xii.

² *Christology of the Old Testament*, ii. 2, 3.

ciples, or perhaps some by the former, and others by the latter. If we accept this position, it will be extremely unlikely that after the combination of these small collections the prophecies should turn out to be in exact chronological order. In fact, before the recent Assyrian discoveries it seemed easy to show that this was no less improbable than the similar view that the Minor Prophets, as they stand, are in chronological order; for how could the section x. 5-xii. 6, evidently written in the crisis of an invasion, be rightly placed so far from chaps. xxviii.-xxxii., which only express an increasing confidence that an invasion was inevitable? The discovery of the large part played by Sargon in the affairs of Palestine has, it is true, made Hengstenberg's position a more tenable one. The prophecy in x. 5-xii. 6 may conceivably refer to the invasion of Sargon, and those in xxviii.-xxxii. to that of Sennacherib.¹ Hence it is less surprising that, after being abandoned by scholars in general, Hengstenberg's view should again be independently maintained by Mr. George Smith the Assyriologist.² Still, some of the old objections to it remain in full force. Some prophecies (*e.g.* chap. i. and chap. xvii. 1-11) cannot be in their right chronological order, unless the remarks in the preceding commentary are very far wrong indeed. The evidence for the existence of groups of prophecies is moreover too strong to be disregarded; and it would argue a mean estimate of the intellect of those who formed these groups to suppose that chronology was their only guide, and that affinity of subjects had no influence on their selection of prophecies.

I assume, then, that the actual order of the prophecies in the Book of Isaiah is not strictly chronological. The results of the present work, however, tend to show that the deviations from chronological accuracy are not considerable. A brief summary will make this at once clear, and serve as a table of contents to the introductions in the preceding commentary.

Isaiah came forward as a young prophet (vi. 1) in the year of the death of Azariah,³ that warlike and enterprising monarch, who ventured to defy Assyria by heading a confederacy of discontented Syrian powers. Jotham, the next

¹ This is certainly conceivable, but far from probable, as the phraseological points of contact between the prophecy in x. 5-xii. 6 and chaps. xxviii. xxix. (see vol. i. p. 68) naturally suggests a contemporary origin.

² *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, ii. (1873), 328-9.

³ The text of Isa. vi. 1 calls him Uziah, and so 2 Kings xv. 13, 2 Chr. xxvi.; but the name is given as Azariah in 2 Kings xiv. 21, and in the contemporary Assyrian inscriptions as Azriyâu. On the Syrian coalition, see vol. i., p. 43, and note the reference to Schrader.

king, was as secular in tastes as his father, and the denunciations in chap. ii. and in ix. 8-x. 4 may well have been delivered in substance during his reign. In these sterner passages our prophet reminds us of his predecessor Amos. But as soon as a real calamity draws near, the tone of his discourses begins to soften, and the passages which we naturally turn to as typical of his genius are centred in the three invasions of Judah by Rezin, Sargon, and Sennacherib. Rezin and his Israelitish vassal were already at the gates of Jerusalem when Isaiah delivered the substance of the prophecies in vii. 1-ix. 7, famous as containing the first distinct predictions of the Messiah. Chap. xvii. 1-11 evidently belongs to the same period, but is probably a little earlier than vii. 1-ix. 7. In 724 (?) Shalmaneser opened that siege of Samaria which was so soon brought to its fatal end by Sargon,¹ and we may presume that chap. xxviii. embodies the discourses of Isaiah on that striking occasion; but Shalmaneser has left but little impression on the Israelitish literature compared with Sargon, his successor. It is to this king's interference with the affairs of Judah² that we are, as I believe, indebted for the following important group of prophecies:—

Chap. xiv. 29-32, a prophecy on Philistia.

Chap. xix. 1-16, a prophecy on Egypt.

Chap. xx., a prophecy on Egypt and Ethiopia.

Chap. xxix.-xxxii., a prophecy on the Egyptian alliance and the Assyrian invasion.

Chap. x. 5-xi. 16, a prophecy on the Assyrian invasion and the times following.

Chap. xxii., a prophecy on the siege of Jerusalem.

Chap. i., a prophecy on the spiritual lessons of the invasion.

(Perhaps also chap. xvi. 13, 14, the epilogue attached to an older prophecy on Moab, and chap. xxi. 11-17, containing short prophecies on Dumah and Kedar.)

The Philistines, destined to suffer so much from Assyria, were already hankering after independence, when Isaiah wrote the short prophecy in xiv. 29-32: 'The rod which smote them' (*i.e.* Shalmaneser) was 'broken,' but the prophet warned them that the new king (Sargon) would dart upon them like a basilisk, and punish them for their disobedience. The unfavourable 'oracle of Egypt' (xix. 1-16) probably comes from the same period. The 'hard lord' into whose hand the Egyptians are to be delivered (xix. 4) is Sargon,

¹ There is some doubt respecting the chronological limits of the siege of Samaria; it is safest, however, to follow Sargon's express statement, that he captured Samaria in the beginning of his reign. See further Schrader, *K. G. F.*, pp. 314-15; Smith, *The Pponym Canon*, p. 175.

² See introd. to x. 5-xii. 6 (vol. i. pp. 68, 69).

and the event referred to is the defeat of Shabaka, King of Egypt and Ethiopia, B.C. 720, near the Philistine town of Raphia. It does not appear that Sargon interfered with Judah on this occasion. Hezekiah had probably refrained from assisting Shabaka, so that the Assyrian army would naturally keep to the coast-road. The security of Judah will also perhaps account for the falling off in style which has been noticed in chap. xix. When the danger was nearer home, the prophet's voice became trumpet-toned.

The woes denounced on Egypt in chap. xix. were not immediately realised, and in chap. xx. Isaiah renews his warning. Still, the results of the battle of Raphia were by no means insignificant. To Rahab, 'the arrogant one,' (such was the symbolic name of Egypt in Hebrew: see on xxx. 7) the acknowledgment of Assyrian supremacy was galling in the extreme; a still greater national calamity was the dismemberment of the country (see introduction to chap. xx.). That Hezekiah should have thought it worth while after this to seek Egyptian assistance is a fact so improbable that nothing short of Isaiah's authority (see chaps. xxx. xxxi.) could establish it. Chap. xxix. also belongs in substance to this period; it declares that Jerusalem itself is in imminent peril. Shortly after, in xxxii. 9-20, the prophet repeats his denunciation to the frivolous ladies of Jerusalem.

Nor are these the only words spoken by the great prophet at this dark period. The two prophecies on the Egyptian alliance contain some passages which clearly refer to this later stage in the history. Thus chap. xxx. 18-33 evidently assumes that the people of Judah are actually suffering from an Assyrian invasion, and xxxi. 4 announces that Jehovah will, as it were, personally descend, and fight for Jerusalem. We are, in fact, in the midst of the first of the two invasions under Hezekiah, when Sargon (*i.e.* probably his Tartan, or commander-in-chief) took 'all the fenced cities of Judah.'¹ Hezekiah had probably followed the example of Yavan, King of Ashdod, and refused the usual tribute to the King of Assyria; so, at least, we may infer from the statement of Sargon that the Judahites who used to bring tribute, were 'speaking treason.'² The fate of Ashdod seemed likely to become that of Jerusalem, and Isaiah (who had already pointed out the danger, xx. 6) felt the urgency of the call for prophetic admonition. Of his discourses during this critical period at least three appear to have been preserved—chap. x.

¹ 2 Kings xviii. 13 (= Isa. xxxvi. 1). On this passage, see vol. i. p. 197.

² See introd. to chap. xx. (vol. i. pp. 120-1).

5-xii. 6, chap. xiv. 24-27, and chap. xxii. The date of the first two is absolutely certain (see introd.), and even Mr. Robertson Smith admits that they were written in the time of Sargon.¹ The only reasonable doubt can be with regard to chap. xxii., the explanation of which, as the student will have seen, requires a more than ordinary degree of exegetical tact.

At length the tide of invasion turned, and very soon afterwards, if I am not mistaken, in a case which again especially calls for tact, Isaiah wrote one of his most beautiful prophecies, chap. i. The generality of its contents (which marks it out as composed for an introduction) makes it unusually difficult to pronounce upon its date; yet there is some internal evidence which points to the time of Sargon's invasion. It would, in fact, be an incongruity if a prophet like Isaiah had been able to compose a purely literary work.

Three years after the subjugation of Judah occurred an event second only in importance for Palestine to the battle of Raphia—the conquest of Babylonia by Sargon (710). From a narrative certainly based on an early tradition (2 Kings xx. 12, &c. = Isaiah xxxix. 1, &c.), we may probably infer that Hezekiah had had some thoughts of a Babylonian alliance. Isaiah would, of course, be opposed to this, but the fall of Babylon must have profoundly shocked him as an evidence of the (humanly speaking) irresistible progress of Assyria. The prophecy in xxi. 1-10, which, taken by itself, is so obscure,² seems in most respects easier of explanation, if we refer its origin to the siege of Babylon in 710. I say 'in most respects,' for I do not deny the striking plausibility of some of the arguments for a Captivity origin.

Isaiah took no narrow view of his prophetic mission, and the fall of Babylon was, according to him, a warning to other nations besides his own. 'Behold the land of Chaldea,' he cried to the proud merchant people of Phœnicia; 'this people is no more' (xxiii. 13). Indeed, Tyre was nearer to the common foe, and had a still better reason for alarm (in proportion to its greater power) than the second-rate or third-rate kingdom of Judah. So sure is Jehovah's prophet of the catastrophe that he bursts into an elegiac ode on the ruin of Zidon's greatest daughter. The concluding verses of the chapter, however, which form no part of the elegy, and seem

¹ *The Prophets of Israel* (1882), pp. 297-8.

² The obscurity consists in the depression into which the writer apparently falls at the news of the fall of Babylon. In *I. C. A.*, p. xxvii., I conjectured that he was 'almost unmanned by affection for his adopted home.' But this is not very probable in a pious Jewish exile, and the theory of a Babylonian origin is also opposed (though not, of course, absolutely disproved) by the numerous points of contact with Isaiah (see vol. i. pp. 123-4).

to have been added by an after-thought, prophesy a revival of Tyre at the end of 'seventy years.'¹

The third event which called forth the energies of the prophet was the invasion of Sennacherib; the attendant circumstances have been described already (vol. i. pp. 200-3). Great as the war was—greater even than the invasion of Sargon—only four of the extant prophecies appear to have been originated by it. These are chap. xviii., chap. xvii. 12-14, chap. xxxiii., and chap. xxxvii. 22-35 (or 32). The first of the four was evidently produced by the news of the approach of the Assyrians, and the consequent excitement of the warlike Ethiopians. The second and third were (according to the historical sketch referred to above) probably composed during the march of the Assyrian general, who, after capturing forty-six fortified towns, was so wonderfully and providentially checked beneath the walls of Jerusalem. The fourth has all the incisive energy which we should expect from the circumstances under which the Book of Isaiah itself declares it to have been delivered.

2.

Such now appears to me, upon a reconsideration of the subject, to be the most probable chronological arrangement of the occasional prophecies. My endeavour has been to avoid arbitrary conjecture, and, whenever practicable, to explain the prophet's allusions from the contemporary Assyrian inscriptions. I confess therefore to some disappointment when that excellent scholar, Mr. Robertson Smith, expresses the opinion that one of the historical bases of the preceding sketch is unsound, and that 'the mere statement of this hypothesis is sufficient to show its extreme improbability.'² A page or two in reply to Mr. Robertson Smith's leading objections is indispensable to complete this essay.

Did Sargon invade Judah, and threaten, or even capture Jerusalem, or not? The grounds on which three well-known Assyriologists³ maintain that he did, have been already given; the documentary evidence is, no doubt, scanty, still it exists, and historical probability is altogether in favour of this view. Mr. Robertson Smith's counter argument has not yet been put in a complete form; but appearances rather indicate

¹ Hence one of the arguments for the view that the epilogue, as we may call these verses, is the work of some unknown writer at the close of the Babylonian exile. Against it see my note on xxiii. 15-18.

² *The Prophets of Israel*, (1882), p. 206.

³ Sayce, Schrader, and Oppert.

that he has been biassed by a partiality for a distinguished recent critic.

In admiration for Julius Wellhausen's brilliant genius I hardly yield to Mr. Robertson Smith. But I cannot help adding that his insight is sometimes marred by excessive self-assertion. His personal dislikes are indeed painfully visible in some of his critiques in the Göttingen *Gelehrte Anzeigen*, and his bias against Assyriology¹ (shared, it is true, by others in Germany) comes out very strongly in an article in vol. xx. of the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* (1875), replied to with exemplary calmness by Schrader, in vol. ii. of the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* (1876), in his article on 'The Azriyâhu of the cuneiform inscriptions, and the Azaryah of the Bible.' I am the more confirmed in my opinion that Mr. Robertson Smith has been 'misled' by German influences, when I notice his own insufficient estimate of the value of the Assyriologists' work in p. 377 of *The Prophets of Israel*, where Gutschmid's extravagant attack on Assyriology is characterised as setting forth the state of things 'very forcibly, though perhaps (!) with an extreme of scepticism,' and no mention is made of Schrader's reply, so impressive from its honesty and documentary completeness, in the *K. G. F.*

Mr. Robertson Smith objects to the view which I have advocated, that it represents Judah as suffering 'precisely in the same way, and to the same extent,' both from Sargon and Sennacherib, that 'history does not repeat itself exactly,' and that 'we must conclude that Isaiah held precisely similar language in the two cases, and that he did this in the second invasion without making any reference back to the events of the siege which has called forth similar predictions two years before' (p. 295). 'Precisely' and 'exactly' are words that shoot beyond the mark. It has not been asserted that history 'repeated itself exactly,' nor that Isaiah used 'precisely similar language' in the two cases. History may surely have repeated itself in the career of Hezekiah, as it did in that of Merodach-Baladan, but the repetition need not have been 'exact'; all that is claimed by Mr. Sayce and myself is a *parallelism* between the two invasions. Next, with regard to the language of Isaiah. It is true, that in both groups of prophecies (those referring to Sargon as well as those to Sennacherib), Isaiah is well assured that Jehovah will interpose for Mount Zion; but is there not a variety amidst the similarity? In Sargon's reign, Isaiah says that the chief men of the city have been captured, and that many of the inhabitants of Jeru-

¹ Comp. introd. to chap. xxxvii. (vol. i., p. 198).

salem shall be slain (xxii. 3, 14); in Sennacherib's, he implies that all shall escape (xxxvii. 22). In Sargon's, he declares that Jerusalem shall be reduced to extremities (xxix. 1-6); in Sennacherib's, that the Assyrian shall not come before the city, nor raise a bank against it (xxxvii. 33; see vol. i. p. 202). In Sargon's, his tone towards his countrymen is most severe (see introd. to chap. xxii.); in Sennacherib's, it is one of consolation and hope.

But why, asks Mr. Robertson Smith, did Isaiah make no reference during Sennacherib's invasion to the events of the former crisis? The question could only be answered with certainty from the contemporary Jewish annals, which we do not possess. It may be that there were circumstances connected with Sargon's siege of Jerusalem, which it was no unmixed pleasure to remember (comp. chap. xxii.), but I do not care to reconstruct history speculatively. Mr. Robertson Smith thinks it also 'highly improbable that [Hezekiah] would have been allowed to restore the Judæan fortresses' (p. 296). But Sargon, in his latter years, was enfeebled by age, and Sennacherib, on his accession, had work enough on his hands nearer home, on his southern and eastern frontier. Next, my friendly critic is surprised at the non-mention of any punishment of Judah in the Annals of Sargon. But these annals cannot claim to be exhaustive. The portion for 711 seems to be little more than an extract from an eponym list, where only the chief object of the year's campaign is recorded. Is it reasonable to suppose that, while Philistia was punished for 'speaking treason,' Judah was allowed to go scot free? Certainly the peoples of Palestine, according to Isa. xx. 6, had very different anticipations. On the following page our author questions whether the Book of Kings would have entirely ignored the invasion of Sargon, had it really taken place. But he might as well question whether Sargon captured Samaria, because the Book of Kings is silent as to the fact.¹ The written traditions of the Jews have obviously come down to us in so fragmentary a state (thanks to the catastrophe of the Exile) that hardly any omission can much surprise us. We may well be thankful for the supplementary and corrective uses of the Assyrian inscriptions, and not least, as students of the prophecies of Isaiah. Mr. Robertson Smith himself admits this, which increases my disappointment that I have failed to convince him on this important question of detail. All opinions on ancient

¹ The absence of any reference to Assurbanipal, except under the mutilated form Asnapper (Ezra iv. 10), may also be mentioned in this connection.

history must be held with a certain amount of reserve, and be liable to modification or correction from more thorough criticism, or the discovery of more complete evidence. Mr. Robertson Smith is well able to contribute to this desirable result. Let me add that, if I have, in the foregoing commentary or elsewhere, expressed myself too positively, I regret it, as it may perhaps have encouraged his own too positive contradiction. At any rate, he will, I know, echo the words with which I concluded this essay in the first edition, that 'the prophecies have surely become more vivid through being read in this new light, and the character of Isaiah as a "watcher" of the political as well as spiritual horizon does but shine with a steadier and more enlivening glow.'

II. THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE PROPHECIES.

I.

THAT there is some principle (or, that there are some principles) of arrangement in the Book of Isaiah, is now universally acknowledged. The book is no mere anthology of single prophecies; this cannot even be said of chaps. i.-xxxix., where a continuous thread of thought is undoubtedly wanting. But the plan of the book is by no means easy to grasp. It seems simple enough to suppose with Hengstenberg that the prophecies in chaps. i.-xxxix. are arranged chronologically, or with Vitringa that similarity of contents was the guiding principle of the collector and editor. But neither theory can be carried out without violence to facts. The suggestion has therefore been offered to divide the book into four smaller books or parts, viz. chaps. i.-xii., chaps. xiii.-xxiii., chaps. xxiv.-xxxv. (with its appendix, chaps. xxxvi.-xxxix.), and chaps. xl.-lxvi.; and this view has been adopted by Gesenius, Hävernick, and (in 1856) Dr. S. Davidson. When, however, we come to analyse these groups, we find that they are by no means homogeneous, and that there are several breaks in the continuity. Hence Ewald and Delitzsch seem fully justified in subdividing the book still further. These eminent scholars differ widely, it is true; the reason being that while Delitzsch regards the prophet Isaiah as himself the sole author and editor, Ewald postulates a variety of authors and several editors. Controversy, however, is not my object. Those who wish to see the thoughtful and only too ingenious arrangement of Delitzsch can easily refer to his widely-known

commentary (Introduction, paragraph 2). My own view on the subject of this essay continues to be based on that of Ewald, and, in offering it anew for acceptance, I would merely remark that it is in no way bound up with any preconceived opinion as to the unity or plurality of the authorship of the book.

It was stated in the present writer's former edition of *Isaiah*,¹ that at any rate that part of the book which contains occasional prophecies 'appears to be composed of several smaller books or prophetic collections.' This view, I repeat, will still be the most probable one, even if we should admit the Isaianic authorship of the entire book. Let us see what it is that it involves. 'The chapter which opens the book in the traditional arrangement is evidently intended as a general introduction to a large group of prophecies. It is impossible, however, to trace any distinct connection between that chapter and the three following ones, which certainly constitute a single homogeneous prophecy. Equally difficult is it to trace a connection between chap. i. and chaps. vi.-x. 4; the latter chapters, with the exception of ix. 8-x. 4' (see vol. i., p. 64), 'are as distinct and homogeneous as the prophecy already mentioned.' But there is a general agreement between the historical circumstances of chap. i., of chaps. x. 5-xi. 16, and of most of the minor prophecies on foreign nations, all of which were probably written under the shadow of the first Assyrian invasion under Sargon. It seems therefore reasonable to suppose that, after the retirement of Sargon, Isaiah prepared 'a new and enlarged edition of his works,' consisting of the two prophetic writings mentioned above (ii.-v., and vi. 1-ix. 7), supplemented by x. 5-xii. 6² (which once doubtless had an independent existence, and which was now inserted as a pendant to the prophecy of Immanuel), and by most of the prophecies on foreign nations.³ Later still, Isaiah, or some of his disciples availing themselves of his literary material, made several insertions in his already extant works, and added a new one to their number. The insertions are xiv. 24-27, which looks like an appendix to x. 5-xii. 6 (compare vol. i. p. 93), xvii. 1-11, xvii. 12-xviii. 7, and, according to conservative critics, xiii. 1-xiv. 23, which were included among the oracles on foreign nations. The only one of these

¹ *I. C. A.*, Introduction, pp. xii.-xiv. The reader will at once notice the points in which I have modified my views.

² I am aware that Ewald considers chap. xii. to be an insertion of post-Exile origin. But it is not my object here to discuss questions belonging to the 'higher criticism.'

³ Amos had already given a series of short decisive oracles on the neighbouring peoples (i. 3-ii. 3). Zephaniah (ii. 4-15), Jeremiah (xlvi.-li.), and Ezekiel (xxv.-xxxii.) did so afterwards.

insertions which requires any special explanation is the last-mentioned, and to this I will return presently. The new prophetic work consists of chaps. xxviii.—xxxii.; it seems intended as a memorial of the state of the Jews during Sargon's intervention in the affairs of Palestine. Four groups of chapters still remain, viz., xxiv.—xxvii., xxxiv. and xxxv., xxxvi.—xxxix., and xl.—lxvi. Let me begin with the third. It consists of a historical narrative in which two prophecies (xxxvii. 21–35 and xxxix. 5–7) and a poem (xxxviii. 9–20), the latter ascribed, not to Isaiah, but to Hezekiah, are imbedded. By whom the narrative was written, and when, is much disputed (see vol. i., p. 203); but that the first of the two prophecies is the work of Isaiah is admitted on all hands, and the analogy of chaps. vii. and xx. shows that the narrative, long as it is, exists for the sake of the prophecies, and not the prophecies for the narrative. The parallel of Jer. lii. suggests further that Isa. xxxvi.—xxxix. were originally intended as a conclusion or appendix to the Book of Isaiah.

As to the three other groups, we must first of all separate chaps. xl.—lxvi., the difficulty with regard to which is, not so much its position, as the arrangement of its contents. Not, I say, its position, for supposing Isaiah to have written these chapters, he or his disciple-editor could not well have placed them anywhere else.¹ To its internal arrangement I return presently. There remain chaps. xxiv.—xxvii., and xxxiv., xxxv., which must be taken in connection with xiii. 1–xiv. 23. Why these groups of prophecies received their present position is certainly not clear at first sight; plausible reasons are all that can be given. The last-mentioned not unnaturally heads the series of foreign oracles with its emphatic description of the day of Jehovah—that day which is always coming anew, whether Babylon or Assyria, Moab or Philistia, be its most prominent victim; while the group, chaps. xxiv.—xxvii., not unsuitably closes it, since the restoration of Israel in which these prophecies culminate is, in fact, the object of history as viewed by Jehovah's prophets. There is also a striking similarity between the closing verse (xxvii. 13) and the passage (xi. 11–16) which concludes the predictive portion of the group x. 5–xii. 6. As to chaps. xxxiv., xxxv., their wide and comprehensive character fully explains their present position at the end of what we may call the first book or volume of Isaiah (chaps. xxxvi.—xxxix. being regarded as an appendix).

¹ Chap. xxxix. 6, with its reference to a 'carrying to Babylon,' forms a natural link between the two halves of the book.

Chap. xxxv., in particular, would commend itself as a finale to one of the most characteristic feelings of a Jew. We have already seen how distressed the Rabbis were by the gloomy tone of the last verse of chap. lxvi. On the other hand, such a comforting word as 'They shall overtake gladness and joy, trouble and sighing shall flee away,' would appear a most appropriate epilogue to the works of so great a prophet.

2.

With regard to the second part of Isaiah, the writer has already stated that he cannot see his way to adopt any of the current arrangements (vol. i. p. 237). The discourse no doubt makes a fair show of continuity. There are none of those headings which in the first part so rudely dispel the dream of homogeneousness, and one can read on for a considerable way without any striking break in the thread of thought. Besides this, there occurs at equal intervals in the volume an expression which looks as if it were intended to mark the close of a book, in the manner of a chorus or refrain—'There is no peace to the ungodly' (xlvi. 22, lvii. 21), and the closing verse of the last chapter may be regarded as repeating the idea of this refrain in a new and more striking form. On this ground, Friedrich Rückert, scholar as well as poet, suggested in 1831 a division of the prophecy into three parts, each consisting of nine chapters; and Ruettschi, a Swiss scholar, attempted, on this basis, to draw out the design of the book, and to show that there was a unity, not only of form, but of subject and of time.¹ This view has met with a large measure of acceptance; it flatters the natural love of symmetry, and appears to accord with the supposed fondness of the Jews for the number three (it gives three books with three times three subdivisions). Voices on the other side, however, have not been wanting, and chief among these is Ewald's, who declares the popularity of Rückert's view to be inconceivably perverse.² It is, in fact, too simple, too mechanical. Had it really the support of the contents, Rückert, a *dilettante* student of the prophets, would hardly have been the first to discover it. Nor are the writers who hold with him at all at one among themselves as to the arrangement of the prophecies within the three books. Naegelsbach, for instance, the latest commentator on Isaiah,

¹ *Theolog. Studien und Kritiken*, 1854, p. 261 &c.

² So I suppose I may paraphrase the characteristic 'es ist im guten sinne unbedenklich' (Ewald, *Die Propheten*, iii. 29, note 2).

only admits five discourses in the last book, and Prof. Birks prefers a sevenfold to a ninefold subdivision. Approaching the book with disenchanting eyes, we see that there is a much larger number of interruptions of continuity than Rückert's division supposes; and, while granting the importance of the division at xlvi. 22, we can attach comparatively little weight to that at lvii. 21, chap. lvi. 1-8 being closely akin to chap. lviii., and even chap. lvii. not so violently separated from the next chapter by its subject-matter as, for instance, lvi. 8 from lvi. 9, and chap. lxii. from chap. lxiii. We cannot, indeed, suppose that the occurrence of the same striking verse at equal intervals is purely accidental. But may it not be that the two verses at the end of chap. lvii. were added by an afterthought to gratify a fondness for external symmetry? that the original prophecy ended at xlvi. 22,¹ and that the remainder of the book grew up by degrees under a less persistent flame of inspiration? This view clearly involves no disparagement to the spiritual importance of the latter prophecies, the importance of which stands in no relation to their technical perfection.

It is the frequency with which the thread of thought is broken which makes it, in my opinion, so difficult to offer a satisfactory division of the latter part of Isaiah. Even in chaps. xl.-xlvi. which are tolerably coherent, there are several points at which it is quite uncertain whether or not we ought to begin a new chapter: this is particularly the case in chaps. xlii.-xlv. To me, indeed, it is tolerably clear that xliii. 1-xlv. 5 forms one section in itself, and xlv. 6-xlv. 25 another. But when I find Delitzsch connecting xliii. 1-13 with chap. xlii., and Ewald, not only accepting chap. xlv. as an independent section, but even forming xlv. 1-9 into a single paragraph, I am obliged to distrust my own insight. In the portion beginning at chap. xlix., however, the difficulties of distribution are much increased. The opening chapter, no doubt, connects itself with the preceding part by the obvious parallelism of verses 1-6 with xlii. 1-7, and down to lii. 12 (see note below) there is no unusual break in the continuity. But from lii. 13 to liii. 12 both style and ideas become strikingly different (see p. 39). It seems to me clear that, though not discordant with the other passages relative to the Servant, this obscure and difficult section cannot have been originally intended to follow chaps. xlix. 1-lii. 12. Let any plain, untheological reader be called upon to arbitrate; I have

¹ lii. 12 has equally the appearance of having been designed as the close of a book. It would be a plausible conjecture that xlix. 1-lii. 12 was originally meant as an epilogue.

no doubt as to his decision. And this section does but introduce a series of still more strikingly disconnected passages which occur at intervals in the remainder of the book—viz. lvi. 1-8; lvi. 9-lvii. 21¹; lviii. 1-lix. 21; lxiii. 1-6; lxiii. 7-lxiv.; lxxv.; lxxvi.² The preceding commentary will, I hope, have proved that these opinions are not thrown out loosely and at random. But a mere glance is sufficient to show the wide discordance of tone between chaps. lx.-lxii. and the passages to which I have just referred.

III. THE CHRISTIAN ELEMENT IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

I.

AN influential modern writer upon the Old Testament, whose name is now at least as often heard as that of Ewald, has thought it necessary in the preface to his most considerable work to defend himself against the charge of arguing points of criticism upon concealed metaphysical premisses. He observes in reply³ that, if he were to introduce his researches by an explicit statement of his theory of the universe, he would make it appear that his critical method and results are the outcome of his views on theology, and consequently of no value to those who do not belong to his own school of thought. The object of the present work, as has been stated already, is mainly exegetical, and only indirectly critical; but it is, perhaps, for that very reason important to meet the expectations of any section of its readers with more than usual frankness. For it is emphatically not a party-book, but designed to help as many students as possible to a philologically sound view of the text, from which they may proceed, if they are so disposed, to the fruitful investigation of the ulterior critical problems. Most English books on Isaiah carry their theological origin on their forefront; this one can hardly be said to do so. The same reason which weighed with Dr.

¹ The tone of lvii. 11b-21 is more in harmony with that of xl.-lii. 12, than the earlier part of the chapter (see on lvii. 11 a).

² I cannot bring myself to believe that chaps. lxxv., lxxvi., in spite of their undeniable points of contact, were written continuously, much less (see on lxxv. 1) that they were intended as a sequel to chap. lxxiv. Even chap. lxxvi. is not as a whole very coherent; compare vv. 1-5 with vv. 6-24.

³ Dr. A. Kuenen, *Historisch-kritisch onderzoek naar et ontstaan . . . van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (Leiden, 1861), vol. i. pp. vii. viii. of the preface.

Kuenen has influenced the writer. But as he has not thought it right to express himself fully in the main body of the work, he hastens to repair the omission in the supplementary portion.

'There is a philological exegesis, and there is a Christian' (Preface, vol. i. p. vii.). In what sense this laconic aphorism is intended, the present essay will show. Its scope, then, is not polemical. The 'strife of tongues' too often leads to the 'darkening of counsel,' and the essays on Biblical subjects called forth by controversy have seldom been those which have permanently advanced the sacred interests of truth. After spending even a short time in the heavy air of controversial theology, the student is forced to exclaim with a kindred spirit among the prophets,¹ 'Oh that I had in the wilderness a lodging-place of wayfaring men!' And if in these days of toleration he cannot join in the same prophet's watchword, 'Fear is on every side,'² yet the misunderstanding and suspicion which from opposite sides meet the Biblical investigator may well render him as reluctant to publish on questions of the day as Jeremiah was to prophesy. Still there is a worse fate than being misunderstood, and that is to be 'to truth a timid friend;' and if the conclusions of this essay should incur the reproach of triteness, yet there may be something a little new and suggestive in the road by which they have been reached. For they were certainly as great a surprise to the writer as any of his results in the critical or exegetical field, and, as the preceding commentary will have shown, he belongs to a school of interpretation mainly, at any rate, composed of rationalists. It is true he has come to believe in a definitely Christian interpretation of the Old Testament, but this he thinks should be based entirely upon the obvious grammatical meaning. To give even the slightest stretch to a word or construction in deference to theological presuppositions, is a fault of which he has an unfeigned horror. Believing personally in the Virgin-born, he dares not render a certain famous text in Isaiah, 'The virgin shall conceive;' and while accepting the narrative in Matt. xxvii. 57-60, he scruples to translate another celebrated passage, 'He was with the rich in his death.'

It will perhaps be said that all Biblical expositors are now agreed in admitting the full supremacy of the grammar and

¹ See Jer. ix. 2. Jeremiah was evidently a profound student of the writings of inspired men, and has, I think, a better title than Ezra to be regarded as the father of the Soferim (students of Scripture: A. V. 'scribes').

² Jer. vi. 25, xx. 3, 10, xlvi. 5, xlix. 29, comp. Ps. xxxi. 14. (Hitzig and Ewald ascribe Ps. xxxi. to Jeremiah. It would, however, be too bold to assert that all passages with affinities to Jeremiah were actually written by that prophet, who seems, in fact, to have been the founder of a school of writers.)

the lexicon. They are doubtless agreed in theory, but their practice does not always correspond. I may seem to be unnecessarily earnest, and even, I fear, discourteous, and I am eager to proceed to still more interesting matters. But even this point has a degree of importance, and the evidence for it cannot be relegated to a footnote. Let me refer, then, to the two passages quoted above—Isa. vii. 14, liii. 9.¹ It is a fact which I have myself emphatically stated, that the word '*almah*' is used everywhere else of an unmarried woman. But it is also a fact that this is only inferred from the context, and there is nothing in Isa. vii. 14–16 to enable us to determine positively whether the mother of Immanuel was a married or simply a marriageable woman. We may, indeed, suspect from the form of the prophecy that Isaiah 'saw something peculiar in her circumstances' (vol. i. p. 48); but we cannot venture to go an inch further. Just as '*elem*' might legitimately be used of a young man who happened also to be married, so might '*almah*' be used of a young woman who was also a wife. It is stretching language unduly, and converting translation into exegesis, to exclude this full possibility with such a meagre context as the prophecy of Immanuel.

With regard to the second passage referred to, a protest is perhaps still more necessary, because two eminent scholars (Dr. Delitzsch and Dr. Kay), while rejecting the ungrammatical rendering of *Vitringa* (and *Auth. Vers.*), continue to illustrate the passage by quoting *Matt. xxvii. 57–60*. How this can be done without a violation of the rules of parallelism, and an injury to the harmony of the style, it is difficult to understand (see note p. 48). This, then, appears to be a case of the involuntary nullification of a rendering by the exegesis, and reminds us forcibly of the words of Scaliger, '*Non aliunde dissidia in religione pendent, quàm ab ignoratione grammaticæ.*'

I have ventured to use the phrase 'a definitely Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. I do not thoroughly like it, any more than I like the distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Both expressions, however convenient and for purposes of classification indispensable, are but provisional to those who have learned 'to sum up all things in Christ' (words which have happily not yet become a *Shibboleth*, and which have as profound a philosophical as religious significance). Everything in the Old Testament stands in some relation to Christ, whether 'definitely' or not. Nor is this all. Every revolution of the ancient heathen

¹ On the Christian interpretation of these passages, see below.

world, whether in politics or in thought, is a stage in its journey towards that central event, which is the fulfilment of its highest aspirations. Plato speaks almost as if he foresaw the crucifixion,¹ and Seneca insists on the historic character of the ideal wise man, 'even though within long periods one only may be found.'² As an accomplished historical theologian has well said :

'The fact that such a character [as Jesus Christ], so unique, so divine, should have come into the world, leads us to feel that there surely must have been in earlier times some shadows at least, or images, to represent, dimly it may be, to former generations that great thing which they were not actually to witness. It would lead us to believe that there must have been some prophetic voice to announce the future coming of the Lord, or else the very stones would have cried out.'³

But provisionally one must draw a distinction between some foreshadowings, some prophecies, and others. There are not, indeed, two Spirits of prophecy, the one for the Gentile, the other for the Jewish world ; but in our present condition of ignorance it is at least not irrational to maintain that the 'prophetic voices' which announce the Messiah in the Old Testament are so definite and distinct, and in such agreement with history, as to prove that God has in very deed revealed himself to Israel (not for Israel's sake alone) in a fuller sense than to other nations.

It is not, however, everyone who is honestly able to come to this conclusion. It depends on one's moral attitude towards the two great Biblical doctrines summed up in the expressions 'the Living God,' and 'the God-man Jesus Christ.' If you believe heartily in the God of Revelation and of Providence, you are irresistibly impelled to a view of the Scriptures, which, though it may be difficult to demonstrate, is none the less in the highest degree reasonable. It is only half of your belief that the Biblical writers saw deeper into spiritual things and spoke more forcibly of what they had seen than ordinary men. It seems to you the most natural thing in the world that, at important moments in the history of God's people, and at the high-water marks of the inspiration of His prophets, typical personages should have been

¹ Plato, *De republ.*, ii. pp. 361-2. It is just possible that Plato's imaginative picture of the sufferings of the righteous man was inspired by the story of Osiris (though the important detail of the resurrection is wanting) ; but from a Christian point of view this most touching story is, in its post-mythic or spiritualised form, an unconscious prophecy of the Gospel. Tertullian, I think, calls our Lord 'alter Osiris.'

² Seneca, *De constant.*, c. 7, § 1.

³ Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey by the Very Rev. Dr. Stanley, Christmas Day, 1879. (Abstract in *Daily Telegraph*, Dec. 26.) On revising my work, I cannot help adding. *Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus Tam cari capitis?*

raised up, and specially definite prophecies have been uttered. Not that the laws of human nature were violated, nor that Christian interpreters are to explain the prophets unphilologically, but that God overruled the actions and words of His servants, so as to cast a shadow of the coming Christ. If, again, you believe in the true though 'veiled' Divinity of Jesus Christ, and humbly accept His decrees on all subjects related to His Messiahship, you will feel loyally anxious to interpret the Old Testament as He beyond question interpreted it. You will believe His words when He says (and I attach no special importance to the accuracy of this particular report of His words, for the idea of it pervades all the four Gospels): 'The Scriptures are they which testify of me.' You will reply to non-Christian critics, 'In spite of modern criticism and exegesis, there must be some sense in which the words of my Lord are true. He cannot have mistaken the meaning of His own Bible, the book on which in His youth and early manhood He nourished His spiritual life. He who received not the Spirit by measure, cannot have been fundamentally mistaken in the Messianic character of psalms and prophecies.'

In short, there are two fixed points with the class of students here represented: 1. that in order to prepare susceptible minds for the Saviour, a special providential guidance may be presumed to have been given to the course of certain selected lives and the utterances of certain inspired personages; and 2. that this presumption is converted into a certainty by our Lord's authoritative interpretation of the Old Testament. To accept these two fixed points is to many persons a very real 'cross.' The torrents of ridicule which have been poured out upon 'circumstantial fulfilments' have left a general impression that they can only be admitted by doing violence to grammar and context, which to a modern student is nothing short of 'plucking out' his 'right eye.' Hence many 'liberal' theologians¹ have been fain to stunt their religion in favour, as they suppose, of their philology, and their example has been followed with less excuse by many who are guiltless of special study. But must there not be some mistake both on the side of the cross-bearers and of the cross-

¹ It is a pleasure to be able to except F. D. Maurice. Speaking of the attractiveness to the Rabbis of the time of Christ of 'merely incidental' statements, such as Mic. v. 2, he observes, 'I do not see that it was any disparagement to their wisdom that they recognised a divine order and contrivance even in such circumstances as these. . . . Devout men welcome such coincidences and recurrences as proofs that they are under a divine education. Why should the like be wanting in a national story? Why should they not be noted in a book which traces all the parts of it as the fulfilment of a divine purpose?' (*Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament*, p. 341.)

rejecters? Can it be that human nature is 'divided against itself,' and left to choose between intellectual and religious mutilation? Here at least scepticism is the truest piety. It is the conviction of the writer that there is a 'more excellent way,' and that the philological and the Christian interpretation can be honestly combined, without any unworthy compromise.

2.

The definitely Christian elements in the Old Testament are mainly (not by any means entirely) of two kinds: 1. foreshadowings of special circumstances in the life of Christ, occurring *as it were* casually in the midst of *apparently* rhetorical descriptions; and 2. distinct pictures of Jesus Christ, the suffering Messiah. It is of the former that I speak at present. We have a right to expect them, and we, as a matter of fact, find them. But it must be remembered, in deference to common sense, that the passages in which they occur admit of another but a perfectly combinable interpretation. The object of special or circumstantial features in an Old Testament description is primarily to symbolise the character of the person or work referred to, and the literal fulfilment of the clause or verse containing them in some event of the life of Jesus Christ is a superabundant favour to those who believe in the Providence of a 'Living God.'¹ For prophecy has in the first place to do with principles and broad general characteristics, and only in the second with details. This caution should be borne in mind to avoid misunderstanding the sequel.—The special foreshadowings spoken of are exemplified in no portion of the Old Testament to the same extent as the Psalms; they relate especially in this book to scenes or features of the Passion. The following references have already been given in the New Testament:—

Ps. xxxiv. 20, in John xix. 36;

Ps. xli. 9, in John xiii. 18;

Ps. xxii. 18,² in John xix. 24 (*not* Matt. xxvii. 35);

Ps. lxix. 10, in Rom. xv. 3;

Ps. lxix. 21, in John xix. 28.

But the Biblical writers have only given us specimens—the parallelisms are both more numerous and more striking than might be supposed from these few instances. In Ps. xxxv. 11, we have a foreshadowing of the false testimony against Jesus; in Ps. xxii. 7, 8, lxix. 12, of the revilings; in

¹ Comp. Mr. C. H. H. Wright, *Zechariah and his Prophecies*, p. 239.

² Our Lord Himself regarded the whole psalm as prophetic of Himself, as we must infer from His utterance of the opening words (Matt. xxvii. 46, Mark xv. 34).

Ps. xxii. 16, of the piercing of the hands and the feet (or, if the other reading be adopted, the cruel, 'lion-like' worrying of the helpless prey); in Ps. lxix. 21, of the offering of the gall and vinegar. It should be observed that these parallels are not such as can be disputed (like some of the Old Testament references in the Epistles) on the ground of far-fetched Rabbinic exegesis; they are taken from psalms which, with one exception,¹ are, as we shall see presently, in a very strict sense Messianic, and, in fact, also supply instances of our second class of prophecies—viz. distinct pictures of the suffering Messiah. It is of course possible to maintain² that the whole of the narrative of our Lord's Passion was suggested by reminiscences of these passages of the Psalms; but the conjecture would not be a plausible one, 1. because of the extreme casualness of the Psalm-parallels,³ and 2. because the whole of the Gospel-narrative, from the beginning of Matthew to the end of John, is pervaded by a parallelism to the Old Testament. Yet Strauss himself did not suppose that the whole narrative was a conscious or unconscious fiction on the basis of Old Testament reminiscences. It may be contended, therefore, that the existence of these circumstantial prophecies in the Book of Psalms confirms the view that there are similar circumstantial prophecies in the Book of Isaiah. That they were conscious prophecies the writer does not suppose, and to many they will only seem accidental coincidences. It is their amount and quality which give them significance; and the full Christian explanation of them as due to Providential overruling (a 'pre-established harmony') is therefore in sole possession of the field.⁴

I have ventured to state my belief that the psalms to which these circumstantial foreshadowings belong are Messianic. Let me briefly explain my position. There is much haziness in the minds of most persons as to the meaning of the words Messiah and Messianic. I have, therefore, first of all to state in what sense I use these expressions. I think I am in harmony with the Biblical writers if I define

¹ The exception is of course Ps. xxxiv., which is only Messianic in so far as any characteristic utterance of a pious sufferer is in the highest degree true of Christ. But the overruling of Providence is as manifest in the literal fulfilment of John xix. 36 as in any other passage of the group.

² Strauss did in fact hold that Psalms xxii. and lxix., 'together with the extract from Isa. liii.,' 'form, as it were, the programme according to which the whole history of the Crucifixion in our Gospels is drawn up' (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. Transl., ii. 369).

³ I mean that except in the light of the Gospel-narratives no one would have thought of regarding these incidental phrases in the Psalms as anticipations of scenes in the Passion.

⁴ See Delitzsch, 'Der Messias als Versöhner,' *Saat auf Hoffnung*, 1866, pp. 116-138, especially p. 136.

the word Messiah as meaning one who has received some direct commission from God determining his life's work, with the single limitation that the commission must be unique, and must have a religious character. Thus Cyrus will not be a Messiah, because 'his function was merely preparatory; he was to be instrumental in the removal of obstacles to the realisation of [God's kingdom]' (*I. C. A.*, p. 166). An individual priest will not be a Messiah, because he has received no unique personal commission; even the High Priest Joshua is only represented as typical of Him who was to be pre-eminently the Messiah (*Zech. iii. 8*). David was a Messiah (compare *Ps. xviii. 50*), because he was God's vicegerent in the government of His people Israel; the laws which David was to carry out were not merely secular, but religious, and of Divine appointment. Each of David's successors was in like manner theoretically a Messiah. The people of Israel was theoretically a Messiah, because specially chosen to show forth an example of obedience to God's laws (*Ex. xix. 5, 6*), and to preach His religion to the Gentiles (*Isa. ii. 3, lv. 5*). Above all, a descendant of David who should take up the ill-performed functions of his royal ancestors was to be, both in theory and in fact, the Messiah (*Isa. ix. 6, 7, &c.*); and so, too, was the personal Servant of Jehovah (*Isa. lxi. 1*), who was both to redeem His people from their sins, and to lead them in the performance of their commission.

Hence we may reckon five groups of Messianic psalms:—
 I. Psalms which refer to a contemporary Davidic king, setting him, either directly or by implication, in the light of his Messianic mission. II. Those entirely devoted to the future ideal Davidic sovereign. III. Those which relate to the future glories of the kingdom of God, but without expressly mentioning any Messiah. IV. Those which, though seemingly spoken by an individual, in reality describe the experiences of the Jewish nation in their unsteady performance of their Messianic commission. V. Those in which, with more or less consistency, the psalmist dramatically introduces the personal and ideally perfect 'Servant of Jehovah' (to adopt the phrase in *Isa. xlii. &c.*) as the speaker.

On the first group there cannot be much difference of opinion. It contains Psalms *xx., xxi., xlv., ci., cxxxii.* The interest of the interpreter is more awakened by the second group, containing Psalms *ii., lxxii., cx.* In *Ps. ii.* we are presented first with a picture of the whole world subject to an Israelitish king, and vainly plotting to throw off the yoke; then with the divine decree assuring universal dominion to

this particular king ; then with an exhortation to the kings of the earth to submit to Jehovah's Son.¹ It is, I know, commonly supposed that the psalm has a primary reference to circumstances in the life of David, but the ordinary Christian instinct seems to me much nearer the truth. Even granting for the moment that the chiefs of the Syrians and the Ammonites could be dignified in liturgical poetry with the title 'kings of the earth,' there is not the slightest indication in 2 Sam. vii. or elsewhere, that a prophet ever conveyed an offer to David of the sovereignty of the whole world. Even Jewish tradition, so zealous for the honour of the Davidic lyre, has not ascribed this psalm to David. Who, then, can the Son of Jehovah and Lord of the whole earth be but the future Messiah, whom the prophets describe in such extraordinary terms? Why should we expect the psalms always to have a contemporary political reference? If one psalmist (see below) takes for his theme the Messianic glories of Jerusalem, why may not another adopt for his the glories of the Messiah himself?

The same arguments apply to Ps. lxxii., which a Unitarian divine pronounces 'the most Messianic in the collection,' adding that it 'is applied by Bible readers in general, without hesitation or conscious difficulty, to the Messiah of Nazareth, as beautifully describing the spirit of his reign.'² The judgment of the plain reader is not to be lightly disregarded, and though Mr. Higginson goes on to speak of 'its true historic marks, which assign it distinctly to the accession of Solomon,' other critics (*e.g.* Hupfeld) altogether deny these, and the Messianic interpretation has not yet been satisfactorily refuted. The psalm is not, indeed, a prediction (as King James's Bible makes it), but is at any rate a prayer for the advent of the Prince of peace and of the world. Ps. cx., again, is as a whole only obscure to those who will not admit directly Messianic psalms. How significantly the first of the two Divine oracles opens, with an invitation to sit on the throne, 'high and lifted up' (Isa. vi. 1), where the Lord Himself is seated! Can we help thinking of the '*El-gibbor*' in Isaiah (ix. 6), and still more of the 'one like a son of man' who 'came with the clouds of heaven,' and was 'brought near before the Ancient of days' (Dan. vii. 13)? True, that 'son of man' is not said to be a priest, but he agrees with the personage in the psalm in that he is conceived of as in heaven, and as waging war and exercising sovereignty on earth

¹ The Aramaic *bar*, not admitting the article, suited the unique position of the personage spoken of.

² Higginson, *Ecce Messias*, p. 30.

from heaven. Neither in Daniel nor in the psalm is anything said about the Davidic origin of the high potentate, but his nature and functions are clearly those of the Davidic Messiah. The priestly character of the 'lord' in Ps. cx. 1 can be fully explained from Zech. iii. 8, vi. 11-13, where a priestly element in the Messianic functions is distinctly recognised.

Over the third group I may pass lightly. It contains some late psalms, such as xcvi.-c., in which the happiness of being under Jehovah's personal government is celebrated, and also Ps. lxxxvii., in which, chief among the Messianic privileges of Jerusalem, the conversion of the heathen is represented as their being 'born again in Zion' (comp. Isa. xlv. 5).

The fourth contains a number of psalms commonly regarded as Davidic, and as typically Messianic, and some which are merely supposed to describe the sufferings of a pious individual. In both subdivisions the language is often hyperbolic, which is explained in the case of the former by the typical character of the writer, and the overruling influence of the Spirit. A similar explanation might plausibly be offered for the seeming hyperboles of the latter subdivision, for every pious sufferer is in a true sense a type of Jesus Christ. But it is much simpler to suppose that these psalms really describe the experiences of the Jewish nation in the pursuit of its Messianic ideal: the supposed speaker is a personification. This is no arbitrary conjecture. The Jewish nation and its divinely appointed ideal were, in fact, to the later prophets and students of Scripture a familiar subject of meditation. I need hardly remind the reader of the 'Servant of Jehovah' in some parts of II. Isaiah, but may be allowed to state my opinion that one principal object of the Book of Jonah was to typify the spiritual career of Israel, and that the so-called Song of Solomon was admitted into the Canon on the ground that the Bride of the poem symbolised the chosen people. Can we wonder that some of the psalmists adopted a similar imaginative figure?

One of the most remarkable of these psalms is the eighteenth. It is probable enough that the psalmist in writing it had the life of David in his mind's eye; but it would be unreasonable to suppose that he merely wished to idealise a deceased king, or even the Davidic family. The world-wide empire claimed by the supposed speaker, and the analogy of cognate psalms, are totally opposed to such a hypothesis. But when we consider that the filial relation to God predicated of David as king in 2 Sam. vii. is also asserted of the Israelitish nation (Ex. iv. 22, Hos. xi. 1, Ps. lxxx. 15), and that in Isa. lv. 3-5

the blessings promised to David are assured in perpetuity to the faithful Israel, it becomes difficult to deny that David may have been regarded as typical of the nation of Israel.—Another of these psalms is the eighty-ninth, which supplies further evidence of the typological use of David. The psalmist has been describing the ruin which has overtaken the Davidic family, but insensibly passes into a picture of the ruin of the state, and identifies 'the reproach of the heels of thine anointed' (*v.* 51) with 'the reproach of thy servants' (*v.* 50).—Ps. lxxi. is another important member of this group, as anyone must admit who will candidly apply this key; see especially *v.* 20, where the reading of the Hebrew text is not 'me,' but 'us.' Perhaps also Ps. cii. may be added. The expressions in *vv.* 3–9 are, some of them at least, far too strong for an individual, whereas in the mouth of the personified people they are not inappropriate. The words in *v.* 23 'he hath shortened my days' (virtually retracted in *v.* 28) remind us of Ps. lxxxix. 45; and those in the parallel clause, 'he hath weakened my strength in the way,' are perhaps an allusion to the 'travail in the way' of the Israelites in the wilderness (Ex. xviii. 8). There are some reasons, however, for rather placing this psalm in the next group.

The remaining members of the fourth group are the so-called imprecatory psalms¹ (*e.g.* *v.*, xxxv., xl., lv., lviii. lxix., cix.). As long as these are interpreted of an individual Israelite, they seem strangely inconsistent with the injunctions to benevolence with which the Old Testament is interspersed.² If, however, they are spoken in the name of the nation—'Jehovah's Son,' their intensity of feeling becomes intelligible. Certainly it was not 'obstinate virulence and morbid moroseness' which inspired them, for 'each of the psalms in which the strongest imprecatory passages are found contains also gentle undertones, breathings of beneficent love. Thus, "When they were sick, I humbled my soul with fasting; I behaved myself as though it had been my friend or brother." "When I wept and chastened my soul with fasting, that was to my reproach." "They have rewarded me evil for good, and hatred for my love!"'³ And, 'finally in the most awful of these psalms, the denunciations die away into a strain which, in the original, falls upon a modern ear with something of

¹ Some of these psalms, however (xxxv., xl., lv., lxix.), belong more properly to the fourth group.

² Ex. xxiii. 4, 5; Lev. xix. 18; Prov. xx. 22, xxiv. 17, 18, 29, xxv. 21, 22, comp. Job xxxi. 29, 30.

³ Bishop Alexander, *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, 1876, p. 53 (Ps. xxxv. 13, lxix. 10, 11; cix. 4, 5).

the cadence of pathetic rhyme (*v'libbēē khaldāl b'kirbēē*, "and my heart is pierced through within me").¹

Among the psalms not ascribed to David which belong to this group is the forty-first, from which a quotation is made in a Messianic sense in John xiii. 18. It is only the people of Israel which can at once confess its former sins (*v. 4*), and appeal to its present 'integrity' (*v. 12*).—The fifth and last group marks the highest level attained by the inspired poets. It contains Ps. xxii., xxxv., xl., lv., lxix., cii. I cannot think that the persistency of the traditional interpretation, at any rate as regards the two first of these psalms, is wholly due to theological prepossessions. In some of its details, the traditional Christian interpretation is no doubt critically untenable, but in essentials it seems to me truer than any of the current literary theories. Let me briefly refer to the twenty-second psalm, which presents such striking affinities with II. Isaiah. In two respects it is distinguished from most others of the same group; it contains no imprecations and no confession of sinfulness. It falls into two parts. The first and longer of these is a pathetic appeal to Jehovah from the lowest depth of affliction. The speaker has been God's servant from the beginning (*vv. 9, 10*), yet he is now conscious of being God-forsaken (*v. 1*). Not only are his physical sufferings extreme (*vv. 14-17*), but he is the butt of scoffers and a public laughing-stock (*vv. 6, 7*). Who his enemies are—whether heathen oppressors or unbelieving Israelites—is not here stated, but from a parallel passage (Ps. lxix. 8) it is clear that the hostility arises, partly at least, from the sufferer's fellow-countrymen. Only after long wrestling with God does the psalmist attain the confidence that he has been heard of Him (*v. 21*). At this point the tone suddenly changes. The prayer becomes a joyous declaration of the answer which has been vouchsafed, and a promise of thank-offerings. 'But he does not end there. He treats his deliverance as a matter of national congratulation, and a cause of more than national blessings. He not only calls upon his fellow-countrymen to join him in his thanksgiving (*v. 23*), but breaks out into an announcement which draws the whole world within the sphere of his triumph (*vv. 27, 28, 31*).'² I need not stay to point out how unsuitable is language of this description to any of the Israelites mentioned in the Old Testament, and how unnatural it is that the establishment of God's universal kingdom should be

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57. (It is not necessary to assume that the faithless friends in Ps. xxxv., *vv. 1, 2*, are mere figures of speech.)

² Maitland, *The Argument from Prophecy* (S. P. C. K.) pp. 95, 96.

placed in sequence to the deliverance of an individual sufferer.¹ The difficulties are strikingly analogous to those which meet us in II. Isaiah.² There, as here, some features of the description seem to compel us to explain them of an individual Israelite, while others remain unintelligible unless referred in some way to the people of Israel, with its Messianic,³ missionary functions. There, as here, the deliverance of the sufferer has a vital influence on the spiritual life, first of all of his own people, and then of all mankind. There, as here, the newly-acquired spiritual blessings are described under the figure of a feast. Is it so very bold to explain Ps. xxii. and the psalms like it as utterances of that ideal and yet most real personage, who in II. Isaiah is the fruit, from one point of view, no doubt, of special revelation, but from another equally justified and perfectly consistent with the former, of an intense longing for the fulfilment of Israel's ideal? To assume that both the sacred poets and the poet-prophet are feeling their way (not, however, at random) to the presence of the Redeemer? That they have abandoned the hope of an earthly King of Israel, and are conscious, too, that even the noblest members of the nation are inadequate to the Messianic functions? And that hence they throw out in colossal outlines an indistinct because imaginatively expressed conception of One who shall perfectly fulfil these functions for and with his people?

The above is but a bare statement of results, which, whatever be their intrinsic value, may claim a certain degree of attention on account of the process by which they were gained. It is not often that a Saul, in searching for his father's asses, finds a kingdom. The object of the special study, of which these results are the principal fruit, was the composition of a chapter in a literary history of the Old Testament. It now appears to the author that they supply a sound basis for the 'Christian interpretation' at any rate of the Psalter; but this is entirely an after-thought. That there is a mysterious *x* in this wonderful book became clear to the author from a purely

¹ Hupfeld, I know, denies that the anticipations expressed in *vv.* 27-31 stand in any relation to the deliverance of the speaker. But by this denial he destroys the unity of plan of the poem; it is certain, too, that the later O. T. writers often connect the conversion of the heathen with the sight of the wonderful deliverance of Israel. And the very connection which Hupfeld denies in Ps. xxii., he grants in the parallel passage in Ps. cii (*vv.* 16-18).

² It would be instructive to make out a list of the numerous parallels in these psalms to II. Isaiah and the Book of Job (for the author of Job, as we have seen, is not without flashes of Gospel light). Comp. for instance, Ps. xxii. 6, 'I am a worm,' with Isa. xli. 14, Job xxv. 6; *ibid.* 'and no man,' with Isa. lii. 14, liii. 2; *ibid.* 'despised of people,' with Isa. xlix. 7; *vv.* 16, 17, with Job's descriptions of his sickness; *vv.* 26, 28 with Isa. lv. 1, 21. *Vv.* 27-29 also find their best commentary in Isa. lii. 14, 15.

³ On the sense of the word Messianic, see above, pp. 185-6.

literary point of view. Applying the key furnished by the Christian theory, he then found himself in a position to explain this mystery, and was further enabled to rediscover those peculiar, circumstantial prophecies which are so natural and intelligible upon the Christian presuppositions.

3.

Such being the case with the Psalter, are we not justified in expecting corresponding phenomena in the Book of Isaiah, viz. 1. foreshadowings of special circumstances in the life of our Saviour; and 2. distinct pictures of Jesus Christ, the suffering Messiah? We may for our present purpose leave on one side the question whether or not this book is of composite origin. It is at any rate a very comprehensive work, by no means limited to the thoughts and prospects of the age of Isaiah. Indeed, it may be called a text-book of prophetic religion, and strange would it be if belief in the Messiah were the only dumb note in its scale.

The foreshadowings of special events in the life of Christ pointed out in the Book of Isaiah by New Testament writers, are even fewer in number than those in the Psalms. Compare the following passages:—

Isa. vii. 14, Matt. i. 23;
Isa. ix. 1, 2, Matt. iv. 15, 16;
Isa. liii. 12 (fourth clause), Luke xxii. 37.

To these are added by the higher exegesis¹ liii. 5 (first clause), liii. 9, and the last clause of liii. 12—added, we can hardly doubt, in the spirit of the apostolic age, which, as the use of *παῖς* in Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30, shows, interpreted the 'Servant' to mean Jesus Christ. Let me touch upon each of these passages. [Add. l. 6, comp. Matt. xxvi. 67, xxvii. 30.]

(a) Isa. vii. 14.—It is true that the sign given to Ahaz consists chiefly in the name and fortunes of the child Immanuel, but the mother is not to be left entirely out of account² (see note *ad loc.*). Isaiah's 'dim intuition' of something remarkable in the circumstances of the mother must, from a Christian point of view, be ascribed to the 'Spirit of Christ which was in' the prophet (1 Pet. i. 11). This is one part of

¹ If we admit the phrases 'higher' and 'lower criticism,' why not also 'higher' and 'lower exegesis'? By 'higher exegesis' I understand one which 'interprets prophecy in the light of fulfilment, and develops the germs of doctrine in a New Testament sense' (Preface to vol. i.); it stands or falls with a belief in the predominant divine element in prophecy.

² I admit an error of judgment in *J. C. A.*, p. 31.

the unexpected 'pre-established' harmony between the verbal form of the prophecy and its fulfilment. Another part is the meaning of the name. Isaiah and Ahaz may have understood it to mean simply 'God is on our side;' but the fulfilment in the Person of Jesus Christ revealed a depth of meaning which Isaiah (though with '*El gibbōr*, 'God-the-Mighty-One,' before us in Isa. ix. 6, we should speak hesitatingly) did not probably suspect.

(*b*) Isa. ix. 1, 2.—It is most remarkable (and might at first sight justify a suspicion of interpolation) that Isaiah, a man of Judah, should have delivered this exuberant promise to the border-districts of Israel, especially as their inhabitants had most likely approximated more to heathenism than those of the rest of Israel. The coincidence with the circumstances of Jesus Christ is too remarkable to be explained away. The Jews certainly inferred from this passage of Isaiah that the Messiah would appear in Galilee.¹

(*c*) Isa. liii. 12 (fourth clause).—The prophet merely meant that the Servant of Jehovah was regarded as a transgressor; but by a providentially 'pre-established harmony' the coincidence with facts is even literally exact. Such honour did the Hand which moves the world put upon the words of prophecy.

(*d*) Isa. liii. 5 (first clause).—The context shows that by 'pierced' the prophet intended to signify a violent death accompanied by torture. As Vitringa remarks, 'there is no word in Hebrew which can more appropriately be referred to the torture of the cross of Christ.'

(*e*) Isa. liii. 9.—Dr. Weir observes, 'When the whole verse is viewed in connection, there seems no reference to the burial of Christ in the grave of Joseph of Arimathea. It would, indeed, be scarcely consistent with the spirit of the Bible, which makes little account of the mere possession of riches, to give prominence in the prophetic page to the circumstance of Christ's being buried in a rich man's grave. Surely it added nothing to the glory of the Saviour to have His body entombed in Joseph's sepulchre; it was a high honour to Joseph that he was privileged to supply a resting-place for the body of Jesus; but surely it did not add to the honour of Jesus to lie in the rich man's tomb.' I need not repeat what I have said above on the inconsistency into which some eminent expositors appear to have fallen. Those who, like Stier, appeal to the singular 'rich man' in the second clause, as indicating Joseph of Arimathea, forget that the alter-

¹ Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. 747. Delitzsch also refers to *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1843. col. 776.

nation of numbers is a characteristic Hebrew idiom (comp Isa. x. 4).

(*f*) Isa liii. 12 (last clause).—This is one of the passages which, from an evangelical point of view, place Isa. liii. as much above Ps. xxii., as that psalm, owing to its complete freedom from imprecations, is (as it may seem to us in some of our moods) above Ps. lxix. It received a fulfilment of which the prophet could never have dreamed in Luke xxiii. 34.

Let us now turn to the other group of passages in Isaiah, containing a distinctly Christian element, viz. the portraits of the teaching, suffering, but in and through his suffering triumphant Messiah (xlii. 1–7, xlix. 1–6, l. 4–9, lii. 13–liii. 12). No greater problem, whether we regard its intrinsic difficulty or the importance of its issues, is presented to the Old Testament interpreter than that of explaining these wonderful passages. Their difficulty arises partly from the abruptness with which they are introduced, partly from the apparent inconsistency of some of the expressions, partly (if we may judge from the efforts of some to explain it away) from the extraordinary distinctness with which the most striking of them at any rate prefigure the life of Jesus Christ. Let us first of all clearly understand the alternatives set before us. (*a*) It is one source of difficulty, that the portrait-passages are introduced abruptly. (There is an analogy for this, however, in the abruptness of the two earliest Messianic prophecies in chaps. vii. and ix.). The alternatives in this case are to suppose (1) that these passages are based on extracts from a separate work, which, perhaps, contained a spiritualised biography of the great martyr-prophet, Jeremiah; and (2) that the prophetic writer is carried beyond himself by a specially strong inspiration of the ‘Spirit of Christ.’ The former alternative is proposed by Dr. Duhm, of Göttingen.¹ The theory partly agrees with that of Ewald, according to whom xl. 1, 2, lii. 13–liv. 12, lvi. 9–lvii. 11, were taken from an earlier prophet, but the difference is sufficient to allow us to quote Ewald’s authority as opposed to the view of Dr. Duhm. The objections to the latter are (1) stylistic (how, *e.g.*, can xlii. 1–6 be ascribed to a different author from the rest of the prophecy?); and (2) that the theory makes the prophet responsible for gratuitously misleading his readers. (*b*) It is also said that some of the expressions used of the Servant are inconsistent. This may be explained, 1. on the quotation-theory just mentioned; 2. as due to a haziness in the author’s conception of the Servant (a view unfavourable to his

¹ Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten* (Bonn, 1875), p. 289.

poetic vigour, and not to be adopted without compulsion), or 3. on a subtle but beautiful and (as it seems to me) well-supported theory to be mentioned presently. (c) Another source of difficulty to some minds is the extraordinary resemblance of the description to the Person of Jesus Christ. Here, again, we have our choice of alternatives. (1) We may say with Mr. Matthew Arnold, that this harmony between II. Isaiah and the Gospels is perfectly natural. 'To a delicate and penetrating criticism it has long been manifest that the chief literal fulfilment by Christ of things said by the prophets was the fulfilment such as would naturally be given by one who nourished his spirit on the prophets and on living and acting their words.'¹ Or (2) we may hold that the Divine Spirit overruled in such a way the mental process of the prophet that he chose expressions which, while completely conveying his own meaning, also corresponded to a future fact in the life of Jesus Christ. This does not exclude us from searching for a point of contact in the prophet's consciousness, and such, I think, it will be possible to find.² Nor does it prevent us from accepting thankfully the element of truth in Mr. Matthew Arnold's too self-eulogistic observation. The harmony between Isaiah and the Gospels is, in fact, perfectly natural. But it is also perfectly unique, and what is unique may in one very good sense be called supernatural. And so we come round again to the judgment of the plain reader, that the hand of God is in this extraordinary correspondence, and as we read the chapter afresh we are conscious of something of the impression which it produced upon the Earl of Rochester, whose vivid language is traceable in his biographer's report. 'He said to me,' says Bishop Burnet, 'that, as he heard it read, he felt an inward force upon him, which did so enlighten his mind, and convince him, that he could resist it no longer: for the words had an authority, which did shoot like rays or beams, in his mind; so that he was convinced, not only by the reasonings he had about it, which satisfied his understanding, but by a power which did so effectually constrain him, that he did, ever after, as firmly believe in his Saviour, as if he had seen him in the clouds.'³

4.

With this striking confession, with which nothing need prevent even a philologist from agreeing, it would be natural

¹ Arnold, *Literature and Dogma* (Lond., 1873), p. 114.

² Some suggestions in aid of this are given in the Essay on the Servant of Jehovah.

³ Burnet's life of John Earl of Rochester (*Lives and Characters*, ed. Jebb, p. 229).

to close this essay. Definitely Christian elements of the two principal kinds mentioned above have, it is believed, been found, without any injury either to common sense or to literary exegesis, in the noblest of all the prophetic books. But a few remarks seem at any rate expedient on what may be called the secondary Christian elements in the Book of Isaiah—secondary, only so far as they relate to doctrines, and not to material, objective facts in the life of the Saviour. To treat these fully would require a peculiar spiritual *χάρισμα*, not to mention the heavy demand which it would make on the remaining space. Stier, with all his faults, still deserves a most honourable place among Christian interpreters for the spiritual insight with which he has treated this department of exegesis, and to his important work I provisionally refer the reader. Two of these 'secondary' Christian elements, however, imperatively require to be noticed.

(a) First, the divinity of the Messiah (I take the word Messiah in an enlarged sense, thus including the truths embodied in the Messianic king, and in the personal 'Servant of Jehovah'). Both parts of Isaiah give us to understand clearly (and not as a mere *ὑπόνοια*) that the agent of Jehovah in the work of government and redemption is himself divine. Not, indeed, the much-vexed passage in iv. 2, where, even if the date of this prophecy allowed us to suppose an allusion to the Messiah, 'sprout of Jehovah' is much too vague a phrase to be a synonym for 'God's Only-begotten Son.' But the not less famous '*El gibbōr*' in ix. 6 may and must still be quoted. As Hengstenberg remarks, it 'can only signify God-Hero, 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, the passage x. 21' [where '*El gibbōr*' is used of Jehovah] 'appears a very inconvenient obstacle.'¹ And who can doubt that, granting the subject of chap. liii. to be an individual, he must be an incarnation of the Divine? That such a conception—such a revelation—was not opposed to primitive religious beliefs has been already pointed out in the notes on ix. 6, xiv. 14.

(b) Next, Vicarious Atonement. It is not surprising that most of those who deny the personal Servant are unwilling to allow the presence of this doctrine in Isa. liii.² Yet in itself

¹ *Christology of the Old Testament*, iii. 88.

² In *I. C. A.*, p. 191, I fully admitted this idea, but my inadequate explanation of 'the Servant' compelled me to give the vicariousness an artificial turn. For a survey of the interpretations opposed to the full Christian one, see V. F. Oehler, *Der Knecht Jehova's im Deuterjesaja*, ii. 66-136. To the list might now be added Riehm's, in his *Messianic Prophecy* (Eng. Transl.), p. 147, and Albrecht Ritschl's, in his *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, &c., ii. 64, 65.

it cannot be regarded as an unexpected phenomenon, nor ought it to be described as a 'heathenish idea.' As Oehler has well observed, 'That the intercession of the righteous for a sinful nation is effectual, is a thought running through the entire Old Testament, from Gen. xviii. 23 *sqq.* and Ex. xxxii. 32 *sqq.* (comp. Ps. cvi. 23, and subsequently Amos vii. 1 *sqq.*) onwards.'¹ And though no doubt it is also stated 'that guilt may reach a height at which God will no longer accept the intercession of His servants' (Jer. xv. 1, comp. xi. 14), yet this is not inconsistent with the idea of Vicarious Atonement, as even Christians understand it, and in chap. liii., the blessings promised by the Servant (whatever we understand them to be) are not promised unconditionally to every member of the community.² Now, intercession is one form of substitution. But there was another and a more striking form of it constantly before the eyes of the Israelites in their sacrifices, whether the taking of life was involved in them or not, for the offerer was represented³ by his offering. And so the way was prepared for the revelation (comp. Isa. liii.) of One to whom a prohibition like that addressed to Jeremiah could not apply, because He was not only perfectly righteous Himself, but able, by uniting them mystically to Himself, to 'make the many righteous;' of One whose sacrifice of Himself was so precious that it could be accepted even for a people which had deliberately broken its covenant with Jehovah, and which therefore was legally liable to the punishment of extermination. (Here the conception implied, as it would seem, by the prophet passes, strictly speaking, beyond the range of the sacrificial ideas of the Old Testament. For the law recognised no sacrifice for deliberate violations of the covenant. Be it remembered, however, that even chap. liii. and the leading New Testament writers make a distinction among those who are equally liable to the legal sentence of death; some, though rebels, are at least susceptible of penitence.) It is true that none of the other foreshadowings of Christ contain this

¹ Oehler, *Old Testament Theology* (Eng. Transl.), ii. 425.

² See commentary on liii. 11 ('the many').

³ In every case of a sacrifice (whether with or without shedding of blood) there is representation (or, using the word loosely, 'substitution'). But we must carefully guard against an error of the older divines, viz. that when a victim was put to death, it was as a substitute for the penal death of the sacrificer. This view is now generally abandoned by Old Testament scholars. The truth is that the blood, according to the Hebrew conception, is the vehicle of the 'soul' (Lev. xvii. 11), and the shedding of the blood of the victim signifies the offering of its life in place of the life of him who offers it. The pure 'soul' of the victim 'covers' (כִּפֶּר) or atones for the impure 'soul' of the offerer; the innocence of the one neutralises the sin of the other. (It must be remembered, however, that the verb in question sometimes has for its subject Jehovah, especially in the Psalms; God 'covers' or cancels sin, without our being told how this is possible).

characteristically (though not exclusively) Christian element of Vicarious Atonement. But that constitutes no reason why it should not occur once. In fact, it is really necessary that it should occur somewhere, to explain that wonderful psalm which, next to Isa. liii., contains the clearest anticipation of Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, for there is a gap between the former and the latter part of Ps. xxii., which can only be filled up by assuming the Vicarious Atonement from Isa. liii. The writer of the psalm foresaw, as it were in a vision, the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, but it was not revealed to him how those sufferings produced so immense a result. His spiritual intuitions were true, but limited. But the prophet of the Servant of Jehovah saw further, and it is upon this ground especially that he has been rightly called an Evangelist before the Gospel.

IV. THE ROYAL MESSIAH IN GENESIS.

IT is a singular fact that the prophet Isaiah should be at once so communicative and so reserved on the subject of the Royal Messiah. The prophecies in chaps. ix. and xi. are so distinct and vivid, that we naturally look for more revelations in the same lofty style. Whatever be the reason, whether some prophecies on the Messiah have been lost, or whether Isaiah did not regard his audience as sufficiently prepared for further teaching—our expectations are unrealised. I venture, however, to adduce a specimen of an early Messianic prophecy of the same type as those in Isa. ix., xi., which, as it seems to me, has been much misapprehended. Here, again, there is reason to suspect that the instinct of simple Christian readers has led them nearer to the true meaning than the critical researches of 'liberal' divines. Some qualifications, indeed, are necessary in my opinion to the traditional Christian view. These will be explained in the following essay, which will probably be new to most readers, though the substance of it has already appeared in a theological paper.¹

It is necessary to mention that I had at first a strong prejudice in favour of the rendering, 'until he (or, one) come to Shiloh,' which is certainly the most natural meaning of the four Hebrew words taken by themselves. And what event was so likely to be referred to in this group of historical and descriptive songs (whether we regard Gen. xlix. 3-27 as really

¹ *Theological Review*, 175, pp. 300-306.

the work of one man, or as a collection of ancient popular songs, ascribed by a poetical fiction to Jacob, makes no difference to the argument) as the assembly of the tribes of Israel at Shiloh (Josh. xviii. 1), when 'the land had been subdued before them'? Indeed, the closing words of this very verse (Gen. xlix. 10) inevitably suggest a comparison with the words just quoted, and therefore favour the view that it is the assembly at Shiloh which is referred to. We cannot, indeed, interpret 'until' in the most obvious of its possible meanings. It cannot signify that the 'sceptre' of Judah was to be resigned at the point of time referred to. Occurring as the clause in question does in the midst of an unqualified eulogy of the tribe of Judah (contrast the sayings on the less fortunate tribes of Simeon, Levi, and Issachar), it can only be intended to mark a great increase in the power of Judah, otherwise the blessings already promised would be neutralised. I therefore took the passage to mean, 'Judah shall be *always* the head of the tribes of Israel, which, under her valiant leadership, shall vanquish the tribes of Canaan, and celebrate their victories by a solemn assembly at Shiloh.'

But the question at once arose, How far do the traditions of the Israelites agree with this conjectural paraphrase? First, Did Judah enjoy the priority among the tribes of Israel before the meeting referred to in Joshua? and, secondly, Did she succeed in maintaining, and more than maintaining, that priority afterwards?

There are some plausible arguments for answering both questions in the affirmative. 1. It is true that the personal leadership of the Israelites in their wanderings was not in the hands of a Judahite, but in those first of a Levite, and then of an Ephraimite. It is true also that on various solemn occasions Judah appears as low as third or fourth in the list of tribes (Numb. i. 7, 26, xiii. 6, xxvi. 19; Deut. xxvii. 12), the order being regulated by the seniority of the sons of Jacob. On the other hand, Judah is the most numerous of all the tribes at both the censuses (Numb. i. 27, xxvi. 22), and it is only natural to expect that its superiority in numbers would give it a priority *de facto*, if not *de jure*, whenever peculiar zeal and energy were requisite. And this we find to have been actually the case. The tribe of Judah took the lead in pitching the tents on the arrival of the Israelites at a halting-place and removing them on their departure (Numb. ii. 3, x. 14). It was, again, the captain of the Judahites who had the privilege of making his offering to the tabernacle on the first day (Numb. vii. 12). And when the territory of Canaan was

portioned out among the tribes by Joshua, it was Judah who received the first 'lot' (Josh. xv. 1). 2. The very first thing which is related after the death of Joshua is a privilege accorded to the Judahites. 'The children of Israel,' we are told, 'asked Jehovah, saying, Who shall go up first against the Canaanites? And Jehovah said, Judah shall go up' (Judg. i. 2). The privilege is renewed in the war against Benjamin (Judg. xx. 18). A long interval elapses before the greatest of the heroes of Judah appears on the stage in the person of the second Israelitish monarch.

It would seem, therefore, at first sight as if the men of Judah had enjoyed a sufficient priority among the tribes to account for the enthusiastic language of the 'Blessing of Jacob.' But there are two objections to this view. 1. The assembly of Shiloh, of which, indeed, we have but very scanty information, was not so manifestly a turning-point in the history of Judah as to explain this decisive promise of imperial rule; and, 2. the words 'and unto him' ought, by the rules of parallelism, which are adhered to in this chapter with unusual strictness, to refer to the subject of the verb in the preceding line.

The next question is, What other meaning can 'coming to Shiloh' have? Dr. Kalisch, one of our most prominent English critics, understands it to refer to the election of Jeroboam as king by the northern tribes; Tuch, Hitzig, and Dozy to pilgrimages to Shiloh, which the pious imagination of the supposed song-writer represented as perpetual—though, by the way, the Shiloh of Dozy is very remote from that of Tuch and Hitzig, being no other than the Arabian Mecca!¹

The main objection to both these explanations is that they compel us to put an unnatural sense on וְעַתָּה , whether, with Kalisch and Luzzatto, we render 'even when' (*a*), or, with Tuch and Hitzig, 'as long as' (*b*). With regard to (*a*), although וְעַתָּה does not necessarily introduce a *terminus ad quem*, it does imply that the act or state which it introduces is intimately connected with that described by the preceding verb. And it would be absurd to say that the accession of Jeroboam was in any way connected with the sceptre not departing from (= remaining with) Judah. Against (*b*) it must be urged that

¹ Mr. Samuel Sharpe, I think, has suggested that 'coming to Shiloh' may allude to some historical event not recorded in the Old Testament, which took place at the temple of Shiloh (as to this temple see 1 Sam. i. 9, Jer. vii. 12, xxvi. 6, 9), and remarked that the genealogist in 1 Chron. vi. appears deliberately to avoid any mention of Eli and Shiloh, in accordance with the natural jealousy of later writers for the exclusive sanctity of the temple at Jerusalem. But though there are many omissions in the historical part of the Old Testament (history not being the primary object of its authors), I doubt if an actual turning-point in the fortunes of Judah and of the Israelites could or would have been entirely ignored.

the sense is contrary to Hebrew usage. And there is this further objection to Tuch's explanation, that the regular word for pilgrimages and solemn journeys of any kind is, not simply to 'go,' but to 'go up;' comp. Ex. xxxiv. 24; 1 Sam. i. 3, &c.; Isa. ii. 3; Deut. xvii. 8.

Failing to be satisfied with the geographical meaning of Shiloh, some have tried to extract from it some other sense, such as 'rest-bringer' (as Hengstenberg formerly); or 'rest,' or 'place of rest' (as Kurtz). Colenso and Delitzsch (for once united) adopt Kurtz's view, so far as the meaning of Shiloh is concerned, but think it is used here with a double meaning (Shiloh the town and 'resting-place'), 'to render the oracle more mysterious,' as the former thinks. And they compare the supposed play upon the name of Shechem in Gen. xlviii. 22. The objection is, that while Shechem is known to have been used in the sense of 'back,' Shiloh is not known in that of 'rest.' There is absolutely no authority for such an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. It would really be a less violent assumption to suppose that an Ephraimitish scribe (or editor) had substituted 'Shiloh' for 'Hebron' (just as in Deut. xxvii. 4, the Samaritans changed 'Ebal' into 'Gerizim'), for it was the coronation of David at Hebron which formed the true turning-point in the fortunes of Judah (see 2 Sam. v. 3).

Two other explanations have a claim to be mentioned from their ingenuity. One is a very old guess, quoted from the Rabbinical compilation called the Yalkut, by Delitzsch, 'until he come whose is tribute' (ל' ש', cf. Ps. lxxviii. 30, Hebr.), which involves no interference with the received text, except dividing the group of letters. The other is that of Matthew Hiller, a learned German Orientalist of the eighteenth century, 'until there come his (Judah's) asked one' (שאלה=שילה, comp. 1 Sam. i. 17), thus forming a parallel to Mal. iii. 1, 'the Lord whom ye seek.' Both explanations imply that the writer of Gen. xlix. 10 had a clear and vigorous belief in the advent of the Messiah. This, in fact, seems to me certain, whatever be the construction of the disputed clause; otherwise how can one make sense of the passage? It is also confirmed by the last line, which reminds one strongly of the *Messianic* promise in Ps. ii. 8.

But I am not prepared to accept either of the above explanations. They are both founded on a late form of the text, the older form being not שילה, but שלה. The former

¹ *Onomastica Sacra* (Tubingæ, 1706), p. 911. Prof. de Lagarde (whom no one will suspect of theological prejudice) has independently proposed the same explanation in his own *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen, 1870), ii. 96.

would require the relative ; the latter has against it the elision, which we should hardly expect in a word which it was so important to make intelligible. And, above all, neither of them accounts for the phenomena of the ancient versions.

The facts about the versions are briefly these. There are two renderings, both claiming the authority of the Sept., τὰ ἀποκειμένα αὐτῷ and ὃ ἀπόκειται. The former rendering is also that of Theodotion ; those of Aquila and Symmachus are unknown (in spite of the commentators), as Dr. Field has pointed out in his edition of the Hexapla fragments. The Targums of Onkelos and Jerusalem render, 'whose is the kingdom ;' the Syriac and Saadya, 'whose it is ;' the Vulgate 'qui mittendus est,' *i.e.* either שְׁלוֹ, of which Siloam ('which is, by interpretation, Sent,' John ix. 7) is a collateral form, or the passive participle שְׁלֹה. From these renderings together we may safely infer (1) that the earliest known form of the Hebrew did not read שִׁלֹה, and (2) that there was a widespread exegetical tradition explaining the passage of the Messiah. Most critics have drawn a third inference, *viz.* that the text followed by the versions had שְׁלו, which, as some think, means Shiloh, or, as others, is another way of writing שְׁלו, *i.e.* with vowel-points, שְׁלוּ, 'whose.' But we have already seen that Shiloh does not make a satisfactory sense, and pointing שְׁלו involves two difficulties : (1) the abbreviation of the relative, which seems to be peculiar¹ to the Hebrew of the northern tribes and to the debased Hebrew of Ecclesiastes, and (2) the ellipsis 'whose' for 'whose is the kingdom,' which I suppose is unexampled for boldness in any language.² The second difficulty is in my opinion insuperable. Nor can it, I think, be called probable that the Septuagint translator of Genesis (a fairly good scholar, be it remembered) should have extracted such a meaning as τὰ ἀποκ. αὐτῷ or ὃ ἀπόκ. from such a miserable scrap of a sentence as שְׁלו. Must he not (and compare in this connection the other versions quoted above, except Vulg.) have either known or *half-consciously divined* that something had dropped out of the text ? If he had the same text that we have, he may have supplied either הוּא (scil. הַשֶּׁבַט) or more thoughtfully מִן־שֶׁבַט from Ezek. xxi. 32 (A. V., 27), which most regard as an allusion to

¹ Job xix. 29 would be an exception, if שְׁלֵי were correct. But there is reason upon reason against admitting this (see Dillmann *ad loc.*).

² Wellhausen's theory presents only the first of these difficulties. He would pronounce שְׁלוּ, and strike out וְלוּ as an intrusive various reading. But this has the effect of spoiling the parallelism, and making *v.* 10 less symmetrical than *vv.* 9, 11 (see *Geschichte Israels*, i. 375).

the passage before us. But it is quite as possible that he found in his copy of the Hebrew a word before, לה (לו), of which ש is but a fragment, the rest of the word having become obliterated, as is so often the case in ancient manuscripts. The disconnected letters would naturally be drawn together, as perhaps in Job xxvii. 18, xiii. 8, and other instances quoted by Dr. Merx.¹ The latter alternative is clearly preferable, as it avoids the abbreviation of the relative (see above). There still remain two questions, but these can easily be answered: (1) What words are there in Hebrew meaning 'to lay up' (ἀπόκειμαι) and containing a ש? Answer: Two; שיה (Symmachus renders נשׁ, used impersonally, in Hos. vi. 11, by ἀποκεῖται), and משׁ, comp. Assyrian *simtu*, 'destiny.' (2) What construction admits of being equally well rendered τὰ ἀποκειμένα αὐτῷ and ὃ ἀπόκειται? Answer: 3rd sing. masc., perf. or imperf. Hofal followed by לו, the relative being supplied either with the verb, or with the preposition and pronominal suffix. If so, the probably true reading will be neither הלשׁ nor שלה (שלו), but either (לו) לה ישׁת or, as Dr. Rönisch has already suggested for the reading of the Sept.,² (לו) לה ישׁם. And we thus obtain a prophecy, in flowing, parallelistic rhythm, of that ideal, Messianic king, whom Isaiah saw in prophetic vision, and of whom he said that 'his rule should be ample' (ix. 7), and that 'unto him should the nations seek' (xi. 10).

Render therefore—

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
Nor the staff (of authority) from between his feet,
Until he come for whom it (*i.e.* the dominion) is appointed,
And to him be the obedience of peoples,

the meaning of which will be, 'The dominion granted to Judah shall only give place to a far wider monarchy, viz. that of the Messiah.'

[Two observations by way of appendix.—1. That the above explanation does not stand or fall with the hypothesis as to the existence of a fragment of an older reading in the Hebrew MS. used by the Sept. translator—the corruption of the text may have been complete before the Sept. version of Genesis was made; and 2. that if this explanation be rejected, we must, I fear, go back either to Mr. Sharpe's hypothesis (see p. 200, note ¹), or to my own alternative suggestion of the substitution of 'Shiloh' for 'Hebron,' both of which are far more violent, and therefore, in my opinion, far less acceptable.]

¹ *Das Gedicht von Hiob* (Jena, 1871), pp. liii.-lvi. of the introduction.

² *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1872, p. 291. Dr. Rönisch does not give the steps by which he reached his conclusion, but it was his suggestion which started my own train of thought in the latter part of this essay.

V. THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

I.

WHO has not heard of 'one of the great results of German criticism' that the personage called the 'Servant of Jehovah' is not really an individual at all, but a collective term for the Jewish people? And that the view which formerly prevailed was due to a theological prejudice in favour of orthodox Christianity? Such at least is the form in which popular writers set forth this 'result,' though their teachers at any rate are too learned to maintain the second, contrary to the notorious facts of early Jewish exegesis.¹ Now Strauss and Dr. Kuenen (whose names may in the present context without offence be combined) are both extremely able critics, but both, as it seems to me, more skilful in the analysis of composite literary works than in fellow-feeling (*Nachempfindung*, to borrow an expressive German word) for the imaginative conceptions of great poets. The facts, in the language of a Review not usually favourable to orthodoxy, may be briefly stated thus:—"The Servant of Yahveh" is, at least sometimes, a collective term for the people of Israel. He is, however, at other times described in language quite unsuitable to a body of persons. The Christian view' [in its crudest form, which rejects points of contact for revelation in the consciousness of the prophets] 'is opposed to the analogy of Hebrew prophecy. What third theory is open?'² The 'Westminster Reviewer' here complains of 'liberal critics' for 'not having given enough attention to the phenomena which partly prevent a more general acceptance of their own views.' He charitably conjectures that there is something in the opposition of conservative critics besides theological repulsion, viz. a sense that the 'collective' theory does not do justice to the most salient and impressive passages devoted to 'the Servant.' And does not this suggest the real point of difference between the two sides, viz. that Dr. Kuenen starts from the passages in which the conception of 'the Servant' is least developed, and conservative critics from the highest points which the prophet's poetic intuition (not to speak theologically) has reached? And is it not fairer to estimate a poet's ideas rather by their strongest than by their weakest expression—rather by the passages in which he has fully

¹ Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, Eng. Transl., i. 314-8; Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, pp. 221-2. Comp. Neubauer and Driver, *The Jewish Interpreters of Isaiah* liii.

² *Westminster Review*, Oct. 1875, p. 475.

found his voice, than by those in which he is still labouring after fitting accents ?

The exegetical facts have been sufficiently laid before the reader in the preceding commentary. It has, I hope, been shown that 'the Servant' is neither exclusively the people of Israel as a whole, nor the pious portion of it, nor the class of prophets, nor any single individual, but that some form of conception must be found which does justice to the elements of truth contained in all these theories. In my earlier work¹ I was captivated by an extremely tempting theory of Ewald, which has hardly met with the attention which it deserves. 'Sometimes,' I said, 'the prophet views the people of Israel from an ideal, sometimes from a historical point of view. Hence in several important sections the "Servant of Jehovah" (like the Zion of xl. 9, &c.) is a purely poetical figure, personifying the ideal character of the pious Israelite, and decorated by the prophet with all the noblest achievements of faith, whether actually realised in the past, or merely hoped for from the future' (*I. C. A.*, p. 155). This theory does not exclude the possibility that some features in the description may have been taken from individual righteous men (such as Jeremiah), just as Dante in his pilgrimage through the unseen world is at once a banished Florentine and the representative of humanity ; and as Calderon's Philotea is said to be sometimes the ideal of the Church, and sometimes a single soul. But I erred, and Ewald erred, in regarding this personage as a 'purely poetical figure.' The truth in the theory is, that 'the Servant' does in reality embody the highest qualities of the Israelite—he is not merely a collective term. But the truth which it has entirely missed is, that the prophet actually sees as it were in vision (such is the strength of his faith) the advent of such an ideal Israelite. And one whole side of the difficulty connected with the Servant it has left out of view, viz., the application of the very same term to the actual people of Israel. Well may the 'Westminster Reviewer' call out for some fresh theory to reconcile the apparently conflicting phenomena !

I believe myself that the theory of Delitzsch and Oehler (see vol. i. p. 259) meets the requirements of the case ; but that it admits of a fuller and more complete justification than those eminent scholars have supplied. I reached it myself from the starting-point of the fragment of truth taught me

¹ A complete retraction of the writer's former opinions might justly expose him to the charge of instability. But in his present view he hopes to retain the element of truth in his former position. The most widely known living commentator on Isaiah (Dr. Delitzsch) has himself not always held his present theory. See above, p. 40.

by Ewald. Let me attempt to explain the course of my thought.—1. The truth in Ewald's theory (as I ventured to state above) is, that 'the Servant' in the finest and therefore regulative passages does really embody the highest Israelitish ideal. We Aryans of the West are accustomed to draw a hard and fast line between the ideal and the real; but the unphilosophical Israelite made no such distinction. The kingdom of God he regarded as really in heaven, waiting to be revealed; and so the ideal of Israel was to an Israelite really in heaven, in the super-sensible world, waiting for its manifestation. But in order to be real, this ideal must at the same time be personal. This is one important element in the solution of our question.—2. Next let us consider the state of mind of the Jewish exiles, for whom (as all agree) chaps. xl.—lxvi. of Isaiah were (mainly, at any rate) written. During the interruption of the ceremonial system they felt the want of a more spiritual type of religion, and above all of a new ideal, high enough for veneration, but not too high to be imitated. They belonged, as we have seen to an imaginative race, prone to symbolism, and averse to abstract conceptions. One of their number, less absorbed than some in the national traditions,¹ and not without some flashes of the light of the Gospel, produced a wonderfully striking type of character, divested of everything Israelitish in appearance, into which he flung in profuse abundance the new divinely-inspired thoughts which were craving for utterance. The result (as after long thought I have satisfied myself) was the poem of Job, in which Job is the type of the ideal righteous man, 'made perfect through suffering. But there were others who, with all their admiration for Job, retained an overpowering interest in the national institutions. One of these was a prophet, for the author of the 40th and following chapters of the Book of Isaiah, as all will agree, either is one of the Jewish exiles, or (to use the language of Delitzsch) 'leads a life in the spirit among the exiles,' reaching in the power of the Spirit across the centuries to the contemporaries of the author of Job. Others were psalmists; for it must, as we have seen, be admitted, that some at least of the psalms refer, not to a historical individual, but (in different shades of the conception) to an ideal and yet (in the psalmist's mind) real representative of the people of Israel. 3. Here I come to the point where I have felt obliged to diverge from Ewald. These

¹ That the publication of the 'Book of the Law' by Ezra presupposes a long study of the Pentateuchal (or Hexateuchal) narratives and laws, and a band of patient students, all critics will probably agree.

devout and inspired men were acutely sensible of the incompetency of the actual Israel for the embodiment of the newly revealed ideal. They felt that, if expressed at all, it must be through a person; and the longings which they felt for the appearance of such a person, and their faith that Jehovah had not deserted his people, prepared their minds for a special revelation that such a Person would appear. Only it was not in a definite prediction that their newly attained conviction found expression. Theirs was rather a presentiment (*Ahnung*) than a clear view of the future, and hence a certain vagueness in it, which, however, almost if not quite disappears at the two highest points of the Old Testament revelation, Psalm xxii. and Isaiah liii. It was not, therefore (as I once thought), the ideal and yet real Genius of Israel, who preached to an unbelieving generation, who was slain but not given up to the power of Hades, and for whom an endless life and a posterity were reserved—but a literal human being perfectly righteous himself, and able therefore to ‘make the many righteous.’

Thus much to account for the assertion that in the more salient and elaborate passages¹ the ‘Servant of Jehovah’ is the historical Redeemer of Israel and the world. I am not without hope that the difficulty felt by some in conceiving of such a surpassing revelation may have been relieved by showing the point of contact for it in the mind of the prophet. The remaining portion of the theory of Delitzsch and Oehler does not seem to require a lengthened justification. In xlii. 19 and xliii. 10 the ‘Servant’ is evidently the people of Israel as a whole; while in xli. 8, 9, xlv. 1, 2, 21, xlv. 4, and xlvi. 20, it is the kernel of the nation, the spiritual Israel. No doubt ‘Servant of Jehovah’ was a common prophetic title for the people of Israel, and the sublime interpretation given to it sometimes in chap. xlii.–liii. is superimposed upon this. It was the fact that Israel did not act up to his title ‘Servant of Jehovah,’ which filled the pious exiles with a longing for a person who should realise it, and by redeeming the Israelites from their sins enable them to realise it likewise. Difficult it was of course to imagine how such a redeemer could arise. ‘Oh for a clean among the unclean!’ cried mournfully one of the inspired writers among the exiles (Job xiv. 4). Yet he must be ‘bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh;’ else how can he offer himself a sacrifice for us, and be our teacher? The prophet in Isa. liii. leaves the solution of the problem to God! he trusts Him who cannot abandon His people to produce such an Israelite. And here is the point of contact

¹ These are xlii. 1–7, xlix. 1–9, l. 4–10, lii. 13–liii. 12.

between the personal and the national 'Servant of Jehovah,' viz. that the person is, strange as it seems, the mature product, the flower and fruit, of the Jewish nation. If all this has a New Testament sound, if Jesus Christ, *der grosse Jude*, as Zinzendorf calls him,¹ answers to this description, so much the better! But the present writer, at any rate, started from a point of view—viz. that of Ewald—which is not in the faintest degree theological. Is not the theological prejudice rather on the side of our liberal critics? Why should they grant the personality of the Messiah (who might surely be a 'collective term'; comp. Isa. xxxii. 1, 2), but not that of the Servant? May not one of their motives unconsciously be that the Servant, as described in Isa. xlii.–liiii., is more distinctly superhuman than the Messiah?

2.

I have spoken in the preceding section of the need felt by the Jewish exiles (among whom the author of II. Isaiah, to say the least, moves in spirit) of a new ideal, a new object of hope, and tried to show how this want was actually supplied. It must not, however, be supposed that there was no point of contact between the new ideal and the old. New phases of prophecy are as carefully adapted to the old, as to the moral and social state of the persons for whom they are primarily designed. Thus the 'one increasing purpose' becomes more and more manifest, and no past phase can be set aside as useless or un instructive. The connection of the new ideal with the old is the subject of the conclusion of this essay.

The Old Testament is pervaded by a longing for the 'kingdom of God' to be set up on earth. Jehovah no doubt was Israel's heavenly king, but the prophets and other holy men yearned for a time when the reality of earth should correspond to the ideal of heaven, and when He whom with more and more intensity they believed to be the rightful Lord of the world should be universally acknowledged by his liege subjects. The universal and (for the Semitic king was not an arbitrary despot) spontaneous obedience of mankind to the will of Jehovah is the kernel of the conception of 'the kingdom of God.' There is, however, a certain variety in the way of expressing this conception. According to some Old Testament passages, Jehovah himself, after an act of swift

¹ 'Wann, grosser Jude, wann kommt deine Stunde?' A line in a metrical prayer sung by Zinzendorf before the Moravian Church on the Jewish Day of Atonement, Oct. 12, 1739.

and sure judgment, is to undertake the personal government of the world; according to others, a wonderfully endowed descendant of David is to be enthroned as his representative. The former type of expression is particularly prominent in the later psalms, but is also found in the prophets (see Isa. iv. 5, 6, xxiv. 23, Joel iii. 21, Zech. xiv. 3-11); the latter became current in the prophetic literature through the splendid revelations of Isaiah, but is far from unrepresented in the Book of Psalms, though to what extent is a matter of much controversy.—These two forms of the conception are never entirely fused in the Old Testament, though an incipient union, pointing in a New Testament direction, cannot (see pp. 187, 196) fairly be denied.

It is one of the great peculiarities of the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah that they contain no distinct reference to the royal Messiah. The 'David' in lv. 3, 4 is not the second David predicted in Hos. iii. 5, Jer. xxx. 9, Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24, but the David of the historical books and the Psalms. Still we must not conclude too hastily that the older Messianic belief has left no traces in the second part of Isaiah. This would be a strange result indeed—a dumb note in the scale of prophetic harmony! Even if the author of the prophecies of 'the Servant' be not Isaiah, he has certainly formed himself, to say the least, in no slight degree on his predecessor; and in limning the portrait of Jehovah's ideal Servant, he was in a manner bound to preserve some at least of the features of the Messianic king. And this is what we actually find in the prophetic description of the Servant. In the statement that 'kings shall shut their mouths because of him' (lii. 15), and that 'he shall divide spoil with the powerful' (liii. 12), it is clear that for the moment the humble-minded Servant is represented as a conqueror in the midst of a victorious host. This is not without analogy,¹ nor is it so anomalous as it may seem. It was natural and necessary that the die, from which the coins with a royal stamp had proceeded, should be broken, the royalistic form of the Messianic conception having become antiquated with the hopeless downfall of the kingdom of Judah; but equally so that fragments of the die should be gathered up and fused with other elements into a new whole. The ideal and yet real Israelite of the future has

¹ There is, in fact, a parallel for it in Zech. ix. 9, where the royal Messiah is described as 'lowly,' as if by an anticipation of the meek Servant of Jehovah. It was not enough for the prophet, and for those to whom he prophesied, that the Deliverer should be a just judge and a victorious warrior: he must also be one with his people in experience of suffering, and who could be touched with a feeling of their infirmities. It is clear that this passage was written in a time of national depression.

therefore some points in common with a king, but withal he is much more than an earthly king. He is a prophet, for it is written that 'he shall bring forth (God's) law to the Gentiles' (xlii. 1); a priest, for 'he shall make . . . an offering for guilt' (liii. 10): and yet he is more than a prophet, for he is in his own person 'a covenant of the people and a light of the Gentiles' (xlii. 6), and more than a priest, for the victim which he lays down is his own life (liii. 10). Exclusively, he is neither king nor prophet nor priest, but all of them together and more.¹ These are but words 'thrown out' (to adopt a phrase from Mr. Matthew Arnold) at an object beyond the power of language to describe. Of the Servant of Jehovah, as well as of the earlier Messiah, it may be said, 'His name is called, Wonderful.'

VI. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CRITICAL CONTROVERSY.

I.

It is with some hesitation that I cross the border which separates exegesis from the higher criticism. The public is eager for results; a Chaldean Genesis, a Babylonian Isaiah, and even M. Jacolliot's Sanskrit life of 'Jeseus Christna' receive the same indiscriminating welcome. For though keenly interested in criticism, the public takes wonderfully little pains to master the preliminaries. It demands the truth about Homer, with the slenderest knowledge of the Homeric poems; and to have the mystery of Isaiah dispelled, when it has but skimmed the surface of the Isaianic prophecies. And yet the chief thing is, not to know who wrote a prophecy, but to understand and assimilate its essential ideas; this is important for all—the rest can be fully utilised only by the historical student. Parts there may be of the exegesis which remain vague and obscure till we know the circumstances under which a prophecy was written,² but these in the case of Isaiah form but a small proportion of the whole. There is no absolute necessity for an honest exegete to give any detailed treatment to the higher critical problems.

A comprehensive discussion of the date and authorship of II. Isaiah is therefore not to be looked for; and it is chiefly because I have given the outlines of such a discussion

¹ Delitzsch, *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, 1850, p. 34.

² Vol. i. p. 237.

elsewhere that I return to the subject here. For though the pages devoted to it in my earlier work are not yet by any means superseded, they require both filling up and correcting, especially in the survey of the arguments for the unity of the authorship. The present essay will therefore be necessarily in a high degree incomplete and fragmentary; it only supplements, and will at the right moment be supplemented. It relates exclusively to the last twenty-seven chapters: not as if chaps. i.-xxxix. constituted 'the First Isaiah,' and chaps. xl.-lxvi. 'the Second,'¹ but simply because the data furnished by the disputed chapters in the first part of the book are found with important additions in the second; and it is mainly concerned with one special question relative to these chapters, viz., what evidence do they afford as to the locality in which they were composed?

The section in *The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged* headed 'Arguments in Favour of the Unity of Authorship' is introduced by a quotation from Dr. Franz Delitzsch, containing the admission that, 'there is not a single passage in the book (Isa. xl.-lxvi.) which betrays that the times of the Exile are only ideally, and not actually, present to the prophetic writer.'² It was tempting to make the most of these suggestive words; but it was a mistake. One may still admire the childlike candour and the strong faith in the absolute security of prophecy, which rendered the admission possible, but a renewed examination has shown that it was entirely uncalled for, and that some passage of II. Isaiah are in various degrees really favourable to the theory of a Palestinian origin. Thus, in lvii. 5, the reference to torrent-beds is altogether inapplicable to the alluvial plains of Babylonia; and equally so is that to subterranean 'holes' in xlii. 22. And though, no doubt, Babylonia was more wooded in ancient times than it is at present,³ it is certain that the trees mentioned in xli. 19 were not for the most part natives of that country, while the date-palm, the commonest of all the Babylonian trees, is not once referred to. The fact has not escaped the observation of Mr. Urwick, who has devoted special attention to the agricultural and botanical references in both parts of Isaiah, with the view of obtaining a subsi-

¹ Yet the author of one of the most remarkable products of rationalistic criticism in England asserts that 'only the most uncompromising champions of what is taken for orthodoxy now venture to deny that the Book of Isaiah is the work of two persons. . . . [cc. i.-xxxix. constitute the work of the former, cc. xl.-lxvi. that of the latter]. (*The Hebrew Migration from Egypt*, Lond., 1879, p. 61 note.)

² See *J. C. A.*, Introduction, p. xvii, but comp. the qualifications of this admission in the new (third) edition of Delitzsch's *Isaia*, p. 406.

³ Rawlinson's note on Herod., i. 193.

diary argument in favour of the unity of the book.¹ Mr. Urwick, however, does not seem to have noticed that the argument is a two-edged one. For the trees mentioned in xli. 19 are for the most part as unfamiliar to a native of Judæa as to a man of Babylonia.² By a similar method it could be proved that the Book of Jeremiah was written in northern Israel, because in xvii. 8 a figure is taken from perennial streams, which were unknown in the drier south; and even that the book of the exile-prophet Ezekiel is a forgery, because of his frequent references to the mountains and rivers of Israel (vi. 2, 3, xxxiv. 13, 14, xxxvi. 1-12, &c.). As has been remarked elsewhere, 'a Semitic race, when transplanted to a distant country, preserves a lively recollection of its earlier home. The Arabic poets in Spain delighted in allusions to Arabian localities, and descriptions of the events of desert-life. Why should not a prophecy of the Exile contain some such allusions to the scenery of Palestine,'³ especially, it may be added, if the natural objects referred to have a symbolical meaning? The allusions will, at any rate, be of small critical value unless they be supported by historical references, which unmistakably point away from the period of the Exile.

Such references, however, are really forthcoming, as the elder traditionalists rightly saw. They are most numerous and striking in chapters lvi., lvii., lxxv., lxxvi., where, however, they are probably often under-estimated, owing to the prejudice produced by the earlier chapters. Let us read them by themselves, and I think we shall hardly doubt that the descriptions refer to some period or periods other than the Exile. And yet, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that there are still more numerous passages which presuppose the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of the Jews in Babylon. How are these conflicting phenomena to be reconciled?

One way (*a*) is to suppose that they are Isaiah's involuntary betrayals of his authorship. It will be remembered that, according to a prevalent theory, Isa. xl.-lxxvi. is a 'monograph' written by Isaiah in a quasi-ecstatic state for the future use of the exiles. No one perhaps (putting aside Dr. Delitzsch) has better expressed this view than the present

¹ *The Servant of Jehovah*, p. 49. Mr. Urwick remarks that there were no vineyards in Babylonia. But M. Lenormant has shown that Mesopotamia produced an abundance of valuable wines (*Syllabaires cundiformes*. Par. 1876, pp. 121-129).

² The myrtle is probably one of the *unfamiliar* trees. It is only mentioned (excluding Isa. xli. 19, lv. 13) in two books of post-exile origin (Zech. i. 8, 10, 11, Neh. viii. 15), and in the parallel Pentateuch-passage to Neh. *loc. cit.* the myrtle is omitted (Lev. xxiii. 40). Dean Perowne has suggested that it may have been imported into Palestine from Babylonia (Smith's *Bible Dict.*, art. 'Zechariah').

³ *J. C. A.*, p. 201.

Dean of Westminster, who does not, however, venture to decide upon its merits. 'The Isaiah,' he says, 'of the vexed and stormy times of Ahaz and of Hezekiah is supposed in his later days to have been transported by God's Spirit into a time and a region other than his own. . . . He is led in prolonged and solitary visions into a land that he has never trodden, and to a generation on whom he has never looked. The familiar scenes and faces, among which he had lived and laboured, have grown dim and disappeared. All sounds and voices of the present are hushed, and the interests and passions into which he had thrown himself with all the intensity of his race and character move him no more. The present has died out of the horizon of his soul's vision. . . . The voices in his ears are those of men unborn, and he lives a second life among events and persons, sins and suffering, and fears and hopes, photographed sometimes with the minutest accuracy on the sensitive and sympathetic medium of his own spirit; and he becomes the denouncer of the special sins of a distant generation, and the spokesman of the faith and hope and passionate yearning of an exiled nation, the descendants of men living when he wrote in the profound peace of a renewed prosperity.'¹

It would carry me too far from my present object to criticise this theory, but let me observe in passing that, if the passages with Palestinian references can be taken as unconscious self-betraysals, they furnish a reply to one of the chief objections by which it has been met. It is commonly said (and with much justice) that so long-continued a transference of a prophet's point of view into the ideal future is without a parallel. For a short time a prophet of the classical period may indeed pass beyond his habitual horizon, but he cannot help betraying his own date in the course of a very few verses or paragraphs. Whether or not this inference from the classical prophecies is justified, need not here be discussed. Suffice it to say that the reply to the objection furnished by the proposed view of the Palestinian references is at any rate plausible, supposing that the passages containing them form an integral portion of the book.

(b) Another conceivable view (which again I do not pronounce upon, but only mention) is this—that the Palestinian references are the involuntary self-betrayal of a prophetic writer living in Palestine *during the Exile*.² It is clear from several

¹ Abstract of University sermon by the Rev. G. G. Bradley, in the *Oxford Under-graduates' Journal*, Feb. 18, 1875.

² So F. W. Seinecke, *Der Evangelist des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1870); also apparently H. Oort (at least for some part of II. Isaiah), *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1876, pp. 528-536.

passages (especially Ezek. xxxiii. 24), and from the fact that, unlike the northern kingdom, Judah was not colonised by foreigners after the fall of the state, that a considerable number of Jews remained behind in their own country.¹ It is far from incredible that some literary men should have formed part of this remnant, and that one of them, at least, should have been a prophet. In fact, it seems almost certain that Lam. v. was written in Judah during the Exile, and we cannot suppose that this was the only Palestinian production of that long period. There are passages in II. Isaiah, besides those already referred to, which may be considered to favour the view under consideration (*e.g.* xl. 9, lii. 1, 2, 5 [?], 7-9), though perfectly capable of explanation on the ordinary theory. It is no doubt a little difficult to realise the selection of a prophet in Judah to address the whole body of the nation (the most important and most cultivated part of which was in exile), but if there was no equally great prophet in Babylonia, it was the only possible choice. There may even have been special advantages in his distance from the centre of the nation, of which we are ignorant. Certainly this theory has the merit of simplicity; it accounts, not only for the Palestinian features in some of the descriptions, but for the paucity of the references to Babylonian circumstances.

Yes, it has the merit of simplicity; but that is hardly a recommendation to 'those who know.' If the solution of this problem is so extremely simple, it will be almost unique. Complication, and not simplicity, is the note of the questions and of the answers which constitute Old Testament criticism. It is becoming more and more certain that the present form especially of the prophetic Scriptures is due to a literary class (the so-called *Soferim*, 'scribes,' or 'Scripturists'), whose principal function was collecting and supplementing the scattered records of prophetic revelation. This function they performed with rare self-abnegation. Of a regard on their part for personal distinction there is not a trace; self-consciousness is swallowed up in the sense of belonging, if only in a secondary degree, to the company of inspired men. They wrote, they recast, they edited, in the same spirit in which a gifted artist of our own day devoted himself to the glory of 'modern painters.' To apply the words of a great American prose-poet, 'They chose the better, and loftier and more unselfish part, laying their individual hopes, their fame, their prospects of enduring remembrance, at the feet of those

¹ Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, ii. 176; comp. his *Historisch-kritisch onderzoek*, ii. 150, note 8, iii. 357-8 (on Lam. v.).

great departed ones, whom they so loved and venerated.¹ Surely if the prophets were inspired, a younger son's portion of the Spirit was granted to their self-denying editors.²

St. Jerome had evidently more than a mere suspicion of the activity of the Soferim, when he significantly remarked that Ezra might be plausibly described as the 'instaurator' of the Pentateuch. It is, however, to Ewald that we owe the first rough sketch of their probable proceedings. The subjective element is unreasonably strong in all that great master's work; and a careful re-examination of the Old Testament records from the same literary point of view as Ewald's is urgently needed. At the same time his treatment of the latter part of the Book of Isaiah cannot be complained of on the score of excessive analysis. The only passages which he denies to have been written by 'the Great Unnamed'³ are xl. 1, 2, lii. 13-liv. 12, lvi. 9-lvii. 11 (by a prophet of the reign of Manasseh), lviii. 1-lix. 20 (written soon after Ezekiel). He also maintains, however, that the author is well acquainted with the works of the older prophets, from which he now and again borrows the text of his discourse (see, *e.g.*, the description of the folly of idolatry in Jer. x.). It is this free use of 'motives' from the earlier literature, and this combination of old material with new in the manner of mosaic-work, which is characteristic of the Soferim.

But though Ewald has been the first, or one of the first, in the field, he has left much land still to be occupied. First of all, he has taken no account of the possibility that the author of chaps. xl.-lxvi. not only put old ideas and phrases into a new setting, but also incorporated the substance of

¹ Hawthorne's *Transformation*; character of Hilda (chap. vi. 'She chose,' &c.).

² This habit of recasting and re-editing ancient writings was still characteristic of Jewish literary men at a much later period. As Dr. Edersheim observes, 'There are scarcely any ancient Rabbinical documents which have not been interpolated by later writers, or, as we might euphemistically call it, been recast and re-edited' (*Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 131). The habit, I say, survived, but the spirit which vivified the habit, was changed. For the editors of the Scriptures were inspired; there is no maintaining the authority of the Bible without this postulate. True, we must allow a distinction in degrees of inspiration, as the Jewish doctors themselves saw, though it was some time before they clearly formulated their view. I am glad to notice that one so free from the suspicion of Rationalism or Romanism as Rudolf Stier adopts the Jewish distinction, remarking that even the lowest grade of inspiration (*בְּרִיית הַקֹּדֶשׁ*) remains one of faith's mysteries.

³ Such is Ewald's title for the author of the greater part of Isa. xl.-lxvi., and abundant has been the contumely it has brought upon him. 'As if,' remarks a well-known Scotch divine, 'the praise of greatness from human lips could ever compensate the loss of degrading the noblest of God's prophets into a man nameless and unknown' (*The Old Isaiah*, by A. Moody Stuart, D.D., Edinb. 1880, p. 7). Such writers forget the self-abnegation characteristic of Biblical authors (where there was no special reason for mentioning their names), and the remark of Origen with regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, *Τὸ δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν*.

connected discourses of that great prophet, of whose style we are so often reminded in these chapters—Isaiah. This is a possibility which it is impossible to raise to a certainty, or even to such an approximate certainty as we are so often fain to be content with in literary criticism. For if the work of Isaiah has been utilised, it has been so skilfully fused in the mind and imagination of the later prophet, that a discrimination between the old and the new is scarcely feasible. But the view is quite in harmony with what we know of the Soferim. Some of the class were, from a literary point of view, mere workers in mosaic (to repeat an expressive figure), others were real artists, real poets and orators, quite capable, therefore, of such work as we are supposing II. Isaiah to contain. Moreover, the view offers two especial advantages: 1. It gives a very simple explanation (though simplicity, as we have seen, is not always a mark of truth) of the linguistic points of contact between the original and the 'Babylonian' Isaiah; and 2. it dispenses us from the necessity of assuming (against the context) such a suspension of the laws of psychology as is implied on the traditional theory by the mention of 'Cyrus' in xlv. 28 (see note), xlv. 1. I may add that it is partly parallel to the case of certain portions of I. Isaiah, where the preceding commentary has recognised the hand of another writer, perhaps that of a disciple of Isaiah, reproducing in a new connection authentic remains of the master's teaching (see vol. i. pp. 43, 185, 235). Still it appears to me that the objections urged in another connection (vol. i. p. 234) against Isaiah's having foretold the fall of Babylon have to be met, before this hypothesis can be said to be securely grounded.¹

Secondly, there are other parts of II. Isaiah as difficult to interpret on the theory of the original unity of the book as any of those which Ewald has mentioned. In fact, from chap. liii. onwards, it is the exception to find a chapter which is not studded with passages by no means easy to reconcile with the unitarian theory. Bleek, who, I need not say, enjoys a high reputation for the caution and reverence of his criticism, points out especially the three prophecies, lxiii. 1-6, lxiii. 7-lxv. 25, and chap. lxvi., which, according to him, were composed shortly after the close of the Exile,² and even Naegelsbach

¹ The hypothesis is supported by Dr. Klostermann of Kiel in a dissertation in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, for 1876 (pp. 1-60), and in the article 'Jesaja' in the second edition of Herzog's *Real-encyclopädie*. A worse advocate for a good cause could hardly be found; such perverse reasoning surprises one in a trained theologian. Still the fundamental idea deserves attention. Both in the first and in the second part of Isaiah the presence of exilic prophecies appears as certain to Dr. Klostermann as to any of the rationalistic critics.

² *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Eng. Transl.), ii. 49, 50. Bleek, indeed, is of

commenting on Isaiah in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, is so impressed by the peculiarities of chaps. lxxv., lxxvi., that he somewhat arbitrarily supposes them to have been interpolated. 'It appears,' he says, 'that one of the faithful Israelites used every opportunity of attaching to the words of the prophet a threat against the abhorred apostates.' His instances are, lxxiv. 9-11, lxxv. 3b-5a, lxxv. 11, 12, lxxv. 25, lxxvi. 3b-6, lxxvi. 17.

But I must postpone further remarks on this too seductive theme. Suffice it if I have made it plain that a number of important exegetical questions have to be settled before the Isaianic authorship of Isa. xli.-lxxvi. can be fruitfully discussed. It is possible that it may some day become an approximate certainty that the latter part of II. Isaiah was once much shorter, and that the author, or one of the Soferim, enlarged it by the insertion of passages from other prophets, introducing at the same time an artificial semblance of unity by the insertion of a slightly altered version of the gnomic saying in lxxviii. 22 as a refrain in lxxvii. 21. There is nothing disparaging to prophecy in such a view, as long as we maintain the divine inspiring and overruling influence for which I have pleaded above. On the contrary, it appears to me that it does honour to the Spirit of prophecy by enlarging the range of His operations, according to that saying of the Man of God in reply to those who 'envied for his sake,' 'Would God that all Jehovah's people were prophets!' It must be remembered, however, that this view can only become an approximate certainty, when the outlines have been sketched of a history of the later Old Testament literature, in which the place of these and similar insertions has on reasonable grounds been indicated. The fault of modern critics has been that they have considered the Old Testament writings too much as isolated phenomena, whereas the complicated nature of the problems urgently demands that the books should be treated in connection. It may indeed be confidently anticipated that the history of Old Testament literature will prove the most effectual justification of Old Testament criticism.

2.

There are still a few other points in which I desire to supplement my earlier statement. 1. As to the paucity of allusions in chaps. xli.-lxxvi. to the special circumstances of Babylon. The fact must be allowed; it was, indeed, so conspicuous as to induce Ewald to suppose that the author opinion that the passages referred to were by the same author as the earlier prophecies; but this may on plausible grounds be contested.

resided in Egypt. It is not unfavourable to the authorship of Isaiah, who might have learned almost as much about Babylon as is mentioned in these chapters either from travelling merchants, or from the ambassadors of Merodach Baladan. The only possible allusion of this kind (if we may press the letter of the prophecy) distinctly in favour of an exilic date, is that in xlvi. 1. to the worship of Bel-Merodach and Nebo, which specially characterised the later Babylonian empire.¹ This paucity of Babylonian references would be less surprising (for prophets and apostles were not curious observers), were it not for the very specific allusions to Palestinian circumstances in some of the later chapters. As I have indicated, there is more than one way of accounting for it.

2. With regard to style. It is proverbially difficult to obtain unanimity on a question of style, but I think it will hardly be gainsaid that the style of the second part of Isaiah is on the whole in many ways different from that of the first. This judgment will be none the less valid because it is founded on an impression. The impression is no casual or arbitrary one, but produced, as Professor A. B. Davidson truly says, by the combined force of many elements. 'It is quite possible to subject this impression to the crucible and dissolve it, reasoning it away bit by bit, and then to assert that the testimony of style is worth nothing. . . . But when the tide of logic recedes, the impression remains as distinct as ever.' The question is, whether such a diversity of style as we are supposing necessarily argues a diversity of authorship. This can only be decided by a careful examination of the elements of the diversity; and here I cannot but think that recent English scholars have failed; Professor Stanley Leathes, Professor Birks, and Dr. Kay, all endeavour unduly to minimise the diversity in phraseology between I. and II. Isaiah. None of them appear to understand what it is that the disintegrating critics mean by their appeal to phraseology, and one can well imagine that they have all felt inclined to use language in which Dr. Payne Smith has actually expressed himself, that 'the aberrations of the human intellect are infinite.'² The truth is, however, that it is not merely upon isolated words or phrases that those critics found their argument, but upon 'the peculiar articulation of sentences and the movement of the whole discourse;' and even within the field of phraseology, it is not so much upon the fact that

¹ See e.g. the Birs Nimrud Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar, *Records of the Past*, vii. 73-78, in which the names of Marduk and Nabu (and no other gods) constantly recur. Sargon, it is true, also mentions these deities with high honour, but makes Assur precede them (*Records of the Past*, vii. 25).

² *The Old Testament, with a Brief Commentary by Various Writers.* (S.P.C.K.).

some words are peculiar to the second part of Isaiah, as upon this, that certain words, though common to both parts, are used in the second in a peculiar sense, and one which implies a great development of thought. And so the argument from phraseology runs up into another (3) based upon the new ideas and forms of representing ideas in the disputed prophecies, on which on a former occasion some may have thought that I placed undue reliance. If I erred, I did so in good company, for the tendency of the most thoughtful Continental scholars is in the same direction. Dr. Paul Kleinert, for instance, in his condensation of the Old Testament Prolegomena into tables for the use of students, mentions as the second argument for the non-Isaianic origin of II. Isaiah that 'the development of many primary ideas (עבר יהוה, משפט, צדק, &c.) is subsequent not only to Isaiah but to Jeremiah.'¹ Still it is well, perhaps, to be reminded of the necessity of caution, lest one should be so far carried away in the ardour of criticism as to relegate to a later 'stage' an idea which an early inspired prophet might perhaps under peculiar circumstances have conceived. On the other hand, conservative scholars should take into careful consideration whether it is admissible to maintain that an idea is Isaianic, if it can only be justified as such by assuming, contrary to the analogy of classical prophecy, a suspension of the ordinary laws of psychology.² Too many theologians rush into the thick of prophetic interpretation without any deep study of this most fundamental of questions.

If I might return for a moment to the argument from diversity of style, I would venture to supplement the question as to its critical value raised above by another, Does unity of style necessarily argue unity of authorship? Dr. Colenso obviously replied to this in the affirmative when he maintained that the Book of Deuteronomy was written by the prophet Jeremiah, and Ewald and Hitzig, by their treatment of the Psalms, have given some support to such a position. But I suppose all that need be inferred from unity of style is that one of the books which display this unity exercised a strong influence on the author of the other. We know that the Soferim had their favourite Scriptures, and it is a conjecture of recent critics that when the prophetic Epigoni edited the older prophecies, they sometimes added parallel works of their own (*Begleitschreiben*), in which they sought to treat

¹ *Abriss der Einleitung zum Alten Testament im Tabellenform* (Berlin, 1878), p. 25.

² On the point thus raised, the student should refer to Prof. Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy* (Eng. Transl., Edinb. 1876).

existing circumstances in the spirit of their predecessors. This is at least a good working hypothesis, and is not in itself inconsistent with a belief in prophetic inspiration.

4. The argument from parallel passages is sometimes much over-rated. How prone we are to fancy an imitation where there is none, has been strikingly shown by Mr. Munro's parallels between the plays of Shakspeare and Seneca,¹ and even when an imitation on one side or the other must be supposed, how difficult it is to choose between the alternatives! That there are parallels between II. Isaiah on the one hand and Zephaniah or Jeremiah on the other is certain, and that the one prophet imitated the other is probable; but which is the original one? As I have remarked elsewhere, our view of the relation between two authors is apt to be biassed by a prejudice in favour of the more brilliant genius; we can hardly help believing that the more strikingly expressed passage must be the more original. A recent revolution of opinion among patristic students may be a warning to us not to be too premature in deciding such questions. It has been the custom to argue from the occurrence of almost identical sentences in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix and the *Apologeticum* of Tertullian, that Minucius must have written later than the beginning of the third century, on the ground that a brilliant genius like Tertullian cannot have been such a servile imitator as the hypothesis of the priority of Minucius would imply. But Adolf Ebert seems to have definitively proved² that Tertullian not only made use of Minucius, but did not even understand his author rightly.

I do not, on the ground of the difficulties encompassing it, desire to expel this argument from our critical apparatus. But I do think that it can only be properly used in a comprehensive work on the Biblical and especially the prophetic literature as a whole. And so I come round to my original proposition that he who would take part, whether as a teacher or a student, in the controversies of the higher criticism, must first of all have equipped himself by a self-denying and theory-denying examination of the texts. Can it be said that all our critics have so equipped themselves, or that all even of our interpreters have been fully conscious of the moral pre-requisites?

¹ *Journal of Philology*, vol. vi. (Camb. 1876), pp. 70-72.

² Ebert, *Tertullians Verhältniss zu Minucius Felix*, reviewed in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1869, pp. 740-743.

VII. CORRECTION OF THE HEBREW TEXT.

THE subject described in the above title is one peculiarly unfit for an essay ; it is obviously not a dissertation, but facts, which the reader requires in order to form a well-grounded opinion upon it, and the facts cannot be condensed into a few pages. Still, for the same reason that I ventured to sketch the connection which, as I think, exists between the philological and the theological interpretation of Isaiah, I will devote a brief study to clearing away some possible misunderstandings arising out of my treatment of the text.

It is a depressing discovery to the student when he first realises the weakness of the authority for the received Hebrew text. And yet the state of the case might fairly have been anticipated. If, in the judgment of Lachmann and Tischendorf, corruptions of some moment have taken place even in the text of the New Testament, almost infinitely greater is the probability that a similar misfortune on a larger scale has befallen the text of the Old. To explain the causes, and investigate the degree of this phenomenon, would be a subject well worthy of a scholar's pen ; but it lies outside my immediate province. Among the manifold causes, however, there is one which will occur directly to every student—the transcription of the Hebrew records from the latest archaic to the modern or square character. M. de Vogüé, an authority on palæography, thus describes the fortunes of the rival alphabets :—

‘If we consider in its entirety the history of the Hebrew writing, as it results from the study of the monuments alone, we may resume it thus :

‘A first period, during which the only writing in use is the archaic Hebrew, a character closely resembling the Phœnician ;

‘A second period, during which the Aramaic writing is employed simultaneously with the first, and is little by little substituted for it ;

‘A third period, during which the Aramaic writing, now become square, is the only one in use.

‘The first period is anterior to the Captivity, and the third posterior to Jesus Christ.

‘The limits of the second cannot be determined exactly by the aid of the monuments alone, for these are entirely wanting ; but here the traditions and the texts come to our help. The name of *ashûrîth* ‘Assyrian,’ given by the Rabbinic school

to the square alphabet ; the part in the introduction of that alphabet which it assigns to Ezra, a collective term for the totality of the traditions relative to the return of the Jews, seem to prove that the introduction of the Aramaic writing coincides with the great Aramaic movement which invaded the whole of Syria and Palestine in the sixth and seventh centuries before our era.¹

It need hardly be pointed out what a wide door this series of changes opens for confusions of various kinds. In each of the alphabets referred to some letters are more easily confounded than others. We have therefore presumably in the received or Massoretic Hebrew text a combination of the errors which arose (1) from the confusion of similar letters in the archaic Hebrew character, (2) from the confusion of letters in the archaic alphabet with similar letters in the Aramaic, (3) from the transliteration into the later square character, and (4) from the confusion of similar letters in the square character itself, after the texts had been transliterated. We have not yet made half enough of palæography as an index of possible corrections, and it would probably be worth while, as M. Renan has suggested, to publish selected books of the Hebrew Bible in the Phœnician character.²

Hardly less striking are the facts relative to the date of the received Hebrew text, and the extant Hebrew MSS. The former appears to have been settled during the Talmudic period which preceded the Massoretic, *i.e.* some time before the close of the fifth century A.D. Since then the text has no doubt been handed down with scrupulous fidelity, but whether 'the oracles of God' had been as jealously guarded in the earlier periods, at any rate before the idea of the canon had attained complete precision, may well be doubted. In Egypt, as the Septuagint sufficiently proves, the transcribers of the Old Testament were specially careless : but even in Palestine, judging from the present state of the Hebrew Bible, its guardians do not appear to have been fully conscious of their responsibility. True, there was a higher guardian, Providence : true, the defects of the letter have been overruled to the good of the Church, which might otherwise have fallen (as fragments of the Church doubtless have fallen) into worship of the letter. But the difficulties arising out of these circum-

¹ De Vogüé, *Mélanges d'archéologie orientale* (Par. 1868), p. 164. M. Lenormant, in his *Essai sur la propagation de l'alphabet Phénicien*, assigns the introduction of the square character to the first century before the Christian era.

² For judicious observations on this subject, see M. Berger's elaborate article, *Ecriture*, in the theological encyclopædia published by MM. Fandoz et Fischbacher, and for a valuable list of instances of palæographic confusions in the texts of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, Herzfeld's *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 80-84.

stances to the exegete are great indeed. Could we feel sure that the standard text had been formed on a critical, diplomatic basis, we might to some extent be reassured. But though it is only a conjecture, it comes from perhaps the most competent of non-Jewish scholars, and has great probability on its side, that the received text is derived from a single archetype, the peculiarities of which were preserved with a 'servile fidelity.'¹ And even apart from this, it is but too obvious to anyone with a sense for language that parts of the texts are extremely incorrect; and it stands to reason that the post-Massoretic MSS. (the oldest are not older than the tenth century) cannot help us in healing pre-Massoretic corruptions.²

These are the grounds on which I venture to urge that without a temperate use of conjectural (but not purely subjective) emendation, but little progress can be made in Old Testament exegesis. It is from a real sense of duty that I have utilised a number of such corrections of the text in my translation of Isaiah. My experienced reviewer, Mr. Samuel Cox, fresh from the study of New Testament criticism, is slightly shocked at this, and kindly attributes it to 'the influence of Ewald's somewhat too arbitrary and impatient genius.'³ This is a misconception which will interfere with the usefulness of my work. I am in no other sense a follower of that great critic than is Professor Delitzsch or Professor Kuenen, and, in the days when the name might not unjustly have been applied to me, my treatment of the text was much more conservative than at present. Purely subjective emendation, I repeat, is not to be admitted on any excuse. If a passage is so utterly corrupt as to give no clue to the correct reading, a commentator, penetrated with the spirit of Hebrew, may suggest an approximation to what may have been in the writer's mind; but his suggestion should be confined to the commentary. Some of the corrections proposed with the utmost confidence by Ewald and Hitzig are as arbitrary as most of those of the too brilliant Oratorian, C. F. Houbigant, in the last century. But when a conjecture has some external support, especially from the versions or from palæography, it is more respectful to the Hebrew writer to adopt it than to 'make sense' by sheer force out of an unnatural reading. I would not propose to introduce even these justifiable emendations into a version

¹ Lagarde, *Ammerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipz. 1863), pp. 1, 2; *Symmicta* (Götting. 1877), p. 50.

² On the extant Hebrew MSS., and on the state of the text in the Talmudic period, see Hermann Strack's *Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum* (Lips. 1873), pp. 59-131.

³ *Expositor*, May, 1880, p. 400.

for ecclesiastical use (though King James's translators consciously or unconsciously did admit a few emendations),¹ but in a work intended solely for students, it is sometimes necessary to emphasize them as I have done (never without stating in a prominent place the received reading), that the reader may feel the difficulty of the passage, and judge of the effect of the alteration. Otherwise we may go on for ever, crying *Shālôm, shālôm*, when the text is far indeed from 'peace' or 'soundness.' With a good will and some poetic imagination most readings, at least in the poetical and prophetic books, admit of a plausible translation; but at what a grievous cost to grammar (some grammatical rules must surely be admitted), and to a critical conception of the duties of an interpreter!

The slightest changes are, of course, those which affect the vowel-points, which, as we are too prone to forget, form, properly speaking, no part of the text.² They represent a comparatively ancient exegetical tradition, and stand on a somewhat similar footing to the versions, especially to the Targums, which in some obscure places enable us to interpret the pointed text. But the early exegetical schools had prejudices of their own (see *e.g.* on xliii. 28, lxiii. 3, 6), and we ought not to regard any of them as infallible. The Church has abstained in her wisdom from giving more than a negative rule of interpretation; why should we submit to the yoke of the doctors of the Synagogue? I would not, however, be in a hurry to forsake the reading of the points. Doubtless future critics may find much to amend, but the alterations of Dr. Klostermann³ are rather beacons of warning than examples of critical tact.

It will surprise no student of the Septuagint that I have followed Gesenius, Ewald, and Hitzig in omitting, or bracketing, certain intrusive glosses (see iii. 1, vii. 17, 20, viii. 7, ix. 15, xxix. 10, xxx. 6), analogous to those which disfigure the Alexandrine version. The only question can be whether a more advanced critical study of the text may not add to their number. For instance, the concluding verse of chap. ii., a word in xxx. 23, and a phrase in xxx. 26 seem very suspicious. They are omitted in the Septuagint, which gives a certain external support to the view that they are interpolations, but, as they do not seriously disfigure the context, I have ventured to retain them. I may perhaps be accused of subjectivism;

¹ See, *e.g.*, Ps. viii. 1, cvii. 3, Jer. l. 5. Alterations of the Hebrew text in accordance with one or more of the ancient versions (*e.g.* Job xxxiii. 17) are also not altogether uncommon in the Authorised Version.

² On the origin of the punctuation, see Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, v. 154.

³ In the article in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift* already referred to (1876, pp. 1-60).

but in the present unrevised state of the Septuagint text, it seems unwise to appeal to it, except in comparatively urgent cases.

'The uncritical state of the Septuagint.' Professor de Lagarde, than whom no one has a better right to speak on this subject, would have critics postpone using the Septuagint altogether, until its text has been restored to the 'original form.'¹ There are two objections to this:—1, the valuable results which have been already attained by the critical use of the Septuagint (it is sufficient to refer to the labours of Thenius and especially of Wellhausen on the text of Samuel)—results which would have had to be foregone if Professor de Lagarde's wishes had been consulted; and 2, the extreme difficulty of his own plan for a critical edition of the Septuagint, which in fact seems to relegate the desired end almost to the Greek Calends. Surely we cannot be justified in neglecting so important a witness to the Egyptian form of the pre-Massoretic text, provided that we remember, 1, that our best MSS. of the Septuagint are faulty, and 2, that the Hebrew MSS. which the Alexandrine translators employed were probably still faultier.

But is it not hopeless to correct the text of the Old Testament, when the critical authority both of the Hebrew and of the Greek is so lamentably scanty? Modifying a well-known German proverb, I would reply that we ought not to allow an impossible Better to be the enemy of the Good. A perfect text is unattainable, and perhaps in one sense undesirable; but a more perfect one than we now possess is within our reach. It would not be right, from a philological point of view, to exclude the Hebrew texts from the operation of improved critical methods; and much more, from a theological point of view, to exhibit any certainly or all but certainly corrupt passage as the inspired 'Word of God.' The needs of the period of the Reformation were met by the Reformation scholars; those of a more scientific and historical age require the application of sounder critical principles. The time for indifference on the part of religious students has gone by. It may be the fact that the leaders of modern criticism, whether in the correction of the text or in still thornier fields, have been often devoid of interest in spiritual truths. But there is no law either of nature or of grace that it should be so. It is a pure loss to reverent readers of the Bible to be shut off from the invigorating influences of critical research. For the true spiritual meaning of the Scriptures can only be

¹ *Anmerkungen zur griech. Uebers. d. Proverbien*, pp. 2, 3.

reached through the door of the letter, and the nearer we approach to a correct reading of the text, the more vivid will be our apprehension of the sacred truths which it conveys.

[Three recent dissertations are concerned with the textual criticism of the Book of Isaiah :—

Hermann L. Strack, 'Zur Textkritik des Jesaias' in *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, 1877, pp. 17-52. Valuable from its account of the St. Petersburg MSS.

G. L. Studer, 'Beiträge zur Textkritik des Jesaja,' in *Fahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1877, Heft 4; 1881, Heft 1. Confirms the view that an editor of Isaiah has to strike the mean between conservative immobility and the 'chartered libertinism' of hypothesis.

Paul de Lagarde, *Senitica*, Part I. (Göttingen, 1878). Pp. 1-32 contain critical notes, occasionally very striking, on chaps. i.-xvii. of Isaiah.

The older books hardly need mention. Kocher's reply to Bishop Lowth, under the title *Vindiciæ S. Textûs Hebræi Esaiæ Vatis* (Berne, 1736), is little known, but worth consulting.]

VIII. THE CRITICAL STUDY OF PARALLEL PASSAGES.

I.

THE exaggerated value sometimes attached to the argument from parallel passages must not drive us to the other extreme of treating them as non-existent or unimportant. This thought, among others, has suggested the present essay, one object of which is to qualify and supplement the discouraging remarks which the over-statements of some critics obliged me to offer (p. 220). It would indeed be an unfortunate result, were any of my student-readers to draw an inference from words of mine unfavourable to the study of parallelisms of expression—a study which is, in my own opinion, a wholesome and much-needed corrective of the various kinds of theoretical bias. The criticism of the Old Testament, which draws its material from so many sources, may yet derive some light from a discriminating selection of parallel passages; and so, still more manifestly, may its exegesis. The principle of explaining the Scriptures by themselves has, it is to be feared, fallen into some disrepute, for which the blunders of our popular 'Reference Bibles' supply an ample justification. And yet our forefathers, whose uncritical but devout Scripture-knowledge is piled up, stratum above stratum, in these editions, were doubtless right in their principle, however widely they may have erred in its application. A few pages will not be wasted on the enforcement of this doctrine, especially as a

request made in my first preface fell but too probably on unheeding ears.

Self-abnegation is the mark of prophetic writers quite as much as of their editors (comp. p. 214). They experienced no *Sturm und Drang*, no 'storm and stress' of an unchastened individuality. They never attempted to set themselves on high, on the pedestal of original genius. Isaiah, *che sovra gli altri come aquila vola*, is as dependent on his less famous predecessors as a Marlowe or a Shakspeare. On at least two occasions (such at least is the most probable view of chap. ii. 2-4 and the main part of chaps. xv. 1-xvi. 12) he inserts passages from earlier prophets, whose entire works have not come down to us; and he is not without some striking affinities (some of which at least will be reminiscences) of contemporary prophets. Look again at his elaborate style, and the artistic distribution of his poetic material! His art is no doubt subordinate to his inspiration, but in no disparaging sense; and its comparatively high perfection attests a longer history of Hebrew poetry and prophecy, and a more numerous band of unrecorded prophetic writers, than we are accustomed to suppose. But it is enough on this head to refer to the Introduction to Ewald's great work on the prophets (now translated); I content myself here with grouping (and observe it is on this grouping that the value of 'references' largely depends) a few striking parallels between the prophet Isaiah and other writers—first of all, those who are acknowledged on all hands to be his predecessors or contemporaries;¹ next, those respecting whose chronological relation to Isaiah more or less doubt has arisen; and lastly, some of those who certainly belong to a later age. In conclusion, it will be only fair to set down some of the striking parallels between the acknowledged and the disputed portions of the Book of Isaiah, and also some of the parallel passages for the latter in other books of the Old Testament.

To the first of the three classes of writers mentioned belong Amos, Hosea, and Micah, the two former being older, the latter probably younger, than our prophet. It has been well observed that the characteristics of Amos and Hosea have found their synthesis in Isaiah.² It is not surprising, therefore, that there should be striking points of affinity between these three prophets—of an affinity, moreover, which extends beyond mere forms of expression to fundamental conceptions and beliefs. Take the following carefully selected instances:

¹ *I.e.* the predecessors or contemporaries of the author of the acknowledged prophecies. The disputed prophecies require, of course, to be considered separately.

² Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, p. 104.

the student will be repaid for the trouble of examining them by a more critical and comprehensive knowledge of the prophetic Scriptures.

Isa. i. 11, 14	Am. v. 21, 22,	Hos. vi. 6,	Mic. vi. 6-8	(against formal worship).
" iv. 2	" ix. 13,	Hos. ii. 21, 22		(fertility in the Messianic age).
" v. 11, 12	" vi. 5-7			(luxury of the princes).
" v. 20	" v. 7, vi. 12			(confusion of morals).
" ix. 10, &c.	" ix. 11, 12			(the Messianic empire).
" i. 21	Hos. iv. 15			(spiritual adultery).
" i. 23	" ix. 15			('law-makers, law-breakers').
" i. 29	" iv. 13			(idolatrous groves).
" i. 2	Mic. i. 2			(protopoëia of inanimate nature).
" ii. 2-4	" iv. 1-3]			
" iii. 15	" iii. 2, 3			(strong figure for oppression).
" v. 8	" ii. 2			(violent extension of landed estates).
" vii. 14,	}	"	v. 3-5	(the Messiah and his birth).
" ix. 7				
" xxx. 22	" v. 13			(idols to be destroyed in the Messianic age).
" xxxii. 13, 14	" iii. 12			(destruction of Jerusalem).
" xxxviii. 17	" vii. 19			(strong figure for the forgiveness of sin).

The second class of writings to be compared with Isaiah includes especially Job, Joel, Zech. ix.-xi., the Psalms, and the Pentateuch.¹ I venture to offer these as fair specimens of parallel passages:—

Isa. i. 8	Job xxvii. 18	(figure from a booth in a vineyard).
" v. 24	" xviii. 16	(root and branch consumed).
" xix. 5	" xiv. 11	(rivers dried up—a quotation).
" xix. 13, 14	" xii. 24, 25	(figurative description of general un wisdom).
" xxviii. 29 ²	" xi. 6	(God's wisdom marvellous).
" xxxiii. 11	" xv. 35	(reap as you sow).
" xxxviii. 12	" iv. 21, vii. 6	(figures from the tent and the weaver's shuttle).

(See also the other parallels between the Song of Hezekiah and the Book of Job in vol. i. pp. 222-3.)

Isa. ii. 4	Joel iii. 10	('swords into ploughshares,' and the reverse).	
" iv. 2	" iii. 18	(fertility in the Messianic age).	
" x. 23	}	"	iii. 14 (חרץ).
" xxviii. 22			
" xxxii. 15	" ii. 22-29	(outpouring of the Spirit, &c.).	
" xi. 1-4	}	"	Zech. ix. 9 (the Messianic King).
" xxxii. 1			
" xi. 11			
" xxvii. 13	" x. 10	(return of captives from Egypt and Assyria).	

¹ I might have added Judges, Joshua, and 2 Samuel (see notes on ix. 3 x. 26, xxviii. 21). Joel and Zech. ix.-xi. are included out of deference to the traditional opinion; for personally I have no doubt that Joel, and in its present form, the whole of the latter part of Zechariah, belong to post-Exile times. The question of the date of the Book of Job is too intimately connected with that of the date of II. Isaiah for me to hazard an opinion upon it here.

² See critical note, p. 146 of this volume.

- Isa. vii. 14 } Ps. xlvi. 7, 11 (God, or Jehovah, is with us).
 " viii. 8, 10 }
 " viii. 7, 8 } " xlvi. 3, 6 (the enemies compared to a flood).
 " xvii. 12 }
 " ix. 5 } " xlvi. 9 (the instruments of war broken).
 " xxxiii. 13 } " xlvi. 10 (summons to the heathen to acknowledge
 Jehovah).
 " xxxiii. 18 } " xlvi. 13 ('counting the towers;' see my note on
 Isa. *l. c.*).
 " xxxiii. 21 } " xlvi. 4 (Jehovah comp. to a river; see on Isa. *l. c.*).
 " xxxiii. 22 } " xlvi. 6 ('our king').
 " xxxiii. 22 } " xlvi. 14 (the nation's divine patron; Delitzsch re-
 marks: 'There is reason to conjecture
 that the proper concluding words [of
 Ps. xlvi.] are lost. The original close
 may have been in fuller tones, and have
 run somewhat as Isa. xxxiii. 22').
 " i. 2 *a* } Deut. xxxii. 1 ('Hear, O heavens').
 " i. 2 *b* }
 " xxx. 9 } " xxxii. 6, 20 (faithless children).
 " i. 3 } " xxxii. 6, 28, 29 ('Israel is without knowledge').
 " i. 6 } " xxviii. 35 (Israel's sickness).
 " i. 7 } " xxix. 22, Auth. Vers. 23 (מהפכה).
 " i. 9, 10 } " xxxii. 32 ('Sodom, Gomorrah').
 " i. 17, 23 } Ex. xxii. 22, Deut. xxvii. 19 (the orphan and the widow).
 " x. 2 }
 " i. 19 } Lev. xxv. 18, 19, xxvi. 18, 25 (prosperity through obe-
 dience).
 " i. 24, iii. 1, }
 x. 16, 23, } Ex. xxiii. 17, xxxiv. 23 (הארון; also Mal. iii. 1).
 xix. 4 }
 " iii. 1 *b* }
 (but see } Lev. xxvi. 26 (the staff of bread).
 note) }
 " iii. 9 } Gen. ix. 5 ('their sin as Sodom').
 " iv. 5 } Ex. xiii. 21, (Num. ix. 15, 16 ('a cloud by day,' &c.).
 " v. 8 } Deut. xix. 14 (violent extension of estates).
 " v. 10 } " xxviii. 39 (curse upon the vineyards).
 " v. 23 } " xvi. 19, Lev. xix. 15 (unjust judgment).
 " v. 26 }
 " xxxiii. 19 } " xxviii. 49 (the swift, unintelligible foe).
 " x. 26 }
 " xi. 15, 16 } Ex. xiv. 21, 22 (the passage of the Red Sea).
 " xii. 2 *b* } " xv. 2 (song of Moses quoted).
 " xxx. 17 } Deut. xxxii. 30, Lev. xxvi. 8 ('one thousand at the rebuke
 of one').

The exegetical value of these parallels is too obvious to need exhibiting. Their critical significance, however, which is sometimes even greater, may not be at once apparent. First with regard to Job. I would not venture to assert that all the passages quoted involve reminiscences on the one side or the other; and yet in some cases this is too plain to be mistaken. Thus (*a*) between Isa. xix. 5 and Job xiv. 11 the most scrupulous critic must admit a direct relation of debtor

and creditor, though which passage is the original, is a question differently answered. And (b) the parallels referred to on Isa. xxxviii. 12, &c. are held by one of our leading commentators (*Hezekiah's authorship of the Song being assumed*) to prove the Solomonic (or, more strictly, the pre-Hezekianic origin of the Book of Job. Secondly, with regard to the Pentateuch. The number of references to Pentateuchal narratives is smaller in the acknowledged than the disputed prophecies, and appears to me insufficient to justify even a conjecture as to Isaiah's acquaintance or non-acquaintance with that famous Elohist document, the date of which is so exciting a subject to modern critics. We cannot even be sure that Isaiah refers to any written narrative; his language may be perfectly explained from oral tradition. It is different, I think, with regard to the apparent allusions to Deuteronomy. The presumption from the number of such references in the first chapter of Isaiah certainly is that the author or editor of that chapter had the book, or a part of the book, of Deuteronomy before him. But I must not allow myself to wander too far from the exegetical frontier (p. 210), and will only add a remark on the parallels between Isaiah and Psalms xlv. – xlviii. It has been conjectured by Hitzig (with whom I was formerly inclined to agree) that the latter are the lyric effusions of the prophet Isaiah on occasion of the successive overthrows of the Syrians, Philistines, and Assyrians.¹ It is, however, simpler, and therefore perhaps in this case safer to explain their Isaianic affinities from the influence of the prophet upon contemporary writers. I say 'contemporary writers' advisedly; for though, in deference to Dr. Delitzsch,² I have placed these psalms in the second rather than in the first class, I can entertain no doubt that they belong at any rate to the age of Isaiah and Hezekiah.

Class III. includes Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Zech. i. – viii., xii. – xiv.,³ Ezekiel, and above all, Jeremiah, upon whom the acknowledged prophecies of Isaiah exercised a most powerful influence. Compare

Isa. xxviii. 4	Nahum iii. 12 (simile of the early fig).
" xi. 9	Hab. ii. 14 ('the earth full of the glory of Jehovah').
" xxxiii. 1	" ii. 8 (retribution to the tyrant).
" xviii. 1, 7	Zeph. iii. 10 (tribute from beyond Ethiopia).
" ii. 3, iv. 1	Zech. viii. 21–23 (spiritual honour of Jerusalem and the Jews).

¹ Hitzig, *Die Psalmen* (Leipz. 1863), vol. i. p. xxiii.; *I. C. A.*, Introduction, p. xv.

² This critic, followed by Canon Cook in the *Speaker's Commentary*, places these psalms in the reign of Jehoshaphat (comp. 2 Chron. xx.).

³ Zech. ix. – xi. ought, however, in my opinion, to be included; see above, p. 228, note 1.

Isa. xix. 24	Zech. viii. 13 (Israel a source of blessing).
„ vi. 13	„ xiii. 9 (repeated purifications).
„ i. 3	Jer. viii. 7 (irrational creatures wiser than Israel).
„ i. 11, 12	„ vi. 20, vii. 21 (formal worship unacceptable).
„ v. 1-7	„ ii. 21 (Israel compared to a vine).
„ vi.	„ i. (inaugurating vision).
„ vi. 9, 10	„ v. 21 (judicial blindness).
„ xv. xvi.	„ xlvi. (against Moab).
„ xxxii. 1	} „ xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15 (the righteous King).
„ xi. 1	
„ xxxiii. 19	„ v. 15 (the unintelligible foe).
„ x. 20-22	Ezek. vi. 8, xii. 16 (the remnant of Israel).
„ xv. 2	„ vii. 18 ('on all their heads baldness').
„ xxxvi. 6	„ xxix. 6, 7 (Egypt a 'cracked reed').

I now turn to the parallels between the acknowledged and the disputed prophecies of Isaiah, less with the view of furnishing material for the higher criticism than of helping the reader to form a fuller idea of the literary and prophetic physiognomy of the book. For, to be quite candid, I do not believe that the existence of such numerous links between the two portions of Isaiah is of much critical moment. There are points of contact, as striking, if not as abundant, between Old Testament books which no sober critic will ascribe to the same author. Dr. Moody Stuart's remark, questionable even in reference to ordinary literature, is especially so in its application to inspired writers:—'An assiduous author might become the double of another by a skilful repetition of his ideas. But he cannot by any art fashion himself into his second half; he cannot engraft his own conceptions into the other's mind by completing his deepest thoughts, and so fit them in, and fill all up, as if only one thinker had conceived the whole.'¹ On the contrary, it is a characteristic of the prophetic literature that, in the midst of superficial divergences, there is a fundamental affinity between its various elements. Ascribe it, as you please, to the overruling divine Spirit, or to the literary activity of the Soferim (see p. 214), or to both working in harmony, but the fact cannot be denied. We may now proceed to compare—

i. 11, 13	with lxvi. 3 (against formal worship).
i. 15	„ lix. 2, 3 (prayers unanswered through sin).
i. 21	„ lvii. 3-9 (spiritual adultery).
i. 26	„ lxi. 3 ('City of righteousness,' 'Oaks of righteousness').
i. 27, iv. 2, 3,	} „ xlvi. 10, lix. 20, lxx. 8, 9 (doctrine of the 'remnant').
vi. 13, x. 20,	
22, xxxvii. 31,	
32	
i. 29	„ lvii. 5, lxx. 3, lxxi. 17 (idolatrous gardens).

¹ *The Old Isaiah* (Edinb. 1880), p. 41.

i. 30	with lxiv. 6 (figure of the fading leaf).
ii. 2, 3	„ lvi. 7, lx. 12-14 (pilgrimages to the temple).
ii. 11, 17, v. 15	„ xl. 4 (high things abased).
iii. 26	„ li. 17, lii. 1, 2, lx. 1 (Zion sitting on the ground).
v. 7	„ lx. 21, lxi. 3 (Israel, Jehovah's planting).
v. 13, vi. 12, xi. 11, xxii. 18, xxxix. 5-7 (?)	„ xl.-lxvi. (captivity, though the parallel is incomplete).
vi. 1	„ lvii. 15, lxvi. 1 (the two divine thrones).
vi. 9, 10, xxix. 18	„ xlii. 7, 18-20, xliii. 8, xliv. 18, lxiii. 17 (judicial blindness).
vi. 11	„ lxiv. 10, 11, (cities laid waste).
ix. 8	„ xlii. 9, lv. 11 (self-fulfilling power of prophecy).
xi. 1	„ liii. 2 (the puny Plant).
xi. 2	„ lxi. 1 (the Spirit rests upon the divine Agent).
xi. 6-9, xxx. 26	„ lxv. 17-25, lxvi. 22 (future glorification of nature).
xxviii. 5	„ lxii. 3 (Jehovah a 'crown' to His people; His people a 'crown' to Him).
xxviii. 1, 7, 8	„ lvi. 11, 12 (carousing habits of the rulers).
xxix. 16	„ xlv. 9, lxiv. 8 (the clay and the potter).
xxxii. 15	„ xlv. 3, 11 (outpouring of the Spirit).

Better proofs than these can hardly be required of the intimate connection between I. and II. Isaiah. The writer of the latter prophecies evidently knows the former, as our native idiom finely has it, 'by heart.' Some readers, however, may perhaps be impressed more by exact verbal correspondences, such as the following:—

- קדוש ישראל 'Israel's Holy One,' fourteen times in the acknowledged prophecies (including x. 17), and fourteen times in the disputed ones (including xlix. 7). Comp. also 'your Holy One,' xliii. 15. Rare outside Isaiah.
- דבר 'the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken,' i. 2, 20; also xl. 5, lviii. 14. Peculiar to Isaiah (but Mic. iv. 4 has 'פי צבאות ד').
- יאמר 'saith Jehovah' (the imperfect tense), i. 11, 18, xxxiii. 10; also xli. 21, lxvi. 9 (comp. xl. 1, 25). Peculiar to the Book of Isaiah, Ps. xii. 6 being an echo of Isa. xxxiii. 10.
- אביר 'hero,' as a title of Jehovah in relation to his people, i. 24 (see note); also xlix. 26, lx. 16. Only parallels, Gen. xlix. 24, Ps. cxxxii. 2, 5.
- רם ונשא 'high and exalted,' ii. 13, vi. 1; also lvii. 15 (comp. lii. 13, lvii. 7). Peculiar to Isaiah.
- יבלי מים 'streams of water' or 'water-courses,' xxx. 25; also xliv. 4. Peculiar to Isaiah.
- 'My mountains,' xiv. 25; also xlix. 11, lxv. 9. So Ezek. xxxviii. 21 (omitted in Fürst's Concordance), and Zech. xiv. 5.

It would be easy to make out a longer list, but the gain would, in my opinion, be problematical. I am not a Professor of Philosophy, and cannot think that a valuable 'cumulative argument' is produced for the unity of Isaiah by counting up words like אבה and אביון and אור and אור, which occur (how could they help occurring?) in both parts of the book;

and it is with real sorrow that I notice a 'tutor in Hebrew' priding himself on the discovery that 'שע', and its participle or noun, occurs fourteen times in the later portion, and seven times in the earlier.'¹ Perhaps, however, the following data deserve to be mentioned, if it be only to warn the student against overrating the force of the previous instances:—

- אור** 'glow' or 'glowing fire,' xxxi. 19; also xxiv. 15 (?), xliv. 16, xlvii. 14, l. 11. Elsewhere only Ezek. v. 2.
- איים** 'countries' (specially used of the maritime countries of the West), xi. 11; also xxiv. 15 (?), xl. 15, xli. 1, and ten other passages. (But note the infrequency in I. Isaiah, and see further below.)
- ברא** 'to create,' iv. 5; also xl. 26, xli. 20, xliii. 7, and thirteen other passages. (But the infrequency of this word in the first part contrasts remarkably with its frequency in the second. It is not specially Isaianic, whereas the emphasis on the divine creatorship is peculiarly deuter-Isaianic. See *Last Words* on iv. 5.)
- נזע** 'the stock of a tree,' xi. 1; also xl. 24. Elsewhere only Job xiv. 8.
- נשת** 'to dry up,' xix. 5 (Nifal); also xli. 17 (Kal). Elsewhere only Jer. xviii. 14 (Nifal); transposing letters), li. 30 (Kal).
- צאצאים** 'offspring,' xxii. 24; also xxxiv. 1, xlii. 5, xliv. 3, xlviii. 19, lxi. 9, lxxv. 23. Elsewhere only four times in Job.
- תהו** 'chaos,' or 'a thing of nought': a characteristic word derived from the narrative of the cosmogony: xxix. 21, also xxiv. 10, xxxiv. 11, xl. 17, 23, and six other passages. The same remark applies as in the case of **ברא**.
- תעלולים** 'vexatious petulance,' iii. 4; also lxvi. 4. Peculiar to this book. (But the related verbal stem is not uncommon.)

To these we may add two phrases: (a) **נרדוי ישראל** 'the outcasts of Israel,' xi. 12, lvi. 8; elsewhere only Ps. cxlvii. 2. But the value of this correspondence will be diminished by comparing xvi. 3, 4, xxvii. 13, Jer. xl. 12, xliii. 5, Deut. xxx. 4; (b) **מי ישיבנה** 'who can turn it back' (said of God's work), xiv. 27; also xliii. 13 (see note), and three times in Job (with a different suffix). And, lastly, a linguistic fact of much more importance, viz. the habit of repeating a leading word in successive clauses, which is characteristic of both portions of the Book of Isaiah. See i. 7, iv. 3, vi. 11, xiv. 25, xv. 8, xxx. 20, xxxvii. 33, 34; and also xiii. 10, xxxiv. 9, xl. 19, xlii. 15, 19, xlvi. 21, l. 4, li. 13, liii. 6, 7, liv. 4, 13, lviii. 2, lix. 8.² In grammatical parlance, it is the figure *ἐπαναφορά*, another variety of which abounds in the so-called Step-psalms (as the very name, perhaps, is intended to indicate) and in the Song of Deborah.

It still remains to furnish references to parallel passages for the disputed portions of Isaiah, corresponding to those

¹ Urwick, *The Servant of Jehovah*, p. 37.

² The examples are taken from Delitzsch, who remarks that the list is not offered as complete.

which have been already given for the undisputed ones. Some of these, of course, will be originals, some will involve reminiscences, while a few may perhaps arise from undesigned coincidences. We must also allow for the bare possibility that, in the case of two parallel passages, neither one may be original, but both dependent on some lost work. It is specially important to bear this in mind in an enquiry peculiarly liable to be impeded by prejudice, that prejudice I mean which is unavoidably caused by the combination of the acknowledged and the disputed prophecies in one volume. Let me also remind the reader of the grounds for caution which I have mentioned above, derived from the phenomena of non-Biblical literatures (p. 220). Compare, then—

Isa. xiii. 19	with Deut. xxix. 23 (the 'overthrow' of Sodom and Gomorrah).
" xxiv. 18 c	" Gen. vii. 11 ('windows opened' at the Deluge).
" xl. 2	" Lev. xxvi. 41, 43, comp. 34 ('guilt paid off').
" xli. 4, &c.	" Deut. xxxii. 39 ('I am He').
(see note)	
" xliii. 13	" " ('none that rescueth out of my hand').
" xli. 8, 9	" Gen. xi. 31-xii. 4 (call of Abraham and Israel).
" li. 2	
" xliii. 16, 17	" Ex. xiv. 21-31 (passage of the Red Sea).
" li. 9, 10	
" lxiii. 11-13	
" xliii. 27	" Gen. xxv. 29-34, xxvii. (Jacob's sins).
" xlv. 2	" Deut. xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 6 (Jeshurun).
" xlviii. 19	" Gen. xxii. 17, xxxii. 12 (Israel as the sand).
" xlviii. 21	" Ex. xvii. 5-7, Num. xx. 7-13 (water from the rock).
" l. 1 (but see note)	" Ex. xxi. 7, Deut. xxiv. 1 (law of divorce).
" li. 3	" Gen. ii. 8 (Eden).
" lii. 4	" " xlvii. 4; comp. xii. 10 (Israel's guest-right in Egypt).
" lii. 12	" Ex. xii. 11, 51, xiii. 21, 22 ('in trembling haste'; Jehovah in the van and in the rear).
" liv. 9 (see note)	" Gen. viii. 21, ix. 11 (the Deluge, and Jehovah's oath).
" lviii. 14	" Deut. xxxii. 13 ('riding over the heights of the land').
" lix. 10	" " xxviii. 29 ('groping like the blind').
" lxiii. 9	" Ex. ii. 24, iii. 7, xxiii. 20-23 (Jehovah's sympathy with Israel, and the guidance of His Angel).
" lxiii. 11	" Deut. xxxii. 7 ('remembering the days of old').
" lxiii. 14	" Ex. xxxiii. 14, Deut. iii. 20, xii. 9 ('rest' in Canaan).
" lxx. 22	" Deut. xxviii. 30 (a promise modelled on a threat).
" lxx. 25	" Gen. iii. 14 (dust, the serpent's food).

Notice also the mention of Sarah (unique outside the Pentateuch) in li. 2, of Noah in liv. 9 (comp. Ezek. xiv. 14, 20), and of the 'shepherds' of Israel (*i.e.* Moses, Aaron, and perhaps Miriam) in lxiii. 11. These allusions to the Penta-

teuch in the disputed prophecies are a fact of some critical moment; not so much on account of their number (for such references are not wanting in I. Isaiah) as of their phraseological exactness and of their referring almost, if not quite, exclusively¹ either to Deuteronomy or to the portions of the first four books of the Pentateuch commonly regarded (by Delitzsch no less than by Knobel), as Jehovistic. I do not wish to prejudge the still open questions relative to the higher criticism, but am bound to give some indications of the critical bearings of textual and exegetical data. A study which has such a varied outlook on history as well as theology ought not surely to be put aside as dull and unprofitable.

The next group of parallels which invites us connects the second part of Isaiah with Job. There are parallelisms, as we have seen, between the first as well as the second part and the Book of Job; but comparatively few. The illustrative value of those which I have now to mention is so great that a separate essay will be required to unfold their significance. Compare

Isa. xxvii. 1 ^r	}	with Job xxvi. 12, 13 (mythic expressions).
" li. 9, 10		
" xl. 2	" "	vii. 11 (a 'warfare' of trouble).
" xl. 7	}	" "
" xlii. 5		xii. 2 ('the people' = mankind).
" xl. 14	" "	xxi. 22 (God's perfect wisdom; He has no teachers).
" xl. 23, 24	}	" "
" xlv. 25		xii. 17-21 (God's omnipotence shown in revolutions).
" xl. 27	}	" "
" xlix. 14		iii. 23, xix. 7, 8, xxvii. 2 (complaints against Providence).
" xli. 14	" "	xxv. 6 (man likened to a worm).
" xlv. 24	" "	ix. 8 (God 'alone stretched forth the heavens').
" xlv. 9	" "	xl. 2 (murmuring rebuked).
" l. 6	" "	xii. 4, 5, xvi. 10, xix. 18, 19, xxx. 10 (humiliation and scorn, the lot of the righteous).
" l. 9	" "	xiii. 28 (human frailty; a close verbal parallel).
" lii. 14, 15	}	" "
" liii. 3		ii. 12, Ps. xxii. 6 <i>a</i> (the unrecognisable form of the righteous sufferer).
" liii. 3	" "	xix. 14 (desertion of friends; verbal parallelism).
" liii. 9 (see note)	" "	xvi. 17, vi. 29, 30, xxvii. 4 ('although he had done no wrong,' &c.).
" lix. 4	" "	xv. 35 (pernicious scheming; a proverbial expression).
" lxiii. 10	" "	xxx. 21 (God 'turning himself' into an enemy).
" lxiv. 5	" "	xiv. 4 (none without sin:—in Job <i>l.c.</i> render, 'Oh for a clean one among the unclean!').

¹ The only exceptions which occur to me are the allusions in xl. 2 to Lev. xxvi. 41, 43 (a passage of a section of Leviticus—xvii.—xxvi.—which presents striking resemblances to the Book of Ezekiel), and in liv. 9 to Gen. ix. 11 (Elohistic), which is, however, not certain (see my note).

Next come the parallelisms of the Psalms, on which I need not delay long. They chiefly occur in the later psalms, the authors of which may be truly said (as I have remarked, on lii. 9, of the author of Ps. xcvi.) to have known II. Isaiah 'by heart.' Canon Elliott has given a list of the most striking of these passages, and it will be noticed as a singular fact that only one of them relates to the acknowledged prophecies of Isaiah.¹ This of course does not prove that the latter part of Isaiah was a work of recent composition—we know how long it was after Shakspeare's death before his works received the honour of quotation. It does, however, show that these later prophecies exercised a special attraction upon post-Exile writers, which is a fact of no small significance.—The most interesting parallels in the earlier psalms are undoubtedly those in Ps. xxii., to which I have referred already (p. 191, note ²). See also those relative to Jehovah's 'highway in the desert' (note on xl. 3), His care of 'grey-headed' Israel (on xlvi. 4), 'Rahab' (on li. 9), 'the loving-kindnesses of David' (on lv. 3), and 'the holy Spirit' (on lxiii. 10).

A large and important group follows. Compare

Isa. xiii. 19-22	} with Jer. l. 39, 40 (Babylon 'overturned' like Sodom; desolate, and haunted).
" xxxiv. 14	
" xxxiv. 6, 7	" " xlvi. 10, L 27, li. 40 (Jehovah's 'sacrifice,' &c.).
" xl. 5, 6	} " " xii. 12, &c. ('all flesh;' see vol. i. p. 240, col. 2).
" and parallels	
" xl. 12, 22	} " " x. 12 (description of creation).
" and parallels	
" xl. 13, 14	" " xxiii. 18 (who is Jehovah's counsellor?).
" xl. 18-20	} " " x. 3-11 (Jehovah contrasted with the idol-gods, and an ironical description of the origin of the latter).
" and parallels	
" xliii. 5	} " " xxx. 10, xlvi. 27, 28 ('my servant Jacob;' promises of restoration).
" xliv. 12	
" xlv. 9	" " xviii. 1-6 (the symbol of the potter).
" xlvi. 1	" " l. 2 (gods of Babylon broken).
" xlviii. 1	" " iv. 2, v. 2 (true and false swearing).
" xlviii. 6	" " xxxiii. 3 (see critical note above).
" xlviii. 20	} " " l. 8, li. 6, 45 ('Go ye out of Babylon').
" lii. 11	
" xlix. 1	" " i. 5 (predestination).
" li. 15	" " xxxi. 35 ('who stirreth up the sea,' &c.; a quotation).
" lv. 3 (see note)	} " " xxxii. 40 ('an everlasting covenant').
" lxi. 8	

¹ *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iv. pp. 506-512 ('Excursus on Psalms xci.-c.'). The solitary parallel alluded to is that between Ps. xcix. 3, 5, 9 and Isa. vi. 3, by no means one of the closest. Two parallels are given for Isa. xii., but the Isaianic authorship of this chapter is disputed on plausible grounds by Ewald and Lagarde, though acknowledged by most critics.

Isa. lvi. 9	with Jer. xii. 9	(‘wild beasts, come to devour’).
„ lvii. 20	„ „ xlix. 23	(‘the sea which cannot rest’).
„ lviii. 11	„ „ xxxi. 12	(‘like a watered garden’).
„ lxxv. 7	„ „ xvi. 18, comp. xxxii. 18	(‘their recompence first’).
„ lxxvi. 16	„ „ xxv. 31, 33	(‘holding judgment with all flesh,’ &c.).

The number and closeness of these parallels (as compared with those connected with I. Isaiah) is a phenomenon which prepares us for the still greater abundance of parallel passages in the post-Exile psalms. The fact is not without its bearing on the ‘higher criticism.’¹ Some scholars have even offered the hypothesis that, where the parallelism is the strongest (viz. in Jer. x., l., li.), the text of Jeremiah has been interpolated by the same exiled prophet who, as they suppose, was the author of Isa. xl.–lxvi. This view (supported by the eminent names of Movers and Hitzig) is too peremptorily rejected by Dean Payne Smith,² who has perhaps not given much thought to the complication of such critical questions. Each field of philological inquiry calls peculiar faculties into exercise, and our distinguished Syriac lexicographer would be the last person willingly to put a stigma through his dogmatism on the inquiries of some as conscientious, and even as reverent, as himself. In the spirit of confraternity, I venture to protest against the irritating and inaccurate statements which so repeatedly occur in the Dean’s contribution to the *Speaker’s Commentary*, whenever he has occasion to deal incidentally with questions of date and authorship. *Non tali auxilio*. Agreeing as I do with the Dean’s religious presuppositions, I am the more surprised at what appears to me a violation of Christian love, and a disregard for the *charismata* of his brethren. At any rate, it would be unseemly for me to meet dogmatism with dogmatism, even were it a part of my plan to furnish a text book of the ‘higher criticism.’ Suffice it to have indicated anew the variety of interest attaching to the comparative study of the Hebrew prophets.

The most important parallels to Ezekiel are suggested by chaps. lvii.–lix. of Isaiah. These chapters, it will be remembered, stand out from the rest of the ‘Book of the Servant’ by their striking peculiarities of form and content. Indeed,

¹ On this subject see, besides the critical and exegetical works of Movers, Hitzig, Graf, &c., Küper’s *Jeremias librorum sacrorum interpres atque vindex* (Berl. 1837), or better, the excursus in pp. 274–291 of his *Das Prophetenthum des Alten Bundes* (Leipz. 1870), and Caspari’s ‘Jesaianische Studien’ in the *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, 1843, pp. 1–73. Both these works discuss the relation of the disputed prophecies of Isaiah to the other prophecies between Isaiah and the Exile besides those of Jeremiah.

² *Speaker’s Commentary*, vol. v. pp. 387, 554.

with regard to chaps. lviii.-lix., the impression formed by Ewald¹ on stylistic grounds was so strong that he ascribed them to a younger contemporary of Ezekiel. A general impression cannot of course be analysed; but the following passages will at least establish the real affinity of these chapters with Ezekiel:—

Isa. lvi. 1-8	comp. Ezek. xx. 11-21	(see above, p. 62).
„ lvi. 9	„ „	xxxiv. 8, xxxix. 4.
„ lvii. 7, 9	„ „	xxiii. 40, 41.
„ lviii. 7	„ „	xviii. 7, 16 (works pleasing to God).
„ lix. 11	„ „	vii. 16 ('mourning like doves').

As a rule the tone of Ezekiel is too different from that of II. Isaiah to admit of much parallelism either of thought or of expression; he is rather a legal than an 'evangelical prophet.' Yet a few parallels may be traced. The description of Sheól in Isa. xiv. 9, &c., closely resembles the dirge upon Egypt in Ezek. xxxii. 18-32. Isa. xxvi. 19 may be illustrated from Ezek. xxxvii. 1-10, Isa. li. 2 from Ezek. xxxiii. 24, and Isa. li. 17 from Ezek. xxiii. 32-34.

The so-called Minor Prophets follow. Compare—

Isa. xxvi. 19 (see note)	}	Hos. vi. 2	(Israel's resurrection).
„ xliii. 11		„ xiii. 4	('no saviour beside me').
„ lvii. 3	„	i. 2, ii. 4	(spiritual adultery).
„ lviii. 1	„	viii. 1, Mic. iii. 8	(a mission to rebuke).
„ xxvi. 21	„	Mic. i. 3	(a strong anthropomorphism).
„ xxiv. 23	„	iv. 7	(Jehovah 'become king' in mount Zion).
„ xli. 15	„	iv. 13	(Israel's threshing-time announced).
„ lvii. 1, 2	„	vii. 1, 2	(the pious have become extinct).
„ xliii. 6, 9	}	Joel i. 15	(a striking assonance quoted).
„ xliv. 3		„ ii. 28	(the outpouring of the Spirit).
„ xlix. 23	„	ii. 27	('knowing Jehovah,' &c.).
„ lii. 1	„	iii. 17	(Jerusalem free from foreigners).
„ xxiv. 1	„	Nah. ii. 11, A. V. 10	(assonances).
„ li. 19	„	iii. 7	('who condoleth with thee?').
„ li. 20	„	iii. 10	(a verbal parallelism).
„ lii. 1, 7	„	ii. 1, A. V. i. 15	('the feet upon the mountains,' &c.).
„ xxxiv. 16	}	Zeph. ii. 14	(the desolate city).
„ xlii. 21			
„ xxxiv. 11			
„ xlvii. 8	„	ii. 15	('I and none beside').

The critical importance of some of these parallels (viz. those in Joel, Nahum, and Zephaniah) has no doubt been exaggerated; but no thoughtful person will disregard them. They show how instinctively the prophets formed as it were a canon of prophetic Scriptures for themselves, and also how

¹ *The Prophets of the Old Testament*, Eng. Transl., vol. iv. p. 253.

free they were from the morbid craving for originality. But they have not the interest of the parallelisms in some of the former groups.¹

2.

Enough, I hope, has been said to show the value of a careful examination of parallel passages, which is indeed a great step towards the comparative study of the Old Testament. Here I might lay down the pen, were it not for certain peculiar phenomena of the Book of Isaiah, which the student is in some danger of overlooking. That Isaiah, taken as a whole, has divergences as well as affinities relatively to other books, none will be tempted to deny; but it is not everyone who has a clear and single eye for discerning linguistic differences within the Book of Isaiah itself. The prejudice of the unity of authorship is of such a natural growth that I seem bound in fairness to supplement my list of parallelisms between I. and II. Isaiah by a corresponding conspectus of the principal phrases and expressions peculiar, at any rate, to the latter prophecies. To be absolutely complete, it would no doubt be necessary to go further, and collect the words and formulæ found in the acknowledged, but absent or rare in the disputed prophecies; in fact, nothing short of a thorough analysis of the two parts of the book would enable the reader to estimate the state of the evidence with mathematical precision. Such, however, is not my object. I would rather allure the student to work for himself with his Hebrew Bible and his Concordance on the lines which I have marked out; and should indeed be somewhat afraid of weakening the force of the more striking portions of the evidence by combining them with those of less significance. Now, the most essential of the linguistic peculiarities within the Book of Isaiah itself are those which meet us in the disputed prophecies. The natural tendency is to accommodate II. Isaiah to I. Isaiah, volatilising the differences between them, rather than *vice versa*; so that if, in pursuance of my object, a selection has to be made, it will not appear strange if I devote the remainder of this Essay to the peculiar words, phrases, and forms of the disputed portion of the Book of Isaiah.

It has been said by Dr. Franz Delitzsch 'that though the disputed prophecies contain some things which cannot

¹ Mr. W. H. Cobb thinks he has proved the single authorship of Isaiah by showing from the Concordance that the vocabulary of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. (taken as a whole) does not agree with that of the later prophets, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi ('Two Isaiahs or One,' *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1881, p. 230, &c.). But such an uncritical use of the Concordance is of little service.

be paralleled from the others, that which is characteristically Isaianic predominates.'¹ Now, I admit that it requires great nicety of judgment to determine such a point; but I must confess that, after a careful revision of the data, I have come to an opposite conclusion. Not that I suppose this conclusion to carry with it the non-Isaianic origin of the latter prophecies. If on general grounds it is probable that Isaiah in his old age entered upon a new field of prophetic discourse, it will appear natural to suppose that new forms of expression should have met the promptings of his intellect. The occurrence of numerous peculiar phrases and expressions in II. Isaiah will only become a matter of primary importance, should they warrant the inference that the author belonged to a different linguistic stage from the historical Isaiah. Two writers of the same period may conceivably differ very widely in the character of their diction; but it can hardly be admitted that a writer, conspicuous for the purity of his style in one prophetic book, should have sunk to a lower level in another, while soaring higher than ever in thought and imagination. My own opinion is that the peculiar expressions of the latter prophecies are, on the whole, not such as to necessitate a different linguistic stage from the historical Isaiah; and that consequently the decision of the critical question will mainly depend on other than purely linguistic considerations. But more of this elsewhere.

I. Among the most characteristic expressions of the latter prophecies are—

(1) Those descriptive of the attributes of Jehovah, and emphasising especially His uniqueness, eternity, creatorship, and predictive power:—

(a) 'I am Jehovah, and there is none else (or, beside),' xlv. 5, 6, 18, 22, xlvi. 9.

(b) 'The First and the Last,' xli. 4, xlv. 6, xlvi. 12.

(c) 'To what will ye liken me?' xl. 18, 25, xlvi. 5.

(d) 'The creator of the heavens' (xlii. 5, xlv. 18), 'the maker of everything' (xliv. 24); comp. xl. 22 (*note*), xlv. 12.

(e) 'Who announced (this) from the beginning,' and parallel expressions. See xli. 26, xliii. 9, xlv. 7, xlv. 21, xlvi. 14.

(f) 'The Arm of Jehovah,' for the self-revealing aspect of the Deity, xl. 10, and six other passages (see on xl. 10).

(g) The use of 'Holy One' (*Qādōsh*) as a proper name, xl. 25, lvii. 15, for which no doubt a point of contact may be found in the characteristically Isaianic 'Israel's Holy One,'

¹ *Der Prophet Jesaia*, 3te Ausg., p. xxxi.

comp. also 'God, the Holy One,' (*haqqādōsh*, with the article), v. 16, but which may by some be regarded as a later development (it is only found elsewhere in a prophecy of the Babylonian period—Hab. ii. 3, and in writings *possibly* belonging to the age of the Captivity—Job vi. 10, Ps. xxii. 4).

(2) Equally characteristic is the ironical language of II. Isaiah with regard to idolatry—see xl. 19, 20, xli. 7, xliv. 9–17, xlvi. 6, and note the parallels referred to in my note on the first-mentioned passage. In the acknowledged prophecies idolatry does not receive a large share of the prophet's attention, though contemptuous expressions, side-thrusts as it were, are not wanting (ii. 20, xxxi. 7).

(3) So, too, is the abundant use of personification. Zion, Jerusalem, Israel, constantly appear in the character of persons. See on xl. 9, and comp. essay on 'The Servant of Jehovah.'

II. Passing to the vocabulary, let me mention (1) peculiar words, and (2) peculiar significations, first reminding the student that in order to estimate the importance of any single instance, he will have to consider whether the word or the signification is strictly peculiar to II. Isaiah,¹ or whether it occurs elsewhere (though not in I. Isaiah), and if so, where (the comparative study of the vocabularies of Job and II. Isaiah would be a real critical and exegetical service). It should also be borne in mind that lists similar to those which follow might be made out for I. Isaiah. I have mostly chosen words which occur but once in chaps. xl.–lxvi.²

אציל	xli. 9	זוב	xlvi. 21
ארכה	lviii. 8	זול	xlvi. 6
אשמנים	lix. 10	זיז	lxvi. 11
גדופות	li. 7	זרח	lx. 3
נאל	'to be impure' (Nif. and Hif.) lix. 3, lxiii. 3	חברה	liii. 3
נאולים	lxiii. 4	חדל	liii. 3
גור	'to stir up (strife),' liv. 15	חוג	xl. 22
גשש	(Piel) lix. 10	חטם	xlviii. 9
דק	xl. 22	חשכים	l. 10
דראון	lxvi. 24	טפח	xlviii. 13
הזה	lvi. 10	ימר	(Hithp.) lxi. 6
המסים	lxiv. 1	יעט	lxi. 10
הריסות	xliv. 19	יישמון	xliv. 19, 20
זבול	lxiii. 15	כהה	(verb and noun) xlii. 3, 4 ; lxi. 3

¹ Under the name 'II. Isaiah' I include *all* the disputed prophecies—not merely chaps. xl.–lxvi.

² The list, which is not complete, is based upon the invaluable *Zusammenstellung* at the end of Naegelsbach's *Jesaja*.

כהן	(Piel) lxi. 10	עדינה	xlvi. 8
כנה	(Piel) xliv. 5; xlv. 4	עות	l. 4
בעל	lxiii. 7 (repeated, lix. 18)	עננה	xlvi. 1
כפלים	xl. 2	עסים	xliv. 26
כריתות	l. 1	ערף	(verb) lxvi. 3
כרכרה	lxvi. 20	פורה	lxiii. 3
כשפים	xlvi. 9, 12	פעה	xlvi. 14
מורג	xli. 15	פצה	(always with רָקַה or רָגַן) xiv. 7; xliv. 23; xliv. 13; lii. 9; liv. 1; lv. 12
מותים	liii. 9	פקחוקח	lxi. 1
מטמנים	xl. 3	פרק	lxv. 4
מכאב	(plural) liii. 3, 4	צב	lxvi. 20
מלח	(Hifil) li. 6	צר	lx. 4; lxvi. 12
מסתר	liii. 3	צוח	xlvi. 11
מִעוֹת } = מְעִים }	xlvi. 19	צוחה	xxiv. 11
מרורים	lviii. 7 (?)	צולה	xliv. 27
משחת	lii. 14	צום	lviii. 3, 4
משיח	xl. 1	צטה	li. 14; lxiii. 1
נבח	lvi. 10	קבעת	li. 17, 22
ננה	(plural) lix. 9	רדד	xl. 1
נדה	lxvi. 5	רכס (plural)	xl. 4.
נואש	lvii. 10	רקע (Piel <i>denominat.</i>)	xl. 19
נוה	(Hifil) lii. 15 (?); (Kal) lxiii. 3	שחר	xlvi. 11
נצח	lxiii. 3, 6	שליש	xl. 12
סנר	xliv. 15, 17, 19; xlvi. 6	שצף	liv. 8
סנן	xli. 25	תבונה	xl. 14 (plur.), 28; xliv. 19 (sing.)
סכל	xliv. 25	תרומה	xl. 20
סכן	(Pual) xl. 20		
ערים	lxiv. 5		

To these may be added the following peculiar forms:—

- (a) $\text{לְמוֹ} \text{ for } \text{לוֹ}$ xliv. 15, liii. 8. (If, however, my view is correct, there is an analogy for this in viii. 15, on which see crit. note, p. 137.)
- (b) $\text{אֹתִי} \text{ for } \text{אֹתִי}$ liv. 15 } No doubt Aramaisms. The same usage is
 (c) $\text{אֹתָם} \text{ for } \text{אֹתָם}$ lix. 21 } found in 1 and 2 Kings, Jeremiah and
 Ezekiel. It also occurs, however, in
 Josh. xiv. 12 (perhaps Gen. xxxiv. 2),
 where, as here, it may possibly be due to
 a later editor.
- (d) $\text{אֲנִי־לִי} \text{ for } \text{אֲנִי־לִי}$ lxiii. 3. An Aramaism.
- (e) $\text{מְנוּחָי} \text{ lii. 5. Hithpoal (with } \text{ת} \text{ assimilated).}$
- (f) $\text{הַחֵלִי} \text{ liii. 10. Hif. from } \text{חָלָה} \text{ (Aramaising), or from } \text{חָלָא}$, another
 form of חָלָה (2 Chron. xvi. 12), with the final א omitted before the
 initial א of the next word: for parallel cases, see 2 Kings xiii. 6,
 Jer. xxxii. 35. So Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, § 255 f., followed by
 Klostermann and Delitzsch (ed. 3).

(g) נָאֵלוּ lix. 3. The form reminds one of the Rabbinic Nithpael; see, however, crit. note above, p. 159.

2. Words used with a peculiar shade of meaning. (Not a complete list.)

(a) אַחֹר 'future time'; xli. 23, xlii. 23.

(b) אַיִם 'maritime lands of the west'; xlii. 15 (see note), and other passages.

(c) בָּחַר 'to test' for בָּחַן, as in Aramaic; xlvi. 10.

(d) הִנִּיר 'to declare' = 'to prophecy'; xliii. 12, xlv. 8, xlvi. 3.

(e) הָעָם 'the people' = 'mankind'; xl. 7, xlii. 5, comp. xlv. 7.

(f) הִרְנִיעַ 'to fix' or 'found'; li. 4.

(g) חִפְּץ 'business,' lviii. 3, 13 (as in Ecclesiastes).

(h) יָתַר 'abundance,' used adverbially for 'exceedingly,' lvi. 12.

(i) מַלְיִץ 'interpreter' = 'prophet,' xliii. 27.

(k) מִסְכֵּן 'impoverished,' xl. 20.

(l) מִשְׁפָּט 'ordinance' or 'law,' used technically for (the true) religion in its practical aspect; xlii. 1, 3, 4, li. 4.

(m) צְדִיק 'true'; xli. 26, comp. lix. 4.

(n) צְדָקָה 'righteousness' = 'success' (God's justification of His people before the world); xlv. 8, 24, xlvi. 13, li. 5, 6, 8, lvi. 1, lix. 17, lxi. 10, 11, lxii. 1.

(o) קָרָא 'to call' = 'to prophesy'; xl. 2, xlv. 7, lviii. 1, comp. lxi. 1, 2.

Looking back upon the preceding lists, it is obvious that there is not only a large genuinely Hebrew element peculiar to II. Isaiah, but also a certain Aramaising tendency. In נָאֵל 'to be impure' we notice an Aramaic weakening of *v* into *n* (comp. נָעַל 'to reject'). נָשִׂישׁ 'to grope,' is suggested by the Aramaic *gash* 'palpavit'; the genuine Hebrew synonym is קָשִׁישׁ (Deut. xxviii. 29, Job v. 14). יָתַר 'exceedingly,' reminds one of Aram. יָתַיר; חִפְּץ 'business' (a sense which can hardly be avoided in lviii. 3, 13) of *ḥ'bhū* 'business,' in Syriac, from *c'bhā* 'to desire,' and שְׂאֵלָה 'a matter,' in Chaldee, from שָׁאַל 'to ask.' סָנַר 'to worship' (which only occurs in II. Isaiah) is the Syriac *s'ged*, Chald. *s'gid*, though the use of the Hebrew word is more limited than that of the Aramaic, סָנַר being only used of idolatry (כִּשְׁפָה and other similar technical words of Aramaic origin are limited in the same way). קָנָה 'to give an honourable surname to' (peculiar to II. Isaiah and Job), though it has both Aramaic and Arabic affinities, is yet most probably suggested by the Aramaic. סַנְנִימִים, 'viceroys,' the Hebraised form of an Assyrian and Babylonian word (see note, p. 144), doubtless came to the Jews through the Chaldee *s'gan*, plur. *signin* (Dan. ii. 48, &c.). Add to these the harsh idiom in xxvi. 11 (see note),

which would lose its harshness in an Aramaic sentence ; and the phrase 'all nations and tongues' (lxvi. 18), which reminds us of a well-known expression in the Chaldee portions of the Book of Daniel (see note, p. 127). If the Massoretic text were correct in xiv. 4, we should also include the singular form מְדַבֵּרָה, 'exactress of gold' (Auth. Vers., margin), from Chald. דַּבְּרָה = Hebr. דָּבַר 'gold.' And yet, when all has been said, most will probably admit with Dr. S. Davidson¹ that 'the diction of the second part of Isaiah is tolerably pure and free from Chaldaisms.' Sporadic Chaldaisms are in fact no novelty in Hebrew literature, and with our very conjectural knowledge of the phases of the Hebrew language, and the process of the final editing of the Hebrew Scriptures, it seems rash to trust to them as a criterion of language. Certainly the case for the antiquity of II. Isaiah, on the linguistic side, is more favourable than for that of the Book of Job, and almost infinitely more so than for that of Ecclesiastes. We must not, indeed, build too much on this comparative purity of diction ; but on the other hand we must not fail to recognise it.

IX. JOB AND THE SECOND PART OF ISAIAH : A PARALLEL.

I.

IF it is no easy task in the case of parallel passages to distinguish the original from the imitation, how much more difficult must it be in the case of *parallel books* ! This reflection forms the link between the present and the preceding essay. The allusion, I need hardly tell the reader, is on the one hand to the 'Book of the Servant of Jehovah,' and on the other to the twenty-second Psalm and the Book of Job. It is not my object, however, to discuss the literary relation between these books, but rather to show by a few details that the parallelism actually exists. Nothing, perhaps, is more helpful to a right appreciation of books than to compare those which amidst some divergences have a real and predominant affinity. The twenty-second Psalm, short as it is, embodies the essence of some of the most striking passages of the 'Book of the Servant,' but I must content myself with the brief enforcement of this view in a previous essay (pp. 190-1). The Book of Job claims a fuller treatment, not with regard

¹ *Introduction to the Old Testament*, ii. 54.

to its literary aspects, however tempting these may be,¹ but to the fundamental parallelism of thought between it and II. Isaiah.

The common view that the hero of the poem of Job is simply an individual must, it is clear, be abandoned. I do not know whether Chateaubriand's views on Biblical subjects are original, or whether he drew from some Catholic theologian; but his comment on the speeches of Job is too strikingly true to be withheld. He says, 'Il y a dans la mélancolie de Job quelque chose de surnaturel. L'homme *individuel*, si malheureux qu'il puisse être, ne peut tirer de pareils soupirs de son âme. Job est la figure de *l'humanité souffrante*, et l'écrivain inspiré a trouvé des soupirs, pour exprimer tous les maux partagés entre la race humaine.'² This is, in fact, the thesis which the following pages are to defend, though not without giving the fullest weight to the elements of the poem which compel us to regard the hero as an individual. The truth is that Job is at once an individual and a type: need I remark how interesting a parallel is suggested with the Servant of Jehovah?

But I must first of all invite the reader to accompany me in a brief preliminary survey. I leave the Prologue for the present out of the question, and turn at once to the speeches which, indeed, are capable of standing independently of both Prologue and Epilogue. An analysis would occupy us too long; I will only point to the continually recurring passages in which the sufferings of Job are spoken of in terms hardly suitable to an individual. Sometimes, for instance, we are startled at the ejaculation,

My days are swifter than a runner,
They have fled away without having seen prosperity (ix. 25),

although we have learned from the Prologue that 'this man was the greatest of all the sons of the east' (i. 3); and then by still more excessive complaints, in which Job's Oriental sense of dignity seems to vanish altogether, and which must sound strangely enough to those who have watched in real life the calm heroism of great sufferers—

O that my vexation were duly weighed,
And my calamity lifted with it into balances!
For it would then be heavier than sand of seas;
Therefore have my words been rash (vi. 2, 3).

¹ I have touched upon these in a paper called 'The Book of Job; a Literary and Biographical Study,' in *Fraser's Magazine*, July 1880, pp. 126-134. The parallelism between Job and the Introduction to Proverbs has but little corresponding to it in II. Isaiah, the influence of proverbial wisdom upon the latter being comparatively slight. The range both of thought and expression in the Book of Job is wider than that in II. Isaiah.

² *Génie du christianisme* (Paris 1802), ii. 305.

How surprising it is again, when Job falls to meditating on the hardships of humanity—

Has not frail man a hard service upon earth,
And are not his days like the days of a hireling? (vii. 1)

One would have thought that it would be some comfort to the sufferer, that he was not worse off than the rest of his kind! But no; it does but open the floodgates of lamentation—

Like a slave, who panteth for shade,
And like a hireling who waiteth for his recompence,
So am I made to possess months of disappointment,
And troublous nights have been allotted to me (vii. 2, 3).

And again, after the pathetic reflection,

Man, born of woman,
Short of days and full of unrest,
Cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down,
Fleeth like a shadow and stayeth not (xiv. 1, 2),

how hard it is, on the ordinary hypothesis, to account for the (apparent) invasion of self-consciousness in the second line of the next verse,

Yet upon him dost thou keep open thine eyes,
And me dost thou bring into judgment with thee (xiv. 3)!

Equally strange phenomena are the political and social digressions in which Job repeatedly indulges. The changes of empires, the violence of tyrants, and their immunity (not universal, however, as Job virtually admits in chap. xxvii.) from punishment, the hardships of slavery and poverty, the calamities of war, pestilence, famine, and wild beasts, are mingled inextricably with the personal theme of his unmerited sufferings.

It is strange, no doubt; but Job himself seems to give us the clue to the mystery, when he and his friends unexpectedly fall into language implying that he is not an individual, but a plurality of persons. 'For me the graves' (Job; xvii. 1). 'How long will ye hunt for words,' 'Wherefore are we . . . held unclean in your sight' (Bildad; xviii. 2, 3). 'He counteth me as his adversaries'¹ (Job; xix. 11). Perhaps I might add, in illustration, xvi. 10 and xxvii. 11, 12, where Job addresses his friends as if they were the assembled multitude of 'wise men.' Certainly, I can see no other explanation of those apparently hyperbolical complaints, that strange invasion of self-consciousness, and that no less strange 'enthusiasm of

¹ See, however, above, p. 26 (top of col. 1).

humanity,' of which I have spoken above, than the view expressed or implied by Chateaubriand that Job is a type of righteous men in affliction—not merely in the land of Uz, nor among the Jews in Babylonia,¹ nor yet, on Warburton's theory of the poem, in the Judæa of the time of Nehemiah, but wherever on the wide earth tears are shed and hearts are broken. Not that Job ceases to be an individual; it is evident, not merely from the Prologue, but from Ezek. xiv. 14, 20, that there was an ancient tradition of a Hebrew king Priam, whose name had become the symbol of immeasurable woe. That Job is a type no more destroys his claim to be an individual than the typical character of Dante in his pilgrimage and of Faust in Goethe's great poem annuls the historical element in these two poetical figures. Job, in fact, if I read him aright, is 'not merely a patriarch in the already remote youth of the world, but the idealised portrait of the author himself.'² The sacred poet, we may reverently conjecture, was prepared by providential discipline for his appointed work. 'In the rhythmic swell of Job's passionate complaints, there is an echo of the heart-beats of a great poet and a great sufferer. The cry, "Perish the day in which I was born" (iii. 3), is a true expression of the first effects of some unrecorded sorrow. In the life-like description beginning "Oh that I were as in months of old" (xxix. 2), the writer is thinking probably of his own happier days, before misfortune overtook him. Like Job (xxix. 7, 21-25), he had sat in the "broad place" by the gate, and solved the doubts of perplexed clients. Like Job, he had maintained his position triumphantly against other wise men. He had a fellow-feeling with Job in the distressful passage through doubt to faith. Like Job (xxi. 16), he had resisted the suggestion of practical atheism, and with the confession of his error (xlii. 2-6) had recovered spiritual peace.' All this is credible, and more than credible, if we remember that mere artistic creations are not in harmony with the old Semitic mind—that personal experience is the basis of the Biblical Hebrew as well as of the old Arabian poetry. This is not, however, the only channel by which the author's subjectivism has impressed itself on the traditional story. 'There is yet another aspect to the personality of the author of "Job"—his open eye and ear for the sights and lessons of external nature. He might have said with a better right than Goethe, "What I have not gained by learning, I have by travel."³

¹ See on xl. 12 (vol. i. p. 242).

² The passages within inverted commas are quoted from the paper in *Fraser's Magazine*, referred to above.

³ 'Was ich nicht erlernt habe, das hab' ich erwandert.'

He is such a one as Sirach describes (Ecclus. xxxix. 4), "He will travel through strange countries, for he hath tried the good and the evil among men." From a wide observation of nature he derived the magnificent scenery—scenery, however, which is more than scenery, for it furnishes important elements of his sacred philosophy. Not that the imagination is allowed to be inactive. . . . For the full and free consideration of his subject, he felt that he required an absolutely clear medium, disengaged from the associations even of the true, the revealed religion. (Is he not in this point a warrant for the "apologetic" treatment to which we, like the author of "Job," though in other forms, are obliged to subject our religion?) With a poet's tact, and with a true sympathy for doubters, he created an ideal medium, in which hardly anything Israelitish is visible. The elements which he fused together came from the three countries with which he seems to have been best acquainted—Arabia, Judah, Egypt. From Arabia he takes the position which he assigns to Job, of a great agriculturist-chieftain. The stars of the Arabian sky must have deepened his unmistakable interest in astronomy (ix. 9, xxxviii. 31-33). Personal knowledge of caravan life seems to have suggested that most touching figure, which our own Thomson has so finely, though so inaccurately, paraphrased¹ (vi. 15-20). And the same desert regions doubtless inspired those splendid descriptions of the wild goat, the wild ass, and the horse (chap. xxxix.) which extorted a tribute of admiration from the traveller Humboldt. But neither agricultural life alone, nor the phenomena of the desert, have furnished him with sufficient poetic material. He who would 'rise to the height of this great argument' must have gained his experience of life on a more extensive and changeful theatre. From Judah, then, the poet borrows his picture of city-life, which presupposes a complex social organism, with kings, priests, judges, physicians, authors, and wise men. This description of the sessions of Job in the gate (chap. xxix.) is distinctly Judæan in character. It was the Nile-valley, however, which supplied the most vivid colours to his palette. He is acquainted with the Nile and its papyrus-boats (ix. 26), with the plants which grow on its banks (viii. 11, xl. 21), and with the habits of the two wonderful animals which frequent its shores (xl. 15-xli. 34). He is no less familiar with mining operations (xxviii. 1-11), such as were practised since the

¹ In Cairo's crowded streets
 The impatient merchant, wondering, waits in vain,
 And Mecca saddens at the long delay.
 (*Summer*, 980-2; of the caravan which perished in the storm.)

earliest times by the Egyptians. But the author of "Job" is no mere observer of details. Phenomena are in his eyes but manifestations of the perfect and all-ruling but incomprehensible wisdom of God.' No contrast can be greater than that of the over-taught, sophisticated modern, who exclaims with Leopardi,

. . . conosciuto il mondo
Non cresce, anzi si scema,

and the author of 'Job,' who beholds the universe with an eye quickened by the thought of God. In him, the fountain of admiration has not been dried up by an ill-assimilated science. 'Orion and the Pleiades above, the forests and the torrents below . . . the neck of the war-horse, the scales of Leviathan, are marvels in his eyes—the speaking fragments of an almighty life behind. From us, the wonder of these things is gone.'¹ But the more we live ourselves into the Biblical literature, especially into the inspired and inspiring poem of 'Job,' the more the wonder comes back to us. 'My Father made them all.'

The infinite wisdom of God—this is one of the sacred poet's two solutions (or substitutes for solutions) of the problem before him, How are the sufferings of Job to be reconciled with the Divine justice? The other is embodied in the Epilogue, which seems to have been appended by an after-thought, either by the poet himself or by one of the Soferim or Scripturists. It is this, that Job, after passing victoriously through his trial, was restored to twice his former prosperity. The two solutions are seemingly inconsistent: but are not so in reality. The one applies to the case of Job both as an individual and as a type; the other only as a type. The sufferings of any innocent individual could not, at that early stage of revelation, be accounted for; God is All-wise, was the only thought which could quiet the troubled mind. The same truth had, no doubt, its bearing on the sufferings of the innocent as a class; but there was also another still more comforting thought in reserve, viz. that they would yet receive compensation; they would 'inherit the earth;' there would be, in Christian language, a millennium. Now let us turn to the Book of the Servant. The people whom the prophet addresses (whether as a contemporary or across the centuries, we need not here enquire) are preoccupied by the thought, Why is redemption so slow in coming? And the answer is, Because of your sins, especially your unbelief. Only a righteous people can be delivered; a people which trusts its

¹ James Martineau, *Hours of Thought*, first series, p. 31.

God implicitly, and devotes itself to carrying out His high purposes. But how faint and dim the prospect of the people's ever becoming righteous! Hence (not to repeat my former explanations (the inner necessity for a special Divine interposition. A divine-human representative must appear, and at once atone for the breach of the covenant, and 'make the many righteous.' And so the Servant, like another Job, appears on the stage, and suffers more than even Job suffered, and through his suffering wins the reward of eternal life for all who become his spiritual children. The sufferings of the Servant are those of an individual, but they are also those of the representative of a class; his reward, too, is not merely that of an individual, but purchased for a great company. This is, in brief, the parallelism between the Book of Job and of the Servant of Jehovah.

2.

Let me now briefly indicate some of the points of detail in which this affinity can be traced.

1. Both Job and the Person in whom the predictions of II. Isaiah culminate are Jehovah's righteous servants. 'Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a blameless and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil?' (Job i. 8). 'The righteous one, my servant' (Isa. liii. 9). Job has, indeed, a fault, but it only appears in the course of his trial—he misinterprets the All-wise Creator.

2. Both in the Prologue and in the body of the poem Job is represented as a leper (ii. 7, vii. 5, 15, &c.). The sufferings of the Servant in II. Isaiah are also described in language suggestive of this fell disease (see on liii. 3, 4). The leprosy of the Servant is doubtless typical; but so also is that of Job, if at least we have been right in regarding Job as at once an individual and a type. It is, moreover, worth noticing that, in the pictures drawn by Job's friends of the prosperity to which he would be restored upon his repentance, and in the narrative of the Epilogue, no allusion is made to his recovery from leprosy. (See v. 17-26, viii. 5-7, 20-22, xi. 13-20, xxii. 21-30, xlii. 7-17.) May we not infer that the leprosy of Job was in its highest meaning only one form of expression among others for the manifold misery of 'the woman-born'?

3. The horror with which Job's appearance fills his friends reminds one strongly of the similar effect of the disfigured form of the Servant (see parallel passages in preceding essay).

4. The mockery and desertion by his friends of which

Job complains find a close parallel in the experience of the Servant (see parallel passages).

5. Job is restored to more than his former prosperity; 'Jehovah gave Job twice as much as he had before' (xlii. 10). The Servant passes through trial to a glorious reward (liii. 12), and the faithful remnant of Israel, which is mystically united to Him, receives 'double instead of its shame' (lxi. 7).

6. So near does Job stand to his God that he can intercede effectually for his guilty friends (xlii. 8, 10). Of the Servant the same is told us (liii. 12). We must not dilute the parallelism, but neither must we exaggerate it. For the Servant 'makes intercession for the rebellious,' *i.e.* for the breakers of the covenant, who had committed the 'sin unto death,' for which none but a Divine intercessor is allowed to pray (1 John v. 16).

7. Last of all (for I will leave some parallels for the student to glean), let me mention the obvious correspondence between the happy immortality anticipated by Job (xix. 25-27) and the triumphant life after death of the Servant of Jehovah (Isa. liii. 10-12).

But the strong points of resemblance between the Books of Job and of II. Isaiah, and especially between the portraits of the patriarch and of the Servant, must not be allowed to conceal from view the equally strong elements of contrast. That luxuriant growth of imaginative ornament which twines around the Book of the Patriarch has but a slender counterpart in the Book of the Servant. The author of the latter never forgets that he is a prophet, and though he does not literally address the people in the market-place, his style is chiefly modelled on that of the spoken prophecies. He does not, indeed, refuse a large literary and, as one may say, poetical element; ¹ writing in private, without any view to oral delivery, he could not wholly exclude the graces of literature; but there are times when, as in chap. lviii. 1-7, ² the reproduction of the true prophetic style is so complete that we could believe ourselves standing in the crowd gathered round a prophetic orator.—Another consequence of his prophetic character which equally distinguishes him from the poet of 'Job' is his studious self-concealment. True, he does apparently refer to himself on four occasions (xl. 6, xlv. 26, xlvi. 16, lvii. 21), whereas the Book of Job contains no direct allusion to the author; but the four references to himself are in no sense autobiographical, while the Book of Job is so eloquent in its

¹ It is noteworthy that the affinity of 'Job' with the Book of Proverbs has nothing really corresponding to it in II. Isaiah.

² See also note on xlvi. 6.

seeming silence that we can venture to read 'between the lines' the life of the author himself. Whether the prophetic writer of II. Isaiah had passed through such great deeps of spiritual experience as the author of 'Job,' whether he took as wide an interest in nature and in man, whether he was a traveller, or had never moved from Jerusalem, we may feel inclined to question, but cannot venture to pronounce dogmatically. It is of course possible that being a prophet and a confessor, in picturing Him who was both and more than both, he may to some extent have pictured himself; but there could, from the nature of the case, be no design in this partial coincidence. The vocations of the two writers were different, though not unrelated. The author of 'Job' wrote as a theistic moral teacher, excluding, for more than merely artistic reasons, considerations drawn from revealed religion. 'He has not, indeed, solved, nor even tried theoretically to solve, the problem of human suffering, but at least concentrated into a focus the data for its discussion, so far as they could be derived from the experience of his day. The author of II. Isaiah wrote as an interpreter of the signs of the times to the Jewish exiles, as an agent in the great work of preparation for redemption, and as the final revealer of that wonderful personage who should by his life and death explain all the problems and fulfil all the aspirations both of Israel and of humanity. But the one beyond question helped the other. I cannot say with some recent writers¹ that the poet of 'Job' was 'inspired' by the prophet of II. Isaiah, for it can, I think, be made reasonably certain that 'Job' is the earlier of the two works, and that if any work has suggested the theme and the mode of treatment of 'Job,' it is, not II. Isaiah, but the glorious little treatise (chaps. i.-ix.) which opens the Book of Proverbs.² Nor can I even adopt the converse of this proposition, and maintain that the Book of the Servant was suggested by that of the Patriarch, for the influence of the latter appears to me rather indirect than immediate, and the author of the former to have immensely outrun his predecessor:—how could it be otherwise when he was a prophet? But I do most fully admit the importance of the general and, if I may say so, atmospheric influence of the Book of Job, which must have contributed to a 'fit audience, though few,' most precious elements of thought preparing them for higher truths. In a word, I think with Dr. Mozley that from a

¹ Seinecke, *Der Evangelist des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1870), and Hoekstra, in an essay entitled 'Job, the Servant of Jehovah,' which opens the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* for 1871.

² See the paper in *Fraser* already referred to, pp. 129-130.

Christian point of view this great work was the providentially appointed pioneer of the supreme revelation of the suffering Saviour. 'If the Jew was to accept a Messiah who was to lead a life of sorrow and abasement, and to be crucified between thieves, it was necessary that he should be somewhere or other distinctly taught that virtue was not always rewarded here, and that therefore no argument could be drawn from affliction and ignominy against the person who suffered it. The Book of Job does this. It devotes itself to the enunciation of this injustice and irregularity as a law or principle of the present order of things. However the mass might cling to the idea of a visibly successful Messiah, such a book would insensibly direct the minds of the better sort into another channel, and prepare them for the truth of the case. It spoke things *φωνᾶντα συνεροῖσι*, in describing the afflictions of one, whom when the ear heard, it "blessed him, and when the eye saw, it gave witness to him; who delivered the poor that cried, the fatherless and him that had none to help him."¹ And thus [to the few who had "ears to hear"] it stood in a particular relation to the prophetic books of Scripture—a kind of interpretative one; supplying a caution where they raised hopes, suggesting suspicions of apparent meaning and conjectures as to a deeper one, and drawing men from a too material to a refined faith. By the side of a long line of prophecy, as a whole outwardly gorgeous and flattering, and promising in the Messiah a successful potentate, and opener of a glorious temporal future for the Jewish nation, there rose one sad but faithful memento, and all that appearance of approaching splendour was seen in qualifying connection with other truths.'²

X. ISAIAH AND HIS COMMENTATORS.

I.

IT is an unfortunate custom which, though of modern origin, promises to be difficult to eradicate—that of interpolating exegetical observations with a long array of names of authorities. In spite of the eminent precedents which may be claimed on behalf of the practice, its extension is, I think, very much to be deprecated. If, indeed, 'always, everywhere, and by all' complete unanimity were enjoyed as to the objects

¹ Job xxix. 11, 12.

² Mozley, *Essays Historical and Theological*, ii. 227-8.

and method of exegesis, we might safely allow the commentator the same liberty which we grant the poet ; it is pleasant to read a Miltonic roll of famous names. But in the unideal conditions of human thought it is not open to us to make light of the distinctions of ages and schools. To mix up a St. Augustine with an Ibn Ezra, an Estius with a Calvin, a Hengstenberg with a Hitzig, is equally offensive to the historical sense and injurious to the exegetical student. Perhaps the practical point of view is that from which one may have most hope of disestablishing the custom ; the practical danger is too manifest to be ignored. Commentaries are not written primarily for the finished scholar, and nine students out of ten are without a living conception of what these bare lists of names symbolise. Not only are their memories clogged with a useless skeleton of knowledge, but their judgments are biased by a misplaced regard to often very questionable authorities. Authority has no doubt a value, but only to those who possess a clear insight into the grounds of its existence. There are commentators whom we may gladly hear on a theological inference,¹ but whose opinion is of little or no importance on a point of grammar. It is history which alone enables us to discern between various *charismata*—the history, that is, of exegesis, which is itself the history of philology, philosophy, and theology in miniature.

It is impossible here even to sketch the outlines of these three great subjects ; but some of my readers may thank me for that elementary information which will vivify the few names of commentators which I have thought it necessary to mention. Besides, it is of consequence to the student not to tie himself to any single commentator or school of commentators. The Scriptures shine with a prismatic radiance, and the gifts and perceptions of their expositors are equally manifold. The richest stores of the intellect have been lavished on the illustration of the prophecies, and it were self-impoverishment to neglect to turn them to account. A really good commentary on a many-sided author is never quite superseded. Two or three representative works should always be at hand, not as crutches for the indolent, but as friendly guides to those who have already a preliminary knowledge of the text. I speak here only of commentators ; a special handbook is required for the versions, and in its absence the Introductions of Bleek and Keil are familiar to

¹ See, e.g., the quotation from St. Athanasius in the supplementary note on xlv. 14.

all. And I can say but little of the earlier exegetical writers,¹ who would involve me in too many digressions, and, indeed, like the versions, require a very special treatment. The object of my work has been to place the reader in the centre of the great modern exegetical movement, and it is on the merits and demerits of those who have taken part in this movement that the reader is entitled to expect a word of guidance.

But how can I omit ST. JEROME, who in his seclusion at Bethlehem laid the foundation of a philological exegesis, and bridged over the gulf between the Synagogue and the Church? The only ancient Latin commentary on Isaiah comes from his facile pen (A.D. 410). It is divided into eighteen books, and, like this Father's exegesis in general, may be described with Dr. Merx as 'eine fleissige, elegante, aber principlose Compilation.' Not the least valuable element in its multifarious contents is that derived from St. Jerome's Jewish rabbis (see his notes on i. 10, vi. 1, vii. 8, xiii. 10, xiv. 19, xx. 6); there are also golden grains in his geographical and archæological notices (see *e.g.* on ἀχι xix. 6, and on ζύθος xix 10).² Among Christian teachers. St. Jerome probably owes much to Origen, like whom he expatiates freely in the allegoric mysticism of 'tropology.' His merit, however, and it is not a slight one, is this—he distinctly lays down that 'tropology' must never violate text and context, *his tantum legibus circumscripta, ut pietatem sequatur et intelligentiæ sermonisque textum*,³ and that the fundamental sense of the Scriptures is the literal (*fundamenta jaciens Scripturarum*).⁴ In the preface to the fifth book (on Isa. xiii.-xxiii.), written in a simpler style than usual at the request of the bishop Amabilis, he even hazards a gentle censure of his great predecessor Origen, who *liberis allegoriæ spatiis evagatur, et interpretatis nominibus singulorum ingenium suum facit ecclesiæ sacramenta*.⁵

The next great link between Jewish and Christian scholarship was NICOLAS DE LYRA (died 1340), a Franciscan monk at Paris, the author of *Postillæ perpetuæ*, in 85 books

¹ My plan prevents me from more than mentioning R. SAADYAH (892-942), born in the Fayyûm in Upper Egypt, who was one of the early lights of Jewish-Arabic philology, and whom I have referred to occasionally as a translator. His Arabic version of Isaiah was edited in a very faulty manner by Paulus (Jenæ, 1790-1), and will be re-edited, it is hoped, by Prof. de Lagarde. Salomon Munk made important contributions to a more accurate text in vol. ix. of Cahen's great Bible (Paris, 1838). It would be interesting to examine his commentary, which has been discovered (in Arabic) in a new collection of MSS. in the St. Petersburg library, though, from his date and theological position, we cannot expect it to be seriously philological.

² Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaja*, p. 115.

³ Comment. in Abac. i. 11.

⁴ Præf. in libr. quint. Is.

⁵ *Ibid.*

(Benedictine edition, Antwerp, 1634). The well-known verse, 'Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset,'¹ is in reality a tribute to Jewish scholarship, for Lyra was so largely dependent on Jewish exegesis as to receive the not unmerited nickname 'simia Salomonis' (Rashi's name being properly R. Solomon Yīqkhaki). Let us pay the debt of gratitude to the name of Lyra, and be thankful that we are not reduced, like Luther, to submit to his infiltration of Jewish exegesis. Lyra's great teacher, RASHI (died 1107), was the glory of the rabbinical school of northern France. He has left commentaries on nearly the whole of the Old Testament, printed in the rabbinical Bibles, and partly translated into Latin by Breithaupt (3 vols., Gotha, 1710). His merits are thus summed up by Grätz the historian:— 'His accurate tact and his sense of truth guided him to the right meaning and the appropriate connection. Only he too often allowed himself to be diverted by the Agadic exegesis, assuming that the exposition in the Talmud and in the Agadic literature was meant to be taken seriously. Yet he was conscious, though somewhat vaguely, that the simple sense (פשוט) was the contradictory of the Agadic explanation (טורי). In his old age this consciousness became more distinct, and he expressed the intention to his learned grandson and disciple (Rashbam) of recasting his commentaries on the Bible in the sense of a sober, literal exegesis.'² A greater genius than Rashi was the illustrious Abraham IBN EZRA of Toledo (died 1167), poet, philosopher, theologian, and exegete. His commentary on Isaiah (one of his earlier works) has received the honour of a critical edition from Dr. Friedländer, who has appended a valuable glossary for the benefit of those who are not conversant with the technical terms of the rabbis, and who has also published a translation.³ As Mr. C. Taylor, editor of *The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* remarks: 'The large class to whom the term Rabbinic suggests a futile display of misapplied subtlety will see occasion to revise their judgment after some study of the work now presented to them in a comparatively popular form.'⁴ The obscurity of the author's style is the chief drawback to the perusal of his works in the original.

¹ Or, 'totus mundus delirasset.' There are also other forms of the couplet. With regard to Rashi's influence on Lyra and on Luther, see Dr. Siegfried's papers in the *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, i. 428, &c., ii. 39, &c.

² Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi. 73. Rabbi Eleazar, of Beaugenci, whose Hebrew commentary on Isaiah has been edited by Mr. Nutt (1879), was a pupil of Rashbam, the second grandson of Rashi.

³ Published for the Society of Hebrew Literature by Trübner & Co., 1873 (translation), 1877 (text).

⁴ *The Academy*, Dec. 1, 1873, p. 451.

DAVID KIMCHI of Narbonne (died 1235) was distinguished alike as a grammarian, a lexicographer, and an exegete, though less by any original contributions of his own than by his sound judgment, and his discriminating use of the labours of others.

Of these three celebrated commentators, Ibn Ezra is decidedly the most original, and it is not perfectly clear why Dr. Merx denies him the capacity of historical criticism,¹ when he has certainly anticipated modern historical scepticism (in the good sense) on such a salient point as the authorship of Isa. xl.–lxvi. Gesenius more plausibly complains of the Jews for ‘preferring the superstitious and often crazy Rashi to the clear-headed and thorough Ibn Ezra.’² None of them present us, however, with what we naturally look for at supposed Messianic passages, viz. a traditional Jewish exegesis. Ibn Ezra is the most eccentric; many passages commonly regarded as Messianic are explained by him from the history of David, Hezekiah, &c., though he protests against being supposed to be a disbeliever in the Messiah’s advent.³ Kimchi is the most polemical; he loses no opportunity of expressing his horror at the idolatry of the Christians (טײנים). But a common ‘Jewish interpretation of prophecy’ is altogether wanting; the most striking proof of this is the thick octavo volume in which the comments of Jewish writers on the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah have been brought together by Dr. Neubauer and Mr. Driver at the instance of Prof. Pusey. There was evidently no tradition, no rule of interpretation, to bind the Jewish rabbis. All that we have in this admirably edited work is the anti-Christian interpretations of individual Jews, ‘privatmeinung, notbehilf, abfindung mit christlicher theologie.’⁴

To return to Christian exegesis. It is sad but true that, by the unhistorical antedating of ‘unwritten traditions,’ the Roman Catholic Church has done its utmost to cut the nerve of historical exegesis. It has even, by its declaration of the ‘authenticity’ of the Vulgate (without, however, providing a critical text of that version), and by the ominous decree, ‘ad coercenda petulantia ingenia,’ made it practically all but impossible to be, even in the most humble sense, an exegete of the original texts.⁵ *Non ragioniam di lor*, we must say,

¹ *Die Prophetie des Joel* (Halle, 1879), p. 255.

² *Der Prophet Jesaja*, p. 123.

³ Friedländer, *Essays on the Writings of Abraham Ibn Ezra*, p. 98.

⁴ Lagarde, *Symmikta*, vol. ii. (Götting, 1880), p. 13.

⁵ ‘. . . . Perspicuensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ab ipsius Christi ore ab apostolis acceptæ, aut ab

but in a very different tone from the stern Florentine, *ma guarda e passa*. The leaders of the Reformation took a directly opposite attitude. They appealed, in the interests, as they believed, of spiritual religion, from an unverifiable tradition to the text of the sacred Scriptures, and the study of the Bible immediately rose to a position of primary importance. Exegesis, without becoming less Christian became distinctly more scientific. In the Old Testament, for instance, the Protestant divines sought to harmonise their exegesis, not merely with their Christian assumptions, but with the rules of the new philology. The atomistic mode of treatment gave way to a patient, thoughtful study of contexts. The reaction against dogmatic accretions inspired a wholesome dread of the licence of allegory. A growing distrust set in of the manifold senses of the older expositors; in fact, one of the greatest dangers of Protestant exegesis became the identification (so unnatural, if it be understood extensively, and not intensively) of the literal interpretation with the Christian. I speak of course, merely of tendencies, not of accomplished results.

It was in the Reformed Church, which attached greater importance than the Lutheran to the authority of the Scriptures on *all* points of doctrine, that the problem of Biblical exegesis was apprehended with most distinctness. MUSCULUS, however (whom I have had occasion to cite once), has been praised by a competent judge for his careful distinction between the scientific and the practical elements of exegesis, and his special attention to the former;¹ and Musculus was an adherent of the doctrines of Luther. In the Reformed Church the name of the ardent Hebraist PELLICANUS deserves honourable mention, as we have been reminded by a recent discovery in our national library.² His

ipsis apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt. 'Præterea, ad coercenda petulantia ingenia, decernit, ut nemo, suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei, et morum ad ædificationem doctrinæ christianæ pertinentium, sacram scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimum consensum patrum ipsam scripturam sacram interpretari audeat, etiamsi hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent.' *Canones Concilii Tridentini, Sessio Quarta.* (I fail to see how the former quotation is reconcilable with any theory of historical development, or how the art of exegesis is ever to be practised either by master or by scholar with such a sword of Damocles suspended over his head.)

¹ Musculus: *In Esaiam prophetam commentarii locupletissimi*, Basil., 1570. Comp. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (Jena, 1869), p. 268.

² Pellicanus was the predecessor of Reuchlin as a writer on Hebrew Grammar. The story of his exertions to learn the sacred tongue can be read in his autobiography, edited by Professor Riggenbach for the festival of the fourth centenary of the University of Tübingen, in 1877. His grammar (entitled *De modo legendi et intelligendi*

notes upon Isaiah, which are concise, and mainly devoted to paraphrasing the grammatical sense, occur in the third volume of his *Commentaria Sacra* (Zurich, 1540). But the only writer of this age who still retains, and is likely to retain, his importance is CALVIN (1509–64). ‘Unrivalled in his own age,’ says Diestel, ‘his works offer even yet a rich store of Biblical knowledge.’¹ Mercerus² was no doubt a far deeper Hebraist (though the scholarship of Calvin has been most unduly disparaged by Richard Simon), but if we consider Calvin’s deep insight into the aim and method of historico-philological exegesis, the extent of his exegetical labours, and the high average level which, in spite of the enforced rapidity of his work, he attained, we shall probably come to the conclusion that, even as an Old Testament interpreter (and he is more than this), there is no greater name in the Reformation age (nor perhaps in any subsequent one) than that of Calvin. It is indeed remarkable that one so eminent as a dogmatic theologian should also have shown himself so loyal to the principles of philology. The only apparent effect of his dogmatic speculations upon his Biblical exegesis is to give it a greater depth. The most celebrated specimen of his exegesis is his commentary on the Psalms, of which it is hardly possible to speak too favourably; but even his work on Isaiah,³ though neither so mature nor so elaborate, well deserves to be consulted. It certainly gives one a high idea of the exegetical lectures—not by any means confined within a narrow range—which this great Reformer was constantly delivering to the future ‘ministers of the word of God.’

In the seventeenth century the centre of Biblical studies was transferred to Holland. The national characteristics of coolness, good sense, and thoroughness, appear in the Dutch exegesis: let it suffice to mention GROTIUS and DE DIEU. The former (1583–1645) was primarily a statesman and a jurist. His peculiarity as an exegete consists in his thoroughly secular attitude towards the Biblical writings; he writes as a layman for laymen. Of the depth of meaning of

Hebraum) was lost sight of, till Dr. E. Nestle discovered it in the British Museum copy of the 1504 Strasburg edition of Reisch’s *Margaritha philosophica*, of which Pellicanus’ Hebrew Grammar forms part. A photolithographic reproduction of this curious work was brought out by the discoverer in honour of the Tübingen festival.

¹ Diestel, *op. cit.* p. 267.

² Mercerus (Le Mercier) was, although a Huguenot, regius professor of Hebrew at Paris. He died 1570. Schlottmann calls him ‘the greatest Old Testament exegete of the sixteenth century’ (*Das Buch Hiob*, p. 121). It is to be regretted that he has left no commentary on Isaiah.

³ Printed at Geneva, 1551, and dedicated to King Edward VI.

the Scriptures he has no real comprehension ; but he has done yeoman's service for the letter. He wrote ' annotations ' in the strict sense of the word—*i.e.* scattered, unconnected notes on certain difficult passages—extending over the whole of the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha. De Dieu (1590–1642) excels where Grotius is deficient, as a grammarian and a lexicographer ; he not only sifted the vast and multifarious Rabbinical tradition, but actually advanced Hebrew philology by an independent comparison of the cognate languages.¹ He had also a keen and subtle judgment, and stimulates even where he does not convince. Well qualified as he was, however, he seems to have objected on principle to add to the number of continuously written commentaries ; he has therefore only given us a *spicilegium*. Nor did any of the great Orientalists (not even our own Pococke), who formed a kind of philological ' succession ' in the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth century, choose the prophet Isaiah as the subject of special study.² ALBERT SCHULTENS (1686–1750), who has left an ineffaceable mark on Hebrew philology, confined himself, like De Dieu, to observations on difficult passages,³ which, though highly praised by Gesenius, require to be read with caution, on account of the author's illusion as to the illustrative value of the Arabic vocabulary. It was, however, a remarkable production for a youth of twenty-three, and reminds us forcibly of the early achievement of one of his greatest successors.

In 1722 the academic world of Franeker was gathered in the university church to listen to an oration from Albert Schultens 'in exequiis *principis theologi* Campegii Vitringa.' There is a refreshing enthusiasm in VITRINGA⁴ ('ardens, vehemens, et nobile quid ac magnificum spirans,' are the epithets of his friend Schultens) which makes us wonder whether he can be really the countryman of Hugo Grotius. But this ardour is not inconsistent with a love of completeness and an ἀκρίβεια, which have always characterised the best type of Dutch philology. One is tempted to add, with a prolixity peculiar to himself ; for who else in a land fruitful above others in philologists would have thought of devoting

¹ See his posthumous work, *Animadversiones in Veteris Testamenti libros omnes* (Lugd. Bat., 1548).

² Bochart, the French Protestant (died 1667), only touched on antiquarian and especially zoological allusions ; here, however, he shows vast reading. His works are—*Geographia sacra*, Caen, 1646 ; *Hieroicon*, London, 1663.

³ Schultens, Alb.: *Animadversiones philologicae et criticae ad varia loca Vet. Test.* Amstelod., 1709.

⁴ Vitringa : *Commentarius in Librum Prophetiarum Jesaie*, &c. Tomi duo-Leovardiæ (*i.e.* Leuwarden), 1714–20, and 1724.

two folio volumes of 710 and 958 pages respectively to a commentary on a single author of no great length? Not that Vitringa is properly chargeable with verbosity, but that he has the cheerful faith that all truth is divine and therefore reconcilable, and not enough intellectual independence to sift the pretensions of all the claimants of that sacred name. His exegesis is, in a word, involved in an 'infinita sensuum silva,' if I may borrow an expression from St. Jerome, who would certainly not have recognised his own type of tropology in Vitringa's. The mitigation is that the various senses and fulfilments of the prophecies are carefully kept asunder, and that no pains are spared to explain and illustrate the primary grammatical sense and historical background. Vitringa was, for his day, a fine Hebrew and especially Rabbinical scholar, and his commentary is a mine of learning, and even of sound sense, which may still be worked with advantage. His preface on the aims and methods of prophetic exegesis is a brilliant piece of modern Latin composition, and reveals the author as equally fervent in his Christianity and profound in his erudition. Only one remembers the very different ideal of a commentary in Calvin's golden preface to his work on the Romans, and sighs at the two folio volumes!

Vitringa is a specimen of the late summer of Continental orthodoxy; it is natural that when England has her word to say, it should be marked with the secularity of the English eighteenth century. ROBERT LOWTH (1710-1787), Professor of Poetry at Oxford, by his lectures on the sacred poetry of the Hebrews (first edition, 1753) began that important æstheticising movement in Biblical criticism which, with all its faults of shallowness and sometimes perhaps irreverence, fulfilled (one may venture to surmise) a providential purpose in reviving the popular interest in the letter of the Scriptures. What Lowth began was continued with far greater ability and insight by Herder; but an Englishman may be proud that Lowth began it. The principles which he thus introduced to the world were further exemplified in his translation of Isaiah,¹ in which the English text was for the first time arranged according to those rules of parallelism, not, indeed, discovered, but first brought vividly home, by the Oxford professor. A long preliminary dissertation restates the principles and characteristics of Hebrew poetry, and does justice to the acute Rabbi Azariah de' Rossi (1513-1576), who 'treated of the antient Hebrew versification upon principles

¹ *Isaiah. A New Translation, with a Preliminary Dissertation and Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory.* Lond. 1778.

similar to those above proposed, and partly coincident with them.' The chief faults of the translation are, not certainly its fidelity, nor yet (if I may venture to differ from Dean Milman¹) its inharmoniousness, but the inappropriate selection of a Latinised vocabulary, and further, from a critical point of view, the recklessness with which the translator treats the Massoretic text. There was, indeed, an epidemic of arbitrary emendation in the air, and Lowth did but follow the example of Cappellus and Houbigant (comp. p. 223). I do not deny, however, that he has often considerable reason for his changes; it is rather his inconsiderate haste, which gives him so much the appearance of holding a brief against the traditional text. Where he is most probably right, the discovery is often not due to himself, but to one or another learned friend, especially the recently deceased Archbishop Secker. His emendations were examined more or less successfully by David Kocher in a small volume of *Vindiciæ* (Berne, 1786). The Bishop's notes partly justify his emendations, partly illustrate the text from classical poets and modern travellers. He does not go deeply into the fulfilment of the prophecies, but in the main adopts the ordinary Christian view without discussion. His exposition of the prophecy of Immanuel is, however, sufficiently peculiar to deserve quotation. After stating that 'the obvious and literal meaning' is *not* Messianic (he explains 'the virgin' to mean 'one who is now a virgin'), he continues:—

'But the prophecy is introduced in so solemn a manner; the sign is so marked, as a sign selected and given by God himself, after Ahaz had rejected the offer of any sign of his own choosing out of the whole compass of nature; the terms of the prophecy are so peculiar, and the name of the child so expressive, containing in them much more than the circumstances of the birth of a common child required, or even admitted; that we may easily suppose, that, in minds prepared by the general expectation of a great Deliverer to spring from the house of David, they raised hopes far beyond what the present occasion suggested; especially when it was found, that in the subsequent prophecy, delivered immediately

¹ Dean Milman complains of the Bishop for having 'forgotten that he was translating a poet,' and having 'chilled Isaiah down to the flattest—correct perhaps—but unrelieved, inharmonious prose' (*Annals of St. Paul's*, p. 468). The Dean had evidently not read the 'preliminary dissertation,' in which the translator simply claims the merit of fidelity. To be at once literal and elegant or harmonious is surely impossible. Gesenius, with whom the Dean compares Bishop Lowth unfavourably, is certainly not 'harmonious,' but he has this great advantage over the Bishop, that his vocabulary is simple and natural. The Latinised style of high society is the most unfitted of all for a Hebrew prophet.

afterwards, this child, called Immanuel, is treated as the Lord and Prince of the land of Judah. Who could this be, other than the Heir of the throne of David ; under which character a great and even a Divine Person had been promised.'

Both the works of Bishop Lowth were translated into German, and, with the notes of Michaelis and Koppe, were, for good or for evil, among the revolutionary influences of that unsettled age in Germany. The words of Dean Milman are therefore true in their fullest sense of the great critical Bishop, that his inquiries 'make an epoch unperceived perhaps and unsuspected by their author.'¹

2.

If Calvin is the predominant figure in the Old Testament exegesis of early Protestantism, the modern period may without any substantial injustice be said to date from GESENIUS (1785-1842). Himself a rationalist of the old school, and a zealous promoter of the rationalistic movement in his university, it is not surprising if his exegesis fails to satisfy the deeper requirements of our time. He honestly thought that to allow predictions in the Old Testament was to degrade the prophets to the rank of soothsayers, and that a 'Christian interpretation' was only attainable by doing violence to philology. The truth is that he was more of a philologist than a theologian ; a susceptibility for religious ideas was still dormant in his nature. In two respects, however, he marks an advance ; he absolutely repudiates the shallow and now antiquated æstheticising of the disciples of Herder, and the extravagant disintegrating criticism introduced by Lowth's editor, Koppe,² which, 'whenever the prophet stopped to draw breath, and the discourse surged up anew, fancied it discovered the patchwork of uncritical collectors.' His great work on Isaiah is hardly yet superseded ; it marks precisely the point which historical and archæological research had attained at the date of its composition. It contains also much lexicographical information, and if it entirely neglects the prophetic teaching, this is at any rate better than misrepresenting it. The dates of Gesenius' chief works are :

¹ *Annals of St. Paul's*, 2nd ed., p. 467.

² *E.g.* in his introduction to chap. i., where he opposes Koppe, who divided the chapter into three unconnected pieces on the ground of alleged irreconcilable differences between the descriptions of the internal state of the nation. Lagarde, it may be here noticed, in his note on chap. i. in *Semitica* i., simply follows in the wake of Koppe, except that he supposes the disintegrated fragments to be not complete in themselves, but portions of longer discourses now lost. He offers no discussion of the historical backgrounds proposed for the chapter.

Hebrew Grammar, first ed. 1813; Isaiah, 1821; *Thesaurus*, vols. i.-iii. fasc. 1, 1835-42, completion by Roediger, 1852-58.

HITZIG (1807-1875) resembles Gesenius in his rationalism (Paulus and Gesenius were his earliest academic teachers), which he ever expressed with the most fearless sincerity. The refined monotheism of the Old Testament was discovered, according to him, by superior intellectual vigour¹ (*durch eine stärkere Denkkraft*); but the intellect of the Israelites, he thinks with Lassen and M. Renan, was singularly limited, and Old Testament prophecy is an illusion produced by the objectifying of the higher self.² In exegesis, however, Hitzig displays a rare grammatical sense, and a tact for eliciting the connection, though his explanations are sometimes chargeable with over-subtlety. Of reverence there is of course no more trace than in Gesenius, but his more flexible intellect enables him to sympathise more keenly with transitions of thought and feeling. His discussions of the historical background of the prophecies are in their way equally remarkable, and his acuteness in combination extorts admiration, even where it fails to produce conviction. Criticism to him is no merely destructive power (as it was in the main to De Wette). Both in the criticism of the text and in that of history he aimed at positive results, though he was under a great illusion as to the invariable trustworthiness of his methods. His faults are, however, less conspicuous than his merits in his early commentary on Isaiah (1833), dedicated to Heinrich Ewald, his still youthful teacher, whose grammatical labours he was the first to appreciate and to utilise.

EWALD'S governing idea was that of reconstruction. It was no doubt also that of his period; we find it in Hitzig, but not so strongly developed as in Ewald. As a theologian, he partook (unlike Hitzig) in that yearning for a deeper religion which accompanied the great rising of the German nation; but he never succeeded in dissipating a certain luminous haze which blurred the outlines of his religious ideas. As a philologist, he takes the highest rank. By his Hebrew grammar he earned from Hitzig the title of 'second founder of a science of the Hebrew language,' and Professor Pusey cordially admits the 'philosophical acuteness,' whereby, as he says, 'as a youth of nineteen (? 24) he laid the foundation of the scientific treatment of Hebrew grammar.'³ As an interpreter of the prophets (it would take too long even to

¹ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Leipz. 1869), p. 82.

² *Der Prophet Jesaja*, Allgemeine Einleitung, p. 24.

³ *The Minor Prophets* (Oxf. 1879), p. iii.

touch upon his other labours), he reminds us somewhat of his master Eichhorn, whose poetic enthusiasm he fully shares, though he holds it in check by a strong sense of the predominantly religious character of the prophetic gifts. His style has something in it of Orientalism,¹ which conveys a deep though vague impression of the grandeur and beauty of prophecy; his translation of the prophets has a rhythmic flow, which, though at the cost of elegance, gives some faint idea of the movement of the original. His distinctive merits appear to be threefold:—1. He starts with a conception of prophecy derived from the prophets themselves. This conception is no doubt vague and indefinite, for he totally ignores the New Testament; but it is at any rate free from the anti-dogmatic theories of the rationalists. 2. He has the eye of a historian, and treats the prophetic literature as a whole. No critical theory (as I have suggested already) can be properly estimated until we see how it dovetails into the author's scheme of the historical development of the Old Testament literature. 3. He bestows special care on the connection of thought, though his over-subtle views of Hebrew syntax may have sometimes led him beyond the borders of the natural and the probable. I might, perhaps add a fourth merit—his conciseness. He spares his reader those wearisome discussions of rejected opinions which render so many German works unreadable. He even disdains the help of archæological and historical illustrations, and confines himself mainly to that which he regards as essential, viz. the prophetic ideas. His faults, too obvious to need a long description, are an overweening self-confidence, an excessive predilection for minute systematising, and a lack of dialectic power which often prevents his reader from discovering the real grounds of his theory (how unlike, in this latter respect, one of his most influential successors—the author of the *Religion of Israel*). The following are the dates of Ewald's chief works (a complete list would occupy nearly three pages)—Hebrew Grammar, first ed., 1827, fifth edition recast, 1844, *Die propheten des alten Bundes*, first ed., 2 vols., 1840–41, second ed., 3 vols., 1867–68; the same translated in five volumes, 1875–81.

It is not surprising that the shallowness of Gesenius and

¹ Karl Hase, himself a rationalist of a more cultured school than Gesenius and Hitzig, has given one of his medallion portraits of Ewald. 'Nach Gesenius hat Ewald die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Volkes aufgerollt, er ein rückschauender Prophet mit der orientalischen Zungengabe, kühn und zu Opfern bewährt für die Freiheit, nur durch seine sittliche Entrüstung gegen jede abweichende Meinung leicht verstört' (*Kirchengeschichte*, p. 582).

Hitzig, and the vagueness of Ewald, were profoundly obnoxious to those who resorted to the Scriptures for supplies of spiritual life. Even had the new exegesis been free from theological objection, it would have required unusual strength of faith to admit in practice (what all admit in words) that our knowledge of the sense of revelation is progressive. 'It is not every interpreter who is able, like Luther and Calvin, to place his novel views in a light which shall appeal as strongly to the religious experience of the Christian as to the scholarly instincts of the learned. The rise of new difficulties is as essential to the progress of truth as the removal of old puzzles; and it not seldom happens that the defects of current opinions as to the sense of Scripture are most palpable to the man whose spiritual interest in Bible truths is weak. . . . Thus the natural conservatism of those who study the Bible mainly for purposes of personal edification is often intensified by suspicion of the motives of innovating interpreters; and even so fruitful an idea as the doctrine of a gradual development of spiritual truth throughout the whole course of the Bible history has had to contend, from the days of Calvin down to our own time, with an obstinate suspicion that nothing but rationalism can make a man unwilling to find the maximum of developed spiritual truth in every chapter of Scripture.'¹ Only by such feelings as these can we account for the almost unvarying opposition of HENGSTENBERG (1802-69) to the new criticism and exegesis—an opposition, I must add, intensified by his editorship of a Church newspaper,² which kept him in a continual atmosphere of party strife. Anxiety for his personal religion, which he had learned in the school of trial, and not of this or the other theologian, converted the youthful Hengstenberg into an ardent champion of revelation, and a certain heaviness of the intellect (which no English reader of his works can fail to observe) made him regard any attempt, such as Bleek's, at a *via media*, as sophistry or self-delusion. Hengstenberg had no historical gifts, and never seems to have really assimilated that doctrine of development which, though rejected by Pietists on the one hand and Tridentine Romanists on the other, is so profoundly Christian. He was therefore indisposed to allow the human element in inspiration, denied the limited nature of the Old Testament stage of revelation, and as Dr. Dorner has pointed out,³ made prophecy nothing but the symbolic

¹ Mr. Robertson Smith, *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, July 1876, p. 474.

² The *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, founded 1827.

³ *History of Protestant Theology*, vol. ii. pp. 436-7.

covering of the eternal truths of Christianity. These seem to Dr. Dorner grave faults, which seriously detract from the value of Hengstenberg's exegesis. And yet it should be borne in mind that the rationalistic exegesis had been equally one-sided, and with results far more dangerous. Even from a scientific point of view, it was desirable that the old criticism and exegesis should be once restated in a modern dress, lest perchance in the hot haste of the innovators certain precious elements of truth should be lost. I do not think that there is much in Hengstenberg which cannot now be found in a more acceptable form elsewhere; and his works are but ill translated. But it may be well for the student at least to dip into the *Christology of the Old Testament*,¹ which is still the most complete expression of the theory which interprets the Old Testament solely and entirely in the light of the New.

Hengstenberg's exegesis of Isaiah was confined to the Messianic passages: but a devout and thoughtful commentary on the whole of the book was begun in the same spirit by DRECHSLER,² and, on his death in 1851, completed by August Hahn, with an important appendix by Franz Delitzsch, indicating the thread of thought in chaps. xl.-lxvi., and arguing with great fulness of detail for the Isaianic authorship of the disputed prophecies. Neither Hengstenberg nor Drechsler are strong on the linguistic side; and they have another unfortunate resemblance in the vehemence with which they impute motives to other critics. With Drechsler may be coupled RUDOLF STIER,³ better loved perhaps in England than in his own country, who has left us an exposition of chaps. xl.-lxvi., of real value for its spiritual insight, and conscientious endeavour to base the Christian or theological upon the philological meaning. Much of what has been said above of Hengstenberg is, however, applicable to Stier. He is vehement and incisive in his language (but his vehemence somehow hurts less than that of others), has no historical sense, and is not a sound Hebrew scholar, being (unlike Hengstenberg) afraid of deriving anything, even in scholarship, from a rationalistic source.

We are in a very different atmosphere as we read the commentary of KNOBEL⁴ (died 1863). A model of conden-

¹ First edition, 2 vols., 1829-35; second, 4 vols., 1854-57 (recast). Translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library (for Isaiah, see vol. ii.).

² Vol. i., 1845; vol. ii., part 1, 1849, part 2, 1854 (posthumous); vol. iii. (containing chaps. xl.-lxvi.), by Hahn and Delitzsch, 1857.

³ *Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Jesaias* (Barmen, 1850).

⁴ First ed., 1843; fourth (posthumous), edited by Diestel, 1872. (Diestel, whose

sation, it well deserves its name of 'exegetical handbook.' Great merit is due to it for its linguistic and archæological ἀκριβεία, but the author's view of prophecy is low (see his *Prophetismus*, Breslau, 1837), and in the latter part of Isaiah his excessive realism blinds him to the poetry of the form—he seems to expect the prophet to write with the exactness of a bulletin. One of the most useful parts of Knobel's work is the collection of stylistic peculiarities in II. Isaiah, which, however, requires careful sifting.

But without depreciating his predecessors, apart from whom his own achievement would have been impossible, it is but fair to admit that far the most complete and equal commentary is that of Dr. FRANZ DELITZSCH.¹ He who will patiently read and digest the new edition of this masterly work will receive a training both for head and heart which he will never regret. I think, indeed, that the learned author is now and then over-subtle in his grammatical observations, and too positive of the correctness of the received text; and also that, in spite of his intention to be strictly philological, he has once or twice unconsciously wrested language in the interests of theology; and I know that in the judgment of many his sentences are packed so full of meaning as to have become obscure. But these are but spots upon the sun; and I heartily take for my own a sentence from a writer whom I have had occasion to criticise severely—Dr. Klostermann:—'Delitzsch, from his full stores of knowledge, with his open eye for all that is irregular and uncommon, his delicate ear for all shades of expression, his reverent enthusiasm for the word of the prophets, his unremitting toil, and conscientious regard to minutia, has provided a commentary, with which it will not be easy for another successfully to compete.'² And yet, though it may be long before an equally finished work is produced, there is still so much obscurity, so much diversity of opinion, that we cannot regret the labour which another scholar has bestowed from the same point of view. NAEGELSBACH'S recent work (1878) is fresh and independent even to a fault. Not many, I fear, of its new interpretations are likely to stand; but thoughtful criticism of the exegetical tradition is always valuable, and the book has in some passages really advanced the interpretation of Isaiah. Perhaps its special characteristic is this—that it regards the Bible as one great organism, of which the Book of Isaiah is a part,

university lectures on Old Testament religion were of so high an order as to deserve publication, has himself, too early for science, since passed away).

¹ First ed., 1866: third, 1879. (Clark's translation is from the first.)

² *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, 1876, p. 16.

and that it carries out this principle with greater fulness than previous writers. The abundance of well-chosen parallel passages is a boon equally to the pure linguist and to the exegete; of the invaluable collection of deutero-Isaianic words at the end of the book I have spoken already.

But to come nearer home. Is it not a strange phenomenon that our English and American theologians should be so little awake to the importance of a thorough study of the prophets? General dissertations on prophecy are not, indeed, entirely wanting, but calm and candid, self-denying and theory-denying exposition of the sacred texts is still sadly in arrears. Putting aside the modest, but very useful, compilation of the American Albert Barnes (Glasgow, 1845), I can call to mind but four professedly independent commentaries on the whole of Isaiah¹—those respectively of Drs. HENDERSON, ALEXANDER, and KAY, and of Professor BIRKS. The first of the four certainly supplied with more or less ability a want painfully felt in our exegetical literature. It is unambitious in its object, and confines itself mainly to the letter of the sacred text. But though full of valuable information, it is an unsafe guide even in its chosen field of scholarship. The colour of its exegesis is orthodox, but it stands entirely apart from every form of scientific theology. The second is by far the most complete, and does high honour to the American theology of its date. It is at once full (some perhaps will say, too full) and accurate; but its point of view is that of Hengstenberg, and it is no longer at the centre of the exegetical movement. The third, from its brevity, would seem to address itself to the class for whom the *Speaker's Commentary* was originally intended—the inquisitive but much occupied laity, and the practical clergy. In spite of its incompleteness, it is certainly one of the most original contributions to Canon Cook's series. Like Ewald, the author puts aside mere historical and archæological investigations as not touching the root of the matter: the text itself, both in its primary grammatical sense and in its spiritual application, absorbs the energies of the interpreter. But I shall best consult the interests of the student by quoting the words of a courteous and fair Continental critic, though of an opposite school to the author. He writes thus, in reviewing, with that discriminating tact which characterises him, the two exegetical works of Dr. Kay on the Psalms and on Isaiah:—
'Dr. Kay is one whom I would gladly see on our side. He

¹ Henderson, first ed. 1840; second, 1852. Alexander, edited by Eadie, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1865. Kay, 1875. Birks, first ed., 1871; second, 1878.

is not only a good Hebrew scholar; not only very well read in the Old Testament; but also, if I am not altogether deceived, a thoroughly earnest and above all an upright man.¹ The drawback which Dr. Kuenen finds is a 'self-confidence' which goes hand in hand with 'very subjective and fantastic views, in which he often stands entirely alone, or which at least, have hardly an adherent besides himself, but which notwithstanding are propounded in so positive a tone that the unsuspecting reader may well be taken by surprise.'² I have myself been often struck by the 'subjective' character of Dr. Kay's Hebrew philology, though I gladly admit that one may learn much from his rare command of the facts of the language. His theological arguments would, I venture to think, have gained considerably both in intrinsic value and in effectiveness, if he had been able to recognise the elements of good in those who are still struggling towards the light. In one sense, no doubt, 'the true light now shineth,' and I at least must agree with Dr. Kay, as against Dr. Kuenen in his review, that 'no one who is held in the chains of naturalistic speculation is qualified to expound the writings of the prophets' (p. 3). But this general principle will not, I submit, justify the learned author in throwing down the gauntlet (as he has done) to all critical inquiry into the historic and prophetic literature of the Old Testament. If you wish to overcome heterodoxy, you must surely do so from within, and not from without. Heterodoxy is a product of mixed origin, and you must not violate charity and truth by imputing it to a single cause. Are you sure that your own form of 'supernaturalism' is adequate to all the facts of the Scriptures (to say nothing of physical science)? Have you, indeed, already discovered all those facts, so that you have no further 'light' to wish for? Even if you reply in the affirmative, charity and truth both forbid you to assume that all who are not equally confident are either already 'naturalists,' or drifting into 'naturalism.' Surely it is as plain as the day that there is a growing school of criticism and exegesis, neither in any stiff sense orthodox, nor yet rationalistic, which welcomes and assimilates fragments of truth from all quarters. Dr. Kay will, I trust, listen to this echo of a younger and more hopeful generation.

Some of these remarks are equally applicable to Professor Birks, who is, however, without the counterbalancing merit of sound Hebrew scholarship. Of his painfully unphilological

¹ *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1871, p. 367.

² *Ibid.*, 1875, p. 569.

treatment of the stylistic peculiarities of II. Isaiah I have spoken elsewhere; his historical tact may be estimated by his contemptuous attitude towards 'the boastful bulletins of idolatrous kings' (p. 376)—*i.e.* the royal Assyrian inscriptions. Still Professor Birks is an acute and generally a sensible writer; and I will not deny that some germs of thought may be elicited from his commentary. But I admit that I am much more favourably impressed by the open-minded tone, and the political, and, in general, the historic insight of Sir EDWARD STRACHEY in his 'inquiry into the historical meaning and purpose of the prophecies of Isaiah.'¹ This is emphatically a popular work; it seeks primarily for the moral and political lessons of the great prophet, and treats of the historic background in complete subordination to these. There is much, therefore, which strongly attracts the cultivated lay reader; it is only critics of the new historical school (of the existence of which the author is evidently unaware) who will be unpleasantly impressed by some features of the book. Conservative critics, on the other hand, will have their tastes gratified by the attempt (offered with all due modesty) to discover a new historical argument for the unity of the book, by the aid of the Assyrian inscriptions. The argument applies directly, indeed, only to chaps. xiii., xiv., xxi. 1-10, and xxxix., 6; but it has evidently a certain indirect bearing on the authorship of chaps. xl.-lxvi. I have independently, but on similar grounds, arrived at the same conclusion as Sir Edward Strachey with regard to the authorship of chap. xxi. 1-10, but the problems of chaps. xiii., xiv., xxxix. 6, and xl.-lxvi., are not so easily solved (see vol. i. pp. 81, 234), and must still be left to what is perhaps invidiously called the 'higher criticism.' It is with regret that one notices in a work of so wholesome a tendency, so many uncalled-for reflections on this department of inquiry. The author seems to forget that, though common sense has much to do with science, it is a trained and cultivated common sense which is required. Many as are the faults of German writers on the Bible, a disparagement of the necessity of philological training is not one of them. But I cannot allow myself to part from so sympathetic a work in the tone of complaint. Let me rather quote a passage with which I am in the heartiest agreement, and which well expresses one of the primary requisites both of the commentator upon Isaiah and of his reader. 'If we will be rational, no less than if we

¹ This is the second title of his work, *Jewish History and Politics in the Times of Sargon and Sennacherib*. Second edition, revised, with additions, London, 1874.

will be Christian, we must steadily recognise the reality—the objective, independent reality—of that communication which Isaiah was thus qualified to become the recipient of. How this could be, how God reveals His mind and will to men, how the poetic or other human faculty gives form and expression to truths not imagined nor discovered, but communicated from on high—this can never be explained: an explanation is a contradiction in terms, an assertion that the Infinite is definable, that the Superhuman is subject to the laws, and expressible in terms, of the human' (pp. 87, 88).

NOTE.

Among minor *exegetical* works on Isaiah, both Continental and English, the following seem to have a claim to be mentioned:—

E. F. K. Rosenmüller: *Jesaja vaticinia annotatione perpetua illustravit E. F. C. R.* 3 vols. Lips. 1811–20.

T. Roorda. *Annotationes ad vaticinia Jes. i.–ix. 6*, in Juynboll's *Orientalia*, i. 67–174. Amstel. 1840.

C. P. Caspari. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaja*, Berlin, 1848. [Conservative: thorough to a fault.]

— *Ueber den syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg unter Jotham und Ahaz* (1849).

E. Meier. *Der Prophet Jesaja*. Erste Hälfte [cc. i.–xxiii.]. Pforzheim, 1850. [School of Ewald.]

S. D. Luzzatto (died 1865). *Il Profeta Isaia volgarizzato e commentato ad uso degli Israeliti*. Padova, 1855–67.

[An Italian translation with a Hebrew commentary. Acute and very suggestive.]

L. Reinke. *Die messianischen Weissagungen bei den grossen und kleinen Propheten des Alten Testaments*. Giessen, 1859–62. [Roman Catholic; learned and accurate. Vols. i. and ii. refer to Isaiah.]

V. F. Oehler. *Der Knecht Jehova's im Deuterojesaja*. Stuttgart, 1865.

[Not by the author of the well-known *Old Testament Theology*, but from a kindred point of view. Contains a commentary on all the passages relative to the 'Servant of Jehovah.']

L. Seinecke. *Der Evangelist des Alten Testaments*. Leipzig, 1870. [Accepts the unity of chaps. xl.–lxvi., but dates the book at the close of the Babylonian Exile; the author, however, is placed in *Palestine*. A suggestive commentary, though its *forte* is not in philology. Comp. Riehm's review in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1872, pp. 553–578.]

B. Stade. *De Isaia Vaticiniis Æthiopicis Diatribe*. Leipzig, 1873. [A learned philological and historical commentary on chaps. xvii. 12–14, xviii., and xx.]

A. Hildebrandt. *Juda's Verhältniss zu Assyrien in Jesaja's Zeit nach Keilinschriften und Jesaianischen Prophetieen*. Marburg, 1874. [A suggestive but premature illustration of Isaiah from the Assyrian inscriptions.]

Aug. Klostermann. 'Jesaja Cap. xl.–lxvi. Eine Bitte um Hülfe in grosser Noth.' *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, 1876, pp. 1–60.

Aug. Klostermann. Art. 'Jesaja' in Herzog's *Real-encyclopædie*, vol. vi. [Arbitrary, but suggestive.]

H. Oort. 'Jesaja xl.' *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1876, p. 528, &c.

A. Kohut. 'Antiparsische Aussprüche im Deuterjesaias.' *Zeitschr. d. d. m. Ges.* 1876, pp. 709-722. [A wild attempt to show that II. Isaiah is pervaded by an anti-Zoroastrian tendency. Answered by de Harlez in the *Revue des questions historiques*, April 1877, and Matthes in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Nov. 1877.]

J. H. Scholten, 'De lijdende knecht Gods, Jes. liiii.' *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1878, p. 117 &c.

Éd. Reuss. *Les Prophètes*, 2 vols., Paris, 1876. [Arranged chronologically with introductions, and short, very clear footnotes. The publication was postponed by the Franco-Prussian war. From a 'liberal' point of view.]

Friedr. Köstlin. *Jesaja und Jeremia. Ihr Leben und Wirken aus ihren Schriften dargestellt.* Berlin, 1879. [A re-arrangement of the 'genuine' prophecies, with historical illustrations.]

Lagarde's *Semitica* and a few articles in journals by Kleinert and others have been referred to already.

To the English works mentioned above, and in the course of the commentary (for Perowne, see on chap. viii. 16; Taylor, on viii. 21; Sayce, on x. 5, &c.; Urwick, Neubauer and Driver, on lii. 13, &c.) add:—

G. Vance Smith. *The Prophecies Relating to Nineveh and the Assyrians.* Lond. 1857. [One of the first attempts to utilise the Assyrian monuments.]

R. Payne Smith. *The Authenticity and Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecies of Isaiah vindicated in a Course of Sermons preached before the University of Oxford.* Oxford and London, 1862. [A useful introduction to the Messianic prophecies, from Hengstenberg's point of view; the lines of Jewish interpretation are well sketched.]

J. M'Gil. 'Critical Remarks on Isa. xviii. 1, 2,' in *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1862, pp. 310-324. [The work of an eminent Professor of Oriental Languages at St. Andrew's; retrograde exegesis.]

Rowland Williams. *The Hebrew Prophets translated afresh from the original.* 2 vols. [each containing a part of Isaiah]. Lond. 1866-71. [Very complete in its plan, combining as it does the literary, historical, philological, and theological points of view. Its chief merits are analogous to those of Sir E. Strachey's book noticed above; the philology is eccentric and unsound. The view of prophecy resembles in its vagueness that held by Ewald.]

Stanley Leathes. *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ; being the Boyle Lectures for 1868.* Lond. 1868. [An appendix on the argument from style, which betrays a grave misconception of its nature—see above, p. 218—is the reason for mentioning this pleasingly written popular work.]

T. K. Cheyne. *Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah.* Lond. 1868.

——— *The Book of Isaiah Chronologically arranged.* Lond. 1870.

C. Taylor. 'An Interpretation of יוֹזֵה נְיִים,' in *Journal of Philology*, 1879, pp. 62-66. [Thinks that 'the word required is one which describes a passive condition of wonderment,' on account of the following clause; and suggests 'so shall he agast, or aghast, many nations,' making יוֹזֵה=יְהוּזָה; comp. הוֹיִם, lvi. 10. But the meaning of הוֹיִם is doubtful, if indeed the text is correct.]

H. Krüger. *Essai sur la théologie d'Ésaïe*, xl.-lxvi. Par. 1881. [A

faithful and sympathetic study of the religious ideas of II. Isaiah, well adapted for English students.]

W. H. Cobb. 'Two Isaiahs or One?' in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1881, p. 230, &c.; 1882, p. 104, &c. [See above, p. 239, note. If the critical value of the conclusions is but slight, the tables will still be useful companions to the student of the text of 'Isaiah.']

W. Robertson Smith. *The Prophets of Israel and their Place in History to the close of the Eighth Century B.C.* Edinburgh 1882. [Freshly written, learned and suggestive. The author's arrangement of the prophecies of Isaiah differs considerably from the above, owing to his rejection of the theory of an invasion of Judah by Sargon. See above, Essay I.]

S. M. Schiller-Szinessy. *An Exposition of Isaiah* lii. 13, 14, 15, and liiii. Cambridge, 1882. [The subject of the prophecy, Israel, as represented by the pious in his midst, culminating in the Messiah.]

To these must be added the primitive, unconscious commentators, to whom the present work has been so largely indebted, and of whom we have by no means heard the last. Three deserve to be mentioned with special honour, though, inasmuch as (like most of the Hebrew chroniclers) they wrote anonymously, they can only be entered under the names of their translators.

George Smith. *The Assyrian Eponym Canon.* Lond. 1875.

——— *History of Sennacherib; translated from the cuneiform inscriptions.* Edited by A. H. Sayce. Lond. 1878.

E. A. Budge. *History of Esar-Haddon; from the cuneiform inscriptions.* Lond. 1880.

(For further references, see the present work *passim*. The time has hardly come for a critical conspectus of Assyriological literature.)

XI. II. ISAIAH AND THE INSCRIPTIONS.

I.

WE have now traversed most of the subjects directly or indirectly connected with the interpretation of Isaiah, and with the foregoing rapid survey of the history of the exegesis of the book it would seem as if we had reached our goal. All that remained would be in that case to resume the 'gathering up' of the 'fragments' which might have escaped insertion in the commentary. But before taking this last step, I must return to a 'fragment' of more than ordinary significance, which has already found a place at the end of the first volume. It relates to a discovery which not only throws great light on some of those passages which 'remain vague and obscure till we know the circumstances under which they were written' (p. 210), but also has a special bearing on the great question (too great to be entered upon here) of the limits or conditions of prophecy.

The remarkable favour shown to the Jewish exiles by Cyrus has long attracted the attention of students. Was it dictated

by political motives? such is the first possibility which presents itself. In reply, it must be observed that if gratitude had any influence on the action of Cyrus, it can only have been as 'a lively sense of favours to come.' The statement of the prophet in xlv. 13 ('He shall build my city, and mine exiled ones shall he send home, not for price, and not for reward') precludes us from supposing that his countrymen were conscious of having placed Cyrus under an obligation. The accuracy of the prophet, however, is not in the least disparaged by the hypothesis that one of the secondary motives of the Persian was the belief that the restored Jews would form a useful outpost in a distant part of his dominions. This leaves us free to maintain, with the prophet, that the determining motives of Cyrus were religious ones; and this view of the case has appeared to be confirmed by the history of Persian religion. The description of Ormazd in such an early document as the inscription of Darius referred to in the note on xlv. 7 might, from the purity of its monotheism, have been penned by a Jewish prophet in honour of Jehovah. It would have been quite in the spirit of the highest Old Testament revelations to regard such homage to Ormazd as unconsciously offered to the true God Jehovah (vol. I., p. 256), and a devout monotheist like Cyrus as only needing some one to 'teach him the way of God more perfectly.' Such a friendly guide it was natural to discover in the author of the prophetic passages relative to Cyrus, which, as I have suggested elsewhere, may be plausibly viewed as an *apologia* for the Jews and their religion addressed to their conqueror.¹ The prophet himself does not as yet look upon Cyrus as a full adherent of the true religion, but he cherishes the firm conviction that Cyrus will become such at no distant day.

But now comes Sir Henry Rawlinson's discovery among the latest treasures from Babylon, and throws the gravest doubt not only on *our*, but on what we have supposed to be *the prophet's*, estimate of Cyrus. It represents him as a complete religious indifferentist, willing to go through any amount of ceremonies, to soothe the prejudices of a susceptible population. Fresh from the pages of II. Isaiah, it is difficult to realise that Cyrus was capable of this. He there appears like an idealised David, a 'man after God's own heart' in the fullest sense of the phrase. His conquest of Babylon is the signal for an iconoclasm which marks the downfall of the false

¹ See below, supplementary notes. The view is equally admissible, whether the standing-point of the author of the latter chapters be actually, or only ideally, at the close of the Exile.

religions. 'Bel boweth down, Nebo croucheth; their idols are given up to the beasts and to the cattle' (xlvi. 1)—such is the vision before the prophet's inner eye. Not so, says the 'broad' and politic Cyrus. 'The gods dwelling within them to their places I restored' (*ili asib libisunu ana asrisunu utir*); 'daily I addressed Bel and Nebo that the length of my days they should fulfil; that they should bless the decree of my fate, and to Merodach my lord should say that Cyrus the King thy worshipper and Cambyses his son : . .' (*yomi sam makhar Bel va Nabu sa araku yomiya litamú libikkaru amata dunkiya va ana Marduk bilya ligbú sa Kuras sarru palikhika va Kambuziya abluu. . . .*)¹

The authenticity and accuracy of the newly-discovered inscription are self-evident. The concessions of Cyrus to idolatrous polytheism are, indeed, just what might have been expected, were it not for the strong language of the prophet. They are but typical examples of the practice of the Persian rulers. Cyrus in Babylonia is the pattern of his son Cambyses² and even of the religious Darius in Egypt. But we cannot admit the accuracy of the inscription without detracting somewhat from the accuracy of the inspired prophet. This is no doubt painful to a reverent mind, but here, as ever, truth is the healer of its own wounds. Has not Wisdom already been justified of her children? Throughout our study of Isaiah have we not noticed 'a gracious proportion between the revelation vouchsafed and the mental state of the person receiving it'? There is no defect implied in the revelation, but only in the receptiveness of the human organ. The admission of this relative defect involves no moral disparagement of the latter. In the case before us, for instance, the prophet overrates Cyrus just because he is so completely a prophet. His character is too simple, too religious, for him to realise a mental state so mixed, a policy so complicated with non-religious considerations. He cannot distinguish between the king and the man, between a public and private character. He cannot form a conception of a religious indifferentist. He will have 'no bowing in the house of Rimmon.'³

¹ These are the last connected words in the inscription. I here follow the word-for-word translation of Sir H. Rawlinson; in vol. i., pp. 299, 300, I gave his more readable alternative version. The transliteration is also that of the Nestor of Assyriologists; it differs in many technical points from that with which we are familiar. See Art. II. in *Journal of Royal Asiatic Soc.*, Jan. 1880, pp. 70-97.

² In this reference to the religious policy of Cambyses I follow the contemporary hieroglyphic account, which differs considerably from that of Herodotus. See Brugsch, *History of Egypt*, ii. 297, and comp. Dr. Birch, *Rede Lecture* (1879), p. 40.

³ I have already remarked that the slight inaccuracy in x. 10 (see my note) is a parallel to the case before us. See also on xxxvi. 10.

It is unfortunate that the cylinder-inscription is too imperfect to clear up the history of the fall of Babylon; but the deficiency is supplied by another cuneiform text, for the decipherment of which we are indebted to Mr. T. G. Pinches.¹ The text is arranged in the form of annals, and covers, including the fragmentary portions, the whole of the reign of Nabonahid or Nabonidus, the last of the Kings of Babylon.² The chief point of interest in it is that it shows how it was that Cyrus found Babylon so easy to conquer. Nabonidus, in fact, spent the last years of his reign idling in his palace near Babylon, while his son was with the army in Accad (the northern part of Babylonia). He even neglected the due worship of the gods, thereby giving great dissatisfaction to the priests. Not until his seventeenth year did he rouse himself from his inaction. It was under the pressure of fear. There had been a revolt among the people of 'the lower sea' (*i.e.* the Mediterranean). Then he began to think of his neglected gods, for the text records that 'the god Bel came forth'—*i.e.* probably the image of Merodach was carried round in procession (see on xlvi. 1). The images of the temples of other cities were also brought, especially those of Accad, and this explains the statement of Cyrus in the former inscription that he had restored the gods of Sumir and Accad to their places. Another revolt, which occurred in the last year of Nabonidus, was still more favourable to Cyrus; it was among the people of Accad. Four months after this, Cyrus descended to Babylon, and took it, without, as it would seem, even a street-battle.³ He then began that policy of religious conciliation which is to readers fresh from Isaiah so unavoidable a surprise.

A minor point which is finally settled by the cylinder-inscription is the genealogy of Cyrus.

The line of descent from Achæmenes to Cyrus is, 1. Achæmenes, 2. Teispes, 3. Cyrus, 4. Cambyses, and 5. Cyrus. Teispes, it will be remembered, is also mentioned both in Herodotus (vii. 11) and in the Behistun inscription of Darius⁴ among the ancestors of the latter king.

September 1880.

¹ *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, vol. vii. pp. 139-176.

² So Mr. Pinches, in opposition, however, to Sir H. Rawlinson, who thinks that the years belong to the reign of Cyrus.

³ It was on the 16th of the Babylonian month Dumuzi (Tammuz). On the 15th, corresponding to Midsummer-day, there was a religious festival, of the nature of a marriage-feast, and probably of an orgiastic character (comp. Dan. v.). See Mr. Boscawen's letter in *Athenæum*, July 9, 1881.

⁴ *Records of the Past*, vii. 87.

2.

The above results would be sufficiently important, were it certain (as I have hitherto assumed it to be) that Cyrus was a Zoroastrian believer; and as soon as we have put aside our preconceived opinion respecting Cyrus, we can see that they are in themselves plausible. Prof. Sayce, indeed, appears to think that the theory of Cyrus's indifferentism is excluded by the religious veneration with which he speaks of the Babylonian deities. But is it not a characteristic of primitive paganism, as opposed to the full Biblical religion, that it permits the most various forms of belief to exist peaceably side by side? I for my part can see nothing more wonderful in the religious tolerance of Cyrus than in that of any other primitive pagan monarch. The really surprising fact, which I have not here to consider, is, that this primitive tolerance does now and then give way to a violent spirit of religious centralisation; *e.g.* in the noted case of Antiochus Epiphanes. But such instances belong to the decline of a civilisation. And certainly if Darius, who makes such a parade of his Zoroastrian faith, adopted the policy of religious indifferentism in Egypt, it is difficult to see why Cyrus (even though a less fervent Zoroastrian) should not have done so in Babylonia and Palestine. But the main result of Prof. Sayce's recently published study on the inscription¹ is independent of this incidental expression of opinion; and, startling as it is, it must, I am sure, meet with general acceptance. I ought to add that M. Halévy (so well known in connection with Semitic inscriptions) has simultaneously come to virtually the same conclusion.² The point is this, that Cyrus, though of Aryan origin,³ was in all probability not a Zoroastrian at all. Before, by his victory over Astyages, he became king of the Medes and Persians, he was, in right of his birth, king of 'Anzan' or Susiana. 'I am Cyrus,' he says, 'son of Cambuziya, great king, king of Susiana, grandson of Cyrus, great king, king of Susiana, great-grandson of Teispes, great king, king of Susiana.' Now, Susiana or (speaking loosely) Elam, as the merest tyro in Assyriology knows (witness the names Kudur-mabug, Kudur-nankhundi, and the annals of Assurbanipal), was peopled by a non-Aryan and idolatrous race.⁴

¹ Letter in the *Academy*, October 16, 1880, pp. 276-7.

² 'Cyrus et le retour de l'exil,' in *Revue des études juives*, No. 1, pp. 41-63.

³ His name, however, is probably non-Aryan; see below, on xliv. 28.

⁴ Comp. Mr. Sayce's paper on 'The Languages of the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Elam and Media,' in *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* iii. 465-485.

Teispes, the Achæmenian (see above) was no doubt a Persian, and therefore an Aryan, but he and his band of fellow-Aryans found for themselves a new home among a non-Aryan people. 'The main bulk of their relatives,' as Prof. Sayce remarks, 'seem to have been left behind in Persis, and we cannot wonder, therefore, that the invaders of Anzan [the native name for Elam] should have intermarried with the old inhabitants of their new home, and adopted their religious ideas and art.' This is not a mere hypothesis. It is expressly stated by Darius in the famous Behistun inscription that Gomates, the first pseudo-Smerdis, had destroyed the Zoroastrian temples (*Records of the Past*, vii. 91). This, as Prof. Sayce has well pointed out, would have been an absurd act in the pretender, if Cyrus and his sons had been pure-blooded Zoroastrians. Darius, on the other hand, was (to use his own words) 'a Persian, son of a Persian,' and naturally enough a strong Zoroastrian both in belief and in policy. He 'belonged to the elder branch of the family which had remained behind in Persis, while the younger branch had sought a new kingdom among the non-Aryan population of Elam.' Another documentary evidence pointed out by Prof. Sayce, is the peculiar expression used by Darius in speaking of Veisdates, the second pseudo-Smerdis. He does not say that Veisdates was a Persian, but that he was 'a man who dwelt (in a certain town) in Persia.' His followers, too, are stated in the proto-Medic text to have been not Persians, but the old 'families of Anzan [Elam].'

We can now appreciate the force of the strange silence of Cyrus in the cylinder-inscription with regard to Ormazd, the supreme God of Zoroastrianism, to whom Darius so constantly and devoutly refers. The cause is one which it is a little painful to admit. Cyrus, on whom the prophet of Jehovah lavishes such honourable titles; Cyrus, who, the prophet even appears to hope, may be won over to the true faith; is a polytheist and an idolater. Still the inscription, when rightly understood, is not in conflict with the prophecy, but only with a gloss upon the prophecy. Nebuchadnezzar is called in Jeremiah (xxv. 9, xxvii. 6, xliii. 10) 'My Servant'; and the conversion of idolaters to the true faith is the standing hope of the prophets. The peculiarity of II. Isaiah is that in it the conversion of an individual king is hoped for, whereas elsewhere the prophecy of conversion is vague and general. Yet it should be remembered that the conversion of Cyrus is only a hope, not an assured certainty, and that all prophecy relative to events in the spiritual sphere is limited by the

possibility of the moral resistance of the persons prophesied of.

The shock may be painful ; but, as I have said before, truth heals its own wounds. Our loss, if loss it be, is compensated by a greater gain. It has often been said that the Old Testament religion has been deeply influenced by Zoroastrianism ; and though I have repeatedly had occasion to combat this view (see notes above on xxvi. 19, xlv. 7 ; also *I. C. A.*, p. 130), I could not anticipate such a complete documentary refutation of it. We now know that the Aryan and Zoroastrian element did not obtain supremacy in the Achæmenian empire till the accession of Darius, too late to exert any marked influence on Jewish modes of thought. M. Halévy remarks that the case of the Persian religion is analogous to that of the Persian language, which had no political importance in the empire of the 'great king'¹ ; and further that, 'in spite of the long residence of a Persian dynasty at Susa, the name of Ahuramazda was so repugnant to the Susians that the Susian redactor of the Behistun Inscription adds the descriptive term "God of the Aryans."'

Of direct, circumstantial illustrations of II. Isaiah from the newly-found inscriptions I am not able to indicate many (see notes on xiii. 17, xlv. 2). Knobel, no doubt, would have found more ; and M. Halévy's microscopic eye has discovered points of contact in chaps. xiii.-xiv. 23, xlv. 1-7, xlvi., from which he thinks he can determine the date of those prophetic passages. I venture to think that this part of his able and stimulative paper does not show much evidence of sound judgment. Why not be content with the one great result relative to the religious position of Cyrus ?²

October 1880.

¹ Aramaic was the official, as well as the commercial language.

² Dr. Kuenen (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1882, pp. 135-6, 321-2) disputes the soundness of the historical results assumed above, partly on *à priori* grounds, and partly on the authority of M. Oppert, who, however, is too fond of isolation to be a safe guide. The gloss in the British Museum Corpus of Assyrian Inscriptions (ii. 47, 18), peremptorily declares that Anduan (pronounced, as it states, Anzan) signifies Elamtuv, *i. e.* Elam (Sayce, *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 1874, p. 475).

LAST WORDS ON ISAIAH.

Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα, ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται.
(Evang. d. Joann. vi. 12.)

Now that 'the vintage is done,' the 'gleaning grapes' are more in number than might have been anticipated. But the printing has been long, and the Book of Isaiah is so many-sided that I could not help obtaining some fresh results during the interval. Nothing surely is trivial which helps us to realise any portion of a literature so peculiar from every point of view as the prophetic. The contents of the following supplementary notes relate partly to the exegesis of the text, partly to its illustration from other sources. I trust that the friendly reader, who has accompanied me hitherto, will not desert me before the end, 'that both he that soweth and he which reapeth may rejoice together.'

On i. 24 (vol. i. p. 9). The view adopted in the Appendix to chap. i. that Jehovah Sabáoth is a combination of two proper names has been sanctioned in the *Corpus Inscr. Semit.* (i. 33), where among other parallels Astar-Kemosh is cited from line 17 of the Moabite inscription of Mesha.

On ii. 6, 8 (vol. i. pp. 16, 17). The co-existence of idolatry with the spiritual religion of the prophets and their disciples is a fact which must be accepted even if it cannot be explained. A fusion of races may account for something, but rather in the northern section of the nation than in the southern. For although Canaanitish elements in the popular religion of Judah are not wanting (Isa. i. 29, xvii. 8, 10), yet 'on the whole it is probable that the popular religion was not so largely leavened with Canaanite ideas and Canaanite immorality as in the North; there is nothing in the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah corresponding to the picture of vile licentiousness under the cloak of religion [in N. Israel] drawn by Amos and Hosea.' 'In the population of Judæa the fusion of Canaanite and Hebrew elements was not so great as in Ephraim and Manasseh'; and for several reasons it is probable that S. Israel retained more superstitions of the primitive Hebrews, such as are probably alluded to in Amos ii. 4, and rather fully described in Ezek. viii. 10, &c. (see below on lxv. 4). The practice of divination, too, appears to have

been specially strong in Judah, and there had been no Elijah in the southern portion of the country. (*The Prophets of Israel*, 1882, pp. 200-3.)

On iv. 2 (vol. i. p. 26). Prof. de Lagarde's note on this passage in his *Semitica* is not remarkably lucid. How צמח יהוה and פרי הארץ can be antithetical, consistently with the synonymous predicates, is more than I can understand. Nor does the learned professor attempt to explain the צמח הארמה of Gen. xix. 24, which must of course have included the fruits of cultivated soil; and, as I have remarked in the commentary, the opposite of the Talmudic phrase 'field of Baal' (see below) is—not 'fruit of the land'—but 'field of fountains.' Still, as one competent reviewer of the *Semitica*¹ has been attracted by Prof. de Lagarde's explanation, I will quote a few more sentences, and leave the reader to judge for himself. 'צמח יהוה and פרי הארץ are evidently opposed . . . צמח is that which grows without cultivation; it is said of hair, of wood, of the צשב of the field, Lev. xiii. 37, Eccl. ii. 6, Gen. ii. 5. If we were not in the region of the religion of Jahwé, a formula would be used which is still current among Semitic people, in order to define the word צמח still more distinctly as τὸ αὐτομάτως φύεν. בֵּית הַבְּעַל of the Gemoro is the antithesis to בֵּית הַשְּׁלֶחֶן of the Mishno (*Moed katon*, ii. 11, 1; comp. Buxtorf, 2412.) 'Baal's land,' according to Wetzstein (*Zeitschr. d. d. m. Ges.* xi. 489), means in Arabic land which is nourished, not by springs, but by the rain of heaven; 'Baal's fruit,' that which grows on such land' [comp. Lane, *Arabic Lexicon*, s.v. *ba'lun*]. A candid admission is added that, however far Isaiah may be from Christianity, 'we are certainly here on the road to the Messiah.'

On iv. 5 (vol. i. p. 28). Wellhausen (*Geschichte Israels*, p. 350 note) doubts the genuineness of יִבְרָא, the creative activity of Jehovah being a subject characteristic of the writers of the Exile. No doubt the verse is imperfect, if not corrupt, at the end, but I am not so clear of a corruption at the beginning. Granting that ברא is an Aramaism, does it follow that every Aramaism in Isaiah is a corruption? Ryssel has lately pointed out again how growing an influence was exerted by Aramaic from the times of Ahaz onwards (*De Elohistæ Pentateuchi sermone*, Lips. 1878, p. 25), and the period of Ahaz is suitable for the date of chap. iv. That ברא is of Aryan origin is a hypothesis of Lagarde's and Wellhausen's which does not agree with my own view of the probable affinities of Gen. i.

On chap. vi (vol. i. p. 37). A parallel to 'Holy, holy, holy,' is suggested by Friedrich Delitzsch in the thrice-repeated 'gracious,' and 'may they be at hand' (*assûr, ligrubu*) uttered, the one at the beginning, and the other at the end, of Assyrian intercessory chants. (*Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 253.)

¹ Dr. Eberhard Nestle, in *Schürer's Literaturzeitung*.

On chap. vi. (appendix). The kinship of the seraphim and cherubim maintained in the appendix to chap. vi. is confirmed by Ezekiel's transference of an important detail from Isaiah's picture of the seraphim to his own description of the cherubim (comp. Isa. vi. 2, Ezek. i. 11), and also by the fusion of the two figures in Rev. iv. 8. It has been illustrated with great fulness of knowledge by the Rev. H. G. Tomkins, a communication from whom I am permitted to publish here. The reader will notice the interesting confirmation (near the end of the note) of my own and M. Lenormant's theory of the connection of *kirubu* (the steer-god) and *kurubu* ('the circling bird'). Before we listen to Mr. Tomkins, however, let me supplement the appendix to chap. vi. in a few particulars. 1. I have there spoken of the colossal bulls of Assyria as having the special function of guardians of the temples and palaces; an authority seemed to be lacking for their being also regarded as the divine throne-bearers. Friedrich Delitzsch, however, points out (*Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 182) that the awful 'seven spirits' with whom George Smith has already familiarised us¹ actually bear this name in the inscriptions,² and he maintains that they are fundamentally the same as the steer-gods. 2. I have designedly abstained hitherto from consulting the Egyptian mythology, fearing to distract the reader's attention by cross-lights. But, as Mr. Tomkins has so strikingly illustrated the conception of the seraph from Egyptian sources, a brief reference to Egypt for the cherubim may not be out of place. That winged figures, reminding us somewhat of the cherubim, were common in Egyptian temples, has often been pointed out. Dr. Lieblein expresses himself as follows:—

'The cherubim of the Hebrews are perhaps identical with the winged genii of the Egyptians (see Rosellini, *Monumenti*, plate lv. 2). Like the cherubim, the latter are always in couples, and they protect and defend, repelling the enemy with their extended wings. . . . Their name in Egyptian is not known; but there is a Coptic word (*korb*, repellere, abigere), which will indicate their function, and which I recognise, both as to sound and as to signification, in the Hebrew *krūbhūn*. Possibly too the Kerberos of the Greeks was derived from the same Egyptian word *korb*, repellere, abigere' (*Recherches sur la chronologie égyptienne*, Christiania, 1873, p. 131). 3. It should also be mentioned that M. Lenormant's ground for assuming that the Hebrew cherub was sometimes popularly regarded as a great bird, such as an eagle, is not Ps. xviii. 11, but the description of the cherubim of the ark in Ex. xxv. 18-22:—'c'étaient des *kurubi* plutôt que des *kirubi*, c'est-à-dire de grands oiseaux, aigles ou vau-

¹ *Chaldean Genesis*, edited by Sayce, p. 104.

² e.g. in the Deluge-story, col. 2, line 44, we are told that, together with the gods Raman, Nabu, and Ea, 'the throne-bearers went over the mountain and plain' (*Chald. Gen.*, p. 283).

tours, aux ailes étendues en avant et ombrageant le convercle ou propitiatoire' (*Les origines de l'histoire*, p. 128).

Mr. Tomkins writes as follows:—

'Perhaps the earliest figure that may illustrate the seraph is found in Egypt, and seems to have been overlooked in this relation. I have long suspected that the  *seref* (as the name may be read) which is represented at Beni Hassan with other marvellous composite creatures of the time of the 12th dynasty (*Rosellini*, i. pl. xxiii.) indicates the conception of the seraph, and is connected with  a word rendered by M. Pierret *chaleur, chauffer, chaleur vitale* (*Vocabulaire*, 516).

'It is then the word שרפ of the Bible, with the same idea of the burning one, from the root שרש , which we find in Assyrian *sarapu*, to burn, and *surupu*, burnt (*Sayce*, 513, 222 a). The creature depicted at Beni Hassan is the winged hawk-headed lion, the gryphon in fact, allowing for the substitution of the Egyptian hawk for the Eastern eagle. Now the lion and eagle symbolise heat, especially that of the sun, and the combination is most ancient. In Egypt we have besides this *seref* the gryphon, *akhekkh*, a name which with another determinative denotes a serpent and appears, like *saraf*, to be derived from the idea of burning, since we have *akh*, a holocaust, a brazier for incense (compare אח , *akh*, a brazier, Jer. xxxvii. 22, and the root אחא Gesenius), and *akhu*, fever; also *akhi*, a kind of bird (*Pierret*, *Vocab.* 78-79), and *akh* (with the determinative of a wing), to fly. I mention this series to illustrate the connection of ideas between fire and flight, associated in the dragon or the gryphon.

'The  *seref* of Beni Hassan is illustrated in a most interesting way by the colloquy between a jackal and an Ethiopian cat, which M. Revillout has brought before the readers of the *Revue égyptienne* from a demotic papyrus of about the time of Augustus (1880, 58; 1881, 86). Here we meet with a graduated scale of destruction from the smallest insect upwards, and at the head of all the destroyers we find the *seref*, which M. Revillout regards as a monstrous bird, probably the *rokh* of the Arabs,¹ but nevertheless identifies as the creature of Beni Hassan; and indeed the detailed description of him in the papyrus gives us "his beak as of an eagle, his eye as of a man, his strong sides as of a lion, his scales as of some creature (*abakh*, fish or turtle?) of the sea, his venom as of a serpent"; and "he seizes [his prey] in his claws in an instant, and takes them above the top of the clouds of heaven."² But below this supreme

¹ [Or, at any rate, of the *Arabian Nights*.]

² [This description closely resembles that of the divine Zu bird in the primitive Babylonian mythology, 'the cloud- or storm-bird, the flesh-eating bird, the lion or

creature we find another gryphon called *nār*. Now נור in Chaldee is fire, and here we have, it seems, one more witness to the fiery nature of the gryphon under whatever name. It is the symbol of Menthu and Seti or Ba'al, and seems to have come from the East to Egypt; and so, indeed, do the Egyptian words in question.

'In very ancient Babylonian cylinders a god stands on a gryphon, or a gryphon appears as guardian attendant on a god. (*Studies on the Times of Abraham*, pl. iii. A. C.).

'The brazen "seraph" of the wilderness, the seraphim of Isaiah's vision, and the kerūbim of the ark find in Egypt some analogous expressions of form and symbol.

'When Isaiah "saw the Lord (Adōnai) sitting upon a high and exalted throne," "seraphim were standing above Him." This suggests to me the symbolic uræi or royal serpents above the enthroned god, and the figure of the heaven above all, in Egyptian scenes of worship. I mean only to refer to the position, not to the form, of the seraphim. The beak of the eagle, the sides of the lion, the *eye of the man*, in the Egyptian *seref*, are not the only points by which the seraphim are brought near to the cherubim of Ezekiel's vision, and the Apocalypse joins the six wings and the adoring cry of the seraph with the attributes of the cherub.

'In the biblical visions everything is divinely exalted and hallowed, however the leading ideas of fire and flight, of royal attendance and ministry, may be clad in ancient form.

'The seraphim have both wings and hands. So also is Isis represented with wings below her arms. In the stately and graceful figure of Nūt at the bottom of the magnificent sarcophagus of Seti I. (at the Soane Museum) the goddess has wings (below her arms) folded closely round, and reaching towards, but not to, her feet. The seraphim reverently "with twain covered their feet." In Isaiah's sublime vision there is nothing indicated of a form that might not be human, except the wings. The purifying coal (stone?) from the altar reminds one of the cognate verb צרף (*tsaraf*) to purge by fire, as in Assyrian *tsarapu*, *purifier* (Sayce, 227).

'The Abbé Vigouroux, who has treated with great care the subject of Ezekiel's vision, notices that some of the *nirgalli* the winged lions of Assyrian portals, have human figures to the waist with their shoulders, arms, and hands, free above their wings. (*La Bible*, &c., iv. 348).

'We have seen the way in which the idea flits from bird to quadruped or serpent among the Egyptians; Mr. Cheyne has noticed the

giant bird, the bird of prey, the bird with sharp beak.' Both these mystic birds remind us of the Chinese storm-bird and the *rokh* of the *Arabian Nights*. See Sayce, in Smith's *The Chaldean Account of Genesis* (Lond. 1880), p. 123.]

same thing among the Israelites and the Assyrians (*Isaiah*, first ed., ii. 273). He connects *kirubu*, the steer-god, with *kurubu*, "the circling bird;" indeed the *kirubu* of the portal of Hades is addressed as "the bull produced by the god Zu," but the god Zu is identified with the vast storm-bird. (Lenormant, *Les Origines*, &c., p. 116). The same association seems true of the idea of the seraph.

'The visible or imaginable expressions served as symbols of ideas, rather than as pictures of existing forms, and like the kerūbim of the ark, and the brazen serpent (*sārāf*) in the wilderness (Num. xxi. 8), were hallowed and claimed for the service of the true God as a "shadow of heavenly things." In Egypt the serpent "*shai*," as M. Revillout writes, "seems to symbolise the supreme divinity, or, to express myself better, the divine forces of nature."

'Above the Enthroned, the prophet sees revealed "the bright seraphim in burning row," and their cry is in his ears not only the shout of universal homage but the restitution of alienated glory.'

On chap. vii. (vol. i. pp. 40, 41). Prof. de Lagarde expresses with great cogency the view that this chapter is the work of a later editor. He calls it 'ein cento aus echten, aber musterhaft ungeschickt zusammengefügten, aussprüchen des Isaias.' Unfortunately, he takes the opportunity of introducing anew his extremely contemptuous opinions of prophecy and the prophets (*Semitica*, i. 9-13).

On vii. 13 (vol. i. p. 46). A misunderstanding in a very suggestive article, ascribed to the Rev. W. H. Simcox, in the *Church Quarterly Review* (July 1880, p. 433, *note*), suggests to me to sum up as briefly as possible my views respecting the 'house of David.' I venture to hold that the royal princes (not the 'princes' of the Auth. Vers. of Jeremiah) formed a kind of order, distinct, nominally at any rate, from the שרים, that they held high positions in the State, and in Jeremiah's time exercised the royal function of judgment (Jer. xxi. 11, 12; comp. on Isa. i. 10). Further, that during the reign of Josiah, the שרים (a term which probably includes representatives of the people), and the royal princes, were both equally chargeable with grave offences prejudicial to the State (Zeph. i. 8). Here was no doubt the germ of a possible oligarchy. It appears from Brugsch's *History* that the same germ existed in Egypt. Normally, this royal order would supply the counsellors and officials of the king; abnormally, they would (allying themselves perhaps with the שרים of non-royal origin) convert the king into a kind of *maire du palais*. It has been objected by the writer mentioned above that the massacres of Jehoram, Athaliah, and Jehu would have left but few royal princes remaining. But is this so certain? 'David, according to 2 Sam. v. 14-16, had no less than eleven sons born in Jerusalem; and in Zech. xii. 12 a sort of secondary royal family is mentioned, co-ordinately with "the house of David," viz., "the house of Nathan"'

(*I.C.A.* p. 88). It seems to me that if all the legitimate descendants of all the kings and kings' sons be included, the 'house of David' (which ought strictly to include the 'house of Nathan,' from which the recognised Davidic representative, Zerubbabel, was descended, (Luke iii. 27, 31) would be too numerous and widely-spread to be destroyed. Besides, the descendants of the long-lived Uzziah would have grown up by the time of the Syrian war.

On vii. 9 (vol. i. p. 46, see end of note). Friedrich Delitzsch remarks (*Paradies*, p. 287) : 'The name [Samsi-murūna] reminds us of that of the Canaanitish (Phœnician) royal city Shimron-mērōn, Josh. xii. 20, which was perhaps miswritten for Shemesh-mērōn' (comp. Halévy's explanation in my note). Samsi-murūna is mentioned by Sennacherib, together with Sidon, Arados, and Byblos (Delitzsch, *op. cit.* p. 272).

On vii. 13 (vol. i. p. 48). In the foot-note I have mentioned one relic of the primitive custom of giving authority to the mother-in-law. Indian zenana-life might also have been referred to ; and perhaps Mic. vii. 6 may be quoted in this connection—'A daughter-in-law shall rise up against her mother-in-law.'

On vii. 14 (vol. i. p. 49). The 'sign' of Immanuel. Mr. Robertson Smith adopts the explanation of Roorda and Kuenen, 'that a young mother who shall become a mother within a year may name her child "God with us ;"' and he remarks elsewhere that viii. 3, 4 is a parallel prophecy, with 'a similar and quite unambiguous sign' (*The Prophets of Israel*, pp. 272, 425). There is, of course, no doubt that, in some sense, the birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz may be called a 'sign' (see commentary, *ad loc.*) ; the only difference between myself and Mr. Smith is as to whether 'sign' in vii. 14 is to be used in a different sense from that in which it is used in vii. 11 ; whether it is probable that Isaiah offered Ahaz a wonderful 'sign,' in vii. 11, and finally gave him one of a lower and quite ordinary kind. I cannot see that this is probable. Mr. R. Smith does not offer an explanation of 'thy land, O Immanuel,' in viii. 8.

On ix. 6 (vol. i. p. 59). Prof. Franz Delitzsch (*Academy*, April 10, 1880) supposes me to hold that the five titles of the Messiah form a complete sentence, and remarks that the oldest *Assyrian* name which he has met with is *Abu-ina-ekalli-libur*—'May the father become old in the palace.' I am grateful for the reference, but the complaint should have been addressed to Luzzatto, and not to me (see my note). Such an elaborate sentence-name as Luzzatto supposes, would not be natural in Isaiah's time, though it might be in that of the writer of Chronicles, who distributes the sentence—'I have given great and high help ; I have spoken visions in abundance' among 'the imaginary sons of Heman,' giving a fragment of it to each (1 Chron. xxvi. 4).

On x. 9 (vol. i. p. 70). Kadesh, on the Orontes, the southern capital of the Hittites, had a Semitic name; hence a slight presumption that the northern capital had one too. Friedrich Delitzsch (*Paradies*, p. 268) thinks that Carchemish is of Aramaic origin; he analyses it, after G. Hoffmann, into כְּרֵךְ מִישׁ 'fortress of Mish,' on the ground that the earlier name of Oropos (*i.e.* Carchemish?) was Telmessus (or Telmissus), *i.e.* תֵּל מִישׁ, 'heap of Mish' (the 'fortress' having at last become a 'ruinous heap'). Both this scholar and Mr. Sayce reject Gesenius's connection of the word with Chemosh.

On xi. 11 (vol. i. p. 79). 'And from the countries of the sea.' I would not under any circumstances propose to remove these words from the text, since, whoever wrote them, they have come down to us with the highest sanction, and both Isaiah and the Soferim or Scripturists (see p. 214) must be regarded as 'men of the Spirit' (Hos. ix. 7, Hebr.). But the fact that אֵי הַיָּם and אֵי יָם are specially characteristic of chaps. xl–lxvi., renders it a little doubtful whether Isaiah himself wrote the latter phrase in this verse, which, indeed, seems complete without it. It is possibly due to an editor of Isaiah, a deep student of Scripture, and firmly persuaded of the truth of the promise of deliverance from the אֵי יָם, so explicitly given in the latter part of the Book (lx. 9). The earliest absolutely certain occurrences of אֵי יָם are in Jer. ii. 10, xxxi. 10. I doubt whether Isaiah would have used אֵי הַיָּם as a technical phrase in but one passage of his 'occasional prophecies.'

On xiii. 6 (vol. i. p. 83). The explanation of 'the day of Jehovah' here given will only suit an advanced period of prophetic-religious thought. In Amos v. 18, probably the earliest passage in which the phrase occurs (the antiquity of Joel being very uncertain), the 'day of Jehovah,' which the men of N. Israel 'long for,' must have been a day of victory, and not a day of judicial retribution for Jew and Gentile. It is possible that the conception of these Israelites may have been, not an attenuation of a larger prophetic one, but the primitive, popular germ of the much more developed conception indicated in Isa. xiii. 6–11, Joel iii. 11–16. This is the view proposed by Mr. Robertson Smith (*The Prophets of Israel*, p. 397), who remarks that 'the "days" of the Arabs often derive their name from a place, but may equally be named from the combatants, *e.g.*, "the days of Tamim against Bekr."' Amos was probably the first prophet to take up this popular phrase, the import of which he deepened by including the idea that 'the day' would be one of 'darkness and not light,' for the sinners of Israel as well as of the nations.

On xiii. 10 (vol. i. p. 84). M. Lenormant has pointed out that, according to the Assyrian calendar, *k'sil* should be the constellation of the month *kisiluv* (כִּסְלִי Chisleu, Auth. Vers. Zech. vii. 1, Neh. i. 1)

—*i.e.*, the sagittary (*Les origines de l'histoire*, i. 247). But why should there not have been more than one brilliant constellation called *k'sil*? We can thus give a natural explanation of the plural, and do justice to the ancient authorities in favour of Orion.

On xiii. 21 (vol. i. p. 86). The word *okhim* ('shriekers'?) is to be connected with the Assyrian *akhu*, which corresponds to the 'Accadian' *lig-bar-ra*, *i.e.*, 'beast (dog) striped.' The identification is due to Mr. Houghton, *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* v. 328. On *ṣiyyim* (rendered 'wild cats') see my *Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah*, p. 23.

On xiv. 4-21 (vol. i. pp. 85-90). Dr. Budde has well pointed out how completely the *form* of this *māshāl* is elegiac (*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1882, pp. 12-14). Its resemblance to the first four Lamentations is all the more remarkable, as the preceding discourse (xiii. 1-xiv. 2) and the prophetic epilogue (xiv. 22, 23) are written in entirely different styles. Dr. Budde has proposed various emendations to restore symmetry to the song, the most important of which, however, has already been made by Ewald (see on v. 20).

On xiv. 13, 14 (vol. i. pp. 89, 90). The similarity and the contrast of the general Oriental and the Israelitish view of royalty will be manifest. Some Israelitish kings had not even a shadow of divinity (Hos. viii. 4). The Davidic king, no doubt, approaches the honour accorded to the Babylonian and Assyrian kings; he is called Jehovah's son (2 Sam. vii. 14, Ps. lxxxix. 27), but so too is the people of Israel (Ex. iv. 22, Jer. xxxi. 9, Hos. xi. 1). It is only the Messiah who is described somewhat as the neighbouring peoples would describe their kings—not only as 'my companion and the man who is my neighbour' (Zech. xiii. 7, pronouncing *rē'î*), but even 'el *gibbōr* (ix. 7, Hebr. 6). The exaggerated royalism of the proto-Babylonians, however, led them, in some of the inscriptions, to attach the determinative prefix of divinity to the names of their kings. Two examples of this are given by Prof. Sayce, *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.* v. 442; comp. Lenormant, *Étude sur quelques parties des syllabaires cunéiformes*, p. 14.¹

On xiv. 23 (vol. i. p. 93). The bittern is probably called *kippōd* from its habit of erecting or bristling out the long feathers of the neck, reminding one of the spines of the porcupine or hedgehog. In Arabic, Syriac, and Ethiopic, the cognates of *kippōd* actually mean the hedgehog; in Talmudic the usage is uncertain. The variety of meaning reminds one of the variety in the usage of *rīm* (see on xxxiv. 7). The bittern, unlike the hedgehog, abounds in the marshy grounds of Mesopotamia, and its 'strange booming note' (Tristram) is as awesome a sound as the wail of the hyæna.

¹ I am indebted for these references to Mr. H. G. Tomkins, *Studies in the Time of Abraham*, p. 34.

On chaps. xv. xvi. (vol. i. p. 96). I have endeavoured to do justice to the various textual phenomena. Knobel's statement, though true in the main, is a little too unqualified—'the passage is throughout so peculiar that it must be the only work of its author in the Old Testament.' To counterbalance my own argument, and so give the reader every opportunity of forming an unbiassed opinion, I quote here Dr. Weir's view as to the authorship of the prophecy, from the manuscript notes lent to me. On xvi. 1-5, he confirms the opinion I have myself expressed; his suggestion in the words italicised would, I think, carry more weight were it accompanied by a literary analysis. But from this, Dr. Weir prudently abstained.

'Assuming, therefore, that the two concluding verses of this prophecy are from Isaiah, is the rest of it also originally his, or is it to be assigned to another and an older author? The majority of modern expositors are disposed to adopt the latter alternative; and Hitzig, followed by Maurer, had made an elaborate attempt to prove that the real author of the prophecy is Jonah, and that we have a Scriptural reference to it in 2 Kings xiv. 25. The style, it is said, differs considerably from that of Isaiah; the frequent repetition of *יְהוָה* and *עַל יְהוָה* has been specially noted; also the accumulation of geographical names. No trace here, it has been said, of Isaiah's light and rapid march—of his bold transitions and combinations; the stream of thought flows tediously and heavily along, and cause and consequence are marked with cumbrous accuracy. It must be allowed that these remarks are not altogether groundless. The style of the prophecy certainly differs in some parts from the usual style of Isaiah's compositions; though none but an impatient and fastidious critic would pronounce it heavy and tedious. To account for this difference, it is to be observed that there is in this prophecy a more copious outflow of sympathetic emotion than we usually find in the earlier prophecies of Isaiah, arising probably in part from the historical relationship which subsisted between Israel and Moab; and such emotion is quite inconsistent with the light and rapid march which some critics desiderate here. And if this is not thought to furnish an adequate explanation of all the alleged peculiarities, *there is no reason why we should refuse to avail ourselves of the hypothesis that some of the verses, especially in the fifteenth chapter, may have been quoted from an earlier prophecy.*¹

'Granting this, it appears to me very certain that the prophecy is substantially from the pen of Isaiah. The middle stanza (xvi. 1-5) is, I should say, unquestionably Isaiah's. In the last stanza the description of the vine of Sibmah may be brought into comparison with v. 1-6, and the prominence given to the 'pride' of Moab as the

¹ The italics are the editor's.

cause of Moab's fall is just what we should expect from the author of chap. ii. In the first stanza (chap. xv.) also there are indications, not obscure, of the hand of Isaiah, as in the latter part of *v.* 6, and in the closing words of the stanza (פְּלִיטָה) in the construct state being found only in Isaiah—comp. iv. 2, x. 20, xxxvii. 3.)

On xv. 6 (vol. i. p. 96). 'The waters of Nimrim.' Seetzen had already identified Nimrim with the lower part (still called Nahr Nimrin) of the Wâdy pointed out (see note in vol. i.) by Consul Wetzstein, the luxuriant meadows of which form a strong contrast with the gloomy scenery of the Wâdy en-Numeira. As to the meaning of the name Nimrim, it is rather tempting to connect it with Arab. *namîr*, Assy. *namri* 'transparent,' and to suppose that Beth Nimrâ derived its name from the waters. But it has been pointed out that there are other places with names from the same root, and that in olden times there were divisions of Arab tribes bearing names (Namir, Anmar, Nomeyr) strongly suggestive of the panther. The Syriac writer, Jacob of Sarug, also speaks of *bar nemre*, 'the son of panthers,' as a false deity of Harrân. I find it therefore impossible to resist the conclusion that in Nimrim, as well as in the other cases, there is a reference to the panther. What this panther is, will be clear to those who are convinced by Mr. M'Lennan's evidence, that in widely separated countries a primitive form of worship prevailed called totemism—*i.e.* 'animals were worshipped by tribes of men who were named after them and believed to be of their breed.' It is certain that the ancient Semitic peoples worshipped many animal gods, and the most reasonable view is that these were totems or animal-fetishes. Such a totem to some of the Semitic clans of Syria and Arabia was apparently the panther, and from this panther the places called Nimrâ, Nimara, &c., naturally derived their names. (See further below, on lxx. 4, lxxvi. 3, 17.) So Mr. Robertson Smith, to whose important paper in the *Journal of Philology* for 1880 I refer the reader. I do not, however, see that there is a radical difference between him and Graf Baudissin as to the import of the animal deities of the Semites; for it must be remembered that the planets were regarded by primitive man (comp. the Accadian term for the planets, *lubat*—*i.e.* 'a kind of carnivorous quadruped,' Lenormant) as having a quasi-animal existence.

On xvii. 2 (vol. i. p. 104). The Assyrian inscriptions speak of a place called Qarqara, 'thrown down, dug up, burned with fire' by Shalmaneser II., and again 'reduced to ashes' by Sargon. (See *Records of the Past*, iii. 99, ix. 6.) Mr. G. Smith identifies this place with Aroer, and brings the latter event into connection with Isa. xvii. 2 (*Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, ii. 328). For the interchange of sounds, comp. אֲרַעָא and אֲרַקָא in Chaldee.

On xvii. 8 (vol. i. pp. 105-6). Dr. Stade (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel*,

1881, p. 184) and Mr. Robertson Smith (*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 226) have recently revived the opinion that the word Asherah is not the name of a goddess, but means 'a pole,' and that this pole was the symbol of the sacred tree, which stood on or near the altars of the 'high places.' This seems to be opposed, not only by the occurrence of Asher in Hebrew literature (most probably to be explained on the analogy of Gad, as originally a divine name), but also by passages of the Old Testament literature (see 1 Kings xv. 13, 2 Chron. xv. 16, 2 Kings xxi. 7, where an image of the Asherah is spoken of; 2 Kings xxiii. 4, 7, where we find vessels and tents for the Asherah; 1 Kings xviii. 19—'the prophets of the Baal and the prophets of the Asherah').¹ The truth is that the word Asherah has a twofold value in the Old Testament, 1. as a divine title, and 2. as a material symbol of a divinity. The feminine termination indicates that the divinity was a goddess; but what goddess is intended? Dr. Franz Delitzsch, in his review of vol. i. conjectures that Asherah was first of all a title of the goddess Ashtoreth, which among the Canaanites in course of time supplanted her proper designation. My original view, however, remains unrefuted. Compilers were prone to confound names (e.g. Sargon and Sennacherib in Isaiah, Cyrus and Darius in Daniel), and when the worship of Asherah had passed away, it was natural to identify this goddess with the better known Ashtoreth, in spite of the difference of the initial guttural. I now suspect, however, that the truth may *perhaps* unite elements both of Dr. Delitzsch's and of my former view. As has been remarked already (vol. i. p. 89), there was a masculine as well as a feminine Ishtar (Istar) or Venus; king Mesha, for example, speaks of Astar-Kemosh (Inscr. l. 17). May not the Canaanitish Asherah correspond to the feminine Ishtar (identified in an important cuneiform inscription with Beltis), who represents 'the luxuriously sensual goddess of rest in the arms of love' (Friedr. Delitzsch²), while Ashtoreth, or more properly Astart, may be a later popular derivative of Ishtar or Ashtar, the stern god of war? M. Pinches has already remarked that 'two such opposite attributes could not long remain the characteristics of one goddess [deity]; so, gradually becoming distinct in the popular mind, they became the attributes of two distinct goddesses [deities] of the same name but of different parentage.'³

On chap. xviii. In an essay on this chapter (*Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, Oct. 1881), Mr. Thomas Hodgkin has attempted a new theory of the meaning of this chapter, based upon a careful study of Brugsch-Pasha's *History of Egypt*. He concludes 'that in this chapter the prophet warns the world-shadowing kings of Ethiopia

¹ I take these references from Graf Baudissin's very complete article 'Aschera' in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, 2nd ed., i. 719-25.

² *George Smith's Chaldäische Genesis*, p. 272.

³ *Records of the Past*, xi. 60.

of the insecure tenure by which they hold their empire. They may send despatch-boat after despatch-boat down the Nile to summon their vassals of the Delta to their intended campaign against Assyria, campaigns which are to be commenced at least upon the often-devastated soil of Palestine. All will not avail them . . . Summer and winter will pass over the unburied corpses of the Ethiopians and their Egyptian subjects in the land of Israel.' This theory, as well as the older one that the Jews are the nation referred to in *vs.* 2, 7, is due to a want of tact in dealing with the peculiar phraseology of these verses. Mr. Hodgkin's 'land-mensuration and husbandry' (in the last clause but one) is no less absurd than the 'scattered and peeled' which he rightly rejects in a previous clause. Mr. Hodgkin also misses the connection between chap. xviii. and xvii. 12-14. See also vol. i. p. 109,

On xviii. 2 (vol. i. p. 110), 'vessels of papyrus.' Compare *Mémoires du duc de Rovigo*, i. 94: 'On donna la lettre à porter à un fellah qui ne prit pas d'autre moyen pour exécuter sa commission, que de lier ensemble deux bottes de joncs, sur lesquelles il se plaça assis à la turque, avec sa pipe et un peu de dattes, ne prenant que sa lance pour se défendre contre les crocodiles, et une petite rame pour se diriger. Placé ainsi sur cette frêle embarcation, il s'abandonna au cours du fleuve, et arriva sans accident.'

On xx. 6 (vol. i. p. 123). Dr. Kay illustrates the historical bearings of this prediction (1) by Sennacherib's expression (xxxvi. 6), 'this bruised reed, Egypt,' which 'looks as if Egypt had suffered some serious reverse,' and (2) by Nahum's prediction (iii. 8-10) of the 'exile' and the 'captivity' of 'No-Amon' (the Egyptian Thebes). Both references are in point, though Dr. Kay's suggestion that it was Sargon who captured 'No-Amon' is only possible through his singular heresy relative to the state of cuneiform decipherment (*Speaker's Commentary*, vol. v. p. 143). The merest tyro in Assyriology knows that it was Assurbanipal by whom the Egyptian Thebes was captured and spoiled. Sennacherib's expression, 'this bruised reed,' doubtless refers to the crushing defeat which Egypt sustained at Raphia, and which was perhaps an incipient fulfilment of the prediction in xx. 6, just as the captivity which followed on the subsequent conquest of Egypt was a full and complete one.

On xxi. 1 (vol. i. p. 125). Another explanation is tenable. מדרים may mean either 'plain country of the sea' or 'desert of the sea.' The writer of the heading may have designedly chosen an ambiguous expression (comp. perhaps *v.* 11); Dr. Delitzsch compares for the former meaning *mat tihamtiv* 'land of the sea,' a phrase for Babylonia in the cuneiform inscriptions.

On xxi. 13 (vol. i. p. 128). Prof. H. L. Strack criticizes the word 'superfluously'; might not the Dedanites have lived outside 'Arabia,'

using this word in the limited sense of antiquity? But Dedan appears, from *v.* 16, to be included under 'Kedar,' and Assurbanipal expressly recognises a part, at least, of Kedar as Arabian: his words are, 'and the Kidrai of Vaiteh son of Birvul (?) king of Aribi' (G. Smith, *Assurbanipal*, p. 271, *Records of the Past*, i. 96). Besides, Aribi is a fairly comprehensive term, though not nearly so wide as our Arabia (Schrader, *K. A. T.*, p. 56).

On xxii. 13 (vol. i. p. 134). They are sacrificial feasts which are referred to, for at that time (as Mr. Robertson Smith points out) sacrifice and feast were identical. Thus we get an incidental confirmation of the date assigned in vol. i. to chap. i., which contains so striking a description (see i. 11) of the multiplied sacrifices called forth by the danger of the state.

On xxii. 17 (vol. i. p. 135). The view of נָקָר as a vocative (so Pesh., Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, Hitz., Ew.) certainly gives more force to the passage than any other.

The omission of the article under the excitement of feeling ought not to need a justification (comp. Isa. i. 1, Job xvi. 18).

On xxiii. 3 (vol. i. p. 138). Friedrich Delitzsch thinks Shihor means the Pelusiatic arm of the Nile, comparing Josh. xiii. 3, 'Shihor which is before (*i.e.* to the east of) Egypt'; he doubts the connection with שֹׁהַר 'dark-grey' (*Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 311).

On xxvi. 8 (vol. i. p. 151). The Name, or Face, of Jehovah seems an approach to a personal mode of being in the Godhead. The Semitic deities, indeed, were not triads but duads. They were originally the productive powers of nature, and were grouped in couples of male and female principles, under the names of Baal and Baalath (or Baaltis), and Ashtar (or Ashtor) and Ashtoreth, or by a cross-division, Baal and Ashtoreth. In Eshmunazar's inscription (vii. 8, 9, Schlottmann), the king and his mother say that they have built two houses or temples, the one 'to the Baal of Sidon,' and the other 'to Ashtoreth (or Astarte), the Name of Baal.' (Ewald's rendering—'To Ashtoreth of the name of Baal,' and Dillmann's 'To the heavenly Ashtoreth (wife) of Baal,' seem to me unnatural, and to be due to a prejudice against the androgynous character of the Semitic deity.) It is remarkable that they should have built two temples. This shows that the unity of the Godhead was lost sight of by the Phœnicians, at any rate in the fourth century B.C. The compiler of the Book of Kings, however, who adheres to the unity of the Godhead, speaks indifferently of 'the house of Jehovah' and of 'a house (built) unto the name of Jehovah' (1 Kings iii. 1, 2). Compare Ginsburg's note on the Ashtar-Chemosh of the Inscription of Mesha (*The Moabite Stone*, 1871, p. 43).

On xxvii. 1 (vol. i. p. 155). (Add a reference to Ezek. xxi. 9 (14).) The heavenly sword of Jehovah (comp. xxxiv. 5), reminds us of the

heavenly bow. For the 'bow of Jehovah' is not only 'set in the (visible) cloud' (Gen. ix. 13), but also 'round about the Throne' in heaven (Rev. iv. 3); and the 'bow' like the 'sword' has its Assyrian parallel, viz. the 'bow' of Istar, the 'archer of the gods,' granted, as was believed, to her devoted servant Assurbanipal (*Records of the Past*, ix. 49, 52).

On xxvii. 8 (vol. i. p. 158). The best exegesis of this passage is given by Riehm, *Der Begriff der Sühne im A. T.*, pp. 12, 13, note 2.

On xxviii. 10 (vol. i. p. 161). With 'a little here, a little there,' comp. the word used by Micah's opponents in Mic. ii. 6: 'Do not keep dropping,' *i.e.*, constantly finding fault (a part, at least, of the meaning of the Hebrew).

On xxviii. 18 (vol. i. p. 163). Mr. Robertson Smith takes the 'covenant with Death' and the 'covenant with Sheól' to refer to an alliance with 'the fatal power of the Assyrians' (*The Prophets of Israel*, 1882, p. 284).

On xxviii. 29 (vol. i. p. 165). Besides ix. 6, referred to in my note, comp. Job xi. 6, where Mr. Robertson Smith acutely corrects כִּי פְלִאִים לְתוֹשִׁיָהּ 'for wonders (belong) to (his) wisdom' (or, his realising power).

On xxx. 22 (vol. i. p. 174). It is remarkable and instructive that in this description of the break with Israel's past which must precede the conferring of God's best gifts, nothing is said of the destruction of the high places. It is only by inference that we can assume the tacit opposition of Isaiah to the ancient custom of worshipping at the local sanctuaries—an inference drawn partly from Isaiah's stress on the supreme importance of Mount Zion (ii. 2, 3, xxviii. 16, xxix. 8), and partly from the more or less complete temporary abolition of the high places by the prophet's royal friend, Hezekiah. Considering Isaiah's reserve, is it not more than probable that Dathe, Roorda, and Kuenen are right in reading 'the sin (of Judah)' (*khattath*) instead of 'the high places' (*bāmōth*) in Mic. i. 5? They have, moreover, on their side the authority of the three most ancient versions—Sept., Pesh., and Targ. The received reading is an altogether unparalleled expression, and brings Micah, the peasant-prophet, into opposition to his leader (as we may fairly regard Isaiah), the most original and creative of all the prophets. *Bāmōth* may have been originally a marginal note, intended to explain in what the sin of Judah consisted. Even the abolition of idolatry is spoken of by Isaiah as something still future—a proof of the imperfect character of Hezekiah's early reformation.

On xxx. 29 (vol. i. p. 176). Can the 'feast' referred to have been that of Booths or Tabernacles? It is true, Neh. viii. 17 distinctly affirms that this feast had not been observed 'since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun unto that day'; but this must mean 'not observed

in the formal way prescribed by the Law.' For the Biblical references compel us to assume that some kind of festival was kept after the autumn ingathering, during which men lived in the open air in booths (Hos. xii. 9); and though the feast doubtless had what may be called its secular side, a religious, 'Jehovistic' aspect cannot be ignored (1 Kings viii. 65; 'the feast').

On xxxi. 1 (vol. i. p. 178). The reputation of the Egyptian cavalry is forcibly shown by a passage in Sennacherib's description of the battle of Altaku:—'The kings of Egypt, and the soldiers, archers, chariots, and horses of Ethiopia, forces innumerable, gathered together and came to their assistance,' &c. (*Records of the Past*, i. 36). The illustration is due to M. Vigouroux.

On xxxvi. 2 (vol. i. p. 205). 'The Rab-shakeh.' This hybrid formation is more startling to us than it was to the Assyrians, who had fully adopted *sak* 'captain' into their vocabulary. Such formations were not altogether uncommon. M. Lenormant compares the name of the god Papsukal, the messenger of the gods, from the Accadian *pap* and the Semitic *sukal*.

On xxxvii. 24 (vol. i. p. 214). The Rev. H. G. Tomkins kindly supplements my note thus:—'Comp. further the mention of the felling of cedars, &c. in Lebanon and Amanus in the Assyrian Annals, and the "Remenen" (Lebanon) in Egyptian sculptures in relief, with trees felled.'

On xxxix. 7 (vol. i. p. 234). Dr. Delitzsch, in his review of vol. i., has the following remark: 'The parallel from Isaiah's contemporary, Micah ("Thou shalt go to Babylon," iv. 8), he passes over very lightly; "Babylon is mentioned there only as a part of the Assyrian empire." Certainly, but as the ruling city of the empire of the world, though that empire be held at the time by Assyria.' But how is it possible for Babylon to be mentioned as at the same time a part of the Assyrian empire, and a symbol of the capital of the imperial power ἀπλῶς? The two significations of Babylon cannot surely be combined. One is also entitled to ask what evidence there is for this symbolic use of the term Babylon at so early a date? It is true that 'the River'—*i.e.*, the Euphrates—is used once in Isaiah (viii. 7) to represent the Assyrian empire; but this is not a parallel case, the expression being chosen simply in order to produce a striking poetical figure. I am now able to refer for a full expression of my views on Mic. iv. 8, to my note on the passage in the Cambridge School edition of Micah, where the hypothesis of interpolation is advocated, but not on any arbitrary ground.

On xlv. 28 (vol. i. p. 285). Dr. Kuenen proposes (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1882, p. 132) to pronounce, not *rō'z* 'my shepherd,' but *rē'z* 'my companion,' comparing Zech. xiii. 7, where, as he truly says, this correction is required to match the parallel line ('the man who

is my neighbour'). The mistake would be a natural one; in Jer. iii. 1, Sept. and Pesh. misread *rō'im* instead of *rē'im*. But the received pronunciation gives a good sense here ('my shepherd' = 'the shepherd appointed by me,' comp. 'his king,' Ps. xviii. 50, Heb. 51), and produces a parallelism with 'his anointed' in the next verse. If, however, we accept the correction, it is the highest title which Cyrus has received from the prophet; see above on xiv. 13, 14.

On xlv. 7 (vol. i. p. 289). In the closing words of this striking declaration, does 'all these things' mean 'all that has been mentioned,' or 'all this that thou seest' (*i.e.* the universe, comp. lxvi. 2)? Naeg. is nearly solitary among the moderns in preferring the latter view, though Rab Chanina in the third century A.D. appears to have adopted it. 'Great is peace' (the peaceable character), he observed, 'for it is made equal to the whole creation in the words of the prophet.' It was the same Rabbi who said that he had learned 'much from his teachers, more from his school-fellows, but most of all from his pupils.'

On xlv. 8 (vol. i. p. 289). The mythic form of speech referred to may be illustrated by the Arabic phrases mentioned above on iv. 2 (*Last Words*). See also Lagarde on Astarte, *Nachrichten der Götting. Ges.*, 1881, p. 398; Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel* (1882), pp. 172, 409.

On xlv. 14 (vol. i. p. 292). This voluntary servitude is yet not servile; the symbol reminds us of xlv. 5 (clauses 1 and 3). 'Mystic union' explains it. The 'higher exegesis' (if I may repeat the phrase ventured upon above, p. 192) is therefore in thorough accord with the primary, natural meaning of the passage. St. Athanasius expresses it thus, 'Because of our relationship to His (Christ's) body, we too have become God's Temple, and in consequence are made God's sons, so that even in us the Lord is worshipped, and beholders report, as the Apostle says, that God is in them of a truth' (*Select Treatises*, Oxford transl., Part I. p. 241). The direct reference of course is to 1 Cor. xiv. 25, where St. Athanasius interprets *ἐν ὑμῖν* 'in you,' *i.e.* in mystic union with you, for which I think he has the analogy of this passage of Isaiah (Sept. *ἐν σοὶ ὁ Θεός*). St. Paul, indeed, is not improbably alluding to the prophecy; he says that the heathen visitor 'shall worship God,' but clearly means 'God in the Church,' as St. Athanasius explains (comp. my note on Isa. *l.c.*).

On li. 6. Prof. H. L. Strack remarks, 'Would not the moth (*שׁוּב*) be a more likely animal to select for an image of perishability (comp. Job iv. 19, xxvii. 18)?' He would explain as Delitzsch. But in Job xxvii. 18 we should rather read *עַכְבִּיט* 'a spider,' with Sept. (one of two renderings), Pesh., Merx, and Hitzig. A single passage of Job does not outweigh the Semitic parallels cited in my note.

On lii. 13, &c. (The portrait of the Servant.) A combination of influences, both Biblical and Platonic (comp. reference above, p. 182, note ¹), seems to have produced the outer form of a remarkable passage in the Wisdom of Solomon (ii. 12-21) which has been too much overlooked,¹ and which seems to be a link between the Jewish and the Hellenic world analogous to that supplied in another section of prophecy by the Sibylline Oracle on the κόρη and her royal child (see on Isa. xi. vol. i. p. 75).

On liii. 10. 'It pleased Jehovah.' A poet's words often have deep and true meanings, of which he was not himself conscious, but which he would certainly not have disowned. Such a meaning of the prophet's expression has been pointed out by Dr. Weir. 'Obs., it is not *God*, but *Jehovah*. We thought him smitten by Elohim (v. 4); but no. It was by Israel's God and for Israel's sake.'

— Wellhausen denies that זָבַח in this passage has the sense of 'guilt-offering.'² As a commentator on Isaiah, I am not called upon to discuss the theory which lies at the root of this bold negation. The question is a complicated one; but I may venture to assert thus much—that the position of Kalisch,³ that the laws concerning the sin-offerings and guilt-offerings were modified or amended at a late period, is certainly much more tenable than that of Wellhausen (viz. that 'sin-offerings and 'guilt-offerings' were absolutely unknown prior to the Babylonian Captivity). In Isa. i. 11 (comp. Mic. vi. 7) we have already found one probable allusion to the 'guilt-offering,' and Wellhausen has still to *prove* that the rendering 'guilt-offering' is unsuitable for זָבַח in 2 Kings xii. 17, Hos. iv. 8. Moreover, in the passage quoted from the exile-prophet Ezekiel (xl. 39) there is nothing, as Delitzsch remarks,⁴ to indicate that the sin-offering and the guilt-offering were of later introduction than the burnt-offering, in combination with which they are mentioned. Nor are the supposed novelties referred to at all more frequently by the later writers. Sin-offerings are mentioned twice (Neh. x. 34, 2 Macc. xii. 43); guilt-offerings only once (Delitzsch says, not even once; but in Ezra x. 19 we should probably point זָבַחֵינוּ with Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, ii. 2, p. 133).

On chap. lvi. (Introduction). The remark made above on the growing strictness of the observance of the Jewish Sabbath acquires special importance in view of the recent discovery of an Assyrian Sabbath—a 'dies nefastus,' on which the king at any rate was closely restrained from almost every form of activity. We do not know how far this severe rule extended in Assyria, but the probability is that

¹ Not, however, I observe, by Dr. Mozley (*Essays*, ii. 224).

² Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 76.

³ Kalisch, *Leviticus*, i. 274.

⁴ Delitzsch, 'Pentateuch-kritische Studien,' i. in *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*, 1880, p. 8.

the sacerdotal influence was more extensive there than either in Israel or in the Judah of the pre-Babylonian periods. In the time of the prophet Hosea, the Sabbath was, at any rate in Israel, a bright and cheerful day (Hos. ii. 11). On the Assyrian and Babylonian Sabbath, see Sayce in *Records of the Past*, i. 164, vii. 157, &c., where authority is produced for the statement that the word sabbath itself, under the form *sabattu*, was not unknown to the Assyrians. Compare also Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 118-9, who omits the Babylonian parallel, but traces the development of the Sabbath with great fulness, and calls attention to a point which has an important bearing on Isa. lvi., viz. that Hosea (ii. 11) and even the principal author of Lamentations (ii. 6) presuppose that, so far from its being a bond of union, the Sabbath would pass away of itself in a foreign land.

On lxiii. 6. Two of the oldest St. Petersburg MSS. (dated 916 and 1009 respectively) agree with the ordinary printed text, but in the former כ has been altered *primâ manu* into ג. See Strack, *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.* 1877, p. 51.

On lxiii. 16, 'for Abraham taketh no notice of us.' My note requires supplementing in two points. First, granting that the speaker does not intend (as Dr. Weir supposed) to deny that Abraham and Jacob can 'take notice' of their descendants, what precisely is his meaning? Calvin supposes the argument to be similar to that in xlix. 15; 'potius enim naturæ jura cessabunt, quàm te nobis patrem non præbeas,' but is כִּי ever 'though,' unless perhaps when its clause stands first? It is better to follow St. Jerome, and ascribe the inattention complained of on the part of the patriarchs to the degeneracy of their descendants; to apply the language of Deut. xxxii. 5, the Jews of the Exile were 'their not-children'—לֹא בְנֵי—i.e. the very reverse of their children. The next question is, whether the prophet himself is to be supposed to endorse the words which he utters in the name of the people, or whether he simply condescends to the popular phraseology. On reconsidering my note it appears to me that there is serious difficulty in the latter view. It might indeed be justifiable if the passage stood alone; but some of the other expressions referred to in my note can hardly be thus explained—they seem clearly to show that the Biblical writers themselves believed in the continued interest of the 'saints' in human affairs. The fact that this was generally believed in by the Jews of later times (comp. Matt. xxvii. 47, 49, and the Talmudic legends) ought not to blind us to the evidence of the antiquity of the belief (nor, I must add, to the endorsement of it by our Lord and by the New Testament writers—see Luke xvi. 25-31, ix. 30, 31, John viii. 56, on which see Godet, Heb. xii. 1, Rev. vi. 9-11). Nor can we fairly appeal to those mythic expressions, such as the Face and the Arm of Jehovah, and perhaps the 'hewing Rahab in pieces,' which are symbols of truths and

phenomena not to be adequately expressed in human language ; for since the saints are still literally human beings, that which is predicated of them must also be intended literally. This belief in the sympathy of the 'saints' corresponds to that in the intercession of angels, which we have found already in li. 9, lxii. 6, and which is also presupposed in Job v. 1 ('saints' in Auth. Vers. should be 'holy ones,' *i.e.* angels), xxxiii. 23 ('messenger' should be 'angel'). It is true that these beliefs are not prominently brought forward in the Old Testament teaching ; this, however, is only because they had not yet been denied. It would seem that the progress of revelation had brought about a deeper view of the infinite distinction between God and man, and of the necessity of some mediating link between them—such a view as ultimately issued in the fully-developed doctrine of the *Memra* or Logos. [If I may refer to Calvin again, it is interesting to notice how the honesty of the man conflicts with his anxiety not to support the practice of invoking the saints. He admits that our passage by no means proves that the faithful departed have no more interest in human affairs, but he thinks it necessary to give a strong practical caution against invoking them. Stier, quoting Calvin's concession, admits with equal candour that 'grade das Nicht-anerkennen setzt eher ein Kennen, das Nicht-fürsorgen doch ein etwelches Wissen um die Nachkommen voraus,' and continues : 'Wir wollen hier nich eingehen in die Tiefen des geheimnissvollen Verhältnisses der Todten zu den Lebenden,' suggesting, however, that from New Testament passages inferences may be deduced, 'denen weiter nachzugehen nicht Jedermanns Ding ist.' Here he shows a calmer judgment than the great Protestant champion.

On lxiv. 11. 'Where our fathers praised thee'—praise including prayer (Ps. lxx. 1, 2).

On lxvi. 17, 'after One in the midst.' A reference to the worship of Tammuz, or Adonis, is perfectly consistent with the composition of the prophecy in Palestine. There are several certain or highly probable allusions to this cultus in the prophets. Ezekiel (viii. 14) expressly refers to the women who sat at the gate of the outer court of the temple 'weeping for the Tammuz' (*i.e.* the divinised sun of autumn). The refrain of the Adonis-dirge is probably preserved in Jer. xxii. 18 (where, however, 'his glory,' parallel to 'my sister,' can hardly be correct) ; and, in Isa. xvii. 10, we have already traced an allusion to the Adonis-gardens. After the Restoration of the Jews, we find the name Tammuz given to the fourth Hebrew month. The cultus of Adonis lingered on at Bethlehem, even in the Christian period, according to St. Jerome.¹ In the passage before us, the prophet says nothing of the 'weeping' for Adonis, and Ezekiel, who

¹ *Opera*, ed. Ben., iv. 564 (ep. xlix. ad Paul.).

mentions the 'weeping' of the Hebrew devotees, is silent as to the procession.

On lxvi. 19. 'Put and Lud that draw the bow.' The points of my note are these: 1. that Pul (the received reading) occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament, whereas Put (the reading of the Septuagint) does, and that in connection with Lud, 2. that Lud being a N.-African people (see note), it is reasonable to suppose that the nation coupled with it is also N.-African. From the extreme south of Spain to northern Africa is an easy transition, but I admit that Tubal and Javan do not follow quite naturally. True, the names of places are not always given in geographical order. But it is quite possible that Wetzstein's emendation (palæographically a slight one) of Pul into Pun (*i.e.* Carthage) is correct. From Carthage to Asia Minor (assuming with Wetzstein that Lud means Lydia) is a natural transition, and Javan and the maritime countries follow then as a matter of course. [My friend, Mr. Sayce, is so impressed with the necessity for bringing these geographical references into a natural order that (in a private communication) he boldly identifies 'Pul' with the 'Apuli' of Central Italy. He remarks, 'I do not admit that "Lud" is a N.-African people in Ezek. xxx. 5. It there means the Lydian soldiers by whose help Psammetichus made Egypt independent of Assyria, and his successors maintained their power. Ludim, Gen. x. 13, is distinguished from Lud (Lydia) in v. 22. These Ludim are the Lydian soldiers by whom the power of the Saitic dynasty was maintained.' Dr. Stade gets rid of these Ludim in Gen. *l.c.* and Jer. xlvi. 9, by emending the word into Lubim 'Libyans.' (*De populo Javan*, Giessen, 1880.)]

INDEX.

I. GENERAL.

ABE

- AREN EZRA, *see* IBN EZRA
 Adonis, myth of, i. 107 ; ii. 114, 125, 300
 Alexander, Dr. J. A., i. 219 *note*² ; ii. 269
 Alphabets, various, used in Hebrew writing, ii. 221
 Amorites, supposed reference to, i. 106 ; ii. 142
 Anath, Semitic goddess, i. 74 *note*¹
 Anemone, etymology of, i. 107
 Angels, belief in guardian, i. 145
 Animals, figures from, i. 179-80
Apologia, Jewish, in II. Isaiah, i. 286 ; ii. 275
 Apulians, supposed reference to, ii. 301
 Aramaic, prevalence of, i. 161, 207
 Arnold, Mr. Matthew, i. 153, 259 *note*⁴ ; ii. 195, 210
 Aroer, ii. 291
 Ashdod, siege of, i. 121
 Asherah and Ashtoreth, worship of, i. 10, 105 ; ii. 292
 Assurbanipal, Assyrian king, i. 211-12, 286 ; ii. 295
 Assyrian, illustrations from, i. 12, 17, 31, 40, 41, 45, 46, 69, 71, *et passim*
 Assyrian kings, their boastfulness, i. 214
 Astronomy, Babylonian, i. 303-5
 Athanasius, St., ii. 297
 Atonement, vicarious, ii. 196-8
- BABYLON, captures of, i. 124, 288, ii. 277
 Babylonians, religious sentiment of, i. 304
 Belshazzar, feast of, i. 126, ii. 277 *note*³
 Beltis, supposed mention of, i. 67 ; ii. 138-9
 Birks, Prof., i. 197, 222 ; ii. 269, 271
 Book of the Dead, quoted, ii. 31
 Boscawen, Mr., i. 230-1, 273 ; ii. 126
 Bradley, Dean, ii. 213
 Bunsen, Baron, ii. 39 *note*

EGY

- CALVIN, ii. 259, 299
 Cambyses, religious policy of, ii. 276
 Captivity, Babylonian, reference to, i. 233-4 ; ii. 296
 Carchemish, site and importance of, i. 70 ; ii. 288 (also Addenda opposite i. 1)
 Chaldæans, origin of, i. 140
 Chateaubriand, on Job, ii. 245
 Cherubim, signification of, i. 37, 40-42, 114, 212 ; ii. 149, 283-6
 China, Jesuit missionaries in, ii. 22
 Conjecture, conditions of critical, in correction of text, ii. 223-4
 Consciousness, belief in double, ii. 131
 Cook, Canon, i. 115-6
 Covenant, religious use of term, i. 268 ; ii. 7, 58, 109
 Cox, Rev. S., ii. 223
 Crane, character of its note, i. 225
 Cyrus, genealogy of, ii. 277
 — religious policy of, i. 299-301 : ii. 274-280
- DARIUS, religious position and policy of, ii. 276, 279
 David, house of, i. 48, 75 ; ii. 286
 Davidson, Dr. S., ii. 174, 244
 Davidson, Prof. A. B., ii. 218
 De Dieu, sketch of, ii. 260
 Deity, belief in manifoldness of, i. 175 ; ii. 294
 Delitzsch, his criticisms of vol. i., ii. 287, 292, 296
 — sketch of, ii. 268
 Delitzsch, Friedr., i. 40-1, 211 ; ii. 136, 288, &c.
 Drechsler, sketch of, ii. 267
 Driver, Rev. S. R., i. 209 ; ii. 151-6, &c.
- EDERSHEIM, Dr., ii. 215 *note*²
 Egypt, Semitic influence on, i. 117
 Egyptian, illustrations from, i. 61, 63,

EGY

- 99, 112-117, 166, 173; ii. 31, 120, *et passim*
 Egyptians, their view of the next world, i. 88 *note*¹; ii. 130-131
 Eunuchs, Israelitish, ii. 63
 Ewald, sketch of, ii. 264-5
 Ezekiel, compared with II. Isaiah, ii. 237-8
- FAMILY-IDEA, the, predominant in Hebrew society, i. 20, 21
 Fasting, history of, ii. 77
 Felix, Minucius, ii. 220
 Forgiveness, doctrine of, i. 158, 189
 Fulfilments, circumstantial, ii. 183, &c.
- GAD, traces of worship of, ii. 116
 Gesenius, sketch of, ii. 263
 Glosses, in Hebrew text, i. 19, 20, 45, 51, 52, 54, 167, 170; ii. 105, 110, 145, 224
 Goldziher, Dr., i. 93; ii. 107
 Grätz, Dr., ii. 142, 144, &c.
 Grotius, sketch of, ii. 259
- HALÉVY, M., on the Cyrus-inscriptions, ii. 278-280
 Hardening, judicial, i. 39; ii. 2
 'Hebrew Migration from Egypt,' quoted, ii. 211 *note*¹
 Heilprin, Mr., i. 132
 Henderson, Dr., ii. 269
 Hengstenberg, sketch of, ii. 266-7
 Hezekiah, is he chargeable with selfishness? i. 236
 — Song of, its relation to Job, i. 222-3
 High places, i. 19, 103, 206
 Hincks, Dr., i. 197
 Hitzig, sketch of, ii. 264
 Hivites, supposed mention of, i. 106; ii. 142
 Hodgkin, Mr., i. 109; ii. 292
 Holiness, conception of, i. 3, 27, 37, 64
- IBN EZRA, sketch of, ii. 256
 Idolatry, i. 17, 19, 71, 105-6
 Immanuel, i. 49-50
 Immortality, i. 148, 227
 Incarnations, kings regarded as divine, i. 89-90; ii. 289
 Isaiah, in the light of history, ii. 165, &c.
 — not arranged chronologically, ii. 167

LAG

- Isaiah, partly made up of small collections of prophecies, ii. 175
 — second part of, its arrangement, ii. 177, &c.
 — two parts of, compared philologically, ii. 230
 — Palestinian references in second part of, ii. 213-4
 — second part of, its few allusions to Babylonian circumstances, ii. 217-8
 — links between two parts of, ii. 231-3
- JASHER, Book of, i. 278
 Javan, ii. 128, 287
 Jehovah, day of, i. 83; ii. 288
 — prophetic interpretation of name, i. 250
 — God of the world, i. 23, 295
 — meaning of his return to Palestine, i. 239
 Jeremiah, a type of 'the Servant,' ii. 26
 Jerome, St., ii. 255
 'Jewish interpretation of prophecy,' the phrase criticised, ii. 257
 Job, date of, ii. 228 *note*¹
 — its affinities with Isaiah, ii. 44, 45, 131, 191 *note*², 228, 244-253
 Joel, date of, ii. 228 *note*¹
 Jonah, a symbol of Israel, ii. 26
 Judaism, is it a proselytising religion? i. 279 *note*¹
 Judges, power of, in Judah, i. 5
 Judgment, doctrine of, i. 10, 83, 141-2
 Justification, meaning of, ii. 27, 52
 Justin Martyr, i. 50; ii. 118, 154
- KAY, Dr., sketch of, ii. 269-270
 Kimchi, David, ii. 257
 Kir, locality of, i. 132
 Kleinert, Dr. Paul, ii. 7, 219
 Klostermann, Dr., ii. 69, 86, 94, 152, 216 *note*¹, 224, 268
 Knobel, sketch of, ii. 267-8
 Koppe, ii. 263
 Koran, referred to, i. 15, 18, 195, 238, 250, 260, 289 *note*²; ii. 75, 117, 122
 Kuenen, Dr., i. 122, 193, 198, 210, 212; ii. 145, 155, 179, 204, 269
 — his Hibbert Lectures, ii. 280, 296
- LAGARDE, Prof. de, i. 66, 67, 76, 106, 298; ii. 126, 142, 154, 201, 223-6, 282, 286

LAN

- Land, Dr. ii. 4, 68
 Land-tenure, Hebrew law of, i. 30
 Lenormant, M., i. 41, 201, 203, ii. 283, 288, &c.
 Light, præ-solar, i. 154
 Lilith, or night-fairy, i. 192
 Lowth, Bishop, sketch of, ii. 261-3
 Lydians, supposed mention of, ii. 127, 301
 Lyra, Nicolas de, ii. 255-6
- MCLENNAN, MR.**, ii. 291
 Magic, i. 16, 21, 47, 58, 303
 Martensen, i. 9
 Martineau, James, ii. 249
 Maurice, F. D., ii. 183
 Medes, use of term, in Isaiah, i. 85
 Merit, doctrine of, ii. 108
 Merodach, Babylonian god, i. 155, 296-7
 Merodach-Baladan, i. 199, 229, 231
 Merx, Dr., ii. 255, 257
 Messiah and Messianic, meaning of terms, ii. 185-6
 M'ni, traces of worship of, ii. 116
 Moabite Stone, referred to, i. 96-7, 103, 206, 295; ii. 142
 Moloch, sacrifices to, i. 177; ii. 69
 Mozley, Dr., i. 225; ii. 252-3, 297
 Musculus, a commentator, ii. 258
 Myrtle, late references to, i. 253; ii. 212
 Mythology, embodied in popular religious phrases, i. 6, 9, 12, 22, 36, 55, 84, 86, 94, 155, 175, 192, 227, 241, 264, 289; ii. 17, 31
- NABONIDUS**, fall of, ii. 277
 Naegelsbach, sketch of, ii. 268
 Names, symbolism of, i. 57, 165
 Nature, regeneration of, i. 18, 77, 169, 183; ii. 118-9
 Nebo, Babylonian god, i. 297
 Neubauer, Dr., i. 54; ii. 160, 248, 257
 Nisroch, obscure name of Assyrian god, i. 219
- OLYMPUS**, Oriental equivalents of Mount, i. 15, 90
 Onias, temple built by, i. 113
 Origen, referred to, ii. 7, 215 *note* 3
 Origenists, doctrine of, on evil spirits, i. 146
 Osiris, supposed mention of, i. 67; ii. 138

SCR

- PARALLEL PASSAGES**, critical study of, ii. 226, &c.
 — argument from, ii. 220
 Pauthier, M., ii. 21, 22
 Payne Smith, Dr., ii. 69, 218, 237, 273
 Pellicanus, a commentator, ii. 258
 Phœnician, illustrations from, i. 92, 103, 106, 138, 151; ii. 68, 145
 Pillars, erection of, to Jehovah, not forbidden, i. 119
 Predestination, a Semitic doctrine, i. 27, 287; ii. 11
 Prophecy, i. 25, 35, 237; ii. 276
 — creative and self-fulfilling, i. 64, 76, 263; ii. 3, 12, 165 *note* 4
 — fictitious Assyrian, i. 286-7
 Prophetic writers, their self-abnegation, ii. 227
 Psalms, Christian element in the, ii. 184, &c.
 — imprecatory, ii. 189
 Punishment, everlasting, doctrine of, ii. 131
 Pusey, Dr., ii. 51 *note* 1, 129, 136, 155, 157
- QUEEN-MOTHER**, rank of, i. 48
- RASHI**, ii. 256
 Rawlinson, Sir Henry, i. 196, 299; ii. 275-6
 Remnant, doctrine of, i. 10; ii. 13
 Renouf, Mr. le Page, i. 116, 210
 Resurrection, doctrines of, i. 454
 Righteousness, meanings of term, in II. Isaiah, i. 261, 289; ii. 1, 8
 Rig-veda, quoted, i. 32
 Rochester, Earl of, ii. 195
 Roman Catholic exegesis, ii. 257
 Row, Prebendary, ii. 99
 Rückert, Frederick, ii. 177
 Rutgers, Dr., i. 194, 267, 269; ii. 4
- SAADYAH**, ii. 39, 255
 Sabbath, history of, ii. 62, 298-9
 Saints and angels, doctrine of, ii. 31, 107, 299
 Salvation, meaning of term, i. 80
 Samaria, second kingdom of, i. 46
 Sargon, his invasion of Judah, i. 68-9, 196, &c.; ii. 169, 171-4
 Sayce, Prof., i. 68, 197, 206-7; ii. 128, 278-9, 301, &c.
 Schrader, Dr., i. 11, 198-203, &c.
 Schultens, Albert, ii. 260
 Scripturists, *see* Soferim

SEN

- Sennacherib, his invasion of Judah, i. 185, 196, &c.; ii. 171
 — his character, i. 200
 — Septuagint, critical value of, ii. 225
 Seraphim, i. 36, 42; ii. 283-6
 'Servant of Jehovah,' special meaning of the phrase, ii. 204-210
 Sheól, i. 31, 88-91, 224; ii. 130-2
 Shiloh, ii. 198, &c.
 Sibylline oracles, i. 75; ii. 298
 Siloam, inscription of, i. 72 *note*
 Sinim, land of, ii. 20-23
 Smerdis, pseudo-, ii. 279
 Smith, Prof. Robertson, i. 83; ii. 110, 115, 122, 141, 146, 287-8, 291-7
 Soferim, i. 20; ii. 214-7
 Souls, primitive theory concerning, ii. 130
 Spain, Arab poets in, ii. 212
 Spirit, doctrine of the, ii. 7, 104, 105
 Stanley, Dean, i. 29; ii. 182
 Stars, once regarded as animated, i. 12
 Steinthal, Dr., ii. 31 *note*²
 Stier, sketch of, ii. 267
 Stones, sacred, i. 163; ii. 70
 Strachey, Sir E., i. 122, 160, 232-4, 250; ii. 271-2
 Strack, Dr. H. L., ii. 147, 226, 293, 298-9
 Strauss, D. F., ii. 185, 204
 Stuart, Dr. Moody, ii. 215, 231
 Style, argument from diversity of, ii. 218-9
 Swift, character of its note, i. 225
 Swine, flesh of, why forbidden, ii. 114
 Sword, mystic Divine, i. 155, 190; ii. 294
- TABERNACLES (or BOOTHS), Feast of, i. 176; ii. 295
 Tattooing, supposed allusion to, i. 279

JOB

- Tertullian, ii. 220
 Text, relatively weak authority of Hebrew, ii. 222-3
 Thothmes III., his conquests in Palestine, i. 99
 Tiele, Prof., i. 37, 41, 106, 137
 Tirhakah, is the name correct? i. 109
 Toilette, Hebrew ladies', i. 23
 Tomkins, Rev. H. G., ii. 148, 284-6, 296
 Torments, nature of future, ii. 131-2
 Totem-worship, relics of Semitic, ii. 121-2, 291
 Transcription, sources of error in, ii. 222
 Trent, Council of, ii. 258-9
 Types, ii. 183
- UNION, MYSTIC, i. 8, 281, 292; ii. 297
- VITRINGA, sketch of, ii. 260-1
 Vogüe, M. de, ii. 221
- WELLHAUSEN, DR., i. 166; ii. 146, 149, 172, 202, 298, &c.
 Williams, Dr. Rowland, i. 175, 233
 Wines, Mesopotamian, ii. 212 *note*¹
 Woman, honour paid to, in Messianic descriptions, i. 270 (col. i. top)
 Wordsworth, Rev. J., ii. 149
- ZECHARIAH, date of latter part of, ii. 228 *note*¹, 230 *note*²
 Zinzendorf, Count, ii. 208 *note*¹
 Zoroastrianism, its relation to Judaism, i. 76, 148, 154, 256, 289; ii. 118, 119, 124, 280

II. PASSAGES, CHIEFLY BIBLICAL, ILLUSTRATED.

*. The first numerals refer to the chapter and verse; the second to the volume and page.

- Gen. i. 2, i. 143
 — ix. 13, ii. 295
 — xlix. 10, ii. 198-203
 Ex. vi. 24, 25, ii. 138
 — xxxiii. 14, ii. 105
 Deut. xvi. 21, 22, i. 119
 Judg. x. 16, ii. 103
 1 Sam. xiv. 47, ii. 57
 — xxviii. 14, i. 88
 1 Kings ix. (Jehu), 232

- 1 Kings ix. 13, i. 17
 — xviii. 5, i. 17
 2 Kings iii. 25, i. 96
 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23, i. 300
 Ezra x. 19, ii. 298
 Neh. viii. 17, ii. 295
 Job xi. 6, ii. 295
 — xi. 7, 8, i. 47
 — xvi. 17, ii. 49
 — xvii. 16, ii. 131

JOB

- Job xix. 25, ii. 151
 — xxvi. 12, 13, i. 155
 — xxvii. 18, ii. 298
 — xxxviii. 5, i. 242
 — xxxviii. 6, i. 163
 Psalm ii., ii. 186-7
 — xvii. 15, i. 6
 — xviii. ii. 188
 — xviii. 10, i. 40
 — xviii. 36, ii. 73
 — xviii. 50, ii. 186
 — xxii., ii. 14, 15, 184 *note* ², 190-1
 — xxii. 16, ii. 185
 — xxii. 26, 29, i. 147
 — xxxi. (authorship), ii. 180 *note* ²
 — xxxiv., ii. 185 *note* ¹
 — xxxv., ii. 189-90
 — xlv. 6, i. 63 *note* ¹
 — xlv.-xlviii. (Isaianic affinities of), ii. 230
 — xlv. 4, i. 54, 188
 — xlviii. ii. 190
 — xlviii. 13, i. 188
 — li. 14, ii. 75
 — lv. 2, 189-90
 — lxi., lxiii. (authorship of), i. 253 *note* ¹
 — lxxii., ii. 187
 — lxxviii. 25, i. 72
 — lxxxii. i. 145
 — lxxxiii. 8 (9), i. 120
 — lxxxvii., ii. 188
 — lxxxix., ii. 60
 — lxxxix. 10, ii. 31
 — lxxxix. 27, ii. 40
 — xci. 9, i. 257
 — cii., ii. 190
 — cii. 28, i. 250
 — cvii. 3, ii. 16, 154
 — cx. 1, i. 63, ii. 187
 — cxlvii. 4, 5, i. 247
 Prov. ix. 10, i. 246
 Eccles. xii. 5, i. 135
 Jer. ii. 31, i. 294
 — vi. 13, ii. 74
 — ix. 2, ii. 180
 — xv. 1, ii. 197
 — xxi. 11, 12, i. 48
 — xxvi. 21, i. 21

SOT

- Jer. xlviii. 12, 13, i. 103
 — xlviii. 32, 33, i. 102
 Lam. v. 22, ii. 55
 Ezek. i. 10, i. 41
 — vi. 2, 3, ii. 212
 — viii. 10, 11, ii. 121
 — x. 14, i. 41
 — xxviii. 13-16, i. 40
 — xxx. 17, i. 118
 — xxxii. 27, i. 88
 — xxxiii. 10, ii. 110
 — xxxiii. 24, ii. 28-9
 — xxxvii. 1-10, i. 153-4
 — xl. 39, ii. 298
 Dan. iv. 13, ii. 97
 — vii. 13, ii. 187
 Hos. vi. 2, i. 153-4
 Joel iii. 14, i. 131
 Jonah iv. 11, i. 158
 Mic. i. 5, ii. 295
 — iv. 1, 4, i. 14
 — iv. 5, ii. 4
 — iv. 10, i. 234, ii. 296
 Zech. ix. 9, ii. 209 *note* ¹
 — x. 11, i. 74
 — xiii. 7, ii. 296
 Mal. i. 11, i. 119, 256
 — iii. 1, i. 261
 Matt. viii. 11, i. 147
 — xxvi. 13, ii. 64
 Mark ii. 10, 11, i. 189
 Luke xiii. 33, i. 131
 — xvi. 24, ii. 28
 John xviii. 5, 6, i. 250
 — xviii. 37, ii. 60
 Acts viii. 27, ii. 63 *note* ¹
 Rom. xv. 16, ii. 128
 1 Cor. xiv. 25, ii. 297
 Gal. vi. 17, i. 279
 Phil. iv. 7, i. 150
 1 Tim. iv. 10, i. 80
 2 Tim. i. 10, i. 223
 Heb. iv. 12, ii. 12
 — xi. 12, ii. 28
 Rev. i. 5, ii. 60
 — iv. 3, ii. 295
 — vi. 16, ii. 34
 — xxi. 10, i. 241

APOCRYPHA, ETC.

- 1 Macc. x. 51-66, i. 113
 Sirach xxxviii. 1, ii. 57
 — xxxix. 4, ii. 248
 Wisd. Sol. ii. 12-31, ii. 297
 — xi. 20, i. 243
 Baruch iv., ii. 17

- Baruch vi. 8, i. 283
 Enoch v. 9, ii. 119
 Pirke Abthoth iii. 16, i. 144 (twice)
 — iv. 16, i. 148
 Sota ix. 14, ii. 95

III. ILLUSTRATIONS FROM WESTERN LITERATURE.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Burns, i. 35 | Macaulay, i. 155 |
| Calderon, ii. 205 | Marlowe, i. 12 |
| Dante, i. 24, 41, 72, 148, 242, 260; ii. 72, 100, 106, 205, 247 | Milton, i. 16, 61, 223, 242, 288 |
| Dryden, i. 256 | Pascal, i. 260 |
| Emerson, i. 266 | Plato, i. 107; ii. 182 |
| Goethe, i. 35, 53, 274; ii. 247-8 | Rovigo, duc de, ii. 293 |
| Hawthorne, ii. 215 | Seneca, ii. 182, 220 |
| Heine, ii. 63 | Shakspeare, i. 18; ii. 17, 158, 220 |
| Homer, i. 34, 144, 178-9, 302 | Spenser, i. 8 |
| Horace, ii. 149 | Thucydides, i. 251 |
| Juvenal, i. 61, 214 | Virgil, i. 54, 175, 188; ii. 62, 83 |
| Leopardi, ii. 249 | Wordsworth, i. 12, 55 |
| | Young, i. 250 |

IV. ETYMOLOGIES, ETC. (*Incomplete.*)

- | | |
|--|---|
| Ariel, i. 166; ii. 146 | Rab-shakeh, i. 205, ii. 296 |
| Asnapper, ii. 136 | Rahab, i. 155; ii. 31 |
| Caleb, ii. 122 | Sabáoth, i. 5, 11-13; ii. 281 |
| Chisleu, ii. 288 | Sargon, i. 121 |
| Cyrus, i. 285-6 | Sennacherib, i. 204 |
| Esar-haddon, i. 219 | Shaddai, i. 83; ii. 141 |
| Jeshurun, i. 278 | Tartan, i. 121, and Addenda in vol. ii. |
| Rab-saris, i. 205, and Addenda in vol. ii. | Topheth, ii. 148 |

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| אחיים ii. 289 | עֶשֶׂר ii. 158 |
| אֵיִם ii. 151, 288 | קָפָד ii. 289 |
| בְּרִית i. 262 <i>note</i> 1 | רָאִם i. 191 |
| דֹּר ii. 157 | שֶׁרֶפִים ii. 284 |
| הַזָּה ii. 155-6 | שׁוֹב שְׁבוֹת ii. 155 |
| זְבוּל ii. 160-1 | שָׁחַר ii. 153 |
| קָפָד ii. 146 | תּוֹרָה i. 5 |
| קְרוֹב i. 41 | <i>Nifal tolerativum</i> , ii. 156 |
| קִשְׁפֹּט i. 260 | Suffix <i>é</i> or <i>ém</i> 3 s. m., ii. 137, 157 |
| קָגֶן i. 256; ii. 144-5 | Váv of association, ii. 134-6 |
| עֶלְמָה i. 49; ii. 136, 181 | |

THE END.