# SUPPLEMENTS

## TO

# VETUS TESTAMENTUM

EDITED BY

THE BOARD OF THE QUARTERLY

G. W. ANDERSON - P. A. H. DE BOER - G. R. CASTELLINO
HENRY CAZELLES - E. HAMMERSHAIMB - H. G. MAY
W. ZIMMERLI

VOLUME XIV

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1967

# STUDIES ON THE SECOND PART
# OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

## THE SO-CALLED "SERVANT OF THE LORD"
## AND "SUFFERING SERVANT"
## IN SECOND ISAIAH

BY

### HARRY M. ORLINSKY

## ISAIAH 40-66
## A STUDY OF THE TEACHING OF THE
## SECOND ISAIAH AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

BY

### NORMAN H. SNAITH

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

# ISAIAH 40-66
## A STUDY OF THE TEACHING OF THE SECOND ISAIAH AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

BY

## NORMAN H. SNAITH

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

These studies of the last twenty-seven chapters of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah are lectures delivered as Speaker's Lecturer in Biblical Studies in the University of Oxford in the year 1961/2. They consist of an examination of the teaching of the Second Isaiah and of the results of his teaching. The Second Isaiah had what is known in these days as 'a one track mind.' He was the Prophet of the Return. He was an intense nationalist, and he looked forward to a resurrection to abounding prosperity and world dominion for the exiles in Babylonia. Central in his thought was the conception of the Servant of the LORD. This was primarily those who went into exile with the young king Jehoiachin in 597 B.C., but the concept broadens to include all the Babylonian exiles. One of the marked features of his presentation of the Servant is the sudden surprise of the Servant's triumph. The Servant is a hidden Servant.

There are two applications of this ideal of the Hidden Suffering-but-triumphant Servant of the LORD. One is that by Jesus of Nazareth. I believe that Jesus deliberately modelled His life on the Servant of the LORD. He saw Himself as the Servant: not the Suffering Servant, but the Servant who triumphed out of his undeserved sufferings. Not only is this conscious following of the pattern of the Servant concerned with His passion and death and resurrection, but with His whole ministry. This accounts for the so-called Messianic secret, the way in which He told men 'not to make him known' and the remarkable silences at the trials. In our view, it also explains the nationalistic aspect of the earlier part of the Ministry.

The second application is the exclusive, nationalistic attitude of the returned exiles, and all the unease and ultimate strife between the Israel which returned from exile and the Israel which never left Palestine. This culminates in a high priest murdering his brother in the very Temple itself and the expulsion of all who could not prove their descent from the returned exiles. Here was the establishment by Ezra of post-exilic Judaism.

I have to thank the electors for the honour they have done me in putting my name forward as Speaker's Lecturer, and also Professor

H. H. Rowley for his comments and criticisms of these studies when in manuscript form. Needless to say, I am wholly responsible for the conclusions reached, especially when they vary from those commonly accepted.

Thetford,                                            Norman  H.  Snaith
February 1965.

# THE SECOND ISAIAH

## CHAPTER ONE

## ISAIAH 40-55 AND 60-62

When we say 'The Second Isaiah', do we mean the author of chapters 40-55 only? Or do we include any or all of chapters 56-66?

There has actually been much greater division of opinion than is generally realised concerning the authorship of the twenty-seven chapters 40-66. CHEYNE [1]) gives long lists of examples both in syntax and in vocabulary to show that there are two sections in 'The Book of the Prophet Isaiah', one of which is chapters 1-39 and the other chapters 40-66. The inference to be drawn from these lists is that chapters 40-66 are the work of one author. There had been various other earlier suggestions of composite authorship, culminating in that of DUHM,[2]) who held that chapters 40-55 consist of the work of an unknown prophet in Babylonia, the Second Isaiah (Deutero-Isaiah). The majority of modern scholars hold to this view. Indeed this view is the modern orthodoxy.

It is also generally agreed that chapters 40-48 were written prior to the fall of Babylon in 538 B.C., but not long before. This is on the basis of such assumptions as that 46: 1 f. refer to orders given by Nabonidus for the evacuation to a place of safety of the idol-gods of Babylon, the fall of the city being virtually imminent. Further, if, as most agree, the references to Cyrus in 44: 28 and 45: 1 are genuine and not interpolations, then chapters 40-48 will be later than (say) 546 B.C., the date of Cyrus's capture of Sardis. These two datings appear to be perfectly sound.

Chapters 40-48 and 49-55 are, then, from the same source, but they have strong affinities with chapters 60-62. These three chapters stand out markedly from the remainder of chapters 56-66. Indeed, we are of the opinion that they also are from the same source; they come from the hand of the author of chapters 40-55, the Second Isaiah.

---

[1]) *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 1895.
[2]) *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1892.

SKINNER [1]) says: 'The main features can be paralleled from chapters
49-55, and the strong resemblance to 49: 14 ff.; 51: 7 ff.; 54 would
lead naturally to its being assigned to the same author.' He is referring
to chapter 60. He continues: 'Had the chapter occupied a different
position doubt on this point would hardly arise; it could be accepted
without difficulty as a prophecy of return from exile, written in
Babylon.' He thus assumes that chapter 60 is early post-exilic. This is
partly, at least, because it follows a series of gloomy chapters such as
can scarcely be from the hand of a jubilant Babylonian Isaiah who is
full of hope for the future. But the argument is based on the assump-
tion that chapters 40-55 form one editorial whole, and that chapters
56-66 form another, but distinct, editorial whole. If, on the other hand,
we assume that chapters 40-66 form an editorial whole, then there is
no *a priori* reason why there should not be material in chapters 56-66
which are from the hand of the author of chapters 40-55. It is the
situation of chapters 56-59 that causes the difficulty. These are cer-
tainly of different origin from what precedes them and equally from
what follows them. The attitude of the writer is different, and so is the
content; so, indeed are the whole background and the attendant cir-
cumstances.

It is true that the return of exiles in 60: 4, 9 apparently refers to
Jews who are dispersed among the Gentiles generally. It is also true
that the ingathering of these dispersed Jews, the Diaspora, was an
object of prophetic concern and anticipation in the years following the
reestablishment of the Jewish community in Palestine in the late sixth
century B.C. But these are no reasons for assuming that 60: 4, 9 are
therefore of later date than chapters 40-55. Compare 43: 5 f.: 'I will
bring thy seed from the east, and gather them from the west; I will
say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my
sons from far, and my daughters from the end of the earth'. Or again,
see 41: 9: 'Thou (Israel) whom I have taken hold of from the ends of
the earth, and called thee from the corners thereof.' To these we would
add 49: 6, which we translate: 'I will also make thee a light of Gentiles,
that my salvation may be to the end of the earth'.[2]) C. C. TORREY [3])
claimed that 'chapters 34-66. . .(with the exception of 36-39, which

---

[1]) *Isaiah*, vol. ii, Cambridge Bible (revised 1917), p. 195.
[2]) See p. 155. This translation entails no alteration of the text. It is merely more
accurate. I take 'light of Gentiles' (the 'to' has been inserted by the translators)
to mean 'a world-wide light' to guide every far-away Israelite home.
[3]) *The Second Isaiah*, 1928, p. 53.

have a different origin) form a homogeneous group and are the work of a single hand'. For a man who did not accept the historicity of any exile in Babylonia, it is easy to see that some such statement is inevitable. There are certainly enough similarities between chapters 40-55 and parts of chapters 56-66 to warrant the assumption of a common authorship. TORREY was, we hold, justified so far as chapters 60-62 are concerned, however wide of the mark he may have been in other respects. There are many passages in 40-55 and 60-62 which speak of the gathering of the outcasts from far way. So much is this the case, that either TORREY is right and they all belong to a later date and all refer to the Diaspora, or TORREY is wholly wrong and they all belong to the closing years of the Babylonian exile. What certainly seems to be the case is that, so far as this matter of outcasts returning is concerned, 40-55 and 60-62 go together. Something of this was realised by STADE [1]) when he said that chapters 59 and 63-66 were by a writer later than the author of chapters 40-55, and by CORNILL [2]) who regarded chapters 40-62 as the work of the Second Isaiah, adding that chapters 40-48 were written by him in Babylonia.

The claim that chapters 40-55 and 60-62 have a common authorship and origin is based on the following considerations: similarities in style, vocabulary, a common theme of deliverance, references to a return to Jerusalem.

60: 4.　　Compare 49: 18a, of which it is an exact repetition: 'Lift up thine eyes round about, and see: they all gather themselves together, they come to thee.' The argument is sometimes advanced that 60: 4 must be either a gloss or the work of a copyist or a devoted pupil. The argument is far from being as forceful in the case of the Second Isaiah as it might be in the case of another author. There is no rule, either in law or in custom, against any author, modern or ancient, repeating on occasion his own phrases and illustrations. All of them can, and many of them do, both in written and even more in spoken words. But the Second Isaiah (40-55) has 'a few favourite phrases' and he 'constantly reverts to a few fixed themes.' [3]) Of these recurrent themes

---

[1]) *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1887, S. 70n.

[2]) *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1891, SS. 151 f.

[3]) SKINNER, *op. cit.*, p. xxii.

'children from afar' and references to 'the isles' are perhaps the most marked, whilst references to the return to Jerusalem are frequent. In the case of this particular author, therefore, repetitions tend to confirm authorship rather than suggest copyists. The remainder of 60: 4 has close affinities in referring to the return with other passages within chapters 40-55. Compare 'thy sons shall come from afar' (60: 4) with 'bring my sons from afar' (43: 6); also 'and thy daughters shall be nursed at the side' (60: 4) with 'and they shall bring their sons in their bosom, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers' (49: 22 f.).

60: 9.    'for the isles shall wait for me' לי איים יקוו: compare 51: 5 'for me the isles shall wait' אלי איים יקוו.

60: 9.    The verse ends with 'and for the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee,' which is exactly the end of 55: 5. Such repetitive conclusions are taken elsewhere (e.g. the Holiness Code) as proof of a common origin. Surely the same argument applies to this author. Also the root פאר (glorify) is characteristic of the Second Isaiah; 44: 23; 49: 3; 55: 5 and 60: 7; 60: 9 (here); 60: 13; 60: 21; 61: 3, eight times altogether against five elsewhere.

60: 10.    'for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favour have I had mercy upon thee.' Compare 54: 7: 'for a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee.'

60: 13.    'the fir tree, the plane tree (תדהר, RV 'pine') and the cypress (תאשור, RV 'box') together,' which is found exactly in 41: 19. These descriptions of a bountiful nature are influenced by the tree-gardens (heb. *pardes*, Zend. *pairidaêʒa*) of the Persian kings. Cf. Neh. 2: 8; Cant. 4: 13; Ec. 2: 5.

60: 15.    'forsaken and hated.' See similar ideas in 49:14; 49: 21; 54: 6; 54: 11. The words for the most part are different, but the ideas are the same.

60: 16.    'suck the milk of the nations, and shall suck the breast of kings.' Cf. similar ideas in 49: 23.

60: 16.    'and that thou shalt know that I the LORD am thy saviour,

and thy redeemer the Mighty One of Jacob,' which is a near repetition of 49: 26.

61: 1.   'the spirit of the LORD God is upon me.' Cf. 42: 1: I have put my spirit upon him.' See also 48: 16.

61: 1.   Note the use of the *pi'el* of the root בשׂר, used of announcing the glad tidings of release and restoration: 40: 9; 52: 7.

61: 1.   The release from exile is described under the figure of the release of prisoners from darkness and dungeons; cf. 42: 7 and 49: 9. Compare also Ps. 107: 10-14. We prefer the margins of RV and RSV: 'opening of eyes to them that are bound.' The root פקח in biblical Hebrew is confined to the opening of eyes and ears, and it is not the word for 'opening of prison' (AV, RV, RSV). In modern Hebrew the root means 'be wide awake, be smart.' Further, the association of blindness and darkness is found in 49: 9, and the 'blind eyes' of 42: 7 are those of prisoners in dungeons and those that sit in the darkness of prison-houses. See also Ps. 107: 10.

61: 2.   'the acceptable year.' Compare 49: 8 'an acceptable time' רצון. See also 40: 2: 'her punishment has been accepted' (the verb is the root רצה: RV has 'her iniquity is pardoned').

61: 3.   'a failing spirit' (RV 'a spirit of heaviness). The root is כהה, 42: 3.

61: 4.   building up the old wastes, etc.; cf. 49: 8; also 58: 12; 60: 10.

61: 6.   'the wealth of the nations.' The phrase itself is found in 60: 5 and 6. Note also the characteristic omission of the definite article in chapters 60-62, itself a feature of chapters 40-55. In the main, the article occurs in the Hebrew in these chapters only when it can be inserted without inserting a consonant, i.e. with the inseparable particles. We very rarely have the consonant *he*.

61: 7.   'double' משׁנה, occurring twice. Compare 40: 2, where כפלים is used. Both words mean 'twice as much,' Zech. 9: 12; Job 42: 10.

61: 8.   'an everlasting covenant' ברית עולם with the verb כרת and the preposition ל. Compare 55: 3. The phrase and the idea become increasingly common in the P-tradition.

61: 11.     The metaphor of seed sown and springing up is found in
            42: 9; 43: 19 and especially 55: 10.

62: 4.      The simile of the forsaken and deserted שְׁמָמָה (RV 'De-
            solate') is found in 54: 1. See also 49: 14 ff; 54: 4 f.
            CHEYNE regarded 61: 1 ff.; 62: 1 ff.; 62: 6 ff. as either
            soliloquies of the Servant, or that ideal as reflected in the
            mind of a later disciple.

62: 8.      'the LORD hath sworn by his right hand.' The idea of God
            swearing a binding oath, which must necessarily be 'by
            Himself,' is found in 45: 23; 54: 9. Compare the frequent
            occurrence in Deuteronomy, much of which comes from
            substantially the same time and venue as chapters 40-55,
            60-62. The idea of 'the right hand of the LORD' as the
            instrument by which He delivers Israel is found in Exod.
            15, some Psalms, Isa. 41: 10 and here. The similar phrase
            'the arm of the LORD' belongs in the main to Deuterono-
            my, Jeremiah, some Psalms, and the Second Isaiah:
            51: 9; 52: 10; 53: 1 and here. For the picture of the shep-
            herd gathering the lambs, see 40: 11.

62: 9.      'in my holy courts' קָדְשִׁי (RV, 'courts of my sanctuary').
            It is not necessary to assume that this phrase as used here
            involves the temple already having been rebuilt. There are
            many references to the gates and walls of Jerusalem which
            must belong to the period between the destruction of the
            Temple and city and the time before Nehemiah managed
            to rebuild the walls and set up the gates once more. Nor
            need the writer have necessarily been domiciled in Palestine,
            though this may possibly have been so. The reference to
            firstfruits is plain, and it is plain also that the writer has
            in mind the Deuteronomic rule that the firstfruits must be
            eaten at Jerusalem, Dt. 12: 17 f.; 14: 23 f.; 16: 9-16. But
            these verses refer to the future. The reference in v. 8 to the
            enemies of Israel and foreigners eating and drinking
            Israel's corn and wine does not of necessity refer to de-
            predations which took place after the return, those which
            Nehemiah sought to stop by rebuilding the walls. Such
            depredations could belong to any period of Judaean
            weakness and foreign domination, but especially to the
            years following 586 B.C., when there had been no return
            from Babylon of any kind.

62: 10-12.  Those who think of these chapters as belonging to the period following the Return from Babylonia, find themselves in difficulty here. They have to make these verses refer either to Jews still in Babylon or to the complete ingathering of the Diaspora at some distant date. Much is made of the lack of mention of the desert; but why must any writer mention everything every time? But the desert is not absent to the extent to which some allege. Compare v. 10 'prepare the way of the people' with 40: 3 where the desert is actually mentioned. See also the common use of the word מסלה (highway) in v. 10 and in 40: 3. If the desert had been actually, instead of virtually mentioned in 62: 10, the argument would then have been that it was a sure sign of a copyist. Note also the characteristic repetition of the opening word עברו (pass through), a well-known feature of the style of the Second Isaiah: 40: 1; 51: 9; 51: 17; 52: 11 and 'I even I', 43: 11; 43: 25; (48: 11); 48: 15; 51: 12.

62: 10.    'cast up, cast up' סלו סלו is another characteristic repetition, as in the previous line. This 'throwing up' and 'gathering the stones' is an aditional detail in the picture of building a raised highway מסלה across the desert.

62: 10.  ·   The lifting up of an ensign to אל the peoples (note the plural: it means the Gentiles) is found also in 49:22. The meaning is not universalist either there or here; see p. 159.

62: 11.    'proclaim', using the *hiph'il* of שמע; 45: 21; 43: 12; 48: 2; 44: 8; 48: 5; 48: 6; 41: 26; 52: 7; 42: 9; 42: 2; 43: 9. There are 29 cases in all of this use of this form of the verb, and 12 of them are in chapters 40-55 and 60-62.

62: 11.    'unto the end of the earth' קצה הארץ. Compare 48: 20: 49: 6; 42: 10; 43: 6.

62: 11.    'behold, his reward is with him, and his recompense before him', which is exactly 40: 10.

62: 12.    Once more we have the theme of the redeemed, no longer forsaken.

We see therefore that there are many repetitions, near-repetitions and similarites of style and ideas in chapters 40-55 and 60-62. We find occasional reproductions of actual phrases and on occasion the repeti-

tion of a whole line. ften Othere is a repetition of words combined
with other words and phrases. Sometimes the same theme is expressed
in a closely allied but different way. We judge that all this is precisely
the same mixture, here in chapters 60-62, of repetition, near-repetition
and non-repetition, exact phrases and near-exact phrases, that we meet
with in chapters 40-55, the kind of thing we would expect to find in
anything which the writer of chapters 40-55 wrote. Our conclusion,
therefore, is that we can safely include chapters 60-62 in the writings
of the Second Isaiah.

Most scholars of modern times are of the opinion that chapters
40-48 as a whole are earlier than chapters 49-55, the first nine chapters
belonging to the period between 546 B.C. and 539 B.C., and the rest
after 539 B.C. The idea of chapters 40-55 being a series of detached,
separate poems is not incompatible with this.[1]) The idea of detached
pieces seems to be sound, but at the same time there are three distinct
sections, 40-48, 49-55 and 60-62. These three sections come from three
different periods of the unknown prophet's life and activity. Chapters
40-48 belong to the period when the hope of rescue from exile appears
after the first successes of Cyrus, especially with his capture of Sardis
in 546 B.C. Chapters 49-55 belong to the period immediately following
the fall of Babylon when the release became very much more of a
probability, even approaching a certainty. Chapters 60-62 belong to
the time of waiting after the fall of Babylon, and probably towards
the end of that waiting time. After all, no one would suppose that
Babylon fell one night and that the exiles set out for Palestine early the
next morning. There must have been a measurable time between the
fall of Babylon and the movement of Jews towards Palestine, whether
under Sheshbazzar or another. The note of triumph appears inter-
mittently in the first group; it is much more pronounced in the
second group; it is positively rampant in the third group. The style
is substantially the same throughout all the nineteen chapters, except
that the ecstatic, exuberant elements are heightened in chapters 60-62.
The sense of release and future triumph becomes more pronounced
and imminent from section to section.

---

[1]) C. R. NORTH, *The Second Isaiah* (1964), pp. 4-12. For a discussion of 40-55 as
a series of separate poems, see pp. 166 f.

# THE PROPHET OF THE RETURN

The author of chapters 40-55 and 60-62, the Second Isaiah, is generally recognised as being the Prophet of the Return, that is, of the return of the exiles from Babylonia to Jerusalem. Most scholars, however, go much farther than this and they find the climax of his message in the ideal of the Servant of the LORD, usually with expiatory and intercessory functions, and in universalism, by which is meant a supra-nationalist appeal, that salvation is not for the Jews only, but for all nations on earth. Such conclusions we believe to be wrong. The Return is not merely one of the themes of these sixteen (eighteen) chapters, to be outshone by world-wide humanitarian ideals. It is the prophet's dominant theme. It is true that the prophet invests this return with idealist splendour, and it is also true that the ideal of the Servant is involved in it, but basically the Return is this prophet's ONE theme, and all else is subservient to it.

Many writers regard the idea and theme of the Servant of the LORD as being the great and outstanding contribution of these chapters, whether the conception be thought to be that of the Second Isaiah himself or that of another, whether predecessor or successor.[1] For many, the very mention of the Second Isaiah sets them thinking forthwith of the Servant. Or if they think also of the Return, the thought-sequence is Prophet-Return-Servant. This is wrong: it should be Prophet-Servant-Return. The climax for him was the Return. The emphasis on the idea of the Servant as the climax of the prophet's thinking appears to be due mostly to Christian interpretations of Isaiah 53 as a preview of the Passion and Death of Christ. We hold that everything in these chapters is definitely subservient to the Return from Babylon and the Restoration of the nation. There is another thought-sequence, found more often among modern Jews but something of it also among modern Christians: Prophet-Monotheism-Humanitarianism ($s^e\underline{d}\bar{a}\underline{k}\hat{o}t$), as forming the basis of a world culture and religion. We hold this also to be wrong. The prophet certainly is a monotheist, and in him also monotheism becomes for the first

---

[1] Some scholars regard the so-called Servant Songs as interpolations into the 'main body' of the work.

time clear and definite and unadulterated. But, important as this contribution undoubtedly is, it is secondary. The one theme is the Return, and all else is brought in by means of emphasising and demonstrating the certainty of this.

The difference between this point of view and the usual universalist-humanitarian-expiatory point of view can be shown in the translation of Isaiah 53. Compare the translation usually offered (EVV and elsewhere) with the following translation of v. 12:

> Therefore I-will-give-him-a-share among-the-great-ones,
> And-with-the-strong-ones he-shall-share the-spoil;
> In-return-for being-his-stripped-naked to-death,
> and-he-was-numbered with-the-rebels.
> For-it-was-he that-bore the-punishment-of-the-great-ones,
> And-with-reference-to-the-rebels it-was-caused-to-light (on him).

## *Notes on Isaiah* 53: 12.

רבים can mean either 'the many' or 'the great.' The verse consists of three synthetic couplets, and עצומים in the other half of this couplet certainly means 'the strong ones.' The whole point of the chapter is that the apparently weak and despised slave will in the end share the spoils of victory with the great and the strong.

הערה is the *hiph'il* of ערה (be naked, bare), and the construction is impersonal, cf. English 'one', French *on*, German *man*. Similarly for יפגיע at the end of the verse. For 'his (or 'his life': נפש with suffix) being stripped bare, poured out' as meaning 'death,' see Ps. 141: 8. But here the picture may even be that of the dead of the defeated being stripped bare as they lay on the battlefield.

פשעים definitely does not mean 'transgressors.' The word means 'rebels.' It is the word characteristically used by the prophets of sinners as rebels against God. It is part of their general attitude whereby sin is not a transgression of the law so much as a rebellion against God. Further, the noun פשע represents sin in its most serious aspect: Job 34: 37, 'he addeth rebellion פשע to his sin חטאת.'

והוא is emphatic: 'for it was he who': cf. v. 5. This emphatic use of the copula with a preposition or a noun is frequent in this chapter, because the author is concerned with the amazing contrast between the former and the latter state of the Servant, and his wholly unexpected victory. The point is that it was he who met with disaster and it was undeserved. The punishment which he suffered was that which ought to have fallen on the guilty rebels. It was caused to light on him instead: cf. v. 6 where this same *hiph'il* of פגע is used. This יפגיע is usually interpreted to mean 'interceded for,' but this is reading into the verb a different meaning from that in v. 6. We find here no

thought of 'interceding for' the rebels, and no vicarious suffering in the sense that the Servant suffered in order to save the rebels. The writer is stating the plain fact that the Servant did not deserve the suffering and disaster, and because he did not deserve it, it must necessarily be the case that he will prosper and triumph. The writer is not interested in the fate of the Gentile rebels, but he is convinced that the law of rewards and retribution still holds. The Servant, so to speak, got in the way of the proper retribution which was properly falling upon the guilty rebels. It was not in accordance with the proper ordering of things, and when things are worked out fully the triumph of the Servant must come to pass.

Many writers have emphasised the prophet's insistence on the uniqueness of the God of Israel, and his strong emphasis on a true monotheism.[1]) As in the case of the Servant, this theme is certainly an important element in what the prophet has to say. Also, in both cases his words have borne a greater and a richer fruit than he could possibly have expected. It is also clear that here at last the monotheism of Israel is stated firmly and plainly. Nevertheless, this theme also is subservient to the declaration of the coming Return. To put all this another way. The prophet did not set out to state his doctrine of the Servant, nor did he set out to write a treatise on monotheism. He had neither subject on his list of primary objectives. He had but one theme on this list: the Return. His task was to convince the Judean exiles that the return was certain and that it was increasingly imminent. He had to open their blind eyes and make them see this. The prophet's insistence on the uniqueness of the God of Israel is his main confidence in the Return. This is why he emphasises God's incomparable majesty and power, and His effectiveness against the ineptitude of the idols of Babylon. But the Return is not proof of the unique power and might of God. Rather, the unique power and might of the ONE GOD is the guarantee of the Return. The prophet begins with the Return; he ends with it; he deals with it all the time in between. Everything in the nineteen chapters has to do with it, and everything is subordinate to it. This is his theme: the Return from the Babylonian exile, involving the resurrection as from the dead of the old Israel, and the resurgence as from a new birth of a new Israel.

Not only does the prophet speak of the Return, but he is full of immediate instancy. He is vigorous, he is urgent; he cannot

---

[1]) For an essay on the existence and development of monotheism in early times, see 'The Advent of Monotheism in Israel', *The Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society*, vol. V, pp. 100-113.

wait. It is true that the prophets in general are speaking on the eve
of great events. Indeed, it is usually a time of crisis [1]) that stings them
into speech and action, and imbues them with a zeal and urgency that
will not be denied. Their words which have come down to us have
something to say in a special and divine way for men of every age and
for us now, but their primary intention was to speak to the people of
their own times. Perhaps this was their only intention; indeed, this is
more likely than not. But they were speaking greater truths than they
knew. However this may be, the prophets, without exception, were
urgent in their message. If one is to write an account of the message
of any prophet, the first heading should be 'The Time is at Hand.'
This sense of immediacy is perhaps most apparent in the Second
Isaiah. He is essentially the prophet in a hurry. With him, as with the
writers of the apocalypses, it is a case of 'immediately, if not sooner.'

The literary style of the Second Isaiah is one of hurrying, of rushing
tumultuously on. This atmosphere of hurry is enhanced by the
frequent use of the 3: 2 metre which he uses, with the pattern $a\ b\ c$ :
$b'c'$ and the alternative $a\ b\ c$: $c'b'$. For example:

> Bring my-sons from-afar
> and-my-daughters from-the-end-of-the earth. 43: 6.

which is $a\ b\ c$ : $b'c'$; and

> Who-gave for-a-spoil Jacob,
> And-Israel to-robbers. 42: 24.

which is $a\ b\ c$ : $c'b'$. This metre is known as the *qinah* metre, because
its use was first remarked by BUDDE as being found in laments and
elegies. But it is the lyric metre: see the Song of Songs. It is true that
the metre has what has been called 'a halting effect' and that it is used
to produce or to express an atmosphere suitable for mourning, but in
essence it is expressive of emotion, and in the writings of the Second
Isaiah it has the effect of a man stumbling because he cannot go
quickly enough. He appears to be in such a hurry that he had not the
time to complete the full 3: 3 couplet. He rushes on and in so doing
manages to catch only a passing echo of the first line.

As an illustration of this, we discuss in detail the first couplet of his
writings, 40: 1 and 2a. Here the decisiveness, the thoroughness and

---

[1]) Nowhere is the fact that 'crisis' is the Greek word for 'judgment' is more apt
than in the messages of the prophets.

the speedy effectiveness of the LORD's work in releasing His people is apparent. We consider the first two words in each line of the couplet.

The opening words of 40: 1 are 'comfort ye, comfort ye' נחמו נחמו. Apart from the characteristic repetition of an opening imperative which arises out of the prophet's sense of urgency, it is important from our point of view to realise clearly the precise meaning of this root נחם. Especially it is important to understand that this root does not mean 'comfort' in the ordinary modern use of the word—soothing words which may help in the midst of sorrow and trouble which continue, something to help the sufferer to continue to bear the pain and sorrow. It has little to do with any hope that is merely tentative, however pious and devoted. It has little to do with any betterment which may happen, or even with the preliminary stages of what is going to happen. The word involves a complete, a definite and a decisive change. As used here, especially when it is repeated, the word is part of the vocabulary of a confident, urgent, resurgent nationalist. For the nationalist element in this prophet's writings, see pp. 154 ff.; here we are concerned with the author's frame of mind—this vigorously religious, joyously triumphant Zionist of the sixth century B.C. Of all the prophets, this man is the prototype of the devoted, enthusiastic Israeli of today.

The Second Isaiah is called the Prophet of Comfort chiefly because of these opening words, 'comfort ye, comfort ye'. Further, Isa. 40: 1-26 is the Haftarah (Reading from the Prophets) in the synagogues for the Sabbath *Va-ethchanan* (Deut. 3: 23-7: 11). It is the first of the seven Haftarahs of Consolation which follow the Fast of Ab. The Sabbath itself is called *Nachamu* because of the use of this passage as the Haftarah for this particular Sabbath. But the root נחם does not mean 'comfort *in* sorrow.' It means 'comfort *out of* sorrow', make an effective end of all tears and woe. For evidence for this, see two articles in *The Expository Times*, the first by D. WINTON THOMAS, 'A Note on the Hebrew root נחם' (xlix, January 1933; p. 191) and the second by N. H. SNAITH (lvii, November 1945; pp. 477 ff.). The first article begins with the Arabic *nahama* (breathe hard, pantingly: of a horse), and D. W. THOMAS shows that the connexion of this root with the idea of comfort is through the idea of the relief obtained by taking a deep breath. See Isa. 1: 24, 'I will ease me of my advesaries'; Ezek. 5: 13 refers to the relief which comes when anger is appeased; Job 16: 2 does not refer to 'miserable comforters,' but to 'breathers out of trouble.' The Syriac *naham* means 'make to breathe, resuscitate and

quicken the dead,' because the word really means 'breathe again' and 'breathe deeply.' Thus *nouḥama* in Syriac means 'resurrection,' the idea being that of the dead being once more supplied with breath. In the second article, the main emphasis is that the meaning 'comfort' does not come through ideas of pity, compassion and the like, but through the idea of changing the mind. It is not as 'patently absurd' as Professor JAMES BARR thinks [1]) to suppose that the origin of a word has considerable influence on its subsequent usage. It is comparatively common for a word to retain something of its earlier meaning side by side with a developed meaning: e.g. the English words 'peculiar,' 'quick,' 'frank.' Thus Jer. 15: 6 is 'I am weary with changing my mind' (RV, repenting), i.e. weary of stepping in so as to change the normal sequence of sin and its punishment. See also Exod. 13: 17; 1 Sam. 15: 29, etc., In the Old Testament the word rarely means 'sympathise with in sorrow,' but rather 'comfort out of sorrow' and make an end of it, Gen. 24: 67. It involves effective comfort, the drying of tears once and for all because all has changed. Isa. 40: 1 says that such effective, convincing words are to be spoken as to ensure that Jerusalem's tears shall cease forthwith. All is conviction. The action is immediate.

The same conviction and urgent immediacy is to be seen in the first phrase of v. 2. This phrase is (AV, RV) 'speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem,' or RSV 'speak tenderly.' The Hebrew is דברו על לב, lit. speak to the heart. LEVY [2]) refers to 'sympathetic speech.' This is because the commentaries say that the phrase is used of courtship, Gen. 34: 3; Judg. 19: 3; Hos. 2: 16 (Eng. 14). But there is an error here. The association is not with tender words and soft sentimental speech, though these may well be involved. The reference is to effective, successful courtship. There are other cases of the use of the phrase where courtship is not involved, but what is involved is the idea of conviction. Ruth 2: 13 is near-courtship. In 2 Chr. 32: 6 Hezekiah speaks to the captains and instils courage into them against Sennacherib. In 2 Chr. 30: 22 he speaks with similar effect to the Levites. In 2 Sam. 19: 8 (Eng. 7) Joab speaks in such fashion as to shock David out of his inaction following the death of Absalom. There was nothing

---

[1]) *The Semantics of Biblical Literature*, 1961, p. 171. It is he that uses the word 'decisive'. BARR has rightly drawn attention to the danger of being influenced too much by the etymology of a word, but he frequently exaggerates the statements of those he attacks.

[2]) *Deutero-Isaiah*, 1952, p. 113.

tender or sympathetic in Joab's attitude. It was plain, brutal speech, the exact opposite of honeyed, sympathetic words. So also in Gen. 50: 21 Joseph speaks straightly and plainly to his brothers and shakes them out of their fear of him. Further, against the RSV rendering, the heart is not particularly the seat of the emotions, and certainly not exclusively so. The heart is the seat of thought and knowledge, memory, will and everything else. It is the innermost core of a man's being, the seat of conviction.[1]) Thus 'speak to the heart' is a strong phrase used to describe speech which leads to immediate conviction. It is our 'change of heart.'

There are three instances where נחם (comfort) and דבר על לב (speak to the heart) are used in parallel lines: Gen. 50: 21 E; Ruth 2: 13; and here in Isa. 40: 1, 2a. The Syriac in Isa. 40: 2 expresses the idea of *complete* satisfaction, lit. 'fill the heart.' This is the Peshitta rendering also at John 11: 19 for παραμυθέομαι, which is used by Symmachus for נחם in Isa. 40: 2 and by LXX at 2 Macc. 15: 9.

---

[1]) BROWN, DRIVER and BRIGGS, *Hebrew and English Lexicon* of the Old Testament, 1907, *in loc.*

# THE NATIONALIST

It is usually stated that the Second Isaiah is the great universalist: that is, his message and his promises extend to all mankind on a fully liberal scale, and he looks forward to the spread of Israel's faith throughout all the world. Levy [1]) writes of this hope of the prophet of 'seeing Yahweh's religion prevalent over the whole world.' He says (p. 23) that 'later, Israel chose not to emphasise' this universal spirit, but that 'once roused (it) never died, though often it had to fight for its existence:' which, all things considered, is a very generous description of the exclusive Judaism of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., and, indeed, of the spirit of the Jerusalem 'hierarchy' which very nearly wrecked Christianity at the start, Acts 15; Gal. 1-2.

But statements like this of Reuben Levy's are typical of the general opinion. Scholars find in the work of the Second Isaiah the beginnings of what is called missionary enterprise. Actually, the beginnings of this world-wide religion are to be found in Ezekiel, though even there the thought is still nationalistic. It comes in the realisation that if God's people cannot come to Him in their need, He can come to them. The idea that God is to be found only in the centralised temple at Jerusalem breaks down under the need of God's people. When Isaiah of Jerusalem saw the throne of God, he saw it fixed and firm, immovable (Isa. 6), but Ezekiel did not see it that way. He saw (Ezek. 1) a chariot which had wheels within wheels, so fixed that each wheel could run east and west or south and north, the inner wheel being at right-angles to the outer wheel. Beside the wheels there were living creatures with wings, and these winged creatures could lift into the air the whole concern. The chariot was completely mobile, and could travel over land, and fly over any mountain or sea. Above the chariot there was a platform (RV, firmament), and on this there was the throne of God. Ezekiel 9:3; 10:4; 10:19; 11:23 and 10:20 with chapter 1, tell the story of God's reluctance to leave His ancient home, but indicate also the stern necessity. In Isa. 49: 20 the crowding is at Jerusalem, and in 54: 2 the lengthening of the tent cords and the

---

[1]) *op. cit.* p. 23.

strengthening of the stakes is also in Jerusalem. The Second Isaiah thinks in terms of bringing the people back to Jerusalem.

There are three exceptions to the general opinion that the Second Isaiah was a universalist. They are N. H. SNAITH,[1]) P. A. H. DE BOER,[2]) and R. MARTIN-ACHARD.[3]) To these we may in part add J. LIND-BLOM,[4]) who agrees that the Second Isaiah was nationalist at first, but was universalist after 539 B.C.

The picture of the Second Isaiah as a universalist is considerably enhanced, and for many largely influenced by the usual translation of אור גוים in 49: 6 as 'a light to the Gentiles.' [5]) The usual translation is (RV): I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation (margin: 'that my salvation may be') unto the end of the earth.' Largely on the basis of this, other passages are interpreted and translated as being universalist in intention and content. Without this particular translation of 49: 6, the universal element in the Second Isaiah is much more meagre than many realise. There are many passages which, if they are translated as though this particular rendering of Isa. 49: 6 never existed, are capable of a very different interpretation.

A strict translation of 49: 6 is: It is far too small a thing for you to be servant to me to restore the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the preserved of Israel. I will set you as a light of Gentiles for my salvation to be to the end of the earth.' The verse contains five sections, of which the last four form two couplets. Thus, like 43: 5 (for instance), the first section is without its parallel. 'Restore the tribes of Jacob' is parallel to 'bring back the preserved of Israel.' This is satisfactory. Both phrases refer to the Babylonian exiles. There are many cases where 'Jacob' and 'Israel' are in parallel and have this significance: 40: 27; 41: 8; 41: 14; 43: 1; etc., and especially 49: 5 'to bring back Jacob to him, and that Israel be gathered to him.' In the second couplet, the parallelism is 'a light of Gentiles' and 'for my salvation to be to the end of the earth (RVm),' that is, a light through-

---

[1]) 'The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah' in T. H. ROBINSON Festschrift, *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, 1950, pp. 187-200.

[2]) *Second Isaiah's Message* (Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel XI), 1956.

[3]) *Israël et les nations: la perspective missionaire de l'Ancien Testament*, 1959. English translation, *A Light to the Nations*, 1962.

[4]) *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*, 1963, p. 428.

[5]) What is written here in this chapter is largely a development of what was first put forward in the above-mentioned essay in the T. H. ROBINSON Festschrift

out all the gentile [1]) world, in order that God's salvation of Israel—the
the salvation with which the prophet is elsewhere concerned—may
reach the end of the world. That this world-wide salvation is God's
salvation of Israel can be seen from 43: 6: 'bring my sons from far,
and my daughters from the end of the earth.' Or again: 'whom I have
taken hold of הֶחֱזַקְתִּיךָ from the ends of the earth, and from its corners
I have called thee,' where the previous verse makes it clear that the
reference is to Israel, God's servant, to Jacob whom God has chosen,
and to 'my lover' Abraham's seed.

The phrase 'a world-wide light' (49: 6, RV 'a light to the Gentiles')
is found also in 42: 6, but not in Codex B of LXX, nor in the original
hand of א. The first corrector of א has 'a covenant of my people to a
light of Gentiles' γένους μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν, though other correctors
and other MSS do not have 'my.' There seems to be no sound reason
for regarding 'for a light of Gentiles' as an interpolation in 42: 6.
The structure of the verse demands the inclusion of the phrase in
spite of its omission by two leading LXX manuscripts. On the other
hand, the Hebrew text of 49: 6 is probably right as against LXX (all
major MSS except codex A; Q has it in the margin) in omitting
לִבְרִית עַם (for a covenant of the people) as a gloss from 42: 6.

DE BOER [2]) interprets 'light of (to the) Gentiles' to mean that the
renewed people will be set as a light, openly seen and respected among
the nations. 'Everyone who sees the redemption of the Judean
people, even great nations, kings and princes, will be astonished and
will respect it as a wonderful salvation.' Similarly, MARTIN-ACHARD
says: [3]) 'the shining of the light of the Servant. . .does not necessarily
mean something like the evangelisation of the Hellenistic world in the
first century of the Chritian era.' Or again (p. 30), 'the heathen will
· learn of the redemption of the People of Israel; the salvation that
Yahweh will have given His people will be praised to the ends of the
earth.' MARTIN-ACHARD does not see in the Second Isaiah any
missionary message in the ordinary sense of the term, and no pro-
selytism. Israel is not called to go out to the Gentiles nor actively in
anyway to win them. Rather, and at most, Israel through the salvation
which God has wrought for them and through their loyalty to Him
will be such a dazzling light shining throughout the world, that the
Gentiles will come in humble, subservient awe. 'The heathen, now

---

[1]) There is nothing in the Hebrew equivalent to the preposition 'to.'

[2]) *op. cit.* p. 92.

[3]) *op. cit.* (Eng. tr.), p. 28.

subdued, will give Him the glory that is due to His name (p. 30).'
Both these scholars realise that the Second Isaiah is truly nationalist,
and that he is concerned with the salvation of Israel. Both realise
that he is not interested in the Gentiles as such, and that any place
they may have in the new economy will be entirely subservient,
definitely second-class citizens, if indeed anything more than slaves.
I still prefer my original idea, that the Servant is to be a world-wide
light to guide all scattered Israelites home; but the idea of the Gentiles
as ultimately second-class citizens, if at all, is right. On the other hand
in 51: 4 DE BOER's explanation has much to commend it: the phrase
'to be a light of the peoples' (לאור עמים: note the plural) refers to the
promulgation of the Lord's judgment (i.e. the declaration of His will
in human experience: משפט) shining out among the nations.

The phrase ברית עם, usually translated 'a covenant of the people,'
42: 6; 49: 8, constitutes another problem. The fact that the definite
article is not found is of no account. The Second Isaiah does not
normally use the definite article. There are two cases where the word
עם is found in our chapters with the definite article hē'. The first is
40: 7, which is a gloss (see below). The other is 62: 10 where the
article is intended to belong to 'way' rather than to 'people'.

The Hebrew in 42: 6 has עם in the singular. The Second Isaiah is
consistent about this. When he uses the singular, he means Israel, the
People of God, the true People of God. When he uses the plural, he
means mankind generally, the Gentiles. For the plural (five times),
see 49: 22; 51: 4; (56: 7) and 61: 9; 62: 10. There are twenty-five
instances of the singular, with and without the suffix. In every case
except two, 42: 5 and 40: 7, the reference is to Israel. Sometimes it
means the Servant and sometimes it is distinct from the Servant.[1]
The case of 40: 7 is as clear a case of a gloss as one could find. The
gloss is 'surely the people is grass,' and it means mankind as distinct
from God Himself. LXX and the Old Latin omit the verse, and it is
outside the scheme of versification. With respect to 42: 5, the meaning
there is mankind as a whole, and it is difficult to see how else the pro-
phet could have said what he wanted to say.

In 42: 6 and 49: 8 the Servant is called ברית עם 'a covenant of the
people.' He is to be the means by which God's people is to be in-
tegrated, bound together once more. Various suggestions have

---

[1] For an explanation of how this can be, see pp. 172 f.

been made as to the meaning here of the word בְּרִית.[1]) The meaning
could be 'mediator of my covenant with,' [2]) though NORTH under-
stands 'people' to mean all the Gentiles, interpreting the passage in a
fully universalist sense. We think that here the word בְּרִית retains
something of its original meaning: the root בָּרָה means 'bind to-
gether.'[3]) The Servant is to bind together the old Israel, and this to
make them once more the People of God, the new People of God.

There is, in our view, no possibility of 42: 7 referring to the
Gentiles. 'Blind eyes' (v. 7) means the exiles in Babylonia. Blindness
and imprisonment in dungeons are frequent metaphors for this
captivity. DE BOER [4]) refers to KISSANE as saying that here we have a
figurative description of the conversion of the nations, but there is
no need to pick out KISSANE particularly. This interpretation is
common; it is the orthodox one. As MARTIN-ACHARD points out,[5])
the interpretation which makes עַם mean 'mankind' here and so the
Gentiles generally 'is specifically based on the parallelism which is
found in 42: 6 between בְּרִית עָם and לְאוֹר גּוֹים.' But this latter phrase
('light of Gentiles') is disputed. Many hold it to be a gloss here, and
in 49: 6, from where it is repeated, we hold that a nationalistic inter-
pretation is to be accepted. The Servant's mission, we maintain, is to
release the captives from Babylon, to bring the scattered Israelites
back to Jerusalem and there to establish a restored community, the
New Israel. His task is limited to this. 'There is no question of a
message, starting off from one point and swarming off in the whole
world. . .(all is) relative to the experience of the exile. . .' [6]) The phrase
'covenant of the people' has nothing to do with the Gentiles, but
everything to do with the People of God. SKINNER [7]) agrees with this,
in spite of his general attitude whereby he regards the Second Isaiah
as a universalist. He says 'עַם (people) can hardly be understood of
humanity at large (even if that were a possible use of the word),
because in 49: 8 the phrase is applied exclusively to the Servant's

---

[1]) See especially MARTIN ACHARD, *op. cit*, p. 26. note 12, and more recently,
C. R. NORTH, *op. cit.*, p. 11. He thinks the phrase is an addition in 49: 8.

[2]) NORTH, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[3]) See VAN DER PLOEG, *Les Chants du Serviteur de Jahve*, 1936, pp. 30 ff, where he
cites VASCARI and VOLZ. Also DE BOER, *op. cit.*, pp. 92 ff. and MARTIN-ACHARD,
*op. cit.*, pp. 26 ff.

[4]) *op. cit.*, p. 93.

[5]) *op. cit.*, p. 27, note 12.

[6]) DE BOER, *op. cit.*, p. 100. See also MARTIN-ACHARD, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 ff.

[7]) *op. cit.*, p. 32.

mission to Israel.' This is indeed plain in 49: 8, as we interpret it. The Lord has called and chosen His Servant to raise up and restore Jacob-Israel (v. 6) and thus God's salvation will reach to the end of the earth. Or, if it be held that v. 8 is in a different context from v. 6, it is stated in v. 8 that being 'a covenant of the people' means reestablishing the land and causing the ruined properties [1]) to be occupied once more. This refers to a desolated Jerusalem, and it is to the released prisoners (i.e. the returning exiles) that the prophet is speaking. Again, the returning inhabitants are 'from far,' from north and west and from the land of Sinim, but these are not the Gentiles. These are 'his people' and 'his afflicted' (v. 13). Yet again, there is no justification for assuming that the overcrowding of vv. 19 f. is due to an immigration of Gentiles. It is due to the many scattered children coming back home again. The Gentiles do not appear until v. 22. They do indeed come to a restored Jerusalem (vv. 22-26), but it is to carry Jerusalem's sons and daughters as slaves carry the children of their masters. The kings and queens of the Gentiles are to serve as attendants on the returning Israelites. They are to be Israel's nursemaids, and they will bow low before the Israelites as the most abject of slaves: 'bow down with their faces to the earth, and lick the dust of thy feet' (v. 23). It is then that Israel will know for certain that the LORD is their God. This will be because of the subservience and humiliation of the Gentiles. They will know from actual experience that those who trust in the God of Israel will be triumphant at last. The captives of the warrior shall be snatched from him and Israel's children shall be saved. The chapter closes with v. 26, one of the most bloodthirsty and revengeful verses in the Old Testament. If the Second Isaiah is the great universalist that many allege, meaning by this one who welcomes the Gentiles on something at least approaching equal terms, something more than a 'benevolent colonialism,' then either he has fallen very short of his great ideals, or we must say that this verse belongs to a later time, say, the times of Nehemiah and Ezra.

The nationalist, even anti-Gentile, attitude is plain in 43: 3 f. Here the LORD is the Saviour of Israel and He will hand over Egypt, Ethiopia and Seba for Israel. There can be no doubt but that here כפר means 'the price of ransom for a life,' Job 33: 24; 36: 18; Exod. 21: 30; etc. The next verse clinches the matter: 'Because you are precious in my eyes, you are of great value, and I prefer [2]) you above

---

[1]) נחלה means 'property' rather than 'inheritance'.

[2]) אהב here means 'preferential love,' Gen. 29: 30, 31; Deut. 21: 15.

all others; and I will give men in return for you and peoples in ex-
change for you.' That is, God is prepared to sacrifice the Gentile
peoples for the sake of Israel.[1]) He will deliver them into slavery in
order to release Israel from exile and bondage. There is nothing uni-
versalist here. It is as narrowly nationalistic as the narrowest and most
fervent of modern nationalists could desire. There are times when the
Old Testament reaches no higher than many in this modern world.

As we have already pointed out, one of the main barriers to the
proper understanding of the nationalistic attitude of the Second
Isaiah is that the English Versions have been produced under strong
universalist influence. An example of this is 45: 19-25. According to
SKINNER,[2]) who here is typical of most, here is 'a salvation as universal
as it is eternal.' This statement is made in spite of the fact that the
word of the prophet is addressed to those 'that are escaped of the
nations' (20), and that the concluding verse (25) is 'in the LORD shall
all the seed of Israel triumph [3]) and shall boast.' SKINNER and others
are influenced by v. 22: 'Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of
the earth,' which they interpret to mean all mankind, all the Gentiles,
and to involve the open arms of modern missionary zeal. But 'all the
ends of the earth' is far from involving the Gentiles in any liberal
open-handed fashion. See above (p. 156) and the discussion of 43:6
and 41:9. 'The ends of the earth' is where the Israelites are, where
'my sons' and 'my daughters' are, where 'Israel, my servant' is, and
'Jacob whom I have chosen.' The phrase is a lyrical geographical
exaggeration. Also, as we shall see (p. 161) the nationalistic attitude
is plain to see in 52:13-15. The great ones were astonished, appalled at
the Servant because he was so bedraggled and miserable. But he is no
longer the slave of rulers. The tables have been turned. Now, great
nations will leap to their feet to honour him, and kings will clasp their
hands over their mouths. They will never have heard anything like
this, and they will be forced to take particular notice of it. This new
unheard of thing is the revival and triumph of Israel after a disaster
so apparently final and complete.

---

[1]) Cf. DE BOER, *op. cit.*, p. 12. We are not discussing whether, then or now,
nationalism is better than internationalism, or whether any degree of national
feeling is right. We are not discussing whether the Second Isaiah was right for
his own time or for any other time. We are seeking to find out what the Second
Isaiah actually meant.

[2]) *op. cit.*, p. 71.

[3]) SO DE BOER. See also N. H. SNAITH, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*,
1944, p. 87. This is much better than the 'be justified' of EVV.

We have translated יזה (v. 15; AV, RV 'sprinkle'; RVm, RSV 'startle', but RSVm says that the meaning is uncertain) as 'make leap to their feet.' Formerly there was general agreement that the root is נזה I (spurt, spatter: in the *hiph'il*, sprinkle). This root in the *hiph'il* is used in the Priestly Tradition with a ritual meaning associated with cleansing rites from ritual uncleanness.[1]) It is natural that many should read 'sprinkle' here in 52: 15, especially if they have certain views of the atoning value of the death of Christ, interpret chapter 53 in this way and make use of the temple ritual for disposing of ritual uncleanness. Thus we have the explanation offered that just as the nations formerly shunned the Servant as being unclean, so now he will sprinkle them and cleanse them. Something of this seems to be the basis of the English Versions and of some ancient versions also. It is combined also with the underlying assumption that the Servant's mission is to all mankind. The alternative was to assume another root נזה II (c.f. Arabic 'spring up, leap up'), and this gave rise to the translation 'startle' (RVm, RSV). This rendering is supported by the idea of astonishment which is plain in the context; and LXX has θαυμάσονται. But this second root does not really mean 'startle,' and some critics have pointed out that 'startle' is a long way from the Arabic 'leap up.' This is why there is doubt expressed in RSVm. 'Startle' could be justified as a legitimate extension of the original idea; there have been many stranger developments than this. There is, however, a better suggestion, namely the original 'leap up,' and this is what we are proposing to read. The argument is as follows: the first half of the verse is a parallel couplet. In the other half of the couplet we have (as it is usually translated) 'shut their mouths.' But compare Job 29: 8 f.: 'The young men saw me and hid themselves, And the aged rose and stood. The princes refrained from talking, And laid their hand on their mouth.' Here are two ways of showing the utmost and most reverential respect. One way is to rise to one's feet, the more quickly, the better. The other way is to be silent, close one's mouth and clasp it with one's hand. This is what we have in Isa. 52: 15. The word יזה means 'cause them to leap to their feet.' No change is involved in the Hebrew, neither of consonants or of vowels. Further, the root קפץ in the next half-line does not mean merely 'shut their mouths,' but 'place the hand over the mouth and clutch it, grasp it in the closed hand,' cf. Deut. 15: 7. The verse therefore describes the

---

[1]) e.g. Lev. 5: 9, etc, but not such passages as Lev. 1: 5 where 'sprinkle' is definitely wrong. The root there is זרק (toss), cf. RSV 'throw.'

amazement of the Gentiles, both nations and kings, at the triumph of the Servant, especially since it involved the complete subservience of these same nations and kings.

In 54: 2 we find that those returning will have exceeded all expectations so far as numbers are concerned. After having done everything possible to secure the necessary living space, the returned inhabitants will spread in all directions and their descendants will dispossess the Gentiles. This root יָרַשׁ (v. 3: possess, dispossess, inherit, disinherit) is the verb regularly used in the story of the conquest of Canaan, where it involves the driving out of the original Canaanites and taking possession of their land: Josh. 18: 3 and often in Deuteronomy and Joshua. DE BOER [1]) has 'expel', and this is not by any means too strong a word. It is not universalism, nor anything like it. It is the Joshua invasion all over again, for much of Deuteronomy and virtually all of the Second Isaiah is a second occupation of Canaan. Just as in Deuteronomy, Moses is speaking to the second invaders of Palestine, so here the prophet is speaking to an Israel that once more is to cross over into the land, possess it and conquer the Gentiles. Ultimately the LORD will be called the God of the whole earth, and this will be when His people have become dominant in it. In the end Jerusalem will be supreme. No weapon formed to be used against her will be effective, and no one will be able to stand against her with weapon or tongue in any assault or accusation. 'This is the heritage of the servants of the LORD and their victory (triumph, vindication) which is from me,' 54: 17. All men will run to Israel, and David's successor will be prince and commander of the peoples, 55: 4. God's word will certainly triumph.

In the three extra chapters 60-62 the note of triumph at the expense of and over the Gentiles is clearest of all. Chapter 60 is full of national triumph. All the wealth of the nations is to come to Jerusalem. Verse 12 condemens to extinction the nations and the kingdoms which refuse to serve Israel. Duhm and others object to this verse. This is a natural attitude for all those who have made up their minds that the Second Isaiah and his friends are universalists. Chapter 61 begins by declaring that the Spirit of the LORD is upon the speaker (the Servant), and the purpose is to release the captives and bring new prosperity to Zion. In v. 6 the inhabitants of Zion are to 'eat the wealth of the nations.' The rest of the three chapters breathes the same

---

[1]) *op. cit.*, p. 36.

general air of triumph and the acknowledgement of this by the
Gentiles.

We turn to the assumed references to Cyrus in 41: 2 f. and 46: 11.
It is generally maintained that 41: 2 f. refers to Cyrus. The adjectives
used are 'unquestionable,' 'obvious,' 'no further argument'—all of
which create suspicion. In ordinary daily life and discussion, the use
of the word 'obvious' is taken by the wise as a sure sign that what is
being said is anything but obvious. It is not altogether different
with what is written. The Targum and ancient Jewish authorities did
not find it obvious. They saw here a reference to Abraham (cf.
51: 1-3). What 'obvious' means is that a reference to Cyrus is obvious
to a writer who has certain assumptions deeply seated in his own
mind. These assumptions involve universalism and a belief that
there is a general unity of all the material outside the four so-called
servant songs. But if we establish from other passages the existence
of a nationalist prophet who is looking forward to Israel's victory and
triumph over the Gentiles, and if we can show that we have separate
pieces everywhere and no 'main body' of prohecy, then the identifica-
tion with Cyrus in 41: 2 f. is neither obvious nor necessary. Why
should Cyrus be intended here, when elsewhere we have the picture
of a militant, triumphant, exultant Israel marching home to Jerusalem?
It is extremely unlikely that anyone would think of Cyrus here unless
he had first the notion of an Israel that is generous and kindly to all
the Gentiles, and had previously read 45: 1 f. A more natural ex-
planation is that the 'one from the east' roused [1]) by the Lord to be a
conqueror of kings is the new Israel: cf. 53: 12; 52: 15; 49: 23. Com-
pare the similar phraseology of 41: 25 f., another passage which is
often interpreted to refer to the victories of Cyrus. Here the difficulty
is of 'one that calleth on my name' (41: 25). It is true that in 45: 3 f.
the LORD speaks to Cyrus through the prophet and says, '(I have)
called thee my name,' but this is a very different thing from saying
that Cyrus has called on the name of the LORD, especially when,
according to 45: 4 and again in 45: 5, it is said with particular emphasis
that Cyrus did not know the LORD. The ancient Jewish identification
with Abraham is worthy of consideration in view of 51: 1-3. Abraham
was but one when God called him, but God blessed him and made
him many. The inference in 51: 1-3 is that God will also call Israel,
the new Israel, will call him as once He called Abraham, will make

---

[1]) The Hebrew is עוּר, not נָשָׂא, nor the *hiph'il* of קוּם.

him many, restore him to Zion and make that city a veritable Garden
of God. Abraham was called from Ur of the Chaldees in ancient time;
Israel is called from Babylonia in this latter time. Israel is the 'one
from the east' who has been roused, and victory meets him at every
step, cf. Gen. 30: 30. The LORD who roused him, enables him to
subdue nations and kings, and his sword and bow make them like
dust and wind-driven chaff.[1]) He pursues them and passes safely on by
the path on foot.[2]) Verse 5 and 6 may well be a continuation of the
fear and trembling of the Gentiles, with 'they drew near and came'
as an addition (also outside the metrical scheme), and v. 7 a mistaken
explanation of the help which each gave the other. It seems to us,
therefore, to be a much more likely explanation of 41: 1-5 that it
refers to a triumphant Israel roused by God to new endeavour and
marching proudly to victory.

Who is the עיט (bird of prey) 'from the east', 46: 11? Most agree
that it is Cyrus, but it could at least equally be a triumphant Israel,
swooping down in victory. Similarly for the phrase in the same verse:
'the man who executes my counsel,' i.e. brings my plans to fruition.
This again could be Cyrus, given the necessary assumptions, but
assuming the idea of a triumphant, militant Israel, it is once again
more likely to be a reference to that triumphant, victorious Israel.

Turning to 42: 1-4, it is customary to see here a special meaning for
מִשְׁפָּט (AV, RV 'judgment') analogous to the use of the Arabic dîn,
which can mean 'true religion'. The Arabic usage arises from the idea
of a man's fate being wholly in the hand of Allah (kismet, and so
forth), and from the idea of submission to the will of God. The
Hebrew usage (if it is correct) would arise from the idea that sound
custom and the will of God are one. But if we assume that the Second
Isaiah is an intensely nationalist prophet, then מִשְׁפָּט means 'justice,'[3])
here meaning the verdict in the sense of a penalty of strict retribution.
The Servant is a wick now burning dimly, but in the future he will
not burn dimly, nor will he continue to be a bruised reed. He will
establish justice in the earth. This is the true meaning of מִשְׁפָּט. It is
God's justice as shown in history and experience; cf. the Queen's
justice, which is our English law, based on precedent and custom.

---

[1]) The exact reading of the Hebrew is uncertain. Read either (with LXX) 'he
makes their sword as dust' or 'his sword makes them as dust.' The sense, however,
is clear, whatever the precise construction is.

[2]) The phrase לֹא יָבוֹא (he doth not come, hath not come, will not come) is
not in LXX and is outside the metrical scheme.

[3]) See *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 193. RSV has 'justice.'

Again,[1]) it is true that the Hebrew root יחל (end of v. 4) most often means 'wait expectantly' rather than 'wait with dread,' but the meaning 'hope' tends to be late and the *'aph'el* of the corresponding Syriac root means 'despair.'

This use of מִשְׁפָּט meaning 'judgment, justice' occurs again in 51: 4-6. The message is spoken to 'my people:' [2])

> For a law תורה shall go forth from my presence
> For my judgment מִשׁפָּט shall be 'a light of peoples.'
> I will suddenly bring near ארגיע אקרוב my victory,
> My salvation shall go forth like the light
> And my arms shall judge the peoples.
> For me the isles shall tarry
> And for my arm they shall wait.

Then there follows a verse of terror, and the inhabitants of the earth are dying like gnats (reading כְּנִים for כֵּן-thus). Also, 'like the light' does not refer to a steady and continuous illumination, but to the sudden blazing forth of the light of a new day (see p.176). Further, 'the isles' איים means 'the Gentiles.' [3])

---

[1]) *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 143.

[2]) This is עמי and לאומי. See 42: 3, the other case of מִשׁפָּט meaning 'justice': most read there לְאֻמִּת (peoples) instead of לֶאֱמֶת (in truth).

[3]) BROWN, DRIVER and BRIGGS, *in loc.*

# THE SERVANT OF THE LORD

There is no need here to give a summary of the many and varied attempts to identify the Servant of the LORD. This was done admirably a generation ago by A. S. PEAKE,[1]) and even more comprehensivley in recent years by C. R. NORTH.[2]) This latter volume is most detailed, and every view of importance is discussed. The bibliography is both accurate and extensive. We proceed, therefore, to discuss the identity of the Servant of the LORD with the discussions in Professor NORTH's book as a background. An outline of this present discussion has already appeared in 'The Servant of the LORD in Deutero-Isaiah,' *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, 1950, pp. 187-200, and a preliminary article appeared in *The Expository Times*, lvi (December 1944), pp. 79-81, entitled 'The So-called Servant Songs.'

In the first place, we maintain that the Servant of the so-called Servant Songs (42: 1-4; 49: 1-6; 50: 4-9; 52: 13-53: 12) is the Servant of the remainder of the nineteen chapters, 40-55 and 60-62. As was pointed out in the two above-mentioned essays, the existence of the four Servant Songs as distinct pieces involved their separation from 'the main body of the prophecy.'[3]) Very few have argued against such segregation,[4]) and few have realised any need for discussion. The position here maintained is that there is no such 'main body of the prophecy.' The modern attitude is to think of all four of the Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve) as 'collections of independent and usually short orcales, poems and the like.'[5]) This movement began with H. GRESSMANN[6]) who found 49 pieces in Isaiah 40-55, and these wholly independent of each other. He has been followed by KÖHLER (70 pieces), MOWINCKEL (45), VOLZ (54), OESTERLEY and ROBINSON (54), EISSFELDT (about 50), BEGRICH (70), and CASPARI (many pieces from many authors). MOWINCKEL and

---

[1]) *The Servant of Yahweh*, etc., 1931.
[2]) *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, 1948.
[3]) SKINNER, *Isaiah*, vol. ii, pp. 238 f.
[4]) BUDDE (1922), GIESEBRECHT (1902), MARTI (1900), KISSANE (1943) and Roman Catholic scholars generally.
[5]) O. EISSFELDT, 'The Literature of Israel: Modern Criticism' in *Record and Revelation*, ed. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, 1938, p. 94.
[6]) 'Die literarische Analyse Deutero-jesajas,' ZATW 34 (1914), SS. 254-297.

VOLZ exclude the Servant Songs from their count.[1] More recently, J. MUILENBURG [2] has written in favour of twenty-one separate poems.

If there is no main body of the prophecy, there can be no special group of pieces distinct from it. We are faced with approximately fifty separate pieces, in some of which reference is made to the Servant of the LORD. These references are of varying definiteness, but there are four where the association is particularly plain. These are the pieces which B. DUHM picked out and called *Die Ebed-Jahve-Leider*.[3] These he isolated from the rest, and most scholars have followed him in this. But some scholars include other pieces also, and even DUHM himself varied. The fact is that the four pieces cannot be identified as markedly and definitely as DUHM first proposed. NORTH, for instance,[4] speaks of 'Secondary Servant Songs:' 42: 5-9; 49: 7-9a or 49: 7-12; and 50: 10 f. It has been said that 42: 5-9 is a continuation of 42: 1-4, and later DUHM agreed to this, but in doing so he said that these latter verses were so similar in style to the style of the Second Isaiah that he had at first ascribed them to him instead of associating them with the author of the Servant Songs, whom DUHM distinguished from the Second Isaiah. If DUHM could make such a 'mistake,' it is evident that the style of the Servant Songs does not differ from the style of what is called 'the main body of the prophecy' to anything like the degree which some have maintained. Often arguments depending upon style are far too subjective, but here we accept DUHM's second opinion: the style is for the most part indistinguishable.

We do not agree that 42: 5-9 forms one piece with 42: 1-4. Verses 5-9 undoubtedly refer to the Servant, but he is not specifically mentioned. Further, v. 5 begins with 'Thus saith the El, the LORD,' [5] which GRESSMANN held to be an important criterion for the detection of a new piece. In 42: 1-4 the Servant is referred to in the third person, but in 42: 5-9 he is himself addressed in the second person. Again, in the first piece the message is for all who will listen and is in general terms. In the second piece the message is precise and specific. The word *rûaḥ* is used in different senses in the two pieces. In the first piece, the reference is to the Spirit of God which inspires the Servant

---

[1] For further details, see C. R. NORTH, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* pp. 158 ff.

[2] *The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 5 (1956), pp. 389-392.

[3] 42: 1-4; 49: 1-6; 50: 4-9; 52: 13-53: 12. See *Die Theologie der Propheten* (1875) and again his commentary *Das Buch Jesaia übersetzst und erklärt* (1892).

[4] *op. cit.*, pp. 189 ff.

[5] LXX reverses these titles.

and enables him to conclude his mission effectively. In the second piece, it is the breath which God gives to all men, the breath by which man lives. Duhm was right originally. 42: 1-4 and 42: 5-9 are separate pieces.

Similarly, we hold that Duhm was right originally in holding that 49: 1-6 is distinct and separate from 49: 7-12. In the first piece the Servant is speaking, but in the second piece the speaker is the LORD Himself. Notice also that v. 7 and v. 8 both begin with 'Thus saith the LORD.' Does this mean that v. 7 also is a separate piece, distinct from both 49: 1-6 and 49: 8-12? Certainly in v. 7, God is speaking about the Servant, whereas in v. 8 He is speaking directly to him. The difficulty about v. 7 is instanced by the fact that Condamin (1910) makes the first piece end with v. 7 and not with v. 6. Evidently he connected v. 7 with what follows it rather than with what precedes it. Yet again, there is difference of opinion as to whether the second (? third) piece ends at v. 9a or continues to v. 11 or even to v. 12.

Turning to 50: 4-9, Ley (1893) and Laue (1928) held that this piece is not a Servant Song, and Volz (1932) hesitated. The rhythm is different, and there is a higher proportion of unusual words. North [1] examines the vocabulary very carefully, and comes to the conclusion that, whilst there are differences, 'there are sufficient correspondences with Deutero-Isaiah to make it hazardous, on grounds of vocabulary alone, to deny his authorship.' This makes 50: 4-9 a Servant Song, since North holds that all four Servant Songs are by the Second Isaiah. But what of v. 10, which has a definite reference to the Servant? The Servant is here referred to in the third person; in the first nine verses it is the Servant himself who is speaking. Later, Duhm added vss. 10 and 11 to the song. He was right originally. 50: 1-9 is one piece; 50: 10 f. is another piece.

The last of the four so-called Servant Songs is 52: 13-53: 12. Here again there are differences of the same type as those which scholars have discussed in these other pieces. In 52: 13-15 the LORD is speaking, but in 53: 1-11 the speaker is not the LORD, though apparently he is the speaker once more in 53: 11b and 12. But who is speaking in 53: 1? If 52: 13-53: 12 is a unit, then it is the kings of the Gentiles who are speaking in 53: 1. But this creates a difficulty in 53: 8, where עמי (my people) occurs, since 'my people' (the singular) usually means, in some sense, Israel. Some therefore read עמים (the

---

[1] *op. cit.*, pp. 164 ff.

plural), whilst others read מִפְּשָׁעֵנוּ (because of our rebellions) for מִפֶּשַׁע
עַמִּי (because of the rebellion of my people). This, it must be noticed,
changes the content of the piece, and makes the suffering of the servant
to be vicarious on behalf of the Gentiles. We take 52: 13-15 to be
spoken by the Gentile kings, and chapter 53, certainly as far as v. 11a
to be spoken by the prophet himself, which 'my people' means Israel
in some sense.

There are other pieces within chapters 40-55 and 60-62 which
scholars have sought to include among the Servant Songs. These are
61: 1-3, because of its contents, and 61: 4-6, because of its unmistake-
able connexion with 42: 1-4. There are also 41: 8 ff.; 44: 1-5; and
44: 21-23. Further, there are those pieces which NORTH [1]) refers to
as 'the Secondary Servant-Songs': 49: 7-9a (13); 42: 5-9; 50: 10 f.;
42: 19-21; 48: 14-16; 51: 4-(6) 8; 51: 9 (12)-16; 61: 1 ff. There has
also been hesitation as to whether 50: 4-9 ought to be included among
the Servant Songs. The very fact that other pieces can be described
as 'secondary Servant Songs,' especially by such a careful and accurate
scholar as C. R. NORTH, shows that the Four cannot be isolated as
decisively as is often supposed, whether on grounds of metre, or
literary style, or vocabulary or content. DUHM himself varied his
opinion in two cases, and he admitted, certainly in one case, that the
style is not distinguishable. Scholars have varied as to the number of
these songs. If we count all which have been proposed, the number is
sixteen.

Our conclusion is: It is reasonable to maintain that in Isaiah 40-55
and 60-62 we have between 50 and 60 separate pieces. If we were to
place these pieces in a long line so that those which have nothing to
do with the Servant of the LORD are on the left, and those which have
most to do with the Servant are on the right: if also we try to place
them in order according to the emphasis on the Servant, then we
shall have DUHM's original Four Servant-songs on the extreme right,
and next to them the so-called Secondary Servant Songs, one of which
is within the three chapters 60-62. To the left of these will come the
extra three songs, 41: 8 ff.; 44: 1-5; 44: 21-23; and so on. There is no
'main body' of the work. There are no Servant-songs in any ex-
clusive sense. We have a whole series of pieces, in which, as we move
from left to right, the Servant motif becomes increasingly manifest.

If there are no distinct and separate Servant-songs, then the Servant

---

[1]) *op. cit.*, pp. 127 ff, 189 ff.

of the so-called Songs is the Servant of the rest of the book. Who then is the Servant of the LORD? Our suggestion is that the Servant of the LORD in Isaiah 40-55, 60-62 is the first batch of exiles, those who went into captivity with the young king Jehoiachin in 597 B.C., together with a tendency to include also the 586 B.C. exiles. Ultimately, all the exiles in Babylonian are the true People of God, and it is they who are to return to Jerusalem and restore the situation, but with increased prestige and in the end with world-wide success. [1]

The prophet Jeremiah divided the people of Judah into two distinct groups. First, there were those who went into exile with the young king Jeconiah (Jehoiachin), 2 Kgs. 24: 8-17. Those who went at that time consisted of 'all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, even to ten thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths; none remained save the poorest sort of the people of the land' (v. 14). These who were taken to Babylon, said Jeremiah, were 'very good figs, like figs that are first ripe.' Those that were left behind in Jerusalem he called 'very bad figs, which could not be eaten, they were so bad,' Jer. 24: 2. He continued by saying that the good figs were taken to Babylon 'for good,' and that 'they shall be my people, and I will be their God; for they shall return to me with their whole heart,' Jer. 24: 5-7. He said of Zedekiah and of those who remained behind in Jerusalem that 'the residue (shall be) consumed off the land that I gave to them and to their fathers,' Jer. 24: 10.

It is usually held that Ezekiel began his ministry in Palestine in 592 B.C., and probably (so BERTHOLET) was taken away captive to exile with the second deportation in 586 B.C. However this may be, Ezekiel refers (11: 20) to those who went into exile in 597 B.C. and says of them that they 'shall be my people, and I will be their God.' He says this because a contention has arisen concerning this very matter. It is the first sign of that dispute which led ultimately to the rift between Jew and Samaritan. The inhabitants of Jerusalem have said to the rest, to those who have been 'removed. . .far off among the Gentiles' that they are 'far from the LORD,' and that God has given to them (that is, those who have remained in Jerusalem) this land for a possession, 11: 15. These exiles are far way from the Temple,

---

[1] These suggestions were first put forward in the essay mentioned above, 'The Servant of the LORD in Deutero-Isaiah,' *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, pp. 187-200. C. R. NORTH (*op. cit.*) has examined the history of the attempts at the identification of this figure, and there is no need here to give an account of these studies.

the only place where properly, since the introduction of the Deutero-
nomic reforms, the LORD could be worshipped. The exiles therefore
are indeed 'far from the LORD,' but, says the prophet, the LORD has
become for them for a little while a Sanctuary in the lands whither
they have gone. Thus they will no longer be 'far from the LORD.'
This promise of the Presence of the LORD is fulfilled in Ezek. 9: 3;
10: 4; 10: 19; 11: 23: with the consummation in chapter 1.[1]) These tell
the story of God's reluctance to leave the Temple of His choice,
the place where He chose to set his Name. The glory of the LORD
mounts up from upon the cherub where it has been and comes to the
threshhold of the house, that is, the outer door of Solomon's Temple.
Then the chariot-throne of the LORD with the cherubim (the 'living
creatures' of chapter 1) mounts aloft, but stays at the door of the east
gate (10: 19). It makes a third halt 'upon the mountain which is on
the east side of the city,' 11: 23. And finally the prophet sees the living
creatures, the chariot-throne, and the vision of the glory of the LORD
beside the river Chebar, 10: 22, 23; and chapter 1. The reluctant God
leaves Mount Zion, whose gates He loves more than all the dwellings
of Jacob (Ps. 87: 2), and flies across the deserts to the river Chebar
where His true people are. This is the way in which 'he became a
sanctuary for them for a little,' Ezek. 11: 16. As we have said, where
God's people are, there is He. If they cannot come to Him, He can
come to them. His people are in Babylon, not in Jerusalem, 'for a
little,' and that is why He must be there.[2])

And so the LORD goes to Babylonia to be a sanctuary to His
people who are there. These exiles in Babylonia will be given a new
heart and a new spirit (Ezek. 11: 19), but those left behind in Jerusa-
lem are whole-heartedly following detestable idols and abominations,
Ezek. 11: 12 and chapter 5. They are doomed to complete destruction;
they are a 'rebellious house,' 2: 6; 5: 1-4; etc. But for the People of
God there is a resurrection. These, the exiles, are those who said,
'Our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost; we are clean cut off,'
37: 11. These bones, the dried bones that filled the valley, 'are the
whole house of Israel.' God calls them 'my people' and He will raise

---

[1]) see p. 154.
[2]) The most likely date for chapter 1 is soon after the fall of the city and the
destruction of the Temple. So SELLIN and BERTHOLET. When else would the LORD
leave Mount Zion? One answer is, because it has been destroyed. A better answer
is the true People of God can no longer come to Him there. See also 'The Dates
in Ezekiel,' *Expository Times*, lix, 12 (September 1948), pp. 315 ff.

them to new life, put His spirit in them and place them in their own land, 37: 12-14.

In Ezek. 17: 22-24 we have the parable of the tenderest twig on the topmost of the new growth. This tenderest twig will be cropped off and will be planted 'in the mountain of the height of Israel,' where it will grow into a goodly cedar. This tenderest twig is the young captive king Jehoiachin, unless the whole of the newly reborn People of God is intended.

Thus we see that both Jeremiah and Ezekiel believe the true People of God to be the exiles in Babylonia, and more specifically the 597 B.C. exiles. The first break in the dark clouds came with the release on parole of King Jehoiachin in 561 B.C. by Evil-Merodach king of Babylon, 2 Kings 25: 27-30.[1]) Here was the beginning of the fulfilment of the promise, and it was probably this event which gave the second editor of Kings courage and hope to deal with the appalling problem created by the untimely death of king Josiah. If ever a king should have lived long and prospered gloriously it was King Josiah, the true pattern of all that a Deuteronomic king should be.[2])

But the prophets found it impossible to confine the privilege of being the People of God to the 597 B.C. exiles only. Both in Jeremiah 30 and 31 and in Ezekiel 37, the People of God includes all the exiles in Babylon, all who are described as being scattered exiles 'from the uttermost parts of the earth,' Jer. 31: 8.

When we turn to post-exilic times and to the work of the Chronicler, we find the same attitude. Those who have been in exile in Babylonia are the People of God. Those who stayed behind in Palestine, 'the people of the land,' are not the People of God. These latter are contrasted with the 'people of Judah,' who are the returned exiles (Ezra 4: 4) and they try to weaken their hands. They are 'the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin' (Ezra 4: 1), who, as the Chronicler believed, went to all lengths to frustrate the returned exiles in their purpose of

---

[1]) For the cuneiform account of the details of this king's 'continual allowance', see W. J. MARTIN, 'The Jehoiachin Tablets' in *Documents form Old Testament Times*, ed. by D. WINTON THOMAS, 1958, pp. 84-86.

[2]) See *I and II Kings*, The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 3 (1954), pp. 10 f., where it is argued that the original edition of Kings ended with the word 'Moses' in 2 Kgs. 23: 25, and that this first edition was written not long before the death of Josiah, when he was at the flood tide of his success. It is difficult to see how any editor could have written as he did, if Josiah, by a comparatively early death, had falsified all his theories. Nothing which involved Deuteronomic ideals could easily have been written between the death of Josiah in 609 B.C. and some such event as the easing of the conditions of Jehoiachin's exile.

rebuilding the Temple. These adversaries claimed to be worshippers of God equally with the returned 'children of the captivity,' but Zerubbabel and Jeshua and the rest, for whatever reason, did not allow them to have anything to do with the rebuilding, and that, so the records say, was when the trouble started.

Thus the returned exiles sought to establish themselves, and themselves only, in Jerusalem as the People of God. It is for this purpose that we have the genealogies and lists of the Chronicler: 1 Chr. 1-8; Ezra 2 and 8; Nehemah 7; 10: 1-28; 12: 1-26, together with the list of those who put away their 'foreign wives' (EVV 'strange wives'), the women whom they had married from 'the peoples of the land,' Ezra 10: 2. Anyone who was to be recognised as a priest in the post-exilic community had to be able to point to his family name in the priestly genealogies. If the name was not there, he was put out from the priesthood, Ezra 2: 62. There were priestly families whose names were in the lists, but who had not been to Babylon, but that is another story and was the result of a compromise.[1]) The genealogies were lists of the People of God. If a man's name was not in the list, then he was one of 'the people of the land' עם הארץ; it is probable that here we have the origin of this term, used later on to mean 'the outsiders,' the people outside the law, those who did not observe the ritual rules of cleanness.

Thus when the founders of Judaism limited the People of God to 'the children of the captivity,' they were translating into fact the words and promises of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Our claim is that the Second Isaiah fits into this pattern and is in this succession. He is the link between Jeremiah and Ezekiel on the one hand and the post-exilic returned exiles on the other hand, those who sought to establish themselves as the sole People of God, the story of whose struggle and success is to be found in the writings of the Chronicler, his history of the establishment of Judaism. From the Second Isaiah, in fact, there came an added edge of exclusiveness.

In the next chapter we seek to show the truth of this contention and the soundness of the identification of the Servant of the LORD, and this by dealing in detail with the various pieces of chapters 40-55 and 60-62.

It is on this basis that we would explain Isaiah 48: 1-11, a section with which the commentators have found very considerable difficulty.

---

[1]) See below, pp. 228.

Some scholars have ascribed all the strictures of this piece to an editor, holding that this kind of thing is not at all like the Second Isaiah. So DUHM, CHEYNE, MARTI and others. The most recent commentators accept the section as from the Second Isaiah.[1] The assumption is that here as elsewhere the prophet is speaking to the exiles, and that therefore he is accusing them, or at least some of them, of all these abominations. The critics naturally find this difficult to accept, and so an alternative is that he is speaking to the Israel of history, the people which has been so prone to idolatry and such like waywardness all through the years. The writer is rightly compared with Ezekiel, but when Ezekiel is making these accusations, he is castigating the people who are still in Jerusalem. And so it is in Isaiah 48: 1-11. The prophet is attacking the non-exiles. They call themselves by the name of Israel. They have come forth 'from the bowels[2] of' Judah. They make their oaths in the Name of the LORD, and they commemorate the God of Israel, 'but not in truth, nor in righteousness' (end of v. 1). They say that they belong to the Holy City and they rely upon the God of Israel. This is the content of verses 1 and 2. Some commentators (DUHM, etc.) hold that the whole of these two verses after 'Jacob' is an addition, and so also the strictures of verses 4, 8-10 and 11. If half a section is excised, it is not surprising that a different conclusion is reached from that which appears on the surface. An explanation which demands such wholesale excision is surely suspect. As the section stands, it refers to people whose claim to be the true Israel-Jacob is strongly denied. They are a people who claim that the Holy City is their's. Presumably this is a group actually resident in Jerusalem. They are the inhabitants of the city who were not deported either in 597 B.C. or in 586 B.C. They are 'the rebellious house' of Ezekiel; the 'bad figs' of Jeremiah; they are 'the people of the land' of the Chronicler. The claim of the author of 48: 1-11, which is the basis of all his strictures, is that exiled Israel is the People of God. This is the theme of the Second Isaiah. His nationalism has an exclusiveness which would deny even those who are of the same blood.

---

[1] C. R. NORTH, *Isaiah 40-55* (TORCH Commentaries, 1952), pp. 101 f.; *The Second Isaiah*, 1964, pp. 174-179.

[2] The Hebrew has וממי (and from the waters of). LXX omits. The Targum has 'seed', probably interpreting euphemistically. Most read וממעי (and from the bowels of). Possibly the Hebrew is sound after all, the meaning being that they claim to have survived the waters which have engulfed and overwhelmed Judah, i.e. the Babylonian invasion.

The nation, the People of God, is composed only of the exiles in Babylon. See further, pp. 148 f.

Thus the post-exilic 'reformers,' those whose work culminated in the 'reforms' of Nehemiah and Ezra, were following a tradition, a principle already established. It began with Jeremiah, though he was one of the last persons in the world to desire that anything he said should even begin to establish the kind of exclusiveness which characterised post-exilic Jewry. It continued in Ezekiel. It becomes specific in Isaiah 48: 1-11 with its absolute denial that those who were still living in Jerusalem were to be reckoned among the People of God. This Israel of the exiles, this Servant of the LORD of the Second Isaiah develops into 'the children of the captivity,' and the obstinate ones of Isaiah 48: 4 who wrongly claim to be true worshippers of God become 'the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin' of Ezra 4: 1.

Our proposition is therefore: The Servant of the LORD is primarily the 597 exiles, but gradually it tends to widen in conception to include all the Babylonian exiles. Those remaining in Jerusalem are definitely not the People of God. This situation is found first in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It crystallises in the Second Isaiah. It is put into ruthless execution by Nehemiah and even more so by Ezra.

In the next chapter, we comment on various pieces in Isaiah 40-55 and 60-62 to demonstrate the evidence for the above proposition. To some extent, it is a development of the examination of various passages in the article in SOTP, pp. 187-200. J. LINDBLOM criticised [1]) these interpretations as 'somewhat original but sometimes hazardous exegesis.' Everything depends upon the initial assumptions. In reply to the charge that the majority of scholars assume that the prophet was a universalist and that this prior assumption influences their exegesis throughout, he says: 'It would be equally correct to say that their (i.e. DE BOER and I) own interpretation depends on their idea that the prophet was a consistent nationalist.' [2]) This, of course, is quite right. Everything does indeed depend upon the categories of judgment which the exegete brings to his material. All that can be done is to put forward interpretations of the various sections of chapters 40-55, 60-62, based on the assumptions that the Servant is primarily the 597 B.C. exiles, and that the prophet is a convinced, persistent and consistent nationalist. The reader must judge which set

---

[1]) *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (1963), p. 428.

[2]) *op. cit.*, p. 428.

of assumptions is the more likely to be those of the Second Isaiah. Was he an innovator, as the majority of scholars assume? Or is he in the line of his predecessors and successors, as we assume?

LINDBLOM goes so far as to agree that prior to 539 B.C. the prophet had a nationalist outlook,[1]) and that he became a universalist after 539 B.C. We agree that there was a change in the prophet's outlook. We agree also that the date of the change was roughly 539 B.C. But we think that the change was not one which welcomed all Gentiles, but from the narrower idea of the Servant as the 597 B.C. exiles (cf. Jeremiah, Ezekiel) to the wider idea of all the exiles and possibly all exiled Israelites, but definitely not those who remained in Jerusalem.

---

[1]) *op. cit.*, p. 428.

# EXEGESIS OF ISAIAH 40-55, 60-62

This chapter consists of detailed exegesis of sections and verses in the nineteen chapters of the Second Isaiah, on the basis that (i) the Second Isaiah was essentially a nationalist, and (ii) the Servant of the LORD is primarily the 597 B.C. exiles, and secondarily all the Babylonian exiles.

*Isaiah* 40: 1 *f.* Who is to be comforted? and who is to administer the comfort? The answer is that 'my people' are to administer the comfort to 'Jerusalem.' The passage with which we are concerned is 40: 1 and 2a:

> Comfort-ye, comfort-ye, my-people,
> saith your-God:

> Speak-ye to-the-heart-of Jerusalem,
> and-call-aloud to-her. . .

The frequent assumption is that we have here an exact parallelism between the two longer elements in this pair of 3: 2 couplets, even though there is no such parallel in the shorter lines. It is thus assumed that 'my people' is the object of the verb 'comfort'; 'comfort ye' being the equivalent of 'speak to the heart of,' and 'my people' the equivalent of 'Jerusalem.' This is what the Versions mostly do. Thus, LXX makes 'my people' the object of the verb 'comfort,' but then feels compelled to supply a vocative in order to indicate who it is that is bidden to act as comforter. LXX therefore inserts 'Ye priests' at the beginning of v. 2, and is followed in this by the Syro-hexaplar. The Targum assumed that the command to comfort is addressed to the prophets, and inserts this. Another suggestion is made by F. M. Cross, Jr. and adopted by G. E. Wright,[1] namely, that God is instructing his angels in the heavenly assembly. The Syriac took 'my people' to be the object of the verb, but makes no explanatory interpolation. But the Vulgate has *popule meus*, making 'my people' a vocative,[2] and then follows with *consolamini*, which the Douay Version

---

[1] *The Old Testament against its Environment*, 1950, p. 37n.

[2] Wright has not considered this possibility, but thinks of the verb as active, and not passive.

renders 'be comforted.' But the Latin form is not decisively a passive. It can indeed be the passive of *consolare* (and so 'be comforted'), but this verb is markedly rare. It is much more likely that we are dealing with the deponent verb *consolari* (and so 'give comfort'). The first hand of codex א has λαός (vocative) instead of the normal LXX accusative. It seems most likely that LXX intended the deponent verb and that Douay misinterpreted the intention of the Latin under the influence of the orthodox LXX text. It is not possible to decide from the Hebrew accents whether the Masoretic tradition intended the one or the other. The accents would be the same in either case, since both involve the second word of the three being more closely connected with the first word than with the third.[1]) The most that can be established is that 'my people' is probably, though not certainly, vocative, and thus that 'my people' is bidden to comfort Jerusalem. It depends upon where 'my people' are. If 'my people' are the ones to be comforted, then 'my people' are to be identified with Jerusalem. If we were right in our intepretation of 48: 1-11 (end of the last chapter), then quite definitely 'my people' is not to be identified with Jerusalem. What we have is 'my people', now on the way back or about to be on the way back, bringing comfort to the ruined city.

In 40: 9 the message is certainly to 'the cities of Judah,' but what is the meaning of מבשׂרת ירושׁלם? It could mean, as LEVY[2]) suggests, that Zion-Jerusalem is the messenger who is to announce the good news to the cities of Judah. It is sometimes said that the Greek Versions make Zion the messenger, but this is by no means certain. It is true that in classical Greek εὐαγγελίζομαι takes the accusative of the messenger and the dative of the recipient, but in New Testament Greek both are in the accusative. Who is to say what LXX intends when the noun is indeclinable? The more natural interpretation is that the meaning is 'Zion's messenger,' i.e. a messenger to Zion, especially since this seems to be the case in 41: 27 and 52: 7. Therefore, we hold that in 40: 1, 2a Zion-Jerusalem is the recipient of the message and 'my people' is the messenger. The good tidings are that the LORD is coming back again to His Holy City, the city which He left in order to be with the exiles, Ezek. 1; 11: 16. He is coming as a mighty one, conquering and ruling, but leading His flock like a shepherd with the utmost care and solicitude, carrying new-born lambs in the folds of His cloak and leading on by easy stages the ewes that are heavy with

---

[1]) WICKES, *Prose Accents*, 1887, p. 69.

[2]) *op. cit.*, p. 117.

young.[1]) Thus 'the ransomed of the LORD shall return and come with singing unto Zion' (51: 11), and then it is that Zion once more will be 'my people' (51: 16).

If it is true that 'my people' (40: 1), the returning exiles, are to bring effective comfort and relief to Jerusalem, then it follows that the group which has committed iniquity is Jerusalem and not 'my people.' It is Jerusalem's 'warfare' (צבא here means 'period of hard service, hardship, toil') that is finished and her iniquity that is pardoned. The phrase נרצה עונה means that the punishment which she has received is adequate to compensate for the iniquity she committed: sin demands the full price and when this is paid in full, then 'sin' (or the nature of things, or God) is satisfied רצה. Whether Jerusalem received double punishment or not,[2]) the point here is that Jerusalem sinned and Jerusalem paid.

*Isaiah* 40: 7. 'the people is grass.' This is a gloss, and has nothing to do with our problems. See above, pp. 168 f.

*Isaiah* 41: 8. 'Israel my servant' is equal to 'Jacob whom I have chosen.' Jacob-Israel is either 'the seed of Abraham my loving one' or 'Abraham's seed, my loving one.' The same uncertainty occurs in 2 Chron. 20: 7, though Jas. 2: 23 speaks of Abraham as the friend of God. The phrase 'whom I have chosen' is equivalent to 'my servant' also in 44: 1 f. and 45: 4. The call is to the Servant, which is Israel, and 'I have chosen thee and not cast thee away' (v. 9). That is, the exile did not mean rejection. On the contrary, it meant their being chosen ones, recognised as being the descendants of Abraham. God is going to make these exiles conquerors ('uphold thee with my victorious [3]) right hand' v. 10, RSV). Jacob the worm and Israel the grub [4]) (v. 14) is going to be helped by God, his redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, and everything is going to be smashed flat before him. Compare our interpretation of 41: 2-3 as referring to Jacob-Israel and not to Cyrus (pp. 163 f.)

---

[1]) AV 'with young' and RSV; RV 'give suck.' The Arabic *ġala* means 'give suck (while pregnant),' and the Syriac *'ula'* means both 'foetus' and 'suckling.'

[2]) The root כפל means 'double over.' The noun can mean 'the double of the jaw' Job 41: 5. It can mean being folded over, like the curtain (Exod. 26: 9) or the breastpiece (Exod. 28: 16). Thus it might mean 'equivalent' and not necessarily 'twice.'

[3]) The Hebrew is צדקי, my vindicating, rectifying, saving power.

[4]) Most read רִמָּת (grub), but G. R. DRIVER retains the text and translates 'louse' (cf. Accadian *mutu*), JTS 36 (1935), p. 399.

*Isaiah* 42: 1. According to LXX, this verse should read 'Jacob my servant' and 'Israel my chosen.' Evidently LXX identified the Servant with Jacob-Israel. But Jacob-Israel means the exiles, not the old Israel, not the Palestinians, but the 'good figs' of Jer. 24: 5. It means the new Israel, the one that is ransomed and redeemed (41: 14). SKINNER [1]) says: 'It is at least true that if the Servant of vv. 1-4 be Israel, he is Israel in a new character.' To which the answer is 'quite': he is the new Israel which arose as if from the dead (Ezek. 37; Isa. 53: 8 f.), triumphant and victorious.

*Isaiah* 42: 6-9. Here the Servant is apparently distinct from those who have blind eyes, who sit in the darkness of dungeons. The Servant has been called by God 'in righteousness': this means 'in victory, with salvation' or, as C. R. NORTH [2]) translates it, 'for a saving purpose' But whereas Professor NORTH sees the saving purpose as for the nations, our judgment is that it is for Israel as a whole. The difference between the Servant and the prisoners who are to be released is, we suggest, due to the two deportations. The first deportment of 597 B.C. was, as we pointed out earlier (p. 170), of all the leaders, so that 'none remained, save the poorest sort of the people of the land,' 2 Kgs. 24: 14. This statement may well be, at least in part, Judaean propaganda against the Palestinians (cf. 2 Kgs. 17: 24-41), but we do know that hopes for the future were centred primarily around King Jehoiachin, and that the seventy years of the exile (Jer. 25: 11 f.; 29: 10) are reckoned from 597 B.C. Further, it is these first exiles who are Jeremiah's 'good figs,' and it is those who are not the first exiles who are Ezekiel's 'rebellious house.' This first group is to be the instrument by which all the exiles return home. They are thus 'the covenant of the people,' [3]) the means by which God will bind into one again the scattered People of God, and thus bring them once more into relationship with Him. The People of God does not include any that remained in Palestine after 586 B.C., unless it includes some who were deported c. 581 B.C. In this way we explain as meaning 'Israel' passages which refer to others being rescued and restored apart from the Servant, and we are not led to identify these with the Gentiles.

---

[1]) *op. cit.*, p. 28.
[2]) *The Second Isaiah*, p. 38.
[3]) We regard it as most important to retain the singular here and not assume a plural, as NORTH does, and as LINDBLOM does, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*. 1963, p. 400.

*Isaiah* 42: 18-25. As has been pointed out,[1]) much confusion has been caused by the assumption that the 'blind ones' of v. 16 and v. 18 are identical with the 'blind one' of v. 19. The 'blind ones' of v. 16 are the exiles, all of them. Also 'the blind ones' (and 'the deaf ones') of v. 18 seem to be the exiles. But suddenly the writer turns and says that 'my servant,' 'my messenger whom I send,' 'the one who is to be restored,' [2]) 'the Servant of the LORD' is the blindest of all. The Servant is blind and cannot see that it is all 'for his (i.e. God's) righteousness' sake'. As NORTH has pointed out, this means 'for his saving purpose' [3]); this is the only rendering which gives the phrase meaning. Then 'his law' (v. 21b) means 'his teaching' (NORTH). All this is why he (Jacob-Israel) is a people robbed, imprisoned, without anyone at all to deliver. The LORD did this, against whom we (not the Servant) sinned. *They* (again not the Servant) would not obey God's law, and it was upon him (the Servant) that the disaster fell, but he did not understand. Cf. 53: 1-12 which also says that the people sinned and the Servant suffered the death of exile.

*Isaiah* 43: 1. The LORD speaks to the newly created and newly form-ed Jacob-Israel, whom He has redeemed and to whom He has given this name,[4]) so that Jacob-Israel is His. The prophet means that God has given this name Jacob-Israel to the exiles, those who will be passing through flood and fire. The prophet uses these words 'create,'[5]) 'form,' 'make' again and again, so important is his message that God has remade, recreated Israel. He is referring to an action in the immed-iate past, actually taking place, or is truly imminent. He does not mean that God created, formed, made this Jacob-Israel long, long ago. He means that God has just created and has recently named this Jacob-Isreal. He created them for His glory, so that all the world should admire and be impressed.

*Isaiah* 43: 8-13. It is usual to translate הוציא as an imperative, either

---

[1]) *SOTP*, pp. 194 ff.

[2]) The heb. מֻשְׁלָם is very difficult; see NORTH, *The Second Isaiah*, pp. 39, 118. We take the word to have the same meaning as שְׁלֹם in 53; 5, 'the chastisement which brought us *prosperity, well-being, restored life*.' So either retain the vowels of the Hebrew text and think of the servant as the one who is to be restored, or (better) read as a *pi'el*, in the sense of 'restore' BDB p. 1022b (top).

[3]) *op. cit.*, pp. 39, 118.

[4]) The ancient Versions have the suffix 'I have named *thee*,' as if reading קְרָאתִיךָ.

[5]) 'create' בָּרָא 43: 1; 43: 7; 43: 15.
'form' יָצַר 43: 1; 43: 7; 43: 21; 44: 2; 44: 21; 44: 24; 45: 11; 49: 5.
'make' עָשָׂה 43: 7; 44: 2; 51: 13; 54: 5.

assuming an irregularity or reading a *ṣērĕ* or making it a plural; and
then to follow by translating the prefect נקבצו as 'let. . .be gathered
together' (RV) or 'let. . .gather together' (RSV). But NORTH rightly
translates this last as a perfect: 'all the nations have been convened.' [1])
The opening verb is also a perfect, and from v. 9 it may be understood
that the event is regarded as having taken place. These all may well
be 'prophetic perfects,' the prophet meaning either that the event is
absolutely certain or is imminent or (more probably) both. We would
translate, inverting the construction in the first line:

> The people that is blind, yet has eyes,
>     has been brought out,
> The deaf ones, though they have ears.
> All the Gentiles are gathered together;
> The peoples assemble.
> Who among them foretold this,
> And announced the former things?
> Let them produce their witnesses and
>     show they are right (justify themselves),
> And let men hear and say, 'It is true.'

The passage goes on to say that the new Israel, the released ones,
those who God has saved, are the living witnesses to the saving might
of the Only God. There is nothing here about saving the Gentiles.
They are on trial because they did not forsee the 'former things'
(usually this means the first Exodus), nor did they foretell this second
Exodus.

*Isaiah* 43: 14-21. God here speaks to the exiles. For their sake he has
sent to Babylon and brought down all the honoured ones,[2]) all of
them, and (?) the Chaldaeans shall be bound in fetters.[3]) This is the
God who makes a path through the sea, as He did in the first Exodus,
who brought out chariot and horse and destroyed them all. But do
not look back (v. 18) at these former things. These things took place
long ago. Look forward to the new thing (i.e. this second deliverance)

---

[1]) SI, p. 41.

[2]) G. R. DRIVER, JTS xxxiv (1933), p. 39; בְּרִיחִים, cf. Syriac *berah* 'honoured'.

[3]) The text is uncertain. This reading is based on LXX (אᶜᵃ and A) ἐν κλοιοῖς
δεθήσονται. The normal LXX is 'ships' as the Hebrew, though this might easily be
'with lamentations' (cf. RSV). It is possible that Cod. A may be a correction be-
cause of 'bind,' but it is difficult to see how δεθήσονται could arise in the first
place without κλοιοῖς.

I am about to do. God is going to make a way through the wilderness, and rivers [1]) in the desert. All this is to give drink to this newly chosen people whom God has formed for Himself and whose duty is to rehearse His praise. The whole passage then, refers to the journey across the desert of the exiles, the newly chosen People of God.

*Isaiah* 43: 22-28. A new section begins here. The words are addressed to the old Jacob-Israel, who did not call [2]) upon God, nor did they weary themselves in their service to Him. They brought whole-offerings, but not to God. Their sacred meals (זבח) were not in honour of Him. God did not make them worship [3]) Him with tribute-offerings (מנחה: the cereal-offering of post-exilic times), nor did He weary them by insisting on them providing frankincense. It was not for Him that they bought fragrant cane, and they did not satiate him with the fat of their sacred feasts.[4]) The old Jacob-Israel did indeed worship (serve) God, but it was with their sins. They did indeed weary Him, but it was with their iniquities. Then in v. 25 God says that He, even He, is the One who blots out Israel's rebel actions, and forgets his sins. Then (v. 26) let us see what can be done about it. Recall it all to my memory, and let us judge the matter. Recount what you have to say, you that you may be cleared of your sins (the verb is צדק, put in the right, declared innocent). But no: the whole story is one of unrepented sin, and this was so all down the years. Their first ancestor sinned, God's spokesmen to them were rebellious against Him, His princes defiled His sanctuary.[5]) And so God gave Jacob to the ban, to be utterly destroyed, and He made Israel something for every one to revile. The section tells of the utter and complete rejection of the old Jacob-Israel.

*Isaiah* 44: 1-5. This section is linked to the previous section by the word ועתה (and now). It seems to be outside the metrical system, though such statements tend to be subjective in a line like this one, but single words are found at the beginning of a piece. Here the word provides the contrast between the old Jacob-Israel of the last section

---

[1]) Qumran (A) has 'paths,' which may well be right. It makes a parallel, and see v. 20b.

[2]) Both the direct accusative and the preposition *lāmed* are found with this meaning. The negative is carried over into the second clause, as LXX and V realised.

[3]) The word also means 'serve, act as a slave.' Cf. NORTH, SI, p. 42.

[4]) All the fat of the sacred-meal זבח went to the altar, and none of the flesh.

[5]) This follows LXX.

and the new Jacob-Israel of this section. God has chosen a new
Jacob-Israel, Jacob who is the Servant, Israel whom God has chosen.
He has made him as though newly born. The offspring of the returned
exiles (water for the thirsty, streams on the dry ground) will increase
and multiply like poplars and willows by the river side. They will
claim that they are God's people. There is no basis for assuming that
those mentioned in v. 5 are foreigners, except a basic assumption that
the Second Isaiah is a universalist. The speakers in v.5 are the des-
cendants mentioned in v. 3 .DILLMANN [1]) realised that those who are
speaking are Israelites by birth.

*Isaiah* 44: 21-22. Here Jacob-Israel is the Servant whom God has
formed and chosen. Israel was made for the express purpose of being
God's Servant. Jacob-Israel will not be forgotten [2]) by God. V. 22 is
difficult because these words for 'sin' sometimes mean the actual sin
itself, and sometimes the punishment: which could well be the mean-
ing here. In this case, the meaning is that the sufferings of the exile are
over, and God has redeemed Israel.

*Isaiah* 44: 23. is the description of the triumphant return and restora-
tion of Jacob-Israel, with all the natural world exulting. Cf. 49: 13;
55: 12.

*Isaiah* 44: 24-28. The great Creator God speaks to the people He
has formed. He confirms what the Servant has said: Jerusalem shall
be rebuilt and the cities of Judah inhabited. Cyrus is going to be
the actual agent in this. The Hebrew apparently intends to say that
Cyrus will give the rebuilding instructions, but LXX and V have
the same construction as vv. 26a, 27, 28, all of which makes God the
speaker. Probably the Hebrew is right, and the Versions are as-
similating. Josephus says (*Ant. Iud.* XI i 1) that it was when Cyrus
read this passage concerning the rebuilding of the city that he took
appropriate action.

*Isaiah* 45: 1-7. Cyrus is God's anointed one. This means that he is
appointed for a special purpose,[3]) in this case to free Jacob-Israel
from captivity in Babylonia, to allow these displaced persons to return

---

[1]) *Der Prophet Jesaia*, 1890, *in loc.*

[2]) This is the pointing of the Hebrew, and it would appear to be correct. God
will always remember His Servant, the new Jacob-Israel. Other suggestions are
'you must not forget me' (cf. RVm) and 'you must not play false with me.' When
God remembers, He acts and saves.

[3]) *The Jews from Cyrus to Herod*, 1949, pp. 106-112.

home. Cyrus is chosen for the sake of Jacob-Israel, the chosen Servant of God. Cyrus never knew God, but God nevertheless gives him strength, so that all the wide world may know that the LORD is the only God there is. The call of Cyrus to rebuild the city is mentioned again in v. 13 and he is to free the exiles though no payment is to be made to secure their freedom.

*Isaiah* 45: 14-17. There is much dispute concerning this section. If the section is to be connected with the previous verses, then the workers of Egypt and the merchants of Ethiopia and the tall Sabaeans will come and pay homage to Cyrus and they will say "Nay, but God is in thee." Such an acknowledgement will be wholly contrary to expectation.[1]) This identification with Cyrus is in Jerome, and amongst moderns it is advocated by SKINNER, MOWINCKEL, and others.[2]) If, however, this section is regarded as distinct from the previous verses, then Egypt, Ethiopia and the Sabeans are to come to Jacob-Israel, astonished that God is to be found in them because of all the utter disasters which have overtaken them. It is all idolators who are to be thrown into confusion, but Jacob-Isarel will be saved and delivered once and for all with never any more disappointment or disillusion. God must be in (with) Israel because of Israel's triumph. Verse 15 looks like a pious comment by a scribe.

*Isaiah* 45: 18-25. As has been pointed out,[3]) if verses 22 and 23 are taken separately and lifted out of their context, they can be interpreted as evidence of a generous universalism towards the Gentiles. This is what orthodox modern commentators actually do. But 'all the ends of the earth' does not mean the Gentiles: cf. 43: 5, 6. And verse 23 does not involve, as many suppose, humble worship in willing loyalty. It means 'worship' only to those who are accustomed to kneel in worship, but not to those who prostrate themselves. To kneel means to bow low in humble obeisance and subservience. The call is (v. 20) to those who have escaped from the Gentiles, and the climax is (v. 25) that 'by (through, by the agency of) the LORD all Israel's

---

[1]) Both אף and אך can be used in discussion. אף means 'Yes, and. . .' with the speaker going on to add further corroboration. אך means 'yes, but. . .' with the speaker proceeding to produce an objection. Always a negative, unexpected element is involved: see 'The meaning of the Hebrew אך', VT. xiv, 2, (April 1964), pp. 221-225.
[2]) NORTH, DI, p. 137, who is of the opinion that the 'thee' is Jacob-Israel. Also WHITEHOUSE, *Isaiah* (Cent. Bible), ii, p. 125.
[3]) SOTP, p. 196.

descendants (i.e. the descendants of the exiles) shall be justified (seen to be in the right, vindicated, triumphant) and shall boast.' Here is conquering, boasting Israel. Verse 22 we take to refer to the exiled Israelites (cf. 49: 6 as well as 43: 5, 6). Verses 23 and 24 describe the humble subservience of the Gentiles. As they bow in humility before God, they will say (LXX, verse 24) 'Nay,[1]) but in the LORD are victorious acts and strength. All men shall come to him, and all who were formerly his antagonists shall lose face.' But all the descendants of Israel shall be gloriously vindicated.

*Isaiah* 46: 3-4. This section is wholly independent of verses 1-2, which describe the panic in Babylon and the rush to load the idols on to pack-animals to save them when the city is captured and sacked. The prophet here is talking about the birth of the new Jacob-Israel, not yet come to birth, but being delivered out of the womb of God.[2]) This babe to be born is the remnant [3]) of the old Jacob-Israel. However long the birth is delayed, even though the parent's hair be gray, the birth of the new Israel is certain. This new Israel is the exiles, preserved and reborn. Here is the birth of post-exilic Judaism.

*Isaiah* 46: 8-11. As NORTH pointed out,[4]) 'the rebels' (RV and RSV have 'the transgressors') are the prophet's own people, and not the Gentiles. We understand the reference to be to the exiles as a whole, slow to heed and respond to the words of the Servant. The 'bird of prey' (v. 11, as RSV. RV has 'a ravenous bird') from the east is the Servant, the new Israel, who is represented as being 'from the east' in 41: 2 also; see pp. 163f. above. Compare also 44: 26. All three passages hang together; either they all three refer to Cyrus, or, as we think, all three refer to the triumphant, rampant People of God. Verse 12 encourages all who losing heart (אבדי לב, cf. LXX) because they think they are far from vindication (צדקה, victory, salvation). But this vindication is near and this salvation will not be long delayed. It will be granted in Zion, and it will be for the new Israel, the returned exiles.

---

[1]) The Hebrew is אך. See note on p. 185.

[2]) See the strong anthropomorphisms of verse 4 also, where מלט means 'deliver, give birth' as in Isa. 66 7. See 'The Width and Length of Words,' ET lv 10 (July 1944), pp. 265-268.

[3]) Both שארית and שאר are used of the Remnant, though the latter comes to be the technical term.

[4]) SI, p. 166.

*Isaiah* 48: 1-11. See pp. 173f. above, where it is argued that verses 1 and 2 refer to those who still are in Jerusalem, men who falsely claimed to be true worshippers of God. They say they belong to the holy city and they profess to rely on the God of Israel. But it is all false. Commentators have found this section difficult, and some find more than one piece in these eleven verses. DUHM tought the whole piece has been substituted for a much milder passage. Many difficulties are removed if we think of the Jerusalemites as the rejected ones and the exiles as the remnant, those that have been refined and chosen in the furnace of affliction. The old Jacob-Israel had been told by the prophets of what would come to pass (v. 3), and now it has all happened. New things have come to pass, things that have been hidden and secret (i.e. in God's secret counsel). But they took no notice (v. 8), have not listened, born a rebel and still a rebel. Nevertheless God is not going to exterminate Jacob-Israel. He has refined the old Jacob-Israel, tested and chosen them in the furnace of affliction. In v. 10 the Hebrew is the root בחר, which means 'choose' (cf. RV) and not 'try, test' (as RSV). We see no need to alter the text to בחנתיך (tried, tested) as some do. The passage refers to the choosing of the new Israel (the exiles) out of the furnace in which the old Israel was involved.

*Isaiah* 48: 12-19. These verses are notoriously difficult, since the rhythm and the pronouns are constantly changing. To what extent these changes are due to the activity of scribes, either by accident or in seeking to 'improve' or 'correct', it is difficult to say. There is always the possibility that we have a number of separate pieces. Verse 12 is a summons to Jacob-Israel, the new Israel, the exiles whom God has called to be His people. Verse 14 is a call to all and sundry to hear the declaration of God concerning what is about to happen to Babylon and the Chaldeans. The LORD chose (אהב, special love, choice) Israel, and he shall fulfil His (God's) purpose (חפץ as in 46: 10) concerning Babylon, and exercise His power (lit. 'his arm,' unless we follow LXX and read 'and concerning the seed of' וּבְזֶרַע for זורעו the Chaldeans). God has spoken and He has summoned him, brought him along, and Israel has made his way prosperous.[1]) Verse 16 says that God has never made any secret of all this: i.e. His intention to call the Servant and lead him and the people to prosperity. But now, NOW (ועתה, emphatic, as in 44: 1) the climax

---

[1]) LXX, Targum and Syriac have first person here also, as throughout the verse.

has come, and God has sent the Servant forth (on his conquering way), and 'my spirit. . .' This is a noted crux, and it is very likely that a word has been lost, such as '(is) upon him.' In any case, the general sense is clear. God has called Jacob-Israel and now at long last God's plans are going to be fulfilled. There has been much discussion as to whether vv. 17-19 refer to the past or the future. It is agreed that the first stichos of v. 17 can be translated 'O that thou wouldest hearken. . .' (so RVm), but if we follow with 'then. . .' ,the reference must be to the past. But there is a way in which the reference to the future can be maintained: and such a reference is much more in keeping with the Second Isaiah's attitude rather than useless repining for what might have been. It is best to read: 'O that thou wouldest hearken to my commandments and your peace be like a river. . .(19b) then their (your children, descendants) name shall never be cut off. . .'. This makes the verses promise unending prosperity for the future dependant on the new Israel keeping the commandments of God.

*Isaiah* 48: 20 f. Jacob is the LORD's servant whom He has released from Babylon. The journey back to Jerusalem is described in terms borrowed from the story of the Deliverance from Egypt, for this is a second exodus and it ends in a second entry into and occupation of the Promised Land. Verse 22 seems to be a pious addition: cf. 57: 21, possibly dating from a time when the whole of chapters 40-66 were for some reason divided into three sections of approximately equal length: 40-48, 49-57, 58-66. The division does not seem to have anything to do with the contents of the sections, and any reason offered for such division is wholly without evidence.

*Isaiah* 49: 1-6. This is the second of the so-called Servant Songs. The Servant is Israel (v. 3). All who insist upon an individualistic interpretation of the identity of the Servant find themselves constrained to omit 'Israel' in this verse. It is indeed missing in one Hebrew MS, but this is no. 96 in KENNICOTT's list, in many ways the least satisfactory of his manuscripts. He says of it *plurimas habet variationes*. The metrical evidence for omission is decidedly weak. Indeed, if this word is to be omitted on metrical grounds, then almost any word can be omitted anywhere. The rhythm, especially of the latter half of the lines, is most irregular in this section. Here the Servant is declaring his calling and his mission in the Gentile world. This mission is not only to restore the Jacob-Israel of the Babylonian exile, but to be a guiding light throughout the whole of the Gentile

world in order that God's salvation may extend everywhere. But this is God's salvation of the Jews: see pp. 155 f. above.

*Isaiah* 49: 7-13. Here the LORD is speaking to a despondent Jacob-Israel, despised [1]) by men, abhorred by the Gentiles, and subject to tyrants. There is to be a complete change. When kings and princes see a triumphant Israel, they will leap to their feet in respect and bow low in submission, all because of the LORD who is to be relied upon, the Holy One of Israel who has chosen Israel. Verse 8 says that God has answered and helped Israel in a time of favour רצון. This means a time when God acts favourably with goodwill. It is the same as 'a day of favourable visitation,' a day of salvation. The journey home will be without the normal hardships of desert travel. They will come from far (i.e. from far away Babylon) and others from the north and the west, and yet others from Sinim (? Syene): but they will all be Israelites.

*Isaiah* 49: 14-21. Here is consolation for Zion,—the city, not the inhabitants. The city complains that she is forsaken and forgotten. But God denies this. He has remembered her and has her walls in mind. Her sons [2]) will hurry to her, and those that destroyed her will go away. If Zion raises her eyes and looks, she will see her children returning, crowds of them, so many that there will not be enough living space for them. In v. 21 גלמוד (solitary) means husband away and therefore no chance of legitimate children. The two words גולה (exile) and סורה (removed) are not in LXX and seem genuinely to be outside the metrical construction. They look like realistic interpretations of a prosaic nature inserted into an elaborate metaphor. Further, they are the two words which make Zion an exile, which she definitely is not. Zion is the desolate and empty city, and is quite distinct from 'the People of God': cf. note on 40: 2.

*Isaiah* 49: 22-26. In these verses two things are plain. First, Zion's sons and daughters are being brought back to her from afar. Second, the Gentiles will be their humble slaves. Indeed, the kings and queens of the Gentiles will be in humble attendance on Zion's returning children. Humbly they will bow low with their faces in the dust and they will lick the dust off Zion's children's feet. Nothing could be so

---

[1]) See the full discussion by NORTH, SI, pp. 190 f.
[2]) The Versions have 'builders' בֹּנָיִךְ, which makes good sense, but the Hebrew is better.

abject, and no domination so complete. Normally it is impossible to snatch captives away from a warrior, but in this case God will free captive Israel, because He is the Saviour, the Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob. The section ends with brutal revenge on the oppressors of Israel. In this section, the exiles are the new Israel, and the prophet is entirely nationalistic. Note also that in v. 22 for עמים (peoples), LXX has νήσους (isles), but there is no need to assume that LXX was reading איים. It is more likely that LXX knew that the plural עמים means the Gentiles, and this is what 'the isles' means in the Second Isaiah.

*Isaiah* 50: 1-3. NORTH [1]) is of the opinion that the questions in v. 1 are rhetorical, and that the meaning is: There never was a divorce, and I was never so poor that I had any creditor. But Zion was divorced and the old Israel was sold. The meaning is: Let us have a look at that writ of divorce and see what it says, why the divorce took place: Let us get hold of that particular creditor and ask him why the sale took place. The answer is that it was all because of the people's iniquities that they were sold; and it was because of Zion's rebellious acts (RV, RSV 'transgressions', wrongly) that she was divorced. The difficulties arise through assuming that the metaphors of divorce and selling into slavery are both to be taken to include the exile. This is the problem of all exegesis and indeed of every discussion. When a metaphor or an illustration is used, to what extent is it to be applied? A feature in all arguments is that one man uses an illustration to illustrate a particular point, and the other man picks out other things in the illustration which the first man never intended. Here we would maintain, the reference is only to the disaster and not to the exile which followed it. The prophet is not talking about the exiles at all in verses 1 and 2, but only about Zion and the old Israel. Zion was divorced and her inhabitants sold away, so that when God came to Zion, there was nobody there; when he called there was nobody to answer. They had all been sold; the People of God were no longer there. But (v. 2a) God is able to redeem and deliver. He can dry up the sea (which is what He did in ancient time), and He can turn rivers into desert, so that the fish are in distress [2]) and die. It is not said that God will redeem the actual individuals whom He has sold, but that

[1]) SI, pp. 198 f.
[2]) Ugarit *bʾš* (be bad). DE BOER, *op. cit.*, p. 53; G. R. DRIVER, JTS xxxi (1930), pp. 276 f.

He will redeem and deliver. We believe that it is the exiles that He will redeem and deliver, but not the old Israel.

*Isaiah 50:4-9.* This is the third of the so-called Servant Songs. Verse 4 is uncertain, but it speaks of the Servant learning his lessons, being roused regularly in the early dawn to hear what God has to say to him, and thus being able to declare what he, as a good pupil, has learned. It was a hard discipline, but the Servant did not rebel against his lot. He was submissive. He bore the humiliation of exile and captivity. Therefore God has helped him and he has not been shamed out of existence. He endured bravely with set teeth (lit. 'set my face like a flint'), and he is sure he will not be shamed for ever. His vindication is near. He is prepared to face any accuser and he will win, because God will help him.

*Isaiah* 50: 10-11. All are walking in the dark and have no light, but there are two types. One type is the man who fears God (worships Him devoutly), relies upon God and obeys the Servant. All will be well with him. The other type seeks to make its own fire and does not trust in God nor obey the Servant. Any such will walk in the fires they have made and burn with their own brands.

*Isaiah* 51: 1-3. The meanings of the metaphors 'rock' and 'waterpit' are discussed at length by DE BOER,[1]) but the main message is clear. Remember Abraham and Sarah, who went out from this very country where you are exiled. Abraham was but one man when I called him, but his posterity multiplied like the stars of heaven. What God did for Abraham, He can and will do for you. Zion will be changed from ruin and desert into fruitfulness and joy like that of Eden the Garden of God.

*Isaiah* 51: 4-6. Many follow the Syriac and 12 de Rossi MSS in verse 4 and read עמים (peoples) for עמי (my people), and לאומים (nations, peoples) for לאומי (my nation, people). G. R. DRIVER [2]) thinks they are abbreviations. NORTH [3]) suggests that the singular forms may be dogmatic emendations. We would suggest, on the contrary that the proposed changes from singular to plural are dogmatic emendations. God's fiat will go out as a shining light throughout the world. He will

---

[1]) *op. cit.*, pp. 58 ff. He thinks the Rock is God, not Abraham.
[2]) 'Abbreviations in the Massoretic Text' in *Textus I* (1960), p. 115.
[3]) SI, p. 107.

suddenly [1]) bring his vindication near and His salvation will go forth, and He will judge the Gentiles by His power. This is the judgment by the conqueror. The Gentiles (isles) will wait for Him and His might. Compare 42: 4 where קוה means 'wait,' but not necessarily with hope (in Syriac the root means 'wait with dread'). So also יחל means 'wait' but not necessarily with eagerness (cf. 60: 9), though this is the usual meaning. They are to wait for the might of His arm, and this, combined with the judgment in strenght of verse 4, shows that the section refers to the judgment of the Gentiles and not to their salvation.

*Isaiah* 51: 7-8. This section says that no faithful Israelite need have any fear of men, nor need he be disturbed by anything they say. God's vindication of those who are devoted to His law is firm and secure for ever.

*Isaiah* 51: 9-11. The exiles shall return to Zion. The prophet links up the coming deliverance with the Rahab-dragon myth, according to which God overthrew the forces of chaos and destruction before the beginning of the world; and also with the first deliverance from Egypt. See Exod. 15: 4 and 5; Jonah 2: 3-6; Jer. 51: 34.

*Isaiah* 51: 12-16. God is Israel's comforter (cf. 40: 1). Israel has no need to be afraid of mortal man, here today and gone tomorrow. There is no need to fear the fury of the oppressor when he makes preparations to destroy. The one who stoops will quickly be set loose.[2]) He will neither die nor starve. God inspires his speech, protects him. It is perhaps best to regard v. 16a as within brackets, and then the stilling (רגע II, not רגע I) of the sea (v. 15a) is made preliminary to the work of creation (v. 16b), the stretching out of the heavens and the founding of the earth.

*Isaiah* 51: 17-23. Jerusalem is in great distress, lying prostrate having drunk to the dregs the cup of the LORD's anger. None of her children are there to raise her up and guide her. This we take to fit in with the Second Isaiah's usual attitude that the People of God are no longer in Jerusalem, and so far as her true inhabitants are concerned, the

---

[1]) reading ארגיע with the next verse.

[2]) The verb צעה in v. 14 means 'stoop, bend down.' The meaning can be 'cringe under the fury of the oppressor' or 'bow low under the burden of a slave.' Also, הפתח can mean loosed from fear, loosed from the bonds of the burden, loosed from the bonds of captivity.

city is empty. But God has taken the deadly cup away, and others must drink it, those who have trodden down the people of God like mire in the street.

*Isaiah* 52: 1-2. Zion-Jerusalem is to get up from the dust and put on festive clothing. She is to be a holy city, and no uncircumcised, ritually unclean foreigners will enter her any more. The people (captive daughter of Zion) are to be released, and the rope which tied them all neck by neck in one long line is to be loosed. There always was violent antagonism in old Israel against those who were uncircumcised, but here uncircumcision is linked with ritual uncleanness and we have the beginnings of that exclusiveness which was the dominant feature of Judaism. The uncircumcised are the Babylonian conquerors and possibly also others who have infiltrated into the city, who may actually be intended by the 'unclean'. In any case, the returning exiles claimed that all 'the people of the land' were unclean.

*Isaiah* 52: 3-6. Some editors have regarded this section as 'an interpolation' or as an 'editorial insertion.' Phrases like this belong to the same vocabulary and set of ideas as 'the main body' of the prophecy. If there is no 'main body,' then how can there be an interpolation? If the work of the prophet is regarded as being composed of fifty or so pieces, then any change of metre or of matter does not necessarily involve an insertion. It indicates another piece. In any case, if our view of the identity of the Servant is sound, this section is very far indeed from being an insertion. It is wholly in line with the prophet's message. The prophet is speaking to the exiles, the People of God. They are bidden to remember their history. They went down into Egypt innocently to live there for a while, and they were made slaves. The Assyrians unjustly oppressed them: this refers to the time from Jehu onwards until the fall of Nineveh, except for the period of Assyrian weakness in the time of Uzziah. Now once more, an innocent people is oppressed. They are unjustly carried away into exile. This is in line with the attitude of the prophet elsewhere, and it is also the attitude of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. These exiles were the good figs. Those left behind in Jerusalem were the bad figs. They were Ezekiel's 'House of rebellion.' But the exiles, 'my people,' will know my Name: that is, they will experience the establishment of God's reputation. This will be when He rescues His people from captivity and restores them to Zion. Then they will know that 'here I am' as in the ancient days.

*Isaiah* 52: 7-12. Here is a lyric declaring new life for Zion-Jerusalem. The messenger is bringing good news of salvation and prosperity. His feet are on the mountains (cf. 40: 9) and he is calling (?) from the mountains of Judaea across the valley to Jerusalem. He declares that once more their God has triumphed and established His kingly rule. The phrase יהוה מלך (the LORD has become king) is the Coronation cry. God has just triumphed and has taken His seat upon His throne. He has comforted (נחם; 40: 1) and redeemed Jerusalem. God has returned to Jerusalem and once more 'Jerusalem' and 'my people' are one. This time there is no haste, as there was in the flight from Egypt. This is a triumphal march and all the wide world will see the great salvation which God has wrought for Israel.

*Isaiah* 52: 13-15. This piece is usually held to be the opening of the fourth and last so-called Servant Song, but it is more probably a separate piece, though it may well stand as a title and summary of chapter 53. The Servant will prosper, be exalted and extolled, and be very high. There was a time when many (? the great ones) were appalled at his plight, battered and bruised, afflicted with sickness out of all human recognition. But the time will come when great nations will leap [1]) to their feet at his approach and clasp their hands to their mouths in respect and honour. They will see such things as never were told them before, and perceive things the like of which they have never heard.

*Isaiah* 53. The first three verses tell of the utter astonishment of the heathen world at the unexpected triumph of the Servant. Who, say they, could possibly have believed what we have heard? Who would have thought that in him of all people the victorious might of the LORD would be revealed? He grew up [2]) like a sucker, like a weak sapling, from a root in a dry and waterless soil. He had no shape and no beauty; there was nothing at all about him to admire. Men despised, neglected him. He was a man of much suffering, brought low [3]) by sickness. Men hide their faces from such as he, and that is what the speakers did. With verse 4 we get the beginning of the explanation first

---

[1]) See p. 161 above.

[2]) There is no need to read לפנינו (before us) for לפניו (before him). The suffix is a reference back to the subject of the verb: G. R. DRIVER, JTS 38 (1937), p. 48.

[3]) The root is ידע II, Arabic *wadu'a* (be quiet, humiliated), D. W. THOMAS in *Record and Revelation* (1938), pp. 393 f.

of the suffering and then of the triumph. Why did the Servant suffer? And why so suddenly and unexpectedly did he triumph? The acknowledged theory was that it is the guilty who suffer and it is the righteous who triumph. Surely, to have suffered so much, he must have been the worst of sinners. Surely, to have triumphed so completely, he must have been the most upright and righteous of all. The Second Isaiah supplies the answers in the rest of the chapter, and he speaks on behalf of sinful, guilty Israel. He explains why it is that the sufferings must be temporary, and why the triumph must be complete and lasting. Verse 4 opens with אכן, which is a stronger form of אך, itself expressing a contrast. It means: as a matter of fact, and quite contrary to what has been supposed.

In point of fact, says the prophet, it was our sickness, but he suffered. They were our pains, but he bore the heavy load of them. It was he that was pierced because of our rebellious actions; he was crushed because of our iniquities. The chastisment which brought us health/prosperity fell on him, and through his wound there was healing for us. All of which is saying that the Servant was wholly innocent, that the suffering which he bore was not his at all, he bore it instead of the guilty ones and they went free. The prophet continues: we all of us strayed like sheep, we turned each one of us his own way, and the LORD caused him to encounter the penalty for all of us. This is not saying that the Servant suffered in order than the rest might go free. There is nothing vicarious about his suffering in this sense. It is just a plain fact that he suffered when he ought not to have suffered, and we did not suffer when we ought to have suffered. He was treated brutally,[1]) and he humbly submitted to such harsh treatment and made no complaint. He was dumb and never opened his mouth, like a sheep led to the slaughter or an ewe before her shearers. There is no reference here whatever to any temple sacrifice; the point is the helplessness and dumbness of the animal. He was taken away after [2]) an oppressive unjust sentence, and nobody was concerned about his fate, for he was cut off from the land of the living, because of the rebellion of my people the mortal blow was his. They made his grave with the wicked (guilty) and with the rich [3]) at his death, although he had done nothing violent and had spoken no falsehood. Thus far

---

[1]) נגש is used of the Egyption task-masters, Exod. 3: 7, etc.

[2]) The meaning is wholly uncertain: It could mean 'without arrest and trial,' or 'after arrest and trial.' The preposition מן is often difficult to translate.

[3]) See p. 215.

(end of v. 9) the prophet has been declaring that the Servant is wholly innocent and entirely undeserving of any evil fate. But there is a divine law of retribution in this world and therefore it is entirely right and indeed inevitable that the disasters of the Servant must be temporary. If there is any justice at all in the world, then he must triumph. There was no period at which this belief was more widely held than the period from which Deuteronomy comes, and especially the period of the later sections of Deuteronomy. The prophet has referred to the exile under the figure of death, as Ezekiel did in chapter 37. The Servant must come to life again, as did the dried and apparently wholly lifeless bones in Ezekiel's vision.

It was all part of the divine purpose that the Servant was crushed. It was God who brought the sickness on him. But when [1]) the Servant provides (has provided) the compensatory payment for the wrong that has been done, then he will see his descendants living long, the greatest of earthly blessings, and the LORD's purpose will prosper in his hands. Here אשם means compensation, substitution. The so-called 'guilt-offering' was actually a compensation offering, and was presented in the Second Temple where damage had been done and the loss could usually be assessed. It could be for either inadvertent errors or deliberate offences. The essence of the offering was always that it was a compensation, a substitution.[2]) There is no record of this particular sacrifice before the post-exilic period, and we therefore see no reference here to any ritual sacrifice. The Servant was an innocent substitute for the guilty. The prophet is not concerned about what happens to the sinners, nor does he say that the Servant suffered and died for the sinners in order to save them. There was nothing vicarious in this sense about the suffering and death of the Servant, nor is there anything to do with atonement. The prophet is concerned about the Servant and he is demonstrating that the Servant was entirely innocent, and must of necessity prosper abundantly. The 597 B.C. exiles were the good figs, and those that remained behind in Jerusalem were Jeremiah's bad figs and Ezekiel's 'house of rebellion.' After (lit. away from) his suffering (trouble) the Servant will see light [3]); this means the light of life. His humiliation will give full

---

[1]) As NORTH points out (SI, p. 243) אם can be translated this way, Num. 36 4.

[2]) See 'The sin-offering and the guilt-offering,' VT XV, pp. 73-80. Also, DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel* (Eng. tr. 1961) pp. 420 f. makes a distinction between the sacrifice for sin and what he calls 'the sacrifice of reparation.'

[3]) So LXX and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

satisfaction and the righteous one, my Servant, will be vindicated to the great ones, for it was the penalty for their iniquities that he bore. (Lit. one will be satisfied with his humiliation—same verb as in v. 3—and one will vindicate the righteous one). Then in v. 12 we have the climax: God will grant him to share the spoils of victory with the great and strong ones. After all, he poured out his life in death and he was reckoned with the rebels; but it was the punishment for the sin of the many (great) that he bore and he took the place of the rebels (he intercepted). It is unfortunate that the English Versions, including RSV, have 'made intercession for' in 53: 12, because this phrase involves conscious and deliberate self-sacrifice for others and a pleading with God on their behalf. No one would dream that the same verb (and also the *hiph'il* form) is used in v. 6 and there translated 'laid on him.' We hold that the verb should be translated in the same way in both cases.

But who is 'my people' in v. 8? We deprecate reading the plural here or translating as though the word is in the plural. We maintain that the meaning is my people Israel, the sinful Israel of the days before 597 B.C., the bad figs. The Servant is the innocent victim of their rebellious apostasy, the 597 B.C. exiles, but tending, perhaps here, to include all the exiles.

*Isaiah* 54: 1-10. This section tells of the repopulation of a deserted Zion-Jerusalem. Not only will the city itself be full but it will be overcrowded. Her posterity will take possession of (יִרַשׁ, used in Joshua of the occupation of Palestine) of the lands of the Gentiles. God's desertion of Jerusalem was temporary. He will nevermore leave her, nor will He ever cease from His steadfast love and care for her. The picture is continued in vv. 11-17 with a glorious picture of prosperity and freedom from oppression. Once more the nationalistic element is supreme. At the very least it must be allowed that here the prophet's concern is for the resurgent Israel alone.

*Isaiah* 55: 1-5. God's free gift is offered to the new Israel, a prefigurement of the New Testament doctrine of grace. The ancient promises, the covenant with David will be renewed and made firm for ever. This new Israel is to be a witness to the Gentiles, and he will be a leader and a commander of the peoples. Israel will summon to his presence unknown nations, and nations who now do not know Israel will hurry to answer his summons. All this will be because Israel's God, YHVH, has glorified him.

*Isaiah* 55: 6-13. This last section of the sixteen chapters, 40-55, is a call to repentance. Come now and come quickly whilst the opportunity is here. Let the wicked leave his wicked way: let the evil man leave his evil devices—let him turn in repentance to God who is full of mercy and pardons to the uttermost. God's ways are not our ways, and His thoughts are not our thoughts. He has a different way of doing things, but be sure that His purposes will surely be accomplished. And so (vv. 12 f.) the return home to Zion will be a glorious march through a transformed world. All nature rejoices in this new day. Instead of the thorns and briers of the desert there will be a veritable tree garden like the paradises of the Persian kings.

There remain the three additional chapters, 60-62, which we hold to be the work of the Second Isaiah.

*Chapter* 60. Here the glory and splendour of the restored, repopulated city is joyously extolled in language which almost amounts to idealistic extravagance. Everywhere else on earth and covering all the Gentiles there will be darkness, thick obscuring cloud, but for the new Israel there will be a new dawn and the glory of the LORD will shine out upon them like the rising sun (זרח is used regularly of the speedy brightening of the sunrise). This 'glory' of God is His splendour כבוד, the haze of dazzling light which surrounds Him. It is the magnificence and splendour of the eastern prince magnified a thousandfold. Nations and kings will come to the bright light of this sunrise. Here (v. 4) they all come, the Gentiles come from every direction, carrying Israel's own children. All the wealth and plenty of land and sea will come to Israel; camels laden with gold and frankincense, flocks and rams from the desert tribes, all for the service of the altar in the glorious Temple that shall rise. Here they come (v. 8) like clouds of doves. The Gentiles (lit. isles) wait (קוה; cf. 51: 5) to bring Zion's children home with quantities of gold and silver. In verses 10-14 we get the complete subservience of the Gentiles. The foreigners are to build the walls, their kings are to be attendants. The gates of the city will be open night as well as day because of the continual inflow of wealth from the Gentiles and the Gentile kings among the train of captives. Zion will have absolute control over all, and all former oppressors will bow at Zion's feet in abject humility. The prophet continues this glorious description of Zion ruling all the Gentiles (to v. 18). The chapter concludes with the promise of a speedy exaltation and prosperity beyond the dreams of normal men.

*Isaiah* 61: 1-9. This has been called a secondary Servant Song. The speaker has been anointed to proclaim a day of freedom and joy. The word 'anointed' does not of necessity involve an actual anointing: the anointed one is one chosen by God for a particular purpose (cf. 45: 1). Verse 1 speaks of release from captivity. . .and the end of the exile (p. 143). The ruined cities are to be rebuilt. Israel will all be priests and ministers of God, whilst the Gentiles will do all the menial work. The people of God will receive a doubled recompence (61: 7; cf. 40: 2) and all the world will acknowledge their superiority.

*Isaiah* 61: 10-11. The speaker is either the Zion of the future (Targum, etc.) or the Servant (Delitzsch, etc.), but this represents no difference of opinion, since both become one. The Servant grows into the New Israel, and it is this New Israel which is to rebuild and restore Zion. Once more we have a strongly nationalist attitude. All the Gentiles will see the vindication and triumph of Isarel.

*Isaiah* 62: 1-4. The restoration of Zion-Jerusalem has yet to come. The prophet refuses to be silent till the promises are fulfilled, until Zion's prosperity shines out with the brightness of a flaring torch in the darkness. Then the Gentiles and their kings will see Zion's success and splendour. There is nothing about the Gentiles having any share in all this. Zion is to have a new name: Hephzibah: 'all my delight is in her' or perhaps 'all my purpose is fulfilled in her.' The land is to have a new name: Beulah; married, happy and fruitful. There will be a complete change and a new beginning.

*Isaiah* 62: 6-9. Once more the triumph of Jerusalem, and its glorious future is yet to come. The 'watchmen on the walls' are the prophets who will never cease proclaiming their message. They will constantly bring the LORD's promises to His remembrance. They will give Him no rest until the promises are fulfilled. The day is bound to come when Israel eats her firstfruits once again in the Temple Courts. This is according to the rules of Deut. 12: 17 f., before the time when the firstfruits became the perquisite of the priests, as they did in the post-exilic period.

*Isaiah* 62: 10-12. The conclusion of the prophet's messages is the actual entrance through the city gates. The exiles are pictured returning to Jerusalem and they are 'The holy people,' the redeemed of the LORD. This message has been proclaimed to the end of the earth

(cf. the phrase 'light of Gentiles'), and the message is not a worldwide salvation of all peoples, but the world-wide salvation of the people of God, the 'daughter of Zion.' The stage is now plainly and clearly set for the development of the exclusive nationalism of post-exilic Judaism.

## JESUS THE SERVANT OF THE LORD

One aspect of the career of the Servant sometimes neglected is the suddenness of his triumph and the astonishment which this triumph occasions. This is because the Servant is hidden and obscure till the moment of triumph comes.

The great ones of earth were appalled at the dreadful plight of the Servant (52: 14). He was battered and bruised, and scarcely looked like a human being at all. They are equally amazed at his complete triumph and success: see p. 194. They spring quickly to their feet at the sudden appearance of the triumphant one, and they clasp their hands over their mouths to keep silence before him; cf. 41: 1. They never thought to see what they have seen; they have realised something the like of which they had never heard. The Servant of rulers has astonishingly become the ruler of kings.

The first of the so-called Servant songs (42: 1-4) speaks first of the choice of the Servant and his destiny, which is to bring judgment to the Gentiles. It explains that it is the quiet, the silent, the unpublicised one who is to establish the LORD's justice. The Servant makes no commotion. He does not shout. He does not raise his voice (Targum, 'roar'), nor does he make his voice to be heard in the street. He is a crushed, though not broken, reed. He is a wick faintly burning, but not extinguished. Now there comes a change. He will not burn faintly, nor will he be crushed יָרוּץ, but will be strong and will burn brightly till he has established justice in the earth, and for his law (for him to declare his law) the isles (Gentiles) shall wait. Here we have the initial silence and weakness of the Servant, and then the unexpected but complete success. The same original silence and the subsequent contrast are seen in 42: 14: 'I have for a long time held my peace; I have been still and have restrained myself. (Now) I will cry out like a woman in travail; I will gasp and pant at the same time.'

In 46: 3 f. we find the picture of the long delayed birth and at long last the delivery of the new-born child, the new Israel (p. 164). But the surprise at the sudden appearance of the Servant and the unexpected transformation of the one who is despised and abhorred is seen not only in 52:13-15, but clearly in chapter 53 (pp. 194-197). In 53:1-3 the

whole emphasis is on the surprise and unexpectedness of the exaltation
of the Servant. The silence of the Servant is emphasised in verse 7.
He was harshly treated, brutally like a slave, and humiliated, but he
never opened his mouth. He was silent like a sheep led to the slaughter
and the ewe before her shearers, and all this in spite of being taken
away because of an unjust verdict. But the silent one emerges tri-
umphant.

In chapter 49, the silence and then the unexpected and sudden
triumph of the Servant are plain to see. God made the Servant as a
sharp sword, but He hid him in the shadow of His hand (verse 2).
He made him as a polished arrow, but He hid him in His quiver. Here
we have the picture of the Servant, chosen, called, prepared, tho-
roughly equipped, but hidden and kept secret. Verse 5 begins with
וְעַתָּה 'and NOW saith the LORD. . .' It is true that often וְעַתָּה (and
now) is used in that loose, almost meaningless way in which the word
'now' is used at the beginning of an opening sentence in modern
English, or as the inevitable 'well' with which almost everyone begins
to answer a question in a radio interview. But this is not so in these
chapters of the Second Isaiah, especially when there is a contrast
inherent in the context and where that contrast is being emphasised.
The 'now' is to be shouted loudly and clearly. It is NOW that the
Servant is to shine out like a light throughout the darkling world.

Some scholars have seen in 45: 14-17 a reference to Cyrus, mostly
because of 43: 3, but we agree with WHITEHOUSE and NORTH that
the reference is to Israel, and that the submission of Egypt, Ethiopia
and the Sabeans is to Israel; see p. 159. In this case God hides Himself
in Israel, the reviled, the despised Servant, of whom nobody expected
anything. Another passage which speaks of submissive humiliation
and insult is 50: 4-9; see p. 191.

These passages have been mentioned because of their references
to the silence of the Servant and his sudden, unexpected exaltation
and triumph. But there are other indications of a sudden bursting
forth, an unexpected breaking through. These are to be found in
the prophet's use of the metaphor of light. The usual Western use of
the metaphor of light is brightness, illumination, with an easy transi-
tion to its use as a metaphor for Knowledge: e.g. *Dominus illuminatio
mea*. But the general biblical conception of light is a blazing forth,
not a shining light, but a light that shines out. The picture is mostly
drawn from the uprush of the dawn. It is not for nothing that Usha
is a favourite name for a girl in India. The root אוֹר does not mean

'be light' so much as 'become light,' 'lighten up.' The verb is used
five times in all in the *qal*: four, of the shining of the sun at dawn,
Gen. 44: 3; 1 Sam. 29: 10: Prov. 4: 18; Isa. 60: 1; and once of
Jonathan's eyes brightening up after food, 1 Sam. 14: 27 and 29
(Qere). The same usage is found in the *niph'al*, 2 Sam. 2: 32 of day-
break; Job 33: 30 of the revival of life; Ps. 76: 5 (Eng. 4) of the
shining forth of the majestic splendour of the LORD. All instances of
the use of the *hiph'il* are necessarily of shining forth, of sending out
light. In the case of the noun, we have the frequent phrase אוֹר הבקר
'the shining forth of the light of the dawn,' Jg. 16: 2; 1 Sam. 14: 36;
25: 34, 36; 2 Sam. 17: 22; 2 Kgs. 7: 9; Mic. 2: 1. Also of the dawn,
2 Sam. 23: 4; Jg. 19: 26 (cf. 25); Job 24: 14; Neh. 8: 3 and so forth,
often metaphorically of the shining out of light. This shining forth
of light is a figure for the joyful experience of a sudden salvation, so
that Ps. 27: 1 does not refer to the illumination of the mind, but to the
salvation of the soul. The common word for 'morning' is בֹּקֶר; the
root means 'to cleave.' It is properly the first light of the morning, that
which cleaves the darkness of night. The words which accompany אור
are זרח (shine forth), Ps. 97: 11 probably; 112: 4; Isa. 58: 8; 58: 10;
and נגה (shine, beam: in the Targum *nôgehā'* is the planet Venus),
Isa. 9: 1 (Eng. 2); Hab. 3: 4; Job 22: 28; Prov. 4: 18. A third root
is יפע (shine out, send out beams), Job 37: 15.

Other verses which relate to the sudden shining out of light are
Isa. 58: 8, 'then shall thy light be cleft יבקע like the dawn': Isa. 60: 1,
'rise, shine out אורי for thy light אור has come; and the glory of the
LORD has shone forth זרח upon thee'; Isa. 60: 3, 'and nations shall
come to thy light אור, and kings to the bright beams נגה of thy shining
forth זרח (sunrise)'.

The frequent use of the metaphor of the sudden breaking of the
dawn and the uprush of light is seen in the LXX rendering of צֶמַח.
This word is the 'shoot out of the stock of David,' Jer. 23: 5; 33: 15;
Zech. 3: 8; 6: 12. It is a figure taken from the culture of the vine.
Israel is the vine, Isa. 5; Ps. 80: 9, 15; Ezek. 17; etc., and the
Messianic king is the new shoot out of the old vine stock. Nothing
looks so dead as last years' vine stock, cut back to the point where
it has been cut back year after year, and all gnarled and wrinkled and
old. But the new shoot is virgin green and few shoots grow at a
faster rate. In LXX this figure is wholly unrecognised, and the Syriac
meaning of the root צמח is followed, so that the meaning is not the
springing up of the new shoot of the vine as in the Hebrew, but the

springing up of the dawn. Thus the noun צמח of the Hebrew become the ἀνατολή (dawn) of the LXX. The Messiah becomes 'the dayspring from on high,' Lk. 1: 78.

We turn to Jesus of Nazareth and the concept of the Servant of the LORD. In *Jesus and the Servant* (1959), Miss M. D. HOOKER discusses the 'influence of the servant concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament.' As we view the matter, she is much more in the right than those with whom she disagrees, but not wholly right. Her conclusion is summed up in the blurb: 'although the primitive (Christian) community found the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah relevant to the *kerygma*. . .there is no evidence that the (servant) concept ever occupied any prominent position in their thought.' We would say that the whole discussion starts off in confusion. 'Servant' is taken to mean 'suffering servant.' We agree with Miss HOOKER that the concept of the Suffering Servant had little place in the thought of the primitive Church, that is, the concept of the Servant with the chief emphasis on the suffering. It had even less place in the mind of Jesus Himself, certainly with all the inferences and overtones which the phrase normally carries. The very phrase 'suffering servant' is a mistake in that it conveys a false impression of the theme and purpose of the Second Isaiah. We have sought to show that the Servant is the Triumphant Servant. The purpose of Isaiah 53 is not to provide a prophecy of or an apology for the sufferings of Christ. The purpose was to explain away the sufferings of the Servant, to show that they ought not to have been his at all. The prophet would say, if we are going to form a true estimate of the future of the Servant and what on all counts his fate should be, then we must cut the sufferings alto-gether out of our thinking. His sufferings were illogical. The logical outcome of his life and deeds is triumph. The suffering ought to have fallen on the 'bad figs' of Jerusalem, and none at all on the 'good figs' of the 597 B.C. deportation. It is misleading to say that the suf-fering of the Servant was vicarious, because so often this word carries atonement ideas, 'on behalf of' or 'deliberately instead of.' We do not find in Isaiah 53 anything to do with ideas of atonement. The suffering was an interlude in the life of the Servant. It was an illogical interruption of the proper course of events. He suffered as a result of the sinful rebellion of the old Israel. It is because he was innocent that he must necessarily triumph. His sufferings were indeed an אשם, but not in any sense in which the so-called guilt-offering is usually understood. They were a substitute; he paid the penalty of their

sins. This was not *in order that* the guilty might go free. It is just a fact that he did suffer the consequences of sins that were not his.

We hold that the concept of the Servant occupied a dominant place in the mind of Jesus and of the primitive Christian community. The concept of the Servant of the LORD is: He was hidden, despised, nowhere to lay his head, suffering, but necessarily triumphant at last. It is the triumph that is the really important element: the resurrection from the death of the exile. Jesus, we hold, deliberately modelled His whole ministry on this concept of the Servant. This is why He wrought His miracles of healing, preached to the poor, opened the eyes of the blind, urged silence about His Messiahship, suddenly appeared in Jerusalem and looked confidently forward to triumph even though it was beyond and after condemnation and death.

According to Lk. 4: 16 f. the official opening of the ministry was in the synagogue at Nazareth, where Jesus read Isa. 61: 1, 2 as far as 'the acceptable year of the LORD.' Either He chose the passage Himself, or, if the passage was already a fixed Haftarah (Reading from the Prophets), then the Sabbath was the first in the month Sivan in the second year of the three-year cycle of the lectionary.[1] Either way the choice of the passage was deliberate. Having concluded the reading, which was the normal length for the first official Haftarahs, He said, 'Today hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears.' The opening of His ministry, then, is said by Luke to be the fulfilment of the prophecy. This is the advent of the Servant of the LORD. It is true that the word 'Servant' is not actually mentioned in Isaiah 61, but the characteristic phraseology is unmistakable, so much so that some who cling to the idea of four Servant Songs find themselves thinking of these verses as a secondary Servant song (pp. 169 f.). According to Mt. 11: 2-6 (Lk. 7: 18-23) John the Baptist sent two of his disciples—two because they were to be witnesses: Dt. 17: 6; 19: 15; 1 Kg. 21: 10; Mt. 18: 16; etc.—to ask Jesus whether or not He was 'He that cometh.' Apparently Jesus made no immediate verbal reply, but took them with Him that day. They saw that He 'cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits: and on many that were blind He bestowed sight,' Lk. 7: 21, and as both evangelists say, He told them to tell John what they had seen and heard: 'the blind receive their sight (LXX in Isa. 61: 1 f.) and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up,

---

[1] See further, 'The Triennial Cycle and the Psalter,' ZAW x 3/4 (1933), pp. 302-307.

and the poor have good tidings preached to them,' Mt. 11: 5. These
healings are evidently proof that Jesus was the Servant of the LORD
but this means the Messianic Servant, because Jesus proceeds forth-
with to identify John the Baptist with the messenger of Mal. 3: 1, the
forerunner of the Messiah.

There is no attempt in the Gospels to minimise the healing ministry
of Jesus, embarrassing as many moderns find it. It is mentioned
again and again side by side with the preaching and the teaching.
For instance, Mt. 9: 35 not only states that He taught and preached,
but also that He healed 'all manner of diseases and all manner of
sickness.' Again, after having called the two pairs of brothers, Simon
and Andrew, and James and John, Jesus taught and preached through-
out Galilee, and healed every kind of sickness and disease. The evan-
gelist then says (Mt. 4: 24) that 'the report of him went forth into
all Syria.' This report was not so much because of His preaching and
teaching as because of the healings, since the rest of the verse reads:
'they brought to him all that were sick, holden with divers diseases
and torments, possessed with devils, epileptic and palsied; and he
healed them.' See also Mk. 1: 28: 'and the report of him (the new
teaching and the fact that with authority he commanded even the
unclean spirits and they obeyed him) went out straightway into all
the region of Galilee round about.' In Mt. 8: 17 the account of the
healing of Peter's wife's mother is followed by the healing of the large
crowd at sunset (cf. Mk. 1: 32-34), but Matthew goes on to quote
Isa. 53: 4 in the form 'himself took our infirmities and bare our diseas-
es,' the association being not with the Cross and the Atonement, as
perhaps theologians might expect, but with 'casting out the spirits
with a word and healing all that were sick.'

Indeed, it is the healing ministry of Jesus which is usually cited as
proof of the coming of the kingdom. See Lk. 11: 20: 'if I by the
finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come unto
you'. Also see Lk. 10: 17-20: where the seventy return full of joy
especially that the devils were subject to them and Jesus replies
'I behold Satan fallen as lightning from heaven', i.e. we have got the
devil on the run; he is beaten. In Lk. 9: 43 the healing of the epileptic
boy (unclean spirit) is evidence of the majesty of God. It is mostly
Luke who presents the aspect that the casting out of devils is fighting
against Satan and his counter-kingdom of evil, but Matthew 15: 29-31
(Mark 7: 31-37) includes the most extensive healings of every type
and at the end he adds 'and they glorified the God of Israel.' So also

in the case of the sick of the palsy (Lk. 5: 25) and all the crowd who were there (Mk. 2: 12; Mt. 9: 8; Lk. 5: 26). Another case is that of the widow's son at Nain (Lk. 7: 16): 'and fear took hold on all: and they glorified God saying, A great prophet is arisen among us: and God has visited his people.' Throughout the Gospels the healings are emphasised at least as much as the teaching and preaching.

Mt. 12: 22 f. is important. Here Jesus heals a man who was blind and dumb. All the crowds are amazed and they say 'Is not this the son of David?' This is an extraordinary conclusion to draw. Why should the healing of a blind and dumb man prove that Jesus is the son of David? It is because Jesus is fulfilling Isa. 61: 1 f. healing the sick, preaching good tidings to the poor, and because the Servant triumphs and rules, He is the Messiah also.

The conception of Messiah according to Jesus was not that of a suffering Messiah as against a Triumphant Messiah, but a suffering-triumphant Messiah as against a triumphant Messiah. The difference is in His interpolation, so to speak, of the suffering. This is a result of His identifying Himself in such detail with the Servant of the LORD, but it is important so far as Jesus and the primitive Church is concerned, never to mention the suffering without referring also to the Triumph.

It is essential to include and emphasise the triumph, equally in the words of Jesus as in the words of the Second Isaiah. When, according to the Gospel traditions, Jesus referred specifically to His approaching death, he also referred to His resurrection. See Mt. 17: 22 f., where it is said that while Jesus yet abode in Galilee, he told them that the Son of Man would be 'delivered up into the hands of man, and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised up.' These may not be the exact words of Jesus Himself, but they certainly form part of the earliest Christian tradition, according to which the climax was not the Crucifixion but the Resurrection. See also Mt. 20: 17-19: 'the Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes; and they shall condemn him to death and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock and to scourge and to crucify; and the third day he shall be raised up.' Note the inclusion of the mocking and scourging, both of which are part of the picture of the humiliated, maltreated Servant. See also the parallel Mk. 10: 32-34; Lk. 18: 32 f.; and the post-Transfiguration passages, Mt. 16: 21 and Lk. 9: 22. Here (Mk. 9: 9-12) we find a reference to the time 'when the Son of Man should have risen again from the dead' and also that it is 'written of the Son of

Man that he should suffer many things and be set at nought' which could possibly be Ps. 22: 6 f., though it is more likely to be Isa. 53: 2 f., but why the title 'Son of Man?'

A very great deal has been written about this title 'the Son of Man' ..nd its connexion with Jesus of Nazareth, and for details of these long discussions reference must be made to the work of students of the New Testament. It has often been pointed out that in the Gospel according to Saint Mark, the use of the title is associated with suffering and that the title appears when Jesus first refers to His approaching sufferings and death—except, that is, for 2: 10 (sick of the palsy) and 2: 28 (Lord of the Sabbath). But it is also true that with the suffering, the triumph also is mentioned. It is therefore just as true to say that when Jesus begins to refer to His ultimate triumph, He begins to use the phrase Son of Man, as it is to say that it is when He begins to talk about His suffering. It is as unexpected that the Son of Man shall suffer as it is that Messiah shall suffer. There is no direct link between the Son of Man and suffering any more than there is between Messiah and suffering. Both titles belong to the world of triumph. It was not because of His suffering that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah; it was in spite of it. It was not because of suffering that Jesus took upon Himself [1]) the title Son of Man, but in spite of it. The Servant suffers and dies, but he rises again. Jesus must suffer, must die, but He must rise again. Both the Servant and the Son of Man are to triumph and judge many nations. To triumph and to rule is the destiny of the Son of Man both in Daniel 7 and in the Book of Enoch. Both the Servant of the Second Isaiah and the 'one like unto a son of man' of Dn. 7: 13, 22 are figures of speech for a new Israel, the conquering saints of the Most High, triumphant over all peoples and nations. This is why Jesus is the Servant and this is why Jesus is the Son of Man. But first in both cases come humiliation and suffering and death. This is what Jesus added to the pattern both of Messiah and of Son of Man. See Lk. 24: 26 f.: 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.' This we take to mean, not that He had to prove to them that He was Messiah, but that Mes-

---

[1]) Did Jesus actually use this title of Himself? Or did it become used of Him in the early post-resurrection traditions and so used at an early date as an alternative title to denote His triumph? just as the title 'Lord' (*kurios*) came to be used of Him.

siah had to suffer and die first before He could achieve the triumph which is essentially His.

We hold that Jesus deliberately modelled His ministry on the concept of the Servant of the LORD of the Second Isaiah. This is why the healing, the preaching to the poor takess o large and prominent a place in the Gospel traditions. Indeed John goes so far as to treat the miracles as signs: 'this beginning of his signs σημεῖα did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory,' Jn. 2: 11. He certainly deliberately fulfilled Scripture on the first Palm Sunday. He rode on the ass, which is Zc. 9: 9. He appeared suddenly in the Temple: the journey begins in Mk. 9: 30, and according to Mk. 11: 11 He went straight into the Temple, looked round on all things, and then went straight out; this is Mal. 3: 1: 'and the LORD whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple.' Again, the day was the first day of the Passover Week. If the Psalter was already recited one psalm each Sabbath to correspond to a triennial system of reading the Law, then Psalm 2 was the proper psalm for the second Sabbath of Nisan in the first year. Jesus entered Jerusalem riding the ass on the day following this Sabbath. All men knew that the Messiah would appear at Passover: see the LXX of Jer. 31: 8 (in' the feast of Passover' for 'with them the blind and the lame').

This reference to Jer. 31: 8 brings to mind the curious statement of Mt. 21: 14, where it is stated that on the occasion of the cleansing of the Temple (according to the Synoptists, the next day after the Entry) 'the blind and the lame came to him in the temple, and he healed them.' The Hebrew of Jer. 31: 8 is 'Behold I will bring them. . . with them the blind and the lame,' which, as we saw immediately above, becomes in LXX 'in the festival of Passover' (במועד פסח for בם עור ופסח). Apparently the evangelist knew the double reading, just as in Mt. 27: 3-10, the story of what happened to the thirty pieces of silver which Judas Iscariot received. There was a discussion on the part of the chief priests as to whether this money should go into the temple treasury or not, and they decided in the end to use it to buy 'the potter's field.' Zc. 11: 13 is quoted, though the reference given is Jeremiah. The Zechariah passage actually is: 'Cast it unto the potter (יוצר, but the Syriac has 'treasury' as if reading אוצר. LXX has *chōneutērion* 'smelting furnace'). . .' and 'and cast them unto the potter (Syriac again 'treasury') in the house of the LORD.' The two interpretations are actually in the Hebrew text, for how could there be a potter in the temple? There could be a treasury, and there was. It is

hard to explain all this, but it is plain that the evangelist knew of the double exegesis of Zc. 11: 13. Perhaps LOISY was right when long ago he suggested that the first evangelist was the 'scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven. . .which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old,' Mt. 13: 52.

One of the strange features of the Gospel story, common to all three synoptists, is the double tradition concerning the miracles: did Jesus seek publicity, or did he seek to avoid it? It has been the fashion to say that Jesus did not want to be known as a miracle worker, but rather as teacher and preacher. This is said with particular reference to the healing miracles, concerning some of which He enjoined silence. This is not the overall picture we get from the Gospels. There are indeed times when Jesus expressly bids the healed one not to broadcast the story of the healing, but the general picture is one of healings everywhere, with the people rejoicing in them as visible signs of the coming of the kingdom, of the manifested power and glory of God. This is what we would expect after the announcement in the synagogue in Nazareth, Lk. 4: 16-19. There was one occasion when Jesus told the cured man to tell all his friends and relations what the LORD had done for him. This was the man who had been possessed by the legion of devils (Mk. 5: 19; Lk. 8: 39, but not Mt. 8: 28-32, where two sufferers are mentioned and no legion). The incident took place on the south-east shore of the Lake, in Decapolis, which at that time was an area mostly, if not entirely, east of the Jordan. The fact that this incident took place east of the Jordan is not the explanation for the command, because the healing of the deaf man who also had an impediment in his speech also took place in Decapolis (Mk. 7: 31-37), and 'he charged them that they should tell no man.' Certainly Herod Antipas knew Him as a miracle worker (Lk. 23: 8), whilst the Greek has σημεῖον (sign), the word used regularly of healing miracles in the fourth gospel.

It is on record that Jesus many times urged silence. Why did He do this, when at the same time it is clear that healing the sick was part of the proof of His claim to be the anointed one (Is. 61: 1)? When He sent out the twelve (Mk. 6: 7; Mt. 10: 1; Lk. 9: 1) and the seventy (Lk. 10: 1 f.), He gave them power over unclean spirits and to cure diseases, and even (Lk. 10: 9) to 'heal the sick. . .and say to them, The Kingdom of God is come nigh to you.'

Our explanation is that both as the healer of sicknesses and in the silence He sometimes commanded, Jesus is following the pattern of

the Servant of the LORD of the Second Isaiah. He is the hidden Servant, the silent Servant, suddenly to be made manifest and ultimately, after suffering and death, to triumph. This is the explanation of the so-called Messianic secret. It is actually stated in Mt. 12: 16 ff.: 'and many followed him; and he healed them all, and charged them that they should not make him known: that it might be fulfilled. . .' and then Is. 42: 1-3 is quoted: '(my servant) shall not strive, cry aloud, neither shall anyone hear his voice in the streets.' The two necessities tended to cut across each other. On the one hand He had to proclaim His identity with the anointed (messianic) servant by His miracles of healing and by bringing good tidings to the poor; on the other hand, He sought to conform to the pattern of the Servant, who before His unexpected triumph was to be obscure, silent and dumb.

The commands for silence are frequent. In Mk. 1: 34: 'He suffered not the devils to speak because they knew him' (BW f 1 f 28 add 'to be Christ'; f 13 f 700 etc. 'to be the Christ'; cf. Lk. 4: 41). The order to tell no one that He is the Messiah (Christ) is plain elsewhere. In Mt. 16: 20 He gives this order to the disciples. This is immediately after the declaration by Simon Peter at Caesarea Philippi. The parallel in Lk. 9: 22 agrees with this, but the Marcan account introduces a qualification (Mk. 9: 9) by saying that they are to keep silent until after the Resurrection. Both Matthew and Luke represent Jesus as saying to the disciples that the Son of Man must go up to Jerusalem, suffer many things, be killed and rise again. Luke adds 'be rejected.' Both Matthew 16: 28 and Luke 9: 22 conclude with the statement that some of them standing there shall in no wise taste of death 'till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom' (Luke, 'see the kingdom of God'), which means, not the final judgment with the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven, but the triumph of the silent, hidden, suffering, dying Servant of the LORD.

In Mt. 17: 9 on the way down from the Mount of Transfiguration, Jesus commands the disciples to tell no man the vision (Mk. 9: 9, 'what they had seen') till the Son of Man be risen from the dead. This vision was of Moses and Elijah, the two traditional witnesses to the Messiah. Lk. 9: 36 simply says 'and they held their peace, and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen.'

Similar to this is Mk. 3: 12, where the unclean spirits 'fell down before Him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God.' Whereupon Jesus charged them not to make him manifest (Mt. 12: 16). Compare the two stories in Mt. 9: 27-31 and 20: 29-34 respectively. The two

stories both concern two blind men who received their sight, and the other common factor is that both pairs cry out after Jesus, 'Have mercy upon us, thou son of David.' In the earlier story Jesus commands them to see to it that nobody knows of the cure (9: 30). In the second story Jesus makes no such demand. The Marcan parallel to the second story is that of blind Bartimaeus (Mk. 10: 32-34. Did the one become two because of the name? son of a twin), and here also there is no command to silence. This last incident took place towards the end of the last journey when Jesus had already left Jericho. Perhaps the reason for the difference is that the climax is near when the secret is to be made known. Other cases of silence enjoined after healing are Mk. 8: 22-26 (the blind man at Bethsaida: 'do not even enter into the village'), and Mk. 5: 43. This latter case is that of the raising of Jairus's daughter. Nowhere are the two contradictions more evident, for Luke confirms the charge for silence (8: 56), whilst Matthew says 'and the fame thereof went forth into all the land' (9: 26).

The command to the lepers for silence is probably part of the same pattern of silence on the part of the hidden messianic Servant, though here there may possibly be a taboo reason. The men will not be ceremonially nor civicly clean until the priest has examined them and satisfied himself that the leprosy is dead, Mk. 1: 44; Mt. 8: 4; Lk. 5: 14. The other passage which tells of a leprosy cure is that of the ten lepers, one of whom was a Samaritan. Here the questions of silence and of broadcasting do not arise. The story is concerned with something else: the fact that it was the Samaritan alone who came back to say 'Thank you.' But why in so many instances was it expected that the son of David should heal the sick and make the blind to see, unless it was because of Isa. 61: 1 f. and Jesus following the pattern of the Servant?

But what is most remarkable of all is the silence of Jesus at the trials. Before Caiaphas Jesus uttered not a word (Mt. 26: 63; Mk. 14: 61) until He was put on oath. When He was thus forced to speak, He said 'Thou sayest' (an admission, Mt. 26: 64) or 'I am' (Mk. 14: 62). According to Lk. 22: 67 f. he answered with what appears to be a popular saying:

> 'If I tell you, you will not believe:
> If I ask you, you will not answer.'

But later, under pressure (v. 70), He says, 'You say I am.' But all three evangelists agree that Jesus added 'From now on (Mt. ἀπ'ἄρτι :

Lk. ἀπὸ τὸ νῦν; not Mark) you will see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power (Luke does not have 'you shall see') and (Matthew and Mark) coming on the clouds of heaven.' We suggest that Luke is right in omitting 'coming on the clouds of heaven.' This is a later idea. At first the triumph of Jesus was associated with the rising from the dead. Later His triumph was linked with the idea of the Heavenly Man, the Son of Man (cf. the Book of Enoch), the judge who is to come at the End of Days. But what is important here is that Jesus was silent until Caiaphas forced Him to speak.

Again, in the trial before the governor Jesus adopted the same attitude. Pilate asked Him if He was the King of the Jews, and Jesus answered 'Thou sayest' (Mt. 27: 11; Mk. 15: 2; Lk. 23: 3), but when He was accused by the chief priests and scribes, He kept silence, nor did He make any further reply to Pilate's questions. Before Herod Jesus did not utter a single word from first to last, in spite of Herod's questioning Him in many words (Lk. 23: 9). The chief priests and the scribes vehemently accused Him. Herod was wanting Him to work a miracle. But He maintained silence, and they ended by 'setting him at nought, mocking him and arraying him in gorgeous apparel.'

Why did Jesus keep such silence at the trials, except only to admit before priests that He was 'the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One' (Mk. 14: 61)—Matthew has 'the Messiah, the Son of God' (26: 63), which is the same thing; Luke has the admission that He is the Son of God (22: 70) which is understandable since Luke was a Gentile, writing for Gentiles; and before Pilate that He was King of the Jews? Our answer is that He was following the pattern of the Servant of the LORD, even as He had followed it all through His ministry. He had enjoined silence concerning the healings and yet demonstrated by these and by preaching to the poor that He was the Servant, and all the time Himself had followed the pattern of the silent, hidden Servant. The demand for silence at the trials is insisted upon in Isa. 53: 7 f.

> 'He was brutally treated and humiliated
> Yet he did not open his mouth.
> Like a sheep that is led to the slaughter
> And like an ewe before her shearers,
> He was silent and did not open his mouth.
> After an oppressive, unjust sentence
> He was taken waay, and who was concerned about his fate?
> For he was cut off from the land of the living. . .[1])

[1]) see p. 195.

Another element in the trials is concerned with the two times Jesus broke silence. In each case the accusation He admitted as being true was the one thing which would get Him into trouble in that particular court. Further, the penalty in each case was death. The only thing that would get Him into trouble before the High Priest was the claim that He was Messiah, the Son of God. Whatever this last phrase meant, it was justified by Ps. 2: 7, blasphemy or no blasphemy. The only thing that would get Him into trouble in Pilate's court was the admission that He claimed to be King of the Jews. Before Herod, He made no admission at all. There was nothing that would bring Him there under sentence of death. All this leads to the conclusion that Jesus knew He had to die, just as He knew He must rise again: this is the pattern of the Servant of the LORD which He was following. 'Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself' (Lk. 24: 26 f.).

Lk. 22: 35-38 is a curious passage. It contains a quotation from Isa. 53: 12 'and he was numbered with the rebels' (see p. 197). Jesus tells the disciples to change their ways entirely: the man who has no purse or wallet is to take one, and the man who has no sword is to sell his cloak and buy one. This is because He must be numbered with the rebels, and because the time has come for this saying to be fulfilled. And yet, strangely enough two swords are enough and in the sequel one of the disciples was rebuked for using the sword he had (Lk. 22: 49; Mk. 14: 47; Mt. 26: 51). If we follow the usual translation of 'transgressors,' then we may suppose the evangelist assumes that the prophecy was fulfilled at the trial, counted with the transgressors. But if we realise that the root פשע means 'rebel,' then the prophecy 'he was reckoned with the rebels' is fulfilled by His being arrested in the company of armed men, albeit it was but a token armament. It was done 'that the scriptures might be fulfilled,' Mk. 14: 49: they 'came out as against a robber.'

There are elements in the Gospel narratives concerning which it is difficult to decide how much comes from Jesus Himself and how much belongs to the early post-resurrection traditions, the time when men began to tell the story of His life, His death and His resurrection, all of it with their knowledge of the Servant equation in their minds. There was the spitting: according to Mk. 14: 65; Mt. 26: 67 the chief priests and the whole council spat in His face,

and Mk. 15: 19; Mt. 27: 30 say that the soldiers spat on him. See
Isa. 50: 6. Then there was the scourging, Mk. 15: 15; Mt. 27: 26;
Lk. 23: 22. See Isa. 50: 6 f. and 53: 3 f. Also, in Isa. 53: 9 it is stated
that the Servant was given a grave 'with the wicked and with the
rich את־עשיר in his death.' [1]) It has been suggested [2]) that in עשיר we
should see a second root עשר 'his grave with the wicked and his
burial-mound with the corrupt.' But Joseph of Arimathea was a rich
man, and this rich man's grave was the only grave Jesus ever had.
Perhaps 'with the rich' or even 'with a rich man' is right after all.

Christian exegetes have found considerable difficulty over the
apparent reluctance at one stage of Jesus to have dealings with non-
Jews. It is stated in Mt. 10: 5 that, having chosen twelve disciples,
'he sent them forth, and charged them, saying, Go not into any
way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans,
but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' Then there
follows the list of the signs of the Messianic Servant (Isa. 61: 1 f.).
These they also are to make manifest and to show that 'the king-
dom of heaven is at hand.' The prohibition of any dealings with
Gentiles in general and Samaritans in particular gives the number
twelve special and exclusive significance. When Jesus bade them not
to go to the Gentiles, but definitely to go to the Jews, did He mean
just that? Or are we dealing with some early pro-Jewish and non-
Pauline tradition, such as is evident in the attitude of the Jerusalem
leaders, Acts 11: 1-3; 15: 1-29; Gal. 2 ? This is not a Matthaean
anti-Gentile bias, as we may see from the story of Zacchaeus, which
we owe entirely to Luke (19: 1-10). Verse 9 is 'And Jesus said unto
him, Today is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a
son of Abraham.' So that when it says in the next verse that the Son of
Man came to seek and to save that which was lost, the presumption
is that here it means every lost son of Abraham. This is a Lucan
tradition, and it was the Gentile Luke who realised as soon as most,
that the Gospel was for the Greek as well as for the Jew. Paul had
realised this long before he met Luke, but there can be little doubt
but that Luke strengthened Paul's convictions on this matter. Yet it
is Luke, and Luke alone, who faithfully records what appears to be a
statement limiting salvation to the Jews. How could he do that unless

---

[1]) Or 'his funeral mound'; see BDB 119b with its reference to Ezek. 43: 7
and possibly here also; apparently confirmed by the Dead Sea Scroll, Isaiah A.
  [2]) Reider, VT ii p. 118. This certainly makes a good parallel couplet.

in some way it was firmly embedded in the tradition he received?

The clearest example of this attitude of Jesus is the story of the Canaanitish (Syro-Phoenician) woman, Mk. 7: 24-30; Mt. 15: 21-28. According to Mt. 15: 24, the answer which Jesus gave to the woman was: 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (? those that had gone astray like sheep, Isa. 53: 6). This is not in the Marcan parallel, but both evangelists give evidence of marked reluctance on the part of Jesus to do anything for the woman and her daughter. Mark says (verse 27) that the children must come first, but both give the woman's reply (Mk. 7: 27; Mt. 15; 26) to the effect that even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their master's (the children's) table. Whereupon Jesus healed the child forthwith. The mother's faith was great, and it was this which turned the scale. Either Jesus was testing the woman (which does not seem to be altogether a 'Christian' thing to do considering the great stress of mind of the mother: most of us would not dream of causing the already distracted woman such unnecessary anxiety), or He meant what He said. The natural explanation is that He did mean what He said, and that there was up to this stage in His ministry a pronounced reluctance to have dealings with non-Jews. He welcomed publicans and sinners; they were Jews, and He was out against the exclusive legalism of the scribes, who laid down other conditions than repentance and faith. He did not avoid Samaritans, but an exclusive attitude is shown in Jn. 4:22 f.: 'for salvation is of the Jews'. But there came to be a change, so the Johanine tradition says, because 'the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.' The Marcan saying 'Let the children first be filled' is a less exclusive attitude. It has doubtless prompted the unwarranted introduction of 'also' in the margin of RV in Jn. 4: 23, but it is reflected in the way in which Paul and Barnabas went first to the Jews during their journey in Asia Minor (Acts 13: 5; 13: 46, etc.), and then to the Gentiles when the Jews rejected them. Later Jesus rebuked James and John who wanted fire to be called down from heaven upon the inhospitable Samaritan village (Lk. 9: 52-56), but these were 'sons of Abraham' even though post-exilic Judaism had interposed barriers against them because they did not conform to their rules and regulations.

It would appear, therefore, that at first Jesus was nationalist in that He conceived Himself as bringing salvation to the Jews only. This is,

we have sought to show,[1]) the attitude of the Second Isaiah, and we explain this nationalism on the part of Jesus as part of His deliberate following the pattern of the Servant of the LORD. But there came a time when He realised that there could be no such 'middle wall of partition,' nor any such limits set to the Gospel. It was the incident of the Syro-Phoenician mother which taught Him this. Nevertheless, it is plain that the leaders of the Church in Jerusalem after the Resurrection and even after Pentecost were strong in their belief that the Gospel was for Jews only, and they were very slow indeed to make any compromise on this issue. Indeed, it is likely that only the destruction of the Temple and with it the virtual elimination of these exclusive and nationalist Christian Jews prevented Christianity from remaining a sect within Judaism. But this 'Jews only,' this nationalistic attitude can be explained, in our view, only on the basis that Jesus modelled His whole life and ministry on the Servant of the Second Isaiah, and that this extended at first even to a nationalistic attitude that it was only for the Jews that salvation was come.

We find in this also the explanation of the fact that the Resurrection took so prominent a place in the first preaching. This is shown, for example, in the statement in Acts 17:18 that the Athenians thought Paul was 'a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached Jesus and Anastasis (Resurrection).' See also Acts 17: 32. The absence of emphasis in the early preaching of any vicarious, atoning element in the Cross has puzzled many. We believe with BULTMANN that any such elements 'were put in his mouth subsequently by the church,' [2]) but we think BULTMANN is mistaken when he says 'The tradition of Jesus's sayings reveals no trace of a consciousness on his part of being the Servant of God of Is. 53.' [3]) BULTMANN says this because when he thinks of 'the Servant' he thinks in terms of 'the Suffering Servant.' Here we believe he is wrong, though this is the general attitude. This is why H. J. CADBURY finds it 'almost unbelievably' [4]) so, that the one time when Luke quotes Is 53, he 'escapes all the vicarious phrases with which that passage abounds.' We do not find this omission surprising at all, because in the sense in which the word 'vicarious' is generally used (deliberate atoning self-sacrifice) we do not find anything vicarious there at all. In any case, the Gospel and Acts tradition

---

[1]) see pp. 154-165.
[2]) *Jesus and the Word* (Eng. tr. 1935), p. 214.
[3]) *Theology of the New Testament* (Eng. tr. 1952), vol. i, p. 31.
[4]) 'The Titles of Jesus in Acts' in *Beginnings*, vol. v, p. 366.

is that the suffering-and-death is mentioned with the resurrection also, and the whole point is that the Suffering Servant triumphs. We suspect that the vicarious, atoning emphasis on the sufferings and death of Jesus developed from the time when men ceased to see the triumph in the Resurrection and looked forward more and more to a Second Advent, the time when the Son of Man would come on the clouds of heaven.

# THE THIRD ISAIAH

## EXEGESIS OF CHAPTERS 56-66

Virtually all modern scholars apart from 'conservative evangelicals' [1]) agree in the separation of chapters 40-66 from chapters 1-39,[2]) but there is a much wider division of opinion concerning chapters 40-66 than is sometimes realised. Some still regard 40-66 as a unit, notably W. F. ALBRIGHT [3]) and FLEMING JAMES [4]). They place the whole section as a unity in the years 540-522 B. C. There is also C. C. TORREY [5]) who regards all references to Cyrus and to Babylon as interpolations. He holds that 34-35 and 40-66 'form a homogeneous group and are the work of a single hand' (p. 53). He holds that these chapters consist of twenty-seven successive poems, written in Palestine, probably in Jerusalem, close to the end of the fifth century B.C. They have nothing to do with any return from a Babylonian captivity which is wholly fictional, but have to do with the hope of the gathering in of the Dispersion. This position is in the main supported by G. DAHL (1929) and much of it by G. A. BARTON (1938). Others who maintain the unity of 40-66 are KÖNIG (1926, all from the exile) and GLAHN (1934: 40-55 is before and 56-66 after the Return).

The majority of scholars follow DUHM (1892) and K. MARTI (1892) who held that the Second Isaiah wrote in Babylonia and that another prophet, the Third Isaiah, wrote chapters 56-66 in Palestine as late as 457-445 B. C., dates which place him after Ezra's arrival (accepting, as they did, the earlier date for Ezra) and before Nehemiah arrived. So also LITTMANN (1899), ZILLESSEN (1906), BOX (1908), ELLIGER (1928), ODEBERG (1931) and SELLIN (1930). HÖLSCHER (1914) believed that 56-66 like 40-55 were written in Egypt. Some think in terms of one person as the author of 56-66, but find a closer association

---

[1]) HERZOG (1915), LIAS (1915 and 1918), KAMINKA (1925), ALLIS (1950).
[2]) There is a great deal to be said for adding chapter 35 to chapters 40-55 and 60-62.
[3]) *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* (1932), p. 218.
[4]) *Personalities of the Old Testament* (1939), p. 363.
[5]) *The Second Isaiah* (1928).

than others with chapters 40-55 by saying that the Third Isaiah was a disciple of the Second Isaiah. ELLIGER (1928 and 1933), for instance, held that not only was the Third Isaiah a disciple of the Second Isaiah, but that, besides being responsible for 56-66, he was also responsible for the revision and publication of 40-55. This view is supported by MEINHOLD and SELLIN. Both ELLIGER and SELLIN envisage the Third Isaiah as expanding the work of his master and perhaps incorporating within 40-55 something of his own, notably 52: 13-53: 12. All of this, as WEISER rightly points out, makes the Third Isaiah a contemporary of Haggai and Zechariah 1-8. The period 457-445 B.C. is rather too late for the activity of such a man: that is, supposing him to have been an actual face-to-face pupil of the Second Isaiah. The period 457-445 B.C. involves a man of the next or third generation whose mission was to interpret the Second Isaiah to his own generation who certainly needed whatever comfort and consolation could be brought to them.

There are many variations among scholars in their opinions as to the date and authorship of these chapters 56-66. BLEEK (1859) thought that in chapters 58 onwards, but certainly in 63-66, we have prophecies written by the author of 40-55, but at a later date. On the other hand, STADE (1888) held that 56: 9-57: 13a; 58: 13-59: 21 and 62-66 could scarcely be from the hand of the Second Isaiah in their present form. BUDDE (1891) thought that 56-59 and perhaps 61 and 63-64 were later than other elements in 40-66, whilst KUENEN (1889) made 50-51 and 54-66 later than the rest. And so we come to the positions held by many scholars that 56-66 are not all by the same author, and indeed may be by many authors: CHEYNE (1901), KOSTERS (1896), CRAMER (1905), BUDDE (1909), BUTTENWIESER (1919), J. MARTY (1924), LEVY (1925), ABRAMOWSKI (1925), VOLZ (1932), LODS (1935), EISSFELDT (1934, etc.), KITTEL (1898), WEISER (1961), GRESSMANN (1898), CORNELL (1900), ZILLESSEN (1904), MOWINCKEL (1925), OESTERLEY and ROBINSON (1934), ROWLEY (1950) and others. PFEIFFER (1941) finds innumerable affinities between 40-55 and 56-66, and thinks in terms of 'one or more authors' dominated in thought and diction by the author of 40-55. He says that it is the less attractive features of the Second Isaiah's style that are copied and intensified. Possibly here he means the nationalistic elements rather than literary style.

Attempts have been made to date particular sections of these 56-66 chapters. EISSFELDT allocates 56-66 as a whole to the years 520-516 B.C., but places 57: 1-13 before 587 B.C.; 63: 7-64: 12 (Heb. 11) soon

after 587 B.C.; 66: 1-4 before 538 B.C.; and 65 to the period 400-200 B.C. With this compare VOLZ, who places 56: 1-8; 57:14-21 ; 58: 1-14; 59: 9 f.; 61 in the period 500-400 B.C.; 56: 9-57: 13 as pre-exilic; 63: 7-64: 12 in c. 585 B.C.; 66: 1 f. as c. 520 B.C.; 63: 1-6 as 500-400 B.C.; and 65 and 66: 3-42 as after 331 B.C. G. W. ANDERSON (1959) writes of the whole of 56-66 as a collection possibly spanning the whole period 586-400 B.C. with now and then, as in 58, an echo of the authentic voice of pre-exilic prophecy. One of the criteria of judgment running through most of these attempts at dating the eleven chapters is to be seen in the remark of SKINNER who says [1] that 63: 7-64: 11 must have been written before the building of Zerubbabel's temple in 520-516 B.C. If we are to hold that 56-66 is a unity, then it must all have been written earlier than 520 B.C. If the rest of 56-66 cannot be conceived as being earlier than 520 B.C. then 56-66 is not a unity.

The problem is: Where are these eleven chapters to be fitted in to an accepted historical framework?

| | |
|---|---|
| 597 B.C. | Beginning of the Exile: first deportation. |
| 568 B.C. | Destruction of the Temple: second deportation. |
| 581 B.C. | Third deportation. |
| 538 B.C. | Cyrus captures Babylon. |
| 522-520 B.C. | Accession of Darius Hystaspis and consolidation of the Empire. |
| 520-516 B.C. | Rebuilding of the Temple under the leadership of Zerubbabel and Jeshua encouraged by Haggai and Zechariah. |
| 445/4 B.C. | Nehemiah's arrival in Jerusalem. |
| 432 B.C. | Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem. |
| 397 B.C. | Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem followed by the complete triumph of the Habdalah (Separation) policy. Some say the date is 457 B.C., others 433 (?) B.C.; see pp. 244-261. |
| 331 B.C. | Alexander the Great passes by. The Samaritan schism is at some date between Ezra's arrival and this date. |

We proceed to an examination, section by section, of chapters 56-66.

*Isaiah* 56: 1-2. A most noteworthy feature of these two verses is

---

[1] Isaiah (Camb. Bible, 1917), vol. ii, p. xliv.

the mixed nature of verse 1. The first half of the verse is a command
to 'observe the ordinance' שמר משפט and to 'do right' עשה צדקה. This
parallelism of משפט and צדקה is not true to the Second Isaiah. But the
second half of the verse is definitely true to him: 'for my salvation has
nearly arrived קרובה ישועתי לבוא and my victory is to be revealed
(made manifest) צדקתי להגלות.' This parallelism of ישועה and צדקה in
the sense of 'salvation, victory, the triumph of what is right' is
characteristic of the Second Isaiah and the sentiment of the second
half of the verse is essentially his. But the meaning of צדקה in the
first half is not its meaning in the second half. That 56: 1b is in the
tradition of the Second Isaiah admits of no doubt, but what of 56: 1a?

56: 1a and 56: 2 have associations with Ezek. 20: 19 f. and 11 f. See
also Ezek. 22: 8 and 26. In Ezekiel 20 we find the same association
of observing שמר and doing עשה God's משפטים (verses 11 and 19:
cf. Dt. 12: 1 etc.) and also the immediate association of this with
keeping the Sabbath holy and not profaning it. In Isa. 56: 2 the test of
the true Israel is to hold fast to the ordinance משפט. This shows itself
in (a) keeping the Sabbath by not profaning it שמר שבת מהללו, and
(b) guarding the hand from doing any evil שמר ידו מעשות כל־רע. We
are here in the beginnings of that Sabbath strictness by which this
taboo Sabbath became one of the fixed elements and signs of the
covenant. The first references to this are apparently in Ezekiel 20 and
22 and thus they belong to the early years of the exile (seventh year:
590 B.C.). The Sabbath is to be a sign אות between God and Israel
'to know that I the LORD sanctify them ' 20: 12. Again and again in
Ezek. 20 (verses 13, 16, 21, 24) the refusal to observe the ordinances
משפטים and in this way walk in God's statutes involves desecrating
the Sabbath.

It was during the exile that the Sabbath became a taboo-day.
Before the exile the Sabbath in old Israel was a day when it was
permissible to go on a considerable journey, probably because on
that day the ass and his driver were free from ordinary farm duties,
2 Kg. 4: 23. Both the new-month-day חדש and the Sabbath were
days when ordinary marketing did not take place (Am. 8: 5). They
were days of mirth (Hos. 2: 11) and special assemblies (Isa. 1: 12),
and were condemned by eighth century prophets for their licentious-
ness and debauchery. Evidently, apart from such abuses, the Sabbath
was a day of joy, and herein is that tradition of joy which is still part
of the Jewish Sabbath in spite of all its restrictions: the Bridal Song
and the fact that no Sabbath can be a fast-day. In *The Jewish New Year*

*Festival* (1947) we sought to show (pp. 103-124) that the origins of the post-exilic seventh-day Sabbath with its strict taboos is to be found in the taboo days of tenth century Assyria (1, 7, 9, 14, 19, 21, 28, 29, 30), all days of strict prohibitions. Asshur-bani-pal (662-626 B.C.) reduced these to the 7, 14, 21, 28 of each month. Thus having first come into contact during the ninth/eight centuries with new-moon days (1, 29, 30) and seven-days (7, 14, 21, 28, 19—49 from the previous new-month-day—9 which was Gula's day) with all their taboos, they came into renewed contact with Mesopotamia in the sixth century when the only taboo days were the seven-days. It was thus that the word *shabbath*, which originally marked the end of a period,[1]) came to receive the meaning 'rest' in the sense of taboo, restraint from doing things (even healing the sick, as in Mesopotamia) restraint from moving about (as in Mesopotamia). This change in the Sabbath belongs to the first days of Babylonian domination, and is thus c. 590 B.C.

In Isaiah 56: 1 and 2 we are in the days following the time when the taboo-Sabbath was being established as the sign of the Covenant. This theme, as we have seen, is common to Isa. 56: 1-2 and Ezek. 20. The other crime in Ezek. 20 is following after and looking to idols (verse 16, 18, 24). This is the monotheistic theme of the Second Isaiah. He was, as we have seen, primarily concerned with the coming Return of the People of God to Jerusalem. He was not concerned particularly, even in a contributory sense, with such things as keeping the Sabbath, or with maintaining the distinctions between clean and unclean, except in a general way, 52: 11. Ezekiel 22: 8, 26 regards these things as being of great importance, and thus represents a way of thinking different from that of the Second Isaiah. Both inveigh against idols, but Ezekiel is more concerned than is the Second Isaiah with those distinctions and emphases which later became the essence of Judaism. In Isa. 56: 1 and 2 we get a combination of the two emphases, the legalistic emphasis which is beginning to find prominence in Ezekiel and the emphasis on salvation which is so strong in the Second Isaiah.

In 56: 2 we have 'man' אֱנוֹשׁ and 'son of man' בֶּן־אָדָם used in parellel. SKINNER sees [2]) here reference to mankind in general, mostly because the root of the first word basically means 'be weak' (and so the frailty of human kind) or it may be akin to the Akkadian *tenišêtu* (humanity,

---

[1]) The root originally meant 'come to an end, come to a rest'; the Sabbath originally marked the end of the month: see *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[2]) *op. cit.*, p. 164.

human race), and also because the second word strictly means 'human being,' cf. the Latin *homo* and the Greek ἄνθρωπος. But the two words can also mean 'any man' (i.e. any individual). Whether this means any man out of all mankind or any man of the Jews depends upon the context, and the criteria by which the exegete is judging. For example, 'neighbour' can mean 'neighbour Jew' (as in Lev. 19) or it can mean 'neighbour human being' (Samaritan to Jew, Lk. 10: 25-37). In 56: 2, we think it means any Israelite.

*Isaiah* 56: 3-8. Here we get a point of view far more liberal than the returning exiles favoured. These returning exiles claimed that they and they alone were the People of God and they would cut out entirely the foreigner. This is verse 3, where the 'stranger' of EVV is wrong, and the 'foreigner' of RSV is right. The Hebrew of 'surely separate' (RV, RSV) is הבדל יבדיל. This root belongs mostly to P and the Chronicler. It is the root of the word Habdalah הבדלה, the technical word for that principle of utter separation (cf. AV) which is the core of Judaism and has made the Jew separate and apart throughout all the centuries. It was the work of Nehemiah and Ezra finally and securely to establish this principle of Habdalah [1]) and so create Judaism. Indeed, the third [2]) and last history in the Old Testament, that contained in Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, is really the story of the rise and triumph of the Jewish principle of Habdalah. The first chapter of Genesis (the Priestly tradition) is an account of Creation by Habdalah. The theory of Judaism is part of the fabric of the world. God created it that way in the beginning. Any degree of similarity in development which the first chapter of Genesis may have to any other theory of creation is wholly accidental. Here God creates by making distinctions, by dividing, and the word for 'divide' is always הבדיל, strictly 'to cause a separation.' See verses 4, 6, 7, 14, 18: always God divided this from that. He made the light to be separated from the darkness; the waters above the firmament to be separated from the waters below the firmament, and so on. And the Flood was when this separation broke down (Gen. 7: 11, P). God made every herb with its own separate seed, and every fruit tree separate and distinct from every other. Every creature on land and in the sea and the air was made strictly according to its own species. Everything was

---

[1]) The modern equivalent of a pure race policy, often with religious support, is *apartheid*.

[2]) The first is Deuteronomy-2 Kings. The second is Genesis-Numbers, the P-history, which embodies traditions known as J and E.

created according to the principle of Habdalah; all things were made separated. At the other end of the Old Testament (Hebrew) is Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, which originally concluded with the last verse of Nehemiah: 'Thus I cleansed them from everything foreign נכר . . . Remember me, O my God, for good.' This exclusiveness is what CHEYNE called 'the severe spirit of the restored exiles (cf. Neh. 13) which doubtless began to show itself during the Captivity.' [1]) It did indeed show itself during the captivity. It is the nationalism of the Second Isaiah bearing a fruit which let us hope he did not forsee. But it was not only he; the separation is found also in Ezek. 22: 26 (clean and unclean) and in Ezek. 42: 20 (holy and common). Evidently it was the temper of the exiles as a whole.

But this writer (Isaiah 56: 3-8) does not exclude every foreigner נכרי ('stranger' is wrong). He maintains that every man who keeps the Sabbath, who chooses what is well-pleasing to God and in this way holds fast to the covenant, is welcome in God's house of prayer and is not to be separated from the People of God. The word is כרת, cut off, excommunicated (see the P-tradition), thrown out. But the writer says that even if the man is a foreigner (v. 3) or a eunuch (v. 4), he is nevertheless welcome. Race does not count (which probably here means Babylonian or Palestinian Jew); circumcision does not count. Nothing counts except that a man shall sincerely desire to join himself to the LORD, to minister to Him and to love His Name. God will not separate off (the root is הבדיל) the foreigner, nor will be excommunicate כרת the eunuch.

The LORD will give the eunuch a memorial יד and a name better than sons and daughters. It shall be an everlasting name and shall never be cut off. All this has to do with posterity. It is uncertain what exactly is the nature of this memorial (lit. 'hand'), but Absalom (2 Sam. 18: 18) is said to have set up a stone pillar in the King's Vale because he had no son to keep his name in remembrance. Presumably the three sons of 2 Sam. 14: 27 died in infancy. But this pillar was called 'Absalom's hand' and was apparently still there when 2 Samuel was written down. The word יד (hand), then, has to do with maintaining a man's memory when he has no issue. This certainly is what is intended in Is. 56: 5, and indeed more than this: the name will be continued for ever on the roll of the People of God. He will be more firmly one

_____

[1]) *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, II, p. 64.

of God's people than those whose physical descendants are numbered amongst them.

God will bring the foreigner (v. 6 f.) to His holy mountain, presumably Mount Zion, and will give him great joy in the House of Prayer that is there. The foreigner's whole-offerings and his shared-offerings[1]) זבח will be acceptable, for 'mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples (v. 7).' We understand v. 8 to mean that in addition to God's gathered ones (the returning exiles who claim that they alone are of true descent and truly the People of God), the LORD will gather others to Himself, these foreigners and eunuchs. We are here in the world of 1 Kg. 8: 41-43, a very different world from the Judaism which was established by Nehemiah and Ezra. The writer of 56: 3-8 is thoroughly out of sympathy with the nationalism of the Second Isaiah and its bitter fruit. He is in sympathy with Ezekiel's insistence on keeping the Sabbath, but out of sympathy with his nationalism. This man welcomes all who will keep the Sabbath and seek to do what is well-pleasing to God. He does not work by genealogies, as did the Chronicler; he does not even insist upon circumcision. The LORD will gather others besides the dispersed of Israel (cf. Jer. 40: 12; 43: 5), those who were carried off to Babylonia. The writer is probably one of those who never left Palestine, many of whom were as sincere and devout in their worship of God as any Babylonian Jew (Ezra 4: 2). Even if it cannot be proved that the writer was a Palestinian Jew, he certainly was in full sympathy with those Palestinians who are called 'the people of the land'[2]) in Ezra 10: 11. The most likely date, therefore, for this section is the early days following the Return, but after the completion of the rebuilding of the Temple in 516 B.C.—say, 510-500 B.C.

The other side of the picture is to be seen in Ezek. 44: 6-9, where a charge is made against 'the rebellious ones,[3]) the house of Israel' 'that they have brought in foreigners, uncircumcised in heart and flesh to be in my sanctuary to profane my house.' The charge is

---

[1]) See 'Sacrifices in the Old Testament,' VT vii 3 (Oct. 1957), pp. 308-317; also R. DE VAUX, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice* (1964), p. 42. But see R. SCHMID, *Das Bundesopfer in Israel* (1964), who maintains that they were covenant-offerings.

[2]) This phrase later came to mean 'the common herd,' those who did not keep the full measure of the Law.

[3]) Lit. 'rebellion' מרי. LXX and the Targum assume an original בית מרי (house of rebellion), and so also in 2: 7, where some Hebrew MSS and printed books also have בית מרי. Most exegetes of modern times alter the text and read 'house of rebellion,' but we are of the opinion that this is wrong and confuses the whole passage.

against 'the house of Israel' whom we understand to be the People of
God, the returned exiles, and they are called 'rebellion' because they
are disobeying what the writer believes to be the clear will of God.
He does not call them 'house of rebellion,' because that means those
who did not go into exile in 597 B.C., (Ezek. 2: 3, etc.), and he is not
speaking to them. These are 'the people of the land' of Ezra 10: 11
and they were in favour of what Isaiah 56: 3-8 advocates and Ezek.
44: 6-9 condemns. The charge is that the house of Israel have allowed
these foreigners to offer God's food on the altar, that is the fat and the
blood of slaughtered animals, these being the parts of the animal
which went to the altar, whatever the type of sacrifice, though prob-
ably the reference is to the shared-offering זבח. Thus the house of
Israel has broken the covenant (this is why they are called מרי). All
this is so exactly what is advocated in Isa. 56: 3-8 that if the writer of
Ezek. 44 had seen Isa. 56: 3-8 he could scarcely have been more
precise in his charges.

Thus Isa. 56: 3-8 is universal in the usually accepted meaning
of the word in connexion with the Second Isaiah, but Ezek. 40-48
is nationalistic, as we believe the Second Isaiah to be. What, then,
is to be said of the author of Ezek. 40-48? Most scholars are inclined
to hold that these nine chapters are either wholly or in part from the
hand of Ezekiel himself, the author of (possibly, substantially)
chapters 1-39. Whether this is so or not, the author of 40-48 was
certainly pro-Zadokite, and it is more than likely that he was a Za-
dokite and therefore one of, or descended from the pre-exilic Jerusalem
priesthood, those who were carried off to Babylonia at the destruction
of the Temple in 586 B.C. Whether the author of chapters 1-39 was a
priest is not so clear from the contents of these chapters, since Ezek.
1: 1-3 may be wholly editorial, as certainly some of it is. It may well be
that Ezekiel is called a priest [1]) because of the contents of chapters
40-48. We agree with BERTHOLET (*Hezekiel*, 1963) that the writer of
1-39 (at least) went to Babylonia in 586 B.C. and not 597 B.C., and
the same is true of the author of 40-48, who may or may not be the
same Ezekiel, or of his father.

We take Isa. 56: 3-8 and Ezek. 44: 4-8 to belong to roughly the
period of the struggle for power which took place immediately upon
the Return. The strict party was composed of the returning exiles,
headed by the Zadokite priesthood, who had to fight for their position

---

[1]) It makes no difference whether 'the priest' in 1: 3 refers to Ezekiel or his
father, since the priesthood was a matter of descent in any case.

as priests: see Zech. 3: 7 where Joshua is stripped of his filthy gar-
ments (he had been in an unclean land) and given 'right of access'
(מהלכים, RSV) to the altar. He was restored to the High Priesthood
which his father Jehozadak had held (1 Chr. 6: 15; heb. 5: 41).
Isaiah 56: 3-8 represents the other point of view, that of the Palestin-
ians. Our guess is that this group may have been the Aaronites, who
were not priests at Jerusalem before the exile, moved in probably
during the exile from (?) Bethel,[1]) and formed the minority of the
priests when the final settlement was made.[2])

*Isaiah* 56: 9-12. There is general agreement that this section has
nothing to do with the previous section. It has been held to be an
excerpt from a pre-exilic prophecy. Some have equated the wild
beasts with the heathen peoples generally, others with the Samaritans.
It is impossible to fix the date. It may belong to any century from the
eighth to the fifth, and may even be earlier or later. Blind leaders,
leaders that pursue policies that lead to disaster and leaders that cannot
give warning of trouble and disaster, greedy dogs that never have
enough—no age and no people have a monopoly of these. The situat-
ion is similar to that of the prophet Malachi. The section is not con-
cerned with the question as to who is and who is not the People of
God.

*Isaiah* 57: 1-2. It is not possible to assign any date to these verses.
They form two distinct couplets, and the verse division is not in
accordance with the poetic sstructure. We judge them to be two in-
dependent couplets placed together because of the common words
אסף (gather) and צדיק (righteous). The first couplet is

> The-righteous-man צדיק perishes,
>     and-no-man is-taking-it to-heart;
> And-men-loyal (to the covenant) are-taken-off אסף,
>     with-no-one taking-notice.

and the second couplet is:

> For-from-the-presence-of evil

---

[1]) KENNETT, 'The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood,' JTS vi (1905), pp. 161-
186.
[2]) The priests of the P-tradition were 'the priests, the sons of Aaron,' but two
thirds of them were Zadokite, reckoned as the elder branch and descended through
Eleazar and Phinehas, and one third were Aaronite, reckoned as the younger
branch and descended through Ithamar, 1 Chr. 24 3 f.

the-righteous-man צדיק is-taken-off אסף.
(he enters peace/prosperity)
They-rest on-their-beds,
    (everyone) who-walks straight-forwardly.

The first couplet bemoans the fate of the loyal, righteous man who
keeps the covenant. The second couplet says either that the righteous
man is saved from evil by the peace of the grave (cf. Job 3: 13 ff.),
or that he is snatched away from misfortune and prospers. Once more,
the section is not concerned with the struggle of the early post exilic
days between the two factions.

*Isaiah* 57: 3-14. If, as seems most probable, this is all one piece, then
it is a tirade against people in Palestine who are charged with syn-
cretistic worship. It has been pointed out [1]) that the scenery is Palestin-
ian with its terebinths (RV, RSV oaks), its conifers (RV, RSV 'green-
trees,' lit. luxuriant, fresh, which means evergreen, non-deciduous),
the wadies (RV, RSV valleys) and the clefts of the crags. These
Palestinians have charged the speaker and his friends with being
'children of rebellion' (ילדי פשע: not מרי) and of false descent זרע שקר,
insults which the speaker is hurling back at them. The prophet is
speaking on behalf of God's people (v. 14) who are returning from
Babylonia—compare v. 14 with 40: 4; 'build up' is the same root as
'highway,' and 'prepare the way' is פנו דרך, which is translated
'prepare the way' in 40: 4. The prophet says that he will tell of (broad-
cast) their 'righteousness and doings,' but they will be of no avail.
SKINNER says that the reference to righteousness 'must be spoken
ironically,' [2]) and he rightly refers to the Samaritans (Ezra 4: 2).
The charge is that they have a mixed worship. They may indeed claim
to be true worshippers of YHVH, but this is combined with all kinds
of heathen practices and religious rites.

In order to understand the situation in these troublous times of the
latter quarter of the sixth century (say, 538-500 B.C., and the following
years also), we must turn to 2 Kgs. 17: 23b-41.[3]) This section is the
official basis of the later claim that the Samaritans were not true Jews,
that these northerners were not the People of God. The chapter comes
from the Deuteronomic editors of the Books of Kings, and is most

[1]) e.g. SKINNER, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
[2]) *op. cit.*, p. 176.
[3]) Cf. H. H. ROWLEY, 'The Samaritan Schism in Legend and History' in
*Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (1962), pp. 208-222.

probably an addition by the second and final editors ca. 550 B.C., those who found new courage and hope when they saw the easing in the rigours of imprisonment which came to the deposed Jehoiachin at the accession of Evil-Merodach in 561 B.C. (2 Kgs. 25: 27-30). The basis of the argument in 2 Kgs. 17 is the statement that the whole of Israel, the northern kingdom, was deported by the Assyrian king, and that he settled in their place a miscellaneous population from Babylon, Cuthah, Ava and so forth. These settlers set up their own gods, but neglected 'the god of the land,' that is, the God of Israel. This entailed ravages by lions, which doubtless had multiplied in numbers and in boldness because of the depopulation caused by war and by the deportation. An exiled priest was therefore sent back and he settled in Bethel, with the result that a mixed cult was developed there. 'They feared the LORD, and served (worshipped) their own gods' (v. 33), and they made priests for themselves from non-priestly families. This last, in the mind of a southerner, meant from non-Levites. The reason for the long condemnation is to be found in the last verse (41): 'So these nations feared the LORD and served their graven images; their children likewise, and their children's children, as did their fathers, so do they unto this day.' This is a charge against the sixth century ancestors of the Samaritans. DUHM thought of it all as a polemic against the Samaritans, and SKINNER suggested that the prophet was thinking of a paganised Judaean population closely akin to the Samaritans of the North and cultivating friendly relations with them. These suggestions involve dating the section in 2 Kgs and the section in Isa. 57 much later than is necessary. Both passages are against the Palestinian Judaeans who never left the country. They are charges by returning exiles against 'the people of the land.' The sections belong to the same religious point of view as that indicated by Ezekiel's 'rebellious house,' Jeremiah's 'bad figs' and the Second Isaiah. In these three writers the breach was not as wide as in 2 Kgs. 17 and Isa. 57: 3-14, and the controversy had not grown bitter. Time is not always a healer; somtimes he makes wounds fester.

Thus Isaiah 57: 3-14 belongs to the early days of 'the cold war' between the returning exiles who claimed to be the People of God, and those Israelites who had never been in Babylonia, who claimed that they also sought the same God (Ezra 4: 2). The charges are of licentious rites beneath the ever-green trees, child sacrifice in the valleys, sacred prostitution on the hills, household gods behind the door, spices for the cult of Molech. These are all the malpractices

which Deuteronomy condemns. They are not so much what the
Israelites found in Canaan at their first entry into the land, as what they
found when they entered the second time to occupy [1]) it. Indeed, it is
as though the second Moses of Deut. 18: 15 is the Moses who is
speaking in Deuteronomy, and speaking to the new Israel about to
enter Canaan, just as the old Israel entered Canaan centuries before.
There is no need to assume with SKINNER that the highway of 57: 14
is 'an emblem of the preparation for that larger deliverance to which
the hopes of the post-exilic community were eagerly directed.' [2]) The
passage is not 5th century. It is late sixth century, the beginning of the
cold war.

*Isaiah* 57: 15-20. Ultimately the dating and placing of this section
depends upon the initial assumptions. This is true of many passages
in the Old Testament, but perhaps more in this case than in most.
Verse 15 in LXX differs considerably from the Hebrew text, though
the general background is the same. This particular verse is firmly
in the tradition of the Second Isaiah, especially if 61: 1 f. is included as
being his: the highly exalted One who dwells on high and at the same
time is with the crushed and humble of spirit. There is no contrast
implied (SKINNER, *in loc.*, is right here), since transcendence and
imminence are compatible. It is transcendence and immanence that
are incompatible.[3])

'The humble and contrite (lit. 'crushed') ones who are to be made to
live again (*hiph'il* of חיה, revive) are the exiles. God strove against
them (better 'took up a case as in the courts' ריב) and was angry
with them, but this was not for ever, since in that case 'their spirit
(*mem* lost through haplography) would fail from my presence, and
the breathing-beings (lit. 'breaths') which I have made.' This refers
to the punishment of the exile, as also does v. 17: 'I was angry at his
iniquity for a moment (cf. LXX) and I smote him, hiding my face in
anger. He went stubbornly in the path of his own choice. Then I gave
consideration to his ways (v. 18), and I healed him (read strong-*waw*)
and led him, and recompensed him with full relief (נחמים: see note on
40: 1), creating for his mourners the fruit of lips: [4]) peace, peace,

---

[1]) This root ירשׁ (57: 13) is usually translated 'possess, dispossess.' It means
take possession of the land by occupying it having driven out the previous oc-
cupants, and it is used regularly in the story of the conquest of Canaan.
[2]) *op. cit.*, p. 177. Presumably he means the coming of the Messiah.
[3]) 'God, Transcendent and Imminent,' ET lxviii 3 (Dec. 1956), pp. 68-71.
[4]) A most difficult phrase. It is not in LXX. Perhaps it refers to the effective
words of comfort which God speaks through the prophet—peace, peace.

saith the LORD, to both far and near.' Verse 19 is thought by SKINNER
to refer to Jews still in exile and Jews who have already returned. Thus
it is better to retain 'and led him' וַאֲנִחֵהוּ in v. 18 and not follow
LXX with וַאֲנַחֲמֵהוּ (and comforted him). Many scholars understand
the verse to refer to the Dispersion. Our judgment is that SKINNER
is right, and we assume a date between 538 and 520 B.C. for the
section.

*Isaiah* 58: 1-14. This chapter belongs to a period when the restoration
of ruined buildings, homes and foundations and walls, was an im-
mediate necessity (v. 12). The ancient ruins apparently had not been
restored, and neither walls nor roads remade. The chapter is addressed
to 'my people', 'the house of Jacob' (v. 1). The matter is of some
urgency since the prophet is bidden 'cry aloud with the throat' and
'lift his voice high like the sound of an alarm' (v. 1). The people are
regular in their worship and sincere. They delight to know God's
ways; they do what is right and they do not desert the proper way of
doing things (מִשְׁפָּט, proper custom in life and cultus). But things are
going wrong, in spite of the fact that they are rigorously abstinent
(lit. 'afflict their souls,' the regular phrase in the P-tradition for 'fast,'
Lev. 16: 29, etc.). The prophet says that their fasts are not true fasts.
They fast for their own purposes (חֵפֶץ: cf. 53: 10) and they 'oppress
(נגשׂ, the root used for the 'taskmasters' in Exolus 3 and 8) their
pains.' This phrase means that they deliberately intensify their fasts.
They are using them as a weapon in their quarrels: 'behold, you fast
to quarrel and to fight, and to smite with the fist of wickedness (v. 4).'
There are further charges: oppression, refusing to feed the poor
and care for the homeless, hiding themselves from their own flesh.
The people against whom the prophet is speaking are being very
religious and ultra-strict in their religious observances, and all the
stricter because they are using these religious exercises to set up strife
and to widen the separation between themselves and others. These
others are men of their own flesh—at least, the writer maintains that
they are such. What these very religious offenders must do is to put
away these restrictive practices, stop pointing a scornful finger and
stop speaking calumny. They must obey the Deuteronomic injunctions
(Deut. 22: 1-4) concerning their treatment of their own people. They
must observe the Sabbath in true fashion, make it a day of delight and
honour, and not observe it for their own purposes. These charges all
give support for a date not far removed from Zech. 7: 1-7, namely c.

516 B.C. The writer is pro-Palestinian. He has close affinities with the Second Isaiah (vv. 8 and 9, 10, 12), but he believes that the way in which the glorious visions of future prosperity are to be realised is by including and not excluding the Palestinian Jews.

*Isaiah* 59: 1-4. The question is asked: Why is it that things are going so badly? The answer is that it is not the LORD's fault. His hand is not shortened (cf. 50: 2), and He is still strong to save. It is your iniquities that are causing a separation מבדילים between you and your God. It is not He that has hidden His face from you; it is your own sins. There is no straight-forward dealing in the courts; all is trickery and sharp practice. The passage might belong to any period when things were going badly politically and economically, except for the use of the separation-root בדל, which inclines the balance in favour of the period of the early development of Judaism, c. 500 B.C.

*Isaiah* 59: 5-8. These verses describe the misdemeanours and mal-practices of the time in more poetical language than is employed in the previous verses. They may well belong to some collection of psalms or proverbs. Compare v. 7a with Prov. 1: 16 and Ps. 14: 3 (LXX). The section might belong to almost any period.

*Isaiah* 59: 9-15a. Here the people themselves, or the prophet on their behalf, take up the tale of woe. Verses 12 and 13 read like a General Confession and may be liturgical in origin. The speakers are concerned that salvation from their present and continuing woes is as far away as ever. This is in v. 9, where משפט (judgement, here a divine verdict which will bring them good fortune) and צדקה ('righteousness,' but rather 'being put in the right') both mean 'salvation': see the second half of the verse. Also in v. 11 משפט (judgment) is equivalent to ישועה (salvation) and in v. 14 to צדקה (righteousness: once more in the sense of being put in the right). The passage may belong to any period, though there is influence from the Second Isaiah.

*Isaiah* 59: 15b-21. This section is definitely in the style of the Second Isaiah, indeed there is a great deal to be said for including it with chapters 60-62 as actually from his hand, and placed where it is be-cause of the verbal links of verses 14-15a and 15b. There was no justice and no one among mankind to intervene.[1] He therefore Himself took action to bring salvation and vindication to the sufferers. Thus God

---

[1] As we pointed out in commenting on Isa. 53: 12, the regular translation of the verb פגע in the sense of interceding has been most unfortunate.

armed Himself for the fight like a warrior; armed Himself with צדקה
(actively putting things right), with salvation, with vengeance נקם
and with zeal קנאה. All this is directed agaunst his enemies, his ad-
versaries, who are the isles איים, a word used regularly by the Second
Isaiah to mean the Gentiles. In the end all the world (19) will fear the
LORD, from east to west, so fierce will be the torrent of His onset.
Thus (20) the redeemed will come to Zion and the covenant will be
established for ever and ever.

Chapters 60-62 have been dealt with (pp. 198-200) as being definitely
the word of the Second Isaiah himself.

*Isaiah* 63: 1-6. This section speaks of a ruthless and bloody vengeance
on Edom. LAGARDE, DUHM and MARTI have suggested such emenda-
tions (slight as they are) as would remove Edom from the context,
and substitute 'Syria' (ארם for אדם), but the puns on Edom and its
literal meaning 'red', and on Bozrah and its literal meaning 'first-ripe
grape' make the passage too aptly macabre to warrant any such
changes. If it is allowed that there is a strong nationalistic element in
the Second Isaiah, then this section is not as alien to him and to his
sphere of influence as some suppose. The Second Isaiah is no generous-
hearted lover of all the world with kind thoughts about the Gentiles,
who have ruthlessly smashed his people and all they held dear and
still deny them nationhood and liberty and a future of their own.
The word נקם (vengeance) is found in 47: 3 and in 61: 2, a context
which all are happy to associate closely with the Second Isaiah even
if some hesitate actually to ascribe it to him. No one objects to the end
of verse 1 as being in tune with the Second Isaiah ('I that speak in
righteousness, mighty to save') and in vv. 3 and 5 we have the familiar
(50: 2; 59: 16) statement that He looked and there was none to help.
He had to act alone. The section begins with vengeance on Edom,
who rushed in to take full advantage of the downfall of Judah. It
ends with vengeance and fury on the Gentiles. All this fits in with the
rampant nationalism of the end of the sixth century B.C. The Century
Bible commentary says that 'the conception of redemption has harden-
ed in the interval since the days of Deutero-Isaiah.' The writer of that
commentary has minimised 49: 26; 41: 26; 42: 13: 43: 3; 49: 23.
There is nothing in the section which absolutely demands a Palestinian
locale, just as equally there is nothing which demands a Babylonian
locale, but we are certainly in the world of a resurgent Jewish nation-
alism.

*Isaiah* 63: 7-64: 12. We come now to what, from our point of view, is the most important section of these eleven chapters. This piece is from a member of a group who claim (64: 7, Eng. 8) that the LORD *is* their father, no matter what anybody may say. They are the clay; He is the potter and 'we are all the work of thy hand.' The claim is emphatically made and the way in which it is phrased suggests irresistibly that they are rebutting a charge, a denial that the LORD is their father, and that they are His handy-work. See also 63: 16:

> For thou art our Father,
> Though Abraham does not know us,
> And Israel does not recognise us.
> *Thou*, O LORD, art our Father:
> Our Redeemer from of old is thy Name.'

Here is a group of people whom Abraham-Israel rejects and denies that they are the LORD's. They answer that they are indeed His, as much His as anybody else is: He has been their Redeemer from ancient time, which from the context must mean the rescue from Egypt, the passage through the Red Sea, and the journey through the Wilderness with the Entry into Canaan. L. E. BROWNE [1]) rightly saw here pro-Samaritan and indeed pre-Samaritan literature. The piece begins (63: 7):

> I-will-call-to-mind the-LORD's deeds-of-steadfast-love,
>> The-LORD's deeds-that-call-for-praise,
> According-to-all the-LORD hath-done-for-us,
>> And-the-abundant-good-fortune to-the-house-of-Israel,
> Which He-dealt-us (LXX and Lat.) according-to-his-compassion,
>> According-to-the multitude-of His-deeds-of-steadfast-love.

The next verse is:

> And-he-said: Nay-my-people are they,
>> Children that-will-not-deal-falsely.
> And-he-was to-them a-saviour
>> In-all their-distresses.

Here we have a spokesman who is looking back and calling to mind the great deeds of salvation in the past, wrought by the LORD on behalf of His covenant-people. He is speaking on behalf of a group who are being denied a place among the People of God. We are

---

[1]) *Early Judaism* (1920), pp. 70 ff.

justified in introducing the word 'covenant' here, because the word
חסד has by this time, and especially in such a context as this come
to refer to God's steadfast, sure love for Israel and His faithfulness to
the covenant between Him and them. Further as L. E. Browne has
made clear,[1]) the use of the root שָׁקַר (deal falsely) involves the idea
of the covenant, cf. Ps. 44: 18 (Eng. 17); 89: 34. The speaker uses the
word אַך (63: 8), which is usually, but erroneously, translated 'surely.'
This particle involves assertion in the face of denial,[2]) and whilst it is
possible so to pronounce the word 'surely' in order to ensure this
meaning, it is better to translate it' Nay, but.' The speaker means that
in spite of all his opponents can say, he still maintains that he and his
companions are God's people. We are God's people, he says, and we
will not deal falsely in the covenant. That is why and how we can
say that God has been our Saviour in all our distresses from time
immemorial.

He says further (63: 9) that it was not a messenger nor an angel
(צִיר וּמַלְאָךְ LXX, Latin) who saved them, but 'God's Presence and
His very Self.' Compare Exod. 33: 13 J, where the LORD says: 'My
Presence shall go with thee פָּנַי יֵלֵכוּ and I will give thee rest,' cf. Isa.
63: 14. The piece continues:

> In-his-love and-in-his-forbearance
>> He redeemed-them,
> And-he-lifted-them and-carried-them
>> All-the-days-of old.
> But-they-rebelled and-vexed
>> His-holy spirit,
> So-he-changed-himself to-them to-be-an-enemy,
>> He-himself fought-against-them.

Here we have the story of God's continued mercy, and the cause of the
Disaster of 597 and 586 B.C. The people of God rebelled against
Him and He brought disaster upon them. But there has come a change;
they remembered the days of old (63: 11) and they pray concerning
the present situation (63: 15):

> Then-he (Israel)-remembered the-days-of old
>> Moses his-servant: [3])

---

[1]) *op. cit.*, p. 80.
[2]) 'The meaning of the Hebrew אַך,' VT xiv 2 (April 1964), pp. 221-225.
[3]) These two words are not in LXX; some Heb. MSS and Syriac have 'Moses

Where-is he-that-brought-them-up from the-sea?
　Where-is (Targum) the-Shepherd-of [1]) his-flock?
Where-is he-that-set in-the-midst-of-him
　His-holy spirit?
Who-caused-to-go at-the-right-hand-of Moses
　His-glorious arm?
Who-clave the-waters before-them
　To-make-for-himself a-name (? for ever) [2])?
Who-brought-them through-the-Deeps,
　Like-a-horse in the wilderness [3])
They did-not-stumble.
Like-cattle that-go-down into-the-valley,
　The-spirit-of-the-LORD gave-him-rest.[4])
So thou-didst-lead thy-people [5])
To-make-thyself a-glorious-name.

Here we have a recounting of the details of the ancient saga, par-
ticularly of the Joseph tribes who came into Canaan under Joshua
across the Jordan near by Gilgal. These mighty deeds of old, these
mighty deeds of salvation, are claimed by the writer and his friends
as having been wrought for them and their forbears, the People of
God, and they insist on this in spite of denials by others. They admit
their rebellion against God (10) and acknowledge the justice of the
subsequent punishment, but they remember also those other days [6])
when God extended His covenant-mercy to their fathers. And so in
verse 15 there comes a prayer concerning the present situation:

Look-out from-the-heavens and-see
　from-thy-high-abode, holy and-glorious.

his servant' (עבדו for עמו). A two-accent line is necessary here because of the
metre, and the Syriac reading makes good sense.
　[1]) Heb. has the plural, but it is sing. in many Heb. MSS, LXX, Latin, Targum.
　[2]) Some omit for the sake of the metre.
　[3]) Having come in triumph through the depths of the Sea, they rampaged
through the Wilderness like a war-horse in battle, never stumbling, and came
gladly into the Promised land like cattle down into the valley.
　[4]) The Versions have תַנְחֵנוּ (thou didnt lead them), but the Hebrew is better,
certainly if the meaning is the rest of the Promised Land.
　[5]) After all, the experiences of the Exodus and the Wilderness belonged to the
Joseph tribes rather than to Judah, which was mostly the creation of David, and
only a comparatively small element knew of the Exodus. The South 'stole' the
North's God! This makes the plea of the North more poignant than ever.
　[6]) Compare the southern Ps. 78, especially vv. 67 f.

> Where-is thy-zeal and-thy-might
>     The-yearning-of thy-bowels?
> And-do-not-restrain [1]) thy-great-compassion.
>     For-thou-art our-Father
> Though Abraham does-not-know us
>     And-Israel does-not-recognise-us;
> Thou, O-LORD, art-our-Father,
>     Our-Redeemer from-of-old is-thy-name.

This is a plea for compassion as in the ancient days. The author and his friends claim that they are the true descendants of those whom God called out of Egypt and brought into Canaan through water and desert. Jeremiah condemned them; Ezekiel rejected them; the Second Isaiah spoke against them in Isa. 48; Zerubbabel is said to have rejected them (Ezra 4: 2). The returned exiles stated the claim of their adversaries as a statement that they had worshipped the LORD ever since Esar-haddon's time, they having all been brought there by the Assyrian king (2 Kgs. 17: 24-34), but that was Southern propaganda. Their claim was that they had been there from the beginning of the Israelite occupation.

Verse 17 begins: 'Why dost thou make us to go astray O LORD from thy ways, and hardenest our heart from fearing thee?' These phrases do not mean that God has made them err or has hardened their hearts, but that they have erred and their hearts were hardened—they were stubborn in their wickedness: cf. Isa. 6: 9-12. The Hebrews were sure concerning two things about God: one that He is the One only God, and the other that He is essentially active in this world which He has made. Their zeal for the first led them not to distinguish between *post hoc* and *propter hoc*; their zeal for the second led them to think of Him as the personal link between every cause and every effect, both small and great. The verse continues, 'Turn, for the sake of thy servants, the tribes of thy possession.' This is a plea for a return to the original relationship, that covenant which God made with all the tribes of Israel in the day when He brought them out of Egypt. The verse says 'tribes' and it means 'tribes.'

Verse 18 is 'For a little while thy holy people had possession, our adversaries have trampled thy sanctuary.' LXX and Latin have: 'for a little while we possessed thy holy mountain' (Cod. A adds 'our enemies trampled thy sanctuary'). The root בוס means 'trample,

---

[1]) So LXX and 64: 11, אל תתאפק.

tread down' and is used always of destruction or desecration, so the
first thought is that the 'adversaries' are the Babylonians and that the
temple is still in ruins: which places the section in the period between
538-520 B.C., though L. E. BROWNE [1]) thought of it as having been
written before 538 B.C. but in Palestine by those whom we have called
the Palestinian Jews. On the other had, whilst the root בוס is indeed
elsewhere used of destruction and desecration, it does not follow
that the reference here is to the destructive trampling of the Babylon-
ians in 586 B.C. Compare the root רמס, which also is used of de-
structive trampling down, but in Isa. 1:12 is used of what Isaiah
of Jerusalem held to be the irreligious, though fulsome worship of
his contemporaries. Thus here in 63: 18 the writer may be referring
to the fact that people are worshipping there, of whose attitude he
does not approve, and whose religion he does not think is sound and
right. Also, who are 'our adversaries'? It may well be that the Baby-
lonians are intended. On the other hand, 'adversaries' is a word used
in the strife between the two parties in the fifth century, Neh. 4: 5
(Eng. 11); Ezra 4: 1 especially. In this case, the reference may be to
the returned exiles who have taken possession of the Temple mount
and are driving out and denying access to those who had not been in
exile. It is curious also that the true LXX text refers to 'holy mount'
and not to 'sanctuary.' But in any case, whether the verse refers to the
Babylonians having destroyed the temple or to the returning exiles
having taken exclusive possession of the site, the section comes from
the Palestinian Jews and belongs to the period before 520 B.C.

Verse 19 provides us with what the returning exiles said about the
Palestinians. See L. E. BROWNE, *op. cit.* p. 83. He proposes that we
read 'We are become "From of old thou didst not rule over them"
and "Thy name was not called over them".' He takes the two sentences
within the inner quotation marks to be statements made by the re-
turning exiles about the Palestinians. See also J. ADAMS,[2]) who shows
that the accents do actually demand this interpretation. When this
verse is considered in association with 64: 7 (Eng. 8) and 64: 8
(Eng. 9), we find this section to be pro-Palestinian and anti-Babylon-
ian, belonging to the years 538-520 B.C.

*Isaiah* 65: 1-7. In verse 1 RV 'I am enquired' (margin, 'I was en-
quired of') can scarcely be right, because of the final rejection of

---

[1]) *op. cit.*, p. 78.
[2]) *Sermons in Accents* (1906), pp. 86-88.

v. 7. It is better, therefore, to follow RSV, where the verbs of v. 1a
are treated each as a *niph'al tolerativum*, and then to translate 'I was
ready to be enquired of by "they have not asked me": [1]) I was
ready to be found by "they did not seek me." ' This is the same type
of syntax as in 63: 19. The verse continues, as do succeeding verses,
with the statement of what actually happened: 'I said, Here am I,
here am I, to a nation גוי which is not called by my name.[2])' God
appealed continually to these apostate ones (the root is סור, turn aside,
not מרי, rebellion), but they persisted in following their own in-
clinations. They provoked God to His face continually. This root
הכעיס (provoke) is used 'about fifty times of Israelites provoking
the LORD to anger by deserting Him and serving foreign gods,' [3])
and once of the Samaritans hindering Nehemiah (Neh. 3: 37, Eng.
4: 5) but never of the heathen. Further the idolatries mentioned in
65: 7 are Palestinian, where we would follow LXX and Syriac and
read 'their' instead of 'your' (thus following RSV). This is a statement
parallel to 2 Kgs. 17: 41. We find the section to be strongly anti-
Palestinian and to belong to the same period as the preceding section.

*Isaiah* 65: 8-12. Here we have another anti-Palestinian piece. 'There
is new wine to be obtained from the cluster. They say, 'Do not destroy
it, there is a blessing in it.' The writer makes use of a vintage song
(cf. the title of Pss. 57, 58, 59, 75) to proclaim the doctrine of a rem-
nant. The whole of Israel will not be destroyed. The remnant will be
saved and this group will take possession of 'my mountains' (the
Judaean hills). This group is the LORD's chosen, His servants. All
will be well, and there will be prosperity in Sharon and in the Valley
of Achor. There will be flocks and herds there, and all this 'for my
people that have sought me.' The rest will be slaughtered—those who
have forgotten Zion, who have turned aside to the gods of Fortune
(Gad) and of (?) Fate. They did not answer the LORD's call, nor listen
to what He said. They did what was evil, that in which He did not
delight. All these are charges made by the returning exiles against the
Palestinians. DUHM believed that this section was directed against the
Jews of the land as distinct from the returning exiles. We find this

---

[1]) LXX, Latin, Syriac and 2 Heb. MSS. have the suffix. For this use of the
*niph'al*, see SKINNER, *op. cit.* p. 231.

[2]) The Versions have 'who did not call on my name,' but the vowels of the
Hebrew Text are the more difficult, and the Masoretic interpretation fits the use
of גוי, which means 'a heathen nation.'

[3]) L. E. BROWNE, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

confirmed by the reference to the Valley of Achor. This was the valley through which the Israelites under Joshua first entered Canaan, Josh. 7: 24; 15: 7. It is the valley along which Hosea hoped for a second and happier entry, Hos. 2: 17 (Eng. 15). It is difficult to be precise as to the date of this piece, but it belongs to the early days of the controversy, though perhaps later than some of the pieces, since the spirit of it is much more fierce.

*Isaiah* 65: 13-25. This piece begins by contrasting the happy lot of the LORD's servants with the sorrowful and disastrous fate of their opponents. These wicked ones will leave a name of evil omen behind them, but the chosen ones, the LORD's servants, will have another name. Every man in the land, when he invokes a blessing on himself will use the name of the God of Amen,[1]) that is, the God who says 'Amen' to the words His people utter and confirms those words in action and result. Oaths will be made in His name. The prophet then speaks in glowing and visionary terms of the amazing prosperity which will come to God's people in Jerusalem. There shall be no more weeping and crying. Men will live to a fabulous old age, and every needs of their's will be met and satisfied before it is even expressed. The section is pro-Babylonian.

*Isaiah* 66: 1-2. GRESSMANN placed the first four verses in the period before Haggai and Zechariah had persuaded the people to build the second temple, 520-516 B.C. There is every reason to suppose that he was right so far as the first two verses are concerned. There is no contrast involved in v.1 between heaven and earth, nor is there any suggestion that it is wrong to build a temple on earth. The Hebrew is אי־זה, i.e. 'where, then' is the house... : not 'what.' Thus, the opposite is the case. Rather we have an urgent enquiry for the temple, as to why it has not been built. God may have His throne in the heavens, but He needs a resting-place on earth. The Hebrew is 'a footstool' (lit. a *pied-à-terre!*). He is looking to the man who is afflicted and broken of spirit, who trembles at His word. This last makes the piece pro-Babylonian.

*Isaiah* 66: 3-4. These verses return to the matter of the mixed worship, though the meaning is obscured by the insertion in EVV of 'as he that offereth' and 'as he.' The verses describe a confusion of rites,

---

[1]) v. 16. RV and RSV have 'God of truth,' but see RVm, following DELITZSCH and CHEYNE: cf. Rev. 3 14.

legitimate and illegitimate, pro-YHVH and anti-YHVH: slaughtering
an ox, slaying a man, sacrificing a lamb, breaking a dog's neck,
offering a gift-offering מנחה, offering swine's blood, making a memor-
ial-offering with incense, blessing an idol. Verse 3 continues: 'Yes;
*they* (emphatic) have chosen their ways and *they* (again emphatic,
נפשם, lit. 'their soul,' a fullsome way of saying 'they') have taken de-
light in abominable idols, so *I* (again emphatic) will choose. . ' Then
once more we have the sentiments of 65: 12: these are the people who
did not answer the LORD's call, and did not listen when He spoke.
Thus, once more we have a pro-Babylonian piece accusing the Pales-
tinians of illegimate and idolatrous religious practices.

*Isaiah* 66: 5-6. These verses are distinct from the previous verses,
and it is difficult to see any connexion between them and verse 7.
Verse 5 is a jeering challenge to men whose brethren hate them and
have cast them out in the name of God. The jeer is: if, as you say,
you are faithful worshippers of God, then let God prosper you and
glorify His name. But, says the prophet, *they* (once more emphatic)
shall be ashamed, that is, the ones who have been jeering at the out-
casts will be ashamed, because there will be a roar from the city. It
will be the voice of the LORD (cf. Am. 1: 2) coming from His temple,
rendering recompense to His enemies. The two verses are pro-
Palestinian.

*Isaiah* 66: 7-9. These verses are closely comparable to 49: 17-21
and 54: 1, and refer to the speedy repopulation of Jerusalem when the
exiles return. This theme is carried over into the succeeding verses.
This piece is pro-Babylonian.

*Isaiah* 66: 10-24. There are associations in phrases with the Second
Isaiah. 'Suck the breasts' and 'milk': v. 11 and 60: 16. 'Peace like a
river': v. 12 and 48: 18. The general attitude is that of chapters 49
and 60. 'Borne on the side': v. 12 and 49: 22 and 60: 4. Jerusalem-
Zion will suck the wealth of the Gentiles. The power of the LORD
will be exercised against his enemies: v. 14 ff. and 49: 26. Further,
those who indulge in illegitimate worship in sacred gardens (cf. 65: 3)
will be destroyed. This means the Palestinians, because this is part of
the charge which the Babylonian Jews made against them. All the
Gentiles will come and behold God's glory and they will bring back
the scattered Jews in horses, in chariots, on mules and dromedaries.
Then (v. 21) out of these who have been thus brought back, God will

choose Levitical priests.[1]) This we take to be a reference to the 'the Levites the priests, the sons of Zadok' who were exiled priests and will be chosen once more and given access to the sanctuary (Zech. 3: 1-7). The new conditions shall endure for ever (v. 22), and so shall the prosperity of the faithful, until ultimately all mankind will come and worship. Lest however it be thought that v. 23 is an open-handed warm-hearted universalism the piece closes with a gory picture of the fate of all who have rebelled against God. The piece is pro-Babylonian, with the door opened to such Gentiles as are properly obedient.

We thus see that Isaiah 56-66 belong to the period following 538 B.C., when at least some of the exiles had returned to Jeruslaem, and there were sharp contentions between the Babylonian Jews who had returned and the Palestinian Jews who had remained in Palestine all the time. The argument is as to who are the true People of God. The Babylonians are in the succession of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Second Isaiah and Zerubabel, Nehemiah and Ezra. The Palestinians are fighting all the time against 'the establishment,' until ultimately they withdraw and form what is known as 'the Samaritan schism.' Both parties are represented in these chapters (eight: since 60-62 are held to be true Second Isaiah). The teaching of the Second Isaiah has led to strife and contention which lasted for more than one generation.

---

[1]) The Versions have 'for priests and for Levites,' as also some Hebrews MSS. We follow the Hebrew consonants, but without the *pathach* of the definite article. To make the clear distinction between priests and Levites is to anticipate a later state of affairs. Cf. Deuteronomy which has 'the priests, the Levites' (Deut. 17: 9, etc; Ezek. 44: 15 has 'the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok.' 'The priests the sons of Aaron' and 'the Levites' as distinct from them, belong to the developed P-tradition.

## JERUSALEM FROM 538 B.C. TO 397 B.C.

How did it come about that both parties and both points of view, Palestinian and Babylonian, are found in Isaiah 56-66?

There is every indication that the triumph of Judaism with its rigid policy of exclusiveness—the triumph, that is, of the returned exiles, the Babylonian Jews—did not take place until 397 B.C., which we take to be the date of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem. This victory is described either in Nehemiah 13 or in Ezra 9-10, whichever is the later (but see below pp. 251 f.). There is less evidence than is generally supposed of any serious strife before the arrival of Nehemiah in 445/4 B.C. That there was contention and struggle for religious status there can be no shadow of doubt, but there does not appear to have been any political crisis. Most of us have given too much weight to Ezra 4: 1-6. We have not realised that there is much more opposition expressed in the English translation than there is in the Hebrew of Ezra 4: 3. Further, the theory that the breach opened wide in the time of Zerubbabel depends also on the unity of Ezra 4: 1-6.

We deal first with the problem of Ezra 4: 1-6. Chapter 4, as it stands, makes little sense. The times are all confused. The chapter opens with Zerubbabel and Jeshua taking steps to build the temple. It says that the 'people of the land' (the non-exiles, the Palestinian Jews) did everything they could to hinder and weaken the efforts of the 'people of Judah' (the returned exiles, the Babylonian Jews), and that this opposition continued all the time of Cyrus and on to the reign of Darius. In the time of Xerxes (verse 6) the Palestinians wrote an accusation against the builders, and another complaint (verses 7 ff) in the time of Artaxerxes, a copy of which is given, and after it the kings' reply. Then (verse 24) it is stated that the work on the temple ceased until the second year of Darius.

There are many strange elements in this chapter. It is composed of bits and pieces. Verse 24 (second year of Darius) brings us back to verses 1-3, since it was in this second year of Darius that Jeshua and Zerubbabel became active in building the temple, urged on by Haggai and Zechariah (Hag. 1; Zech. 4: 9). Verse 6 is dated in the reign of Artaxerxes. Whether verse 7 has anything to do with verse

6 is uncertain, but it has nothing to do with verses 8 ff. Presumably this Artaxerxes is Artaxerxes I (Longimanus), so that here we are in the time of Nehemiah, the period 464-424 B.C. But this section is not concerned at all with the building of the temple. It is about the rebuilding of the walls. Whether there was contention between the two parties, Babylonian Jews and Palestinian Jews, concerning the building of the temple, it is difficult to say; it is certain that there was considerable trouble whilst the walls were being built.

Ezra 4: 3 is difficult. The Revised Version has: 'Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build. . .' The Hebrew reads: 'Not to you and to us לֹא לְכֶם וְלָנוּ. . ., for we together כִּי אֲנַחְנוּ יַחַד will build. . .' But the LXX equivalents are different. Esdras B 4: 3 has 'Not to us and to you οὐχ ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν 'and 'for we together ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό'; Esdras A 5: 67 f. (71) has 'Not to you οὐχ ὑμῖν' and 'for we alone ἡμεῖς γὰρ μόνοι.' Usually the phrase לֹא לְכֶם וְלָנוּ is compared to the idiom מַה־לִי וְלָךְ, lit. 'what to me and to you', i.e. 'we have nothing to do with each other' or 'this is no business of yours'. But are the two phrases equivalent? There was nothing whatever to stop the writer saying 'What to us and to you?' The Chronicler knew the idiom (2 Chr. 35: 21), and it was well-known at all periods: Jg. 11: 12; 2 Sam. 16: 10—ten times altogether, including two without the *wāw* (Jer. 2: 18; Hos. 14: 9). The idiom persisted into New Testament times: Matt. 8: 29; Mk. 5: 7; Jn. 2: 4. Compare also the Arabic *mā li walahu*. But we do not have this idiom in Ezra 4: 3. Esdras A says clearly that the building of the temple was definitely nothing to do with the Palestinians, but both Esdras B and the Hebrew Ezra could mean that the building was not the sole concern of either party, but the common concern of both. It is true that the Arabic *waḥad* in the accusative with suffix can mean 'his solitariness,' but the usual meaning of the word in Hebrew is 'together' and not its opposite. It is true also that Neh. 2: 20 says that the Palestinians (Sanballat and his allies) 'have no portion, nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem,' but the context is the rebuilding of the walls, and the date is eighty years later. Ezra 4: 24 is confirmed by Haggai and Zech. 4: 9 in that the building of the house was delayed until the second year of Darius, but neither prophet mentions anything about opposition on the part of the Palestinians.

Consider Zech. 6: 9-15. When verse 13 says that 'the counsel of peace shall be between them both,' who are 'the both'? The prophet is bidden to take representatives of the returning exiles and

meet with them in the house of a certain Josiah son of Zephaniah. The whole section is difficult and has evidently been interpreted later differently from what was originally intended; cf. verses 11 and 14. LXX does not recognise any of the names in verse 10 apart from that of Josiah son of Zephaniah, but has 'rulers and capable and discerning men.' They are apparently the representatives of the exiles. It difficult to identify this Josiah son of Zephaniah. The tendency is to identify this Zephaniah with the second priest who was executed by Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah (2 Kgs. 25: 18). In this case Josiah must have been getting on in years, because the Riblah incident had taken place 66 years earlier. Presumably this Josiah would have been carried off to Babylonia with the rest of the Zadokite priests of Jerusalem,[1]) but his name is not in the lists, and these lists were regarded as final and authoritative (Ezra 2: 62; Neh. 7: 64). Also, verse 10 conveys the impression that Josiah was domiciled in Jerusalem. The section tells of an agreement that 'they that are afar off shall come and build in the temple of the LORD,' and the crown is to be a token, a reminder of this arrangement. The original text mentions one crown only,[2]) made of silver and gold, and this crown is to be set on the head of the high-priest Joshua son of Jehozadak. The prophet is now to say to Joshua, 'Behold a man whose name is Branch, and from his place he shall branch out, and he shall build the temple of the LORD.' The last part of the verse looks like an addition, because the next verse continues: 'and *he* (emphatic) shall build the temple of the LORD and *he* shall bear the glory and sit (enthroned) and rule upon his throne, and shall be priest on his throne, and there shall be counsel of peace between the two of them.' LXX has two crowns and two thrones with the priest sitting on the throne 'on his right,' but the natural meaning of the Hebrew is that Joshua is the Branch and the crown is set on his head.[3]) The Branch is the צמח, the new shoot out of the old vine stock Israel, LXX's 'dayspring' ἀνατολή of the new era (cf. also Lk. 1: 78) the 'my servant' of Zech. 3: 8. Joshua the high-priest is the new ruler, the successor of David for it is of him that the messianic term 'Branch' is used. But who is the Branch in Zech. 3: 8? Once

---

[1]) LXX thought so, since it has τοῦ ἥκοντος for the Hebrew אשר יבא at the end of the verse.

[2]) The Masoretic text has the plural 'crowns' in vv. 11 and 14, but it is plain in each case that the singular was intended originally and that the two plurals are a later interpretation.

[3]) The 'them' has been inserted by the English translators. There is no objective pronoun in the Hebrew text.

again we are of the opinion that it is Joshua the high-priest.[1]) Zerub-
babel is not mentioned in chapter 3 just as he is not mentioned in
chapter 6 and Joshua is not mentioned in chapter 4. This is very
strange. The two are never mentioned together in Zechariah 1-8 but
always (except in the last three verses) mentioned together in Haggai.
Zech. 3 is the story of the establishment of Joshua as the indubitable
high-priest in spite of his having been in an unclean land (the filthy
garments). The verdict in the heavenly trial is that he is to keep God's
'charge' (מִשְׁמֶרֶת, technical term in the P-tradition for service within
the temple), and to have right of access (מַהְלְכִים, verse 7) among those
that officiate at the altar. Verse 8 says that the others who are present
are 'men of portent' מוֹפֵת, that is, they are men involved in an event
which is a sign of things to come, cf. 2 Chr. 32: 24 31. The portent
has to do with the arrival (verse 7b: I will cause to come) of the
Branch, and apparently Joshua is the Branch. The significance of the
stone in verse 9 has been the subject of considerable discussion (see
the commentaries), but the most satisfactory suggestion is that it is an
ornament for the costume of the high-priest. The result of all this is
that the iniquity of that land (Babylonia) will be removed forthwith,
and the chapter ends with a picture of idyllic peace. With this promise
of peace, compare 6: 13 with its promise of peace 'between them both'
(see p. 245 above), and also the agreement that 'they that are far off
shall come and build in the temple of the LORD,' i.e. they are to
take part in the building.

Again, consider Zech. 6: 1-8, which concludes: 'they that go to
the north country have quieted my spirit in the north country.' The
usual interpretation is that 'the north country' means Babylon, but in
this case what does 'the south country' mean (verse 6)? Commentators
from WELLHAUSEN onwards seek to emend the text in verses 6 and 7,
and they send the chariots east and west as well as north and south,
whereas the Hebrew text sends two to the north, one to the south
and the fourth on a general roving commission. It is true that often
'north country' means Babylon (Zech. 3: 6), but any explanation
of 'north country' in 6: 8 should also be in line with some parallel
explanation of 'south country.' Our explanation is that 'north' means
Israel, the Palestinian Jews, those who had not been out of the country,
and that 'south' means the Judaeans, the 'Babylonians', the returned

---

[1]) It appears to be the case that these chapters in Zech. 1-8 have been subjected
to slight changes in order to make Joshua and Zerubbabel throughout to be the
'two sons of oil' (two anointed ones?) of Zech. 4: 14.

exiles, and that this section is talking about an understanding between the two parties. Compare Ps. 89: 13 (Eng. 12) and see *Studies in the Psalter* (1934), p. 43. See also Zech. 8: 13 where the prophet thinks of both the house of Judah and the house of Israel as being a blessing, and none must imagine evil against his neighbour.

Our solution, therefore is: there was at first a sharp contention between the returning exiles and those who had not been deported, but this was (for the time being) settled amicably. Joshua the son of the exiled Zadokite Jehozadak received the high-priesthood which his fathers had held, and the Zadokites obtained right of access to the altar among the other (Aaronite) priests who were there. Perhaps Haggai's appeal to both Joshua the high-priest and Zerubbabel the governor marks this *rapprochement*, whereas the fact that neither are mentioned together in Zechariah 1-8 reflects the prior state of affairs. We would explain Ezra 4: 3 and its variations in LXX on the basis that the Chronicler (or the editor of Ezra-Nehemiah) thought that the enmity between the two parties began with the building of the temple, and he was reading back the enmity which broke out with the building of the wall. He brings the two together in Ezra 5: 3: '. . .to build this house, and to finish this wall.' Whether anything was accomplished in the building of the temple under Sheshbazzar is open to doubt, but it is certain that the project was actively taken in hand in 520 B.C., the second year of Darius I (Hystaspis). We know that the Chronicler thought in terms of four Persian kings, possibly because his sources metioned only the names, Darius, Cyrus, Artaxerxes, Xerxes, and this involved him in much confusion of dates and the sequence of events. It is probable also that in his sources concerned with the building of the temple he found 'the second year' without any specification as to whose second year it was. He therefore confused the second year of Darius (when the activity on the temple site took place) with the second year of Cyrus. Thus we have two beginnings in building the temple. Similarly 'building' appeared in his sources without specifying whether it was the building of the temple or the building of the wall, and that brought about another muddle. Thus he writes of 'the days of Zerubbabel' and 'the days of Nehemiah' as though they were identical, Neh. 12: 47. We shall see later how his identification of 'Artaxerxes' in his sources always as Artaxerxes I gave rise to another muddle.

After all, the Chronicler was writing the story of the rise and triumph of Judaism with its exclusive Habdalah policy. He is not

interested in the northern tribes, but only in the tribe of Judah (with Benjamin). He regards the northerners of his day as apostates, semi-heathen and wholly heathen, not in any way whatsoever the People of the LORD. They are the 'people of the land,' outside the promises, by no means partakers in the covenant. Nothing is more natural than for him to read back the story of the quarrel into the immediate post-exilic period and to make it a religious and political quarrel of the first degree from the beginning. There was indeed initial disagreement and sharp contention together with a certain amount of violence in words, but there was a temporary truce. It was not 'war to the death' until Nehemiah arrived in Jerusalem and began to rebuild the city walls. It was then that the clash came. For nearly a hundred years there had been a 'cold war' with an occasional thaw. It was this period which accounts for the presence of elements in chapters 56-66 representing both parties. If the quarrel was as severe in Zerubbabel's time as many suppose it is unlikely that both parties would be represented in these eleven chapters. It is our opinion that the same mixture of contrary opinions is to be found in the Elohist Psalter.[1])

There certainly was a clash when Nehemiah arrived. He made his plans with the utmost secrecy (Neh. 2: 12-16), so that Sanballat did not know the wall was going to be rebuilt until the building of it was actually commenced (Neh. 4: 1). Sanballat and his friends were worried when they heard about Nehemiah's appointment as governor of Jerusalem (Neh. 5: 14), because he was come 'to seek the welfare of the children of Israel' (Neh. 2: 10)—so at least the Memoirs say— but they did not know at first about the wall. When they did hear about the wall, they forthwith construed it as rebellion against Persia. We are now in the realm of 'politics pure and simple,' though by no means pure and certainly far from simple. It is difficult to decide whether Sanballat really believed what he said to the Persian king or whether he was seeking to cause Nehemiah the utmost inconvenience. Perhaps Nehemiah expected trouble from the beginning and took no pains to avoid it. The whole problem of the relations between Sanballat and Nehemiah, especially the political aspect of them is reviewed by H. H. ROWLEY in an article 'Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple' in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. 38, no. 1 (Sept. 1955), pp. 166-198. See also A. E. COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923), p. 110, where he says 'no religious schism had

---

[1]) *Studies in the Psalter*, pp. 9-46.

as yet (408 B.C.) taken place.' Whether or not this great clash of 445 B.C. was the first clash depends on our view of the history of 538 B.C. to (say) c. 390 B.C. The decisive clash came either in the events of Nehemiah 13 or in the events of Ezra 9-10, which ever is later.

Which is later? Nehemiah 13 or Ezra 9-10? Who was it that was the effective founder of Judaism? Was it Ezra or was it Nehemiah? If the final success is that given in Ezra 9-10, then Ezra was the founder of Judaism, and Nehemiah's success in Nehemiah 13 was temporary. If the final success is that given in Nehemiah 13, then Nehemiah was the founder of Judaism, and Ezra's success in Ezra 9-10 was temporary. One or the other is right—unless JOHN BRIGHT's solution (see p. 255 below) can be accepted, in which case both are right 'and *all* must have prizes.'

There are two ways in which the biblical material concerning Nehemiah and Ezra has been arranged. One is that with which most people are familiar, the order in the Hebrew Bible, according to which Ezra arrived first and the final triumph is that of Nehemiah, related in Neh. 13. But there is a second order, that of the LXX in Esdras A (1 Esdras). Here the order is (using the Hebrew Bible references): 2 Chronicles 35, 36; Ezra 1; 4: 7-24; the story of the three children; Ezra 2: 1-4: 5; Ezra 5-10; Nehemiah 7: 73-8: 12. This story ends with the triumph of Ezra. We would say that the original order of the Chronicler is that of Esdras A with the rest of the present book of Nehemiah following Ezra 6.[1]) This order gives a complete and intelligible account of the establishment of Judaism and its exclusive Habdalah policy. We have Ezra 1 (return under Sheshbazzar); Ezra 4: 7-24 (early attempts at rebuilding); Ezra 2: 1-4: 5 (return under Zerubbabel and the building of the temple); Ezra 5-10 (building of the temple); Neh. 1: 1-7: 72 and 9-13 (Nehemiah's activities); Ezra 7: 1-10 and 8-10; Neh. 7: 73-8: 13 (Ezra's activities), plus Ezra 8: 14-18. This is the Chronicler's original account of the attempts to establish post-exilic Judaism and of the final success. Sheshbazzar tried and failed. Zerubbabel and Jeshua, urged on by Haggai and Zechariah, managed to get the temple built. Nehemiah got the city walls rebuilt in spite of considerable opposition from within and without the city. During his second term of office as governor he established with considerable violence a policy against mixed marriages, here also with considerable opposition from within.

---

[1]) For a full discussion see 'The Date of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem,' ZAW 63 (NF 22), 1951, pp. 53-66.

But this also failed; he never received support from the priesthood. Finally Ezra came and, with strong support from the high-priest of the time, succeeded in establishing once and for all the Habdalah policy based on a combined religious and political basis. The story of the Chronicler was written in the full flush of enthusiasm soon after the success of Ezra's policy in 397 B.C., just as, we would hold, the first edition of the Book of Kings (ending at the word 'Moses' in 2 Kgs. 23: 25) was written at the height of King Josiah's success. Each writer had his hero, the first had Josiah, the second had Ezra. The Greek Esdras A represents the tradition that Ezra was the founder and establisher of Judaism.

But there was another tradition, and this tradition was that Nehemiah, not Ezra, was the founder and establisher of Judaism. This tradition is represented by the editor who changed the order of the narrative into that which is now found in the Hebrew Bible. This change of order was done very neatly. and the discrepancies are not immediately obvious. Ben Sira followed this tradition. See Ecclus. 49: 11-13, where he lists among his famous men, Zerubbabel, Jeshua son of Josedek, and Nehemiah. There is no mention of Ezra. Another writer in this tradition is the author of Enoch 89:72 ('three of those sheep. . .began to build up all that was fallen down of that house'), and yet another was the author of 2 Maccabees 1 and 2. S. Granhild [1]) has maintained that the Chronicler himself used no Nehemiah material at all. This involves following the Greek Esdras A entirely, which contains no reference to Nehemiah as governor. The story of Nehemiah's activities is in Neh. 1: 1-7: 72 and 9-13. But the strength of the Nehemiah tradition makes it almost as certain that Nehemiah existed as the strength of the Ezra tradition makes it likely that Ezra existed. We have to say 'almost' because of the Samaritan tradition of 'the wicked Ezra.' Granhild supposes a 'post-Chronist' editor who inserted the Nehemiah material and also inserted all the Aramaic. This editor evidently believed that it was Nehemiah who was ultimately successful since he put Neh. 13 last. But if he also inserted the Aramaic portions, then he was responsible for Ezra 7: 11-26, the passage which contains the account of the astonishing powers which were granted to Ezra. This does not make sense. It is much more likely that Nehemiah existed equally with Ezra, and that

---

[1]) *Ezrabogens Literaere Genesis*, 1949. See also Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, vol. 2, p. 210.

Nehemiah's activities were in the Chronicler's original story and followed Ezra 6.

Thus we take the position that Nehemiah came to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I (Longimanus) 445/4 B.C., that he returned later, and that Ezra arrived in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II (Mnemon) 398/7 B.C. This gives a period of nearly 100 years for the two strands of Isaiah 56-66 to find a place in the composite collection, with a possibility of the period extending up to 140 years.

The traditional view (Ezra 457 B.C. and Nehemiah 445/4 B.C.) held the field until the time of A. VAN HOONACKER in 1890. It was he who introduced the idea of Artaxerxes II into the discussion.[1]) He supposed that Ezra made a visit to Jerusalem during Nehemiah's second term as governor. This part of VAN HOONACKER's theory is now generally rejected, following L. W. BATTEN, *Ezra and Nehemiah* (ICC, 1913), but see JOHN BRIGHT (p. 255 below). Many scholars follow the rest of VAN HOONACKER's hypothesis and give the date of Ezra's arrival as 398/7 B.C. This means that Nehemiah and Ezra never met, and that there was a whole genration between the times of their activities in Jerusalem. French and British scholars generally have followed VAN HOONACKER with BATTEN's modification, though there has been in recent years a revival of the traditional date for Ezra among 'conservative evangelicals' such as W. M. E. SCOTT and J. STAFFORD WRIGHT. German scholars in general have rejected the idea of an early date (485/7) for Ezra, but equally are not enamoured of the late date (398/7). They have sought to find another date for Ezra's arrival, some time when Nehemiah was not in the city, say 432 B.C. or some such date. Such theories involve a change of text as well as a dislocation of the text.

One of the most important aspects of the problem resolves itself into answering the question: Was Ezra active in Jerusalem whilst Nehemiah was there in the city? The great difficulty of the traditional dating is that Ezra appears never to have heard of Nehemiah. If they both had the authority they are said to have had and if they were both working to the same end, then why in the world did they not collaborate? There were times when each one of them was in such dire difficul-

---

[1]) 'Néhémie et Esdras, une nouvelle hypothèse sur la chronologie de l'époque de la restauration', in *Le Muséon* (1890), pp. 151-184, 317-351, etc. See also his other writings listed by H. H. ROWLEY, 'The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah' in the *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume* (1948), Part I, pp. 117-148, which contains in the notes a comprehensive bibliography.

ty that he would surely have clutched even at a straw, let alone any one who had virtually complete authority. If they were indeed together in the city, then we have a case of departmental government *par excellence!*, a state of affairs where one department acts in complete ignorance of anything the other may do.

There are three places where the two men are mentioned together in the same context: Neh. 8: 9; 12: 26; 12: 36.

Let us first consider Neh. 8: 9. The parallel is the Greek Esdras A 9: 49, where the name 'Nehemiah' does not occur. The Greek tells that Attharates (which is an attempted transcription of the Hebrew התרשׁתא—the governor, a word which evidently Greek did not understand) spoke to Esdras, the Levites and all the people. Neh. 8: 9 identifies Nehemiah as the governor and says that he and Ezra and the Levites spoke to the people. Did Esdras A leave the name out? Or did the editor of Neh 8: 9 put it in? The answer is complicated by Esdras A 5: 40 which has 'Nehemias and Attharias,' whilst the corresponding Ezra 2: 63 has 'the Tirshatha.' But that cannot possibly be Nehemiah, because Ezra 2 belongs to the time of Zerubbabel. Esdras A has certainly wrongly inserted Nehemiah here. The governor of Ezra 2: 63 was Zerubbabel: cf. Hag. 1: 1. It would appear that in both Ezra-Nehemiah and in Esdras A there has been a tendency at work always to identify the governor as Nehemiah and equally to identify Nehemiah as the governor, and that this even brought the name 'Nehemiah' into Esdras A in one place where plainly it is wrong. The problem of Neh. 8: 9 must remain unresolved; there are too many editorial cross-currents.

Next consider Neh. 12: 36. This is the end of the list of those who took part in the procession at the dedication of the wall. One company went one way 'and after them went Hoshaiah and half the princes of Judah' (12: 31 f.), and the other company went the other way 'and I (Nehemiah) after them,' 12: 38. This looks like an adequate and complete arrangement, but the end of verse 36 says 'and Ezra the scribe was before them,' that is, at the head of the first company. This is not the way to treat such a great man as Ezra. He was either the most important member of the community or he was next in importance after the governor. At the very least his name ought to have come in with that of Hoshaiah in verse 32, but not at the tail of the whole list with the strange statement that 'he was before them'. This is too much of an addendum altogether. The mention of Ezra is an interpolation.

Lastly, Neh. 12: 26. This is as clear case of editorial interpolation as can be found. The Hebrew syntax just will not do. Some editor has added 'and of Ezra the scribe' because he thought the two men were contemporaries. Possibly this is the reason for anomalies elsewhere.

It has been pointed out [1]) that the powers which were granted to Ezra as detailed in Ezra 7: 17-27 are so wide and all-inclusive that they clash with the powers given to the governor Nehemiah. In any case Ezra did not use these powers. In our view it is precarious to rest any weight on the Memoirs either of Ezra or of Nehemiah. If Ezra 7: 17-27 is accurate and historical, then it is impossible for both Ezra and Nehemiah to have been in Jerusalem at the same time and both active; nor is it possible to imagine either of them being there and not being active. Neither was that sort of man. Whether Ezra ever had these powers may be doubted, but if he did have them and used them, then Nehemiah was not there at the time. But this is all beside the point, because we are of the opinion that MOWINCKEL was right when he said [2]) that these memoirs are actually memorials, written after the oriental (Persian) pattern to preserve the memory of great ones, especially in contrast to the wickedness of their enemies. The Memoirs of Ezra in particular are not an autobiography, but a memorial, a devotional legend (MOWINCKEL). The Ezra legend had already and early begun to grow. By the time of 2 Macc. 1: 18-36 the Nehemiah legend had developed also. Our judgment is that the arguments which have been put forward, both in favour and against Nehemiah and Ezra being contemporaries, tend to be indecisive. All fall short of definite proof. But the clearest thing that emerges is that it is unlikely that Nehemiah and Ezra were in Jerusalem together or had anything at all to do with each other.

If therefore Nehemiah and Ezra were not in Jerusalem at the same time, another date has to be found for the arrival of one or other of them. If Nehemiah 13 is to be regarded as the final act in the drama and Nehemiah as the founder of Judaism, then scholars like W. A. L. ELMSLIE[3]) may be right in making Nehemiah arrive during the reign of Artaxerxes II (ca. 380 B.C.), but this solution raises new complications because Eliashib was high-priest in Nehemiah's time. If Ezra is to

---

[1]) Most recently by H. H. ROWLEY in the *Ignace Goldziher Memorial*. p. 142

[2]) *Statholderen Nehemie*, 1916; *Ezra den Skriftlarde*, 1916. Also BENTZEN, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, I, 1948, p. 247; II, pp. 209 f.

[3]) *How Came Our Faith* (1949), p. 340.

be regarded as the founder of Judaism, then it is best, as most agree, to regard Nehemiah's arrival as a fixed point, 445/4 B.C. in the reign of Artaxerxes I. It will still be possible to regard Nehemiah 13 as the final act in the drama, if we can find a date for Ezra's arrival before (say) 426 B.C. The date of Nehemiah's return for his second term as governor must be at the very latest a little while before the death of Artaxerxes I, which was in 424 B.C. If this return was in 426 B.C., this gives us six years whilst Nehemiah was absent from Jerusalem, 432-426 B.C., and Ezra must be fitted in here. Thus KOSTERS proposed to read 'thirty-second' instead of 'seventh' in Ezra 7: 7 f. There is no justification for this change except that, if Ezra is to be fitted into this period, a change has to be made. This makes Ezra arrive in 432 B.C. as soon as Nehemiah is out of the way, but it also means that Ezra 9-10 is not nearly as final and complete a victory as the chapters themselves would lead us to believe. BERTHOLET, KENNETT, ALBRIGHT (in 1932), RUDOLPH and WEISER all hold that Ezra was active in Jerusalem between 433/2 and (say) 426 B.C. A variant of this solution has been proposed by BEWER, ALBRIGHT (in 1946) and BRIGHT, namely, to read 'thirty-seventh' instead of 'seventh'. This proposed emendation involves less disturbance in the text than the other, and if a solution has to be made involving an emendation, then this is the one to make. It makes Ezra arrive during Nehemiah's second term in 428 B.C., and 'allows us to resolve the perennial problem of the relationship of Ezra's reforms to Nehemiah's in a manner which is, I believe, both plausible and faithful to the evidence. . .Nehemiah tells his own side of it and claims the credit; the Chronicler, as one would expect, gives the credit to Ezra.' [1]

Our judgement is that the 397 B.C. date is the most likely date for the arrival of Ezra, though the case as put forward by JOHN BRIGHT (*op. cit.*, pp. 375-386) is powerful. The 397 B.C. date involves following the order of the Greek Esdras A. It involves taking Ezra 9-10 to be later than Nehemiah 13—BRIGHT makes them more or less contemporaneous by thinking of Nehemiah writing his own Memoirs and taking all the credit to himself. This view certainly is plausible, but the whole story, in our view, makes even more sense if Ezra's activity is regarded as following that of Nehemiah, and particularly if a few years passed between the two periods of activity. Nehemiah certainly ejected all those who had married foreign (i.e. Palestinian, non-exiles) wives and

---

[1] BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (1960), p. 386.

all foreigners, but evidently they were all there when Ezra arrived.
When Ezra had completed his first four days in Jerusalem, there came
to him certain princes who told him that there were Israelites, both
priests and Levites, who were allied in marriage with 'the people of
the land.' That is, certain of the temple personnel had intermarried
with families who had not been in exile in Babylonia. There were
indeed four members of the high-priestly family among these (Ezra
10:18), who voluntarily put away their wives (10: 19). The com-
plainants also alleged that certain princes and deputies were leaders
in this intermarriage policy, Ezra 9: 1-2. Ezra was distressed beyond
measure. He rent his garments, plucked out his hair, sat amazed
until the time of the evening offering, and then prayed in deep peni-
tence and anguish. Meanwhile Shecaniah son of Jehiel of the Elam
family took action. Whilst Shecaniah and his associates were taking
action, Ezra retired to fast and pray in the chamber of Jehohanan
son of Elisahib. It is difficult to recognise in Neh. 13 as alternative
account of all this, even allowing for Nehemiah's zeal in taking the
credit to himself.

This Jehohanan was actually the grandson of Eliashib. It is not
stated in Ezra 10 that Jehohanan was high-priest at the time, but he
certainly was high-priest ca. 401 B.C. We know this from Josephus
(*Ant. Iud.* XI, vii, 1), for it was at that time that Jehohanan the high-
priest murdered his brother Jesus (Jeshua) in the temple during a
quarrel about the high-priesthood. Thus, if Ezra arrived in Jerusalem
in 397 B.C., then Jehohanan was high-priest at the time and Ezra had
his full support. Here Ezra was more fortunate than Nehemiah had
been, since Nehemiah did not have the support of Eliashib over this
matter of mixed marriages (Neh. 13: 4). Josephus also says that
Bagohi had promised Jeshua the high-priesthood, and that Bagohi
was so incensed at the murder of his nominee that he forced his way
into the temple and inflicted a heavy fine on the Jews. This Bagohi
is apparently the governor of Samaria mentioned in the Sachau
(Elephantine) papyrus i, 13, 14. Josephus identified him with the
famous general of Artaxerxes III (Ochus), but this cannot possibly
be right, because Artaxerxes III reigned from 358-338 B.C. and it was
it was he who deported many Jews to Hyrcania and the country
round the Caspian Sea.

In *Studies in the Psalter*, p. 13 f., I sought to identify this murdered
brother of Jehohanan whose name was Jeshua. If Jeshua was a
brother of Jehohanan and had any semblance of a claim on the high-

priesthood, then he must have been a son of Joiada. Jeshua was a family name, since it was a Jeshua who was restored to the high-priesthood in the first days of the return, Zech. 3: 1-10. It is likely, therefore, that this Jeshua was the elder of the two brothers. This would account for him pressing his claim so strongly. It also means that he was not in Jerusalem when Jehohanan succeeded to the high-priesthood. Was he actually that son of Jehoiada who had married a daughter of Sanballat? Was he therefore the man whom Nehemiah drove out in 432 B.C. (Neh. 13: 28)? There is every likelihood that this identification is sound, and it is the situation thus involved, combined with MOWINCKEL's explanation of the two sets of memoirs (p. 254 above), which seems to us to turn the scale in favour of a 397 B.C. date for Ezra's return against the 428 B.C. date so powerfully argued by JOHN BRIGHT.

We know that there was extreme political rivalry when Ezra arrived in Jerusalem. Ezra had scarcely had time to turn round before a group of princes and deputies were seeking his support against their opponents. Jehohanan was against the mixed-marriage party. Of course he was against mixed marriages if his elder brother was involved in one. How could Jehohanan retain the high-priesthood if the mixed-marriage party got control? The anti-mixed marriage party, as we view the situation, were appealing for Ezra's help in driving out the last remnants of Jeshua's supporters. They appealed to Ezra on religious grounds but with political motives. Whether Ezra's motives for supporting them were in any way political, we cannot say. He certainly supported them from religious motives. He may have been a priestly diplomat of the medieval type. He may have been a deeply religious man who was 'used' by the politicians. Both situations have arisen more than once in human history. and doubtless they will arise again. Probably Ezra was 'used.' He did not use any special authoritative powers, and he retired into seclusion to pray whilst the politicians acted. But whichever way it was, Ezra and his supporters settled the matter once and for all. This is true on both the 397 B.C. theory and the 428 B.C. theory. Nehemiah brought the rivalry to a head because that was the only way he could get the city walls rebuilt and lay any sort of foundation for the future prosperity of the city. After his departure from Jerusalem at the end of his first term of office, one of Eliashib's grandsons married Sanballat's daughter, and Eliashib allowed his ally Tobiah to live in appartments within the temple precincts. Apparently this was the Tobiah who was Sanballat's

ally during Nehemiah's first governorship (Neh. 2: 10; 4: 7; etc.). Nehemiah threw them out bag and baggage when he returned in (?) 426 B.C. But some years later this Jeshua was back again seeking to obtain the high-priesthood, to which as an elder son of Joiada he believed he had some right. The letter from Elephantine ensures that Jehohanan was high-priest in 407 B.C. Jeshua was murdered somewhat later than this time, which most likely was not long after the death of his father Joiada.

Ezra succeeded where Nehemiah failed because he (Ezra) had the full support of the regnant high-priest. Nehemiah never had proper support from Eliashib. Eliashib was far too much involved with Nehemiah's opponents, and had far too many family ties with them. Certainly when Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem we find a grandson married to the daughter of his chief enemy, and that enemy's second-in-command installed by Eliashib in the very temple itself. Nehemiah was powerful enough to put a stop to this, but there is every likelihood that as soon as Nehemiah's strong hand was removed, the whole situation changed, and the mixed-marriage party gained more influence until at the death of the high-priest Joiada they were in a position to take active steps to replace Jehohanan with Jeshua. With the death of Jeshua there could be no doubt but that the anti-mixed marriage party was the winning side. This explains why it was that such a large number of deputies and princes were willing to submit to the demands of Ezra and his supporters (Ezra 10: 18-44) even though some of them had children by these 'foreign' wives.[1]) Only four held out against Ezra and Jehohanan. Their names were Jonathan, Jahzeiah, Meshullam and Shabbathai the Levite (Ezra 10: 15). 'Let their names be remembered for good'— to misquote and misapply Neh. 13: 31.

It ought not to occasion any surprise that members of the high-priestly family and especially the Jerusalem priests generally should be luke-warm for the reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra considering the basic exclusive emphasis involved. We must remember that one-third of the post-exilic priesthood was Aaronite claiming descent from Ithamar the younger son of Aaron, whilst two-thirds were Zadokite claiming descent from Eleazar the older surviving son of Aaron (1 Chron. 24: 3-4). In spite of the fact that the P-tradition refers to the priests as 'the sons of Aaron' (Lev. 1: 5, etc.), the 'covenant of everlasting priesthood' is with Phinehas son of Eleazar

---

[1]) Perhaps there is a reference to this in Mal. 2: 10-4: 13, especially 2: 13-14.

(Num. 25: 13), and it was Eleazar who was 'the priest' (Num. 26: 63; cf. 20: 22-29), and not Ithamar. Thus the high-priestly family was Zadokite and had been in exile in Babylon (Zech. 3, etc.), and with them were two-thirds of the priesthood. But there was one-third of the priesthood who were not Zadokites. Their pre-exilic ancestors had not been priests at Jerusalem, and none of their families had been exiles in Babylon. They were Palestinian Jews and naturally had married 'foreign' women. A compromise was reached and both groups were admitted as Aaronic priests, but the pure-race policy was not enforced until Jehohanan's murder of his brother. Ezra's prayers and Shecaniah and his associates all combined to clear the last survivors of the mixed-marriage party out of the city once and for all. The Palestinian Aaronites had to submit or go. The great majority submitted. It is a strange commentary on the exclusive nature of post-exilic Judaism with its separation from the heathen and its 'holy', separated priesthood that the very priests themselves were one-third 'foreign.'

At first Nehemiah received good support from Eliashib the high-priest. Eliashib the high-priest and his fellow priests took their full share in the building of the wall. They built the Sheep-gate, laid its beams קֵרוּהוּ, set up its doors and built part of the wall as far as the Tower of the Hundred and the Tower of Hananel and sanctified it, Neh. 3: 1. What trouble Nehemiah had at this stage was with Sanballat, Neh. 4. Nehemiah soon found himself involved in trouble of another sort, but again this was no trouble which involved any dispute between Nehemiah and Eliashib. This time it was economic trouble (Neh. 5), and the trouble was with Jewish nobles and deputies. The complainants were 'the people and their wives' who were many and could not get food. Some said they had to borrow money in order to pay taxes. Some said they were having to mortgage their fields and vineyards to get food. It had all involved slavery for their sons and daughters, and in the end the loss of their property. It is difficult to decide who were the people who were being maltreated, whether they were descendants of the returned exiles or whether they were 'the people of the land,' descendants of those who had not been deported to Babylon. But there are two verses which suggest that perhaps Nehemiah was seeking to help 'the people of the land.' In Neh. 5: 5 the unfortunates say: 'Our flesh is as the flesh of our brethren, our children as their children'—which seems a strange thing to say unless

somebody had been denying it, and who would deny it except Babylonian Jews? The other verse is Neh. 5: 17 where Nehemiah describes those who ate at his table: a hundred and fifty of the Jews and rulers, 'besides those that came to us from among the heathen that are about us'. This last group were distinct from 'the Jews.' The assumption is that they were from 'the people of the land,' descendants of the Palestinian Israelites who had never been deported.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that at first Nehemiah did not favour the Habdalah policy of strict separtaion to the extent that has generally been supposed. Certainly on his first visit he does not seem to have taken any steps to turn any Palestinians out of city and nation, provided they were loyal to him and willing to help in making Jerusalem secure. Indeed he was ready to welcome them if they came with good intent. He fed some of them at his own table. He regarded it as his business to get the wall rebuilt in order to ensure some sort of security. He knew that the city could never prosper until the walls were rebuilt. Sanballat's opposition was political. A walled Jerusalem was a menace, since it was very difficult to capture a fortified and well-defended Jerusalem. It took even the Romans under Titus five months in spite of dissensions among the defenders. The city seems to have held out for a long time under Hezekiah against the Assyrians. Nehemiah had enough enemies without making any more. His hatred was directed against Sanballat and his supporters.

But when Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem in (say) 426 B.C. he found that Eliashib was in alliance with Tobiah and had lodged him in the temple buildings, the very room where the perquisites of the priests and Levites were stored. Further, Eliashib's grandson had married Sanballat's daughter. He found that the levites who served in the temple had not been getting their proper supplies and had been driven out of the city. He restored that situation; he threw out Tobiah and his goods and chattels after him; he drove out Eliashib's grandson, and forbade all marriage with 'foreigners.' This was the full Habdalah policy with a vengeance, but it belongs to Nehemiah's second term as governor and not to his first term. Further, he was driven to it because he could not maintain his political independence against Sanballat if the high-priest's family were so closely allied with him. That marriage must have taken place whilst Nehemiah was away. It could scarcely have taken place during the time when the walls were being rebuilt when all the plots and counter-plots were taking place.

It could scarcely have taken place without Nehemiah's knowledge if he was in the city, and it could not have taken place with his consent. It is dangerous to be certain of these things. The ways of politicians are strange and sometimes tortuous, and when the princes of the church are also politicians still stranger things can take place. There is no need to assume that anything else took place in order to make Nehemiah take this action. To find one's chief enemy allied in marriage to the chief-priest and one's second enemy installed in comfortable quarters in the temple buildings—these two things are enough to account for the most violent action. But apparently, as soon as Nehemiah was out of the way, the mixed marriages again became allowable. When the final crisis came with the arrival of Ezra, there were four members of the high-priestly family involved in mixed marriages: Massaiah, Eliezer, Jarib and Gedaliah, and there were thirteen other priests involved, two from the house of Immer, five from the house of Harim, and six from the house of Pashur (Ezra 10: 20-22). These 'houses' were the 16th, the 3rd and the 5th course [1]) (1 Chr. 24: 7-18). All these four courses are in the lists of Ezra 2: 1 and 2: 36-39. The hard core of opposition consisted, then, of only seventeen priests plus the four men mentioned in Ezra 10: 15, out of a total number of 4289 priests (Ezra 2: 37-39). There was also a number of levites, singers and laity, Ezra 10: 23-44. The mixed-marriage party would naturally be small by this time, since Jeshua was dead. If the number had reached any serious dimensions, their suppression would not have been as easy as evidently it was.

As we have said, the two groups lived together more or less harmoniously for a hundred years, from a little after 538 B.C. when the initial compromise was reached to 426 B.C., and possibly, after a short time (if we accept the 397 B.C. date for Ezra's arrival), for another twenty years. This is how it came about that the different points of view could both be embodied in Isaiah 56-66. It was a hundred years of argument, but not open conflict until Nehemiah came back again for his second term.

This means that the nationalist elements in the Second Isaiah triumphed and became the official policy of Judaism. The contrary 'universalist' point of view never wholly died, though sometimes the 'stream ran thinly.' This is the stream which R. LEVY calls 'the

---

[1]) Pashur is another name for the 5th course, that of Malchiah: compare 1 Chr 24: 8-14 with 1 Chr. 9: 12 and Neh. 11: 12.

Deutero-Isaianic stream,' [1]) by which he means the universalist stream, since he holds with other scholars that the Second Isaiah was a universalist. He gives instances of this from the Talmud and the earlier Midrashim (pp. 53-77), and also in mediaeval and modern Jewish Literature. But the official position has always been and still is nationalist and exclusive. Even Christianity had its early struggles against this attitude. It was thanks to St. Paul that the universalism which Jesus of Nazareth realised was inherent in the work of the Servant of the Lord triumphed over the Judaising leaders of the early Church. The battle is always having to be refought.

[1]) *Deutero-Isaiah* (1925), p. 54.

# INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

(excluding Isa. 40-66)