

THE AUTHORSHIP
of
ISAIAH LVI - LXVI

JEROME MARK

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
CINCINNATI OHIO

Feb, 1918.

TO THE SACRED MEMORY OF HER
WHO FIRST TAUGHT ME TO SEARCH
THE SCRIPTURES

MY MOTHER

BESSIE F. MARK

תנצב"ה

ABBREVIATIONS

Books and Authors

Che.	=	Cheyne	-	Introduction to the Book of Isaiah
Du.	=	Duhm	-	Das Buch Jesaja
Jos. Antig.	=	Josephus-		Antiquities of the Jews
Litt.	=	Littmann-		Über die Abfassungszeit des Tritojesaja
Marti	=		-	Das Buch Jesaja
H. P. Smith				
O. T. Hist.	=		-	Old Testament History

Bible and Apocrypha - Books, Authors, and Names in Connection with it

Gen.	=	Genesis	Hos.	=	Hosea
Ex.	=	Exodus	Am.	=	Amos
Lev.	=	Leviticus	Obad.	=	Obadiah
Num.	=	Numbers	Mic.	=	Micah
Deut.	=	Deuteronomy	Hab.	=	Habakuk
Josh.	=	Joshua	Zeph.	=	Zephaniah
Jud.	=	Judges	Hag.	=	Haggai
Ki.	=	Kings	Zech.	=	Zechariah
Is.	=	Isaiah	Mal.	=	Malachi
II.IS.	=	Deutero-Is.	Ps.	=	Psalms (or Psalm)
III.Is.	=	Trito-Is.	Prov.	=	Proverbs
Jer.	=	Jeremiah	Lam.	=	Lamentations
Ezek.	=	Ezekiel	Dan.	=	Daniel
		Neh. = Nehemiah			Ecclus. = Ecclesiasticus
P	=	Priestly code	LXX	=	Septuagint

Words

c., cc. = chapter, chapters
 ca. = about
 cf. = compare

f., ff. = following page, fol. pages
 p., pp. = page, pages
 v., vv. = verse, verses

N.B. B. C. E. is not used because the whole work deals with the time prior to the Christian Era.
 Simplified spelling is used thruout the work.

CONTENTS

		page
Introductory		5
A Outline of Jewish History --- Cyrus to Neh.	538 - 430	5
B The Book of Isaiah		10
C Resume of the Work		11
I	56:1-8	Consolation to Proselytes and to Jewish Eunuchs
		13
II	56:9-57:21	A Against the Rulers B Against Idolatry C A Promise of Divine Help
		15
III	58	On Fasting
		21
IV	59:1-15a	Obstacles to Salvation
		25
V	59:15b-20 63:1-6	Yahweh's Vengeance
		29
VI	60	The Glory of the New Jerusalem
		34
VII	61, 62	The Coming Salvation of Zion
		38
VIII	63:7-64:11	A Prayer for the Renewal of God's Loving-kindness
		42
IX	65, 66	Punishment of the Apostates and Reward of the Faithful
		54

INTRODUCTORY

A

OUTLINE of JEWISH HISTORY --- CYRUS to NEHEMIAH
538 - 430

Chapters 56 - 66 of Isaiah, as we shall find later, were written in what is known as the Persian period of Jewish ^{history}, a time remarkable for its lack of historical data and sources. We must consequently be extremely careful in our treatment of the historical background of these chapters. However, after the thoro investigation that scholars have made in the general Oriental history of the sixth and fifth pre-Christian centuries, ~~and~~ and aided by the few references that we have from Jewish sources, we are enabled to reconstruct in outline an hypothetical Jewish history of the time that cannot be far from right. Naturally, details will be lacking, and the element of absolute certainty may forever be denied us; still we must rely upon this reconstruction if we are to make any headway in our studies. After all, we are not totally in the dark -- for the rest we must trust to our imagination, for "The imagination is the mother of all history as well as of all poetry".*

Owing to this lack of material some scholars modestly but truthfully despair of our ability to know anything of the events of the time -- they find it impossible to gather the few shreds and weave it into a history. Other scholars have gone to the extreme, writing an entire history full of detail for which they have not the least proof. They are positive in their statements, denying one thing and affirming the other according to their pleasure. Thus H. P. Smith, in his 'O T Hist', having hardly any proof whatsoever, flatly denies that Cyrus ever allowed the Jews to return to Jerusalem and to rebuild the temple, he denies that any Jews went back in 538, and questions the historicity of Ezra. Ezra must indeed feel flattered to find himself in the good company of Moses and Jesus -- but in view of documentary proof how can one deny his existence with more certainty than affirm it? Smith himself admits, it seems, that if Ezra did not carry out the work assigned to him, then some other man by the name of Ezra must have done it. The golden mean is always the better path to follow -- a third

* Mommsen, 'Römische Geschichte' V.5.

group of scholars, making use of the little material on hand, have reinterpreted the events chronicled in a conservative manner, and have thus given us, as far as possible, a consecutive history. These men are neither blindly credulous nor are they too sceptical, so that they are in a position to give us a fairly reliable picture of the Jews under the Persian rule. Chief among this third class of scholars is the eminent historian Eduard Meyer, whose presentation of the fortunes of the Jews during the fifth and fourth centuries I shall follow closely. I may add that a scholar like Littman has adopted bodily many of Meyer's hypotheses -- e. g., the view that it was Ezra who began to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. A brief chronology of the important events in the Jewish history of the Persian period is all that I shall attempt here.

In Oct. 539 Cyrus marched victoriously into Babylon. This conqueror was noted for his remarkable mildness towards, and even fondness for, the gods and religions of his subject nations. In Babylon he restored the Marduk cult to a greater splendor than it enjoyed during the prime of Chaldaea. It was not at all surprising, then, that in the summer of 538 he issued a decree allowing the Jews of Babylon to return to their native land, ordering the sacred vessels of the Jewish temple -- Babylonian trophies -- to be restored, and permitting the temple to be rebuilt. It is a matter of conjecture as to how many Jews returned -- evidently only a handful of the less prosperous ones -- for as late as the time of Neh. we find Jerusalem practically depopulated and the Jews in poor circumstances. (Neh. 11:12) It stands to reason, too, that the wealthier class was not prone to forsake its social position as well as its life of luxury and ease for the unknown fortunes of pioneer life. As governor of Judea, subject to the Syrian satrap, Šēšbāššar, son of King Jojakim, was appointed. Fragments of old friendly neighbors -- Kalebites, Jerahme'elites, and Rehabites, pressed further into Judea by outer enemies -- welcomed the returned Jews, and gladly joined them; whilst Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Philistia remained hostile. Those Jews who had not been exiled, finding themselves more akin to their Samaritan neighbors, were also out of harmony with the new arrivals. These older inhabitants made but little progress in their religious development, their primitive Yahweh worship being of the same type which the pre-Exilic prophets, and even Ezekiel, found so objectionable and so much akin to idolatry. The Jews in Babylon, on the other hand, succeeded in developing their religion to a higher conception of monotheism. They also clashed with the older inhabitants of the land because, in order to preserve their identity in a foreign land, they had to guard particularly to keep the seed of Abraham pure from mixture of any foreign blood. Their brethren in

Palestine, on the other hand, did not hesitate to intermarry freely, so that friction arose on that account.

A community, however was organized in Jerusalem, and a subscription made for rebuilding the temple. An altar was first reared, so that religious worship might be resumed - but as for the temple, even if some beginning was made to rear it, its building could make no headway at the time. The people were too few and too poor, all their energies were needed in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves in the land, and building their own homes (Hag. 1:4, 9). Other troubles came too: famine (Hag. 1:6, 10, 11; 2:16, 17), oppressive taxation both for the king and the governor, and suffering on account of Cambyses' campaigns (Zech. 8:10) -- all these gave the Jews no time to devote to the rebuilding of the temple. The miraculous return of all Israel, for which they had hoped, did not take place, their fond hopes and expectations gave way to disappointment, wretchedness and consternation.

522 - 519 were years of great upheaval, and altho Judah was too insignificant to take part in it, yet it expected to reap the benefits of this period of unrest; the Jews saw in the events of that time the world-catastrophe which the prophets foresaw as coming before the establishment of God's dominion on earth. The promised 70 years of their exile was about ended -- all that was needed was a temple with its proper service, then God would reveal Himself and redeem Israel.

In 520 ^FZerubabel, nephew and successor of ^AŠesbazzar, was hailed by the prophets as new king - the branch of the house of David. His first commission was naturally to build the temple (Zech. 6:9-15). Yet the expected miracles failed to come. Persia remained in its place even firmer than ever, with Darius Hystaspis (521-485) on its throne. In the spring of 519 SISINES (Tatnai, Ezra. c. 5), satrap of Syria and Babylonia, coming to Palestine on an inspection tour, regarded the activities of the Jews with suspicion. Darius, however, feared no uprising from the insignificant Palestinian population, so that he allowed them to proceed with their building of the temple, contrary to the expectations of the satrap. Zerubabel's royal aspirations were thus put an end to, and he must even have been deposed, for we hear no more of him. March 10, 515 the temple was completed, but expectations for the Messianic were dispelled.

The community, as far as it was organized at all, had a theocratic aspect. Having no national independence there were no Jewish rulers to usurp the priestly prerogatives. The high-priest was supreme in religious

affairs, and the only authority above him was that of the Persian rulers and satraps. Thus the religious and legalistic development of the Jews was carried on unhampered.

At this time there were three classes of inhabitants in Palestine:

- 1 The Samaritans, with their hybrid Yahweh religion, who were steeped in idolatry and superstition to the extent that they were absolutely obnoxious to the Jews. Yet, having no central shrine of their own, they most likely mingled with the Jews, often worshipping and sacrificing at the Jerusalem sanctuary.

- 2 The peasant inhabitants of Judah who were not exiled by Nebuchdrezzar. Their religion was not far different from that of the Samaritans, and they doubtlessly felt a closer bond of kinship towards them than towards the returned Golah, who appeared strange and foreign. Yet they ~~doubtlessly~~ joined in the community life and religious exercises of their brethren.

- 3 The returned captivity, who had reached to a higher stage of pure monotheism, and who formed the backbone of the religious community after the Exile. As their antagonism for the Samaritans grew, there developed in the second group a definite pro-Samaritan party which opposed all the reforms and institutions proposed by the Gola. Those who did not side with the Samaritans remained neutral or openly avowed the cause of the third class.

There is no doubt that the teachers and leaders of the community often preached to these half-Jews, inviting them to accept their pure monotheistic faith; for this would not only strengthen and solidify the nation and thus prove to its advantage, but it would also add to the glory of Yahweh.

The Samaritans, however, turned a deaf ear. When, on the other hand, the Samaritans wished to join and assist the Jews in their temple work and worship the Jews would accept them only upon conditions which seemed an absolute refusal to the former. So the Samaritans avenged themselves by petty annoyances and hostilities.

As time went on other troubles also increased for the Jews. The famine and the pressure of their enemies, both of which probably ceased for a short time after the temple was rebuilt, now returned even worse than before. Edom harassed them from the South, while their crops and cattle were periodically robbed by the bedouins from the desert. Help came again from Babylon.

In the summer of 458 Ezra was commissioned by Artaxexes I. (Longimanus) to go as governor to Jerusalem, and to institute there some needed reforms. As long as Ezra limited his activity to making some changes within the land the opposition from the Samaritans could not harm him. He soon

saw clearly, however, that if his attempts at rehabilitating the community and placing it on a solid religious basis were to meet with any success whatever, he must first separate the pure Jews from the aliens and heathens who both make deplorable incursions upon their territory as well as exert an unwholesome influence upon their religion. The first duty incumbent was to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem which were lying in ruins for a century and a quarter. So he set about this work altho he had received no permission from his king to do so. Here the Samaritans, who were watching his every move with suspicion, saw their opportunity to frustrate Ezra's designs. Rehum, the satrap of Samaria, reported the fact to Artaxerxes, who forbade Ezra to rebuild the walls. Ezra's power was thus broken, and we hear no more of him until he is brought back into prominence by Neh.

This disappointment caused great consternation among the Jews, so that time and again the authors of Is. 56-66 deal with the problem of why the walls are not rebuilt, and hold out the great promise that the very enemies who helped demolish them will have to ^{erect} ~~rebuild~~ them. The distressing news finally reached Neh., the royal cup-bearer, who obtained leave of absence from his sovereign, with direct permission to rear the walls of Jerusalem. He came in April, 445, and the work was completed in July of the same year. The Samaritans mocked and threatened to put a stop to Nehemiah's activity thru cunning and open attack, but the royal edict as well as the leader's keen and practical foresight saved the day for the Jews. Even the planned attack of the Samaritans miscarried; and before they knew it they were completely shut out from the Jewish community, to their dismay. With them went some influential and leading Jews who found themselves uncomfortably situated in Jerusalem. At the psychological moment a public meeting was held, the community purged of all aliens, a covenant made to serve God, and a new code accepted as the authentic law of Moses. Neh. now disappears from the scene for a time, seemingly leaving Ezra in charge, but he soon returns to prosecute his plans with an indomitable will. His chief enemies were the Samaritans, whom he succeeded in rooting out entirely in time. It may be added that Eliashib was high-priest then, and it was his grandson, Jesus and Jophan, about whom we read in Josephus, 'Antiq.' XI. 1, 1, to be discussed later. Nehemiah's work was concluded successfully, and the Jewish theocracy which he formed lasted for many years.

Thus driven out from all participation in the Jewish temple at Jerusalem, the Samaritans had to think of building a shrine of their own, and Mount Gerizim was the logical place for it. It is hard to say how long they cherished the plan in their bosoms; but Neh. precipitated its completion. Jos. 'Antiq.' XI, 8, 2-4 has it that the Gerizim-sanctuary was built at the

time of Alexander the Great, the same time when Manasseh was expelled from the community; but Jos. is often unreliable, and we know that his Manasseh story is placed a hundred years too late. It seems far more historical, then, to place the event as synchronous with Nehemiah. In Neh. 13:28 we read that the grandson of Eliashib the high-priest, possibly the same Manasseh mentioned by Jos., married the daughter of Nehemiah's inveterate enemy - Sanballat - for which reason Neh. forthwith banished him from Jerusalem. It is not at all unlikely that, pushed to the fore by his powerful father-in-law, this fugitive became the religious leader and priest of the Samaritans; so that it was Manasseh who helped them carry out their plan to rear a sanctuary on Mount Gerizim.

History now throws a veil of mystery over the subsequent fortunes of the Jews down to the Greek period. Here and there the veil is lifted but for a single moment, and thru the medium of some psalmist or prophet we are enabled to see the sad state in which the Jews found themselves, but on the whole a consecutive reconstruction of the events is impossible. We do find a few scattered facts from the time of Artaxerxes III. (Ochus, 358 - 339), but it is more advantageous to treat that in connection with the liturgical composition - Is. 63:7 - 64:11.

B

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

It is not the province of this paper to divide the book of Is. into its sources, nor even to prove that all of it was ^{not} written by Is. ben Amoz in the latter half of the 8th century. Originally cc. 40 - 66 were separated from the first 39 cc. and called II. Is. It was soon realized even by the earlier scholars that these last 26 cc. were far from being a literary unit, so that the II. Isaianic prophecies were limited to cc. 40-55. 56 - 66 reflect an entirely different historical background as well as a different spirit from the 15 preceding cc. These last eleven cc. were popularly named Trito-Is. by Du., a name by which they are now known. III. Is., however, has also been broken up into various compositions and ascribed to different authors by modern scholars. It is the task of this paper to ascertain, as far as possible, the conditions under which these cc. were written and their authorship. The exact time and circumstances of these prophecies will be discussed in connection with each composition. Suffice it to say here that the style, the language, the ideas, the spirit, as well as the historical background all prove that these cc. were written at least after the rebuilding of the second temple.

C

RESUME of the WORK

Taking the discussions in the ensuing pp. for granted, we find that there are nine independent compositions in the eleven cc., written between the years 458 and 347. It is extremely difficult to pick out individual authors - they were all profoundly influenced by the style and ideas of II.Is., and by the theology of Ezekiel; so that, presenting little originality and still less personality, it is hard to distinguish and to discriminate. But the very fact that a period of over a century elapsed between the first and the last compositions precludes unity of authorship. Let us tabulate the dates to see how these will help us:

I	56:1-8	a detached prophecy, time of Ezra, ca. 458	
II	59:15b - 20; 63:1 - 6		" 457
	56:9 - 57:21		
III	58, 59	close to	450
IV	60 - 62		" 445
V	65, 66	" "	430
VI	63:7 - 64:11, the last one, written		" 347

Excluding the last date we have a period of about 30 years, and it is probable for one man's literary activity to have extended that far. The language and historical situation can help us but little in determining the authorship, as was pointed out; and in spirit, too, many of them are uniform. From the internal evidence, carefully weighed in each case, I came to conclusions in many instances similar to those of Che., and contrary to most other critics, Litt. included. Indeed it is possible for no one to point out the author; but we can say with certainty that several schools and types of that are represented in the book. We can at once place 56:1 - 8, with its legalism and insistence on the Sabbath, in the same category with 58:13, 14. This author does not seem to reappear. Litt. suggests that we fail to recognize the same author in subsequent passages because of the discrepancy in time and conditions. This is untenable, because six other cc. were written within thirteen years of the time 56:1-8 was written, and that is not long enough for the author and his 'Weltanschauung' to change so completely. Cc. 58, 59 stand by themselves. Here we miss the vindictiveness and lack of spirituality characterizing the other cc. ~~I have translated as 58 in order to show the kinship with the great prophets of Israel.~~ If indeed any of the authors of Is. 56-66 should be called Trito-Is., it is only the author of 58, 59 that I would honor by joining to the two immortal Isaias. None of

the other prophecies in the book we are dealing with attain to the spiritual heights of these two cc. Thus, we already have three distinct authors : 56:1-8; 58, 59; 63:7-64:11. The remaining cc. all belong to the same school, tho hardly to the same author. In thot, style, and even in language (a more reliable criterion heres than elsewhere) 56:9-57:21 is closely allied with 65, 66. They both attack the Samaritans with equal vigor, and as to their phraseology of. especially 57:15b with 66:2b. CC. 60-62 surely belong to the same group, tho we have no evidence that they were written by the same hand. To this class we may also add 59:15b-20; 63:1-6. Arranging these prophecies in tabulated form we have:

I	56:1-8	458
II	56:9-57:21; 65, 66	457 - 430
	And of the same group:	
	59:15b-20; 63:1-6	
	60-62	
III	58; 59:1-15a	450
IV	63:7-64:11	347

I

56:1-8 -- CONSOLATION to PROSELYTES and to JEWISH EUNUCHS

Short as this prophecy is, it reflects enough of the conditions of the time to warrant its separation from II.Is. the prophet is evidently speaking after the first return of the Golah in accordance with Cyrus' edict of 538 (v.8). The temple is rebuilt and the sacrifices restored (v. 7). The age of exclusiveness and legalism has already set in. The broad ethical connotation which the second Is. attached to the words *אֲנִי מֵעַתָּה* gives way to a narrower technical meaning, as can be seen from its expiation in v.2 *אֲנִי מֵעַתָּה*.

The author is not yet the extremely exclusive legalist that Ezra and Neh. are *. The eunuch may serve in the temple; the stranger is welcomed in language similar to that of Solomon's dedicatory prayer (I Ki. 3: 41-43). The community is established (v.3 *וְהָיָה*), and the sanctuary built, so that the question of the status of the stranger and the eunuch is the most important problem of the day. But the hearty welcome that both these classes receive assures us that the composition must have been written either earlier than 458⁵ or after 445. In 458 Ezra came to Jerusalem, and it can hardly be imagined that the prophet who seems so much in accord with the rest of Ezra's and Nehemiah's work ° should oppose them just in this. The latter date is given because after Nehemiah's activity, his and Ezra's influence may have been forgotten. However, this is hardly likely. That this composition was written later than 445 is out of the question, Ch. to the contrary. V.1 clearly shows that the prophet is looking forward to the arrival of the Ezra caravan. Furthermore, after the promulgation of the P code eunuchs and proselytes would never have been invited so cordially to participate in the temple service by a man as legalistic as our author proves himself to be. V.8 again seems to be awaiting a definite return - not something vague. This return can mean no other than that of Ezra and his company which the Jews must have been expecting when vv.1-8 were written. Only thus

*Cf., e. g., Ezra 9:1-4; Neh. 13:1-3.

°Cf. especially the lang. of vv. 4,6 with that used in P with especial reference to the 'covenant of the Lord' and *בְּרִית יְהוָה*. This is not mere similarity of phraseology - it bespeaks a like theology.

can we appreciate the importance which the *oracles/alla* prophet attaches to the oracle of this v., an importance that seems so exaggerated to Che.

Che. errs in placing this prophecy after Neh. by his hypothesis that Neh. himself may have been one of the eunuchs objected to by the people * and welcomed by this author (p.311). This strange hypothesis is based on the fact that Neh. served wine to the king in the presence of the queen (Neh. 2:6), but nowhere in the Bible is there the least hint that Neh was a *כרית*. This English scholar forgets that Neh. was most active in the promulgation of the P/code, that it was only he who made its acceptance possible - but the P code definitely excludes eunuchs from the community. Both Neh. and P also take a rigorous stand against the stranger welcomed by our author. 65:1,2, a product of the *time* of Neh., seems to know of the welcome extended to strangers by this author (doubtlessly by others, too, of whom we have no direct evidence), and states clearly that at one time proselytes were invited.

An Exilic date is out of the question for this prophecy - of the post-Exilic time, the one shortly before Ezra seems to fit best in accordance with the spirit, ideas expressed, and historical background. The expectation of imminent relief - the keynote of the prophecy, with which it both begins and ends - seems certain to point to the fact that the author was expecting the coming of Ezra and wished to prepare the way for him. It is doubtful whether the author was a coworker of Ezra, the evidences seem to point to the fact that he was an independent prophet, whose activities were confined to Jerusalem, and who expected a great change for the better with the coming of Ezra.

* Cf. Ps. 127.

II - - - 56:9 - 57:21

- A 56:9-57:2 - Against the Unworthy Rulers of the Community
- B 57:3-13a - Against the Idolatry of the Samaritans and
their Friends within the Community
- C 57:13b-21 - A Promise of Divine Help to the Oppressed
and Crushed Party of the Pious

56:9-57:21, in no wise connected with the preceding, offers many difficulties. "This obscure passage", says Che. (p. 315), "which opens with a denunciation of the rulers of the Jewish community for their incapacity, slothfulness and greed, closes with a message of delicately expressed consolation and encouragement to the Jewish people, to the far off and to the near'. Midway comes an invective, in still more vehement terms than the introduction, against a community distinct (as it would seem) from that of Jerusalem, and addicted to the most various forms of heathenism.--- The first question to ask is whether this passage is a whole, or whether two writers have been concerned in producing it." After separating 57:13b-21 from the preceding as the product of a different author and a later time, Che. continues: "The next question is, whether the period of the first and longer part . . . is before, during, or after the Exile". But Che. is wrong in separating this prophecy. His strongest argument is based on linguistic evidence -- he finds the first part to be closely linked with Jer. and Ezek., while the latter relies greatly on II. Is. Which means that both parts rely on prophets who, we are all agreed, lived before the time that the earliest piece in the collection of compositions in Is. 56-66 was written. The prophecy before us, whether a unit or not, is conspicuous by its lack of originality. Why then should we suppose, if other evidences point to the contrary, that the author would draw only upon a single source for his model? Surely all three prophets, Jer., Ezek., and II. Is. were extant at the time; how else could the two authors of Cheny's hypothesis get to them? Is it not more logical to suppose that an author who feels no compunction at borrowing would select as his model material most suitable for his purpose? Where could he find better inspiration for attacking Israelitish idolatry (Isay Israelitish, for II. Is. assails the idolatry of the other nations in contrast with Israel's monotheism) than in Jer. and Ezek.? What prophet, on the other hand, could serve as a better model for comforting and consoling the oppressed than the author of the Servant of Yahweh songs

whose first words are "Comfort ye, comfort ye My people"? Would not the very fact that the author of the first portion draws from two sources -- Jer. and Ezek, as Che. himself admits -- prove that the same author is just as likely to use a third prophet when it suits his purpose? Later in his argument (p. 320) Che. agrees that the first portion does have affinities with II. Is.

Nor is the fact that the third portion deals with a new subject sufficient to separate the composition, for is not the first part entirely independent of the second? Yet the two are sufficiently alike to bespeak a single author. In fact the second part is more closely linked with the third than with the first. 57:4 already intimates the pious to whom the author would later address a message of consolation. True 13:b is a sudden transition, but this makes the contrast that the author wishes to emphasize all the stronger. It is a literary device universally used in literature, and Oriental writers are especially fond of it. Cf. Amos suddenly turning from Moab, Israel's inveterate enemy, to Israel itself (Am. 2:1-6); or note the sudden transition of Hos. from his own private life to the national life of Israel (3:3,4). Furthermore, the third part often reverts back to the wicked mentioned in the second. In objection to this Che. says that "בְּיָמָיו .. is the ordinary expression (see p. 320) for the lawless party among the Jews". Quite so, but must we wait until the Maccabean period to find such a party? Decidedly not! There is not the least doubt that the Samaritans had strong adherents among the powerful Jews in Jerusalem. A cursory perusal of Ezra and Neh. is sufficient to convince any one of this fact -- while Che. himself refers to it when convenient for any of his hypotheses.

Cheyne's main argument for separating the two pieces and placing the last one later than 430, boils down to the fact that the phrase "the far off and the near" (57:19) occurs again in Dan. 9:7, and to נָרָא & נָרָא * being "two late Hebrew words of Talmudic affinities". As to the former -- the author of Dan. may just as well have borrowed from this prophet. After all it is not such a wonderfully new combination of words that it could not have been hit upon by anyone but the ingenious apocalypticist. נָרָא, says Che. is found only in Am. 8:8, and there it is an interpolation --- granted, but what proof have we that it is a Talmudic insertion? Che. seems to forget that the little Bible does not exhaust the rich vocabulary of the Hebrew language. His reference to Sota 34a (p. 322 note)

*It is granted that his emendations in v. 20 seem plausible: נָרָא to נָרָא and נָרָא to נָרָא ...

does not seem at all conclusive.

סלסר שהיו סים ננרשין וקולין
(the water rose more and more) is written in neo-Hebrew, which draws on the Bible for a greater part of its vocabulary. It is dangerous, moreover, to base a theory on what the text might have read. ננרש might have been originally ננרש, as Hoffmann suggests, but there is no proof of it whatever. We may just as well emend the text to ננרש with de Lag. Du. thinks it safer to be conservative in this passage and retain ננרש..

Nor does Ceyne give more conclusive evidence that the word ננרש could not have been extant shortly after the Exile, while he himself admits some affinities between the two pieces. "Peace (v. 19) repeated reminds us of the repetitions in vv. 6, 14."

The conclusion is quite natural: 56:9-57:21 is a single composition.* The prophet first turns his gaze to the unworthy priests, prophets and rulers (who probably fraternized with the Samaritans to a considerable extent); then the godless idolators are attacked. These may be within the Jewish community itself, but it is more likely that the Samaritans and their Jewish sympathizers are meant. The community addressed (note the feminine from V. 6 onwards) seems to be distinct from that whose leaders are spoken of in 56:10-12, and the words "brood of an adulteress and harlot" gain in force when explained of the mixed origin as well as the impure religion of the Samaritans. Moreover, with Haggai and Zech. 1-8 before us, it is scarcely credible that, even in imitation of Ezek. 16:3,45 (written before Zedekiah's captivity), such strong expressions could have been used of the post-Exilic Jewish community. *

*Of course I am not dealing with the text of this piece, nor of III. Is. in general, in regard to which Du. aptly says it is "Ziemlich schlecht erhalten". Were I interested in the textual side of this prophecy I should naturally omit v. 5 in c. 57, and make other necessary ^{changes}. Consequently when I say it is a unit allowance must be made for emendations and omissions suggested by textual criticism.

o. 57:3b Read ננרש וננרש

* For further discussion on this point see section IX, in connection with cc. 65, 66.

Finally the author addresses a word of comfort and hope to the pious members of the Jewish community, a message of which they were in sore need.

Having settled the unity of 56: 9 - 57:21, let us now try to place its date and authorship. Older critics have attempted to prove it a pre-Exilic product (Ewald, Bleek, Graetz, Kuenen, Dillmann, Cornill, Ryssel, Wilboer, and Che. in his earlier writings; Che. p. 315, note 3). Luzzatto, who ascribes all the rest of the book to Is., regards 57:1,2 as a dirge upon Is., who, according to legend, was sawn asunder by order of Manasseh. Luzzatto was followed in his view by Ewald and others who ascribed the whole work to Manasseh's time. Others fixed an Exilic date to this prophecy. Both are impossible. The author's attack on idolatry is not conclusive in itself to ascribe it to either of these periods. In the first place it was pointed out above that the attack is directed against the Samaritans, "i.e. the descendants of the North Israelitish remnant of the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Arabian colonists, who worshiped Yahweh as the 'God of the land'", but who, until the erection of the Gerizim temple and the adoption of the Jewish law-book, cannot altogether have given up the heathenish practices of their ancestors". And even if it be addressed to the heathen superstitions of the Jews, we know that the Jews of the Persian, and still more those of the Greek period were addicted to idolatrous superstitions. Cf. Ps. 16:4; 81:6b-17; Micah 5:9-14, and many other passages. Note also the prohibition of heathenish customs retained in the Levitical legislation (Lev. 17-26). Moreover, the persecution of the righteous and the pious (56:9-57:2), which misled the earlier critics, need not bother us either. "A more thoro study of the Ps, however, has convinced me that (even allowing for some exaggeration in the psalmists' expressions) there were times when poor and pious Jews were exposed to something like persecutⁱon, even after the Return, and that their oppressors were not merely foreigners, but also rich and lawless Jews; it has also become very doubtful whether the whole of Micah 7 is not post-Exilic, and tho the sins rebuked in 56:11, 12 are old ones among the priests and prophets^o, yet the rebuke of the priests in Mal. (2:1-8) and the story of Shemaiah in Neh. (6:11,12) show us that the later priests and prophets were not exempt from the traditional errors of their class. Zeph. 3:1-4 may also supply evidence of this fact, for the section to which it belongs is most probably post-Exilic. Note also the sad description of the rulers (who may be included under 'watchmen' in 56:10) in Neh. 5:1-5" *

* II Ki. 17:24-28; Ezra 4:9-10; cf. II Ki. 23:15; Jer. 41:4.

^o See, e.g., 28:7; Micah 3:5-11; and cf. Ezek 13:19

Thus it is not at all imperative to ascribe this composition to an Exilic or earlier date. If then our literary evidence will point to post-Exilic period, as I shall show it does, we need not hesitate to accept the conclusions. Here are some important parallelisms: 56:9' זמן closely resembles Jer. 12:9b (cf. Ezek. 34:5,8; 39:17), while 56:11-57:1 reminds us of Zeph. 3:1-7; Mic 7:1-6 (both late passages?), and Ps. 10:1-11 (doubtless from the same period', Ewald); 12:2; 14:1. The description in 57:5 etc. recalls similar passages in Jer. 2 and Ezek. 16, 23.

57:6, the contrast between the 'portions' of the two classes of persons, and the reference to 'libations' suggest Ps. 16:4,5.

There are also four points of contact with II.Is.:

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|---|
| 1 | 56:11 with 53:6 | 2 | 57:1 with 53:8 |
| 3 | 57:12 " 41:29 | 4 | 57:13 (the wind shall carry them all away') with 41:16,29.* |
- I might also mention a number of words and phrases, but I should merely have to quote bodily from Che. Note also the "far off and the near", as well as זמן, זמן discussed above. It cannot be gainsaid that they are late words and expressions, tho we may disagree with Che's conclusions.

These evidences prove at least an Exilic date for the prophecy under consideration. In the light of this, our further testimony will be sufficient to place it in a time later than the Exile. In his message to cheer his oppressed brethren the author has nothing to say about the return from Babylon, evidently because it is an accomplished fact -- but like other post-Exilic writers he looks forward to a still future return from all the countries of the dispersion; so that the promised land, within its widest limits, may be occupied by none but Israelites. The ideas of II.Is. are modified by this prophet to suit a different time. To him the genuine Israelite is only he who is crushed in body and mind by trouble. He has no hopes for a 'Servant of Yahweh' --- only God Himself can revive the failing spirit of Israel. Again, "The reason which he gives (57:16) for his expectation of the divine mercy is not that which we find in II.Is., viz. that Yahweh has called or chosen Israel and cannot be untrue to His word, but that, being the Creator, He cannot and will not punish weak men too severely." We may indeed find the germ

* Che. 318-322. It is remarkable that Che. quotes all these four passages from the first part, which, he says was not influenced by II.Is., while he quotes none from the last part, which, to his mind, was copied from the great prophet of the Exile.

° Cf. Ps. 78:39; 90:5-12; 103:9,13-16.

of 57:16 in 42:5,--

Who giveth breath to the folk upon it, and spirit to those who walk thereon,

but the second Is. follows up these fine expressions with the assurance that Israel has received special privileges from Yahweh. The new writer, for the present at least, appeals not to God's loving kindness (חַסֵּד) but to His compassion (רַחֲמִים). (Che. 323)

Let us now summarize all the evidences in an effort to fix the date and authorship of the piece more definitely. We find clearly the following conditions prevailing in Jerusalem at the time of this composition:

- 1 Babylon is no longer an obstacle in the way of their national revivification.
- 2 The Jews are already settled in Palestine, and Jerusalem is repopulated.
- 3 The community is suffering from many troubles. Internal weakness and poor leadership are making it an easy prey to the 'beasts of the forest'. This is aggravated by the poor being crushed by their rich brethren.
- 4 Above all, the danger from the Samaritans is most imminent. Strong as are the sections dealing with the leaders and comforting the pious, the tone and feeling in the section against the Samaritans is far more vigorous. The prophet's arraignment of the 'brood of an adulteress and harlot' is merciless. Hence the feeling against the Samaritans must have been most bitter at the time.

The three conditions first mentioned seem to indicate the time of Ezra and Neh. -- with the strength of the fourth evidence there is no doubt left that this prophecy was written immediately upon the interference on the part of the Samaritans with the rebuilding of the walls by Ezra. Consequently 56:9-57:21 must have been written about the year 457.

III

58 - - - ON FASTING

Chapter 58 offers difficulties similar to those of the foregoing prophecy. First the question arises whether cc. 58, 59 constitute a single composition, or whether they should be separated. Surely they both deal with the same problem: Why does not God's salvation come more speedily? The answers in both are also of a similar nature: Oppression, lack of mercy, justice, truth and faith. In spirit and that these two cc. are doubtlessly akin - they present unmistakable proof that they come not only from the same period, but even from the hand of the same author - yet it is better to separate them for our purpose of examination. Each of the two cc. is complete in itself, each grapples with the problem in its own way, develops it and finds the solution without the help of the other. Moreover 58 limits its discussion to the efficacy of fasting in bringing about the promised salvation, while 59 is more general. Furthermore 58 advises mercy and acts of love, while 59 is based on strict justice.* We shall therefore treat them separately as companion pieces.

We must next ask ourselves whether c. 58 is a unit. Box, in introducing the prophecy, says: "The Fast. A Later Appendix on the Sabbath". Vv. 13, 14, with their legalism are certainly foreign to the subject matter of the preceding as well as to the spirit of the prophet who foretells God's salvation to the Israelites provided they deal out their bread to the hungry and hide not from their own flesh. A new subject, too, is introduced abruptly - the question discussed is no longer the fast day, but the Sabbath. There is little bond of sympathy or union between 58:1-12 and 56:1-8, while 58:13, 14 remind us a great deal of the last mentioned prophecy. Cf. particularly these two vv. with 56:2, 4, 6 -- these are the only two passages in Is. 40-66 in which reference is made to the Sabbath. Che. further bases his proof of the late date of vv. 13, 14 on the hypostatization of the Sabbath, which is called the קדוש היום. This goes even beyond Neh. (9:14), who calls it שבת קדש or Ex. 16:23 (P), where the Sabbath is referred to as שבת קדש. This is a dangerous conclusion, however, tho it may be true. Scholars are not at all certain that the text is correct as it stands - just because of this strange phenomenon emendations have been suggested: * These ideas are mutually complementary rather than exclusive, but they do bespeak a different point of view at the time of writing.

לחורש יהיה חסד & לקדוש ישראל סכנר. Che. continues: "The forced character of the expressions and the reminiscences in v. 14, of Job 22:26 and Deut. 32:13 (both post-Exilic) makes it difficult to defend an earlier date than the age of Neh". (P.324) But this gives us no aid in solving the question of the unity of the c.; it helps us merely to place the two vv., and, if they should not be separated from the preceding, it helps us find the date of c. 58. Let us consider, however, the fact that the promises for the glorious future given in v. 14 are so vague and indefinite. Precisely what do these phrases mean - 'and I will make thee to ride upon the high-places of the land, and I will feed thee the inheritance of Jacob, thy father'? Cf. this with the rest of the c. V.3 states that the community expects recognition on the part of God for its piety. V.8 promises in broad general terms - but no less definite - the salvation that will come if the conditions outlined are observed.* Vv. 9, 11, and especially 12 give the definite results of the outlined piety, viz. the nearness and ready answer of God when they seek Him, the flourishing of the community under peaceful conditions, the ruins replaced by prosperous habitations and the walls rebuilt -- definite and tangible. Finally v. 12 is a fit conclusion to the theme, while 13, 14 at best read like an appendix - which they doubtlessly are. Just when these two last vv. were written is hard to say, tho Che. is undoubtedly correct in placing ^{them} in the age of Neb. at the earliest.

Now we are ready to take up 58:1-12. After announcing his mission - that of denouncing the sins of his people in tones of unsparing criticism - the prophet takes up their false notion of piety. The Jews ^{are} ~~represented as~~ think that the highest worship acceptable to God is fasting. This can never go unanswered. And indeed we know that the Jews of that time regarded fasting as the most efficacious method of attracting divine grace.^o But here is where the prophet parts company with his contemporaries, becoming a member of that small immortal band of the great literary prophets. Having in mind the deep insight into true ethical religion

- - - - -

* Attention has already been called to the fact that the conditions stipulated here are in direct conflict with those of v. 13 - the one looks to love and mercy, the other to legalistic Sabbath observance.

^o Cf. Zech. 7:2; 8:19; Num. 29:7 (P); Joel 1:14; Jonah 3:5-7.

higher level of prophecy than does Mal., yet the situation in Judah at the time c. 58 was written is remarkably similar to that prevailing when Malachi prophesied. -- most likely, according to Driver, between Nehemiah's return to Persia and his second visit to Jerusalem, 445 - 432. It was a time of depression and discontent. The expectations which earlier prophets had aroused had not been fulfilled, the restoration from Babylon had brought with it none of the ~~individual~~ ideal glories promised by II. Is. : bad harvests increased the disappointment: hence many among the people began to doubt the Divine justice" (Driver 357). Despairingly do they exclaim 'Wherefore do we fast and Thou seest not?

Wherefore do we afflict our souls and Thou takest no heed'?

We can ascertain the date of c. 58 even more closely. The great promise that the prophet holds out to his coreligionists is the rebuilding of the walls. In fact the community is to receive a new name - no less a title than 'The Repairer of the Breach'. This certainly indicates a time before Nehemiah's first arrival, but after Ezra's work was interrupted by the Samaritans. Hence we can safely put the date of this c. as between the years of 457 - 450, closer to the later date.

Still guided by Duhm's dictum that the text of Is. 56-66 has come down to us considerably corrupt, we must first examine c. 59 closely to separate it into its different elements before we can hope to find its author and date. All critics agree that vv. 5-8 constitute a late interpolation (Du., Litt., Box, Che., Marti). These vv. both interrupt and obscure the context. Vv. 3,4 charge the Jews with committing acts of gross injustice both in private and public life -- v. 9 continues that consequently God still permits His people to languish under the foreign yoke. Reiterating the sins in the confession (vv. 13,14), the prophet enumerates the same faults as in 3,4 (except 'apostasy and denial of Yahweh', - but this "in reality is only a general and more directly religious expression for the moral aberrations of the people). Now, considering the fondness of the post-Exilic Jews for proverbial composition, and the LXX insertions in P^{xxv}, is it not very probable that vv. 5-8 were inserted by an early editor? May they not be a quotation from some favorite book of moral teaching; or, as Du. suggests (cf Ps. 14 in LXX), from some late Ps.? It is noteworthy that v. 7a has been inserted in the Massoretic text of Prov. 1 (tho not found in LXX) where it stands as v. 16 to the great detriment of the connection and the interruption of the metre.* Furthermore, the prophet is addressing the community -- but vv. 5-8 are undoubtedly delivered against a few sinners of the blackest dye. Again, the rest of the c. speaks of the community's sins in the second person, using even the first person in the confession, whilst 5-8 are written against some outsider, in the third person. Vv. 5-8 must have been inserted by a late editor.

It may also be added that v. 10 offers difficulties, and v. 18 is at least corrupt; but in neither case does it interfere with our understanding of the context. V. 18 should probably read:
 כַּעַל נִסְלֹחַת נִסְלֹחַת יִשְׂרָאֵל לְצָרֵינוּ נִסְלֹחַת (בְּלִימָה?) לְאִיבֵינוּ.
 But that is not at all certain, other emendations may be just as correct. V. 20 likewise offers difficulties, the text having been variously emended,

- - - - -
 * Che. 329.

yet we know what the author means to convey, and that is enough for our purpose. V. 21 is more important - is 21 original? If so then the section to which it belongs must be post-Exilic, and even after the adoption of the P code, for it is this new covenant to which it refers. 'And as for Me, this is my covenant with them' alludes to Gen. 17:4 (cf. Gen. 9:9). "It contains virtually a declaration that the kahal, the true Zion, which has now come into existence (Neh. 9:10 is the Servant of Yahweh spoken of by II. Is." (Che 336). רוח ה' = רוח of Neh. 9:20, which God gave to instruct His people. 'My words which I have put in thy mouth' are the words of the Law in which Josh¹ and all pious men² must meditate and which make for the permanency of the church-nation. It is noteworthy that this v. is written in prose and the transition ^{to} from its context is abrupt; so that if we can show its context to be of earlier date, the lateness of 21 need not bother us. We shall simply regard it as a later insertion by the editor.

Examining vv. 1-4, 9-20 we find that we are again not dealing with a unity. 15b breaks the continuity of the c. Should we merely omit this half-v. and regard the rest as a single prophecy as some critics suggest? This would in nowise help us. 16-20 deals with the vengeance of God, closely allied with 63:1-6, an entirely different subject from the preceding. The half-v. may be emended in accordance with Gunkel or Box³ but even as it stands we can well see its relation to the following. The fact is that both 1-15a and 15b-29 are fragments and they may have been put together on that account - especially because of the sins catalogued in 12-15a. This gave them an outward appearance of unity, tho the inward logic is poor, for God would not punish the nations because Israel is sinful. In joining the two fragments the editor must have been misled by Ezek. 22:30; Jer. 5:1 (cf. also Gen. 18:23-32).

In considering the first part, viz. 1-4, 9-15a, we find it to agree with c. 58 in spirit, tho and style. True, 59 is stronger, more vehement

* Josh. 1:8

² Ps. 1

x Gunkel's version: וירא האלה בעיניו וידע ב' אין

Box would read it: " וירא בעיניו ב' אין " " "

The first is suggested because of the difficulty in metre, the second for a better understanding of the v.

in its denunciation, yet the hand of the same author is easily recognized. The same problem is expounded, the same answer found. Is Yahweh impotent? Or is He growing weak so that He no longer can answer the cries of His suppliants? No. Yahweh is still as powerful. It is the sins of the community that separate the people from God. A catalog of sins is given, and the dire consequences recounted. Still the author does not despair; he frames a confession which will again bring his nation, himself included, into divine favor. Here the prophecy breaks off abruptly.

The circumstances are identical with those of c. 58, conditions prevalent in post-Exilic times. Murder was as common an occurrence after the Exile as before, and when committed by the rich and mighty, was easily condoned in court. For proof of this cf. Is. 4:4, post-Exilic according to Che., Marti and Du. Here the author declares that only a special divine energy can wash out the bloodstains of Jerusalem. In Ps. 51:16 (post-Exilic) personified Israel prays to be delivered from bloodguiltiness -- cf. Ps. 59:3; 139:19; Mic. 7:2,3 (post-Exilic). In the last reference we find that judicial proceedings have become utter distortions of justice. Cf. further Ps. 55:12b ("obviously late", Che.) ולא ימים סתומה זר וסתר with Is. 59:14 כי נעלה ברחב אסח. "The moral scenery of Is. 59 recalls that of Ps. 52-59, which cannot be adequately explained by any pre-Ex. or Exilic circumstances". (Che 332) Ewald compared the confession in 59:12 with Ps. 51:5. But it lacks some important elements which the psalmist has, elements also which even II.Is. would not have omitted. The confession in 59:12 makes no appeal to God's covenant love, makes no vow of self-devotion to God's service. True in 59 we have but a fragment; comparing it however with 63:16 and 64:8, passages very similar to 59:12, we find the same omission. At best 59 is an appeal to the Father and Redeemer of Israel, but note well that even in these later passages there is no mention of the covenant of which II.Is. made so much capital. The distressing circumstances under which c. 59 was written were undoubtedly trying. So great was the trouble that it seemed to the Jews that God had hidden His face from them. Mal. 3:14; Job 9:22 must well express the people's despair: 'It is vain to serve God, He destroyeth alike the perfect and the wicked'. This led them perilously near to atheism -- of which the prophet exhorts his coreligionists to repent.

The style and phraseology is ^{as} heavy and post-Exilic. 2a must have been written in the same literary period as Gen 1:6 (P). כרך
itself, in Hiphil, occurs only four times in pre-Exilic writings, - more

than

20 times in later literature (Che. 261). הוֹלִיר אֶן in v. 4
is surely post-Exilic, especially in its promiscuous use. (Che. 269,333)

"The only possible date for 59:1-15a is a post-Exilic one".

It is so closely allied with 58 that we dare not separate the two pieces too far. Possibly the community suffered more than when 58 was written. It may be that their neighboring enemies, foremost among whom were the Samsaritans, gave them greater trouble; consequently the prophet is more vehement in denouncing the sins and in formulating a confession with which to approach God. We know that when Ezra came the hopes of the community ran high. But the building of the walls was interdicted and there was disappointment on every side. They could well exclaim: 'We hoped for light, but lo, darkness! (9) We hoped for justice, but there is none; for salvation - but it is far from us.' (11)

We thus have the same author as c. 58, but 59 was written slightly later -- close to 450.

59:15b-20 -- 63:1-6

Yahweh's Vengeance

The fragment 59^{15b}-20 can best be understood in connection with its companion piece 63:1-6 (also a fragment). I do not mean to merge the two pieces as one composition, yet they are so similar that they can best be treated together; regarding 63 as the beginning and 59 as the ending of the same thot. Their unity can best be seen by comparing 59:16 with 63:5, tho^{a/s} the thots and language of the two pieces doubtlessly prove that they belong together.

It is useless to repeat the circumstances under which both fragments were written. Suffice it to say that cc 58-62 serve as its background. The poor oppressed community looked on every side for help, but met only with darkness and despair. Even the prophets had little comfort to offer. They looked to the encouraging words of II. Is., but these sounded empty now. There was not another Cyrus on the horizon, a man to regarded as the anointed, called by God to fulfill His purpose in history and to bring salvation unto decimated Israel. Conditions were unendurable! A change had to come!

Yahweh saw that there was no man,

He was astonished that there was none to interpose! (59:16)

Of the peoples there was no man with Me! (63:3)

I looked - there was none to help!

I was astonished - there was none to uphold! (63:5)

But Yahweh needs no human help! He can well accomplish His ends himself. So in c. 59 He is represented as girding Himself with righteousness as with a coat of mail, putting a helmet of victory upon His head, arraying Himself in garments of vengeance, being clad in zeal as in a cloak. In 63 we behold Him coming back in the majestic awfulness of the conqueror. Yahweh tells of treading the wine trough alone, being sustained by His fury. Altho He comes from Edom, His wrath was not limited to that inveterate enemy. All the adversaries of the righteous community - and thus God's own adversaries - met with their just deserts. Then Yahweh comes unto Zion as a Redeemer, to turn away rebellion from Jacob.

Examining these pieces more closely we find that some Jews are already in Zion (59:20), but find themselves in dire distress. The vengeance and recompense of God are

coming fast. Against whom is this crusade directed? Du., regarding 59:15b-20 as one piece with 59:1-15a, is constrained to say that אִיבִיּוּ ... צָרָו (v.18) mean the apostate Jews. True enough, if c. 15 is a unit, then Du. is justified in saying: "Denn der Vf.^u kann doch nicht sagen: Jahveh kann nicht helfen, denn wir sind sündig, darum - hilft er". But there is no doubt that 59 comprises two compositions, written by two different men, the first part fitting admirably with c. 58, the last part with 63:1-6. The last named fragment is certainly directed against the hostile nations. Du. explains that the intercessor and helper sought in 63 is a man similar to Cyrus, but in 59 the עֲרֹם is a man from the community who should reform the Jews and check their sins. But Duhm's Trito⁶¹ Is. is a man who takes his task seriously, he is the same man who wrote 42, the same man who wrote the opening words of c. 62 -- why then would not the author regard himself as the 'man and intercessor', after denouncing the sins of the community the way he did in 58, 59:1-15a? Both fragments are doubtlessly directed against the alien enemies of the Jews, and not against the Jews themselves (though we may imagine God punishing or otherwise correcting the backsliding Israelites as well -- especially if we accept the emendation to v. 20, and read אֲנִי הָיָה לְעַמִּי מִלְּפָנֶיךָ). V.19 settles the question without a doubt -- God is ready to punish the nations that beset the Jews from every side.

Exactly who then is this man and intercessor of 59 and the 'helper and upholder' repeated in 63:5? The authors of Is. 56-66 are profoundly influenced by II.Is. They merely reinterpret, in accordance with the spirit and the needs of their times, cc. 40-55.*

II.Is. had Cyrus to rely on. He was the tool in the hands of Yahweh. Fortunately the conqueror lived up to the prophet's anticipations, and Yahweh's plans were carried out. Conditions have changed since 536. The new Jerusalem was nothing like that outlined by II.Is. In 458 Artaxerxes Longimanus sent Ezra to Jerusalem, but his activities were soon interfered with by Rehum, who complained to the king (see p. 9). The Jews were hopeful - they expected Artaxerxes, like Cyrus before him, to stand on their side and help in the plan of God to reestablish Judah on a firmer basis, on a more solid foundation. Unfortunately the Persian emperor disappointed them. Artaxerxes was to be the intercessor -- but Yahweh's power is great, He need not rely on man. Israel's courage must not wane - God Himself will come to the rescue, and with the

- - - - -

Needless to say that in many respects they fail to appreciate II.Is.

prophet's eye our author sees Him coming, glorious in victory.
This would put the date of the two fragments shortly after 458.

63:1-6 is in the form of a dramatic dialog between an imaginary bystander - perhaps in Jerusalem - watching the victorious warrior (Yahweh) coming from the field of battle, on the one hand, and the hero himself, on the other. In trying to understand these vv. we are first confronted by the difficulty of interpreting *סבצר* .. *אָדום*. Du. needlessly changes the words to *אָדום* .. *סבצר* thus translating v. 1 'Who is this coming, all red, redder in his garments than a vintage?' But why this change? The text as it stands is good idiomatic Hebrew, whilst the proposed text is unsatisfactory. *אָדום* suggests the idea of red - *אָדום*, *בציר* suggests *בציר* - vintage. "There are indeed no more wine-vats of Bosra, but her fields are fruitful vineyards". We should expect *אָדום* to be followed by *בציר* and not *סבצר*, for *בציר* means merely picking grapes (cf. Jud9:27). The anticipative mention of *בציר* spoils the effect of vv. 2,3, the intentional pun is lost. DU. bases this latter change on *עַק* *Bosra* in the LXX, but why should not *Bosra* mean Bosra, as it does in 34:6 (see LXX ad loc.)? As to the question why Edom and Bosra should be singled out when all the enemies are to be avenged, we may simply answer that we often meet with Edom in post-Exilic writings symbolizing the heathen enemies of Israel. Cf. Is. 34, all of Obad., Lam., Ps. 21:22. From Ps. 137 it is evident that Edom rendered military service to Babylon at the time of the first destruction of the temple. We find similar references to Edom in Ps. 83°, written in the time of Artaxerxes Ochus. We thus find Edom the traditional enemy of Judea from 586 to 358. Cf. further Ps. 60 (paralleled in 108); Jer. 49:7-11 (post-Exilic). We can thus understand why God comes from Edom when He wishes to avenge Himself of His enemies; and we have sufficient reason to retain the text. Che. would further connect with 63:1-6 Psalms 24:7-10 (post-Exilic). "Indeed the two passages might almost be combined, Ps. 24:7-10 being taken as a poetic description of a later point in Yahweh's return to Zion on the day of the great slaughter (p. 349).

Let us not be misled by what was said about Artaxerxes Ochus

* *.....* Doughty, Arabia, I, 38. Quoted Che. 348.

° We shall have more to say about this Ps. in connection with cc. 63, 64.

into giving so late a date for the two fragments under consideration. Most of the writings of Is. 36-66 belong to a much earlier date, and this fits well with its companion pieces in its language as well as in the ideas and thoughts expressed. Take, e. g., the very first words of 63 - ^אנִי יְהוָה cf. it with 60:8 - ^אנִי יְהוָה, (and with ^אנִי יְהוָה in Ps. 24:8).

We found Edom to be the arch-enemy of the Jews, and explained on that ground the fact that God was returning from avenging Himself on this hated nation. Yet the reference to Edom may lead us even closer in ascertaining the dates of the two fragments under consideration. Litt. (as well as Che.) well points out that in the fifth century especially, the Jews had considerable trouble from Edom. From 63:1 it would seem that at the time of writing ^{Edom} either had just suffered great defeat, or it was just at the time most troublesome to the Jews. The great trouble lies in the fact that we are utterly in the dark about conditions in the Persian period of Jewish history! If we only had some satisfactory sources we could ascertain this better! But we have proved this composition to be a product of the time of Artaxerxes I in explaining the references to 'man, intercessor, helper, upholder' (p. 30); consequently it may shed some light, scant tho it be, upon the situation of the Jews in regard to Edom. The writer of 63:1 had more in mind than the mere conventionality of regarding Edom as the typical enemy - there must have been more trouble. From the vision of Obadiah* and from Mal. 1:3 we find that Edom ^{was} suffering defeat at the time we are speaking of. Pushed from their homes by the Nabataeans, the Edomites overran the Negeb in Judea. Our author's indignation at Edom and his song of triumph over it would seem to fit both events -- the 'searching out of Esau,' and their overrunning Judea. It is not at all unlikely that our author joins his prophecy of justice over the nations to this event. We know that the prophets, and even the apocalyptists in their wild dreams, based their expectations upon some tangible historical happening -- they did not look for something to fall out of the clear sky. Thus, II. Is., e.g., wove his entire hope of the glorious future of Israel upon the rise of Cyrus on the political horizon. Similarly this author points to the

* Cf. Wellhausen's view that Obad. was inspired by the expulsion of the Edomites from their homeland early in the fifth century by the Nabataean Arabs (Driver p. 321).

discomfiture of Edom to show that speedy destruction is coming upon all the enemies of the Jews -- to the Samaritans, to the threatening heathen nations - and even to Artaxerxes who failed to rise to the occasion and allow the ruined walls of the holy city to be rebuilt. That Persia is included as foremost among the enemies, the nations upon whom Yahweh would wreak vengeance, must be read between the lines --- the author in Jerusalem dared not declare it openly. Yet we cannot fail recognizing this intimation.

Scholars are agreed that the Nabataean conquest ended in the first half of the fifth century, and we cannot be far from right in placing these two fragments at the same time. Che. puts it as late as 432, but this is unnecessary and impossible. As we have seen, the helper that disappointed the prophet was Artaxerxes I., who would not have *been* attacked thus after he sent Neh. with the mission of reestablishing Jerusalem. As for the conditions of the time, we find there are some Jews in Palestine. Not only is help looked for from the enemy, but also religious reforms (v. 20). The ideas expressed in the two pieces are post-Exilic, the description of the judgment tallies best with other compositions of the fifth century. We find that there is no nation or leader on the side of Yahweh (63:3), there is none to defend Israel, the foes are all the ~~same~~. Yahweh will inevitably come out the victor, then it will not be "the awful glory of the destruction of the foes, but the bright radiance of the new Jerusalem which will attract the gaze of the nations (i. e. those outside the circle of the hostile peoples, cf. 66:19)", as is also borne out by 60:3; Ps. 102:15, 16 (Che. 334). V. 20 shows some connection between moral conduct and redemption - this is dwelt on more in detail in 58, 59 as well as in Zech. 8:16-19.

We thus have three facts to consider:

- 1 It must have been written at the time when Edom was troubled and in turn troubled Israel ca. 475
 - 2 It must have been written about the same time with most of the other cc. of the book of III. Is. " 450
 - 3 Doubtlessly references are made to Artaxerxes stopping Ezra's erecting the walls of Jerusalem " 457
- Consequently we place 457 as the approximate date of 59:15b-20
63:1-6

VI

60

- - - - -

THE GLORY of the NEW JERUSALEM

Arise, shine, for thy light is come,
And the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee!

This is the watchword of c. 60, and its companion piece, cc 61,

62. The author is speaking with the authority of a prophet and seer -- Zion is the one addressed, the one *ציון* who is to be the recipient of all this splendor and glory. Tho it can hardly measure up to the poetry of II.Is., yet it is the most poetical piece that we have studied so far; the poet retains to a greater extent his lyrical strain thruout the c., whilst the other compositions soon fall into prosaic verse even if they do begin with a line or two of genuine poetry. C. 60 is composed of ten stanzas of four double lines each.*

The thot expressed is that altho it is true that now the Jews are in the dark, while the gentiles are enjoying light, yet a great light - the

*There are four corrections if we wish to maintain this. The critics all agree that *וְהָיָה וְלִבְנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל* in v. 6 is a gloss. It is not necessary, it is repeated in v. 9, and with few other interpolations mars the symmetry of the lines. V. 12, intruding with its practical prosaic materialism is surely a later interpolation. It is unrhythmical, and doubtlessly based on Zech. 14:16-19. In v. 14 *הַשְׁתַּחֲוִי עַל כַּפּוֹת רִנְלִיר כֹּל סַעֲעִיר* is also the note of a glossator. It not only destroys the metre, but overburdens the thought. Lastly, in v. 17, we must omit

וְהָיָה הָעֵצִים נִשְׁמָה וְהָיָה הָאֲבֹנִים בְּרוֹז

After mentioning in v. 13 the fine woods that will be brot to beautify the temple it would be ridiculous for the author to say that the wood will be substituted by copper. In the first stanza gold and silver are so beautifully ornamental that we can excuse the author for substituting them in poetical fashion for the useful copper and iron. But why the later substitution? In view of these arguments we are justified in throwing this clause out as a gloss if we find it marring the metre.

brilliant glory of God - will soon arise for the pious nation while the heathens will be plunged into utter darkness. As a consequence the nations will be forced to come unto Jerusalem to be enlightened, bringing along the faithful but scattered sons and daughters of Zion, and carrying abundant gifts for the house of Yahweh., to adorn and to glorify the temple and to offer as sacrifices upon the holy altar. It must be noted that the temple is already standing, the gifts are to adorn it (13b). The sacrifices, too, tho instituted, are not yet satisfactory; only the flocks of Kedar and the rams of Nebaioth (v.7) are sufficient to be worthy as a sacrifice to the great Yahweh. The author fails to realize that material sacrifice, no matter how stupendous, is insufficient as a tribute to God. The walls are not yet erected - v. 10, 'Strangers shall build thy walls'.

Examining closer into the prophecy we find the author doubtlessly writing or speaking in Jerusalem. V. 15 represents a bad state of affairs - Zion is forsaken of inhabitants (see also v. 4) and hated by the rest of the world. The foreign yoke rests heavy upon the Jews (v. 14). On the whole, the community is in a sorry state. A ray of hope is coming from somewhere, however. "The exuberance of the writer's anticipations shows on the one hand that the existing distress is deep, and on the other that a gleam of hope has visited the minds of pious patriots". (Che. 338) There is not sufficient evidence to suppose with Che. that the author believed Yahweh's presence was still unfelt, that He had not yet returned to His temple.* On the contrary, the temple, tho as yet poor and unadorned, is already God's holy place, His footstool (v. 13). In 62:11 *הנה יאמר בך* does not mean that God is about to come, but rather that the Jewish salvation is at hand. True, Zion is not yet the glorious place that the prophet predicts it will be; but altho he gives no reason, it seems more likely to refer to 59:2 as the reason rather than to accept Cheyne's explanation. The author clearly refrains from mentioning such a reason because it would sound a discordant note in the message of hope and joy that he brings. The auditor is to draw his own conclusions.

I have already hinted at the author's lack of a deep moral in-

* Che. 338. The author bases this view on Zech. 2:10; Mal. 3:1, but I fail to see any approach to this that in Is. 60.

sight - if only the sacrifice be sufficiently rich and abundant it will be acceptable upon Yahweh's altar.(v.7) This is also borne out further by his silence as to the yearning of the heathen nations for moral instruction.*¹ Still a moral regeneration must also take place in Judea: violence shall no more be heard in thy land, rapine and ruin within thy borders (18). Thy people shall all be righteous' (21). Zion is of the utmost importance, and the author represents God as lavishing His most ardent love upon it. In fact it is to be called 'The city of Yahweh, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel.' (v. 14)

Che. further expatiates on the style and phraseology to prove that the c. is of post-Exilic date -- but to introduce these proofs here would be unsatisfactory copy-work, so that I must content myself with his conclusions, conclusions which I can obtain more satisfactorily from a study of the historical background and the animus of the author.

"The late summer", says Che., in concluding his remarks on c. 60, "which produced the masterpiece of the Second Is. is over; imitators and copyists have taken the place of that soaring religious genius". Cc. 61,62 will doubtlessly throw more light on the exact authorship of 60, yet we can venture, from internal evidence, to place it independently. To sum up the evidences, we find the same conditions here that characterized our earlier prophecies - viz.:

- 1 Some people are in Palestine, but they are in darkness and despair.
- 2 The temple is already erected, but is in a poor state and the sacrifices are unsatisfactory.
- 3 The walls are still lying in ruins.
- 4 The prophecy was written in Jerusalem.
- 5 The author is endowed with an unfaltering faith in the power of Yahweh, and hope for His redemption.
- 6 The yoke of oppression is still heavy, but Babylon is no longer mentioned as the cruel mistress.

This would suggest a date prior to 445, and later than 515.

Who are these בני נכר who are to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem? On pp. 8-10 the theory is discussed that at first the Samaritans were invited to join the Jewish community. In 56:3 the בְּנוֹתֵינוּ is welcomed with open arms. The בני נכר could hardly mean the surrounding heathens. These would accept the Yahweh religion only if Yahweh showed Himself potent and mighty thru the victorious prosperity of His people (as is suggested often enough thruout all post-Exilic literature). Moreover, these heathen were all hostile to the Jews (cf. 63:1-6) +

witness the catalog of enemies in Ps. 83 (Persian period).

The Samaritans, however, turned a deaf ear to the welcome extended them--even becoming their enemies. When Ezra attempted to rear the walls of Jerusalem they demolished it, and Neh. was hampered in his work chiefly by the Samaritans --&Tobiah, the Ammonite slave, and Geshem (more correctly Gashmu) the Arabian (Neh. 2:19). When a prophet arose at that time to bring the cheering message to his people, is it to be wondered at, then, that this prophet should threaten the enemies, that he should promise that the very 'strangers' would rebuild the walls, and that the country of Gashmu and his followers - Kedar and Nebaioth - should supply the victims for Yahweh's sacrifices?

While we have nothing decisive to bear out our theory, yet there is not the least proof against it. Let us bear in mind that the references we have are but casual -- Gashmu is only mentioned in connection with Neh., but the chances are that he did not stand alone among his tribesmen to oppose the Jewish community, nor did he begin just at the time of Neh. This would consequently put c. 60 at about the time of Nehemiah's activity, close to 445. We shall find that the next two cc., closely linked with the one we are discussing, can also be assigned to the same date on evidences found there only. This naturally strengthens the theory advanced.

- - - -

* (From P. 36)

In contrast of this cf. C. 42. The remotest reference to it may be found in 9a, but there the text is corrupt. In accordance with 8 and the parallelisms in 9, 9a should read יָמֵי (ships, or seafarers) כִּי לִי צִיָּים

VII

61, 62 - - - - - The Coming Salvation to Zion

After discussing c. 60 in detail, 61, 62 offer little that is new or difficult. The spirit of the prophecy, the conditions under which it was written, even its form and phraseology -- all point to the same time and even the same authorship as that of 60.

The prophet starts out with stating his mission:

To bring good tidings unto the humble;
 To bind up the broken-hearted,
 To proclaim liberty to the captives,
 To liberate the bound,
 To proclaim the year of Yahweh's pleasure (on the one hand),
 The day of vengeance of our God (on the other hand).

Then the prophet comforts the mourners of Zion, painting in glowing terms its new glory when Yahweh will crown Zion with its due victory and renown. Zion's enemies shall be punished - these very enemies who lorded over the pious community, - will now become servants of the Jews; while the Jews, living on the fat of the land, will be the priests of Yahweh, God's ministers. Thus will Zion be fitly vindicated! Altho the prophet does not rise to the moral heights of his great model, II. Is., yet it must be noted, contrary to the censure of our pious Christian critics, that even this prophet has not lost his inherent Jewish sense of ethics. The Jews will be exalted over the nations not because this¹³ the whim of the powerful Yahweh - but "Because I, Yahweh, love justice, I hate iniquitous plundering (read *אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה לְעֵדָה*); and I will give them their recompense faithfully". In order to hasten the coming of God's salvation watchmen are set upon Zion's walls - the Lord's remembrancers, who must take no rest and give God no rest till He establish and till He make Jerusalem a praise in the earth. Whereupon Yahweh takes an oath that the invader shall no longer eat the fruit of Israel's toil (62:9). The inhabitants are to prepare for the return of the Diaspora. Henceforth the Jews shall become known as the holy people, Zion shall be called the City Unforsaken. The whole prophecy most likely ends with a shout of joy - Zion's response to the promises of the author.* 'I will rejoice heartily in the Lord',

* 61:10 is surely out of place in its context; it is a fragment of liturgical poetry that interrupts the sequence of that of 61:9 and 11.

she says, 'my soul shall be joyful in my God; for He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath arrayed me (יָעֲמִידֵנִי) in the robe of victory. Like a bridegroom who orders the coronal (יָכִיִּן), and like a bride who decks herself with her jewels'.

The same conditions as outlined on p. 36 with reference to c. 60, prevail here. "The land of Judah is in part repeopled, and the temple rebuilt (62:9, in the courts of My sanctuary), but the Jews are still despised of all men (61:11; 62:7; Zech 1:12), and among these we are justified in including the walls of Jerusalem (62:6; cf. 60:10, 11)." Nomadic tribes ravage the country with impunity (62:8, 9). The mass of the Jews are still in bondage, scattered among the nations (61:1; cf. 42:7, 22; 49:9; Joel 4:8; Deut. 28:68). Liberty has once more to be proclaimed, and the 'way of the people' again and more effectually to be prepared (41:1; 42:10). "The return of the exiles, in a full and worthy sense, has still to take place" (Che. 342).

In style and phraseology the author relies slavishly upon II. Is.; some places, in fact, being little more than a mosaic of fragments gathered from 40-55. Note especially 62:11, where the author leaves us without an object for הִצִּילֵנִי ('redemption' was doubtlessly in his mind; see 48:20). Further, what is the subject of הַמִּלְחָמָה... אֲנִי? Cf. the opening words of c. 61 - 'The spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me' - with 42:1 - 'I have put My spirit upon him'; cf. the rest of v. 1 with 42:7. The solemn phrase יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָמָה recalls the soliloquy of the Servant in 50:4-9.* Cf. 61:3, with 42:3. These are but a few of a whole catalog of comparisons showing how entirely the author relies upon II. Is. especially, and upon the writings of others, including even the authors of 56-66.

Aside from other late references, such as the rebuilt temple, etc., we should be able to place this prophecy immediately as not belonging to II. Is. if only from the fact that, depending, as this ^{piece} does, literally upon II. Is., it nowhere mentions the mission of the Jews to disseminate the knowledge of Yahweh to the peoples of the earth. It merely contents itself with enslaving these heathen enemies, and making them receive payment, in the fashion of poetic justice, in the very coin which they have dealt out to the Jews.

It seems quite logical to regard it as standing at the end of c. 62.

* Che. 343. It must be noted, however, that the Lxx reads simply *Τρεῖς καὶ ὀκτώ* there: *cf. 60:15 (skje)*. *Ancient ruins still need to be restored (61:4; cf. Zech. etc.)*

In treating c. 60 I referred to Arabic tribes who robbed the Jews of their crops -- in 62:8,9 we have the reference more clearly. The walls of Jerusalem, too, play again an important role (61:4, and particularly 62:6). This would lead us once more to a date about the time of Neh. We must bear in mind that the most distressing news told Neh. was that the walls were demolished (Neh. 1:3; 2:3,8). This agitated the Jews most, for it was due to this condition that the Jews were subject to the insults of the surrounding enemies, as well as to the unwelcome mingling of these troublesome neighbors with the life of the community --- their intermarriage with the unworthy leaders and rulers of the Jews, and their general baneful influence.

Some reforms of Ezra must also have been attempted when 60-62 were written. A more effective separation from the Samaritans seems to be implied - the prophet addresses only the purified 'kahal' and mentions the wicked and Samaritans only en passant (unlike 56:9-57:21, e. g.). This purification and segregation of the Yahweh worshipers, they believed, removed all obstacles in the way of the fulfillment of II. Isaiah's promises. The Zion to which the prophecy of salvation and glory is addressed is the company of those who 'feared Yahweh' and 'spoke often one to another' (Mal. 3:16) -- it is 'all those who had separated themselves from the מִן הָעָם unto the law of God' (Neh. 10:28). This community constituted the 'trembling listeners to Yahweh's word' (66:2; cf. Ezra 9:4; 10:3).

The fact that this pious community is called the 'holy nation', and the 'priests of Yahweh' points to the beginnings of those religious reforms which culminated in the Priestly code. The Jews are the priest-people, only to sacrifice and to eat of the fat of the land. No other service is exacted of them, no other responsibility placed on their shoulders. Only the rigorous cult is in the mind of the prophet. The question might have been asked by the Jews (according to Littmann), if we devote so much time to all this cult, when will we attend to our practical needs? The answer came in 61:5: 'Strangers shall arise and feed your flocks, aliens shall be your ploughmen and windressers'. This suggestion may be gratuitous, still we cannot help feeling that changes and reforms were in the air at the time 60-62 were written --- an upheaval that answers historically only to the time of Neh. and the P code reforms. It was a time when the fulfillment of II. Isaiah's promises were felt coming, and the prophet even imitates the Servant of Yahweh oracles (tho he grossly misrepresents them). To hasten the time watchmen are set on the ruined walls of Jerusalem who are charged to keep God mindful of His

promises. Whether these remembrancers of the Lord be human prophets or an angelic host or even pious worshippers is of no consequence in helping us to place the date and authorship of these cc. One hypothesis is as much a conjecture as the other, for we lack further information on the subject and the author himself is silent on the matter. There is one thing certain from all this, however -- a religious and economic change is expected to come every minute. This tallies well with the activity of Neh. who was sent by the king himself. There is no evidence to lead us to suppose that Ezra had already promulgated his new law --- but not only was the law in preparation, even the minds of the people were being prepared to receive it favorably. This author must surely have come from the same circle with Ezra, the Scribe of the Law of Moses.

This independent proof leads us to place 61,62 at the same time with 60, and to ascribe the same author to the three cc. We can hardly err, therefore, in dating 60-62 about 445.

A PRAYER for the RENEWAL of GOD'S LOVING-KINDNESS as of OLD

The troubles of the Jewish community in Jerusalem at the time this liturgical thanksgiving was written had literally become unendurable. The water had reached to the neck, and only Yahweh could rescue His drowning faithful servants. A petition full of heartrending details of suffering, ruin and desolation, accompanied by a confession of guilt is sent up to God -- He is reminded of His great and fearful power, surely He can save if He so desires.

Yahweh's loving acts will I praise, Yahweh's deeds of renown,
In proportion to all that Yahweh, so rich in goodness, hath wrot for us,
That He hath wrot for us according to His compassion and His
manifold loving-kindness.

He said, surely they are My people, sons that will never prove false;
So He became to them a deliverer from all their distress.*

Not an angel-messenger^o, his presence it was that delivered them,*
And took them up and carried them all the days of old.

But they resisted and pained His holy spirit,
So He changed for them into an enemy, He Himself fought against them.
Then Israel remembered the days of old, the years of past ages, saying: +
Where is He that brot up from the sea the shepherd of His flock?
Where is He that placed within it His holy spirit?

He that made His glorious arm to proceed at the right hand of Moses? (63:7-11)
The retrospect of the glorious deliverance under Moses, and God's kindness,
is thus continued until v. 14. Then the poet contrasts the distress and
calamity prevailing at the present.

Look down from heaven and see, (v.15) he importunes God; for he has
none else to whom to turn --

- - - - -

* The first two words of v. 9 belongs with v. 8

^o לא ציר ומלאך לא ציר מלאך

* Budde, Du., Che. et al. find the elegaic rhythm in this poem, hence they omit באהבתו ובחמלתו הוא נאלם. It adds nothing to the development of the } that either.

+ צאנו חסדנו, רעה חסדנו. Read: צונו צונו דר ודר. Cf. Deut. 32:7.

For Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not regard us;
 Thou Yahweh, art our Father, our redeemer, from of old is Thy name. (14)
 True, Israel can claim no righteousness, but why does God

.... cause us to err from His ways?

Why does He harden our hearts to keep us from fearing Him? *
 Return, O God, he pleads,

Return for Thy servants' sake, for the sake of the tribes of
 Thine inheritance. (v. 17)

64:18a is difficult to understand. The Jewish Pub. Society Bible translation reads

Thy holy people they have well nigh driven out. This is not what the words mean - if they mean anything at all is questionable. Many emendations have been suggested, the most acceptable seems to be the reading in accordance with the LXX - לאֲנַפְרֵי יִרְשֹׁנוּ הָרַ קְדֹשׁ - But for a short time have we inherited Thy holy mountain, our adversaries

desecrate Thy sanctuary. He complains further:

We have become like those over whom Thou hast never ruled,
 Like those over whom Thou hast never claimed lordship ---

" O that Thou wouldst rend the heaven and come down!
 Then, in case the voice of fatherly compassion should continue mute, the almost despairing Church makes a fresh appeal to Yahweh to be reasonable. Does the potter lightly break a vessel on which he has lavished his utmost skill?" (Che. 350f)

We are the clay, Thou our potter, how canst Thou bear to see
 Thy holy cities converted into a wilderness?
 Zion a desert! Jerusalem - a desolation!
 Our holy, glorious house, where our fathers praised Thee, is
 burned down!

All the things that we prize are become a ruin!
 Wilt Thou at such things restrain Thyself, O Yahweh?
 Wilt Thou be silent and afflict us exceedingly? (64:9-11)

This is the majestic way in which the poet lays his bitter complaint and and frantic cry for help before his God, supplicating for a renewal of His mercies.

Since the last three vv. of c. 64 will help us largely later in determining the date of this composition we may discuss now whether or not these vv. belong here or were later inserted by an editor, as is intimated by Marti and others, and accepted by Box. Marti bases his assertion on a minor textual reason as well as on the reference to יִרְשֹׁנוּ in 63:18.

* For this theology of Is. 6:10; Ex. 10.

This would prove that the temple was not burned down, as our last three vv. seem to indicate. But *qad* used in connection with a holy place means to desecrate, as does *even* (Dan. 8:13. Cf. late editions of Gesenius' *Wörterbuch* as well as Brown, Briggs and Driver's *Dictionary*). We shall find later that at the time we think this elegy was written we have sources to show both that the temple was partly burned and that it was desecrated in other ways. Thus there is no contradiction at all between the two passages, and we need not throw the last one out. *qad* may have been used in a more general way, 64:10 becoming more specific. How can we throw the last three vv. out? 64:7-11 forms the climax to the entire poem. C. 63 ends with a strong appeal - if God would only rend the heavens and come down! 64 ends again with a tragic exclamation -- can God behold all this with equanimity? The ideas, thoughts, and even the language all lead up to this climax, so that the whole prayer would be incomplete without vv. 9-11. Furthermore, in v. 8, when God is implored to look down from heaven, what is He to behold? Simply that the suffering Jews are all His people? What then? He is to see the desolations wrought in the land, the destruction of His own sanctuary -- then surely will He not be silent!

A. The sanctuary was possessed by the Jews but for a short time, now the holy people are as without a shepherd. Yahweh has hidden His face from them.

B. Cities, including Jerusalem, are destroyed; the temple consumed by fire. These two facts are uppermost in the writer's mind. His consternation is aroused to such a degree that he "even permits himself to call Yahweh unmerciful and unreasonable" (Che. 351).

Any possible date between 586 and 170 is given by different scholars as the time when this poem was composed; and indeed, superficial proofs may be found for them all. 586, the time of the Babylonian captivity, would tally well with some of the descriptions and historical background found in 73:7-64:11. The temple was destroyed, the cities devastated, the Jews disconsolate. The Maccabean period, on the other hand, would also answer well to some of the conditions given here. The temple was desecrated, the general distress and consternation was great, and the Jews looked for immediate intervention of God on their behalf. Upon closer examination, however, we find neither of these dates satisfactory. Could it have been written shortly after the Babylonian captivity, or even within the 70 years, before the dedication of the second temple? *

* Che. combats the hypothesis that it was written by H.L.s., but this is

But for a short time have we inherited Thy holy mountain could never have been written with reference to the Solomonic temple. Nor is the synagogal וְיָרִיב, confession of sin, found until post-Exilic times.* It reminds one of the church-confession in Is. 59:9-13 (discussed in c. 4), and resembles in its contents the elaborate synagogal prayers in Neh. 9; Dan. 9:4-13 (tho this one has a finer poetic style). It also recalls those retrospective confessional psalms recited in the synagog for the purpose of edifying the congregation as well as for the reawakening of God's mercy. These are Ps. 44, (51), 78, 80, 81, 89, 105, 106, 136.

Remembering that the psalter was the hymn book of the second temple, we can conclude immediately that the poem under consideration must be post-Exilic. It is especially allied with those psalms of complaint uttered under an oppression which almost killed the national life of the Jews, e. g. 44, 74, 79, 80, 89. Ps. 89, like our poem, opens with a eulogy of Yahweh's loving-kindness, then passes into a melancholy contemplation of the miseries of the present. Ps. 74 parallels our poem by its reference, "with all the pathos of an eye-witness, to the destruction of the temple by fire". Ps. 51 is like Is. 63:7-64:11 in its intense consciousness of guilt, in the strange excuse that Yahweh Himself is responsible for it, in its reference to Levitical uncleanness (64:4,5; Ps. 51:4,7,9). They both further emphasize the זָכַר in its late hypostatization (Is. 63:10,11; Ps. 51:13).°

The style and phraseology is also too late to warrant an Exilic date. Again I must rely upon Cheyne's exhaustive catalog of late words and phrases, (found on pp. 354ff.). It is most noteworthy that the very words with their peculiar connotations that are found in this passage are duplicated in the psalms cited above. One example will suffice here: 63:8 יִשְׁקָרְבֵנִי; Ps. 44:18 יִשְׁקָרְבֵנִי; 89:34 אֶשְׁקָר. It is of interest

hardly necessary. If it was written shortly after the Babylonian captivity then we should try to find the author. Disproving II.Is. would not disprove his age, while if the evidences prove a later date why bother about II.Is.?

* Hos. 14 can under no circumstances be cited as a parallel.

Che. 353f.

in this respect that Litt. and Che. point to the same words to prove their respective hypotheses, while they differ in exactly a hundred years as to the date of this prophecy. The words quoted by both are:

63:9	נמל	Another point of contact with II.Is. *	40:15
10	סרה .. עזב	Especially combined	Ps. 78:40
13	החמזה	8 times in Ps.	
15	זבל	I Ki. 8:13 Hab. 3:11	" 49:15
15; 64:11	החאפק	"	42:14
19	לא משלה	Not same word, but idea expressed (post-Ex.) Is.	26:13
64:3	חכה	Waiting for Yahweh, cf. Is. 30:18	Ps. 33:20
5	מסא	Levitical uncleanness	Ps. 51:4,7,9
5	עדים	Late -	Is. 30:22
6	התקורר	*	Is. 51:17
6	סנן	Hoses	11:8
10	סחמדינו	Lam.	1:10

So far the evidences all point to a post-Exilic date: its spirit is fully in harmony with late psalms and other late literature, its historical background does not fully correspond to Exilic times, and its language and style is undoubtedly late. There is only one objection raised by the scholars against a post-Exilic date for 63:7-64:11, viz., "why does the retrospect of Yahweh's past loving-kindness keep silence respecting the fall of Babylon? The Exodus from Egypt and the accompanying wonders are described in pathetic language 63:11-14); why not also the Exodus from Chaldea? 'The man who wrote vv. 11-15 of c. 63', says Prof. G. A. Smith, 'had surely the Return still before him; he would not have written in the way he has done of the Exodus from Egypt unless he had been feeling the need of another exhibition of divine power of the same kind. The prayer, therefore, must come from pretty much the same date as the rest of our prophecy, - after the Exile, but while the Return had not taken place'.^o A similar objection has been raised in England to the post-Exilic date of the historical psalms." (Che. 356) Che. gives two cogent answers to this objection:

* It is explained that there must be some linguistic affinities with other literature, why not with II.Is.?

^o *Expos. Bible II*, 447. Quoted by Che.

1 The wonders of old time are the highest example of what Yahweh can do for His people. These wonders are to revive Israel's faith (cf. 43:16,17), they are referred to in order to point out what Yahweh can do, and not because the writer feels the need of exactly similar divine manifestations.

2 The Return from Babylon is not expressly referred to because it was accompanied with so many disappointments; it was so unlike II. Isaiah's predictions that to refer to it would provoke dismay instead of inspiring faith. To these two I should like to add a third reason -- the past is ever idealized, invested with glory, while the present seems prosaic, lacks the proper perspective. The golden age is always a thing of the past. The nomadic state of the Israelitish tribes constituted the ideal period for the prophets; while our rabbis tell us if the ancients were angels we are human, but if they were only human - then we are like asses. What wonder then, that the events of a thousand years ago, celebrated in song and folk-lore, adorned by fable and fiction should be held up as the great deliverance, the wonderful manifestation of Yahweh's power, the like of which was never seen again? The Return from Babylon was too recent, too many of the disappointing facts were not yet forgotten, the halo of the dim past had not yet enveloped it. It is for a miraculous deliverance, comparable to that of Egypt, that the saddened community hopes; not a mere human one which came thru the conquest of a heathen king - Cyrus.

If the poem under consideration is post-Exilic, is it as late as the Maccabean times? Here too, some facts agree -- but will it stand the test of detailed criticism? Prof. Battenwieser, in his article "Are there any Maccabean Psalms?", proved beyond any doubt that not only can there be no Maccabean psalms, but there can be no literature whatever in pure Hebrew and idiomatic style dating from the Grecian period of Jewish history. The conditions alluded to in this elegy, as well as in the supposed Maccabean Ps. are couched in such general terms that, as we have seen, we might even have placed the authorship of this poem as early as 586, were we not guided by a more thoro examination into the composition. 64:10 tells of burning of the temple, but in the Maccabean times only the gates and porch were ruined by fire (I Maccabees 4:38; II M. 1:8; 8:33). As in the case of the Solomonic temple, 'but for a short time have we inherited Thy holy mountain' could not have been written of the second temple at the time of the Maccabees, after it stood for about 350 years. (Nor is there any evidence that Judas Maccabeus built the temple, all that is told of him is that he purified and repaired the existing one.

Dr. Battenwieser rightly points out that there is a fundamental error in the customary presentation of post-Exilic Jewish history. The conflict between Hellenism (or the Seleucidae) against Judaism must not be identified with the wars waged by the Maccabees for their religious liberty. The latter is only the closing act of a struggle which extended over two centuries. The sore afflictions and severe trials of the Jews began with the last half century of the Persian period, and save for the short interval of respite and peace during the reign of Alexander the Great they suffered persecution and oppression down to the Maccabean times. The very legends the Jews have spun around the name of Alexander, hailing him as their friend and deliverer and fellow Jew even show that their previous oppression must have been unbearable. Jos. (Contra Appion I, 191, 193) tells us that in the latter part of the Persian period non-Jews had control over Judah, even building their temples and altars in the country; while the Jews who destroyed them met with severe punishment. Job, written in the first quarter of the fourth century, represents the orthodox view that the reigning heresy in Judea (undoubtedly prevalent because of the oppression and evident silence of Yahweh; cf. p. 27) was due to the strangers possessing the land (Job 15:17-19). The brief spell of rest and freedom granted by Alexander terminated with his death, and the Maccabean wars constitute the closing act in a struggle which lasted thru a century and a half. I need not go into detail here. It is sufficient merely to call attention to Palestine's position as a buffer state in the wars between Egypt and Syria - the Ptolemies against the Seleucidae (cf. Jos. Antic. 12:1; Contr. Appion 1:186; and the Letter of Aristeus). In all this period of struggle, darkness and chaos the great historical event was the passing of Hebrew as a spoken language. Consequently, if we find psalms or other liturgical literature, such as Is. 63:7-64:11, complaining of oppression, destruction, rapine and ruin we cannot relegate them to the Maccabean period without first examining them as to their style of Hebrew. We have Hebrew products of the Maccabean period and even earlier, let us but compare these (e. g. Eccles., the Hebrew parts of Dan., etc.) with genuine Hebrew of the classic period and we shall immediately see the difference.

We still have about three centuries left (6th - 4th) in which we might place this composition. Three dates are possible:

- 1 520, the time of the new temple, when there was both dissatisfaction with the temple and trouble which may have led to its desecration.
- 2 450, the age of Neh.

3 350, during the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus.

The argument in favor of the first date is that 64:10 refers to the destruction of the stately Solomonic temple by Nebuchadnezzar. The new structure was only a disappointment to those who remembered the glory of the first temple (Ezra 3:12,13). The high hopes of the Golah gave way to despair and disappointment. The enemies beset the Jews on every side. If Yehweh would only manifest Himself as He did at the Exodus from Egypt! (63:19—64:3) This was the fervent prayer. Hence 64:10, the truly glorious temple is not yet replaced. The arguments in favor of the second date, accepted by most of the scholars of today, may be summed up in the words of Kuenen (Ond.² I, 507; II, 140; Rel. of Israel 224; cf. BL, p. 213f. Quoted in Che. p. 357): "What led to the destruction of the walls of Jerusalem, and the burning of her gates, we do not know for certain. But the discontent which already began to prevail in the more remote provinces of the Persian empire, and in which the Jews may have been involved, even against their will, is quite enough to account for such an occurrence." The Samaritans may have broken down the walls after they had been erected just as later they had attempted to oppose Nehemiah's rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem. This must have taken place during the disturbances produced by the revolt of Megabyzus (ca. 448).

Both the first and the second date are impossible, however. The Jews were surely too insignificant to be bothered with by Megabyzus, nor are there any proofs whatever for either hypothesis. Our literary evidence, on the other hand, proves a later date if only by the parallels found with other late literature. The exegetes who argue for the first date make v. 10 (c.63) complain of an evil already partially remedied - true the temple was burned, but there is a new one, no matter how humble, in its place - while v. 9 complains of conditions still existing. Furthermore, why all this lament now, after the rehabilitation of Jerusalem and the other 'holy cities' had already begun? This would rather be a time of thanksgiving, for we find in the book of Neh., in other literature of that time, as well as in the portions of Is. 56-66 coming from the time of Neh. that there were already wealthy Jews in Jerusalem, and that some readjustments had already been made. An orthodox Hebrew writer, too, would still behold sanctity and beauty in the temple, no matter how poorly it substituted the earlier one. Nor can we rely on the historicity of Ezra 3:8-13. True, cc. 58, 59 (ca. 450) do show a great deal of trouble and despair, yet it in no wise parallels the liturgy

on hand. The latter passage says nothing about the ruined walls of Jerusalem, either, nor about the oppression of fellow Jews by Jews. Even the language of 59 fails to show as much passionate excitement, and such a depth of almost hopeless misery as that of 63:15-64:11. We may note here, too, that although Litt. places this piece along with his other III. Is. prophecies as far as the date is concerned, yet he hesitates to assign it to the same author on linguistic grounds. The suffering and misery portrayed in this poem seem to have been of a critical nature at a definite point of time, and not a continued existing sad state of affairs as is portrayed in Neh. 1:3. Thus neither the date of Zerubabel, nor the age of Neh. can be pointed to as the time of 63:7-64:11.

The only date left for us, then, is the time of Artaxerxes Ochus. A hasty outline of Persian history of the middle of the fourth century will prove this date to be correct. Artaxerxes III. (Ochus) ascended the Persian throne in 358. He was an unscrupulous, cruel, shrewd and energetic monarch; his was the bloodiest reign in Persian history. In 350 he was defeated by the Egyptian king Nectanebus, who had the aid of Greek generals and mercenaries. This defeat encouraged many of the Persian provinces to revolt, among which was Sidon. The provinces were most likely aided by Egypt and had Greek soldiers at their command. Collecting a large army Ochus sacked Sidon and completely subdued Egypt in 343.

Jewish historical sources are silent as to the fate of the Jews in these 15 years of cruel bloodshed, or the role they played in the Syro-Egyptian uprisings and defeats. Jos. associates the name of Bagoas, 'the general, of another Artaxerxes', with an enslavement of the Jewish people and the pollution of their temple (Antiq. XI, 7, 1). Bagoas is evidently identical with the eunuch Bagoses, one of Ochus' most cruel generals in the Syro-Egyptian campaign. According to Jos., Jesus, Bagoas' candidate for the high-priesthood, was slain in the sanctuary by his brother John. This led to Bagoas entering and desecrating the sacred precincts and to the taxing of every sacrifice as a penalty. From other sources we know that at the same time Jericho was also sacked, the captives being taken to Babylon.

We are hardly in a position to know what really happened. It is difficult to believe that even the cruel Bagoas would have wrought all this desolation out of revenge for Jesus' death. Human life meant too little to him. Jewish as well as non-Jewish* sources seem to bear faint

* Eusebius' Chronicle; Solinus; Sincellus; Orosius; Diodorus.

echoes of the events of the time. The book of Judith may hark back to this event somehow - Holofernes may be the Olofernes, colleague of Bagoases. Enoch 19:74,75 may also refer to this time. It is a safe conjecture that the Jews could not have kept out of the Syrian revolts against Persia. In their own camp they were led on by their fond hopes of independence inspired by the prophets, by their growth in size and importance, as well as by their sense of legalistic piety ushered in by the strict adherence to the new P code, which would guard them from all harm. (Cf. Joel 3:9,10) On the other hand they were forced from without to take the step by the brutal cruelty of Ochus which destroyed all their sense of gratitude to the Persian Empire. Add to this the Jews' fear of their powerful immediate neighbors and we can be tolerably certain that they did join their neighbors in the uprising against Persia. We know from parallel cases that the Jews have always played an important part in similar Syrian revolts; cf. the Syro-Ephraimitic war as one instance. Needless to say that when Artaxerxes defeated Syria the Jews suffered the same fate as their neighbors. Jericho was captured -- but what about Jerusalem? Ochus went from Syria to Egypt -- could he have left this natural stronghold to be a menace in his rear? But why then are the Jewish sources silent about it? Robertson Smith (OTJC² 1892, quoted in Che. 360) says: "The whole Bagoases story (of Jos.) looks like a pragmatical invention designed partly to soften the catastrophe of the Jews, and partly to explain it by the sin of the high-priest". "The collectors of Jewish traditions threw a veil over the inexplicable mystery of a second pollution and destruction of the temple by a heathen enemy" (Che. p. 361).

All this reconstruction of history was made without the help of biblical sources, especially without the cc. under consideration. What if these cc. bear out the events detailed above? We have already referred to certain psalms paralleling in ideas, thoughts, vocabulary and historical background the elegy under consideration. Ps. 44,74, 79, 89 especially reflect the same conditions as our prophecy -- note in particular 74:3,7. It was proved by Prof. Rutenwieser beyond a doubt that Ps. 74 must date from the time of Ochus. The others certainly do, too. The great dread of both psalmist and prophet of this period was that 'Yahweh had cast off His people', their consternation was increased all the more because they relied so much upon the new covenant and its assurance of divine favor.

Ps. 74,79,(89) have the largest affinity with the work now

before us., and would probably be even closer allied to it were it not for the alterations which these psalms received at the hands of the temple editors.. Let us therefore consider these parallelisms:*

Ps.	Idea Expressed, or Word	Is. 63:7-64:11
74:1 } 79:13 }	Israel a flock	63:11
74:2	The tribe of Thine inheritance	17 זבטי
2	Mount Zion	18 (in LXX)
3-7 } 79:1 }	Outrages on the temple, culminating in its burning	{ 18 64:10
74:8	All God's meeting places burned °	9 x
20	חנני	{ 63:15 64:8
79:8	Let not Yehweh remember inherited guilt	8 +

One more objection remains to be met before we can accept the parallelism and synchronism of the psalms discussed with our prophecy: Ps. 74, 79 clearly imply that the Jews are suffering, in part at least, for their religion; while there is no evidence of this in our liturgy. On the contrary, here we find complete abasement for sin. Still we can easily imagine both these states of mind to have coexisted and each expressed in different liturgical poems. In 64:5-7 we find an exaggerated confession, proving that the guilt acknowledged was not altogether the product of sins consciously committed and remembered by the speakers, but partly inferred from the extremity of the mental distress. (63:17). As was pointed out above, the Jews considered themselves חֲסִידִים, pious ones, but the savage treatment of Ochus convinced them that God was

- - - - -

* Cf. Che. 361.

° זבטי dubious -- Dr. Rutenwieser.

x 'Yahweh's holy cities are a desert.' The meeting places of God, which supplanted the old bamoth, consecrated the cities.

+ Same idea implied.

punishing them for sins - known as well as unknown, their own as well as those of their fathers (64:8 cf. Ps. 79:8). But Ochus did not regard himself as the 'rod of Yahweh'. On the contrary, he had nothing but contempt for the Syrian and Egyptian religions.* This intensified the Jewish sense of close connection with Yahweh, expressed in the psalms while only hinted at in Is. 63,64; but at the same time it revived their sense of being under God's wrath, fully spoken of in the Is. passage while only intimated in the Ps. Yet we must note that it is intimated even in Ps. 74:1; 79:5, psalms in which Israel is spoken of as the innocent turtle-dove and the people of hasidim.^o

Besides the psalms mentioned Is. 24-27 may throw much light on the contemporary history of 63, 64. 27:7-11, with its sombre description of the devastation of the cities of Judah and the despondency of the Jews can refer to no other period than that of Ochus, according to Che. We must bear in mind, however, that Grey in the I.C.C. warns us that this conclusion as to the authorship of Is. 27 is not at all certain. The particular historical circumstances remain evasive, and all that can be said about it is that it dates from a post-Exilic period. (ICC ad loc.) But it is hardly necessary for us to study Is. 24-27 more closely. We have sufficient evidence to prove that 63:7-64:11 can best be dated about 350 B.C.E., to be more exact - 347.

* For Cyrus' contrary view cf. the Cyrus Cylinder. There the conqueror is shown even to reestablish the forsaken shrines of the people he conquered. Cf. particularly his attitude to Marduk.

^o Che. 362f.

PUNISHMENT of the APOSTATES and REWARD OF the FAITHFUL

To treat cc. 65, 66 adequately we must first have a correct text and a full understanding of the prophecy. The first thing to attract our attention is that 66:23, 24 is foreign to the spirit of the composition.

These vv. are doubtlessly much later than the prophecy and were probably added by the redactor of 40-66 (as Du. suggests), the same man who inserted 50:10, 11. Tho poetical in form, these vv. have no true metre and are entirely unlike the rest of the c.. They are clumsily connected with the preceding by וְהָיָה, but we can well see that the prophecy ends with v. 22; in fact v. 22 is not only the logical ending but also the stronger one. The writer has finished with the temple on v. 21, why should he return to it again? In v. 16 כָּל בָּשָׂר means all nations - here it means only the faithful Jews (cf. Joel 3:1). דְּבָרָאן occurs only twice in the Bible - here and in Dan. 12:2 -- evidently this passage is about as late as the book of Dan.

Our next problem is whether 66:1-22 is a unit. Let us examine the text more closely to decide on this:

- 1 Thus saith Yahweh: The heaven is My throne, and the earth My footstool;
What sort of a house can you build for Me?
What sort of a place of rest for Me? *
- 2 All these° My hand hath made
And so all these are Mine,† is the oracle of Yahweh.
For such have I regard, for the poor,
For the crushed in spirit, and those who tremble at My word +
- 3 He that slaughtereth an ox is also a slayer of human victims,

- - - - -

* דִּבְרֵי מְנוּחָי

° I. E. the temple buildings in Jerusalem. Cf. הֵבֵא in Jer. 7:4.

× וְלִי הֵיוּ כָּל אֵלֶּה Or, if the text is to be retained, 'And so all these are established'.

+ חָרַד אֶל דְּבָרִי

He that sacrificeth a sheep is also a dog-strangler,

He that bringeth an oblation also pours out a libation of swine's blood,*

He that offereth a memorial offering of incense is also a blower of idols.*

3b, 4 are simple enough - directed against the same class of people as

3a. V. 5 is probably of one piece with the foregoing; v. 6 promises recompense to Yaweh's enemies - we shall see later who they are.

V. 7 should read ^{אמר יהוה - 9: היוחל עם ארץ - 8; והיא במרם תחיל ילדה בן}

7-9 evidently speak of the rehabilitation of Palestine; 10-16 continue the same thot. 10 should read ^{בנהר שופם שלום - 12: סער - 11: שחתי אף ירשלים}

14: בן בירושלים וגו' - 13: וינאקם על צד תנשא: ובנחל בכור וגו'

17, 18a seem to refer back to the idolatry mentioned in 1-5. 17 ends with והעבבר. 18

should read:

יחדו ישפם מעשיהם ויחבתיהם נאם יהוה כי הנה באה העת לקבץ וגו'

Vv. 19, 20 should read:

ושחתי בהם אות ושלחתי סהם שלמים אל האיים הרחקים: והנידו
אם בכודי בנוים והביאו את כל אחיבתם ככל הנוים מנחה ליהוה על הר
קדש וגו' (Du, Marti, Che., Box, et al.)

18b-22 again deals with the nations of the world among which the Diaspora is scattered, and harks back to 10-16.

Thus we see that 66:1-22 deals with the Jews, first in their relation to idolators within their own camp, and secondly in their relation to the nations of the world. And yet it may be - and is - one piece. The most we may say is that 17, 18a are misplaced - and Che. may be right in putting them after v. 5; tho I should rather place them after 4, because, as Marti points out, 5 and 6 are closer related than 4 and 5. At any rate there is no decisive proof just where this v. and a half belong. After making this change we have a perfect unit in 66:1-22. Cheyne's argument that vv. 5 and 20 belong to two different authors because אחיבת is used in the one to denote Jewish enemies, in the other Jewish exiles, is gratuitous. The context explains the use in either case.

The c. opens as a polemic against the idolatrous party within the

* נאקך דם חזיר

° Evidently directed against those who combine Yaweh worship with repulsive idolatrous practices and superstitions. Cf. Marti ad loc.

Jewish camp, and when these taunt the Jews, upbraiding them that their long cherished hopes of better times are slow in coming (v. 5 'Let Yahweh be glorified that we may gaze upon your joy'), the prophet says, 'Nay, the time is close at hand when the Diaspora shall be returned, and Zion become resplendent with glory'. Already he can hear a roaring from the city - Yahweh Himself is coming to avenge the injuries of his suffering and innocent servants. Both the idolators addressed and the nations who hold the Jews in bondage are to feel His wrath. Thus the c. cannot be anything but a unit.

C. 65 needs but little attention. It is certainly addressed to the same idolators, and the same eschatological promises are held out to the faithful community. The text, tho somewhat corrupt, offers little difficulty in understanding the prophecy. The same idea is developed and carried thru in both cc., and even the same phrases are used, cf. especially 65:12 with 66:4. 65 and 66 thus form a unit. Now we are in a better position to find the approximate date and authorship of this prophecy.

The servants of Yahweh, who 'tr^{ble} at His word' doubtlessly dwelt in the holy land, judging from the tone of the prophecy; yet the nation is but half-born. (66:9) Exiles are to be brot back only to swell the numbers and importance of those already in the land. Note especially 66:10, 20 where we can read the Exile as well as the Return without the least doubt. This at once combats Knobel's view that it is directed against the Jews of the Exile who wished to build a temple in Bsydon, and thus written there. There is not the least doubt that it was written in Jerusalem. It is suggested that ~~the~~ in 65:20 proves its authorship outside of Jerusalem, but we must bear in mind that this city, 'the perfection of beauty', was so beloved by post-Exilic poet and prophet that they never weary mentioning it. Having^{named} it in vv. 18, 19 the author does not repeat himself, but uses an adverb. Cf. his use of ~~in~~ in v. 19. So that there is not the slightest doubt that it was written in Jerusalem, at least after 586, and even after 536, but can we not infer from 66:1-3 that it was written in opposition to the preaching of Hag. and Zech. for the rebuilding of the temple and the reinstitution of sacrifices on a larger scale? No, this is also untenable. The temple was already standing - 65:11 ~~the~~ can mean nothing else, nor can the opening words of 66:2 refer to anything else than the rebuilt temple. The temple is even directly referred to in 66:6. Also the eschatology of vv. 65:17-20, 25; 66:22 show marked Persian influence, and are thus much later than Hag. and Zech. Comparing it with 51:16 we have the

contrast especially clear - II.Is. uses the creation of heaven and earth as a sign that God is the all-powerful, in this chapter a new heaven and a new earth are literally hoped for. Jewish that was certainly influenced thruout the ages by all the peoples with whom they came in contact; and this hope for a new cosmogony is a direct offspring of Zoroastrianism modified by Jewish monotheism. Yet this author does not come late in the Persian period, for he has not yet developed his eschatology to the extent that the authors of Enoch or Dan. have it -- he still lacks the resurrection and the perpetuity of life found in later writings.

For the linguistic proofs of the post-Exilic origin of this prophecy I must again refer to Cheyne's exhaustive catalog of words and phrases showing its affinity with P as well as with other writings of Ezra's and Nehemia's age.

On the other hand, we miss the usual historical references that helped us place the former cc. - the walls of Jerusalem no longer play an important part here, ^{no reference is made to} and such clear events as the coming of Ezra and Neh. or to any religious reforms. But there is something else that will help us place these two cc. with almost certainty. Let us examine closer into this composition to see against whom ~~it~~ it was written:

I * offered admission to those who asked not after Me;

I offered my oracles to those who sought me not;

I said, Here am I, Here am I,

To a nation which called not upon My name °.

I have spread out My hands continually

To an unruly and disobedient people, *

Who follow the way which is not good,

After their own devices. 65:1,2

Against whom is this invective addressed? Who is that nation which called not upon God's name? On the other hand who are these few faithful servants who are to receive all the blessings and joys? Judging from pre-Exilic prophecy it would seem that the entire Jewish community is addressed; it is the Jewish nation which refuses the teachings of God, follows heathen superstitions and idolatry, and is in general a rebellious

- - - - -
* God is speaking.

° Read לא קרא

* Supply וסורה

and stubborn people. Only a few there are who can grasp the message of the prophet, the disciples with whom preaching of the prophet is sealed up. The doom of the rest is unalterably decreed. Conditions after the Exile are different tho. In the Jewish community of the Persian period the religion is thoroly organized, and the prophets preach in the name of this religion, in an effort to strengthen and encourage it. Those belonging to the community are 'all righteous' (60:21), they are the poor down-trodden people, trembling at the word of God, waiting patiently for His long delayed deliverance. In time there developed even among them some godlessness, oppression of the poor, injustice - but not to any considerable extent. The Return was too recent for the existence of conditions similar to those of Jeroboam the second which called forth the strong voice of protest from Amos. For such conditions we need years of peace and prosperity. The injustice that did exist among the members of the community was dealt with in a far different manner from that of the pre-Exilic seers. Nehemiah's pleading, accompanied by a dramatic curse was sufficient to recall the rich Jews to their duty (Neh. 5). In the prophetic writings of the Persian period these same oppressors are attacked too, but in language too dissimilar from 65,66 to lead us to believe that these oc. too were directed to persons within the community. We need only to examine closely Is. 58,59:1-15 and the sermons of Joel and Malachi in contrast with 57:3-13; 65;66 and we will readily see that the latter prophecies are addressed to an entirely ^{different} set of people than the former. The ^{former} breathes the spirit of love and correction, the latter unmitigated hatred. The former exhorts to a change in conduct, and then promises that Yahweh's mercies will be poured out in abundance upon His people, for it is only their sins which separate them from Yahweh's saving-kindness -- the latter prophecies are relentless. Those addressed in 57:3-13; 65;66 are hopelessly depraved, nothing will save them. They are a smoke in God's nostrils, He will not rest until He requites them fittingly. Their name will be left as a curse --- surely this could not have been written to the struggling suffering Jews after the Exile. Who then is it that is attacked so fiercely?

The answer that it must have been the Jews, for the prophets did not speak in obscure enigmatic language, and if they had meant someone other than the Jews they would have said so, is untenable. The same objection may be reversed: The prophets spoke openly - if they meant the Jews, even the rich and ruling classes, why did they not speak out? 56:9-57:2 tells definitely that it is against the rulers. Amos addresses Israel directly, even the whole clan which God brought up from the land

of Egypt (Am. 5:1). The king of Bashan, the rulers, the priests, even the king - all are mentioned definitely by name. Hos. speaks to Ephraim, Samaria, and Israel -- he leaves us to imply nothing. Micah denounces the sins of Jacob and Israel, and the bamoth of Judah. Even where God contends with the nation, Israel is called 'My people', definitely. Cf. further Is. 1, where the wicked Israel is called "a sinning nation, a people burdened with guilt, sons that do corruptly" - words that are closely paralleled in the prophecies under consideration - but here we find the same thing, the v. just before it leaves us without a doubt that the prophet speaks to Israel - 'My people'.

The people addressed must have been very close to need no further introduction -- and indeed, from the context we find that they were close at hand, tho not members of the organized community. Let us but read the text closer: These people are called children of a sorceress, brood of an adulteress and harlot. Surely, the prophet would not call his brother Jews that! The prophets refer to Jacob as a deceiver, and to the first father of the Jews as a sinner (Hos. 12:4; Is. 43:27) - but nowhere do they cut their noses to spite their faces. Further - these people against whom the prophet is so incensed are idolators of the worst dye, still clinging to repulsive cults of an abominable sexual nature, and even to human sacrifice.* But the Jewish religion after the Exile was much purer, largely developed in Babylon along prophetic lines, so that the descriptions in our several cc. cannot fit the religious practices of the returned Exile.°

66:5 separates two classes of people:

- 1 Those who tremble at the word of God, the faithful ones, to whom promises of reward are held out; and
- 2 The 'brethren' of the first class, who hate and loathe the first for

- - - - -

* 57:5, and possibly implied in 66:3. Varti understands the difficult v. 3 of c. 66 as sacrificing oxen and at the same time offering up human victims, which seems plausible; for the author who has priests and Levites, 66:21, must give them some function of sacrificing. To say with other exegetes that he who sacrifices in the wrong place is as bad as a homicide is also unwarranted. The author would tell us that and not leave it to our own inference.

° To say, on that account, that it is not post-Exilic was already shown to be impossible.

God's name's sake'. The first are to constitute the regenerated Zion, but there is no threat that the second class will be exiled from Jerusalem - in fact, they must be outside of Jerusalem, for they have forgotten Yahweh's holy mountain. Nor have they suffered from the Exile - they are still to be punished not only for their own iniquity but also for the iniquity of their fathers, who burned incense upon the mountains and dishonored Yahweh upon the hills (65:6,7). Their sin cannot consist merely of individual backsliding from the Yahweh religion, for their works and their plots (66:18) imply concerted action. Surely they must be a definitely organized class of men, working against the plans of God and His people. They are superior in numbers too, for the first class is compared to only a few good grapes on a cluster (65:8). And yet these godless people regard themselves as Yahweh worshippers, for in 66:3 (directed against the same) even according to the most orthodox interpretation שׁוֹמֵר הַזֶּהָרִים .. מִלֵּלָה מִנְחָה .. מִזְבִּיחַ לַיהוָה all mean Yahweh sacrifices that they offer. 66:1, addressed to the same people, also shows that a temple to Yahweh is under consideration. Yet it is not the Temple on Zion's heights that the author disparages - this is already consecrated by God for worship by the humble and contrite - on the contrary, the great sin of those attacked is that they have forgotten Yahweh's holy mountain (65:11, cf. also 66:21).

All these considerations bring us much closer to the solution of our problem - viz. who are the two classes in this prophecy? For a more exact solution we must take into consideration the historical conditions at the time this composition was written. We have seen that it undoubtedly belongs to the Persian period. It would not do to put it as late as 63, 64, i. e. the time of Artaxerxes Ochus, or later; for the enemy here is not the cruel conquerer from without, nor are the conditions reflected as terrible as those in cc. 63, 64. True, many Jews are still in Exile, and the foreign yoke is ^{also} oppressive, but its parallel is rather found in 60-62. Cf. the new ^{name} of 65:15 with 60:14; 62:4, 12*. Cf. further 65:18, 19; 66:10, the joy in Jerusalem, with 60:8=61:1-3, 10. Also 65:22, where the Jews are no longer to fear spoliation of their crops, with 63:8. Also the nations coming to the glory of Jerusalem,

* 62:2 cannot be cited, the new name there is most likely an interpolation.

bringing the scattered Jews, and supplying abundance for the pious community, even in labor - 66:12,18-21, cf. with 60:3-14;61:5-7,9;62:2. *וְיָבִיאוּ אֶת הַיָּתוּדִים וְאֶת הַנָּזִירִים* - even these words are duplicated in our prophecy from 60-62. We can hardly err, then, in setting the tentative date for 65,66 at about 450.

We can place this prophecy with greater certainty, but before doing so we must bear in mind especially our historical discussion in the introductory c., especially pp. 8-10.

Even from a cursory reading of Is. 56-66 we can readily see that the Jewish community had two kinds of enemies - those from without, and those within their very gates. Their foreign assailants are spoken of in 59:16-20;63:1-6 et passim thruout the book. The inner enemies are attacked in 57,65,66. 60-62 has references to both. These internal foes can be none other than the Samaritans and their Jewish allies recruited from the ruling class of Palestine. This conviction gains in force from the undisputed fact (arrived at from independent evidences) that the prophecies in which these idolators and schismatics are attacked all date from the time of Ezra and Neh. The fights that these two leaders and reformers carried on against the Samaritans and their Jewish partisans are too well known to be recorded here. It must be emphasized with Marti that from our sources in Is. 56-66, as well as in Ezra and Neh. we find that the Samaritans did not stand alone, they had a powerful following within the Jewish community, even among the priests and nobles (cf. 56:9-57:2; Ezra 9; 10; Neh.13:23-28, et passim). "Nicht die Samaritaner sind geschildert, sondern die 'samaritanische Art', die damals auch in der jerusalemisch-jüdischen Bevölkerung vorherrschte" (Marti p. 367).

Having thus approximated the date as well as the conditions we can use each to help us ascertain a fuller knowledge of the other. The people attacked by the prophet at the time of Ezra and Neh. are brethren of the Jews; who have caused the Jews no end of trouble; who hate and loathe the Jews for God's name's sake and devise plans against the Jews. They are Yahweh worshipers*, and at the same time prepare a table for

- - - - -

* 66:3 et passim. They are spoken of as disobedient to Yahweh and forsaking Him because the author takes the old prophetic attitude that 'Yahweh, our God, Yahweh is one'. He accuses them of idolatry in the same way that Is. and the other literary prophets accused their own contemporaries of serving idols.

Gad (Fortune) and pour out mixed drink for Meni (Destiny) *

The general descriptions of their idolatrous cults all agree with what we know of Syrian Religions. Fortune and Destiny were Syrian deities, worship in the gardens was an old Palestinian cult.

It is pointed out by some that the Samaritans must have had a uniform religion (even before the building of the Gerizim-sanctuary), while the different descriptions in Is. 56-66 of the worship of those people condemned by the prophets vary. But why should we suppose that their religion was a simple one? In the passage from the book of Ki.* we find that each Samaritan group combined its own religion with Yahwism. Furthermore, as Che. points out, in periods of transition and trouble there is a general syncretism of religions, and a reversion to primitive types of worship.^o

Knowing the religious development of the Jews in Babylon, as we do, knowing their purer monotheism and their loyalty to Yahweh which prompted many of them to migrate to Jerusalem, we cannot say that these disobedient idolatrous brethren, steeped in superstition, were members of the Jewish community. Not being outsiders, they must necessarily have been the Samaritan and pro-Samaritan schismatics, most of whom had remained back in Northern and even in Southern Palestine.

Now we are in a position to understand two important passages: A 65:1,2,12; 66:4, and B 66:1,2. The first clearly means that the Jews attempted to proselytize the Samaritans, but met with no success. Tho the schismatics welcomed the opportunity to make use of the central sanctuary at Jerusalem, yet they refused to subject themselves to the rigorous exacting religion of prophet and scribe. In time they were entirely excluded from the pious community. This indeed fails to accord with the reports of Neh., and especially of Ezra, but we must bear in mind that these last named sources are unreliable. After they were driven out they set about building their own temple, and the prophet again found fault (B 66:1,2). Yahweh doth not dwell in a temple erected by

* Cf. II Ki. 17:33.

^o Cf. Ezek. 8:10,11; Jer. 44:18. This was also true in Greek history, as Burnet points out in his *Early Greek Philosophy*, p. 84.

humans - this Jerusalem temple was instituted by God Himself, but what manner of house can the haughty idolators build Him? This temple is acceptable because its worshipers are the poor, humble, crushed in spirit, who tremble at Yahweh's word.

In view of this unmistakable historical background we need not hesitate to date 65,66 at precisely the time of Ezra's and Nehemiah's activity -- 440 - 430. The sources are too scant to determine whether it was before the promulgation of the P code, nor can we ascertain the personality of the author. He was surely a spiritually minded Jew fully in accord with the activities of Ezra and Neh.

Bibliography

Author	Book	Publisher	Year
Bennett, W. H.	The Religion of the Post-Exilic Prophets	Scribners	1907
Box, G. H.	The Book of Is.	Is. Pitman & Sons London	1908
Buttenwieser, Prof. Moses	Are there any Maccabean Psalms?		1917
Cheyne, T. K.	Introduction to the Book of Is.	Adam & Chas. Elack London	1895
"	Jewish Religious Life After the Exile	Am. Lectures on the History of Religions 3rd Series 1897-8 G. P. Putnam N.Y. and London	1901
Creelman, Harlan	An Introduction to the O. T. Chronologically Arranged	Macmillan Co. N. Y.	1917
Delitzsch, Franz	The Prophecies of Is. Vol. II	Clark's Foreign Theological Library T. & T. Clark Edinburgh	1910
Driver, S. R.	An Introduction to the Lit. of the O. T. 11th Edition	International Theological Library N. Y. Chas. Scribner's Sons	1905
Duhm, Bernhard	Das Buch Jesaia III. verbesserte u. vermehrte Auflage	Hand Kommentar zum A. T. Vondenhoeck u. Ruprecht Göttingen	1914
Glazebrook, M.G.	Studies in the Book of Is.	Clarendon Press Oxford	1910
Gray, Geo. Buchanan	The Book of Is. I - XXXIX	International Critical Commentary N. Y. Chas. Scribner's Sons	1912
Guthe, Herrmann	Geschichte des Volkes Israel	Mohr Tübingen	1914
Kent, Chas. Fos- ter	A History of the Jewish People During the Bab., Persian, & Greek Periods	10th Edition N. Y. Chas. Scribner's Sons	1914

Knobel, August	Der Prophet Jesaia	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum A. T.	1861
		S. Hirzel Leipzig	
Littmann, Enno	"Über die Abfassungszeit des Tritojesaia	J. C. B. Mohr Freiburg i. B. Leipzig u. Tübingen	1899
Luzzatto, Samuel	ספר ישעיה	Padua	1855
David			
Marti, Karl	Das Buch Jesaia	K. H.-C. zum A. T. Mohr Tübingen	1900
Meyer, Eduard	Geschichte des Altertums III. IV. V. Band	J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger Stuttgart	1912
	Das Perserreich u. die Griechen		
Skinner, J.	Is. XL - LXVI	Cambridge Bible for Schools & Colleges Cambridge	1902
Smith, Geo.			
Adam	The Book of Is. Vol II. XL - LXVI	Hodder & Stoughton <i>The Expositor's Bible</i>	
Smith, H.	O. T. History	Int. Theological Library	1915
Preserved		Chas. Scribner's Sons N. Y.	
Smith, J. M.	University of Chicago, Class Lecture Notes,		
Powis	Summer Course, 'Judaism & History'		1917
	History and Literature Exile - Maccabean Period		
Steuernagel,	Lehrbuch der Einleitung		
D. Carl	in das A. T.	Tübingen Mohr	1912
Whitehouse,	Is. Vol. II	The New Century Bible	
Owen C.		Henry Frowde N. Y.	