

ISAIAH FIFTY-THREE

A DEVOTIONAL AND EXPOSITORY STUDY

by

EDWARD J. YOUNG

Professor of Old Testament,
Westminster Theological Seminary,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Author of

*Introduction to the Old Testament, The
Prophecy of Daniel, etc.*

PREFACE

"If there is any one passage in the Old Testament which seems to the Christian heart to be a prophecy of the redeeming work of Christ, it is that matchless fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. We read it today, often even in preference to New Testament passages, as setting forth the atonement which our Lord made for the sins of others upon the cross. Never, says the simple Christian, was there a prophecy more gloriously plain." These words of a great Biblical scholar, J. Gresham Machen, express quite admirably the attitude which the humble believer in Jesus has as he approaches this grand and majestic chapter. Here, in words that seem incapable of misinterpretation and misunderstanding, the humble believer says, is the Gospel.

For this interpretation of the prophecy he could appeal to that episode in the book of Acts which relates the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch. In obedience to the Angel of the Lord, the account states, Philip the evangelist left Jerusalem and went down toward Gaza. On the way he met an Ethiopian eunuch who had been to Jerusalem to worship, and who, on his return, was seated in his chariot, reading the prophecy of Isaiah. As, at the command of the Spirit of God, Philip approached the eunuch, he heard him reading and asked, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" To this the eunuch replied, "How can I, except some man should guide me?" He then asked Philip to sit with him. The passage of the Old Testament which he was reading was this: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: In his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." The eunuch did not understand the passage and so asked Philip, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?" In reply to the question Philip began with this very passage and preached unto the eunuch Jesus.

The answer which Philip gave to this question, as we have seen, is the answer which has always found a ready welcome in the heart of the Christian. There are some, however, who in reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah have not found Jesus Christ at all. They too have asked the question of the Ethiopian eunuch, "Of whom speaketh the prophet this?" and they have answered that question differently from Philip. They have said, "He is speaking of himself," "He is speaking of the Jewish people," or "He is speaking of some great religious figure." Unless, however, they have been born again of God's Spirit, they have not said, "He is speaking of the Christ to come." Despite such various interpretations, however, the prophecy itself is clear, and those who have the eyes to see may indeed see that here, in wondrous fashion, the prophet, under the compulsion of the Spirit of God, is looking forward to the great salvation that was to be accomplished by God at the time when He would heal the breach that separated Him from His own people.

Yet, since the Christian interpretation of this remarkable chapter has not been universally accepted and has even been severely criticized and attacked, we shall do well to ask ourselves whether we really are justified in referring the words of this prophecy to the atonement of Jesus Christ. Can we, as true believers in the Saviour, read these statements of Isaiah and apply them to the One who died for us upon Calvary? In other words, is the time-honored attitude of the Christian heart toward this chapter justified or not? For our part, we believe very firmly that it is justified. We believe that the prophet was not speaking of himself but of another, and that One of whom He was speaking was the One who was crucified in the first century of our era. To show that this belief is correct we must turn to a study of the prophecy itself. We shall plan to proceed, verse by verse, considering the meaning of each word. Such a procedure should bring us face to face with Calvary. It should also make clear that if Isaiah was not predicting the death of Jesus Christ, we simply do not know what he was talking about.

It is a striking word — this favorite commencement of the prophet. It well serves to arrest the attention so that we shall give eager heed to that which he, as the spokesman of God, is about to say. After this introductory word, the prophet immediately brings before his hearers the heart of the message. That which is uppermost in his mind is clearly set forth. It is the One whom the Lord announces as "My Servant" — and it is also the fact that the Servant through the use of the best, means will attain the highest end, namely, the successful completion of His work. It is this to which we are commended to direct our thoughts by the announcement, "My Servant will deal prudently."

It is very difficult to render in English the precise connotation of this remarkable verb. In its primary signification, it merely means to act with the understanding or intelligence. Since, however, such intelligent action usually results in success, the verb comes also to include the idea of effective action. Thus, we are to understand that the Servant will work so wisely that abundant fruition will crown His efforts. The ultimate success which is to be His will be attended with appropriate and effective action.

This is a clear statement of the fact that the Servant will be successful in the work which He is to undertake. It is not so much the idea that He will Himself be prosperous as it is that the mission which He seeks to accomplish will be brought to a successful conclusion. This is the first thought that the prophet brings to our attention, for in the Hebrew-language the word which we have translated "he will deal prudently" appears even before the subject "My Servant." We may note also that Isaiah does not revert to this theme until the tenth verse of chapter fifty-three. There is, of course, a reason why the success of the Servant's mission is thus stressed at the outset, a reason to which we shall later return. Suffice it now to note that before mentioning anything else, the prophet would focus our thoughts upon this ultimate outcome of the task which the Servant is to undertake — He is to be successful.

We may then mark well that the One who is thus to work effectively and to carry through that work to a suc-

cessful conclusion is introduced as "My Servant." It is God the Lord who speaks and who introduces the Servant. The Servant, we learn, belongs to God and serves Him. This same Servant had already been introduced in Isaiah 42 :1-4, where He was set forth also as One who had a mission to accomplish and who would complete that mission successfully. In Isaiah 49:1-7 He had again been presented. This time, however, it appears that there were to be great difficulties in the execution of His work. In chapter 50:4-9, the Servant had Himself spoken, mentioning the suffering which He was to face. No reason, however, had been given for this suffering. It was reserved for this present passage to tell us why the Servant must suffer. Indeed, this present passage sets forth that suffering in great detail. We are even to learn that men regarded the Servant as One who had been punished by God for His sins. It is to protect us also from falling into such an error and from entertaining such a wrong conception that Isaiah at the outset makes it clear that the Servant belongs to God and that in the accomplishment of His work will truly reach the highest heights of success.

The second half of the thirteenth verse stands as a correlative to the first. It sets forth the effect which is produced by what is stated in the first half. The Servant will deal wisely and so will effectively bring to its accomplishment the task which lies before Him. That is the message of the first part of the verse. In facing the disgraceful suffering that was to come upon Him, He will so act that He will come forth victorious.

This exaltation of the Servant is presented by means of three verbs which denote respectively its beginning, continuation and climax. The first of these we may translate, "He will rise" or "He will become manifest as exalted." The second is reflexive in force, and may be rendered, "He will raise Himself." The last expresses a state, "He will be very high," and thus it sets forth the final point of exaltation. Perhaps we should not seek to differentiate too much as to the precise significance of each of these three

verbs. That which is most important to observe is that the three taken together, present the highest peak of exaltation. He who has suffered most deeply is now raised to the point where He towers high above everything else.

It is impossible to read this description without being reminded of the revelation given in the New Testament, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Philippians 2:9-11). It is natural and understandable that when we read the words of Isaiah's prophecy, our thoughts should thus turn to the New Testament, for Isaiah was foreseeing the Christ of the New Testament. The Old Testament prophet and the New Testament apostle in writing of the Christ were both under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, and both gave expression to the same grand theme of the exaltation of Him Who is the only Redeemer of God's elect.

It is also understandable that some devout students of Isaiah should attempt in the three words which exhibit the Servant's exaltation a reference to the three stages in the exaltation of Christ, namely, His resurrection, His ascension and His session at the right hand of the Father on high. When our Lord came to earth, He was humbled, for He undertook to perform a work of deliverance and salvation. In order to do this, He was born of a woman, made under the law, died the cursed death of the Cross and was buried, continuing for a time under death's power. From this state of humiliation, however, He was gloriously exalted by God. On the third day, He rose from the dead; He then ascended to heaven and sits at the right hand of God the Father, whence on the last day He will come to judge the world. Hence, when Isaiah says "He will rise," there are those who believe that this is a very direct prophecy of the resurrection of Christ. When he says, "He will raise Himself," they would apply the thought to the ascension of Christ, and the phrase "He will be very high," since

it expresses a state rather than motion, is, they think, a clear reference to Christ's sitting at the Father's right hand. It is of course very appealing thus to apply the words. Yet we are probably not justified in so doing. The purpose of the prophet seems not to be to predict actual details in the course of Christ's suffering and exaltation, but rather to set forth a picture of the suffering Servant as such. It is better therefore to understand the prophet's use of the three verbs as stressing most forcefully the complete and utter exaltation which would come to the Servant.

With this introductory verse we are prepared for the stupendous message to follow. The Servant is to perform a task, we have been told, and He is to perform it well. As a result of His excellent performance He is to be exalted most highly. The last words of the verso ring in the ears, "He will be very high." The exaltation is not to be accomplished temporarily. He is not to be lifted up on high and then forgotten. Rather, having been exalted, He shall continue so to be. The three statements of this exaltation thus serve well to impress it upon the mind. What then is this labor which the Servant will perform, that He is so highly to be lifted up?

As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men.

When we read the fourteenth verse, we immediately make the discovery that Isaiah delights to deal in contrasts. From the remarkable statement of the Servant's exaltation, we are plunged at once into a contemplation of the deep degradation that came upon Him. And from this there appears the reason for the clear statement of the exaltation. It is necessary that this exaltation should be so clearly and force-

fully presented, since we are now called upon to consider the Servant's sufferings. As we look upon these sufferings, we might easily forget, since they are so severe, that they are not to destroy the Servant. We might easily think that He would be overcome by them, and so forget that ultimately He would triumph and be exalted on high. Hence, we need verse thirteen and its comforting message of the ultimate glory of the Servant, so that when, through the words of the prophet, we consider the woes that came upon the Servant, we do not forget that death could not hold Him.

To turn our eyes towards the Servant's suffering, the prophet addresses the Sufferer directly, but this address at once falls into an objective tone. "Even as many were astonished at Thee," the prophet writes, and then inserts a parenthetical statement which explains why many were astonished, namely, "so was His appearance disfigurement from men and His form from the sons of men." When we find a sentence that begins with the words "even as," we naturally expect the sentence to be completed with words such as "so also" or the like. Here, however, these words do not appear, but the thought itself which such words usually introduce, does occur. The sentence which Isaiah writes is grammatically quite difficult, and very devout students of the Bible have differed as to how it should be understood.

There are doubtless many people who do not see the need of introducing grammatical points in a devotional study of the Bible. Grammar, they would probably say, is tedious and uninteresting. Cannot we simply read the Bible, and, apart from all grammatical considerations, let its message flow into our hearts to bless us? The answer to questions such as these, however, is that the message of the Bible cannot bring blessing to us, unless we first understand what the message of the Bible is. And to understand what the message of the Bible is, we must study grammar. This applies not only to the theologian, but to all who would study the Bible. If we are to understand God's Holy Word, we must be prepared to work; we must read with

care, and we must carefully consider what God has so graciously revealed to us. We must, in other words, study just as we studied when we were at school.

Let us then look at the verses before us. We shall arrive at the prophet's meaning more easily if we diagram the passage somewhat as follows.

1. Even as many were astonished at Thee
 Parenthesis (so was His appearance disfigure-
 ment from men and His form from
 the sons of men)
 Second parenthesis (So shall He sprinkle many
 explanatory of the nations)
 first
2. Kings shall shut their mouths at Him, etc.

Thus the great contrast expressed in the verse appears to be between the astonishment of the many and the attitude of the kings in shutting their mouths before the Servant. Corresponding therefore to the astonishment, which the many exhibited when they beheld Him is the reverential awe displayed by the kings in the shutting of their mouths, a reverential awe occasioned by the Sufferer's atoning work. At one time the many beheld the Sufferer and were astonished at Him. Just as truly as this was the case will the kings, upon hearing of His atoning work, show a true awe before Him. Such is the great contrast which the prophet brings out.

It is necessary to consider, however, why Isaiah says that many were astonished at the Sufferer. The answer is given in the first parenthesis. The Sufferer was so disfigured in His appearance, that He hardly looked like a man. The reason for the astonishment, therefore, is to be found in the appearance of the Sufferer. A second parenthetical statement is then made, which serves to explain the first, since it indicates that while the Sufferer was indeed disfigured, yet as a disfigured One He makes an atonement by sprinkling many nations.

By way of summary we may thus expound the thought. "Many were astonished at Thee, and the reason why they were thus astonished is that the Sufferer appeared to them so disfigured that He no longer resembled a man. While He was thus disfigured, however, He sprinkles many nations and thus performs a work of atonement. Because of this kings will shut their mouths, just as formerly many had looked on in astonishment." The thought contained in the verse is difficult to set forth, but perhaps this paraphrase will help the reader to grasp the wondrous message which the prophet has written.

With this mere summary of the verse, however, we cannot rest. It is necessary to consider more carefully the force of Isaiah's strange words. When he states that many were astonished, he uses a word that suggests disconcertment which has been brought about by a disturbing and paralyzing astonishment. Those who beheld were appalled or awestruck, because they believed that the terrible disfigurement which had come upon the Servant was due to Divine chastisement.

The same word is used by the prophet Ezekiel when addressing Tyre. In picturing the time when the city will be "broken by the seas in the depth of the waters" the prophet goes on to say, "All the inhabitants of the isles shall be astonished at Thee, and their kings shall be sore afraid, they shall be troubled in their countenance" (Ezekiel 27:35). It is a grim picture that Ezekiel paints. The inhabitants of the isles will look upon the once proud Tyre and will be struck with awe, for they realize that God's punishing hand had visited the city.

Thus it is that many regarded the Servant. They believed that He too was the object of God's punishing hand, for His appearance was not like that of a man. That which might be seen of Him, namely, His appearance, was *disfigurement*. What a graphic way of saying that His appearance was disfigured! To such an extent was this the case that He no longer appeared as a man, nor did His form resemble that of men. Is it any wonder that those who beheld Him thus regarded Him as suffering a Divine chastise-

ment? Surely God must have punished Him, they would have reasoned, since His appearance was so disfigured.

So shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at Him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider.

As a matter of actual fact, those who were thus astonished at Him were wrong in their judgment. There was indeed a reason for His being disfigured, but that reason is not to be found in His being a sinner punished by God. Rather, as One who is disfigured, He Himself does something for others, in that He sprinkles many nations. The word "so" indicates that while He is thus disfigured, He will sprinkle the nations. While the Servant is so horribly disfigured He is, in other words, to perform a purifying rite. His disfigurement, therefore, was mistakenly regarded by the many as a chastisement for sin; it was, as a matter of fact, not such a chastisement, but rather the condition in which He would bring cleansing to the nations.

A technical word, which also occurs in the Mosaic law for the sprinkling of water, oil or blood as a cleansing or purifying rite, is here used. In order to understand the force of this word, we may note some of its occurrences in other passages.

WATER

And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times (Leviticus 14:7a).

BLOOD

And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the LORD, before the veil of the sanctuary (Leviticus 4:6).

OIL

And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all his vessels, both the laver and his foot, to sanctify them (Leviticus 8:11).

From these verses it becomes evident that the one who did the sprinkling was performing a purifying, cleansing rite. He was a priest, and it is as a priest that the work of the Servant in the prophecy of Isaiah is also set forth. He who was regarded as utterly unclean and Himself in great need of purification will rather as a priest Himself sprinkle water and blood and so purify many nations. And this He will do as a Sufferer, as One who is so afflicted by His sufferings that He no longer resembles a man. His sufferings, therefore, are for the sake of expiatory purification, and they thus produce a profound change in the attitude of those who behold Him.

The interpretation of these remarkable words which has just been set forth is one which by no means finds universal acceptance. There are many students of the Bible who would say that we have completely misunderstood the meaning of the prophet when we assume that he here pictures the Servant as an expiatory Sufferer. Those who object to this interpretation which we so profoundly believe to be correct may themselves be divided into two classes. On the one hand some objectors tell us that the text of the Hebrew Bible at this point is corrupt. The word which we have translated "He will sprinkle," they say, should be changed. Some other word, they maintain, originally stood here, and the text as we now have it is therefore incorrect. If, however, the text as we now have it is incorrect, what was the original text? To this question many answers have been given. Some say that the text originally had a word which should be translated "He will cause to leap for joy." Not all agree, however, and so they have made still other proposals. Consequently, we are told that the translation should be, "they will spring up," "they will do obeisance," "they will wonder," "they will be amazed,"

"he will shine," and so on. Those who believe that the Hebrew at this point is incorrect have not, therefore, been able to come to agreement as to precisely what in their opinion the text did say.

A new factor, however, has now been injected into the situation. Readers of the Bible have been interested in the discovery of a very old manuscript of the book of Isaiah which has been found in Palestine within recent years. This manuscript has been made the subject of very exhaustive study. Scholars are not all in agreement as to its date, but there seems to be no question but that it is the oldest extant copy of any book of the Bible. Possibly the manuscript comes from about the time of Christ. It is, at any rate, very old, and one of the remarkable and interesting characteristics of it is the way in which it supports the accuracy of the Hebrew text of the Bible. It is particularly interesting to note that it also supports the translation "he will sprinkle," for which we have been contending. In the present writer's opinion this is indeed strong evidence for accuracy of the Hebrew text.

We cannot, therefore, give heed to those who think that the words of the Bible at this point should be changed. The text, as it stands, is perfectly correct. A new question, however, now arises. There are scholars who will be in perfect agreement with us in refusing to see a need for changing the text. At the same time they do not want to translate as we have done, namely, "He will sprinkle." The word which we have thus translated, they say, should be rendered in some other way. It has, we are told, an entirely different meaning. It should be "he will cause to spring up" and not "he will sprinkle." With this position, however, we cannot bring ourselves into agreement. For our part, we are convinced that the traditional rendering is the correct one. This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion of the question, but, suffice it to say, the traditional rendering has much in its favor, and is far more satisfactory than any of the substitutes which have been proposed. The Servant is set forth here as One who performs the work of a priest. He who was regarded as ut-

terly unclean and in great need of purification will rather as a priest Himself sprinkle water and blood and so purify many nations. His sufferings, therefore, are for the sake of expiatory purification, and they thus produce a profound change in the attitude of those who behold Him.

With this statement, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," we have reached the heart of the message concerning the .Servant. This is the work which He is to do prudently, and as a result of which He will be highly exalted. In the fifty-third chapter the prophet enlarges upon what he has here stated so succinctly. However, it was necessary that even in the Introduction to the prophecy we should be told what it is that the Servant is to accomplish. Even from these few words we can see why the prophet would assure us of the successful outcome of the Servant's work. He who is to be most greatly exalted was once subject to the most abject degradation. His sufferings brought down upon Him the reviling and the rejection of men. Yet thus He performed an expiatory work which has brought the sinner into right relation with God. The priest in Moses' day sprinkled water or blood in order to effect purification. In this verse we are not told what it is that the Servant as a priest is to sprinkle. In chapter fifty-three, however, the prophet is not entirely silent upon the matter. There he makes it clear that the life of the Servant is to be given, which means that His blood must be shed. So it is that atonement is wrought. "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Hebrews 9:22).

The Servant is to sprinkle many nations. The benefits of His work are thus not to apply to all but to the many nations. The work is a successful one, for on account of Him even kings will close their mouths. Possibly these kings who are so overcome at the news of His saving work are representatives of the nations which are to experience the blessings of the Servant's expiatory suffering. The nations are blessed, and their kings are to such an extent amazed and overpowered at the unusual exaltation of One whose degradation had been so great, that involuntarily they shut their mouths. It is a case of speechless astonishment, of

being struck completely dumb by the news that the Sufferer has atoned for their sin and has been highly exalted by God.

The thought is well illustrated by a passage in the book of Job. In Job 29:9, 10 we read: "The princes refrained talking, And laid their hand upon their mouth: The nobles held their peace. And their tongue cleaved to the roof of their mouth." From these words, which describe how the princes used to act when they saw Job, it becomes clear that the speechlessness of the kings is a sign of awe and honor. It is just that which will happen to the Servant. He will be honored. He whom men once despised and rejected, since they mistakenly believed that He was being punished for His sins, will be honored and revered by the kings.

There is a reason for this attitude on the part of the kings in that the message concerning the Servant is utterly new. "For that which had not been told to them have they seen, and that which they had not heard have they perceived." This concept of the absolute novelty of the future salvation of the Lord appears elsewhere also in Isaiah, "And from eternity have they not heard, they have not given ear, eye hath not seen, a God apart from Thee; (who) will do for him that waiteth for him" (Isaiah 64:4). The Apostle Paul applies this prophecy to the Gospel itself, "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him" (I Corinthians 2:9). These words are very often applied to the blessings which shall be ours in heaven. If, however, we note carefully the context in which they occur, we shall see that Paul is talking about the wisdom of God. If the princes of this world had known that hidden wisdom of God, so runs Paul's argument, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. Yet, those things which the princes of this world have not known, God has revealed unto us by His Spirit (I Corinthians 2:10).

It is well to consider the absolute newness of this glorious message, for the blessed story of the suffering and death of

the Servant is such a message as has never entered the heart of men. To make this assertion does not imply that, because men have never themselves devised such a message, they are therefore not religious. They are indeed religious, for they have been created in the image of God, and they have within them a sense of His being. They must, therefore, give some expression to this sense of deity, and this they do in different ways. Men are indeed religious, but mere religion, such as proceeds from the heart of sinful man, will not meet the needs of lost humanity. The religions which men devise all have one thing in common. All, however much they may differ in some respects, agree in teaching that man can save himself. To the question "What shall I do to be saved?" religions which are merely of human origin reply with one voice, "Work out your salvation, buy your salvation; merit it; earn it; struggle for it. You can save yourself." Man is not original, and religion after religion repeats itself. The Bible, however, is quite different. In answer to the question "What shall I do to be saved?" the Bible says in effect, "You cannot save yourself, you need to be saved by Another, even Jesus Christ." There is no comfort in being told that we must save ourselves, for we are under the dominion of sin and slaves to it. We cannot save ourselves. The Gospel, however, tells us that we have been saved by Christ, and that is news indeed.

"The kings will shut their mouths at Him," and so indeed will all who hear of the blessed thing that He did for them when He bore their griefs and carried their sorrows. This message is one which had never been before told nor heard. When, however, a man does see and perceive, then speechless astonishment must result. Those who remain indifferent to this message are those who have never seen nor perceived; their hearts are heavy and their ears dull of hearing.

Thus, in three short verses Isaiah has given a brief survey and summary of the grand theme which is to be developed in the fifty-third chapter. It is necessary that we should have this Introduction. It is necessary that we should become acquainted at the outset with the fact that

the Servant will be raised to the highest of exaltation and that the sufferings which He endured were not inflicted because of His own sins but rather were for the healing of the nations. Had we not known this, we too, like the many, might have been astonished at Him; we too might have regarded Him as having justly suffered chastisement. From falling into this grievous error, however, we have been prevented by the introductory words of this remarkable passage.

GOLGOTHA

Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the LORD revealed?

The body of the passage begins with Isaiah himself taking over the word which the Lord had spoken, so that his first utterance is really an echo of the Lord's last expression. The words "our report" remind one of the expression "they had heard" of verse fifteen, and in the original they sound somewhat alike. We may thus represent them: SHAM'U (they had heard) and SHMUATHEYNU (our report). Thus the words of God, "and that which they had not heard," prepare for the question "Who hath believed our report?" It is with this question that the prophet, speaking not only for himself, but also as the representative of his people, begins.

It is an interesting question. Isaiah asks it, not because he thinks that none have believed, but in order to call attention to the paucity of true believers in the world at large. The message which he had proclaimed concerning the Servant and His fortunes is a strange one. The kings who heard it believed, but in thus believing" not all followed them. Most men have paid no attention to the message. Few indeed are they who have believed. It is a question which is asked not only by the prophet but by all who preach the Word of God in sincerity and truth. The message concerning the Servant is so clear and convincing that one wonders why anyone who hears it refuses to believe.

Yet men do refuse to believe. Sometimes, it is true, they seem not to neglect the message altogether. Sometimes, on the other hand, they are ready to despise it. Some dismiss it with an opprobium. They label it "medieval theology." It may once have been helpful, they assert, but in

this day of materialism, we cannot go back to once-held theories of the atonement. Most, however, pay no attention to the message. The churches are empty because people are not interested. Very few really care about the death of the Servant. There are more "practical" matters to occupy their attention. In the churches themselves there is too much time devoted to the putting across of a program, and men are not concerned with theology. In the world at large, Christ is not needed. "Who hath believed our report?" It is a question tinged with sadness. The "practical" modern world deems irrelevant and unimportant that which is its only hope. It will not hear; it will not believe.

This question of Isaiah's has been subjected to many • strange interpretations. Some have thought that the speaker was the heathen nations who by asking this question were confessing their error with respect to the sufferings of Israel. Israel the nation, so runs this interpretation, had suffered in that she was taken captive into exile. The nations round about her had misunderstood this event. They had thought that Israel was thus being punished for her own sins, but now they come to realize that she had suffered on behalf of others. This view of the question is not held widely at present. Indeed, it has been largely abandoned. It supposes that the Servant is not a person but a nation, and this supposition is more and more being shown to be incorrect. Other interpreters have believed that the speaker was the nation Israel herself. There are also weighty objections to this view. The speaker, we believe, is not the heathen nations nor the nation Israel, but the prophet himself. No doubt he speaks in the name of his people as their representative, but it is he, and possibly other prophets also, who declared the message about the Servant, who ask the question with which this chapter begins.

What is meant, however, by the phrase "our report"? In itself, the words can mean either "the report about us" or "the report which we have received" or "the report which we proclaim." There is only one way in which we

can determine which of these views is correct. We must carefully examine the context in which the words are found, and this will serve as a most helpful guide. There have been, of course, differences of opinion as to how these words are to be taken. One very fine student of Isaiah has adopted the view that we should accept the second interpretation. According to him, the phrase is designed to indicate the revelation which has come to the prophets and which had not been received among the people. Indeed, this interpretation is not without supporters. Some have thought that in this first verse, Israel is asking a question which really has reference to herself, as though to say, "We have heard about the sufferings of the Servant. He was in our midst and we did not recognize Him. The message about Him was preached to us. Yet, who among us believed the report which had come to us?"

This same type of interpretation has appeared in very recent days in connection with a different view of the whole passage. There are those who do not think that Isaiah fifty-three is a direct, special revelation of God to the prophet. Rather, they think, this remarkable chapter has its roots in ancient mythology. In the ancient Near East, we are told, the belief was widespread that the saviour-god died and rose and that the story of his death and resurrection was annually recited in the religious service of the people. Isaiah fifty-three, it is claimed, is an imitation of this traditional myth of the dying and rising saviour-god, and so the phrase "our report" really means "the tradition which we have received."

In the epistle to the Romans, however, Paul obviously understands the words as containing a reference to the message which was preached (Romans 10:16). One cannot believe, says Paul, unless there is a preacher, and one cannot preach unless he be sent. All, however, have not believed the Gospel, for faith cometh by hearing. In other words, unless a man hear the Gospel, he cannot believe.

That this interpretation of the inspired apostle is the correct one may be seen from the very context of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah itself. "Who hath believed our

report?" the prophet asks. With this he might have stopped, but to emphasize the point he continues expressing his thought in a slightly different form, "And the arm of the Lord, unto whom hath it been revealed?" If these two expressions are printed side by side, it will be noted that the second is parallel in thought with the first.

Who hath believed our report?	And the arm of the LORD, unto whom hath it been revealed?
----------------------------------	---

This phenomenon, in which the second member of the sentence parallels the first in thought is very common in the Hebrew language, and is known by the name *parallelism*. It occurs chiefly in poetry, but it is also found in the elevated prose which comprises so great a portion of the prophetic books. We can perhaps better understand the phenomenon if we consider one or two examples. Thus, the opening verse of Psalm forty-three reads:

Judge me, O God, and plead my cause against an ungodly nation;	O deliver me from the deceitful and unjust man.
--	---

In this verse it is evident that the second member expresses essentially the same thought as the first. As a further example we may note the first verse of Psalm forty-nine, in which the parallelism is very clear.

Hear this, all ye people;	give ear, all ye inhabitants of the world.
------------------------------	--

The second member of the verse, however, does not always repeat the thought of the first. At times it expresses the consequence of what is stated in the first member. Thus,

we read, "The Lord is my shepherd," and as a result of this fact, "I shall not want." Often the second, and even the third member of the verse, sustain an even different relationship to the first. Very interesting, therefore, and very instructive is the study of Hebrew parallelism. There is of course a reason for its widespread use in the Bible. The poetry of the Bible is not written merely for the enjoyment of man. It does indeed gladden the heart; it is beautiful poetry of the highest kind. Its purpose, however, is far greater than to satisfy man's esthetic sense. The poetry of the Bible was given to teach. It has a message to convey, and parallelism serves as a very suitable vehicle for presenting its message. There is a force and strength in the use of parallelism which impresses the message of the writer upon the reader and hearer. To state a fact once may indeed be helpful; to state it twice, and that in slightly different manner, is to make it far easier for the reader to retain the message.

It is this phenomenon with which we are confronted in the first verse of Isaiah fifty-three. The question "Who hath believed our report?" is in itself forceful and thought provoking. However, its force is greatly strengthened when we find the heart of the same idea expressed in different words, "And the arm of the Lord, unto whom hath it been revealed?" Here, under the cloak of different phraseology, the same message is repeated. Consequently, the revelation of the arm of the Lord and the believing of the prophet's report really constitute one and the same thought. Thus it becomes clear that the words "our report" really mean the report which we proclaim, and not the report which we have received. Parallelism, therefore, is often a very helpful and a very useful tool in ascertaining the correct shade of thought of the inspired writer of Scripture.

Thus, the report mentioned is that which we had caused others to hear, namely, our proclamation. Martin Luther was correct when he translated the word "our preaching."

The message concerning the suffering Servant, we thus learn, had not found ready response in the hearts of many listeners. There is comfort in these words for every true minister of the Word of God. It is often very discouraging to preach week after week and to see little in the way of result. The mass of men passes the church by, and even those who are most faithful in attendance are often indifferent to the true Gospel. The Church of the present day is perishing because of ignorance. Yet the true minister must remember that, despite these sad conditions, it is his duty to preach the Word of God. The results are not the work of the minister; they are the work of God. God's Spirit may not work as often as we sometimes might wish, but God's Spirit does work. Who hath believed our report? we may ask. The Word of God never goes forth in vain nor returns void. There are results, and, although we may not always know of them, there are those who believe our report.

In the Bible the arm is used for the figure of active strength, and in the present passage it appears as a synonym for strength itself. So Jeremiah declares, "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed is the man who trusts in mankind, and who makes flesh his arm, and from the Lord he turns his heart" (17:5). The revelation of the arm of the Lord upon a person, in other words, is a revelation of power, and since this question is parallel in meaning with the first, it therefore follows that to believe the report which has been proclaimed is evidence that God's power has been revealed. If one believes the message concerning the Servant, he does so only because God has given him the strength to do so. Every believer is a manifestation of the fact that the arm of the Lord has been revealed upon him.

The words of the prophet are of supreme importance for the minister of the present day. All too often we who preach the Gospel are prone to forget that the sinner in his

own strength cannot believe the Gospel. Since he is dead in trespasses and sins, he is unable of himself to come to God. It is very wrong, therefore, when we preach, to give the sinner the impression that he is able to save himself. Sometimes we do this through carelessness; sometimes through ignorance. How often one hears proclaimed that Christ cannot save a man unless that man wants to be saved! How often it is declared that God has done all that He can to save the sinner, and now it is up to the man himself. God can do no more, we hear it said, and unless a man believes, he will be lost. How erroneous such statements are! How far removed from the teaching of Isaiah! Unlike many modern ministers, Isaiah did not say that a man had the strength to believe. Far from it; if a man believed, according to Isaiah, it was evidence that the power of the Lord had come upon him.

It should of course be perfectly clear to any reader of the Scriptures that lack of ability to believe the Gospel does not in any respect lessen one's responsibility to believe. The widespread doctrine that ability limits obligation is a very pernicious one, and it is not taught in the Bible. If, according to the Bible, man does not believe, he thereby sins against God and will be held accountable. On the other hand, unless the sovereign Spirit of God is revealed upon a man, he cannot believe. This may seem to be a contradiction. Yet it is not a contradiction, but a mystery that our finite minds cannot solve, for God in His great wisdom has not seen fit to reveal to us its answer. We who know the power of God in salvation, however, know how true the Scripture is, when it speaks of our lost condition, and we should ever be filled with praise that in His wondrous good pleasure God has seen fit to send His Spirit unto our hearts and to give us the ability to come to Christ. We who thus have received of His goodness in salvation should ever pray that He will send His Spirit to convict the hearts of many sinners. One thing surely we know; faith in Christ is not the work of unaided man; it

is the blessed gift of the Spirit of God. Had He not come to us, we should yet be in our sins.

For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.

The utterance of astonishment at the paucity of true believers expressed in verse one prepares the way for a description of the Servant's course of life. We may understand the relation between verses one and two by a paraphrase of the thought. "Few indeed were they who believed our proclamation and only upon a few did the Lord's power manifest itself. And so He Himself appeared among us. In connection with our great lack of belief He lived His life in our midst."

The common translation of this verse begins, "For he shall grow up before him, etc." In the original, however, the past tense is used. "And he came up before him," and this usage of the past immediately poses a problem. If the description is in the past; if, in other words, the Servant has already lived upon this earth, are we then correct in applying the passage to Jesus Christ? And was the evangelist Philip correct in so applying the passage? There are some who very frankly and candidly say that we are not correct in so doing. The verbs are in the past tense, they say, and consequently the prophet is not describing one who is still to come in the future, but rather one who has already come. To find the identity of the Servant, therefore, they believe that we must look for someone who has already lived. This, however, is not easy to do, and those who think that the prophet, whether he be Isaiah or someone who lived long after Isaiah's time at the period of the

Babylonian exile, was speaking of an individual who lived in the past, have had a difficult time in making the identification. Of whom was the prophet speaking? Was it Moses, Job or Jeremiah? Name any historical character, and as soon as one compares him with what is described in this chapter difficulty upon difficulty arises. The fact is, that if the Servant is an individual who lived before the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah was written, we do not know who that individual was.

A careful study of the use of the tenses in this chapter adds another difficulty to the position that the Servant was someone who had already lived at the time the chapter was written. If we consider again the Introduction to the passage, we note that the setting is placed in the future. "Behold, my Servant *shall deal* prudently, he *shall be* exalted and extolled and *be* very high. . . . So *shall he sprinkle* many nations; the kings *shall shut* their mouths at him. . ." In these words of the Introduction the Servant is presented as One who is yet to come. He has not yet appeared upon the scene of history; He has not yet performed His expiatory work; rather, He is to do so in the future.

Likewise, the Conclusion to this passage strikes the same note. " . . .when thou *shalt make* his soul an offering for sin, he *shall see* his seed, he *shall prolong* his days, and the pleasure of the Lord *shall prosper* in his hand. He *shall see* of the travail of his soul, and *shall be* satisfied; by his knowledge *shall* my righteous servant *justify* many; for he *shall bear* their iniquities. Therefore *will I divide* him a portion with the great, and he *shall divide* the spoil with the strong" It is obvious, then, that both in the Introduction and Conclusion the setting is placed in the future. In the body of the passage, on the other hand, it is placed in the past. Hence, we may illustrate the arrangement of the entire passage as follows.

Introduction 52:13-15	FUTURE
Body 53:1-10a	PAST
Conclusion 53 :10h-12	FUTURE

This arrangement is clear, and greatly facilitates the understanding of the prophecy. It sets in central focus the question how the past tenses of the Body of the passage are to be interpreted. We can, of course, say that the Body of the prophecy has no relation either to the Introduction or to the Conclusion. If, however, we adopt such an expedient, we really take away from the section any true meaning at all. There is a far better and sounder way of regarding the question. It is to allow the Introduction and the Conclusion to set the time in which the action is to take place. According to them the action is to take place in the future. Hence, we must regard the Body of the passage as also referring to the future.

Is it, however, possible to do this? What warrant is there for interpreting the phrase "and he came up" as having reference not to the past, but to the future? In answer to this question we may draw attention to a common phenomenon of the prophetic language, known as the prophetic perfect. When the inspired prophet looked into the future, he saw so clearly the message which he predicted that it was to him as though it had already taken place. Hence, instead of describing his prophecy with the future tense of the verb, he used the past. An example will make this very clear. The well known prophecy of the Messiah given in Isaiah nine should be translated literally as follows.

For a child *has been born* to us,
A son *has been given* to us;
And the government *has been* upon his shoulder,
And his name *was called*, etc.

It is perfectly clear that the Divine Child of whom the prophet speaks had not yet been born. His birth was to be in the future. So certain, however, is the birth to the prophet that he describes it as though it had already taken place. !

It is this same phenomenon which occurs in the body of Isaiah fifty-three. The well known King James' version of

the Bible, therefore, is really not incorrect in translating "For he shall grow up before him." This translation at least has the merit of bringing out the true meaning of the prophet's words. For it would be a grave mistake to think that Isaiah was describing someone who had already lived. As has earlier been indicated, there have been those who have tried to avoid the conclusion to which we have come with respect to the time of the fulfillment of the prophecy. They feel sure that the time of the action has already passed, and the prophet is talking of someone who has already lived. What, then, we would ask such interpreters, is to be done with the clear reference to the future in both Introduction and Conclusion?

There is a further point which must be called to mind. The Servant of the Lord Who is mentioned in Isaiah fifty-three appears for the first time in the book of Isaiah in the forty-second chapter. It will be well to consider the introductory words of that chapter. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles." Here again the work of the Servant is set in the future. Now it should be noted that there is a certain progression of thought from Isaiah forty-two to Isaiah fifty-three. In other words, Isaiah fifty-three describes something which occurs after that described in chapter forty-two. In Isaiah forty-two the appearance and work of the Servant are yet future. And even future to that is the description of chapter fifty-three. Hence, there would seem to be no doubt at all but that the prophet would have us understand the work of the Servant as from his point of view in the future.

As we proceed to examine more carefully this verse, we may note that it gives a reason why so few have believed the preaching concerning the exaltation of the Servant from His deep degradation. This reason is to be found in the fact that the Servant's entire course of life was one of humiliation. And this second verse serves also to give a general statement of that humiliation.

In the first place, it seems best to understand the passage as teaching that the Servant's life was lived entirely before God. The sentence "and he came up before him" has reference, we think, to the life of the Servant before God. The phrase "before him" most naturally refers to God, and thus at the outset it is made clear that the coming up, i. e., the course of life, which was of no account before men, nevertheless was in the keeping of Jehovah. One is reminded of the words of Peter, ". . . disallowed of men, but chosen of God and precious" (I Peter 2:4).

The One therefore whom men rejected and despised was One who lived His life in the presence of God. His life was in no sense an accident or chance happening. He lived rather before God, whose all-controlling hand guided His every step. Men may have rejected Him, but God was ever present with Him.

At the same time, although His life was lived before God, He came up as a suckling. The words "and he came up" really have reference to His entire course of life. He lived before God, and yet as a suckling, which is but a tender twig deriving its nourishment from the trunk of the tree. That they may not drain away the life of the tree, men pluck off such sucklings. In other words, to preserve the tree, the suckling is destroyed. In the eyes of men the suckling is of no value, and must be plucked off to spare the tree. Thus it was that men considered Him. He was like one of these sucklings in their eyes, of no value and of no moment.

He is also compared with a root which comes from a dry ground, and in this comparison there appears to be a reference to or a clear remembrance of the earlier prophecy, "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit" (Isaiah 11:1). In the dry ground the root must struggle with difficulty for its existence. A dry ground does not appear to be a promising soil for growth. Yet He appears as a root which has come from dry ground. This description is particularly appropriate as a designation of the lowly con-

ditions among which the Saviour was to make His earthly appearance.

There have been many interesting interpretations of the words, "dry ground." They have been applied to Bethlehem, to the Virgin Mary, and to the condition of the people when Christ was born. But it seems best to regard them merely as serving to complete the figure, and so further to emphasize the lowly and humble beginning of the Servant's life. As a root which grows in a dry, parched ground must struggle to keep itself alive, so was His first appearance upon earth. It was not grand. Men would not compare Him with the tall and honorable trees such as the cedars of Lebanon (cf. Amos 2:9) but rather with the weak and feeble root which, in a desert ground, must strive vigorously to preserve its life.

In appearance there was nothing attractive about the Servant. The splendid physique which might characterize others was lacking in Him. It had been reported to Saul that David was a "man of form," by which was meant a man of handsome form, a comely person. Of the Servant, however, Isaiah says, "He has no form." Nor does He have beauty or glory of appearance. Hence, we look at Him, but there is no appearance which would cause us to desire Him.

There is a very old interpretation of this passage which we should now consider. It would arrange the thought as follows.

There is no form nor comeliness that we should see Him, And there is no appearance that we should desire Him.

It is true that this arrangement does give a certain regularity to the structure of the verse. However, it seems better to understand the passage in the sense in which we have taken it. The Servant, we are told, has no form nor

comeliness. Next follows the statement, "And we behold Him, and there is no appearance that we should desire Him." In other words, the verse teaches that when men look at the Servant they do not see that which would draw them to Him. There was nothing in His appearance, to attract or delight the senses of mankind.

There are those who would seek to derive from this verse an idea of the physical appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ. In our opinion, however, such a procedure is entirely unwarranted. The four Gospels tell us not a word as to the physical appearance of the Saviour. The present passage of Isaiah likewise is not intended to present a picture of the physical characteristics of Christ. Rather, its intention is to show that the appearance of the Servant among men was not such as to attract their admiration. What the Servant accomplished for men, He did not accomplish by those things which are important in human sight. People beheld Him living a life of humiliation and suffering, and so they completely misunderstood the purpose of that life. Men judge according to the outward appearance, and hence do not understand. God grant that we who read this prophecy may not misjudge the Servant. God grant that we may not look for might and power when God has decreed to work our salvation by another means. God grant also that we may realize that the humiliation and suffering which seemed so repulsive to men were undergone on our behalf.

He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

With verse three the prophet begins to set forth in more detailed fashion the humiliation of the Servant. When

speaking of this humiliation in verse two he had merely made a general statement and he had also used negative terms. He had asserted that there was no form and no glory and appearance. In other words, he had mentioned those qualities, the presence of which seems to be desirable to attract the attention and respect of men. These characteristics the Servant did not have. Comeliness, beauty, appearance — these were not His. There were certain things, however, which were His, and were His in a very large measure. It is the purpose of the third verse to state what these were.

Not only did the Servant lack that outward form which would attract men, but He rather was actually despised by them. They did indeed react to Him. They did not ignore Him, for none can ignore Him, but in their sight He was despised. This word sets the keynote for the following description, and is again introduced in the verse when the prophet says "He was despised and we esteemed Him not." With this statement Isaiah begins a series of predicates in the form of disconnected phrases or words, the subject in the original not being expressed. This striking arrangement of the verse may be illustrated as follows, although the parentheses are not actually found in the original as separate words.

(He)	(is)	DESPISED
		REJECTED OF MEN
		A MAN OF SORROWS
		ACQUAINTED WITH GRIEF

One by one, these statements concerning the Servant's degradation are, as predicates, thus forcefully brought to the reader's attention.

DESPISED. This is the first characteristic which is mentioned. Men did not accept the Servant, but rather poured upon Him their scorn and contempt. Included in the word is the thought of rejection. Thus the Scripture speaks of Esau as having despised his birthright (Genesis

25:34). The word well sums up the attitude which men have entertained toward the Servant. When confronted with the question of His suffering, men have rejected Him. Thus, by their rejection, they have despised Him. It should be noted that as a matter of fact one cannot actually be neutral in his attitude toward the Sufferer. He will either rejoice in His salvation and esteem Him, or he will reject Him and thus despise Him. For this reason it is well to take these words to heart. We today who have no room for Him in our hearts, who are too busy to read the Bible, to pray, to worship God in His house, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ — we also despise Him. It is sometimes said that men are indifferent to Christ. In reality, however, men cannot be indifferent to Christ. There is no such thing as indifference to Jesus Christ. He who seems to be indifferent is in reality hostile; he has despised the Lord of Glory in his heart.

REJECTED OF MEN. This phrase has occasioned much discussion as to its proper meaning. By some it has been understood in the sense "the ending one among men," "the one who takes the last place." It is better, however, to follow the common rendering, and to consider the word as passive in force. The Servant is thus set forth as One from whom men withdraw their favor and esteem. In the opinion and regard of men He finds no place. They would wash their hands of Him and have nothing to do with Him.

This statement may well give pause for thought. The world rejects the Servant, but in so doing the world at the same time characterizes itself. The suffering of the Servant was for the salvation and deliverance of man. Indeed, the only hope that man has lies in that which the Servant did. Man however does not recognize the true meaning of the Servant's work, and so rejects Him. This has been the history of the world's attitude toward the Saviour. He who has come to bring salvation is rejected by men.

A MAN OF SORROWS. It is necessary to stress the first word, a MAN. We have just read that the Servant is rejected of men, and now it is stated that He Himself is

a man. There is a play upon these words in the original which we may represent as follows. "Rejected of *men* (TSHIM) ; (TSTI) a *man* of sorrows." The two words come together in the Hebrew, and thus form a remarkable contrast. Although MEN hold off from Him, He is Himself a MAN. MEN—and the word probably has reference to the better class of men — reject the MAN. He is indeed a man, but He is a man of sorrows. That is, His chief characteristic is to be found in His sorrows. The distinction of His entire life lay in His steadfast endurance of pain and grief.

ACQUAINTED WITH GRIEF. The Servant, for such is the actual meaning of the original, is also One that is acquainted with sickness. This statement is not to be understood in the sense that He is made known to others, or distinguished in the sight of others by His sicknesses. It means rather that He Himself has been made to know sicknesses, and so we may correctly translate "acquainted with sickness." It would be a serious mistake, however, to regard this phrase as implying that He was sickly in body and so fell prey to one disease after another. The word "sickness" is but a metaphor to describe sin. Isaiah had earlier set forth the sinful condition of Judah in terms of physical sickness, ". . .the whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores; they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment" (Isaiah 1:5b, 6). That the word sickness is used in this sense here is clear from the fact that the deliverance to be accomplished is not from physical sorrows and sicknesses (at least not primarily) but rather from the source whence such sicknesses flow; namely, sin.

In the latter half of this verse the prophet graphically states the manner in which we have rejected the Servant. The phrase commonly translated "and we hid as it were our faces from him" accurately represents the original, although the original is quite difficult to interpret. If we

were to translate literally, we should render "and as a hiding of faces from him." On the other hand the phrase could equally well be rendered "and as a hiding of faces from us." In the Hebrew language the one word *mimmenu* can be translated either "from him" or "from us." Hence some students of the Bible have thought that the prophet was speaking here of the Servant's action and so have preferred to consider the words as though they spoke of the Servant hiding His face in shame from those who beheld Him. The thought upon this translation is that as men approached the Servant, He, a man of sorrows, turned His face from them so that they would not behold Him. In addition to other difficulties which this view involves, however, we may note that it is not the conduct of the Sufferer which receives the principal emphasis in this verse, but rather the reaction which His appearance produced in the hearts of those who saw Him. We who saw Him, since He was covered, as it were, with griefs and sicknesses, found Him so revolting and repulsive to look upon, that we covered our faces in order that we might not be forced to witness such a sight. It was impossible for us to endure the sight of Him.

The verse reaches its climax in the repetition of the statement, "He was despised," and this is followed by the words, "and we did not esteem Him." It is a forceful repetition. It removes all doubt as to the situation. Men despised Him, and we reckoned Him as nothing and as of no value.

Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

It is with somewhat of a shock that we read verse four. When a man has been greatly marred and disfigured, and

when that marring is viewed by those who behold it as a punishment from God, it is perhaps understandable that they would turn away from the revolting sight in disgust. Thus it was that those who saw Him reacted toward the Servant. They looked upon Him as One punished by God. With verse four, however, an entirely new element enters into the picture. It is now stated that the griefs and sicknesses which the Sufferer bore were not His own but were ours. This new and startling thought is introduced most cogently by the use of an affirmative particle which is a very interesting word. At times it is employed in the Bible in what may be called an adversative way, so that it could be translated "but" or "yet," and there are some who would thus understand it at this point. There are some who think that the meaning of the passage is, "Though the Sufferer had been despised and rejected of men, yet He was really worthy of their confidence, for He suffered for them."

For our part, however, we cannot accept such a translation. It is much better, it seems to us, to take the particle in an affirmative sense as having the meaning of "truly, indeed, surely, of a certainty." Thus a certain element of grandeur is immediately introduced. Of a certainty it is He bore our griefs. He was without any question a man acquainted with sicknesses, but these sicknesses were not His own. That which made His appearance so revolting was something which belonged to us who beheld Him. The sicknesses were ours, but He had taken them upon Himself.

There is a striking contrast between "us" and "He" which is difficult to bring out in English, but perhaps the contrast may be appreciated if we render, "The sicknesses of US HE bore." This contrast between the One and the many brings to the fore the idea of substitution which characterizes the chapter. It is not only a numerical contrast, one and many, but more than that, it is a qualitative contrast. On the one hand there is the One who is righteous. On the other are the many who have no righteousness, but who do have sicknesses, griefs, transgressions and iniquities.

In the Gospel of Matthew (8:17) it is stated that Jesus "himself took our sicknesses and carried our diseases." And this reference is quite appropriate. For, in the present verse the prophet also includes the consequences of sin. At the same time, the two cannot be divorced. If a man possesses sicknesses, it is a sign that he is a sinner. Yet, as the fifth verse proves beyond question, the Sufferer delivered His people not only from the consequences of sin but also from sin itself.

The verbs which Isaiah uses imply more than a mere taking away of sicknesses. It is not as though the Prophet merely declares that the Servant shared our sufferings with us. It is far more than that. What the Prophet would have us understand is that the Servant took these sufferings which were ours and which we deserved to bear upon Himself as though they were His own. He bore them in His own Person in order that we might be delivered from them. They were indeed ours. They had rested upon us like a burden. He, however, took them from us so that they no longer remained upon us. If, however, He thus took upon Himself the suffering that we should have had to bear, it follows that He was acting in our stead. Instead of our bearing that suffering He bore it and thus He became our substitute.

As our substitute, since He was bearing the wrath occasioned by our sin, it is correct to say that He was expiating that sin. This thought must be developed in order that we may fully appreciate it. The Hebrew verb which is here employed means to bear the guilt of a person's sin. In Leviticus 5 :17b the same verb is used, ". . . though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity." To bear a person's iniquity means, of course, to bear the guilt brought on by that iniquity. In the nature of the case it must be so. Iniquity in itself is not something that can be borne. Iniquity, however, involves guilt and consequently liability to blameworthiness and to punishment. If a man breaks the law of God, that man may immediately be accused as a lawbreaker who may be justly blamed for his act and may" also be justly punished for that act. This is what

is meant by guilt. The guilty man is the man who may be blamed and who may be punished because he has broken the law. In other words, when Leviticus says, "he shall bear his iniquity," it means that he shall bear the punishment which is due because of his iniquity. Example after example of this usage could be presented, but the above suffices to make clear the prophet's emphasis. When Isaiah says that the Servant bears our sicknesses, he means that the punishment which is due to us because of those sicknesses falls upon the Servant instead of upon us.

There is a chiasmic order in the mention of sickness and sorrows. In verse three the sorrows were mentioned first and then the sicknesses. In verse four the order is reversed; the sicknesses are first mentioned and then the sorrows. The verb which we have translated "carry" suggests the bearing of a heavy burden. It would have been a suitable word to describe the condition of Christian in the allegory as he bore upon his back the weary burden of sin. It also stresses the idea of substitution. The sorrows, so the thought is, belonged to us. He however has taken them from us and bears them upon Himself. He is laden with them.

We, however, — and Isaiah gives the pronoun an adverbative force — completely misunderstood the reason for the Servant's suffering. Upon seeing Him laden with sicknesses and sorrows, we mistakenly thought that they were His own. We thought that He had been stricken with a loathsome disease by God from above. Isaiah employs a word which had been used in Genesis to describe the afflictions that God had imposed upon Pharaoh. "And the Lord *afflicted* Pharaoh with great *afflictions*" (Genesis 12:17a). Again in 2 Kings 15:52 we read, "And the Lord *afflicted* the king and he became leprous." The word that we have translated "stricken" is so strong that many have been led to conclude from it that the Servant is actually described as a leper. This view was held in ancient times, and appears in some of the early Greek translations of Isaiah which were made by the Jews. There was also a tradition among

the Jews that the Messiah was to be a leprous one. From time to time Gentile scholars have advanced the view that the Servant was a leper, and it is of course conceivable that the word does have reference to leprosy. However, this cannot be proven, and perhaps we are doing more justice to the original if we merely assume that it refers to the infliction of a hateful, loathesome, disgraceful disease, the precise character of which is not mentioned.

Furthermore, it is stated that the Servant is smitten of God. The word "smitten" is also used elsewhere of the infliction of disease. It is but additional evidence of the fact that those who saw the Sufferer were convinced that the sicknesses which characterized Him were the result of Divine chastisement.

Lastly, the prophet employs a word which expresses the idea of being afflicted or covered with sufferings. It is this word which gives the climax of the false opinion which men held concerning the Servant. Now, at last, the true state of the case is set forth, namely that the Servant, although characterized by griefs and sorrows, yet possesses sorrows which are not His but ours. We however, did not understand. We persisted in our thought that God was punishing Him and that the smiting which came upon Him was from God. The prophet does not yet state why we have misunderstood so completely the nature of the Servant's sufferings. For the time being he leaves that in abeyance. Thus, he brings into even greater relief the vastness of our error and our complete misjudging of the truth concerning the Servant.

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.

In verse five the true state of the case is presented. Because of its clear-cut statement of the substitutionary atone-

ment, it is a verse that is dear to every devout Christian heart. It begins with a glorious disjunction. The prophet has just set forth the erroneous view which men had held of the Servant. Now, however, he gives the real reason for the Servant's suffering; "but he . . .," and with these words we are introduced to this real reason. We, so the thought may be paraphrased, thought that God had smitten Him because of His sins, but the real reason why He was smitten is found in the fact that He was wounded for our transgressions. There is also a contrast between the "we" of verse four, and the "He" of verse five. It is as though Isaiah had said, *We* had esteemed Him smitten, whereas, as a matter of actual fact, *He* was wounded for our transgressions.

In such a striking manner the prophet introduces this matchless declaration of vicarious suffering. It is first stated that He was wounded. Perhaps we shall more closely approximate the original if we render, He was pierced through for our transgressions. The word employed is passive and implies that the Servant has received this calamity from without. While then, in itself the word may merely mean "pierced" or "wounded," its passive force seems to indicate that it applies to one who has been actually wounded and is now dead.

This piercing is said to have been for our transgressions. When, however, we assert that He was wounded for our transgressions, what we really mean is that He was wounded because of our transgressions. It was, in other words, our transgressions which caused Him to be pierced through. It may very well be asked how this could be. Why was it that the transgressions which we had committed should cause Him to be wounded? How can there possibly be a relationship between our having transgressed and His having been wounded?

To answer these questions aright we must first consider what Isaiah means by "transgression." If by his reference to our transgressions the prophet simply has in mind certain unfortunate errors which we have made, then it is indeed difficult to understand how there can be any true rela-

tionship between what we have done and what has come upon the Servant. If, also, the prophet merely has reference to the transgression of certain human laws or statutes, then again it is rather difficult to recognize any real connection. We have broken some human laws, let us suppose; why therefore is it necessary for the Servant to be wounded for our deliverance? If this is all that the writer has in mind, then we must confess that we do not think the passage makes very much sense. If we have broken some human laws, then we ourselves could pay the penalty, but it is rather difficult to see how the wounding of Another could satisfy the claims of the situation.

Suppose, however, that Isaiah is not talking about the transgression of mere human ordinances and statutes. Suppose, rather, that the old evangelical interpretation is after all correct, and that the prophet is speaking of the transgression of God's law. Immediately, the whole picture becomes filled with rich meaning. We are then transgressors, not merely of some law of human origin; we have transgressed, rather, the immutable law of the holy God. We stand therefore under His wrath and the curse of the law. From this situation there is no saving of oneself. Nothing within our power could even begin to satisfy for the sins that we have committed. Those sins demand eternal death. The blow, however, so our passage teaches, has not fallen upon us who transgressed; it has fallen, rather, upon the Servant. "Our transgressions" — we may thus paraphrase — "demanded wounding. Yet that wounding did not fall upon us; it fell upon Him. Because we transgressed, He, in order to deliver us from the consequences of our transgressions, was wounded for us,"

Likewise, the verse states that our iniquities caused Him to be crushed. We had transgressed, and therefore He was pierced; we had done iniquitously, and because of this, He was crushed. The thought is not that our iniquities, resting upon Him as a burden, thus crushed Him; but rather that, because of these iniquities, He was crushed. It is very important to note this distinction. It was not His sin and iniquity which crushed Him thus; it was our sin and iniquity

uity which crushed Him. In order that we who had sinned might be free from the penalty that would come upon us as a consequence of our sin, He took these sins upon Himself and was crushed and pierced. Thus, He made an atonement for us. He rendered satisfaction, so that the punishment which was due to us would no longer fall upon us.

There is a very important question to be decided if we are rightly to understand the meaning of these words. Does the verse describe something that came upon the Servant as He was alive, or does it rather have reference to that which took place in His death? The form of expression in these clauses seems to make it clear that the latter is the case. The two words chosen "pierced through" and "crushed" are among the strongest expressions found in the Hebrew language to denote a violent and a painful death. This cruel and painful death He underwent because He had taken our sins upon Himself to make an atonement for them.

It is next declared that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him. There are those who would translate the word as though it meant no more than "instruction given by words." It is of course perfectly true that at times the word may have this connotation. But the context precludes it here, for the reference is surely to One who *suffers*. We may best bring out the force of the original by translating, "the chastisement that procures our peace." We in other words were in need of peace. Since, however, we had transgressed God's law, we did not have peace. There awaited us, not peace, but a fearful onlooking of judgment. The consequences of our sin lay ahead of us. We therefore were deeply in need of peace. If, however, there was to be peace for us, there must, because of our sin, be chastisement. There was chastisement, indeed. This chastisement, however, by which our peace was procured, was not placed upon us but upon Him. In other words, by His bearing the chastisement which should have fallen upon us, our peace was procured.

The word "peace" signifies general well being. It includes more, however, than mere outward prosperity and harmony. It includes also peace in the heart, but above all peace with God. Of course, the word "peace" brings first to mind the thought of cessation and lack of war. In this instance, however, such a meaning is out of place. The situation described in Isaiah fifty-three is not that of men who were at war and who needed a military peace. If that were the case, it is difficult to see how the death of the Servant could have procured such a peace.

Likewise, if by the word "peace" we are to understand merely material prosperity and well being, it is again difficult to perceive why the death of the Servant was necessary to obtain such peace. The very fact that peace must be obtained by so unusual a method, even the vicarious death of the Servant, is in itself evidence that the peace to be procured is far more than cessation of hostilities or material prosperity. Correctly to understand the meaning of the word, we must first consider how sin and transgression could preclude peace. When we do that we come face to face with the right understanding of the prophet. Then we begin to understand that the transgressions which we had committed had placed us in a hostile relationship with God. It was He, the Holy One, whose pure and just law we had offended, and hence He must punish us. What we needed above all else was to come into a right relationship with Him whom we had offended. We needed to be right with God. Our transgressions, however, made this impossible. The chastisement which should have fallen upon us was placed upon the Servant, and therefore, by that means, peace with God was obtained. By this word "peace" we are therefore to understand that those things which once stood as barriers between God and ourselves have been removed, and we are now in a right relationship with Him.

Such is the blessed peace which the sufferings and death of the Servant have obtained for us. This peace of course includes an attitude of heart in which we maintain a peaceful disposition toward God, but it includes, as we have seen, far more than that. It indicates that the obstacles which

had once kept God from being at peace with us have been taken away, and that now He is at peace with us.

At this point no doubt there will be objection. Are we not, it may be objected, guilty of reading into the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah the doctrines of a later Christian theology? Are we correct in thinking that Isaiah the Old Testament prophet really believed that God must be reconciled to men by means of expiatory suffering upon the part of the Servant? These questions have their place, but they can be easily answered. We are not guilty of reading into the prophet's words thoughts which are alien to his own mind. If the interpretation which we have drawn from these words seems strange to the modern mind, it is only because the modern mind is to a large extent under the influence of the position that the primary message of the prophet was to his own day. Once, however, we have disabused ourselves of this idea; once, indeed, that we pay serious heed to the witness which the prophets gave of themselves as the mouthpieces of Jehovah, then shall we also give more serious heed to what they say on other subjects as well. And when we do this, we shall discover that, under the strange compulsion of the Holy Spirit, these men of ancient Israel were speaking of the Messianic salvation to come.

Hence it is that Isaiah may so clearly affirm that true peace can come to us only because of the chastisement which the Servant was called upon to bear. If there should yet be any doubt as to his meaning, it is removed by the last words of the verse, "and by his stripes we are healed." We, according to the prophet, had possessed sicknesses and sorrows, and it is now to be understood that these were because of our transgressions and iniquities. For us, however, there is healing — a blessed figure of the removal of that which causes suffering; namely, sin. "We are healed," the prophet declares, and by the statement he means a complete freedom and deliverance from all those things which caused Him to die. We are healed, however, not through

any efforts of our own, but only by means of His stripes. Whether in this word there is an incidental secondary reference to the actual stripes which our Lord endured, is difficult to say. The word in the original is singular and seems to be employed with the force of a collective, so that it may be translated "wounds" or "stripes." At any rate, whichever way we translate it, what is clear is that He in our place submitted to a cruel suffering which led unto death, and by thus suffering He has healed us from the woes which would have wrought our destruction.

There is another objection which may be raised at this point. It is an objection which has to do, not so much with the interpretation of the passage which we have given as with the actual teaching of the passage itself. It surely must be clear to any careful reader of Isaiah fifty-three that the doctrine of satisfaction is here taught. The doctrine is here present that if there is to be peace between God and man, there must first be the death of the Servant. Because of man's sin, God was estranged from him. In order that once more right relations should be restored, and that there should be peace between God and man, the suffering of the Servant was necessary. This teaching, however, does not find favor with many people. It is unworthy of God. They say, to demand a sacrifice before He is satisfied. Rather, they would assure us, God needs no satisfaction at all. The only thing that keeps Him from receiving us joyfully is our own unwillingness to confess our sins and to come to Him. If only we would confess our sins, and tell God that we are sorry for all that we have done, God would be so happy about it that He would freely forgive us. After all, so the common argument runs, we must not hold anything against others. If others come to us with pleas for forgiveness, we should forgive them. It would not be worthy to demand some kind of payment. A forgiving spirit is what we need, and we are told it is such a forgiving spirit which God has also.

This statement of the matter is very commonly heard today. For the most part it is uttered by those to whom

doctrine is generally abhorrent. Men are very ready to judge God by themselves, and in rejecting the Scriptural doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, they may often think that they are doing a worthwhile thing. Very often they may think that they are thus obtaining a more noble view of God. In reality, however, they are doing nothing of the kind. In reality, they are rejecting the God of true love and substituting for Him a god who is hardly worthy of respect.

This is not the place to enter into a full defense of the Scriptural doctrine of the substitutionary atonement, but there are certain things which may be said here which will not be out of place. For one thing, who are we to set ourselves up as judges of what is and what is not worthy of God? According to the Bible we are in no position to make such evaluations, for we are ourselves sinners. Rather than judge with a calm and dispassionate judgment, we ourselves are sinners who love darkness and hate the light. We are those who have turned aside from the right way and have gone astray, who drink iniquity like water. We, therefore, are in no position to state what is and what is not worthy of God.

Furthermore, those who think that it is a low conception to hold that God must be reconciled to man before He will forgive man have no real understanding of the nature of sin. If a man thinks that sin is merely an unfortunate occurrence, involving no really serious consequences, then perhaps he cannot understand why an atonement is needed. If sin is something that anyone can handle by himself, then perhaps the teaching of Isaiah is out of place. If, on the other hand, sin is what the Bible represents it as being, it is a very serious thing indeed. For sin brings with it liability to condemnation. Sin, in other words, imprisons the sinner so that he cannot extricate himself from its cords, and it drags him onward to everlasting death and punishment. Those who do not know the true nature of sin may look with no favor at the doctrine of the atonement. Those, however, who realize what sin is, know that they have offended the holy God and long for something to be done to

remove God's wrath and to bring again to them the light of His countenance. When therefore we hear objections to the Biblical doctrine of the atonement, we may well examine those objections to see whether or no they have taken account of the true nature of sin. A low view of sin will always be accompanied by a low view of the nature of God, and likewise a low view of God will always be found in company with a low view of sin.

At any rate, whether men will have it or no, this verse and the one preceding teach very clearly the doctrine of a substitutionary atonement. One cannot read these words without being impressed by the stress that the prophet places upon this thought. So prominent is the idea that one scholar, who was by no means a conservative, felt compelled to write: "Substitutionary suffering is expressed in this Divine oracle in not less than five sentences. It is as though God could not do enough to make this clear."

Is this doctrine of the substitutionary atonement after all an unworthy doctrine? Did God do an unworthy thing when He gave His only-begotten Son to die in the place of sinners? For our part we cannot accept the opinion of those who think that He did. When men say that the death of Another is not needed, and that each man must atone for his own sins, we are at a loss to understand how they can thus reason. No man can atone for his sins. Man cannot bring to God the sacrifice that is requisite to make such atonement. Those who object to the Biblical doctrine do not reckon with this factor that man has not the power to atone for sin. What man needs, because of his sins, is deliverance. He cannot deliver himself. Is it unworthy of God if He Himself provides the Deliverer and does for man that which man is unable to do?

Sometimes it is argued that God compelled Christ, against His will, to die for sinners. When, however, we reason thus, we show that we do not understand the Scriptures. In the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the patience and voluntary character of the Servant's sufferings are made abundantly clear. It is not against His will that the Serv-

ant died, but rather in order that the good pleasure of the Lord might prosper through His hand.

The sacrifice which has wrought our peace with God was thus an efficacious sacrifice. It was in fact the only sacrifice that could pay the debt of our sins. It may be very humiliating to human pride to be compelled to fly for refuge to the sacrifice of the Servant, but, be that as it may, there is one fact that cannot be escaped. It is that "with His stripes we are healed." The stripes of some other would bring no healing, nor would our own sufferings. With the stripes of the Servant, however, there is healing.

The true state of the case is that the Servant came voluntarily to die for His people. By His death He has removed all those obstacles which kept God's favor from being revealed to His own. Upon the basis of the Servant's death, there is healing and pardon and peace.

We who believe in the substitutionary death of the Servant need not be ashamed, therefore, to proclaim with all boldness His remarkable saving work. Whether men will hear Him or no, He is their only hope. There is no other salvation, nor can deliverance from sin be found elsewhere. In this substitutionary atonement of the Christ the Church of God has ever rejoiced and delighted. Those who have not understood have raised their objections to this doctrine. Be that as it may, the heart which knows that the terrible burden of sin has been removed, looks with true gratitude and devotion to the Cross where the guilt of sin was once borne by Another.

We are today living in an age when doctrine is not popular. One reason for this lack of popularity is probably to be found in the fact that so few people know what doctrine is. It is very rare that one hears a sermon that can be called doctrinal. And that valuable institution, the catechism class, has almost entirely vanished from the churches. If people knew something about doctrine they might make the astonishing discovery that, far from being dry and uninteresting and irrelevant, doctrine is the most interesting and relevant of all subjects.

The fact is, nevertheless, that we are living in a day of doctrinal declension. In the churches men are very much interested in a program, and anything, such as doctrine, which might tend to interfere with the smooth working of that program, is looked at askance. Yet there is nothing more important than doctrine. The word simply means teaching, and surely it is important to know what teaching the Word of God contains. The greatest need of the day is a revival of doctrinal teaching and preaching. Surely the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is doctrinal through and through, and as we consider its words, we may well come to understand how important doctrine truly is. When once men have this understanding, there may come a revulsion from the shallowness of so much of our modern religious life and a genuine return to the Word of the living God. May God hasten the coming of that day!

All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.

After the remarkable statement of substitutionary suffering given in verse five a new factor is injected into the picture, in that the prophet now sets forth the reason why it was necessary for the .Servant to suffer. The Servant, we have learned, has indeed suffered, and He has suffered in the stead of others. The substitutionary nature of His suffering has been made abundantly clear. The question arises, however, why such suffering was necessary. The answer to this question may partly be ascertained from what has already been stated, but further light is given in verse six.

"All we, like a flock," says the prophet, and he speaks not only for himself, but also for all Israel, "had gone

astray; we had turned each one to Ins own way." It is not to the Babylonian exile that Isaiah here has reference. Nor is it to idolatry. It is rather to the fact that, like a flock which has lost its shepherd, we too, through sin, had gone astray. That which had caused us to err, in other words, was sin. It is important to note the force of the verb, "we *had* gone astray." We had, in other words, turned aside from the right path and were lost. We had wandered, not knowing whither we were going. And, having gone astray, we remained astray until the Servant rescued us.

This sinful action of going astray like a flock which had no shepherd is also characterized as a turning unto our own way. We did not seek to follow the way that God had laid down for us but sought rather our own way, and in thus doing we glorified the creature rather than the Creator. We were selfish, and the result of our selfish action was that we became lost.

Hence, if we were to be delivered, it was necessary that God Himself should intervene. The Lord, Ave are told, caused to light upon Him the iniquity of us all. The word "iniquity," as Isaiah here employs it, has reference not only to the actual transgression itself, but also to the guilt which it involves and to the punishment which follows. The Lord caused our guilt and its punishment to strike forcefully in Him, not alone in His body but in His Avhole Person.

Tt now becomes perfectly clear why the Servant must suffer. It is because we had transgressed God's commandments and so had gone astray. In order that we might once again be made right with the holy God, God Himself caused our iniquity to strike upon the Servant. The guilt which was ours was placed upon Him, and with that guilt went a terrible punishment. The very wrath of God was poured out upon Him who bore our guilt. That wrath, however, was poured out upon Him. not because of His own sin, for He had none. He was perfectly righteous, and it is not as a righteous "One that wrath comes upon Him. At the same, time, that wrath does indeed have reference to Him in so far as He as their substitute identifies

Himself with those sinners who are themselves deserving of wrath.

This verse is a veritable compend of life-giving theology. Here is the doctrine of total depravity — we had gone astray, we had turned each one to his own way. These words set forth the fact of our sinfulness. We had already sinned and were gone out of the way. This is to say that we were in no condition to save ourselves. If one has gone astray, he is lost and needs to be found.

Here too is the doctrine of God's sovereignty — for He is the ultimate cause in the Servant's suffering. Up until this point the LORD is not explicitly mentioned in Isaiah fifty-three. Now, however, it appears that it is He who causes our iniquity to strike upon the Servant. It is well to consider the thought carefully. The Servant was a righteous One, with no sin of His own. His death therefore must have been the work of evil men. It was an unjust death, for He did not deserve to die. Yet even this unjust death could not have occurred apart from the Lord's so decreeing. The LORD does reign supreme in the heavens, and He foreordains all things that come to pass upon this earth.

In this verse there is also found the doctrine of salvation by grace, for the Lord, by causing our iniquity to light upon Him, has done that which was necessary to save His people. This verse, therefore, is in perfect harmony with the remainder of the Bible, for everywhere throughout the pages of Scripture, salvation is set forth as the work of God and not of man. It is His free gift and all of grace. Here too is the doctrine of a vicarious punishment, for the terrible wrath of God which we deserved, struck Him in the stead of us. How clearly the Scripture sets before us the vicarious or substitutionary nature of the Servant's death! If we do not believe, it is because the blindness of our hearts which is a result of our fall in Adam, still remains, and the veil has not been taken from our eyes.

Here too are the doctrines of satisfaction and expiation. It is the Servant who by His death offers a sacrifice to put away sin. It is He who sprinkles many nations. The iniquity

uity which meets in His soul is expiated by His death and that death satisfies every accusation that can be brought against the sinner, for it is because of His suffering that we are made right with God. And, lastly, here is the comforting doctrine of Divine Providence. The Servant's suffering was not accidental. It was brought about by God Himself who ordereth all things according to His own will.

There is a certain intimacy in this verse which is lost in the translation. In the Hebrew it begins with the words "all of us" and it closes with those same words. *All of us* had sinned, but the Lord had intervened and caused to strike upon the Servant the iniquity of *all of us*. This is not a false universalism. The passage does not teach that all men will be saved; its purpose rather is again to draw a contrast between the all and the One. All for whom the prophet speaks had sinned; the One has taken away that sin. Thus, once again, we meet the idea of substitution. If we are tempted to look askance at this doctrine of the substitutionary atonement, we might well consider that the prophet believed it to be a most important doctrine, for he takes every opportunity to stress it in connection with our salvation.

He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

A question, however, may now arise. The LORD was the ultimate cause of the Servant's suffering. Did the Servant, however against His will or did He voluntarily submit to His agonies? These questions are answered with crystal clarity by the seventh verse, which describes how He suffered and died.

"He was afflicted" —with these words the verse begins. It is perhaps more accurate thus to translate that as the King James' Version does, "he was oppressed." By this declaration of oppression we are reminded of the passage in Exodus 3 :7, "And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and their cry have I heard from before those who afflict them, for I know their griefs." The picture is clear. Those who afflict the people (it is the same verbal root that Isaiah employs) cause them to suffer griefs and to cry out. The Servant too has been afflicted. It is as though He had been oppressed or vexed by a taskmaster.

As a matter of fact, however, He Himself submitted to affliction. We can best translate the verse, "He was afflicted, and He suffered Himself to be afflicted." He willingly humbled Himself and did not open His mouth. It is somewhat difficult to bring out the exact force of the Hebrew verbs, but it seems that the two statements. "He suffered Himself to be afflicted" and "He opened not His mouth" serve to describe the circumstances or conditions under which He was afflicted. We may perhaps thus render the thought; "He was afflicted, and while He was afflicted He Himself suffered voluntarily and did not open His mouth." Thus, the dreadful suffering which the Servant had to undergo is again stressed. Indeed, its importance is emphasized by the fact that it is mentioned first in the sentence. From these statements, however, two new factors emerge. In the first place the suffering is voluntary. Secondly, the Servant suffered patiently. He did not open his mouth in self defense or protest.

This second thought is so startling that the prophet proceeds to enlarge upon it. He compares the Servant with the sheep which is led to the slaughter and with a lamb which is dumb before her shearers. The sheep was brought to the slaughter that it might be sacrificed. The lamb stood dumb before those who would shear it. Thus also it was with the Servant. He opened not His mouth. The

repetition of this phrase lends a vivid' forcefulness to the description. It is not a needless repetition, for it serves to stress the wondrous conduct of the Sufferer during the time of His agony.

The prophet has given a beautiful description. The sheep before the slaughter and the lamb before its shearers are harmless and helpless. It would be difficult to conceive a more graphic picture of innocency and patience. This illustration removes forever from the mind any lingering suspicion that the Servant might have been suffering for His own sins. That He is innocent of wrongdoing is now abundantly established. And He is also patient to the utmost. Hence it is that the New Testament refers to Him as the Lamb of God. It is a beautiful figure, and one upon which we do well to meditate. He who bears the sins of others is Himself spotless, harmless and undefiled, as a Lamb without spot and without blemish.

He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.

When these facts of the Servant's voluntary suffering and His extraordinary patience have once been established, the prophet introduces a more detailed description of the suffering. Thus, in verse eight, he begins with the statement, "From oppression and from judgment he was taken away." The Hebrew original is capable of different translations, and three general interpretations have been advanced. It is grammatically possible to translate, "Because of an oppressive judgment he was taken." It is also possible to translate, "Without oppression (hindrance) and judgment he was taken," and then the thought would be

that the Servant was taken away without a fair trial at all. It is far better, however, to take the words as is done in the King James' Version, and then we may translate literally, "From oppression (or, as some suggest, from prison) and from judgment he was taken away."

This last rendering has the preponderance of evidence in its favor. In the first place, the preposition is most naturally to be translated "from." This is also supported by the statement "he was taken." Furthermore the other translations of the preposition do not yield a satisfactory sense. We may assume, then, that the prophet is speaking of the Servant's being taken away from an oppressive judgment.

Some interpreters think that the rendering should be "prison and oppression," and this may possibly be correct. The word which they would translate "prison" has the literal meaning "coercion" or "restraint." Whether it will actually bear the concrete sense of "prison" is questionable, for the occurrences are so infrequent that a positive statement cannot be made. A rather suitable translation is "arrest."

It is obvious that the prophet is speaking of a physical restraint or coercion that has been placed upon the Servant. It is a distress or oppression which must be understood in connection with the judgment mentioned. And when this connection is kept in mind, it becomes clear that the oppression involved is such as would be occasioned by legal arrest.

The judgment mentioned has reference to the legal sentence which was passed upon the Servant. It appears therefore, that the Sufferer had been arrested — and we are probably to understand the arrest as particularly oppressive in nature — and He had also been brought to trial. A legal case was made against Him; He was accused and declared to be guilty and worthy of death. Since, however, He was innocent of wrongdoing — indeed, more than that, since He was positively righteous — the sentence passed upon Him was an unjust one.

It comes somewhat as a shock to read that He who was Himself without sin should be subjected to an unjust trial. There have, of course, been intimations of this even earlier

in the book of Isaiah. When, in chapter forty-two the Servant is first presented, He is set forth as One who has a great mission to perform and who will continue in His labor until that mission has been accomplished. In the next appearance of the Servant, namely, in chapter forty-nine, there has been some indication of the difficulty of the work to be undertaken. In the words of the Servant Himself, "Then I said, I have labored in vain, T have spent my strength for nought, and in vain: yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God" (Isaiah 49:4). In chapter fifty the poignant suffering is depicted with even greater clarity. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting" (Isaiah 50:6). The reason for this suffering, however, has not yet been given. It is reserved for the fifty-third chapter to state that the reason for the Servant's agony is found in the fact that He suffers for others and in their place, and that He does this because God has laid their iniquity upon Him.

That, however, which caises surprise is the thought that He who is without sin should suffer unjustly at the hands of men. It is of course perfectly true that the LORD is the ultimate cause of the suffering. The Lord did indeed lay upon Him our iniquity. It becomes increasingly clear, however, that the suffering of the Servant was also at the hands of men. Why however, we may ask, should men wish to bring grief upon Him? Why should the)' condemn an innocent person to death? In answer to these questions it may be said that they were simply mistaken in their judgment. Occasionally an innocent man is unjustly accused and even condemned, and such may have been the case in this instance. This explanation, however, will not satisfy. Here is far more than an example of mistaken condemnation. No, the answer is to be found much deeper than that. The Servant is condemned, because men are themselves wicked. They will not hear the Servant's words; they will not believe that He is the Saviour. They, rather, would take Him away from the earth. Darkness does not receive the Light. This earth which has been cursed by sin

will not receive the Son of God, but when He comes, rises up and slays Him.

It will not do for us' today to look with disdain upon those who unjustly tried and condemned Him, as though we ourselves would have acted differently, for after all is said and done, it was because of our sins that He died. It is not strictly correct to say that the sins of mankind in general brought about His death. That which caused Him to die was the sin of those whom He purposed to save, His own elect. It was for those who are actually saved that He died, and it was their sin which brought Him to the grave. There is no room here for the condemnation of others. In the light of the unjust trial and condemnation of the Servant, the entire world stands condemned. This earth is wicked; it loves not the Truth, fo^r when the Truth comes to walk this earth, it rises up against the Truth and slays Him.

From this oppressive arrest and from this unjust judicial proceeding He was taken away to death. That this is the correct understanding of the passage is shown by the parallel clause, "he was cut off from the land of the living," and it is also supported by an appeal to Proverbs 24:11 in which occur the words ". . . them that are drawn unto death." It is furthermore interesting to note that students of the Bible of all shades of interpretation accept this position that the Servant is here represented as actually dying. The Servant, we are told, was taken away from judgment. How was this done? The answer is. He was taken away by death. The result of the trial and judgment was that He was led away to die.

Attempts, of course, have been made to show that such is an incorrect understanding of the teaching of the passage. There have, in other words, been efforts to demonstrate that, according to the passage, the Servant never died at all. Such endeavors, however, have not been many, nor have they been very successful. Perhaps the most learned and convincing defense of the position that the Servant did not die was made by a German scholar, Ernst Sellin.

Sellin wrote much on the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, and he changed his mind about the meaning of the chapter several times. In the year 1898 he claimed that the Servant was Zerubbabel. Three years later, however, he gave up this opinion and declared that the Servant was not Zerubbabel but Jehoiachin. It was in connection with this strange interpretation that Sellin sought to show that the Sufferer is not represented as having died. To the defense of this position he brought all his vast learning and erudition. The phrase "he was cut off from the land of the living" according to Sellin, had no reference to death, but was merely an expression for exile or banishment from Palestine. Thus he sought to apply it to Jehoiachin. What Sellin wrote is worthy of careful study, and we shall probably never again have so cogent a defense of the view that the Servant did not die. Cogent as was this defense, however, it failed thoroughly to convince even its gifted author, for he later abandoned it, and in his latest writing upon the subject clearly held that the Servant had died. In 1922 Sellin expressed the thought that the Servant was Moses, and that Moses had been murdered at Shittim. Thus, in this writing, the idea of the death of the Servant became quite prominent. Once more in 1937 Sellin again changed his mind. He now held that the Servant was the prophet — the so-called "second" Isaiah, and again in this work he pointed out that the Servant is regarded as having died.

This brief digression for the purpose of reviewing Sellin's views has been necessary because such a digression will really help us to see that we are not on the wrong track in interpreting the passage before us as teaching that the Servant did die. The arguments to the contrary were really not strong enough to convince Sellin permanently, and they surely have not convinced many others. If, however, there had been any doubt on the question hitherto, that doubt is now removed by this verse. It should be further noted that in verse nine there are positive statements in which mention is made both of the death and the grave

of the Servant. The Servant died, and thus His suffering was brought to a climax.

The remainder of verse eight 'has called forth various interpretations, and we shall not now seek to consider the merits of all of them. Suffice it to say that we are still impressed with the merits of the translation which would render the original about as follows, "and among His generation, who considered that He was cut off from the land of the living?" If this rendering is correct, the verse teaches that the death of the Servant caused little comment upon the part of His own generation. His contemporaries gave little serious thought to His death. They did not meditate upon it.

The fact that the sentence is phrased in the form of a question implies that men should have meditated upon the Servant's death. They did indeed see Him as smitten of God, but they thought that He was thus smitten for His own sins. He was arrested and unjustly sentenced and died. The facts about Him had been proclaimed. Men should have considered — as they should consider today, and God will hold them responsible for not considering — that He died, and that He had died, not for His own sins, but for the sins of others, "the just for the unjust." Indeed, there is nothing which should so engage the deepest thoughts and meditations of the heart as this blessed fact that He was cut off from the land of the living.

It is not, however, the death in itself to which men should give their thought. It is the death and *the interpretation of that death*. Isaiah has not set forth a bare account of how the Servant died. In itself that would have little or no meaning for us. What is all important, and what must never be lost from view, is the *reason* why He died. He died — there is the fact; He died for my sins — there is the interpretation of the fact, and it is that which men should know and understand.

Isaiah here sets a model or pattern for all who would preach the Gospel. There are many who claim to preach

the Gospel who in reality do not preach it at all, and the reason therefore is found in the fact that they do not preach doctrine. It is quite common to hear men speak of the death of Christ and to tell people to believe on Christ without giving an explanation of what they are saying. It is not enough to say that Christ died; it is not enough to say even that Christ died for sinners; that which must be preached is that Christ died for sinners in their room and stead, as their substitute and as a sacrifice. It is that which Isaiah found necessary to proclaim. And that is the heart of the Gospel. Oh! that men today were aflame with such a love for Christian truth. Oh! that evangelists would come forth, not with some minimum amount of Christianity to present, but believing in the whole counsel of God, they would passionately proclaim the doctrines of the Christian Faith and plead with men to accept those doctrines. Then there might come a return to the one living and true God, and with that return a genuine repentance for sin. But men will not repent of sin and come to Christ unless first they know what sin is and what Christ has done for them. The answer to the world's need is not to be found in some watered down, attenuated form of Christianity; the answer to the world's need is the whole body of revealed truth which God has seen fit to give in His holy Word.

That — to return to the exposition — all possibility of misunderstanding concerning the Servant's death may be ruled out, Isaiah adds, "because of the transgression of my people there was a stroke to him." It is the Lord who speaks. My people — the people who belong to Me — have transgressed, and because they have transgressed, the terrible stroke has fallen upon Him. It was, therefore, not the sin of all mankind, but the Sin of My people — the elect — which caused the stroke to come upon Him. At first sight it might seem that the words "my people" constituted a reference merely to the historical nation of Israel. However, in the light of the context it becomes clear that those who are designated are a people whose sins have been expiated, who have received a spiritual salvation, and who have received the righteousness of the righteous Servant.

They are God's people in a peculiar sense. They are the redeemed, because of whose sins the Servant was smitten.

And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

After having stressed both the patience of the Servant in His suffering and also the manner of His death, the prophet mentions the nature of His burial. We are familiar with the common English translation, "And he made his grave with the wicked." Eut these opening words have called forth various interpretations. Some have said that the subject of the verb is Jehovah; others that it is the "my people" of the preceding verse. But probably it is best to take the verb as impersonal and to translate by a passive, "and his grave was made (i. e., appointed) with the wicked." Another good rendering which brings out the impersonal force would be "and they gave his grave."

The following clause, "and with a rich man in his death." has also occasioned much discussion. There is objection upon the part of many expositors to allowing the words "rich man" to stand in the text as they do. It is quite widely felt that the expression "rich man" must present a proper parallel to the "wicked" in the preceding clause; else, so the argument runs, they are without force. However, the two expressions are not parallel in meaning. The phrase "rich man" does not mean "wicked rich man." Nor is it satisfactory to manipulate the Hebrew text so as to obtain the reading "doers of evil." The phrase is indeed a strange one, and cannot be understood apart from its fulfillment.

The thought may be summed up as follows. The Servant's grave was assigned with the criminals, and after His

death, with a rich man. Thus, the first clause makes clear with whom His grave had been assigned. It was intended that His place of burial should be among the wicked ones. The second clause, however, serves to bring out that after He had died a most painful death, He was as a matter of fact with a rich man.

The word which in our English Bibles is translated "in his death," in the original is plural, "in his deaths." There is a reason for this plural, and consequently there is no justification for emending the text. The plural serves to bring out the intensity and violence of the death and thus to contrast the violent death of the Servant and His association with a rich man.

When one recalls the actual death of our Lord, as it is set forth in the Gospels, he will remember that Christ was with the criminals in His death and that His burial was with the rich man. However, there is no real incongruity between the account of Christ's death in the New Testament and that which is related in the present verse. In the present verse the two expressions "grave" and "death" are almost interchangeable, and too hard a separation between them cannot be made. What the text means to say is that in His death and burial the Servant was with the rich and the wicked.

There thus appears to be a turn in the Servant's fortunes. It was intended that He should die and be buried as a criminal. But whereas man proposes, it is God Who disposes. As a matter of fact after His violent death He was with a rich man. He was expected to be buried like a criminal; but in reality He was buried in a tomb intended for a rich man. Thus, in a certain sense, His exaltation and glorification began with His death.

The second half of the verse sets forth the reasons for the turn in the Servant's fortunes. This turn was to serve as an attestation of His innocence. He was with the rich in His death because He had done no violence, neither was deceit found in His mouth. The reason why the Servant was given an honorable burial immediately after His dis-

honorable death, therefore, was to be found in His perfect innocency. He had done no violence, no overt act of wrong. Nor was there deceit in His mouth. His plans and intentions were pure. Thus, by means of these two statements His perfect innocency is established, and because of this complete freedom from wrongdoing the Lord caused His burial to be different from that which wicked men had intended for Him.

Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.

With this tenth verse a contrast is immediately introduced. Despite the innocency of the Servant it pleased the Lord to bruise Him. Lest we should form the opinion that the Sufferer's condemnation and death were entirely in the hands of unjust men, it is made clear that the ultimate cause of His suffering was God Himself. The verb that is used is indeed a strange one. We may render, "it pleased the Lord," and thus the word serves to express the purposes of God. At the same time the word also means to take pleasure or delight in something. Perhaps we can best get at the meaning in this particular passage by paraphrasing "it was the pleasure of the Lord that He should be bruised."

This does not mean that the Lord found pleasure in the bruising of the Servant upon the part of others, but rather in His bruising upon the part of the Lord Himself. The word is reminiscent of the phrase "crushed for our iniquities" which had been employed earlier. In line also with the earlier (verse three) description of the sicknesses which characterized the Sufferer is the brief statement "He hath

put him to grief," or, to translate more accurately, "He has caused to make him sick." This terse phrase is in the original expressed by one word, and appears to serve as a general statement of the degradation which was imposed upon the Servant.

There was a reason why God thus caused Him to be made sick, and this reason is expressed in the phrase "when thou shalt make an offering for sin, he shall see his seed." It is possible to take the words "his soul" as subject and then to translate "when his soul shall make an offering for sin." Thus, if the Servant's soul should place an offering for sin, a blessed result would follow. By the words "his soul" we are of course to understand His life. This is at first sight a difficult phrase, but its meaning is clear. If the life of the Servant shall have placed an offering for sin, then we must understand that offering to be not only one which proceeds from the life but rather one which consists in the life itself. The offering, therefore, is the very life of the Servant which was taken away by the violent death which He died.

The offering is specified as a trespass-offering. Now it is difficult to indicate precisely wherein the trespass-offering and the sin-offering differed, but one point at least is worthy of mention. In the trespass-offering the primary idea was that of a satisfaction. It is the sacrifice which pays the debt or satisfies for the guilt contracted and so frees the sinner. Perhaps for that reason it was chosen as the most appropriate word to describe the Servant's offering. At any rate it is here used primarily as a generic term for expiatory sacrifice.

The violent death and the excruciating sufferings of the Servant are now seen in their true light. His death — the pouring out of His life's blood — was a sacrifice designed to expiate sin. to render that satisfaction which the justice of God required. This idea is further strengthened by the use of the phrase "to place," which elsewhere in the Bible, as, e. g., Job 17:3, is used of the giving of a pledge.

When however, we say that the death of the Servant was the offering of a sacrifice, we are also saying that the Servant performed the work of a priest. The sufferings were voluntary; the One Who bore our griefs and carried our sorrows was not One who had been driven to this death against His will. He was not forced to submit Himself as a sacrifice, offered by the hands of others. It is rather He who freely offered Himself. He is the righteous Priest who offers a righteous sacrifice, even Himself, in order that a satisfaction may be made for the guilt of others. He is thus Priest, and He is Guilt-offering. It is therefore not the sacrifice of an animal, but the offering of a Person, and so it differs *toto coelo* from the sacrifices mentioned in the Mosaic Law. Since it is the offering of a Person, and since, more than that, it is the offering of Himself upon the part of this particular Person, it is a sacrifice utterly unique, in a class by itself. It rises far above those animal sacrifices required by the Pentateuchal legislation. It is, indeed, antitypical, whereas those offerings were typical. It is a sacrifice with which no other sacrifice can even for a moment be compared. Dark Golgotha! "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Hebrews 9:26b).

SIT THOU ON MY RIGHT HAND

It was not possible, however, that He should be holden of death. The result of this voluntary placing of Himself as a guilt offering is a glorious spiritual victory. The Servant Himself is not to remain in the grip of death, but is to live again. He will see a seed. In itself this phrase means that there will be a large posterity, a family of many descendants. In the nature of the case this is not to be a line of literal descendants but rather a spiritual seed, those whose guilt the Sufferer has removed by His death.

It is also stated that He shall prolong days. This phrase evidently has reference to Himself. He, although He had died, will continue to live on. It is a strange thought. Death had not been the end. He is now alive again, and He will continue to live. Indeed, the source of life is in Himself, for He will prolong (i. e., cause to lengthen) days. In the New Testament we read, " I am he that was dead, and behold! I am alive for evermore" (Revelation 1:18).

Isaiah has laid stress upon the activity of the Servant. His soul will make a guilt-offering. He will see a seed. He will prolong His own life. And it was important that this activity should be stressed. It was important so that the true character of the sufferings as *voluntary* should be sufficiently brought to light. At the same time, the Servant had come to do God's will. Through His mediation the good pleasure of God would be carried through unto a successful conclusion, and this good pleasure of God, as the context makes abundantly plain, is the salvation and glorification of His own people. This wondrous purpose, the deliverance of His own from the guilt and power of their

transgressions, will be accomplished by the Servant. And it is the good pleasure of the Lord that Tie should do this.

He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

In verse eleven the exaltation of the Servant is mentioned first, and this is followed by a description of His saving work. Many expositors interpret the verse as though it began with a temporal particle, "after the travail of his soul, etc." Such an interpretation may easily be defended upon grammatical and other grounds. However, it is more probable that the opening particle does not have a temporal force but rather serves to denote the efficient or procuring cause of the exaltation. Hence, it is better to translate, "because of the travail of his soul." The thought is that because the Servant has suffered the great anguish of soul which has already been described so carefully, He shall have abundant satisfaction. This conception is expressed by means of the words "He shall see — He shall be satisfied," and these two statements are an illustration of that grammatical principle known as hendiadys, wherein one word simply serves to qualify another. Thus we may render, "He shall see abundantly," or "He shall see with abundant satisfaction."

After this mention of the Sufferer's exaltation there follows one of the clearest and most pointed statements of the Gospel in the entire Bible. The statement is introduced with the words "by his knowledge." Some students of the Bible would connect these words with what precedes so as to obtain the effect, "he will be satisfied with his **knowl-**

edge." This, however, is rather lame and does not yield a good sense. More often it is thought that the phrase means "by the knowledge which he possesses." This view has had many able defenders, but there is a strong objection to it. If the phrase is speaking of the knowledge which the Servant Himself possesses then the thought is that by means of this knowledge the Servant carries on His work of justification. Such a conception, however, appears to be quite foreign to the context. The justification of the many is accomplished, according to this verse, not by means of the knowledge which the Servant has, but by means of His bearing their iniquities.

Hence, it is more in keeping with the context, and it is perfectly grammatically, to translate "by the knowledge of Him," or "by knowing Him." It is knowledge, therefore, not which He Himself has, but which is possessed by those whom He would justify. This knowledge is not only intellectual apprehension of who He is and what He has done — although it certainly includes that — but it is also the practical appropriation of all His benefits. It is a personal, intimate knowledge such as one person has of another. It involves faith, trust, intellectual apprehension and belief. It is that intimate, experiential relationship which we have in mind when we speak of one person's knowing another. It is thus the blessed life-giving knowledge of the Servant upon the part of others, and the expression rightly reminds one of the New Testament phrase "justification by faith." It is by or through knowing Him that the Servant justifies many.

The force of the next clause can best be brought out by rendering "the righteous one, my Servant, will justify many." The reasons which are sometimes advanced for rejecting the words "the righteous one" are not weighty. The principal contrast to be stressed is that between the righteous Servant and the many who stand in need of righteousness. As a righteous One, He justifies the many. The many are laden with iniquities; they are without righteousness. The Servant is the truly righteous One; He is without iniquities. The many receive the righteousness of the

Servant, and He receives their iniquities. It is a glorious and blessed interchange, and it clearly anticipates the New Testament doctrines of the imputation of Christ's righteousness to His people and the imputation of their guilt to Him.

The question may be asked how the Servant justifies the many. All doubt how He does this is removed by the final words of the verse, "he shall bear their iniquities." They are laden with iniquities. He, however, removes these iniquities by taking them from the many and placing them upon Himself. In turn He gives His perfect righteousness. Thus, the many are regarded as no longer possessing iniquities, but rather as possessing righteousness. In the very nature of the case, therefore, it is a forensic justification. Of the many God says, "They no longer have iniquities; they have righteousness." They now, since their iniquities have been taken away and they have received the perfect righteousness of the Servant, stand in a right relationship to God.

Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

Therefore, because of what He has done, God declares — for it is God who is speaking — that He will divide to Him among the many. The thought is that there are many who are victors. They all shall receive their share of the spoils of victory, and among them the Servant is to take His place. He is thus seen to be equal to the greatest conquerors. More than that, however; not only is He equal; He is greater than all others, for He shall divide the spoil with the powerful ones. He is Himself the greatest of

conquerors and He appears thoroughly victorious. What the spoils are which He divides, it is difficult to say. Perhaps the prophet is merely seeking to carry out the figure and to show the greatness of the Servant's victory. If, however, some definite reference is intended, it must, in the nature of the case, be to a spiritual victory, and the spoils would probably include those whom the Servant has rescued from the bondage of sin.

Why, however, should the Servant receive this place of unparalleled honor? That we may never forget why God "hath highly exalted Him" this remarkable prophecy closes with a review of His suffering. In the first place, He exposed — for such is the force of the original — His soul unto death. Secondly, and here the original is better represented by a reflexive than a passive, He permitted Himself to be numbered among the transgressors. He yielded to a most unjust judgment, which, despite the fact that He was righteous, condemned Him to a cruel death. And in the eyes of His contemporaries He was regarded as One who had been severely punished by God because of His own sins. He also made His death with the wicked, and all this He did voluntarily. Thirdly, although He was numbered among the transgressors, as a matter of actual fact. He bore the sin of many. The many had sinned, but He had taken the guilt of that sin upon Himself in order that He might expiate it. Lastly, He intercedes for His people. A form of the verb is used which is generally causative in its force, and the idea therefore seems to be that He effectively intercedes. We may bring out the thought by saying that He makes — for the verb should be translated by the present and not by the past — a meritorious and prevailing intercession. Thus, the chapter closes with a statement of priestly activity upon the part of the Servant. In the midst of His suffering, He makes intercession. Even while others regarded Him as a transgressor, He, the great High Priest, was praying for those who were the real transgressors.

When the Christian heart faces these remarkable words, it bows in solemn and silent assent. He of whom the

prophet speaks is worthy indeed of all honor and dominion and power, for He is the great Deliverer and the Captain of our salvation. The Christian heart can but look with gratitude at this wondrous description of the work of the Saviour, and with the Church of all the ages cry out, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing" (Revelation 5:12).

OF WHOM SPEAKETH THE PROPHET THIS?

In our study and discussion of Isaiah fifty-three we have proceeded upon the basis of two very fundamental assumptions. In the first place we have assumed that the author of this passage was a prophet, one raised up of God to declare His word concerning the Servant, and we have regarded this prophet as Isaiah the son of Amoz. Such an assumption, however, is very contrary to modern scholarly opinion. Indeed, there are very few scholars today who believe that Isaiah the son of Amoz was the author of the fifty-third chapter. In making this assumption, then, we have been going counter to the current of much recent scholarly opinion and thought. To this question, therefore, we must shortly return.

In the second place, we have also proceeded upon the assumption that the Servant of the Lord of whom Isaiah was speaking in this fifty-third chapter was none other than Jesus the Christ. We have assumed that, when he penned this chapter, the prophet was actually engaged in prophesying, and that he was speaking, not of himself but of Another, and that the One of whom he was speaking was Jesus Christ. It was thus, we have seen, that Philip the Evangelist interpreted the passage and, with the historic Christian Church, we have but followed in his footsteps. During the course of the past two centuries, however, voices have arisen which have asserted that the prophet was not speaking of Christ but rather of someone or of some group which was contemporary to himself. Some have even gone so far as to deny the possibility of such a predictive prophecy.

It will be necessary, therefore, in the light of current opposition to the positions which we have espoused, to make some brief remarks as to the tenability of the assumptions which have guided our study. During the eighteenth cen-

tury the view was first set forth with some consistency and clarity that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah could not have been written by Isaiah himself. The reason for this was that these twenty-seven chapters were supposed to reflect the time of the exile, whereas Isaiah himself had lived about two hundred years earlier, during the eighth century before Christ. In the early nineteenth century it was also pointed out that there were even chapters, such as thirteen and fourteen, among the first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah which also seemed to point to the time of the exile. If, however, Isaiah did not write the last twenty-seven chapters of the book, the question arose, who did write them? To this question different answers were given. Some said that a great prophet, unknown to us by name, was their author. Others declared that they were the work of a number of different writers. During the nineteenth century, the view gained ground among many scholars that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah were really the work of a great prophet who lived at the time of the exile. For convenience sake this prophet, whose name was unknown, was called the "second" Isaiah. Some scholars could not praise him sufficiently. He, they said, was really the first consistent monotheist in history. He raised Israel's religion to a peak which it had never reached before.

In 1892 however something happened which sent the great "second" Isaiah toppling from his throne. A German scholar by the name of Bernhard Duhm wrote a commentary on Isaiah in which he said in effect that the prevalent viewpoint about "second" Isaiah was mistaken. For one thing, he maintained, "second" Isaiah did not live in Babylon at all, but lived in Phoenicia, probably in the Lebanon. Then too, he was not the author of the last twenty-seven chapters, but only of chapters forty through fifty-five. Furthermore, he did not even write all of this section, for four chapters which deal with the Servant., including the fifty-third, were, according to Duhm, not written by him, but were inserted into the book at a later time. The remaining chapters, fifty-six through sixty-six, were written

about one hundred years later in Jerusalem by another man whom Duhm designated the "third Isaiah."

The appearance of this commentary made a profound change in the course of critical opinion. New questions, however, now began to arise. Who was this "third" Isaiah? Was he an individual, or were these chapters written by a number of men? From Duhm's day until the present the discussions have continued, and it cannot be said that unanimity of opinion upon these questions has been attained. One other factor of considerable importance has also been injected into the study of Isaiah. Proceeding upon the assumption that the prophets merely spoke their messages but did not write them down, a school arose which sought upon the basis of this supposition to discover what it thought to be the original message of the prophet. This was done by attempting to discover the life situation which had supposedly called forth each utterance. Some scholars thought that by this method they had succeeded in reaching the original words which the prophets uttered. They explained the writing down and the editing and collecting of these original prophetic oracles as the work of later editors and schools, who followed the teachings of the prophets.

For our part we are unable to accept these modern views as to the origin and composition of the prophetic books. The heading of the book of Isaiah identified the prophecy as the work of Isaiah the son of Amoz, and we have no reason for not accepting the testimony of the heading. While, however, this is not the place to discuss the various arguments which may be adduced for accepting the trustworthiness of the heading, there are certain factors which we do wish to point out to the reader, factors which are decisive for all who believe the Bible to be the infallible and inspired Word of the living and true God. What we have in mind is the testimony which the New Testament makes to the question of the authorship of the prophecy. In our opinion the New Testament settles the question once and for all time. We realize, of course, that there are those who will not be moved by any appeal that may be made to

the New Testament. If we are to be honest scholars, they will tell us, such an appeal is out of place. With this attitude, however, we disagree very firmly. If the New Testament cannot be trusted in what it says on the question of Isaianic authorship, why should it be trusted in anything else? If the New Testament witness to the authorship of the prophecy of Isaiah is of no value, then in consistency we should also hesitate to accept what the New Testament has to say about the saving death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. For our part we are not ashamed to appeal to the witness of the New Testament, for we believe that it is the very Word of the God of Truth, and consequently, that its statements upon any question are decisive.

What then does the New Testament have to say on the question of the Isaianic authorship of the prophecy? In answer we may note that the prophecy of Isaiah is quoted in the New Testament more than all the other prophetic books combined. And it is very instructive to consider the nature of these quotations. They are introduced by phrases such as — the prophet Isaiah — Isaiah the prophet — the prophecy of Isaiah — Isaiah prophesied — in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet — the book of the prophet Isaiah — Isaiah said again — Isaiah said — saw — spoke — reading Isaiah the prophet — well spake the Holy Ghost through Isaiah the prophet — Isaiah cries — as Isaiah said before — Isaiah says — Isaiah becomes bold and says.

These introductory formulae make it clear that the New Testament, in making reference to the prophecy, speaks not so much of a book which bore the name Isaiah as it does of the prophet himself as a spokesman. It is well to stress this fact, for there are those who think that the word "Isaiah" was simply a designation of the book in common use and that it indicated nothing as to who the author of that book was. The New Testament usage, however, refutes that idea, for it directs our attention, not to a book which happened to bear the name "Isaiah" but to the man himself.

It may be noted therefore that quotations taken both from the first and the second part of the prophecy are attributed in the New Testament to Isaiah himself. It is particularly with the quotations of Isaiah fifty-three however that we shall now concern ourselves. Thus, in Matthew 8:17 we read, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." In Romans 10:16 Paul writes, "But they have not all obeyed the Gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" A passage in the Gospel of John is of peculiar significance. John states that the Jews did not believe, even though Jesus had done many mighty miracles among them. This lack of belief on their part was in fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah who said "Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" Here, of course, is a quotation from the fifty-third chapter (the second part of Isaiah) attributed to Isaiah himself. John then proceeds by saying that they could not believe because Isaiah said again, "He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." Then the evangelist proceeds "These things (that is, both the quotation from the second part and the quotation from the first part of the prophecy) said Isaiah, when he saw His glory and spake of Him." In other words, the very conditions of the prophesying are given. Isaiah said these things and spoke of Christ when he saw Christ's glory. There is the "situation in life" in which these words were uttered. Isaiah saw Christ's glory (John 12:38-41).

For our part we are willing to accept the testimony of the New Testament. We believe that these words of the New Testament are true and faithful. There are of course difficulties in this position that Isaiah is the author of the entire book that bears his name. But we believe these difficulties are almost inconsequential when contrasted with the great difficulties that any alternative position brings with it. Consequently, with knowledge and appreciation of what has been written by modern scholarship upon the subject,

we still assert our belief in the Isaianic authorship of the fifty-third chapter. We believe that in writing as he did, Isaiah saw Christ's glory and spake of Him.

It will be seen immediately that this fundamental assumption which has underlain our discussion of the fifty-third chapter also has serious consequences as far as the interpretation of the prophecy is concerned. Here again, we would make it clear that we believe that the prophet, in speaking of the Servant of the Lord, was predicting the sufferings and death of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And here, in adopting this second fundamental assumption which has guided our study, we again part company with the vast majority of Biblical scholars. We do so, however, not out of any desire to maintain a traditional viewpoint, but simply because we are compelled by the evidence to do so.

There is an almost fundamental axiom which seems to undergird much recent study of the prophecy of Isaiah and of the other prophetic books as well. It is the assumption that the prophet was primarily a man of his own times and that he was speaking to his own times. This view was held by the older liberal theologians, but it has also come to expression in more recent study. We must, we are told, seek for the very situation in life which called forth the utterance of the prophet's word. There was a situation in the experiences of the prophet which led him to utter the words that he did, and it is the interpreter's duty to discover what this situation was.

Now it is perfectly clear that if we must be guided by this presupposition that we are always to find the life situation that called forth the utterances of the prophets, we shall do away almost entirely with true predictive prophecy. The New Testament gives a situation for the utterance of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah when it tells us that Isaiah spake of Christ when he saw His glory. That, however, is predictive prophecy. If, in addition, there was some local, historical situation back in the days of Isaiah, or, as most

critics would say "second" Isaiah (the time of the Babylonian exile) then, if we are to discover the one, we shall probably discount the other. There may be some who would try to find an historical situation in life and at the same time regard the prophecy as referring to Christ. This would be to give it a double reference, but for our part, we do not believe that this can be consistently carried out. In all fairness, of course, it must not be charged that all who seek for an historical situation in life are disbelievers in predictive prophecy; at the same time, however, many of them are such. And it is interesting to note that evangelical scholars who abhor modernism and destructive criticism of the Bible, have been the ones who have insisted upon the predictive element in the prophecy, whereas, all too often, those who have stressed the "situation in life" have willingly embraced a divisive critical attitude toward the Bible and have been willing to accept its statements as in error.

Suppose, however, that we accept this fundamental postulate of the modern school. Suppose that we are willing to seek for the "situation in life" of every prophetic utterance, what do we find? Well, with respect to Isaiah fifty-three we find a great divergence of opinion. We find that for a long time scholars have been divided into two principal groups. On the one hand there were those who said that the Servant was an individual; on the other there were those who insisted that the Servant represented a group. And so, the two types of interpretation, the individualistic versus the collectivistic, have long been engaging in struggle for the mastery. But if the Servant is an individual, who was he? Various answers have been given. He was, it has been said, Moses, Job, Jeremiah, Zerubbabel, Jehoiachin, Meshullam, Isaiah, "second" Isaiah, or an eschatological figure. The candidates for the position are numerous indeed, and we have mentioned only a few of them. Suppose, on the other hand, that the collectivistic interpretation is correct. To what group, we may ask, does the prophet have reference? Again, various candidates have been proposed. The group is said to be Israel, or the

prophets, or the godly remnant in Israel, or the teachers of the law.

At the present day, the battle between the collectivistic and individualistic views has somewhat subsided due to the emergence of a new type of interpretation, an interpretation which is likewise concerned with discovering the life situation or original nature of the prophecy. Perhaps it is safe to refer to this type of interpretation as new, at least it is a refreshing change from the views of the older liberalism. From the Scandinavian countries a vast amount of literature upon the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah has in recent times made its appearance. Much of this literature is characterized by an attempt to trace the origin of the idea of the Servant to ancient oriental backgrounds. We shall sketch briefly only one of these positions, so that the reader may have an idea of the direction that present study of Isaiah fifty-three is taking.

According to one expression of this modern interpretation the figure of the Servant of the Lord is derived ultimately from the old ideology of the kingship, but freed from some of the national limitations which clustered about this ideology. Isaiah fifty-three, we are told, really belongs in the same category as some of the Psalms, which may be described as "royal passion" Psalms. Now, in their original situation these Psalms were rituals which had reference to the function of the sacral king in the cult; the passages in which the Servant is mentioned, however, are really a remodelling, done by the prophets, of a liturgical composition which was connected with an annual festival in which the king appeared as one accused and as one who was responsible, not only for his own sin, but also for that of the entire nation. In this festival the king is supposed to have made confession and by means of various symbolical acts to which correspond ideologically his "suffering," "death" and "resurrection," to have made atonement.

The figure of the Servant, however, we are told, is not the king himself. Rather, he is the Messiah who is portrayed in the motifs and categories of the ideology of the sacral king. The formulae and modes of expression derived

from this cult are therefore applied to the expected Messiah. This ideology is similar to the old ideology of the Tammuz cult, and thus it shows how the Davidic Messiah can at the same time be the suffering Messiah, the Saviour, and the real figure for whom the Davidic dynasty awaited. At the same time, although the chapter has reference to the Messiah, we are not to regard it as a prophecy of Jesus Christ.

We have done nothing more than sketch this view in its bare essentials. It is a position that has been advocated by a great scholar and with much learning and acumen, and we have mentioned it because it is the type of interpretation which will probably hold the field in the study of Isaiah fifty-three for some time to come.

The reader will notice, however, that here again is an attempt to explain the chapter upon the basis of the situation in life which gave rise to it. Consequently, this view also labors under the same disadvantages that attend all those theories that reject the clear teaching of the New Testament on the nature of prophecy.

And this brings us to the heart of the matter as far as the question of prophecy is concerned. How are we to regard the prophets of Israel? Shall we adopt the view that they were simply men of deep religious belief and conviction who possessed a more profound insight into religious truth than did other men? Shall we assume that in His providential workings God did indeed permit the prophet to speak in terms which might later be found very suitable as a description of the sufferings and death of Christ? Is there, after all, merely a correspondence, albeit a Divinely designed correspondence, between the description of the Servant in Isaiah fifty-three and the actual sufferings and death of Christ?

Or shall we say rather that the prophets of Israel were men who occupied a unique position in Israel because the one true God Who made heaven and earth, did speak in a special direct manner to them and thus gave to them a revelation of His will? When Isaiah uttered the wondrous

fifty-third chapter, was he merely setting forth a complex of ideas concerning the substitutionary suffering of the Servant, or rather, was he, under the special compulsion of the Holy Spirit, prophesying of the coming Saviour? There is a vast difference between these two viewpoints. Is Isaiah fifty-three merely a description of suffering and death which corresponds remarkably with the sufferings and death of Christ, or is Isaiah fifty-three a real prediction of those sufferings and death? To state the matter in slightly different terms, did Jesus Christ see in Isaiah fifty-three a pattern of sacrifice which He adopted as suitable for Himself, or rather was Isaiah fifty-three actually a prophecy of the suffering and death which Jesus Christ was to undergo? The latter is the answer of the New Testament and of the historic Christian Church. It is, we believe, the only tenable answer, for it alone satisfies all the requirements of the case.

There are of course objections to this time honored view of Christ's Church, but some of these objections rest upon an estimate of the powers of the human reason which is not in accord with the truth. The spirit of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was one which had highly extolled the powers of man's mind. Human reason had been unduly exalted, and everything, it would seem, must now be brought before the bar of human reason and subjected to its criticism. Hence, we are told that the belief that God spoke directly to the prophets is too mechanical. Such a belief, it is argued, makes of the prophets mere machines and deprives them of their personalities.

Is such, however, actually the case? Certainly it is not if we allow the Scriptures themselves to speak. When therefore, we do allow the Scriptures to speak, what do we find that they teach concerning the inspiration of the prophets? For one thing they make it clear that God did indeed place His words in the mouths of the prophets. The words which the prophets spake were the words of God; they were of Divine origin. Lest the objection should be raised that such a position amounts to virtual dictation, it might be well to pause and to note that, after all, man is

not on an equality with God. It is no detraction from the nobility of man that the sovereign Creator should reveal His will to those whom He has created. It does not debase man at all; rather, it is an act of wondrous condescending grace that God should so speak to His creatures. Hence, when men raise cries of "dictation," as though that were somehow a valid objection to prophetic inspiration, we are not greatly impressed with the force of the objection. If God has thus revealed Himself to the prophets, we can but lift our hearts to Him in profound gratitude that He has so exalted and honored our human race as to reveal His will unto it.

Does however this revelation of God deprive the prophets of their human characteristics and responsibilities, so that they are, after all, merely automata? The answer is that it does nothing of the sort. In a very mysterious manner God has so conveyed His words to prophets that, in the utterance of these words, although they are truly of Divine origination, nevertheless the prophet speaks as a man. Very instructive in this respect is the heading, for example, of the prophecy of Amos. Here we read of the "words of Amos which he saw," and this sets forth the true state of the case. The words are those of the prophet himself. His own style and human characteristics are employed in writing them down. At the same time they are words which he saw by Divine revelation; they are the words of God. This doctrine of prophetic inspiration is one which passes human comprehension, but that is not sufficient reason for its rejection. Very wondrous and very precious is this doctrine, and it alone explains the strange phenomenon of the prophetic utterances.

There is yet another objection that is raised to the view which we have set forth. How, it is at times asked, could a prophet who lived centuries before the time of Christ know anything about the sufferings and the death of the Saviour? How could he foresee such things? Of course, we may say by way of answer, in his own strength and by

his own power he could not foresee them. If, however, God placed the message in the mind of the prophet, there is no reason why he could not have uttered it. We may freely grant that the prophet spoke far more deeply than he realized. At the same time, as Isaiah uttered these sad words which describe the atoning work of the Servant, he must have realized that he was not writing of some past or contemporary figure but rather of the Messiah who was to come. And, if in God's providence, he had been permitted to walk past Calvary on that dreadful day, he would have realized that there, in that central Figure that hung upon the Cross, was the One of whom he had been writing.

There is one factor which must not be ignored in any serious study of the prophecy. The (salvation which the Servant obtains for sinners is depicted as spiritual in nature. It is not deliverance from foreign oppressors or unjust affliction that forms the grand theme of Isaiah fifty-three. It is, rather, salvation from the guilt and power of sin.

In the Old Testament salvation in this high sense is attributed to God alone. Freedom from earthly bondage or human oppressors may at times be ascribed to men, but there is only One Who can set men free from the power of sin. It is when we pay serious heed to the nature of the deliverance described that we realize that we are face to face with the picture of a deliverance such as God alone can accomplish. And thus our hearts readily give assent to the New Testament interpretation of the prophecy.

The real objection to the interpretation which we have been expounding lies in the fact that it posits the entrance of the supernatural into human history in a special, direct manner. And the climate of human opinion today is very hostile to such a position. It is the tendency to exalt human reason to a point where, perhaps unconsciously, we make it the bar of judgment before which everything must be tested. Now, reason is a wondrous gift of God but reason can only be in accord with the truth when it thinks God's

revealed thoughts after Him. Human reason, in other words, must be in accord with God's reason, else we shall ever be in profound error. And to elevate human reason to the position of supreme arbiter of all things is to attribute to it a function which it cannot discharge. It is really to exalt man above God.

If, therefore, we are to understand the Bible, which is a Divine revelation, we must bring our reason as a captive to God and consecrate it to His own service. This is of course a difficult thing to do. It is a difficult thing to become as a little child and to trust entirely in the revelation that God has given us. Yet, only by becoming as little children shall we come to the knowledge of the truth.

Perhaps more than was the case with a former age our modern scholarly world shrinks back from too much open praise of unaided human reason. At the same time, in undertaking research we set ourselves up as judges of what is and what is not relevant to our investigation. We are very proud of that modern creation of the human mind, the "scientific" method. As students of the Bible we are not interested in that which cannot be empirically controlled. We are fond of setting up limits as to what is and what is not scientific, and beyond these limits we will not go, for beyond these limits, we have decided, lies the realm of faith, and that realm, we think, lies outside the area of a proper scientific method. In our modern approach, however, we are as far from the truth as were ever the crass rationalists of former years.

In our efforts to abide by the "scientific." method, however, we never seem to arrive at the key to the mystery—Strive as we do to understand Isaiah fifty-three, we do not arrive at the truth. For a time our solutions have seemed very satisfactory, but the passage of time had pointed out how unsatisfactory they really were. That which satisfied the scholars of a generation ago is now discarded, and other interpretations are more popular and pleasing at present.

When however the warm sunshine of God's grace enters the heart, a very strange thing takes place. It now becomes

clear to us that, since our minds are created, they cannot know all things, but rather must seek to think God's revealed thoughts after Him. And before these revealed thoughts we bow, like little children, in humility and gratitude. No longer do we seek in our own unaided wisdom to understand the Bible, but we gladly accept it as the Word of God.

Thus the strongest arguments against the Messianic interpretation of Isaiah fifty-three disappear from before the eyes. To him who, through God's grace, has become as a little child, it is now clear that God did, in most gracious fashion, reveal to the prophet the glorious truths which are so sublimely expressed in this chapter. Others may try to explain the chapter as primarily a human message, called forth by certain circumstances existing in the prophet's day. He however who is willing to accept the testimony of the Bible as trustworthy, knows that it is nothing of the sort. He knows that it is what it claims to be and what the New Testament says it is, a prophecy concerning God's Servant who was to deliver mankind from the guilt and pollution of sin. And he would bow in humble adoration before the God of history and prophecy who, in the sending of His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, has so wondrously fulfilled that which He earlier revealed unto His servant the prophet, concerning Him Who was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities.

NOTES

The sub-headings "Golgotha" and "Sit Thou On My Right Hand" have been suggested by the commentary on Isaiah by Franz Delitzsch (re-printed, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1949).

Page 5 — The quotation from Dr. Machen is taken from his work. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 1930, p. 294, and is used by permission of the publishers, Harper & Bros.

Page 26 — The scholar referred to is Franz Feldmann, a Roman Catholic who has written a valuable commentary on Isaiah. See *Das Buch Isaias*, Zweiter Halbband, 1926, p. 163.

Page 28 — Luther's translation of 53:1 reads: "Aber wer glaubt unserer Predigt? und wem wird der Arm des Herrn geoffenbaret?"

Page 53 — The reference is to Paul Volz: *Jesaia II*, 1932, p. 180. "Das stellvertretende Leiden ist in diesem Gottesspruch mit nicht weniger als fünf Sätzen ausgesprochen! Es ist als konnte Gott sich nicht genug tun, dies festzustellen."

Page 61 — Christopher North: *The Suffering Servant In Deutero-Isaiah*, 1948, p. 124, has a valuable discussion of the text of this passage.

Page 85 — The position which has here been briefly sketched has been ably presented by Ivan Engnell: "The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs And The Suffering Messiah In 'Deutero-Isaiah'," in the *Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library*, Manchester, Vol. 31, 1948, pp. 54-93.

The best recent defense of the Isaianic authorship of the entire prophecy is that of Oswald T. Allis: *The Unity Of Isaiah*, Philadelphia, 1950.