

Exegesis of Isaiah 53

by Herbert C. Winterstein

[Written as a conference paper in 1969]

In his commentary on “Jesaias Zwei” August Pieper outlined the last 21 chapters of the book of Isaiah into 3 chief parts, each of which consists of 9 chapters: chapters 40-48, dealing with “The Future Glory of the Church,” chapters 49-57, dealing with “The Redemption of the World from the Guilt of Sin,” and chapters 58-66, treating “Scriptural and Eternal Redemption.” Each of these 3 chief parts of 9 chapters are divided into 3 triads of 3 chapters each. Therefore it can hardly be looked upon as sheer coincidence that in such a symmetrically written work Isaiah, greatest of all preachers of the Old Testament, should have placed the section we are dealing with in the middle portion of the middle triad of the middle chief part. But even supposing that this was not the result of conscious artistic effort, if any chapter of the Old Testament deserves to be placed in the very center of things, it is this chapter, chapter 53 of Isaiah. Due to an error in the division of chapters that took place in the 13th century, the first 3 verses of our section were placed at the end of chapter 52. The section we are dealing with consists of a total of 15 verses arranged in our Bible as verses 13-15 of chapter 52 and all 12 verses of chapter 53. We might note even further that the 15-verse section that we are dealing with has as its central point what we know as verses 4-6 of Isaiah 53 – “Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows,” etc. Here in the very center of the 2nd part of the book of the prophet Isaiah is that section or group of 3 verses that we undoubtedly all know by heart and almost involuntarily choose to speak to people when we want to proclaim the very heart of the Gospel comfort, Christ’s vicarious death on the cross.

Although he wrote 700 years before Christ’s coming, there is no more beautiful homiletical material or more lucid doctrinal presentation of that holy of holies of our faith which we will soon meditate on during the season of Lent, the substitutionary suffering and death of the God-man for mankind. Therefore last November 25 the program committee requested me to write an exegesis of this great chapter that we will surely all be making use of during Lent, either as sermon texts themselves or as material for appropriation in the unfolding of the Gospel message. Although this presentation will not be completely exhaustive, it is hoped that it will serve to refresh and stimulate us in our study for the message of Lent.

I.

As was stated above, Is. 52:12 to Isaiah 53:13 is the middle portion of the middle triad of the middle part of Isaiah’s so-called book of Comfort. The middle part deals with “The Redemption of the World from the Guilt of Sin;” the middle triad of 3 chapters shows us that The Zealous Love of the Lord redeems his wretched congregation through the substitutionary sufferings of His servant and leads them with Him to glory. Our own portion of 15 verses deals with the *Successful Substitutionary-Suffering of the Servant of the Lord*. The chapter can easily be divided into 5 strophes of 3 verses each:

- 52:13-15 tells us of the Exaltation of the Successful Servant who had been humiliated;
- 53:1-3 tells of the Great Humiliation of the Servant;
- 53:4-6 tells that In His Humiliation the Servant bore our Suffering;
- 53:7-9 shows that He suffered patiently though He was Innocent;
- 53:10-12 again prophesies of The Exaltation of the Successful Servant after His Great Suffering.

Strophe 1: The Exaltation of the Successful Servant who had been humiliated

v.13 : הָיָה יְשׁוּבָה לְיְרוּסָם וְנִשְׂאָ וְנִגְבָּה מֵאָדָּם

Behold, my servant will be successful. He shall arise and lift Himself up and be exceedingly high.

Hinneh is emphatic, asseverative; *Jaskhil* is the third person, sing. imperfect Hiphil from *Sakhal*, which according to Gesenius means to be prudent, or act prudently, to be what in the German is called *klug*. Gen. 48:14 says of Israel or Jacob, He placed his hands prudently, or of set purpose, for Manasseh was the firstborn. However, the final meaning given by Gesenius for the Hiphil is that of “To be successful or to act prosperously.” He cites as examples of this sense Joshua saying, “Only be thou strong and very courageous that thou mayest observe to do according to all the Law which Moses my servant commanded thee; turn not from it to the right or to the left, that *thou mayest prosper (Taskhil)* withsoever thou goest.” Jeremiah 23:5 also uses *Sakhal* in the same sense in the well-known passage, “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a king shall reign and prosper (*Hiskhil*).” The full force of the Hiphil is felt in this sense: his prudent actions will be carried out and executed to their conclusion. He will not only act wisely, but he will prosper and successfully attain his goal through his wise action. The context here certainly calls for this sense, for the whole strophe brings out his success. Chapters 42, 49, and 50 had already brought out the thought that the servant of the Lord will succeed and complete the work assigned to Him in spite of all difficulties. This thought of the success of his work in our success-conscious society – which at the same time is completely unsuccessful in building its “heaven” here below – could certainly also be used homiletically.

Since the following 3 verbs are a development or further explanation of *Jaskhil* they presuppose the humiliation of the servant described in v.14.

Jarum is the 3rd Sing. Masc. Imperfect Qal of *Rum*, which according to Gesenius means to arise, grow; with the three connotations of “to show oneself powerful; to be exalted or become high; or to be high, lofty.”

He didn’t remain in His condition of humiliation, but again triumphs and conquers by arising, showing Himself according to Romans 1:4 to be the Son of God with power. The basic meaning of this verb is “to arise.” The Holy Ghost must be pointing to the resurrection here, as evidence of His success in His humiliation.

Since *Jarum* is imperfect, the vav consecutives make the following perfects *nissah* and *gabbah* both futures. *Nissah* is the piel of *Nassah*, to take up, or lift up. In the piel it means to lift up or exalt. According to the immediate and original reflexive meaning of the Niphil, it means to lift oneself up. I took it as a Niphil. The Piel could be either *Nisah* or *Niseh*, especially when we note its position between *Jarum* (He will arise) and *Gabbah* (acc. to Gesenius, to be high, elevated, exalted, expressing the condition of being on high), we can only take *Nissah* as referring in advance to the **ascension** and *Gabbah* as referring to the **session** at the right hand of God. *Nissah* is the process of taking or lifting himself up into the safety and security of heaven where he is now elevated on high above all powers, exceedingly, as will shortly be explained inverse 15, even over the heathen and heathen kings.

v.14: כְּאִשֶּׁר שָׁמְמוּ עָלֶיךָ רַבִּים בֶּן־מִשְׁחַת מְאִישׁ מְרֵאָהוּ וְתֹארוֹ מִבְּנֵי אָדָם:

Just as many were astonished because of you— So great was His appearance disfigured more than any man, and His form than the sons of men—

Kha’ascher Schaminoo Alejka rabbim has its conclusion first in v. 15. The clause beginning with *Khen mischchath* is parenthetical.

Schaminoo is the 3rd Plural Qal from *Shamen* which according to Gesenius means “to be astonished because of anything” when followed by *al*. The second meaning “to be laid waste.” Pieper connects these two sentences by saying that *Shamen* designates the condition of spiritual and physical destruction, stiffness, and death, here an horror at the disfigurement of the form of the servant referred to in the parenthesis.

The parenthesis contains the reason for the astonishment caused by the servant of Jehovah. It also prepares the way for the change of persons from direct address to the Servant to a declaration in verse 15. Isaiah quite often changes person e.g. 42:20 and 1:9, since he is quite dramatic in his style.

Mishchath may be *Mishchath* with a chamez in the construct case before the comparatives Gesenius gives the meaning of *Mishchath* as destruction, or marring. In the concrete it can mean something marred, or disfigured, as it does here. The other possibility which has been mentioned by commentators is that *mischchath* really stands for *moschchath*, the Hophal participle of *schachath*, to destroy. In either case the sense is certain; His appearance and His form were disfigured and distorted. *Mishchath* must be repeated before *Mibb'ney*.

We fail to follow the logic of Delitzsch when he comments on this verse, "Unattractive in appearance, though not deformed He no doubt was in the days of His flesh; but He is ideally beautiful in His glorification." First of all, this contradicts his statement, "His appearance and form were altogether distortion." Secondly, the use of *Thoar* points to a nobility of natural appearances, if anything. *Thoar*, related to the root *Thaar*, to mark or describe, means the form of a body, especially of a beautiful form. Now this doesn't prove he was the handsomest looking person in the world, especially in light of a few verses ahead, but since the word doesn't mean an ugly or distorted or unattractive form, the most natural explanation is to think of the disfigurement and distortion which took place spiritually and physically in His deep degradation. Verses 3, 4, 5 and 7 of the following strophes amplify and elaborate on this and the Passion story also confirms it in the fulfillment. We sing such songs as "Stricken, smitten, and afflicted, See Him hanging on the tree."

v.15 כִּן יִזֶה גּוֹיִם רַבִּים עָלָיו יִקְפְּצוּ מְלָכִים פִּיהֶם בִּי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־סָפַר לָהֶם רְאוּ וְאֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ הִתְבּוֹנְנוּ:

So shall He be sprinkled upon many nations, and kings shall shut their mouths at Him because those to whom He was not recounted shall see and those who have not heard shall understand.

Now in v.15 we have the conclusion of the 1st clause in v.14. Just as strong as was the horror and astonishment of many over the disfigurement of the servant, so strong will be their joy at His glorification. The *rabbim* in v.14 has grown to the *goyim rabbim* in v.15.

Jazeh is the imperfect Hiphil of *Nazah*. According to Gesenius, *Nasah* means to exult with joy in the Qal. In the Hiphil, used with fluids, it means to be sprinkled, spatter (*spritzen*) followed by *Al*, upon or at anything. Gesenius translates or better paraphrases this verse, "Christ shall sprinkle many nations as if they were scattered as drops." He also quotes Luther as explaining this "He shall purge them in His own blood."

There is no doubt that this is a problem text.

Pieper states that *hissah* does not have the meaning of sprinkle with the accusative of person. When we look at Exodus 29:21, it says, "Sprinkle it upon Aaron and upon his garments." The Hebrew for sprinkle here is *vhizaatha*, certainly a Hiphil form of *Nazah*. It also says in Numbers 8:6,7, "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." Here the Hiphil imperative is used, *Hazeh*. It is true that in both instances the preposition *al* occurs before the persons, but perhaps this is because such a ceremonial sprinkling was an outward sprinkling which could not really wash away sin in the heart. However, persons were sprinkled. Pieper also states that the connection with the previous, that is, the opposition to *schaminoo rabbim* and the connection with the following (the loss of speech and kings etc.) doesn't allow us to think of a process of purification or cleansing of the heathen, but it demands an act which is somewhat similar to the closing of the mouths of the kings as far as its results are concerned. The horror and the loss of speech of the unbelievers at the sudden appearance of the servant on Judgment Day is meant. He then refers to Matthew 24:30, 25:31ff; Luke 23:30; Rev. 6:15,16 compared with Isaiah 2 and Hosea 10. But one fails to see how any of these references conforms to the idea of kings shutting their mouths at Him. Incidentally, *Yikritsoo* is the Imperfect Qal from *Kapats*, meaning contract or shut. Let us see if the people in the references had a loss of speech as a result of Christ's coming to judge. In Matt. 24:30 the wicked steward was still complaining, the people on the left side contradicted him, those in

Luke and Rev. were crying loudly, Ye mountains and rocks, fall on us. In no cases does one see the loss of speech of the unbelievers at the sudden appearance of the servant on Judgment Day.

It almost seems like Pieper hasn't even thoroughly convinced himself, for he adds, "This doesn't exclude the other revelations of the glory of Jesus, also the spiritual one to conversion" compare Is. 49:7.

This verse cited, Is. 49:7, is quite interesting. "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful etc." To the one whom the nation abhorreth Kings shall see and arise – Princes shall worship. You don't have to have your mouth open for this. You can be dumbstruck with awe and adoration and worship. The greatest honor we pay him is when we sit like Mary and listen to Him in His word. When we stop boasting about our works and righteousness and listen in worshipful silence to the Gospel. Doesn't that give all glory to Him? In this connection also Ps. 2 is of interest. The kings of the earth set themselves against the Lord and the Lord's anointed and said "Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us." While they opposed Him they had their mouth open. Then later it says "Kiss the Son lest He be angry." Close your mouth and worship Him. This, of course, doesn't prove the meaning of our passage Isa. 52:15. It only shows that the statements "Kings shall shut their mouths at Him," doesn't prove it either.

But there is another clause yet in this verse which adduces the reason why the glory of the servant put the people and kings into such a state. They perceive something entirely unexpected, unheard of, incredible. Because that which was not told them, they shall see, and that which they did not hear, they shall understand. *Rau* is external perception, and *Hithbonanu* (in the clause here) is internal perception, *Hithbonanu* is a Perf. Hithpael from *Bien*. Acc. to Gesenius this means to perceive, discern, have understanding. *Soophar* is a Pual from *saphar*, which means to scratch, scrape, write letters on stone in the Qal, and narrate, and recount in the Piel. I take *Rau* and *Hithbonanu* to be Prophetic perfects, because they are translated with the future tense when this passage is quoted by Paul in Romans 15:21.

But if Paul quotes this in the New Testament, shouldn't this shed some light on the meaning of v.15 of Isaiah 52. Neither Delitzsch nor Pieper quote this clear quotation from Is. 52:15 in Romans. Romans 15:20-21 says, "Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation: But as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand." It is obvious that here Paul understands this passage as referring to the conversion of the heathen. It is interesting to note that even Kretzman who said about the same thing Pieper did in a shortened form when commenting on Isaiah does say in commenting on Romans 15:21, "The prophet, namely Isaiah, had plainly said that the kings and nations of the earth would at the time of the Messiah's coming, hear and see something which had not penetrated to them before, namely, the glorious news of the Servant of God."

The understanding of Paul, written by inspiration, really settles the matter. Scripture interprets Scripture. That also fits in beautifully with the context. The first strophe paints a picture of the rest in advance. None of the remaining strophes again take up the theme of the horror of the unbelievers. But it does say in v.12, therefore will I divide Him a portion of the many etc. Moreover, it also fits in with the clause in verse 14 which says, "As many were astonished at thee." Pieper gave us reason for his interpretation that the second half of the parallel was in opposition to the first half. But we must ask, "Where then is the opposition?" Isn't it rather a repetition of the 1st clause to say that many nations shall be astonished with horror at Him? But there is a true contrast when we understand as does Luther. As many were astonished, so many nations that shall be sprinkled with His blood of the New Cov't, for nations and kings shall see and hear what they haven't before the Gospel which applies and transmits the forgiveness wrought by His blood. And then also that previous passage which even Pieper still couldn't forget, Is. 49:7, speaking about kings arising and seeing him, fits in beautifully with the seeing in verse 15, especially when we remember that the basic meaning of *nazah* is to arise and leap for joy. In fact, that would be better understanding of *nazah*, to cause to leap for joy, just the opposite of *shamem*, than to cause to leap internally for horror. Finally, since in the 19 other times the verb is used in the OT, it means sprinkling – the leaping and springing up of liquid. We see no reason to differ in the least from what Luther translated, so shall He sprinkle many nations, namely purge them with the blood of the New Cov't.

II.

The second strophe Is. 53:1-3. The great humiliation of the servant.

v.1 מי האֲמִין לְשִׁמְעָתָנוּ וְזִרְוֹעַ יְהוָה עַל־מִי נִגְלָתָהּ:

But Who believes our message and to whom is the strength (arm) of the Lord revealed?

How wonderfully the understanding v.15 as the conversion of the heathen also fits in with the next verse. In contrast to their hearing and seeing, the prophet, asks “Who has believed our report?” Pieper repeats over and over that verse 15 does not refer to conversion of the heathen and then explains, “the implicit connection of the thought.” But Luther’s understanding of v.15 is much more congruous with v.1.

Heemin is the Hiphil Perfect from *Aman*, to prop, stay, sustain, support in the Qal, and to lean upon, to build upon; fig. to trust, confide in, believe, in the Hiphil. *Schimuatheynu* is the noun *schimuah* with a plural suffix. The noun means message, tidings, a message sent from God. Who has leaned upon, or trusted and confided in our tidings? Delitsch says that since in v. 2 the children of Israel are included in this “we” – so also here. But did they do the preaching? The “our” in this verse doubtless refers to the prophet in relation with all of his companions in office. All the prophets of the Old Testament, including Isaiah and his companions were not accepted as long as their reporting or preaching (if you take *Shimuah* subjectively) or their report of message (if you take it objectively) was a true one. The only time that they were honored is after they were dead, when the people built sepulchres to them because they didn’t have to listen to them anymore – The way Luther is honored today as a great hero by all Germane according to Dr. Oesch, because now they don’t have to listen to what he says. Isaiah talked himself blue in the face and almost no one would believe him.

It is still true today that most men refuse to believe the report of the truth. All should believe our report. All should confess the vicarious atonement. But we also know from experience that the message concerning the Suffering Servant may be presented ever so clearly, and yet many people in the world today despise it. The talk about a vicarious atonement isn’t practical enough for many even though it is the most practical message that there is – the only one that can deliver modern man from outer darkness and endless pain.

Prof. Pieper points out that we should not be surprised that Isaiah switches to a different person as the speaker in v. 2 because Isaiah is a dramatist who permits different persons to speak without indicating it. In verses 13-15 the Father is speaking; He says “My servant.” In verse 1 of chapter 53 the prophet himself is speaking with his companions. In 53:2-7 the people are all included in “we”; in v. 8 suddenly the Lord (my people); in verses 9 and 10 again the people or the prophet, and in verses 11 and 12 again the Lord as at the beginning. The text critics see a reason for a correction in the occurrence of the *ammi* in v. 8, but one has no trouble if he remembers there is a change of speakers throughout.

In v. 1 we have a rhetorical question. Isaiah has preached much about the glory of God’s servant in chapters 4, 7, 9, 11, 32, 33, 34, 35, 40, 42, 49, 50, but until now it seemed to be entirely in vain. Who believes it? The perfect could be understood as a perfect of experience or one that designates the past extending into the present.

Only when the Spirit transposed him among the disciples at Pentecost did he see the eyes of the elect opened. As is done in poetry, the second line of this verse states a similar thought to that of the first. *Zimah* means arm; especially the forearm; fig. strength, might, power. The power of the Lord, the covenant God is of course his gracious power, *Nigilah* is the Niphal 3rd s. fem. because *ziroah* is feminine. *Galah* means to make naked, reveal, uncover in the Qal, and be revealed, appear, in the Niphal. This gracious power of the lord has been revealed when people come to a spiritual knowledge of the truth of the Gospel and place their confidence in it.

This last statement certainly also contains the truth that it is as a result of the Lord's strength that one comes to believe the Gospel. One might be tempted to think that if he appeals to man's own ability to convert himself, he will have more results with his preaching. He may even want to do this subconsciously, realizing how people respond to flattering of their powers and abilities. That kind of preaching we could call the "Graham-hype." But this certainly a thunderbolt against a "Graham-type" of delivery which would give man the impression that decision is up to him. Isaiah teaches that if a man has believed it is due to the Lord's power. He agrees perfectly with Paul who says that "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. 12:3.

v.2 וַיֵּעַל כַּיּוֹנֵק לְפָנָיו וּכְשֶׁרֶשׁ מֵאֶרֶץ צִיָּה לֹא-תֵאָר לוֹ וְלֹא הָדָר וְנִרְאָהוּ וְלֹא-מִרְאָה וְנִחְמְדָהוּ:

And He shall go up as a shoot before his face and as a small root from the dry earth. He has no form and no honor, and if we shall see Him, He has no appearance that we should desire Him.

Vs. 2 and 3 are the basis of v. 1. The Vav consecutive imperfect is explanatory. It has the force of the prophetic perfect. *Jonehq* is really a Qal participle from *yanakh* (to suck) meaning a suckling, a shoot, or a sucker. Israel didn't recognize the divine glory of the servant since He appeared in such a humble form. He was like a stem or shoot of a branch that goes completely unnoticed. *Schoresch*, root or shoot, has the same sense as *nezer* in chapter 11, the Rod or really small twig or shoot coming out of the stem or dead stump of the house of Jesse. Here it says that the Servant will go up before Israel as a shoot or small twig, and a root from *Ziyah* meaning aridity, drought, arid desert land, related to the verb *Zahah* to be sunny, arid. He is like a root from an arid, desert land. This dry land is similar to the dead stump of Jesse from which the rod is said to spring. In our verse the house of Jesse or David is represented as a dry earth or desert land from which a root cannot sent forth shoots in a natural way. This royal house of David is in a withered condition. "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Matt. 13:55ff. "What good thing can come out of Nazareth?" John 1:46.

As we noted before *Thoar* refers to the form of the body in its literal sense, often a beautiful form. *Hadar* is an ornament, adorning, decoration, or honor, used also of the majesty of God. The outward form of Christ was not like that of a "Greek god" which would cause everyone to recognize that He was the Son of God. This word *Thoar* is also used in I Sam. 28:14, when Saul asked the witch of Endor, "What form is he of?" concerning the spirit he was invoking.

Still we cannot draw any conclusions about the actual appearance of Christ from this except that it wasn't extraordinary. The heads of Christ are artistic ideals. Scripture doesn't describe his real appearance. The thing that is really being talked about here is the adornments such as rank and position, power and outward brilliance which appear splendid to the eyes of natural man. The appearance of the Suffering servant among men was not striking or of the kind that would attract admiration, He didn't achieve the success in His redemptive work by what is important in human sight. As far as rank and position and outward showmanship, you wouldn't compare him to the Cedars of Lebanon which are admired by all, but with a weak root struggling to live in the dry earth. In fact, he told his disciples in Matt. 8:20, "The Son of man hath not where to lay His head." How much respect would a person command by the people of this world today if he didn't even have a house or formal education. He would be looked upon as a kind of bum, a second-rate person without a bit of status, to say the least. One is reminded of the poster on Wis. Luth. High School, "Boy – that's what they'll call you all your working life if you drop out of high school." As it says in Phil 2:7: "He made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant." This was part of His humiliation. The rest of the verse has 3 different *vavs*. We can understand the first vav temporally or conditionally, When or if we shall see him. *Rahah*, remember, refers to external seeing in contrast to *Bin* – there is no *Mareh* appearance, look, aspect, vision, sight, form, that we should delight in Him. The verb *Chamad* means to desire, covet, delight in, according to Gesenius. The form *Vnechmedehoo* is the 1st Person Plural Qal Imperfect with a masc. sing. suffix as is

Nirehho. The 2nd vav introduces the consequent clause to “If we shall see Him,” and the 3rd vav introduces a result clause.

v.3 נְבֹזָה וְחָדַל אִישִׁים אִישׁ מְכַאבוֹת וַיְדוּעַ חֲלִי וּכְמִסְתָּר פָּנִים מִמֶּנּוּ נְבֹזָה וְלֹא חֲשַׁבְנָהּ:

He was despised and forsaken by important men, a man of pains and acquainted with suffering (afflicted) and, and like one causing us to hide our faces. He was despised and we esteemed him at nothing.

V.3 intensifies the thought of v. 2b. *Nibseh* is the Niphal Part. from *Bazah* to despise, to condemn, trample. The last phrase of v. 2, *W'lo Vnechmideyho* expresses the contemptibility of the appearance of the servant negatively, now this *Nibseh* does it positively. Young notes quite aptly in this connection that one cannot be neutral in the attitude toward the Suffering Servant. Either he will rejoice in His salvation and esteem Him, or He will reject and despise Him. When today we have no time for worshipping Him, reading His Word, praying to Him, etc., we are also despising Him.

Wachadal ischim becomes more concrete. *Chachel* is a verbal adjective from the verb *Chadal* to leave off, cease, desist, forsake or also to be wanting or lacking. He was forsaken by men. He was wanting men. *Ischim* is used as the plural of *Isch* only in Ps. 114:4, and Proverbs 4:8 outside of this passage. *Anaschim* is the usual form. It undoubtedly refers to men of nobility, persons of position. In the singular *isch* often means that, as in chapter 2:9. He is without the surroundings of the high and the influential. The chief men of the nation withdrew and forsook Him. Now the description moves forward another step. A man of sorrows or pains – *Makh'both* is the plural of the feminine noun *Makh'ob* which is from the root *Caeb*. It means pain literally and pain of soul or sorrow, metaphorically. Here it undoubtedly refers to pains of both body and soul. The chief feature of his life was pain of body and soul. *Widua choli* – *W'dua* is vav and *J'dua* the construct form of *J'dua*, the Qal passive participle of *Jadah*. The dictionary meaning for this word is “to perceive, to acquire knowledge, to know, to be acquainted, to know by experience” (p.333 of Gesenius). *Choli* is the pause of *Chali*, disease, internal or external; affliction, sadness; evil, calamity. Some have said that he had by nature a sickly body. But when we think of the tremendous amount of work he did just in some of the typical days in His ministry, that certainly cannot be accepted. The *J'dua* is a passive participle, but could also be used here in a stative or active sense in the fashion of a Latin deponent: “experienced or acquainted with affliction.” Pieper has suggested the possible translation of “The one recognized or known by his suffering.” This would preserve the passive meaning of the participle and understanding *choli* as a genitive of cause. He cites Ps. 22:7, where the Lord is called the one rejected by the people. Of course, this translation would also imply that he was experienced with affliction, for anyone who is recognized by his affliction must be experienced and acquainted in it. Yet Pieper chooses to translate “*mit Leid vertraut*,” the one who passed his life in mourning with sorrow. And I agree because “Acquainted with affliction or sadness” is a parallel thought with the previous words, “a man of pain, His acquaintanceship,” was not with the high and mighty, it was with pain, affliction, and sadness. Affliction, sadness, and suffering were His lifelong companions. Man that is born of woman since the fall into sin is born unto affliction and trouble – and the substitute for sinful man drew all the sufferings of this accursed world upon Himself, especially in His great passion. These pains and affliction suffered were not from chronic ill health, but the wrath and curse and punishment for our sins. *Mastēr* is not a Hiphil part, for then it would be *Mastir* nor is it a Hophal part *Moshthar*, besides there is no Hophal of *sathar*. It is a noun formed from the Hiphil as *Mascheth* in a previous verse. Therefore we retain the Hiphil force in translating. “Like one causing the hiding of the faces from us” would be a literal translation. More smoothly translated, “Like one causing us to hide our faces.” So horrible was his form that it moved those who looked upon Him to hide their faces by covering them up with their garments. No one could bear the sight.

Nibseh is again, repeated and summaries the whole verse. *Chaschab* means to reckon, value, esteem, prize. *Lo* was translated by Luther not as a simple negation, but very emphatically, for nothing. That certainly

fits the context. If He was despised He wasn't regarded as being anything at all. We estimated Him to be nothing who made heaven and earth. We estimated Him to be nothing who alone could save us from hell. We estimated Him not only of less value than a house or car, but nothing.

III.

v.4 אָבָן חֲלִינוּ הוּא נָשָׂא וּמְכַאֲבֵינוּ סְבָלָם וְאַנְחָנוּ חֲשַׁבְנוּהוּ נָגוּעַ מִכָּה אֱלֹהִים וּמַעֲנָה:

But truly He has lifted up our sufferings (afflictions)—and our pains, He has carried them. Yet we esteemed Him to be stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

Now in this strophe we see the reason for the great humiliation presented in strophe 2. It was not His own guilt, but a foreign guilt which the Lord laid upon Him and caused Him to be the most despised and sorrowful of men. Here the kernel of God's counsel of redemption is revealed so clearly as nowhere else in the Old Testament. This strophe places all the Old Testament Messianic prophecies into their proper perspective. The guilt and punishment lay upon Him and by His stripes we are healed. This is the New testament Gospel in its entirety.

The entire strophe is full of contrasting statements, statements placed in opposition to one another. *Ackhen* is emphatic in itself. "Truly, indeed." In this context we should also understand an adversative emphasis, "But truly, Yet indeed."

Cholajenu is the same noun we had before, *Choli*, meaning affliction or sadness, or as we translated—suffering. But the big difference is the 1st person plural suffix (The *jod* is fallen out of the suffix). He was acquainted with sadness. Why? It was our afflictions and sadness' that he was experiencing in His great humiliation.

V. 4 says he lifted up our afflictions. *Nasah* means first of all, lift up or take up, and secondly bear, carry. Here we translate with take up because the prophet goes on to use the verb *sabal* which means to bear, or carry a heavy burden and fig. to bear grief's or sins, to receive the penalties which another deserved. Gesenius on p. 578 of his Lexicon cites Lam. 5:7 as an example of this use of the verb. When Isaiah uses these two verbs next to one another, *nasah* means lift up or take up and *sabal* bear—compare ch. 46:4 & 7. *Maschobenu* is the same word that was used in verse 3 meaning pain or sorrow. But again there is that all important plural suffix. The *hu* in the previous clause emphasized He took up our afflictions and sadness. Now the *Hu* is dropped and the object is stressed. And our pains or afflictions sufferings, He bore them. He bore our pains too. One can almost feel the excitement. He actually both took up and bore our pains and sadness. He loaded them upon Himself and carried them away. This verse doesn't yet speak of the guilt of sin which is dealt with in verse 5, but the results of sin, suffering and pain, every woe which sin has brought upon us. Of course, every time Scripture speaks of the punishment of sin being borne, that implies that the guilt is borne, for it is only through guilt that one is liable to punishment.

The *va* before *anachnu* is adversative, because *anachnu* stands in contrast to *Hu* in the first sentence. While it really was our punishment that He was bearing, we esteemed Him to a *nagua*. This is the Qal passive participle from *Nagah* to touch, reach unto, to violate or injure, and finally to strike or smite with a plague. So according to the prophet's own confession, Israel holds the man of pain and sorrows to be one overtaken in his own arrogance by the judgment of God. *Mukkah elohim* explains the word *nagua*. *Elohim* is God as the ruler and judge of the world in contrast to the Lord, the God of grace. *Mukkah* is the Hoph. Part. from *nacah*. Israel supposed that the judgment consisted in this, that He was a *Miooneh*—the Niphal participle of *anah* which means to bestow labor upon, exercise oneself in something (Eccl. 1:13) in the Qal, and to be afflicted or depressed in the Niphal. They looked upon him as one who was depressed and bent down, humbled by the Almighty. Remember how in John 10 the Jews wanted to stone Jesus for His supposed blasphemy, because, He being a man, made Himself God?

v.5 והוא מחלל מפשענו מדכא מעונתינו מוסר שלומנו עליו ובחברתו נרפא־לנו:

But He was mortally wounded because of our rebellions. He was crushed to pieces for our sins (because of depravities). The punishment for our peace (safety) was upon Him; and by His wounds there is restoration to us.

The *vav* is again an adversative one. *M'cholal* is the Poal participle of *chalal* which means to perforate, pierce through or wounding mortally as in chapter 51:9. It often refers to the slain in battle. Since it is here in parallel to *M'dukkha* the pual from *dacah*—to be broken in pieces, crushed, *M'cholal* undoubtedly means mortally wounded. V. 5 doesn't just repeat v. 3, but leads forward the thought of being loaded with sufferings and pains to being killed and destroyed, bringing the description of Christ's sufferings to a conclusion. *M'dukka* is the strongest term, designating the complete destruction of the person. The *Min* before *P'sha'ejnu* points to the reason on account of which; the 5th type of *min* classified by Gesenius on p. 482 as expressing the notion of going out of something. Other passages which contain such a *min* are Judges 5:11, Ps. 68:30, and Deut. 7:7. *Peshah* is a defect, rebellion. It stresses a sin, fault or trespass against God, and appears stronger than *Chataath* (חַטָּאת).

While God was the efficient cause of His sufferings; our rebelliousness was the ethical cause. The LXX therefore translates with *dia* and the accusative. *Avan* is perversity, depravity in general. It can also refer to a depraved action, a crime or sin and as in Ex. 34:7 where it refers to the guilt of the fathers and in Gen. 15:6 where it refers to the guilt of the Amorites, it is often guilt contracted by sinning. *Musar* is a masc. noun related to the verb *yasar*, which means to correct by blows or stripes, to chastise. This is the verb which is used in I Kings 12:11 where Rehoboam said, "My father chastised you with whips, but I shall chastise you with scorpions." The noun *Musar* is used in Proverbs 23:13: "Withhold not correction from a child, for if thou beatest him with a rod, he shall not die." In the context in which the pains and sufferings for the guilt of our sins are spoken of, it would be best to translate it with punishment. We compare, for instance, Gal. 3:13: "He was made a curse for us." Pieper also chose the stronger term *Strafe* rather than *Zuechtigung*.

This punishment was decreed for the purpose of our peace, *Sch'lolenu* is an objective genitive, approaching a Dative of Advantage or Purpose. One other passage with this use of the genitive is Ps. 44:23, "Sheep appointed for the slaughter." As far as the content of the word *shalom* is concerned Gesenius states that it means wholeness, safety, soundness, health; and secondly, peace, since in the time of peace affairs are safe and sound as opposed to the time of war. Christ made peace for us with God by suffering the fury of His curse, the punishment: in our place.

There are those say that it isn't worthy of God to demand His pound of flesh. That would make a kind of Shylock out of Him. It is unworthy of God to think that God needs a sacrifice or would punish Christ in order to forgive us and grant us freedom from damnation. After all, if others come to us asking for forgiveness shouldn't we forgive them without demanding any kind of a payment? And so, it is reasoned; a good God would surely forgive us without having to punish Christ. For instance the Mohammedans speak about God's mercy and forgiveness, but completely forget about the vicarious punishment of Jesus Christ. Thus Robert Hoyer spoke in the May 1961, Cresset quoted in the 3rd Edition of *Catechism of Differences* (p. 30), "The Sacrifice did not reconcile an angry God...You begin to understand the cross when you sacrifice yourself to angry men on behalf of God, to appease their wrath and reconcile them to a loving God." We could also mention the way the modern trend is to place taboo upon such primitive a word or concept as that of "propitiation" in theology. That an angry God should demand punishment or inflict a curse because His holiness is offended, offends their ideas of what God should be like.

And yet if you read the Holy Scriptures as the inspired revelation of God about what He is like, it will become quite clear that either God never meant the curses He attached to the Law (e.g. Deut. 27:26), the types of Christ which had to be killed because of the sin laid upon them typified nothing, and such passages as Ps. 85:1-3 and Gal 3:13, are mere figures of speech, or our Confessions are right after all the "Law always accuses

us, always manifests to us an angry God” (p. 203, *Triglote*), and it is only for Christ’s sake that we have a “reconciled Father” (p. 205, *idem*).*

Naturally God’s love existed before Christ died and moved Him to plan our redemption (John 3:16) as well as elect us (Eph. 4). No theologian can solve the mystery of God’s justice and mercy except in the cross of Christ. But a refusal to confess with the Lutheran Confessions that “God’s wrath demanded Christ be punished in our place” or that “God’s anger was stilled for the sake of Christ” or “God is propitiated and reconciled for the sake of Christ” reveals a low concept of the evil of sin and also a low concept of the perfection of God’s justice and God’s faithfulness to keep the threats of the Law. Young (p. 52-53) says that “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....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.”

And, surely when we keep in mind that God, being a holy and just God, could only grant us forgiveness, peace and salvation if His justice was satisfied (Rom, 3:25-26), and Christ was made the object of His wrath (Gal. 3:13) then we truly begin to apprehend what is the depth of His love to procure salvation for us creatures, so miserable and undeserving as measured by His Law and compared to His holiness, and the depth of the love of Christ to bear this foreign guilt and foreign curse in our place. O the depth of the riches of God’s mercy and wisdom. How can we even begin to thank this grace for all eternity. Who can sufficiently praise such grace and stop marveling at the grace of God, that by Christ’s punishment there is healing, soundness, full restitution for us.

Now the last sentence unfolds the thoughts inherent into the phrase *musar sch’lomenu* (punishment for our safety or soundness Pieper says salvation). Our salvation or safety was not only the intended result, but also the actual result of His being punished. *Chaburatho* is usually written *Chabarburatho* and designates stripes or streaks. The article with the *Ba* shows that it is a singular because it refers to the genus. *Nirpah* is from *Raphah* which means to sew together to mend (the root imitates the sound of a person sewing rapidly. Secondly, it means to heal, particularly a wounded person, namely by sewing up his wound. In this connection Luther joked that physicians were really the cobblers of the Lord. Metaphorically, God is said to heal a person, a people, a land, to restore it to its original happiness. Since this restoration depends on the remission of sins – think of Matt. 9:2, Be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee – *raphah* can also mean pardon or comfort. *Nirpah* is a Niphal. It was healed to us. With *l* it is impersonal. I Peter 2:24; 2 Cor. 5:21, 8:8; Romans 8:3-4; Gal. 3:13, 4:4-5, and many Christian hymns and sermons have repeated this great oxymoron. Through his wounds swelling with streams of blood we are healed, we are restored, reconciled, our salvation has been attained. Those are truly precious wounds to us. In that blood and in stripes is our secret for eternity and a godly life.

v.6 כָּלֵנוּ בְּצֵאֵן תְּעִינֵנוּ אִישׁ לְדַרְכּוֹ פָּנִינוּ וַיְהִי הַפְּגִיעַ בּוֹ אֶת עֵזוֹ כְּלָנוּ:

All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned, ourselves, everyone of us, to his own way; and the Lord has caused the perversity of us all to fall upon Him.

* Especially the Apology to the Augsburg Confession is full of such statements that “we ought to set Him against the wrath of God” (p. 205); “In Christ...God ceases to be angry” (p. 195); “For Christ’s sake God is reconciled to us even though we cannot satisfy the Law” (p. 197).

Hoenecke is right when in his Good Friday Sermon based on Mark 15:37-43, (translated by Prof. W. Franzmann in *Glorified in His Passion* he says, “Him He made to be sin for us...as soon as Jesus died...God is reconciled” (p. 92) (emphasis ours); and our Cat. of Differences is right when it says on p. 30 “The payment was made to God, and not to men...God’s anger required it” (emph. ours). It would take pages to quote the many forceful statements just in the *Apology* on this matter. Here every Lutheran pastor will continue to review his Confessions lest his thinking and preaching be influenced more by current trends than by the Scriptural concepts confessed by the Reformers that he has made a solemn promise to consciously teach and promulgate.

Khullanu – “All we” is emphatic and sets up another contrast. The entire people without any exception was a single great mass headed for destruction. The article in *Khazzo'n* doesn't point to a definite herd, but it is the article of comparison.

The point of comparison is the helplessness and the unconsciousness of the condition of wandering sheep. Thus all we have gone astray. *Taah* means to err, wander, go astray. Used of the mind, it means wander from the path of virtue and piety and the true worship of God and His precepts (Ps. 58:4). Each one of us by nature blindly follows his own way, his sinful drives and lusts without thought of death that is constantly surrounding him. This is not the Exile as Delitsch thinks, but the blind wandering in spiritual error that Jesus talks of in Matt. 9:36. Spiritual error was Israel's sin from the time of the Exodus until even today. Thousands of times Israel broke God's covenant and rebelled against his ways. The *Paninu* is the 1st Plural Qal from *panah* to turn oneself to followed by *L*. They can't blame God for their rebelliousness. They turned themselves. They wanted to go their way. *Berek* is basically a going or journey, but can also mean a way of living or mode of worshipping God, religion.

What did God do while His people were blindly fumbling toward destruction? The Lord, *Adonai*, the Covenant God, caused all of our iniquities to fall upon Him the suffering servant of the Lord. *Hiphgiah* is the Hiphil of *Pagah*, which means to strike upon or against, to rush upon, or light upon in the Qal, and to cause anything to fall upon in the Hiphil. *B* can have the sense of (upon), motion down to a place, Lev. 20:9 states, “His blood came upon him” with a *B*. In Numbers 14:10 it again means upon in the phrase “Upon the tabernacles of the congregation.” This truly wonderful counsel, that the punishment should not strike the guilty, but because of our perversity, all our sin, to fall upon Him.

v.7 נָגַשׁ וְהוּא נִעְנֶה וְלֹא יִפְתַּח-פִּי כְשֶׁה לְטֹבַח יוֹבֵל וּכְרִחִל לְפָנַי גְּזוּיָהּ נֶאֱלָמָה וְלֹא יִפְתַּח פִּי:

He was forcibly driven, still He continually submitted Himself and did not open His mouth. He was led as a lamb to the slaying and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He did not open His mouth.

In order to understand the 4th strophe fully, it should be noted that there is a kind of triangle of emphasis put together in these three verses concerning the sufferings of the servant: His forceful assault, His patience and His innocence. The emphasis of the entire strophe is on the forceful assault made upon Him, but this also serves to emphasize His patience.

Nigas the Niphal of *Nagas*, means to impel, urge, drive in the Qal and to be pressed, or harassed, or to be wearied out with toil in the Niphal.

Naaneh is really the niphal participle of *anah* which means to be afflicted or submit oneself to someone here and in Ps. 119:107. The *Hu* again emphasizes Him. This participle nominal clause is subordinated to the finite verb *niggas* in such a way that we cannot really express the fully. It undoubtedly is to emphasize his condition as being an extremely afflicted one who continued to submit Himself.

Nagas is the forceful driving of those who have might. A *Noges* is an Egyptian overseer in Ex. 3:7. The *Naaneh* expresses the uninterrupted continuance of His yielding Himself. So the best way of translating it is “He was driven forcefully, still He continually submitted Himself.” The abstract or general idea in *Hu Naaneh* is now followed with something more concrete and picturesque, namely *Lo Yiphtach Pi*. This clause explains the previous one further. *V* is therefore explicative. *Pathach* means to open. He didn't open His mouth, He was silent. No sinful contradiction or protest of complaint came out of His mouth. The Lord did speak to Judas and the high priest, but none of His words were impatient sinful contradictory words. I Peter 2:23 says, “Who when He was reproached, issued no counter reproach when He was suffering, did not threaten, but entrusted Himself to the one judging righteously.” By suffering in His golden silence He atoned for our railing and evil speaking.

Next the prophet uses some tender comparisons. A *seh* is a lamb. The point of comparison here is its being dumb and patient and not striking back as it is brought to the *Tevach* or slaying. This word is used of the slaying of cattle in Prov. 7:22 and the slaying of men in Is. 34:2 and 6. *Yoobal* is the Hophal Perf. in Pause from

Yabal which in the Qal means to flow, run, walk, and in the Hiphil to lead, bring, bear, carry. The Hophal of course is the passive of the Hiphil, so we translated He was led (brought). *Rachel*—a feminine noun—refers to a ewe in Gen. 31:38. Gesenius says it can mean any sheep here. *Gazaz* means to cut, especially to shear a flock. Our form is a Qal part. with the plural suffix for the fem. sing. because *Rachel* is f. singular. *Ne'elamah* is a Perf. Niphal in pause from *alam* which means to bind in the Qal, and to be bound in the Niphal, then also to be silent or dumb as if tongue-tied. In Ps. 31:19, it means to be dumb or mute as well as here. It has the fem. sing. suffix for a singular noun because it modifies *Rachel*. The last *V* gives the answer to *Cha* before *Rachel*. As a sheep...So He opened not His mouth. This repetition of His silence is certainly effective.

v.8 מֵטָצַר וּמִמְשַׁפֵּט לְקַח וְאֶת־דֹּרוֹ מִי יִשׁוּחַח כִּי נִגְזַר מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים מִפְּשַׁע עַמִּי נִגַּע לָמוֹ:

He was taken by a violent (forceful) judicial process and with respect to His contemporaries, who shall consider that He was cut off from the land of the living. On account of the rebellion of my people the stroke was upon Him.

This verse speaks about the violence and the assault that was made upon the servant. It really develops the *Niggas*, for the prophet couldn't do away with this in one short word. Both the *ozet* and the *luqqach* convey the idea of force, to seize forcibly, to force away. Literally, we have, "He was taken away by force and judgment." Luther understood the *min* as having a local meaning, but it is undoubtedly that of efficient cause, the 3rd use given by Gesenius for *min* under the 2nd main meaning. If God Himself would have torn Him away from the force and judgment of the enemy, then a local sense would be natural. But of course God didn't, and the connection with the next phrase would be unclear, for the next phrase is still really describing his death and humiliation, and we would have the salvation from force and judgment described before the death itself. Or we would have the impression that God completely hindered His death by taking Him away from violence and judgment, which is wrong. The King James also seems to follow the local idea and confuse the issue. *Ozet* means shutting up, restraint, or also oppression, vexation. *Mishpat* means judgment, used of the act of judging or the place of judgment, or the sentence of a judge, especially a sentence by which a penalty is inflicted in Deut. 21:22; Jer. 26:11, Jer. 1:16, 4:12, 39:5, 52:9; II Kings 25:6. Pieper has a good idea here when he says that this is an hendiadys. It could be translated either a "violent judicial process, or a judicial deed of violence." This also makes the *niggas* more concrete from assault, (whereas v.7 emphasized the facet of His innocence).

Dor is related to the verb door which means to go around, to go in a circle. As a noun it means and age, generation of men, as the period and circuit of the years of life. We could translate it as contemporaries. The *eth* before *dor* is the sign of the accusative. This is an accusative of respect. With respect to his generation or contemporaries.

Mi'J'shocheach is the pilel from *Schiach* which means to produce, bring forth, put forth, of shoots and shrubs in the Qal. In the Pilel it has the intensive meaning of to meditate, to think about anything. Who among his contemporaries considers or meditates upon the way in which He was seized by a violent judicial process? Pieper says here that *socheach* means to speak with zeal while *hagah* means to speak casually. In Job 7:11 the Qal of *Schiach* is translated, I will complain in the bitterness of my soul. In Ps. 77:3 it says, I complained, and my spirit was overwhelmed. This is the way Pieper understood it. From one point of view the servant has been brought to death by a violent judicial verdict. From the other aspect, there is no one among the people who complain about His death. While this also contains a fine contrast, in view of the previous idea of the violent judicial process, the meaning of Gesenius expresses even more of a contrast. The people not only didn't complain about it, but they also didn't even consider or recognize this travesty of justice by which He was delivered to death.

Now we have *chi* used to begin an object clause. *Gazar* means to cut or divide or to cut away or cut off. Here the Niphal means that He was cut off from the land of the living. The last clause should be understood independently. *Min* here has the meaning on account of which. It does not express the agent or instrument or

efficient cause of the smiting which of course, is God, but the ethical basis of his being struck. This is the *Pesha*, the rebellion of the people, their sin against God. *Lamo* has the sense of a dative of reference. I took *nega* as the noun meaning stroke or blow. The servant was struck on account of the rebellion of the people, and they didn't even have the slightest suspicion of it. It's hard enough to receive blows when people know you are receiving them for them, but the people didn't even realize here what was going on much less praise or adore him for it. What humiliation!

v.9 וַיִּתְּנוּ אֶת־רְשָׁעִים קְבֹרוֹ וְאֶת־עֲשִׂיר בְּמַתְיוֹ עַל לֹא־חַמָּס עָשָׂה וְלֹא מְרָמָה בְּפִיו:

And they wanted to put Him with the wicked in His sepulchre, but He was with a rich one in His condition of death since He had done no wrong and there was no deceit in His mouth.

V. 8 dealt with the death of the servant. V. 9 deals with the burial. The subject of *Wajjithen* can't be God, so we understand it impersonally. The verb is to be taken in a kind of voluntative sense as can be seen from the next clause. They wanted to put or place Him by or in the fellowship of the godless with respect to His burial. *Nathan* can mean give, but in the Piel – which we have here – it means to set, put, place. A *Rashah* man is a wicked or unrighteous one just the opposite of the *Sadio* man. *Eth* is here a preposition meaning with, by, in the fellowship of. A *Chever* is a sepulchre or grave. *Ashir* means rich either in the sense of an honorable and noble rich one, or in the sense of haughty and impious rich one, inasmuch as riches are the fountain of pride. Here it's used in the good sense of a rich one. The change from the plural in *Rishayim* to the sing. in *Aschir* most likely points to the fact that it would be a rich one, as we know *Nicodemus*, that he would actually be with or by in his condition of death. There is an antithesis between the 1st clause and the second clause. *Mothaj* is a stative construct of *maweth* with the s. masc. for the plural suffix. The plural brings out the idea of the condition of death. In other words His enemies had designated His corpse for the grave of a criminal with criminals, but the Lord ordained that it was placed in a splendid vault for a rich one. Clause 1 expresses His humiliation, but clause 2 is spoken with a view to His exaltation. There are some who oppose the antithetical understanding of the second clause by saying that *al Lo* in the second half of the verse must be understood as a concessive clause, and then couldn't be harmonized with our translation of the first half of the verse. "But he was placed with a rich one in his condition of death although He had done no violence etc." wouldn't make very good sense. But *lo* can also be translated since or because. This is shown by Ps. 119:136 which states, "Rivers of water, run down mine eyes because (AL) hey keep Not (Lo) thy law." *Chamam* is a masc. noun meaning violence, wrong, oppression. *Mirmah* is deceit, the Greek *Dolos*. He was with a rich one in His death since or because He had done no wrong, and there was no deceit in His mouth. Cf. I Pet. 2:22. He had committed sin neither by deed or word. This is the basis of the first half of the verse and also serves to introduce us into the last strophe.

v.10 וַיְהִי־הָאֵלֹהִים חָפֵץ דַּכְּאוֹ הַחֲלִי אִם־תְּשִׂים אֲשֶׁם נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה זְרַע יֶאֱרִיךְ יָמָיו וְחָפֵץ יְהוָה בְּיָדוֹ יַצְלַח:

Still the Lord willed to crush Him to pieces, He caused Him to suffer. When His soul will make a guilt offering, He will see His offspring. He will prolong His days; and the will of the Lord be accomplished by His hand.

This strophe which we summarized by saying Isaiah again prophecies of the exaltation of the successful, servant after His great suffering is connected with the 3rd one in this, that it also shows the ruling counsel of God which v. 9 already began to show.

The *v.* in v. 10 can be translated with still. *Chaphetz*, is a verb which means to bend or curve, and intransitively to be inclined, to will, desire, to be favorable, to delight in. *Dako* is the Piel infinite with an accusative suffix of *Daka*, which means to be broken in pieces, to crush in the Qal, but to break in pieces or crush in the Piel. Here it refers to His being crushed to death. *Checheli* is the 3rd Sing. mas. Hiphil from

Chalah, to be polished or smooth, worn down, sick, pained. In the Hiphil it means to make sick or grievous. Still it was the Lord who delighted to crush Him, He made Him full of grief or suffer. This clause governs the following as far as contest is concerned. Jehovah stands out emphatically in contrast to that which the people in vv. 7-9 had done. The people killed Him. But all that only fulfilled the good pleasure of His will. Jesus Christ is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, delivered up to the premeditated counsel and providence of God, Rev. 13:8; compared with Acts 2:23. In the following this is explained in greater detail. *Im* can mean behold, whether, or when – as we take it here. *Thasim* is the 3rd sing. fem. Qal. of *asah*. *Ascham* means fault, guilt, blame, that by which one contracts guilt. Gesenius says here it means a sacrifice for transgression. But more can be said on this.

It's that kind of a fault or sin by which one injures God or the next one and is obligated to make restitution. So as an offering it is that kind through which one performs restitution. The guilt offering rests upon the consciousness of one's guilt and a voluntary confession of the same. The servant of the Lord as the vicarious bearer of our sins took our guilt upon His conscience, consciously experienced as His guilty and voluntarily made restitution and satisfaction for the same. Since *Nephesh* is feminine, we take this to be a 3rd person sing. form of the verb. Only from the fact that the servant made Himself the sacrifice for guilt does what is following come to Him as a reward.

With *Jireh* we begin to see the consequence of His voluntary sacrifice. *Zereh* means sowing or seed-time, seed which is scattered, or semen, offspring, progeny, descendants. An offspring or posterity should spring or shoot forth from his voluntary offering of death. In John 12:24 Jesus said that the grain of wheat must die to bring forth much fruit. Many of the epistles of Paul picture all the spiritual life of the church as springing from the death and resurrection of Christ. Salvation and eternal life really spring from the death of Christ as a guilt offering. By the *Jireh*, the imperfect of *raah* the resurrection of Christ is indicated. He not only will have seed, but see this seed or spiritual offspring. Now obviously since He is going to be crushed into pieces and put in a tomb, He is going to rise again. *Arak* means to make long, extend, stretch out, lengthen, prolong. Here it is used in the Hiphil imperfect. Eternal life itself flows for him as a result of His voluntary death offering. In Rev. 1:18 He says, "Behold, I am He that liveth and was dead. And behold, I am alive forevermore, and have the keys of hell and of death." And of course this eternal life is the life He won for us, just as the sufferings and death were for us. In Him there is life for all men as a reward for His guilt offering. The next clause *W'chephez Jihovah* shows that the "seeing His seed" and "Living long years" are according to the will and desire of the Lord. *Hephez* as a mas. noun means delight, desire, will or something precious; a pursuit, ardor, affair, or matter. *Jizlach* means to prosper or succeed, be accomplished, (all enmity to the contrary, according to Pieper). It is the Imperfect of *zalach* which means to flow or pour out or to cause any one to go on well, to be prospered, to be raised to great honors. The *B* is instrumental, The Lord's gracious will be accomplished by the hand of the servant, that is, by His own doing, His voluntary, vicarious guilt offering. The futures at the end of v. 10 and in the rest of the chapter together with those in the first strophe set the stage as far as the time is concerned for the whole chapter, and show us that the perfects in the middle strophes are prophetic perfects.

v.11 מַעֲמַל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה יִשְׁבַּע בְּדַעְתּוֹ יִצְדִּיק צְדִיק עַבְדֵי לַרְבִּים וְעֹנֶתֶם הוּא יִסְבֹּל:

On account of the vexation of His soul He will see, He will be satisfied; By His knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, justify the many for He shall bear their perversities.

V. 11 and 12 now unfold and continue the statement in v. 10 that He will see His seed. *Min* before *amal* should be understood in the ethical – causal sense in vv. 5 and 8. – On account of the labor of His soul. *Amal* is heavy, wearisome labor, when it is used in the fig. sense of the mind it means weariness, trouble, vexation. Not only had he suffered greatly in His body, but also His soul was vexed and troubled most severely, beyond human comprehension, from the Garden of Gethsemenae to the Forsakenness on the cross. Therefore He will see, He will be satisfied. *Yisbah* is the imperfect of *sabah* which means to be or become satisfied. In v. 49:4 he

expressed the fear that He had worked in vain. Now He sees the fruit of His offering of guilt, the seed. In the next sentence it is designated as *Harabbim*, the many, that is, as the definite crowd or mass which God has given to Him as a reward for His faithful work in His office, a mass both from the Jews and the Gentiles. – *Yazdiq* is the Hiphil imperfect from *Zadaq*, to be right or straight, to be just or righteous in the Qal. Followed by which is here used in the place of the accusative, means to declare righteous or just to justify in the Hiphil. In the Piel it also means to declare just, absolve or acquit, and is used in the well known passage of Is. 5:23. Pieper takes *abdi* to be in apposition to *zaddiq* and says that this doesn't mean "My righteous servant" but "the righteous one, my servant." Thus *zaddiq* would be an adjective used substantively explaining His authority to pronounce righteous. He also says that *hizdiq* is a forensic concept in a loose sense, namely to judge or pronounce salvation. Then he adds that *Zaddiq* is here not simply the righteous one, but the Savior, and translates, "Through His knowledge will the salvation of the Savior, my servant, be granted to the many." Here I wonder if one can really find all this expressly in the text itself. Naturally, it is something that is true doctrinally.

How he shall justify them is expressed by *b'datho*. *B* means among, near, or expresses accompaniment or instrument. In Joshua 10:11 it means "with the sword." It is used with the expression cry with the throat. Now if *daath* is used in its first sense of knowledge or knowing, then this must be expressing the instrumental cause, or as we usually say, the means of appropriation, and this would of course, refer to subjective justification. The suffix would express an objective genitive and the *daath* would be used subjectively as far as its content is concerned. The *daath* would then be saving knowledge as John 17:3 speaks of it, the means of the reception of justification offered to it. However, one wonders then how the final clause fits in. It could of course, be expressing the objective redemption and implied objective justification as a basis for the Lord's justifying people subjectively through faith in their heart. But it is much easier to understand when we take *daath* in the second meaning, namely, that of intelligence, understanding, wisdom, and the suffix to denote possession. In chapter 11:2 it says that the Spirit of wisdom and understanding shall rest upon Him. Thus here the understanding of the servant could be the means of executing His last work, the blessing of the many with power. His own *daath* or the knowledge of the counsel given by God is the efficient cause by which He will impart justification. No man knoweth the Father but the Son and He to whom the Son will reveal Him. And Kretzmann's interpretation of this as His Gospel would fit in as this knowledge which has now been revealed to us, although *daath* seems to be a wider concept in this verse. The *datho* again would cause us to think of the *jaskhil* in v. 13, ch. 52, which basically means to do wisely, and to succeed because of intelligence. Here His intelligence and wisdom would be shown to be active right until the completion of His entire work.

Jisbol is an imperfect from *sabal* to bear or carry, to receive a penalty which another deserved. The imperfect here expresses uninterrupted, continual action, Pieper says, for He is an eternal priest after the order of Melchizedek, from eternity to eternity. That's true, but does He continue to bear our sins? I suppose what he means is that the effect of His work is continual and so no other bearing is necessary. I take this to be explanatory. Once again the prophet brings out the basis for His justifying the many, namely His bearing their iniquities. The basis of His justifying us is His redemptive work as the Suffering Servant. We are reminded of Rom. 3:23,24. Being just. by His grace through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ. The whole verse speaks about objective justification and redemption.

v.12 לְכֹן אֶחֱלֶקְלוֹ בְּרַבִּים וְאֶת־עֲצוּמִים יַחֲלֶק שְׁלֹל־תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱרָה לְמוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ וְאֶת־פְּשָׁעִים נִמְנָה וְהוּא חֲטָא־רַבִּים נָשָׂא וְלַפְשָׁעִים יַפְגִּיעַ:

Therefore I will give Him the many as His inheritance and He will distribute the strong as booty because of the fact that He poured out His life unto death and He was numbered with the rebellious and He bore the failings of the many, indeed He even will make supplication for the rebellious.

Lakhen therefore, refers to the entire vicarious satisfaction and work described in all the foregoing. It reminds us of the *dio* in Phil. 2:9. Because the servant has humbled Himself so willingly, the Lord will give Him his portion. *Chalaq* means to be smooth or to divide in the Qal. This latter sense is really derived from the noun *Cheleq*, which denotes as smooth stone which was used as a stone in reckoning and therefore signified a lot or inheritance. In the Piel, the verb always has the second meaning of the Qal, to divide, e.g., to divide booty in Gen. 49:27. Our form here is 1st, sing. masc. Imperfect Piel. The portion or inheritance is the many, this is the same many referred to in the previous verse Luther translated, “Therefore I will give Him a great throng for booty.” He lead captivity captive as a result of His successful work. The Father gave Him this reward.

Some, including the A.V., take the *eth* before *azumirn* to be a preposition with. But who would the strong, robust, or powerful (as this adjective used substantively here means) be? Surely not the angels. They were not co-redeemers, nor are they to be co-heirs of the booty. And with other strong ones would the Lord distribute the booty? But if we translate the *eth* as the sign of the accusative, and translate He will distribute the strong as *shalal*, spoil or booty, then we will still have to ask, who are the strong? To this we can find an answer easily from Scripture. For instance Ps. 2:8 says, “Ask of Me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.” Ps. 22:27 says, “All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.” Isaiah himself in 45:23ff. 49:7, and chapters 23 and 25, and even in 52:15 had referred to this. Jesus Christ is now Lord over all. We think of Phil. 2:10ff. That at His name every knee should bow. Pieper says that the distributing as booty may mean either conversion or the plain downthrow of those who are the plunder. The exalted Servant governs and rules also the godless according to His pleasure. That he talks about the “plain downthrow” is probably because He had cited 52:15, the passage in which he said sprinkle many nations meant to cause them to be inwardly terrified at His exaltation. Then he turns around and says, However, we think the spiritual gifts which Paul speaks of in Eph. 4:7ff. on the basis of Ps. 68:19 are meant. I agree with this last statement, and add that if he would have understood 52:15 as did Luther, he wouldn’t have had any problem at all in accepting Eph. 4:7ff. as being relevant here. The fruit and reward of His toil described in v. 10 was the fact that He would see His seed and prolong His days. Now it is that the strong will be given Him as booty. Think, for instance, of such men as Paul, Augustine, Luther, Fred. the Constant and others who were men strong intellectually and physically who were now converted to call Jesus Lord and burn out their lives in service to him.

The rest of the verse again states in a conclusive manner the foundation of His exaltation and rule, specifically His recompense. *Tachath Ascher* originally meant instead of that. Here it means for this reason that. *Heerah* is a Hiphil Perfect from the verb *Arah*. In the hiphil it means “to make naked” or uncover, and to pour out. With soul here it means the latter. This repeats the thought in v. 10 of His soul being offered as a guilt offering. Only this time it is a little more descriptive. He humbled himself as our vicarious substitute bearing our guilt even to the point of pouring out His soul completely as an offering for our sin. According to the Old Testament in Lev. 17:11, the soul or life lies in the blood. This the servant has poured out until the last drop and thereby given His life for us as an offering, a guilt offering for the payment of our guilt, as vv. 4-6 and *lo* bring out.

Niminah is the Niphal from *Manah* which means to be divided in the Qal and to be numbered with followed by *eth* in the Niphal. God dealt with Him as a transgressor. Cf. v. 9 This second clause is related to the vexation of His soul in v.11, “And He bore the sins of many” again repeats the thought at the conclusion of v.11. But the final clause is a new thought. *Yaphgia* is the 3rd sing. masc. Imperfect Hiphil of *pagah* which means to strike upon or assail in the Qal, but to cause to supplicate in the Hiphil. Jer. 15:11 uses it in the sense, I will make the enemy make supplications for you. Gesenius says it means really to assail with prayers followed by *L* of the person for whom the prayers are made. The *v.* here is a copulative which also emphasizes and could be translated, indeed even.

Chet means sin and is related to *Chatah*, to miss, err from the mark, the Greek *hamartano*. We might note in review four features Pieper points out of Christ’s humiliation described in this chapter:

- 1) Its depth as the most despised
- 2) Its substitutionary nature
- 3) His willing patience while suffering innocently
- 4) Its cause in the human deed of violence, the rebellion of the people, and the judgment of God.

Four Pictures of His exaltation were given in v. 9 and following.

- 1) His honorable burial
- 2) His eternal life and posterity
- 3) The refreshment of His soul
- 4) His lordship over the great mass of the redeemed

Isaiah 53 describes the effect of the suffering of Christ as well as their depth. Ps. 22 describes and pictures the sufferings in greater detail but doesn't really say much about the effect. But between these 2 chapters of the O.T. the Jewish people had a real good picture of the vicarious atonement of the Messiah as we do from the Epistles and Gospels.

May we keep this picture before our eyes in life and death. We also sing with the hymn writer in looking at this chapter,

Be Thou my Consolation
 My Shield, when I must die;
 Remind me of Thy passion
 When my last hour draws nigh.
 Mine eyes shall then behold Thee,
 Upon Thy cross shall dwell,
 My heart by faith enfold Thee.
 Who dieth thus dies well.

Bibliography

Bente, F., *Triglot Concordia*. CPH, St. Louis, MO, 1921.

Delitzsch, Franz, *Commentaries on the Old Testament – Isaiah Vol. II*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1877.

Gesanius, *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI.

Kretzmann, P.E., *Popular Commentary of the Old Testament, Vol. II*. CPH, St. Louis, MO, 1924.

Pieper, August, *Jesaias II*. NPH, Milwaukee, WI, 1919.

Young, Edward, *Isaiah Fifty-Three*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, MI, 1952.