

REFORMED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ONE TEMPLE TO RULE THEM ALL? HOW ISAIAH AND STEPHEN SHOW
JERUSALEM'S TEMPLE IS NOT THE ONE TEMPLE

SUBMITTED TO DR. WILLIAM ROSS
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
OT-5350

WORD COUNT: 5,998

BY
JOSEPH HYATT
DECEMBER 3, 2020

Stephen quotes Isaiah 66:1–2 in Acts 7:49–50 just prior to his execution. Together, these texts make clear that Jerusalem’s temple, the true Old Covenant means of God’s presence with His people, was a mere type of the ultimate temple of God’s presence yet to come more gloriously in the New Covenant. Establishing Isaianic unity first will allow for proper historical, literary, and theological understanding of the text. An exegesis of Isaiah 66:1–4 in its historical and literary contexts, with particular emphasis on the prophets’ condemnation of religious presumption, the Covenant Lord’s delight in the humble and contrite, and the rejection of improper sacrifices shows that the temple should have always been viewed as a type of the ultimate presence of God yet to come. Stephen’s quotation of the Isaianic text furthers this condemnation and elaborates on how the temple is properly understood as a temporal, though obsolete, means of God’s presence.

Composition

The debates surrounding the composition and authorship of Isaiah are a modern phenomenon.¹ For all of church history, biblical scholars, theologians, and biblical interpreters everywhere were virtually unanimous about the fact that the Book of Isaiah was written by the

¹ The reader ought to be familiar with the standard divisions of the Book of Isaiah from the outset. Isaiah 1–39 is commonly referred to as “First Isaiah.” Isaiah 40–55 is commonly referred to as “Second Isaiah” or “Deutero-Isaiah.” Isaiah 56–66 is commonly referred to as “Third Isaiah” or “Trito-Isaiah.” In this paper, though I ultimately argue for the unity of the book, the terms “First Isaiah,” “Second Isaiah,” and “Third Isaiah” will be used to refer to their respective sections. Quotations may refer to “Deutero/Trito-Isaiah” and for this reason have been mentioned.

single prophet named at the outset of the book: Isaiah, son of Amoz (1:1).² Only following the post-Enlightenment work of German higher criticism did the multiple-authorship view become mainstream.³ However, while the multiple-authorship view is currently dominant among interpreters, the view is far from conclusive, having details that are nearly all debated.⁴ Since

² This is contrary to Hays who states, “[E]ven in the premodern period commentators realized that not all of the book was attributable to a single prophet working in that time.” Hays fails to cite any historical sources for this claim. Christopher Hays, “Isaiah,” *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Books of the Bible* 1:384–409. However, Hays may be referring to Abraham Ibn Ezra, a 12th century rabbi who has been called the “forerunner of biblical criticism” due to his insistence that Isaiah 40–66 was written by a prophet other than the 8th century prophet Isaiah, son of Amoz. Louis Jacobs, “Ibn Ezra, Abraham,” in *The Jewish Religion: A Companion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 261–62. However, the voice of a lone rabbi is far from establishing historical precedence for the multiple-authorship view of Isaiah.

³ This is particularly following the work of Bernhard Duhm who posited a view of Isaiah that claims at least three authors. Duhm broke up the text into three essential sections: 1–39; 40–55; 56–66. He posited Isaiah 1–39 was the earliest but was unsure concerning the dating of the latter half of the book: “Probably they are older [speaking of chs. 40–55] than the third document of chs. 56–66, which in form and content is the product of a single writer, whom we call Trito-Isaiah for the sake of brevity.” Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902), xiii. Duhm also insists on a swathe of editors who both rearranged, added to, and excised from the text.

⁴ Oswalt states, “[T]here is complete disagreement... about what degree of coherence or incoherence may exist in the book of Isaiah, and there is even less agreement on the relationship between whatever degree of coherence one is willing to grant and the matter of authorship.” John N. Oswalt, “The Implications of an Evangelical View of Scripture for the Authorship of the Book of Isaiah,” in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015), 273. For example, a handful of debatable questions are: (1) How much of the Book of Isaiah did Isaiah, son of Amoz write? (2) If he didn’t write all of the book, how many authors were there? Two? Three? A dozen? (3) When were the various portions of Isaiah written? (4) Why is there pervasive unity in theme throughout the book while also showing sharp dichotomies? (5) Why were the various parts of the Book of Isaiah assimilated into one volume if the parts were, in fact, written by different authors? (6) Did the compilers/editors simply have more space in their scroll and thus filled it with the work of another (or multiple other) prophet(s)? (7) Did the compiler intentionally place these works together in order to give some sense of unity and (false) assurance to the people? (8) Why did the people accept this volume as from the hand of Isaiah if it was well known that it was, in fact, not from the hand of Isaiah? The list of questions could continue on.

this debate is so large and multifaceted, a level of selectivity is necessary when addressing these problems.⁵

External Evidence

It is unnecessary to elaborate on external evidence in the main body of this paper, for it is decidedly in favor of Isaianic unity. There are no extant mss. indicating Isaiah was ever anything but a unified work. External evidence is generally recognized as less important in this debate.⁶ The reader is directed to Appendix C for more on the external evidence.

Historical Discrepancies and the Nature of Future-Oriented Prophecies

Scholars make much of the literary flow of the Book of Isaiah, which can be represented by three major themes: warning, comfort, and redemption.⁷ While the prophecies contained in these latter two “books” are directed primarily at the exilic and post-exilic community, two problems with this view are evident. First, divisions between these three “books” are debated and unclear.⁸ The overall message of First Isaiah may be that of warning, but it also contains messages of hope and redemption.⁹

⁵ I have chosen what seem to be the most important and persuasive arguments in this discussion. Certainly others will dispute my points of emphasis but this does not belittle the significance of the points of contention I have chosen to discuss.

⁶ The fact that external evidence carries less sway in the debate is not necessarily a good thing, but it is the place of scholarship at this time. External evidence is generally required to make any kind of historical claim about a text, but such is not the case in this debate.

⁷ These correspond to the supposed “three books” of Isaiah which many stress follow historical chronology. Christopher R. Seitz, “Isaiah 1–66: Making Sense of the Whole,” in *Reading and Preaching the Book of Isaiah*, ed. Christopher R. Seitz (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 112.

⁸ This is due to the nature of the material—it is an “extremely complex collection of material, with a diverse background.” Seitz, 111.

⁹ Isa 1:18–19; 2:2–5; 6:1–6; 7:3–9; 9:1–7; 11:1–16; 12:–6; 25:9–12; 26:1–9; 27:1–13; 30:15, 18–22; 35:3–4; 37:5–7. Likewise, Second and Third Isaiah contain messages of warning as well. For just two examples, see Isa 44:9–20 and 63:1–6.

While boundaries between sections and the themes therein may be blurry, one can accept broad movement from warning to redemption within the Isaiah. The message of comfort at the outset of Second Isaiah fits well with the context of the exile (Isa 40:1). However, the second problem is that many think only the exilic and post-exilic communities would have understood the prophecies in the latter sections of this book. This is an improper conclusion.¹⁰ The people of Judah had already seen the destruction of the Northern Kingdom of Israel by Assyria (722 BCE). The same threat existed for Judah, being nearly overtaken by Assyria themselves (Isa 36). While the Covenant LORD delivered Jerusalem from Sennacherib's siege (Isa 37:21–37), he had already taken forty-six of Judah's walled towns and many villages resulting in over 200,000 deported

¹⁰ This is true even if the prophecies were not understood in full. That prophecies had to be fully comprehensible by the recipients is a common assumption and is often referred to as “prophesying out of one’s own time.” This will be addressed more when the Cyrus prophecies are discussed below.

individuals.¹¹ Likewise, the prophetic threat of deportation to Babylon was still looming (Isa 39:5–8). In light of the promised exile, a message of comfort was needed.¹²

The reference to Cyrus is one of the biggest historical challenges to Isaianic unity (Isa 44:28; 45:1). Due to Cyrus' presence in the book, Kirkpatrick states Isaiah must have been written in Babylon.¹³ In Kirkpatrick's support, Cyrus is portrayed as already present when the prophecies concerning him are spoken.¹⁴ Yet this is common for future-oriented prophecies. For example, Isaiah 9, which concerns the coming savior, has similar grammar.¹⁵ While the people hearing the Cyrus prophecy would not have needed to know this individual's name, knowing the name of the individual whom the Covenant LORD would use for their salvation from tyrannical

¹¹ This is according to Sennacherib's own testimony (and therefore may be embellished). He states in great detail, “As to Hezekiah, the Jew, he did not submit to my yoke, I laid siege to 46 of his strong cities, walled forts and to the countless small villages in their vicinity, and conquered (them) by means of well-stamped (earth-) ramps, and battering-rams brought (thus) near (to the walls) (combined with) the attack by foot soldiers, (using) mines, breeches as well as sapper work. I drove out (of them) 200,150 people, young and old, male and female, horses, mules, donkeys, camels, big and small cattle beyond counting, and considered (them) booty. Himself [speaking of Hezekiah] I made a prisoner in Jerusalem, his royal residence, like a bird in a cage... Thus I reduced his country, but I still increased the tribute.” James B. Pritchard, ed., “Sennacherib (704–681): The Siege of Jerusalem,” in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1955), 288.

¹² This is not to deny that the promise of comfort may be more directly applicable to those individuals already in exile, but it is to point out that the claims that Isaiah, son of Amoz's audience wouldn't have understood his prophecies is weak. Indeed, even if the prophecy of Isaiah assumes a different historical background (such as already being in exile) that is far different from requiring that the prophet be in exile with them. As Oswalt states, “[W]e may believe that these chapters have exilic and post-exilic readers in view, but that is very different from saying that the material was written during those times.” Oswalt, 285.

¹³ “The place of writing can hardly have been other than Babylonia.” A.F. Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, 1897 reprint. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958), 357.

¹⁴ “The deliverer is on his way. Cyrus is already in full career of conquest. Babylon is doomed.” Ibid., 355.

¹⁵ This is a phenomenon in the Hebrew language known as the “Prophetic Perfect.” See, Takamitsu Muraoka, “Prophetic Perfect,” Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics 3:279–80.

Babylon would not have done harm.¹⁶ The Judahites were assured their God had such a certain plan that He even knew the name of the particular individual He would use in their redemption 150 years later.¹⁷

The particularity of the Cyrus prophecy is also a common objection to its origination with Isaiah son of Amoz.¹⁸ This is not necessarily an anti-supernaturalist bias, but an assumption that the Covenant LORD would not prophesy in this particularized, before-the-fact manner.¹⁹ Many suppose the prophets only prophesied out of their own circumstances.²⁰ This may often be true,

¹⁶ Schultz points out that the irrelevance of the Cyrus prophecy to the eighth-century audience is a common objection to the single-authorship view. Richard L. Schultz, “Isaiah, Isaiahs, and Current Scholarship,” in *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith? A Critical Appraisal of Modern and Postmodern Approaches to Scripture*, ed. James K. Hoffmeier and Dennis R. Magary (Wheaton: Crossway, 2012), 250. Yet even if the name itself were considered irrelevant, the prophecy for deliverance certainly would not have been. Many Americans surely would like to know of a political leader who would re-unify and deliver the nation from incessant hostility and division. Many people live with the hope that one day things will “get better” and everyone will live in harmony. Wouldn’t these people love to know if such beneficence was actually going to happen—even if it wasn’t going to happen until their grandchildren’s children were adults?

¹⁷ In response to Goldingay who stated concerning this prophecy, “What would God be doing giving Isaiah in the eighth century words to write down that were addressed to people two centuries later?”: Precisely this. Reassuring that though all looks hopeless the Covenant LORD has a plan down to the last detail. John Goldingay, “What Are Characteristics of Evangelical Study of the Old Testament?,” *EvQ* 73.2 (2001): 105.

¹⁸ “Now while it is *conceivable* that Isaiah might have been transferred in spirit to a future age, and, taking his stand in the midst of the tribulations which he foresaw were to come, might have predicted the deliverance which was to follow, such a hypothesis does not seem to be in accordance with the economy of revelation.” Kirkpatrick, 359.

¹⁹ Schultz, “Isaiah, Isaiahs, and Composition,” 244.

²⁰ Kirkpatrick, 359. He states this prophecy would be “entirely disconnected from the author’s time.” Likewise, H.G.M Williamson, “Isaiah, Book Of,” in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2012), 371. “The setting presupposed by different parts of the book varies considerably. Much of Isaiah 40—55, for instance, takes its standpoint with those who have suffered judgment in the past and should now be anticipating deliverance; what sense would that make in the eighth century BC? If a concept of divine inspiration lies behind the view that all of this material was written at that earlier date, it would mean that God did not speak in a way that was intelligible to its audience at the time of delivery, so that this flies in the face of Christian understandings of the word of God.”

but need not be true all of the time.²¹ However, it has been shown above that the Cyrus prophecy was still relevant to the Judahite recipients, even if it did not immediately change their circumstances. The question, then, is whether or not the Covenant LORD would prophesy in this way. Two things must be said. (1) The Covenant LORD'S ways are not the same as the ways of people (Isa 55:8–9). If the Covenant LORD chooses to prophesy concerning a particular person 150 years in advance then He is free to do so.²² (2) Other than naming Cyrus, the Cyrus prophecy is really no more particular than other prophecies. The lack of details regarding Cyrus' deliverance of the people has led some to use this prophecy as evidence for single-authorship.²³ If the prophecy were written after the fact interpreters are faced with the problem of understanding why the prophet would (1) not include more details²⁴ and (2) write in such a way

²¹ Prophesying out of one's own time does not necessarily mean that everything is entirely relevant or understandable to the individuals hearing the prophecy—or even to the prophet himself (Dan 12:8; 1 Pet 1:10–12). Prophesying out of one's own time could simply mean that there is a hardship presently occurring, which may evoke prophecies concerning deliverance centuries (as here) or millennia away (Gen 3:15).

²² Indeed, the Covenant LORD declared much of Israelite history to Moses just prior to his death (Deut 31:14–18). Who are humans to contend with the omniscience and perfection of God? (Job 38:2–3.)

²³ Willem A. VanGemeren, “Isaiah,” in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*, ed. Miles V. Van Pelt (Wheaton: Crossway, 2016), 251; Oswalt, 286.

²⁴ Lack of detail seems to indicate unfamiliarity with the particulars of exilic life.

that portrays itself as if it was written long beforehand.²⁵ Indeed, why would readers find themselves trusting a “god” who can do little more than the idols he repeatedly mocks (Isa 40–48)?²⁶ Prophecy “after-the-event” is directly contrary to the theology of the section preceding the Cyrus prophecies. Therefore, despite the difficulties, it remains best to see these as future-oriented, divinely-given prophecy that is both relevant at the time of Isaiah’s ministry and subsequently in the exile.

Vocabulary and Thematic Differences

Many authors claim the vocabulary and themes of Second and Third Isaiah are different from that of First Isaiah, reflecting a later period in the history of the nation. Two brief comments can be made. (1) This type of claim requires various assumptions. There simply are not enough extant documents to give scholars any real indication of (a) what reflects earlier or later vocabulary and usage; (b) what reflects earlier or later verbiage and phraseology; (c) what

²⁵ Prophecy “written after the event” is known as *vaticinium ex eventu* and is used by some scholars to explain away this situation. Concerning this G.K. Beale states, “Such views claim that prophecy contained material that was mainly relevant for a prophet’s contemporary audience and did not contain predicted events that had no relation to the present. Thus, most predictions are viewed as *vaticinium ex eventu*, which means ‘prophecy after the event.’ In other words, recent events in the lives of a prophet’s audience were written down as if they had been prophesied many years, or even centuries, earlier.” G.K. Beale, “A Specific Problem Confronting the Authority of the Bible: Should the New Testament’s Claim That the Prophet Isaiah Wrote the Whole Book of Isaiah Be Taken at Face Value?,” in *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2008), 147. But we must ask, would the deported Judahites have found the prophecy written after-the-fact to be an encouragement? What is so special about a god who can only declare situations after they already occur? Can not even men do this? If a man did this in the modern era he would be written off as, at best, insensitive.

²⁶ Esp. Isa 41:22–24, but also Isa. 40:18–20; 41:21–29; 42:17; 44:6–20; 46:1–13; 48:3–5.

reflects common phraseology, etc.²⁷ These claims must be taken lightly. (2) Recently, various authors have sought to show that there is pervasive unity within Isaiah. One author finds fifteen themes throughout Isaiah and argues for the book's unity.²⁸ Brevard Childs has also been helpful in this field with his developments of "canonical interpretation."²⁹ The supposed differences between themes and vocabulary of older scholarship are increasingly rejected.³⁰

The New Testament Witness

²⁷ B. Elan Dresher, "Methodological Issues in the Dating of Linguistic Forms: Considerations from the Perspective of Contemporary Linguistic Theory," in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé and Zony Zevit, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 8 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 3–18. Dresher, while arguing that dating of materials is still possible has a helpful article pointing out the difficulties of linguistic dating. She lists three at the beginning of the article: revision of books through the years, knowing the change of pronunciation is impossible due to the lack of vowels, and there is little evidence other than the Hebrew Scriptures, which can lead to circularity (22).

²⁸ Rachel Margalioth's fifteen unifying themes are: (1) God; (2) Israel; (3) introductory formulas for oracles; (4) pairing Zion and Jerusalem; (5) the ingathering of the exiles; (6) messages of consolation and encouragement; (7) expressions of joy and gladness; (8) hopes of a universal millennium; (9) words of admonition; (10) chastisement; (11) the use of thesis-antithesis pairs; (12) distinctive words and linguistic forms; (13) word pairs; (14) similar constructions; and (15) parallel groups having similar content. Summarized by Tremper Longman III and Raymond B. Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 306.

²⁹ Childs rejected the traditional view of single authorship, believing that to hold to such a view resulted in a "literary and theological flattening of the richness of the prophetic witness." Nonetheless, by his own testimony he "remain[ed] deeply concerned with the unity of the book." Thus, Childs believed the shredding of Isaiah into several authors *each with different emphases* (this component was key for Childs) was an equally dubious interpretative method. "In the end, it is the canonical text that is authoritative, not the process, nor the self-understanding of the interpreter. Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah*, 1st ed., The Old Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 3, 4. One wonders whether or not he would view the authorship of Isaiah similarly to Longman and Dillard who declare the whole investigation "somewhat moot." Longman and Dillard, 311.

³⁰ Of course, this does not mean that most scholars advocate for single-authorship. Instead, most of these authors argue that we should accept and read the book as it has been received for the last 2000+ years. This perspective follows Childs. While this paper is arguing that this is not far enough of a claim, it is a step in the proper direction of seeing Isaiah as one united work.

The NT repeatedly refers to the Book of Isaiah.³¹ Many authors claim that the NT refers to Isaiah in an anachronistic manner: as an Isaianic tradition or collection of prophecies. Williamson argues that because the NT citations of Isaiah do not include Isaiah the prophet in any capacity other than as speaker or author, the NT citations are irrelevant since they could be interpreted as “a reference to the book, not the author.”³² But is this true? An Isaianic tradition is both theologically and historically dubious.³³ Likewise, if Isaiah did not write the material then all of the NT texts stating “Isaiah the prophet” are in deep water.³⁴ One is forced to ask: “Do the NT claims concerning Isaianic authorship of the Book of Isaiah as it has been received for the last 2000+ years carry any authority?”³⁵ The answer is yes.

The NT witness is decidedly in favor of one interpretation: Isaiah, in its entirety, was written by Isaiah the prophet. “[T]o hold that there were multiple authors must lead those who are consistent to one inevitable conclusion—Jesus and the New Testament writers were wrong in their assessment of the book’s authorship.”³⁶ Thus anyone who seeks to uphold the testimony of the NT must affirm single authorship.³⁷

³¹ E.g. Matt 3:3; Luke 4:17; John 12:38; Acts 8:30; Rom 9:27.

³² Williamson, 370.

³³ This is briefly elaborated on in Appendix C.

³⁴ Matt 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; Luke 4:17; John 1:23; 12:38; Acts 8:28, 30; 28:25. “Isaiah the prophet” clearly refers to an individual, not a school, disciples, or a tradition.

³⁵ To be sure, this is, in part, a theological question. Many critical scholars would not give any thought to this question at all because of their rationalistic presuppositions. However, Evangelicals, who are shifting more and more toward the multiple-authorship view, are forced to reckon with this question.

³⁶ G.K. Beale, “A Specific Problem,” 126.

³⁷ One could argue that the New Testament and Jesus were simply accommodating themselves to the culture and presuppositions of the day. However, this is an inappropriate application of the theory of accommodation. No more can be said here, but the reader is directed to Beale, “A Specific Problem,” 143–46.

Exposition of Isaiah 66:1–4

Historical Context

Isaiah 66 is the last chapter of the prophecy. There is no historical information in the latter chapters of the prophecy,³⁸ making it difficult to pinpoint a historical era. Though, in light of single-authorship, there is enough reason to find the historical context of Isaiah's writing to be exactly what the superscription states, "in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah" (Isa 1:1).³⁹ Hezekiah is of particular interest since Isaiah 1–39 ends with him before beginning a different focus that will remain for the rest of the book.⁴⁰ Whereas many believe Isaiah 40–66 assumes an exilic or post-exilic context, single-authorship mandates the historical context be the late eighth century wherein Isaiah prophesied to a yet-to-fall Judah. This does not

³⁸ I.e. Isa 40–66.

³⁹ Some authors claim that Isa 40 is indicative of a call-narrative for Second Isaiah, but this is unlikely for many reasons (not least of which being that no prophet is named as a prophet in every other prophetic call narrative). There is no attempt to name a call narrative for Third Isaiah. Seitz, "Isaiah 1–66," 109.

⁴⁰ It has been stated above that the themes and divisions within the book of Isaiah are blurry. This is still true. However, there is no reason to reject the overall change of emphasis, as has also been stated. The first 39 chapters of the book are primarily directed toward Isaiah's contemporaries, with the present historical occurrences in view, though there is the obvious exception of the virgin birth (Isa 7) and the coming savior (Isa 9) which would not ultimately be fulfilled for another 700 years. Chapter 40 does shift its attention away from particular historical circumstances to focus on the overall plan of God in His redemptive purposes. Thus, since there is little material in Isa 40–66 to establish its chronology, it is best to place the prophecy as historically "on the tail" of Isa 39 even if many of the prophecies will not be fulfilled for quite some time.

mandate that all of the prophecies in Isa 40–66 were fulfilled within Isaiah’s lifetime.⁴¹ Divine prophecy often declares the future beforehand.⁴²

Isaiah 66 can be placed in the historical context of Sennacherib’s failure to conquer Jerusalem (2 Chron 32:20–23; Isa 37:14–38) and Hezekiah’s pompous selfishness that seals the fate of exile for Judah (Isa 39:5–8). The entire message of Isa 40–66 is applicable to Isaiah’s contemporaries and subsequent exiles and post-exilic returnees to the land of Judah.⁴³ Therefore, the prophecy of Isa 66:1–4, while it speaks of the building of a temple, does not necessitate that the Jerusalem temple has already fallen.⁴⁴ Isaiah 66 addresses the pre-exilic Judahites who have seen their Northern neighbors horrifically annihilated,⁴⁵ the terror of the Assyrian war machine and its ruthless leader Sennacherib, been promised they too will go into exile under a new, greater kingdom,⁴⁶ and are in need of comfort and deliverance since their king cares only for his personal well-being.⁴⁷

⁴¹ To quote Oswalt again, “To be sure, as mentioned above, we may believe that these chapters have exilic and post-exilic readers in view, but that is very different from saying that the material was written during those times.” Oswalt, “Implications,” 285.

⁴² This occurs throughout the OT. E.g., Gen 3:15; 12:1–3; 15:12–16; Deut 31:16–18; 1 King 9:5; Isa 9:1–7; 52:13–53:12; Jer 31:31–34. 1 Pet 1:10–12 is particularly important for it indicates that even the prophets knew their work was not to serve themselves. “Not only does this underscore long-range prophecy by prophets from the Old Testament but also that the prophets consciously knew that they were predicting things that would occur well after their own generation. This is just the opposite of the presupposition... [of] many in the contemporary Old Testament guild, that prophecy included primarily material that was relevant for the contemporary audience of the prophet.” Beale, “A Specific Problem,” 153.

⁴³ This is called “multiple horizons of fulfillment.”

⁴⁴ John L Mackay, *Isaiah: Chapters 40–66* (Carlisle, PA: EP Books, 2009), 610.

⁴⁵ The destruction of Israel by the powers of Assyria in 722 BCE resulted in the exile of Israel and the loss of the Northern ten tribes for the rest of history.

⁴⁶ The Babylonian exile and destruction of the Jerusalem temple came many years later in 586 BCE.

⁴⁷ “Then Hezekiah said to Isaiah, ‘The word of the Lord that you have spoken is good.’ For he thought, ‘There will be peace and security in my days.’” Isa 39:8 (ESV).

Literary Context

To set the literary context, primary focus will be upon “Second Isaiah.”⁴⁸ Isaiah 1–39 portrays the Covenant LORD as the ruler of all nations, having “a day against all that is proud and lofty” causing mankind to cast away its idols (Isa 2:12, 20). He is the one who sits “upon a throne, high and lifted up,” served by seraphim, and the One in whose presence sinners cannot stand. He will bring judgment on the nations (6:1–5; 7:3–9; 13:9–16; 23:1–16). His purpose is unshakable (14:24–27). This Covenant LORD is exalted for all of Isa 1–39. Yet this exalted Covenant LORD still desires a relationship with His people, thus bringing about the declaration of comfort to His own (40:1).

Chapters 40–55 declare the mercy of the Covenant LORD. God is portrayed herein no longer as the the Great Judge (39:6–7) but as the God who brings comfort (40:1), the Redeemer (41:14; 43:1), and the one who forgives sins (44:21–22). Though the exile has still not yet come, He is the One who will bring the Judahites out of exile through Cyrus—Babylon will fall (44:28; 45:1; 47:1–15). Not only will the Covenant LORD possess Israel once again, He will make His servant to be a light for all nations (49:6).

Though the Covenant LORD vows to redeem Judah from out of exile and make them into a beacon of hope to the world, the people of Judah are slow to hear in faith (49:14). This prompts the Servant to declare that he hears the Covenant LORD’s word, summoning of the people to faith

⁴⁸ I.e. Isa 40ff. Two helpfully concise overviews of Isa 1–39 are: VanGemeren, “Isaiah: Message and Theology,” 254–261; and Gordon J. McConville, “Isaiah,” in *Exploring the Old Testament: The Prophets* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2002), 12–23.

(50:5, 10; cf. 66:4). Then the righteous are given another message of comfort (51:1–3).⁴⁹ Subsequently, after a challenge from the Covenant LORD (51:4–6), the people respond in faith, glorifying the God who promises their salvation (51:9–11). The Covenant LORD assures His people that He will remove His bowl of wrath, placing it on the oppressors of Israel and Judah (51:22).

Yet to remove the cup of wrath and deliver the people from exile is a huge cost. The Servant of the Lord must be pierced and wounded, bearing the sins of the people who have strayed like sheep (53:5). It is only by the slaughtering of this individual that the people will be restored—not merely from physical exile from the land, but from spiritual exile away from the presence of the Covenant LORD. Gloriously the people are redeemed and the Covenant LORD is portrayed as a husband (54:5). Though the people face exile, they will yet be restored and kept in everlasting love (54:7–8). This is brought about by the ministry of the Suffering Servant. The means of the Covenant LORD’s ultimate comfort has been revealed: an innocent individual must die in the place of the people, for all are guilty (53:6).

In light of the great salvation brought about by the Covenant LORD, the people are exhorted to “keep justice” and “do righteousness,” for though salvation has been promised, it has not yet come (56:1). The historical context must be remembered: the people are still in Jerusalem facing the promise of exile. Even though the promise of exile remains, so does the promise of eternal salvation. Salvation is even held out to foreigners who join themselves to the Covenant

⁴⁹ They are comforted because they are righteous; they are righteous because they seek the Lord and have His law in their heart (51:1, 7). This is an important point to emphasize, for it is these with whom the Lord is pleased (66:2b).

LORD (56:6).⁵⁰ In the meantime, the righteous still perish and the Covenant LORD is still mocked (57:1, 4). The people forget their Redeemer, though He has been patient (57:11). There are many who are outwardly pious while inwardly pompously hedonistic (58:3). The Covenant LORD cares little for outward rituals, desiring rather for the people to act uprightly before Him as religious acts without delight in the Covenant LORD are unacceptable (58:6–14). The Covenant LORD is then portrayed as a divine warrior, vowing to slash down the wicked (59:15–19). Yet in the light of the divine warrior, redemption is held out to those who turn from transgression (59:20).

Chapters 60–62 focus on and ultimate fulfillment of all of God’s promises—the end of the age. This is the ultimate redemption that the people long for. Many will flock to the light of God’s people (60:3). Those who stand against His people will perish (60:12). Good news will be brought to the poor and the hearts of the broken will be bound up (61:1). The Lord who loves justice will bring recompense to the wicked and make an everlasting covenant with the righteous (61:8). Zion, the mountain of the Lord, will be glorified (62:1). This three chapter section is the center of Isaiah 56–66. It is around this message of eschatological hope that all the other messages of these chapters revolve. Until that day, the Covenant LORD once again portrays Himself as a great warrior. This God, though He promises redemption, is not to be trifled with (63:1–6). Ethical righteousness is required, for rebelling causes the Covenant LORD to turn away (63:10). A prayer for mercy is offered (63:15–19) and the people plea for the Covenant LORD to make Himself known (64:1–12). Yet the Covenant LORD declares that He has already offered Himself, though He was rejected (65:1). The message of this chapter is heart-wrenching, for the Covenant LORD’s people have rejected Him, choosing to walk in evil ways and provoking His

⁵⁰ This is a furtherance of the promise to bring light to the nations (49:6).

anger (65:2–3). Yet, the Covenant LORD will have His remnant (65:9) and the wicked will be slain (65:11). The Covenant LORD’s servants will be satisfied, but the wicked will always thirst and hunger (65:13). Ultimately, the heavens and the earth will be renewed and gladness will be everlasting (65:17–18). Indeed, the Covenant LORD will pour His grace before the pleas are even finished (65:24).

It is in this context that 66:1–4 is found. 66:1–4 is a clear break from 65:17–25 which detailed the eschatological age. 66:1–4 returns to the present to give a message the people: serve God wholeheartedly, for hypocritical worship has no place before the Covenant LORD.

Exposition⁵¹

The Covenant LORD’s Possessions (vv. 1–2)

Isaiah 66:1 begins a new pericope, as indicated by the prophetic formula, “Thus says the Covenant LORD.”⁵² This regularly indicates the beginning of a prophetic oracle. In light of the majesty of the new heavens and new earth just declared (65:17–25) the Covenant LORD admonishes His people through the mouth of Isaiah. The Covenant LORD’s declaration here is not unlike the image of a king addressing his people by means of a herald. The Covenant LORD has more to say regarding the new heavens and new earth that are yet to come (66:21–24), but He redirects the attention of the people to the glory of His being. Calvin stated it well when he

⁵¹ The Scripture citations herein are my own translation. The full translation and justification for the translation can be found in Appendix A.

⁵² Aaron Chalmers, *Interpreting the Prophets: Reading, Understanding and Preaching from the Worlds of the Prophets* (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2015), 95.

said, “His aim [is] to shake off the self-complacency of the pretended or hypocritical worshippers of God, He begins with His nature.”⁵³

“The heavens are my throne,” the Covenant LORD declares (cf. 63:15). The immensity of this God who makes Himself available to the people is on full display. He is a king sitting on a throne, but not just a throne of gold and pearls as the kings of the earth, this God is the Covenant LORD who sits on the throne of the heavens.⁵⁴ One is immediately reminded of Isaiah’s glorious vision at his commissioning (Isa 6:1–5). There the Covenant LORD is depicted as “sitting on a throne, high and lifted up; and the train of his robe filled the temple.” This great God whom Isaiah has seen now declares that He sits on a throne of His own making: the heavens themselves (cf. Isa 57:15). Every Hebrew would immediately recall the creation of the heavens in the beginning (Gen 1:1). Indeed, this glorious image of the Covenant LORD ought to reveal to the people that He is entirely unapproachable. That is, unless one approaches by His Word.⁵⁵

⁵³ John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, trans. William Pringle, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), 409.

⁵⁴ Mackay helpfully states concerning the ancient concept of the throne, “Ancient thrones were often set high off the ground to emphasize the dignity of their occupants.” Mackay, 611. If the earthly kings sat on thrones a few feet off the ground to emphasize their dignity, surely the Covenant LORD enthroned on the heavens would have inspired nothing less absolute awe. The Judahites should have responded as Isaiah in Isa 6: “Woe is me! For I am lost; for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips” (v. 5).

⁵⁵ Koole states that this prophecy begins with a messenger formula to suggest the Covenant LORD reveals Himself in His word. Nonetheless, the access of the people does not in any way “detract from His exaltedness.” Jan L. Koole, *Isaiah III*, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 1997), 471.

The Covenant LORD continues, “and the earth is my footstool.”⁵⁶ This is an uncommon depiction⁵⁷ in the Hebrew Bible but given that the Lord has just declared the heavens to be His throne it is nothing less than fitting.⁵⁸ Most often, the ark of the covenant itself is depicted as the Covenant LORD’S footstool.⁵⁹ While it is a remarkable thought to consider the mercy seat as the Covenant LORD’S footstool,⁶⁰ the earth as His footstool draws greater emphasis to His glorious being.⁶¹ Certainly this also indicates the Covenant LORD’S possession of the entire earth, for Jesus declares, “Do not take an oath at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, or by the earth, for it is his footstool” (Matt 5:34b–35a, ESV).

⁵⁶ This statement, of course, is an anthropomorphism. That is, the Covenant LORD depicts Himself in a way that is easy for the people to understand. Calvin has the best comment regarding the anthropomorphism of the Bible: “For who is so devoid of intellect as to not understand that God, in so speaking, lisps with us as nurses are wont to do with little children? Such modes of expression, therefore, do not so much express what kind of a being God is, as accommodate the knowledge of him to our feebleness. In doing so, he must, of course, stoop far below his proper height.” John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008), 1.13.1. That God has body parts is not all that common of a thought today, but it is a heresy that the Church had to fight in the past.

⁵⁷ This is pointed out by many authors. E.g., Mackay, 610. Westermann, 412.

⁵⁸ Mackay states (continuing from the quotation cited above), “and [these thrones] required a footstool to access them without an ungainly clamber.” Mackay, 211. Of course, this is not to suggest that the Covenant LORD needed any help from the earth to access His throne. Instead, this is merely appropriating imagery with which the people would have been familiar.

⁵⁹ This is stated by Westermann, citing Psalm 132:7. Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*, trans. David M. G. Stalker, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), 412. However, it is also used of Jerusalem itself (Lam 2:1). Nonetheless, the earth as the Covenant LORD’S footstool is far more all-encompassing than either of these two.

⁶⁰ The mercy seat being the Covenant LORD’S footstool highlights the grandeur of His mercy.

⁶¹ J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1993), 533.

In light of this declaration, the Covenant LORD asks a rhetorical (and jeering) question, “Where then is the temple that you will build for me?”⁶² The Covenant LORD’S question ought to be viewed as one aghast as if saying, “The heavens are my throne! Where do you suppose you might get enough material to contain that?”⁶³ The obvious answer is *nowhere*. Indeed, the Covenant LORD cannot be contained within any temple, as was declared by Solomon when the temple was first built (1 Kings 8:27; cf. 2 Chron 2:6). The Covenant LORD formed and fashioned all things, who is man to suppose he could contain such a glorious God?⁶⁴ Indeed, “What is man that He is mindful of him?” (Ps 8:4). It must be stated, though, that this is not a repudiation of the temple itself. The Covenant LORD blessed the building of the temple initially (2 Chron 2–7) and also commanded the rebuilding of the temple after the exile (Hag 1:8). Instead this is an outright

⁶² The temple was destroyed in 586 BCE with the Babylonian overthrow of Jerusalem. The post-exilic returnees to the land (under Persian rule) would undertake the rebuilding of the temple. This prophecy is especially relevant to those post-exilic who put too much hope in the temple as a building, but also to those in Jerusalem who found the building of the temple to be irrelevant (cf. Jer 7:4; Hag 1:1–15) The proper view of the temple neither views it as binding and containing the Covenant LORD nor as irrelevant to the people. Both of these errors were committed by the people. G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, NSBT 17 (Downers Grove: IVP, 2004), 44, 224.

⁶³ Motyer states that this comment comes with a “degree of puzzlement.” Motyer, 533. I think of the scene in the film adaptation of Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings* wherein Gandalf is attempting to retrieve the “One Ring” from Bilbo who then calls it “My Precious.” The look on Gandalf’s face reveals a degree of puzzlement over Bilbo’s response.

⁶⁴ “It is not possible to build a house which can contain Yahweh and provide him with a place of rest. This is not to dismiss the propriety of erecting a temple for Yahweh.” Mackay, 611.

condemnation of those who thought they were safe because the temple of the Covenant LORD stood (Jer 7:4; Isa 48:1–2; 59:4).⁶⁵

“And where then is the place you would build my resting place?”⁶⁶ Though awkward in English, this perfectly parallels the thought of the first question. This, too, is a rhetorical question. The answer is still *nowhere*. Developed is the idea of a resting place. After the six days of creation, on the seventh day, the Covenant LORD is said to have “rested” (Gen 2:3).⁶⁷ The heavens are the Covenant LORD’s resting place and therefore the thought that man could build Him a place of rest is ludicrous.⁶⁸ The people were invited into this rest but rejected it (Isa 28:12), yet they will experience it because of the reign of the Righteous King (Isa 32:18). David declares that he sought to build a “house of rest”⁶⁹ for the ark of the covenant, though the Covenant LORD commanded he not build one (2 Chron 28:2).⁷⁰ The resting place of the

⁶⁵ One may suppose that the similarity between the citation of the Jeremiah verse is a claim that Isaiah and Jeremiah refer to the same individuals, thus forcing the Isaianic statement into the exilic period. Such is not the case. Single-authorship has already been established thus such a conclusion does not follow. Instead one ought to consider the statements in Isaiah to be earlier examples of the same kind of heart that Jeremiah also condemns: a heart that trusts and relies on outward appearances rather than on the heart (cf. Isa 11:3; 1 Sam 16:7; John 7:24).

⁶⁶ Koole states that the question, “where then” is stated twice because it “has so much emphasis.” Koole, 472.

⁶⁷ This is not the same Hebrew word, but concepts go beyond mere vocabulary. Meredith Kline makes a similar point in reference to this verse: “One indication that God’s Sabbath-rest consequent to the finishing of his cosmic house was an enthronement is that the Scriptures present the converse of the idea; they portray God’s enthronement in his micro-cosmic (temple-)house as a Sabbath-rest. Thus, when Isaiah makes his challenging comparison between the earthly temple built by Israel and the creation temple of heaven and earth built by God at the beginning, he introduces the Sabbath-rest imagery of the creation history as a parallel to God’s throne house.” Meredith G Kline, *Images of the Spirit* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999), 111.

⁶⁸ A prophecy of Jesus declares that His resting place will be glorious (Isa 11:10).

⁶⁹ בֵּית מִנוּקָה

⁷⁰ Instead, Solomon was to do this. 1 Chron 28:9–21.

Covenant LORD is where He takes up His residence and “makes His home.” In direct parallel to the previous clause, the Covenant LORD cannot be contained in a place built by man.⁷¹

“For all these my hand made—and all these things were declares the Covenant LORD.”

The Covenant LORD’S statement refers to the heavens and the earth mentioned at the beginning of the verse.⁷² The Covenant LORD answers His rhetorical question with a conclusive blow: “For I have already made all things.”⁷³ Indeed, the cattle on a thousand hills are His (Ps 50:10) and He laid the foundation of the earth (Job 38:4). Neither the temple man could build nor the sacrifices he could give are any profit to the Covenant LORD (Isa 1:11). This statement harkens back to the creation account in Genesis 1 wherein after the Covenant LORD’S creation each day is the refrain, “And it was so.”⁷⁴ The foolishness of the people presuming upon the Covenant LORD is now even more clear, for all things were made by Him in an instant. “Declares the Covenant LORD” serves as a royal stamp of approval and authority before shifting His focus.⁷⁵

The focus of the passage then turns away from the sheer grandeur of the Covenant LORD to His humble dealings with His people for He says, “And to this one I will show favor: to the humble, contrite spirit who is fearful because of My word.” The statement is shocking. One may expect after seeing the marvelous glory of God that He looks upon only the lofty and powerful, or upon the beautiful temple and its myriad of sacrifices, but that is not the Covenant LORD.

⁷¹ As will be seen, the Covenant LORD builds a house for Himself that is not made by hands but made of people.

⁷² One may suppose that this phrase refers to the temple and the resting place due to their close proximity but this not so. Westermann, 412.

⁷³ There is clear parallelism in this statement between the two occurrences of “all these things.”

⁷⁴ Gen 1:7, 9, 11, 15, 24, 30. The text here in Isaiah reads, וַיֹּאמֶר כָּל־אָלֹהִים.

⁷⁵ The glory and grandeur of God are on full display. “Declares the Covenant LORD” is regularly found at transition points within prophecies of judgment. Chalmers, 96.

Instead, He looks on the lowly—those who do not presume upon His kindness, choosing rather submit to Him in humble dependence.⁷⁶ The one who is fearful because of the Covenant LORD’s word is an image of one trembling in this Great God’s presence. It is not unlike Isaiah’s self-woe in Isa 6:5 or Manoah’s surety of death for having seen God (Judg 13:22).⁷⁷ Indeed, this is the posture of the righteous—and of the earth (Nah 1:5; 2 Sam 22:8; Ps 46:6).

The Covenant LORD’s Rejections (vv. 3–4)

Isa 66:3 indicates a transition within this oracle. Whereas vv. 1–2 declared God’s greatness and gave three descriptors of those on whom He looks with pleasure, vv. 3–4 describe the rituals of those whom the Covenant LORD rejects and His reasoning for doing so.⁷⁸ The Covenant LORD’s description of those who displease Him, is made up of seven participles.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Gary Smith, *Isaiah 40–66*, vol. 15b of *NAC* (Nashville: B&H, 2009), 730. Mackay states, “They had pleaded with Yahweh to look with care (cf. 63:15); now he declares (cf. 1:24) that he does. However, the focus of his gaze is supremely not on buildings but on mankind, not on the outward appearance but on the inner disposition of the heart (cf. 1 Sam 16:7).” Mackay, 613. Cf. Matt: 5:3–12

⁷⁷ Peter is also an example of this posture, for after seeing Jesus’ miracle he declares, “Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!” (Luke 5:8). Yet Jesus, as the Covenant LORD in Isaiah, does not condemn Peter, but calls him into discipleship (Luke 5:10b–11).

⁷⁸ Calvin states that this text shows “that the Jews, though they had a religion which was peculiar and which God had appointed, yet were in no respect better than the Gentiles, among whom everything was polluted and profane, and were not more highly approved by God.” Calvin, *Isaiah*, 415. Indeed, this is precisely why the Covenant LORD rejected them: they did not follow His specific requirements. The sacrificial law that the Covenant LORD had established was a “regulated entrance [to the Covenant LORD’s presence] that results in blessing, holiness, and life, rather than in judgment.” To reject these means is to reject the Covenant LORD Himself. L. Michael Morales, *Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus*, NSBT 37 (Downers Grove: IVP, 2015), 214.

⁷⁹ These participles are each functioning nominally and therefore they make up sets up nominal clauses. In the Hebrew poetic form, each of these “nominal clauses” makes up what is called a colon. In English translations, this is most often represented by arranging the clauses each as their own line of poetry.

These can be dealt with as a group since the descriptions clearly overlap.⁸⁰ Two things must be addressed before detailing the thrust of this section: (1) grammatical ambiguity and (2) sacrificial overtones.

First, this section is grammatically ambiguous. The LXX contains a comparative particle between the first participle and the second participle of each colon. However, the addition of this particle has been rejected herein as a later addition.⁸¹ Thus, the translation offered indicates that the legal sacrifice stated first is polluted because that same individual also does the second action.⁸² However, the translation offered also allows for a more comparative understanding.⁸³

Second, the benefit to this translation is that it does justice to the sacrificial setting⁸⁴ while not insisting on the claim that “the one who offers a bull” also literally “strikes a man.”

⁸⁰ Some of the statements in this section are a bit ambiguous as well so discussing the details may prove both less than conclusive and unhelpful. For example, the “one who strikes a man” could indicate (1) murder, (2) human sacrifice, or (3) injury. I have opted for the last of these three due to its close verbal tie with the “contrite” spirit (v. 2). This indicates the irony of the people’s worship and the one whom the Covenant LORD actually finds delight in. Another example concerns the “one who breaks the neck of a dog.” It is unknown what the significance of the breaking of dog’s neck was, but the dog was an unclean animal to the Hebrews (Lev 11:27). Recently, though, an excavation site has uncovered a burial ground wherein many puppy skeletons were found with broken necks. This seems indicative of the use of dogs in covenant sealing ceremonies of some ANE peoples. David W. Baker, “Isaiah,” in *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*, ed. John H Walton, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 187.

⁸¹ See Appendix A for argumentation.

⁸² I.e. The one who slaughters a bull *also* strikes a man. The one who sacrifices a sheep *also* is one who breaks the neck of a dog.

⁸³ Young, for example, adheres to the comparative notion. He states, “[A]ll sacrifice is abominated by God if offered in the wrong spirit... To slay an ox as a sacrifice when the accompanying spirit of devotion was absent was no act of faith, but an act of murder, just like the smiting of a man.” Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 520.

⁸⁴ “Slaughters a bull” (Lev 4:10); “Sacrifices a sheep” (Exod 12:5); “Presents an offering (Lev 2:1); “Offers frankincense” (Lev 2:1).

These participial pairs are made up of a legal sacrifice and a wrongful sacrifice or deed.⁸⁵ The interpreter is free to see these phrases as either hypocritical worship⁸⁶ or syncretistic worship wherein the individuals have conjoined themselves to ANE practices.⁸⁷ The first option more clearly focuses on the heart issue, whereas the latter focuses on the external act that is indicative of the inward heart.⁸⁸ The people knew what the Covenant LORD demanded (Isa 1:19–20; 2 Chron 29:3–36; cf. Deut 28) but willingly chose to employ ANE cultic practices. This indicates hypocritical trust in the Covenant LORD and impure worship. It is proper to see the Covenant LORD'S comments here are a direct condemnation of the people's as described in 65:2–5.

⁸⁵ This is true even of the colon, “The one who presents an offering offers pig’s blood.” Whereas in Hebrew the verb “offers” is not present, it is implied by nature of the grammatical construction. This is discussed in Appendix A (fn. 138).

⁸⁶ E.g. “Empty ritualism that does not symbolize a genuinely repentant and obedient heart is worse than useless.” John Oswalt, *Isaiah*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 694.

⁸⁷ E.g. P. A. Smith, Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah: The Structure, Growth, and Authorship of Isaiah 56–66, vol. 62 of Supplements to Vetus Testamentum (New York: Brill, 1995), 156. “First, the connections of vocabulary to 65:3–5... in which literal practices are most likely described, suggests that we may be dealing with real practices in 66:3. Second, it is difficult to comprehend why the author should have chosen such apparently obscure practices in order to satirize the orthodox cult or his opponents. The power of this supposed polemic would have no effect if the practices described were not prevalent and well known, indeed, could have been practiced by the opponents concerned. Third, there is no reference elsewhere in the Old Testament to the worship of Gad and Meni (65:11), yet there is no good reason to think that the author has simply plucked these names out of the air.” While Smith's overall arguments and presuppositions have some problems, he is correct here.

⁸⁸ C.f. “Whether hypocrisy or syncretism is involved, it is clear that those engaged in temple worship lack real religious discrimination and are being sternly denounced for their corrupt practices.” Mackay, 614. It is the opinion of the present author that syncretistic worship also entails hypocritical worship. The first two commandments of the Ten Commandments necessitate this claim. The people knew that they were to have no god besides the Covenant LORD and that they were to make no idol to serve or worship (Exod 20:3–6). Likewise, the participation in syncretistic worship is a breach of the third commandment not to take the Covenant LORD'S name in vain (Exod 20:7). One may consider hypocritical worship as the starting point for syncretistic worship. In essence, syncretistic worship like this is the fruit of hypocritical worship (Prov 4:23).

Whichever option the interpreters chooses, the thrust of these comments are the same: this people's worship fails to adhere to the Covenant LORD's required practices and therefore they are rejected by Him.⁸⁹

Indeed, they have “plainly chosen their own ways,” delighting in abominations that the Covenant LORD hates. This clause is triply emphatic,⁹⁰ emphasizing the heinousness of the decision that the people have made. The history of Israel reveals that the Covenant LORD had always been gracious and kind to them, but the people always went astray. Those of Isaiah's generation were no different than their forefathers. The word “abominations” is used of pagan

⁸⁹ It is the opinion of the present author that the pairs are intended to be taken literally. Thus, the one who offers a bull also fails to uphold the commandments to love one's neighbor as oneself and not to kill (Exod 20:13; Lev 19:18; Mark 12:28–34). The commandment not to kill is especially broken if the word translated “strikes” above refers to murder or human sacrifice which the Lord despised (Jer 19:2–6; e.g., Joseph A Alexander, *Isaiah, Translated and Explained*, vol. 2 (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1981), 439; Mackay, 614; Smith, *Isaiah 40–66*, 730). Isaiah 65:2–5 also seems to indicate false worship that was actually occurring. The thematic ties between these two sections are evident. The Covenant LORD is shown to spread out His hands to a people ignoring him while also speaking and being left unheard (65:1–2; 66:4b). The people the Covenant LORD reaches out to in 65:2 are a “rebellious people” whereas those who the Covenant LORD condemns in 66 are ones who do what is evil in His eyes (66:4c). 65:2 also states that the people follow their own thoughts whereas 66:3c states that they have chosen their own ways. The historical context of Isaiah likewise lends itself to understanding his polemic literally. This was a time when the people were being threatened by Assyria and forced to pay massive tribute to the king. The wealthy plundered the lands of the more general population and the elites grew more elite while the poor grew more desolate. While Hezekiah had cleansed the temple and restored its worship (2 Chron 29) it is reasonable to believe the people were fully capable of lapsing into the former wickedness they lived in under kings Jotham and Ahaz (2 Chron 27:2; 28:2–4, 22–25). Ahaz went so far as to even sacrifice his sons as burnt offerings (2 Chron 28:3) which may connect with the idea of striking a man (Isa 66:3) if murder or sacrifice is in view. Yet it is unnecessary to be dogmatic about the interpretive decision one makes here. Either the people literally practiced these evil deeds alongside of the deeds the Covenant LORD commanded or they went astray in their hearts and therefore their worship was as good as pagan worship. Indeed, the Covenant LORD always sought worship from the true and pure heart and therefore neither interpretive option ought to be considered impossible (Ps 50:7–15; Prov 21:3; Isa 1:10–20; Hos 6:6; Rom 12:1; John 4:24)

⁹⁰ See Appendix A for the grammatical explanation.

gods and images, indicating a breach of both the first and second commandments (Exod 20:3–5).⁹¹

Therefore, the Covenant LORD'S patience has come to an end. Just as the people chose what is contrary to the Covenant LORD, He chooses “ill treatment” and to bring horrors upon them (66:4). The reason for this is plain: “I called and there was no answerer. I spoke and they did not hear,” declares the Covenant LORD. And the people did more than ignore the Covenant LORD: they actively committed evil in His sight (2 Chron 6:19; Heb 4:13). Their horror of being delivered into the hands of foreign nations (2 Chron 30:6–9) will come true. It must be emphasized that the Covenant LORD’s judgment could have been avoided. Just as Samuel had declared to Saul generations earlier, if they had kept the commands of the Covenant LORD, He would have established them in the land (1 Sam 13:13), which would have fulfilled the blessings promised to Israel through the mouth of Moses (Deut 28:1–14). Instead, the people chose their own ways, delighting in abominations and casting the Covenant LORD aside thus bringing upon themselves the curses also declared by Moses (Deut 28:15–68).⁹² Yet, there are still those who tremble at the Covenant LORD’S word and they will be established (66:5; cf. v. 2). These will be the ones who rejoice with Jerusalem (66:10) and receive the peace the Covenant LORD extends (66:12). The people as a whole face the judgment of God, but the Covenant LORD faithfully

⁹¹ “Abominations” indicates “what is loathsome and a cause of revulsion” to the Covenant LORD. Mackay, 615.

⁹² Notice how much longer the curses of Moses are than the blessings. Surely this should have curbed the people’s desire to sin. Yet they still went astray (Gen 6:5). This is not unlike the fall of Adam and Eve. Whereas the Covenant LORD provided everything to Adam and Eve, they still chose the one thing forbidden (Gen 3). Just the same, Israel was given a land and told to wipe out all the peoples from the face of it so that the Covenant LORD could establish them (Deut 7:16), yet they failed to do so and worshipped idols repeatedly (Judg 1:28). What a mournful thing for the people and their great Covenant LORD (Ezek 33:11).

maintains a remnant and will restore all who are His, comforting them as a mother comforts her child (66:13). Simply, the Covenant LORD must be known—and He is known by both judgment and mercy (Ps 30:5).

Stephen the Copycat

In Acts 7:49–50, Luke records Stephen quoting Isaiah just before his martyrdom. While Isaiah has been shown not to be rejecting the temple outright, one may suppose that Stephen, being a minister of the new covenant Gospel, is taking Isaiah’s critique further to the point of condemning the temple entirely. However, this conclusion does not follow.

In order to understand this, the context of Stephen’s quotation must be set. In Acts 2 the Holy Spirit comes just as Jesus promised, filling both the house in which they sat and each individual (2:1, 4). Multitudes gathered to hear Peter preach which resulted in an exhortation to repent and be baptized, after which they would receive the Holy Spirit (2:5–41, esp. 38). After healing a lame beggar, Peter and John are arrested for declaring Jesus in the temple (3:1–4:1–3). Nonetheless, Peter and John’s preaching efforts were not in vain, for five thousand more came to believe (4:4). After their release, the disciples all pray for boldness to continue being faithful servants (4:23–30). Similar to Pentecost, the place is shaken by the Spirit and they are all filled with the Holy Spirit yet again (4:31).

The apostles continue spreading the Gospel, condemning those whose hearts are filled with Satan and performing signs and wonders (5:1–16). After being arrested again, the apostles are set free from prison by the Holy Spirit who opened the prison door for them and ordered them to go speak the “words of life” to those in the temple (5:19–20). Gamaliel then challenges

the Jews to allow the apostles to continue their work (5:23–40). The Jews concede and the apostles continue their work in the temple and from house to house (5:42).

Stephen, who was chosen to serve tables, is then introduced (6:1–7). Yet, this is no menial task for Stephen who was “full of grace and power” (6:8). Angsty Jews who failed to out-debate Stephen stir up strife against him, declaring that Stephen had spoken blasphemous things “against Moses and God” (6:9–11). The testimony given against Stephen is that he “never ceases to speak words against this holy place⁹³ and the law” (6:14). The high priest questions Stephen, to which Stephen responds with a lengthy explanation of God’s goodness and presence throughout the entirety of Israelite history (7:2–53).

Stephen begins with the call of Abraham (7:2–8), highlighting two things: (1) the promise of God to make Abraham into a people who would worship Him and (2) God’s giving of the covenant of circumcision (vv. 7–8). God was good to Abraham from the start—before the tabernacle or temple. Then Stephen reminds them of Joseph who had been sold into slavery in Egypt but used to bring deliverance to Jacob and his family (7:9–16). This is when the Israelites began to multiply and Moses was born, receiving a top-of-the-line education in Egypt (7:17–22). Moses’ story is told (7:23–29) culminating in the burning bush and the declaration that God Himself has “come down” to deliver the Israelites (7:30–34). After God delivers the Israelites, Moses goes up Mount Sinai to receive the Covenant LORD’S law (7:35–39). Here the Israelites rebelled and Aaron crafted a golden calf to which they could sacrifice (7:40–41). God then turned away and gave the people up to the worship of idols (7:42–43).

⁹³ I.e. The temple. This phrase is clearly intended to parallel the allegation that Stephen “never ceases to speak against Moses (law) and God (this holy place).” The equation of God and the holy place is little different than that of the Judahites discussed above.

Yet, the Covenant LORD was gracious and directed Moses to make a “tent of witness” so that God could dwell among them. Under Joshua, the tent of witness was brought into the land as they dispossessed the Canaanites (7:44–45a). Subsequently, David found favor in God’s eyes and asked to build a permanent dwelling place for God (7:45b–46), though Solomon would ultimately be the one to build the temple (7:47). It is at this point that Stephen quotes Isaiah 66:1–2, in order to declare the Covenant LORD does not dwell in man-made buildings (7:48–50).⁹⁴ Of course, Stephen could have quoted Solomon himself who recognized that God exceeds even the furthest bounds of the heavens (1 King 8:27). The fact that Stephen chose instead to quote Isaiah is important for it shows that Stephen recognized Solomon’s temple was not the ultimate fulfillment of God’s promise that a son of David would build a temple for God.⁹⁵ Just as the Israelites in Isaiah’s day (and the post-exilic returnees to the land) needed to hear, God is not bound to a physical location. Instead, God is enthroned in the heavens. Solomon’s temple was nothing more than a prototype of the ultimate temple that God would build: a temple made not with hands (Mark 14:58; cf. Rev 21:22).⁹⁶

⁹⁴ It is generally recognized that Stephen follows the LXX text rather than the extant Hebrew text contained in the MT. This is neither theologically nor hermeneutically problematic but it does offer a slightly different rendition of Isa 66:1–2 than the translation I offered previously.

⁹⁵ G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission*, 217. God’s promise that one of David’s sons would build Him a temple is found in 2 Sam 7:12–13.

⁹⁶ F.F. Bruce cites this verse in favor of the building of an eschatological temple. While it comes from the mouth of Jesus’ accusers it represents a true understanding of Jesus’ intentions with the temple. F.F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 176. See also Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission*, 222. “Stephen’s narrative explains that this paradox is resolved by realizing that Solomon’s temple was a mere pointer to a time when God’s dwelling on earth would not be limited to a ‘handmade’ house.”

This is precisely what has been shown through the overview of Acts 1–7. The temple was meant to be the dwelling place of God, but since God cannot be contained in a physical building the temple could never ultimately fulfill the promise of God to dwell among His people (Exod 29:44–45; Deut 12:11). It is important to see that the eschatological temple is being built at the time of Stephen’s speech—and he sees this. Returning to Acts 1, Jesus (who was “God with us” Matt 1:23) ascends into the heavens.⁹⁷ After this Judas is replaced and the apostles continue their work as the ministers of God.⁹⁸ The Holy Spirit then descends and indwells the Christians (Acts 2:1–4). The indwelling of these individuals is hugely significant, for it reveals two things: (1) God’s presence in the temple has finally returned after centuries of being absent⁹⁹ and (2) God’s temple is now made up of people rather than stone. This is the beginning of the great eschatological temple that the physical temple foreshadowed.¹⁰⁰ After the Christians are indwelt by the Spirit, they continue their work in sharing the good news of Jesus Christ. Yet as they stand

⁹⁷ Jesus Christ is the culmination of the temple in the Old Covenant era. In the new covenant era, the idea of the temple exceeds even the bounds of the physical person of Christ as the Church itself is made into the holy dwelling place of God (Eph 2:21; 1 Pet 2:5). With far more eloquence, Morales states the same thing: “Whereas the height of the old covenant was God’s dwelling among his people, tabernacling finally as the incarnate Son, the wonder of the new covenant is a second sort of incarnation: God’s dwelling within his people, the church gathered as a living temple of God.” Morales, 298.

⁹⁸ This cannot be elaborated on here, but it is important to note that the twelve apostles parallel the twelve tribes of Israel. Indeed, even Jesus’ selection of the twelve apostles is a work to continue God’s redemptive purposes in establishing a new Israel who will reach the world. “When Jesus chose the Twelve, their number implied that they represented the faithful remnant of the old Israel who would also be the foundation of the new.” F. F Bruce, *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 62.

⁹⁹ The Lord’s presence was essential for the people but Ezek 10 records God’s withdrawal from the temple. There is no reason to believe that His presence in the temple was ever the same—until this point in redemptive history when He built a spiritual temple for Himself.

¹⁰⁰ “The height of the new covenant, its consummation, however, awaits with eager expectation the new creation.” Morales, 298. The eschatological temple built by God rather than the hands of man will continue to be built until the return of Christ. Cf. 1 Pet 2:5.

before the council of the Jews in Acts 4, they declare another important reality: Jesus Christ is the cornerstone of the temple, which the Jews have rejected (4:11). Without the cornerstone, the temple falls. This is Stephen's emphasis when he condemns the Jews.

Just as the Israelites chose a golden calf over Moses and were given up to idols and a debased mind (7:39–43; cf. Rom 1:28), so also were the people who refused Jesus, the cornerstone of the true temple. This is Stephen's primary point in quoting Isaiah 66.¹⁰¹ Yet, even though the Jews have rejected Jesus,¹⁰² the Covenant LORD is portrayed in these chapters of Acts as still building His temple. Indeed, the work continues, for Acts 8 reveals not only the proclamation of Christ to the Samaritans (8:4–8), but also the proclamation of Christ to another Gentile: an Ethiopian eunuch, which is itself the fulfillment of prophecy (8:26–40; cf. Isa 56:3–5).

Does Stephen reject and repudiate the temple? No. Like Isaiah, Stephen calls out the idolatry of a building made by hands,¹⁰³ summoning the people to truly worship God in the Spirit (John 4:23). The physical temple had served its purpose and God had begun the work of building His new, eschatological temple. Indeed, God is still building His temple—the ultimate temple that was promised to King David of Israel now three thousand years ago (2 Sam 7:12–16). The promises of God are true. And as both Isaiah and Stephen remind us, God does not dwell in a

¹⁰¹ Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 218.

¹⁰² Who was Himself the fulfillment of all the Old Testament prophecies (Luke 24:27).

¹⁰³ Polhill posits that Stephen rejects the notion of the temple being a “house of God.” But this is an unnecessary conclusion. The word used in Isaiah 66 is *בָּיִת*, which is regularly translated “house,” even though here it refers to the temple. Neither Isaiah nor Stephen repudiate the idea of the temple being the “house of God,” for this only refers to His dwelling among His people. Rather, both Stephen and Isaiah reject the idea that God can be contained in a place made by human hands, for He has made all things—even the heavens and the earth. John B. Polhill, *Acts*, NAC (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 203.

house—not the Israelite temple, nor the modern American church building—but He does dwell in a people: the humble, contrite in spirit who tremble at His word (Isa 66:2b; Acts 2:1–4; 4:31).

APPENDIX A: TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH 66:1–4

1 Thus¹⁰⁴ says the Covenant LORD¹⁰⁵ 106 //

¹⁰⁴ **Thus** (v. 1): The first clause of this section begins with an adverb (נִכְּן) functioning as a discourse marker. Technically, the adverb modifies the immediately subsequent verb (רָאשָׁה) but as a discourse marker “draw(s) attention to the contents of the succeeding sentence(s).” C. H. J. Van der Merwe, J. A. Naudé, and Jan Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, Second edition. (New York: T&T Clark, 2017), 11.8. נִכְּן is the first word of the introductory clause mentioned in footnote three, serving to indicate the Covenant LORD speaks “thusly,” that is, as “as follows.”

¹⁰⁵ **the Covenant LORD** (v. 1): This is the Divine Name, known as the Tetragrammaton (יהָהָה). It has been variously represented in English over the years as “Jehovah,” “Yahweh,” “LORD,” and the simple transliteration of the Hebrew letters “YHWH.” Given that none of these are precisely correct (though, arguably, “YHWH” is most correct, it is also the least helpful), the current work renders the Name much lengthier with the surrogate “Covenant LORD,” following after O. Palmer Robertson’s *The Christ of the Prophets*. English Bibles also employ a surrogate by rendering the Tetragrammaton “LORD.” The reasons for using the surrogate “Covenant Lord” are, primarily, threefold: (1) The covenants are integral to understanding the entirety of the Old Testament text and, indeed, are therefore central to understanding the prophets themselves. As Robertson succinctly states, “All the ministries of the prophets may be explained in terms of their application of the various covenants to the people.” O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Prophets*, Abridged. (Phillipsburg, N.J: P&R, 2008), 134. And elsewhere, “From creation to consummation the covenantal bond has determined the relation of God to his people.” O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: P&R, 1985), 25. (2) “Lord” is a lofty title but remains far too small of a name of the magnificent God of the Bible. The use of small capitalized letters, while helpful and potentially reverence-inducing if intentionally reflected on, is never done in English texts and therefore it remains too foreign to bring about the intended result. Indeed, capital letters are regularly used simply to bring EMPHASIS (as here), which is clearly not the intended result of rendering the Divine Name. (3) While it has just been stated that capitalization alone is of little help, “small caps” paired with the essential means by which this God communicates and interacts with His people helps to bring about the result intended by the use of small capitalized letters alone. The inclusion of “Covenant” prior to the rendering of “LORD” helps to see a few things: (i) the one who is represented by this term is sovereign and unapproachable, (ii) the one represented by this term has come near of His own will, and (iii) the one who is represented by this term has a particular means by which He can be approached and known. Similar concerns regarding the rendering of the Hebrew יהָה by surrogates like “Lord” can be found here: Aloo Osotsi Mojola, “Name of God in Modern Non-Western Bible Translations,” *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* 2:247–51. For more on the Divine name, see the fascinating work by R. Kendall Soulen: *The Divine Name(s) and the Holy Trinity* (Louisville: WJK, 2011).

¹⁰⁶ **Thus says the Covenant LORD** (v. 1): This is the first full clause of the section, which serves to introduce the prophetic oracle that is to follow (vv. 1-4). It is a standard introduction to prophetic oracles, often called a prophetic formula. Aaron Chalmers, *Interpreting the Prophets: Reading, Understanding and Preaching from the Worlds of the Prophets* (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2015), 95. Other instances of this prophetic formulaic clause within Isaiah are: 8:11; 18:4; 29:22; 31:4; 37:6, 21, 33; 38:1, 5; 43:1, 14, 16; 44:2, 6, 24; 45:1, 11, 14, 18; 48:17; 49:7, 8, 25; 50:1; 52:3; 56:1, 4; 65:8; 66:12. This formula pervades the entirety of the Hebrew Scriptures, though. A sampling of verses is as follows: Exod 4:22; 5:1; 7:17; Josh 7:13; 24:2; Judg 6:8; 1 Sam 2:27; 10:18; 1 Kgs 11:31; 22:11; Jer 2:2, 5; 4:27; Ezek 11:5; 21:8; 30:6; Amos 1:3, 6, 9.

the heavens¹⁰⁷ are¹⁰⁸ my throne¹⁰⁹ // and the earth is¹¹⁰ my footstool.¹¹¹ //

¹⁰⁷ **the heavens** (v. 1): Serving as the subject of the clause, the Hebrew word translated here is **שָׁמָיִם**. It has been rendered as “the heavens” not simply to accurately render the dual number of the noun itself, but in order to differentiate between the idea of “Heaven” as a place for the physically deceased (“Paradise,” Luke 23:43) and “the heavens” as the idea for the entirety of the universe (Gen 1:1). The intention in this case is clearly the latter as God is claiming dominion over all that He has created (v. 2). While the former is not incorrect, the latter is more precise. This verse recalls Isaiah 65:17 wherein God declares He will create new heavens and new earth. Interestingly, while the ESV, NASB, NLT, and KJV all translate **שָׁמָיִם** in that verse as plural, they each translate **שָׁמָיִם** in 66:1 as a singular. The difference cannot be explained merely by lack of the article and, given the close proximation with 65:17 and the Genesis 1:1 paradigm, it is best to render **שָׁמָיִם** as a plural. Bonn Bartelmus offers a lengthy theological discussion of the term in “**שָׁמָיִם** (**Šāmayim**),” in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, trans. David E. Green, vol. 15 of (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 204–36.

¹⁰⁸ **the heavens are** (v. 1): This is a nominal clause (i.e., it contains no verb: **הַשָּׁמָיִם אֲנִי**). In Hebrew, the copular “is” or “are” would be understood as implicit, but in English the copula “are” has to be provided. “The heavens” is the subject while “my throne” is the predicate, which, in Hebrew, forms a complete, albeit verbless (or “nominal”), clause. BHRG, 12.4.3. This is a standard feature in Hebrew and Semitic languages at large. Tamar Zewi, “Nominal Clause,” Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics 2:830–39. Arnold and Choi list two basic uses of the nominal clause: identification and description. Bill T. Arnold and John H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Second edition. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 5.1.1. This nominal clause and its coordinate clause (see footnote 7) identify the Covenant LORD as the God over all things (Gen 1:1).

¹⁰⁹ **my throne** (v. 1): This is the predicate of the nominal clause discussed above. The Hebrew word (**אָנוֹ**) can refer generally to a seat or particularly to the throne, a seat of honor. *DCH* 4, s.v. “**אָנוֹ**.” Given that this is in reference to the Covenant LORD, throne is a better translation (Isa 6:1).

¹¹⁰ **and the earth is** (v. 1): See footnote 5 for information on the nominal clause. There are only two differences between this nominal clause and the preceding nominal clause: (1) the presence of a *waw* and (2) the copula, which in this case is “is” rather than “are.” Using “is” rather than “are” is simply due to the singular (**גַּתְתָּה**), as opposed to dual (**גַּתְתָּה**), subject. The use of the *waw* on **גַּתְתָּה** is relatively insignificant. It is simply coordinating the two clauses, completing the Covenant LORD’s claim on authority over all of creation.

¹¹¹ **my footstool** (v. 1): Literally, my foot’s footstool (**רַגְלֵי**). The dual use of “foot” does not seem to be significant as it is present every time the word **רַגְלֵי** is used in the Hebrew Bible (1 Chron 28:2; Pss 99:5; 110:1; 132:7; Lam 2:1) and has therefore been translated simply as “my footstool.” Koole notes that **רַגְלֵי** is “always in a genitive construction with **רַגְלֵי**.” Koole, 471. Nonetheless, the Dictionary of Classical Hebrew offers a translation of the parallel text in Psalm 110:1 with both “foot” and “footstool” translated. *DCH* 2, s.v. “**רַגְלֵי**. Of course, this is an anthropomorphism, for God is without form (Deut 4:12). The attribution of body parts to God is a form of accommodation. As Calvin so famously stated, “For who is so devoid of intellect as to not understand that God, in so speaking, lisps with us as nurses are wont to do with little children? Such modes of expression, therefore, do not so much express what kind of a being God is, as accommodate the knowledge of him to our feebleness. In doing so, he must, of course, stoop far below his proper height.” John Calvin and Henry Beveridge, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008), 1.13.1.

Where then¹¹² is¹¹³ the temple¹¹⁴ that you will build for me?¹¹⁵ // And where then is¹¹⁶

¹¹² **Where then** (v. 1): The ESV renders this word pair (נַיְיָ) “what,” whereas NASB, KJV, and NET (among others) render the words “where.” “Where” is a more accurate understanding of the words, though the ESV rendition is understandable given that God’s greatness is in view in these verses. Yet, “where then” more precisely translates both the words and thought of the clause. The grandeur of the Covenant LORD’S dwelling place has already been established in the previous two clauses and therefore the Covenant LORD poses the rhetorical, mocking question, “In light of this, where would you build My temple?” “Where then” is offered specifically by Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “אָ,” *HALOT* 1:37–38. It has been adopted here as it conveys the jeering nature of the statement. Cf., David J. A. Clines, “אָ,” *DCH* 1:202–3. While אָ is rendered as it has been above with or without the added הָ, Joüon and Muraoka note that הָ is often added “without any notable change in meaning.” Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, SubBi 27 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), 143g. [499]

¹¹³ **Where then is** (v. 1): Note that the copula “is” must be added here as well. Otherwise, the translation would read, “Where then, the temple?” While this is fully understandable in English, adding the copula “is” makes the translation more readable.

¹¹⁴ **the temple** (v. 1): While directly translated “house,” the Covenant LORD’S “temple” is the temple of God (1 Kings 8:27). It has been rendered thus in order to convey the theological significance of the term. 2 Samuel 7 develops the idea of God’s temple extensively. Gesenius also offers “temple” as a proper translation. Gesenius, “בֵּית,” *Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*, 116. This serves as the referent of the relative clause immediately following.

¹¹⁵ **Where then is the temple that you will build for me?** בֵּית אָיְזָה and are both dependent clauses. These clauses are connected by the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, which functions as a resumptive pronoun to tie together the subject (בֵּית) that precedes אֲשֶׁר with the verb phrase (תָּבִן־נְרִיּוֹת) that follows אֲשֶׁר. Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 333.

¹¹⁶ **And where then is** (v. 1): See footnote 10. The only difference is the inclusion of the *waw* on אָיְזָה. The *waw* highlights the parallelism within this verse. This verse can be easily broken into two parts: (1) God’s declaration that He rules all things בְּכָל־הָשָׁמְדִים כָּל־אָיְזָה וְאָרֶץ כָּל־זָמָן רָגְלֵי; (2) God’s rhetorical question to his hearers (בְּבֵית אֲשֶׁר תָּבִן־נְרִיּוֹת). Each of these parts contains parallelism. “The heavens are my throne” parallels “and the earth is my foot’s footstool.” Likewise, “Where then is the temple that you will build for me?” parallels “Where then is the place which is my resting place?”. Parallelism cannot be drawn out here, but suffice it to say that parallelism is integral to Hebrew poetry. In both of these cases, the second clause carries forth the idea of the first clause further. This type of parallelism is developed extensively by James L. Kugel in his *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

the place you would build my resting place?¹¹⁷ // 2 For¹¹⁸ all these¹¹⁹ my hand made¹²⁰//

¹¹⁷ **the place you would build my resting place?** (v. 1): *HALOT* recommends translating this phrase (מְלֹא קָרְבָּן נָגָה) “my dwelling place.” “מְלֹא קָרְבָּן נָגָה,” *HALOT*, 2:600. Such has not been done here for a few reasons: (1) מְלֹא in its most straightforward meaning refers to rest, not a dwelling. While God’s “dwelling place” is the only place rest can be found, such a fact does not necessitate the translation of מְלֹא קָרְבָּן as “dwelling place.” (2) God’s house mentioned in the first half of this couplet of parallelism already carries the idea of God’s dwelling place. If the reader/hearer knows anything of the Old Testament (and the original audience would have) then the reader already has the concept of God’s dwelling place in his mind prior to reaching this portion of the verse. (3) Rendering מְלֹא קָרְבָּן as “my resting place” carries forth the idea of God’s house (and therefore His dwelling place) further. “You would build” has been supplied in this second rhetorical question, though it is not present in the Hebrew. This clause is verbless and, given the parallelism with the prior clause, the idea of the people building something for the Covenant LORD has been carried over. Gary Smith, *Isaiah 40-66*, NAC (Nashville: B&H, 2009), 729.

¹¹⁸ **For** (v. 2): The *waw* at the beginning of the phrase לֹא וְאַתָּה-כִּלְאָתָה has been translated “for” because it is expanding on the preceding thought. This is the epexegetical use of the conjunction. Arnold and Choi, 4.3.3. [158]

¹¹⁹ **For all these** (v. 2): אָתָה is a demonstrative pronoun and is used to replace the nouns to which it refers: the heavens and earth of v. 1. כִּלְאָתָה modifies אָתָה as a substantival adjective. Together, כִּלְאָתָה form the subject of the present clause (אָתָה-כִּלְאָתָה יְצִיר עַל-אָתָה). While כִּלְאָתָה refers to two subjects and could theoretically be translated “both,” it has been translated “all” in order to carry forth the idea of totality. See William L. Holladay, “כִּילָה,” *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* 2:156–57. The word order in the present clause is marked. That is, the subject “for all these” (אָתָה-כִּלְאָתָה) has been fronted in this clause. In this case, the purpose of the writer is to emphasize the quantity of the referent—the referent being the heavens and the earth just mentioned. See *BHRG*, 47.2. Maintaining the Hebrew word order in the translation helps to signify the emphasis of the clause.

¹²⁰ **my hand made** (v. 2): Here God states that His hand made all things, which seemingly contradicts the account of creation in Genesis 1-2 where God’s speech created all things. What is to be said here? Only that the text once again contains anthropomorphic language, just as the earth is not literally the footstool of the Covenant LORD’S foot (v. 1). See footnote 8. “The Reformed do indeed acknowledge that the Scriptures frequently attribute to God human members... but that this does not occur except by a human way of speaking [ἀνθρωποπάθειαν], and that it must be understood in a way worthy of God... Thus ‘eyes’ does not denote anything in God except his knowledge, ‘hands’ his power, ‘feet’ his presence, ‘heart’ his love.” Petrus van Mastricht, *Theoretical-Practical Theology*, ed. Joel R. Beeke, trans. Todd M. Reester, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2018), 1.2.6.

—and all these things were¹²¹ declares the LORD¹²² //

¹²¹ **and all these things came to be** (v. 2): For a comment on the demonstrative and its referent, see footnote 16. The demonstrative here refers to the same head nouns as the previous demonstrative. More must be said about this verse, though, as it contains a minor text variant concerning the word וַיְהִי. The Greek text of Isaiah reads καὶ ἔστιν ἔμα in place of וַיְהִי which in Greek would be καὶ εἰσίν (present) or καὶ ἤσαν (imperfect). There is no aorist form the Greek verb εἰμί. The Latin and Syriac texts follow the Greek translation. Translated, the Greek renders, "and they are mine." The Greek is unlikely to be the original. A few reasons: (1) The Covenant LORD has already claimed dominion over all things (v. 1). It is likely the Greek translators harmonized verses 1 and 2 in order to make the Covenant LORD explicitly claim full dominion in each verse. (2) The Hebrew found in the MT is another instance of Hebrew parallelism. "For all these my hand made" parallels "and all these things were." This is lost if the Greek translation is considered original, though the Greek offers a parallel to the idea of verse 1. (3) The most convincing reason the MT is correct, though, has to do with the original creation account in Genesis 1. A very similar phrase occurs in Genesis 1 after each of the Covenant LORD'S creation. A portion of Genesis 1:7 is copied here: וַיְהִי בָּשָׂר אֶלְהִים אֱתָה הָרָקִיעַ וַיְבָרֶל. In Gen 1:6, God declares that there ought to be an expanse. In Ge. 1:7, God makes that expanse. At the end of the verse, two words are important for the present argument: וַיְהִי-כֵן. These words are translated, "And it was so." This occurs in Gen 1:7, 9, 11, 15, 24, 30. While a different number (singular in Gen 1 and plural in Isa 66), the verb is the same: הָיָה. Likewise, each of the occurrences of the verb are imperfect waw consecutives, which are used to express the "logical result" of the immediately prior action. See Arnold and Choi, 3.5.1b. Watts also affirms the MT reading but gives no reason as to why. John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34 - 66*, ed. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, and John D. W. Watts, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 351. It ought to be noted that modern English translations follow the MT as opposed to the LXX as well. The rendering of וַיְהִי as "and all these things came to be" must now be explained. The subject of the third person plural verb is בָּלָל-אֶלְהָה. If the verb clause was to be literally translated, the text would read "and all these were." Yet, such a translation does not read well in English since "were" often implies pre-existence or, at least, past existence. Translating וַיְהִי "came to be" better conveys both (1) the durative nature of the verb and (2) the beginning of the referent's existence. Cf., Watts, 350; and Motyer, 534 who both translate the clause "came into being." Blenkinsopp, 290 translates as above with "came to be." Similarly, Koole, 473 opts for the simple "became." Each of these authors follows the MT as opposed to the LXX.

¹²² **declares the Covenant LORD** (v. 2): The word translated here "declares" (מִבָּרֶךְ) is not a verb. Rather, it is a noun. Thus the phrase rendered variously by scholars: "Oracle of Yahweh" (Watts, 350); "word of Yahweh!" (Koole, 473); "[a pronouncement of YHVH]" (Blenkinsopp, 291). Others render it simply as "says" such as Westermann (411), NET, KJV (though in typical KJV language: "saith"). ESV and NASB translate מִבָּרֶךְ as "declares" while NLT translates the phrase, "I the LORD have spoken!" None of these are incorrect, but nor are they precisely correct. The word is best explained by its function, which is to close out the section (Chalmers, 95). While the present oracle of the Covenant LORD goes on, this phrase seems to bring what has just been said to an emphatic climax. Offering "announcement" as a translation, one lexicon states מִבָּרֶךְ is an "almost completely fixed technical expression introducing prophetic oracles" while also noting that the word is at times a concluding expression. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, "מִבָּרֶךְ," HALOT 2:657–58. Another lexicon states that, when מִבָּרֶךְ is in construct with the Divine Name, the word sets out a prophetic oracle. David J. A. Cline, "מִבָּרֶךְ," DCH 5:579–80. Given all of this, מִבָּרֶךְ has been translated here as "declares" primarily for two reasons: (1) If the phrase were to be translated, "oracle of the Covenant LORD," it would be conceived of in English as an aside—that is, as secondary material. This seems to be an irresponsible translation. (2) Likewise, though, "utterance," or "says," seems too common, for the word of God is binding. Thus "declares" has been taken as the best option since it highlights the sovereign power of God to declare as He just has.

And to this one¹²³ I will show favor:¹²⁴ to the humble, contrite spirit¹²⁵

¹²³ **And to this one** (v. 2): The preposition **ל** (translated “to”) is used in this verse to indicate the Covenant LORD’s favor. This is variously defined as the “perceptual” usage (Arnold and Choi, 4.1.2.), the “metaphorical” usage (BHRG, 39.3), and the usage of “advantage” (Williams, 302). This is reminiscent of Numbers 6:24-26, which uses the same preposition. “One” is added in English, though it is implied by the demonstrative **הוּא**. Note that this pronoun (**הוּא**) is singular. This is important because the following adjectives are each descriptions of this one individual. See footnote 23 for more on this. This clause also contains marked word order, with the fronting of “and to this one” (**וְאֶל-הוּא**) prior to the verb (**תִּשְׁאַל**). The purpose is likely to emphasize the identity of the individual to whom the Covenant LORD looks, who is further described immediately following the verb. See BHRG, 47.2.

¹²⁴ **I will show favor:** (v. 2): Lit. “I will look.” This is a fairly common idiom. For the Covenant LORD to look upon someone or something is for Him to show favor or “accept as an act of grace.” Jackie A. Naude, “**נִבְטָה**,” *NIDOTTE* 3:8–10. The context helps to make this particular understanding of the word clear. Little is to be made of the Hiphil verb form as this verb is most often found in this form (Gen 15:5; 1 Kg 18:43; Isa 63:15). The Hiphil generally refers to causative action, which is easily seen in verbs of seeing for one always causes himself to look upon any given thing.

¹²⁵ **to the humble, contrite spirit** (v. 2): The repeat of the preposition **ל** (“to”) is simply resumptive. The dual inclusion of the preposition makes its object more explicit. **עַמְּדָה** can be quickly explained but before **עַמְּדָה** can be explained the textual variant must be addressed. First, **עַמְּדָה** occurs fairly often in the Hebrew Bible. Calvin (413), Motyer (534), and Watts (350) each translate **עַמְּדָה** “humble.” Motyer explains that the humble “are socially those who are at the bottom of the heap, pushed down by stronger, dominant interests. However, religiously they are those who are ready to take the lowest place before and for God.” There is no reason to believe these two meanings (social and religious as Motyer puts forth) are mutually exclusive. Indeed, the historical setting of Isaiah indicates that the social meaning would have been immediately understood. Yet, the more grand theological significance of the term is also true and finds many parallels (Isa 61:4; Matt 5:3, 5). Thus, **עַמְּדָה** ought to be understood as both socially low and spiritually meek. “Humble” puts forth this idea better than “poor,” which would be a more rigid translation. The meaning of the phrase **עַמְּדָה** is made more clear by the other occurrences of the word form in 2 Sam 4:4 and 9:3 where it is used to describe Jonathan’s son who was “crippled in his feet.” In light of these parallels, the author seems to be portraying a “crippledness of spirit.” However, a few manuscripts read **עַמְּדָה**. If the variant form is maintained it finds parallels in Prov 15:13; 17:22; 18:14. Each of these occurrences describes a spirit (as here). However, unlike the current text, each occurrence has **רִזְקָה** prior to **עַמְּדָה**. No matter which is original, the meaning is essentially the same: the individual’s spirit is wounded deeply. Nonetheless, the variant clearly makes the text easier to understand and thus the MT ought to be maintained in order to follow the general rule in textual criticism that the harder reading is usually the original. There is also a similar word found in Isaiah 16:7 (**אַכְּבָה**). It is reasonable to think that these two words are parallel to one another, but the different forms are nonetheless intentional. It seems most likely that the scribes of these divergent mss. sought to harmonize the occurrence in Isaiah 66 with the occurrences in Proverbs since they make more obvious sense than the parallels in 2 Samuel. The close verbal tie of the MT in 66:2 with 66:3 seems to indicate an intentional juxtaposition by the author (see footnote 27). Thus, the MT stands. In such a case, **עַמְּדָה** means something like “crippled,” “lamed,” or “stricken” in spirit. “Contrite” is a common translation (Motyer, 534; Calvin, 413; Watts 350; *DCH* 5, s.v. “**עַמְּדָה**”). Following the great cloud of witnesses above, the word has been rendered “contrite” here as well. The word thus is a perfect parallel to the immediately prior “humble” (**עַמְּדָה**). Interestingly, the LXX renders this word **ἡσύχιον** (“quiet”), which offers a helpful interpretation of the state of a contrite individual.

who is fearful¹²⁶ because of My word.¹²⁷ // 3 The one who slaughters¹²⁸ a bull¹²⁹ is one who strikes¹³⁰

¹²⁶ **who is fearful** (v. 2): The word here is an adjective in Hebrew (חרד). The word in this form only occurs five other times in the Hebrew Bible (Judg 7:3; 1 Sam 4:13; Isa 66:5; Ezra 9:4; 10:3), though the root appears fifty-four times altogether. Holladay suggests the rendering “frightened of” for the occurrence in Isaiah 66:2 (Holladay, 116). Motyer states that this word “denotes a sensitive longing to obey” (534), but if that is the case then it is only used as such in Isaiah 66, for every other occurrence clearly indicates fear, not reverent obedience (see citations above). Each of the forms depict essentially the same thing: great terror or fear. “The intense emotion is physically manifested by shaking or trembling.” The word has been translated as “fearful” here in order to portray the adjectival nature of the word as well as the inner state of the individual being described. That is, he is not simply trembling on the outside (as may be supposed if the word was translated as “trembles”) but has a deep sense of “reverential terror or fear for the things of God.” Miles Van Pelt and Walter C. Kaiser, “חרד,” *NIDOTTE* 2:263–65. While this word and the words defined in footnote 22 are each separated by a *waw*, they describe one individual. Therefore, the *waw* has been left untranslated. So also: Watts, 350.

¹²⁷ **because of My word.** (v. 2): 'בְּ here clearly indicates cause and has thus been translated accordingly. See BHRG 39.19; Williams, 291; and Arnold and Choi 4.1.16.

¹²⁸ **The one who slaughters** (v. 3): The word translated here (טבַשׁ) and the word translated in the immediately following line (טבַשׁ) are clear parallels. Parallelism has already been mentioned herein (footnote 14) and thus it will not be mentioned here again. The two different words seem to highlight two different parts of a sacrifice. The present word emphasizes more of the action of the sacrifice; that is, the actual killing of an animal is highlighted by this word (טבַשׁ). Hence why it has been translated here as “slaughters.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “טבַשׁ,” *HALOT* 4:1458–1460. The word is found throughout the OT, especially in Leviticus (Gen 22:10; 37:31; Exod 12:6, 21; Lev 1:5, 11; Judg 12:6; 1 Kgs 18:40). The present occurrence is one of three in the book of Isaiah. (The other two are found in Isa 22:13; 57:5.) Also, it ought to be noted that the present form of the word is a participle and it has thus been translated nominally since it is functioning as a subject. טבַשׁ is explained below in footnote 28.

¹²⁹ **the bull** (v. 3): “The bull” is a generic term for “one single beast,” though “bull” is “predominant in the cognate languages.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “בָּרֶזֶב,” *HALOT* 4:1452. Since “bull” is more generic than “ox” in English (ESV, NASB, KJV, CSB), it is rendered as such here. See Lev 1:3, 5; 17:3–7.

¹³⁰ **who strikes a man** (v. 3): This word (נִכַּה) portrays the deep irony of the worshippers just mentioned. While they kill bulls in order to fulfill their sacrificial duties, they also strike men. It is fully within the realm of possibility to translate this word “strike dead.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “נִכַּה,” *HALOT* 2:697–98. If such is the case then the irony is even more striking. Yet, given the close verbal ties with “contrite spirit” (נִזְהָרֶת) of v. 2, it seems best to translate this simply as “strikes.”

a man.¹³¹ // The one who sacrifices¹³² a sheep¹³³ is one who breaks the neck of a dog.¹³⁴ // The

¹³¹ **The one who sacrifices the bull is one who kills a man... The one who offers up a memorial offering blesses iniquity** (v. 3): 66:3 is made up of three lines of Hebrew poetry. The first two lines are made up of two clauses each. Each clause in each line of poetry parallels the other clause in that same line of poetry. That is, the first clause of the first line of poetry in 66:3 parallels the second clause of the first line of poetry in 66:3. This is also true of the second line. Thus, there are four clauses altogether in the first two lines of poetry in 66:3. The last line of 66:3 (גַּם־אָתָּה בְּקָרְבָּם וּבְשָׂקָרָם נִפְשָׁם חַפְצָה:) forms a couplet with the first line of 66:4 (גַּם־אָתָּה אַכְּתָּר בְּתַעֲלִים וּמְאֹרְתָּם אֲבָא לְלָבָב). There are a two things to say about this section of the text. (1) Each of the verbal forms in this section are participles. They each have been translated nominally. The copula "is" has thus been added in order to make the text more readable. In light of this, each clause is functioning like a nominal (i.e., verbless) clause, which has been discussed above (footnote 5). Thus, in this section the first participle of each line functions as the subject of that line whereas the second participle of each line functions as the predicate of each line. While this is a bit odd, as one author states, "A participle can have any function that a noun can have in a clause." Gregor Geiger, "Participle: Biblical Hebrew," *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* 2:34. (2) It is difficult to know how this section is intended to be translated. In the translation offered above, "is" has been supplied between each participial phrase (except in the third instance where "offers" has been supplied). Many translations (ESV, KJV, NASB) supply "is like" or "is as if" between the phrases in order to indicate that the individuals doing the first action are not *literally* doing the second action. However, whether or not the second action was literally done is unknown. Given the last two lines of the verse it seems entirely possible that the second participle in each line is to be taken literally ("They have plainly chosen their own ways and in their abominations their soul delights."). NET offers a similar translation and explanation. It is the opinion of the current author that "is" supplies a better translation because it allows for both a literal and metaphorical translation.

¹³² **The one who sacrifices** (v. 3): The word translated here (בָּבָח) is parallel to the word translated in the immediately preceding line (טְבַשׂ). There does not seem to be much of a difference in meaning, for both words can mean "slaughter." *DCH* 3, s.v. "בָּבָח." Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, "בָּבָח," *HALOT* 1:261–62. The word is often used with its nominal form בָּבָח (Gen 31:54; Exod 24:5), yielding "offer a sacrifice." Yet, a general perusal of its occurrences indicates that it may highlight the offering in general rather than the act of slaughter itself. (Gen 31:54; 46:1; Exod 3:18; 5:3, 8; 8:4, 21–25; Lev 9:4, 17:5, 7.)

¹³³ **a sheep** (v. 3): "The sheep" renders the Hebrew word שֵׂה. This is a generic word that includes both sheep and goats. E.-J. Waschke, "שֵׂה," in *TDOT*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, trans. David E. Green, vol. 14 of (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 46–49. Thus, the burnt offering law is in view by use of this word (Lev 1:10; 17:3–7).

¹³⁴ **is one who breaks the neck of a dog** (v. 3): The translation of this clause is simple enough but its meaning it a bit more ambiguous. It is uncertain what the significance of breaking a dog's neck was, though it ought to be noted that dogs (כלב) were viewed as "contemptible animal(s)" and considered unclean according to Mosaic law. Nobuyoshi Kiuchi, "כלב," *NIDOTTE* 2:640.

one who presents¹³⁵ an offering¹³⁶ offers pig's blood.¹³⁷ // The one who offers¹³⁸ frankincense is one who blesses¹³⁹ an idol.¹⁴⁰ // They have plainly chosen¹⁴¹ their own ways¹⁴² // and in their

¹³⁵ **The one who presents** (v. 3): When in the *Hifil* case, הַלְּצָה can refer to presenting a sacrifice at the altar. That הַלְּצָה immediately follows this word indicates that it is being used in this manner in the present verse. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “עלָה,” *HALOT* 2:828–31. Cf. Gen 8:20; Lev 14:20.

¹³⁶ **an offering** (v. 3): The word translated here (הַלְּצָה) can refer to a non-sacral gift, but given the verb immediately prior, the condemnatory context of the word, and the other sacrificial language surrounding this word, it is best to translate this word as “an offering” in reference to a sacrificial offering. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “מְנֻחָה,” *HALOT* 2:601. Given the verbal parallels, this clause and the following clause likely have the background of the food offering of Leviticus 2:1 in mind.

¹³⁷ **offers pig's blood** (v. 3): Lit. “the one who presents an offering, pig's blood.” “Offers” has thus been supplied here in order to make the translation more readable. It is implied that the one who presents an offering either offers pig's blood as the offering or has an offering that is as good as pig's blood. The former has been followed here for the same reasons that “build” was supplied in the clause “the place you will build my resting place” above (footnote 14). See footnote 28 for a bit lengthier of a discussion concerning this whole section.

¹³⁸ **The one who offers frankincense** (v. 3): This clause is somewhat difficult given the verb used (זָכָר), which generally refers to naming or mentioning. Yet, when the word is used with לְבָנָה as it is here, it refers instead to an offering. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “זָכָר,” *HALOT* 1:270.

¹³⁹ **is one who praises** (v. 3): The Hebrew word translated here could be one of two words with the same root. The first means “to kneel down” while the second means “to bless/praise.” The former is particularly appealing given that the object of the action is an idol. Yet, given the rarity of this verb and the abundance of the latter, particularly in its *piel* stem (as here), the latter option is still intended by the author. While generally meaning “bless,” it can also mean “praise.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “בָּרֶךְ,” *HALOT* 1:159–61.

¹⁴⁰ **idol** (v. 3): This word generally means “iniquity” or “evil” but can also refer to idols or idolatry (Isa 1:13). Of course, it is iniquity to bless an idol and thus the two meanings are not mutually exclusive.

¹⁴¹ **They have plainly chosen** (v. 3): The entire structure of this clause is emphatic—three times over. First, there is nearly unanimous agreement among the Hebrew grammars that the בַּגְדָּא particle here is used as an emphatic. Waltke inserts the word “plainly” in order to highlight this and the translation offered here adopts the same rendering.. Waltke and O’Connor, 39.3.4. [664] Cf., Arnold and Choi, 4.2.5; Williams, 379. Second, the inclusion of the third person pronoun (הֵאָתֶם) also brings emphasis to this clause. Third, the pronoun is placed before the verb, which emphasizes the “exclusive role” of the referent—the people in rebellion against the Covenant LORD. *BHRC*, 36.1.3.

¹⁴² **their own ways** (v. 3): The בְּ preposition used here is used to “introduce a particular circumstance” and has thus been left untranslated. For other occurrences of this see, Deut 16:3; Ps 73:8; Isa 9:11. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “בְּ,” *HALOT* 1:104. In this case, the particular circumstance introduced is that of the people choosing their own way in rebellion against the Covenant LORD (cf., Isa 55:7).

abominations¹⁴³ their soul delights.¹⁴⁴ // 4 Thus I too¹⁴⁵—I am choosing¹⁴⁶ ill treatment¹⁴⁷ for them and I will bring their horror¹⁴⁸

¹⁴³ **and in their abominations** (v. 3): In cultic contexts, “abominations” (זְבָדָה) refers to “images and symbols of pagan deities.” Cf., Deut 29:16; 2 Kings 23:24; Jer 4:1. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “זְבָדָה, זְבָדָה,” *HALOT* 4:1640. The same idea should be understood here especially in light of the abundance of sacrificial language in this context.

¹⁴⁴ **their soul delights.** (v. 3): The verb here (זָבַד) generally refers to desire, but when it occurs in the same context as the **בְּ** preposition, it refers to “delighting in.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “זָבַד,” *HALOT* 2:340. This stands in contrast to the Covenant LORD’s delight at the end of 66:4. “Soul” (שְׁבָדָה) refers to the very center of the person and the “transmitter of feelings and perception.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “שְׁבָדָה,” *HALOT* 2:713. It should be noted that “their soul” is a collective noun. “Soul” is singular while “their” is a third person plural ending (מִשְׁבָּדָה). The group to which the Covenant Lord speaks is viewed as one whole unit.

¹⁴⁵ **Thus I too**— (v. 4): The reoccurrence of the **וְ** particle stresses the contrast between the people’s choosing and the Covenant LORD’S choosing. *HALOT* offers the translation of these two **וְ** phrases as, “where as they... so also I.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “וְ,” *HALOT* 1:195–96. Along with the use of the **וְ** particle, the inclusion of the first person pronoun (אָנִי) is emphatic. It is often used in this construction in the context of “pledges or promises” or “where someone is being confronted with what he or she has done.” *BHRG*, 36.1.2.

¹⁴⁶ **I am choosing** (v. 4): This imperfect has been translated as a progressive verb. The Covenant LORD’S action here is both contingent on the choice of the people and ongoing at the time of this utterance. Thus, since the **וְ** particle has illustrated the resultative nature of the Covenant LORD’S decision, the progressive nature of His choice has been made clear by this translation. See Arnold and Choi, 3.2.2c.

¹⁴⁷ **ill treatment for them** (v. 4): The word translated here as “ill treatment” (לִזְעָלָה) is a rather rare word in the Hebrew Bible and its precise meaning is uncertain. It only occurs one other time, which also happens to be in Isaiah (3:4), though the cross-reference is less than helpful. The word most likely refers to ill punishment and, following *HALOT*, has been rendered as “ill-treatment” here. Given the parallel with the prior clause, the idea is that the people chose ill treatment for the Covenant LORD in their choosing their own ways and thus the Covenant Lord is returning the same treatment on their own heads. The **בְּ** preposition here is serving the same purpose as the one mentioned in footnote 40.

¹⁴⁸ **and I will bring their horror** (v. 4): The word translated here (הַגְּרָרָה) is a rather rare word in the Hebrew Bible. It refers to fear, but given the emphatic nature of the verse (see footnote 42) it has been rendered “horror.” Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “הַגְּרָרָה,” *HALOT* 2:544. Cf., Psalm 34:4. *DCH* notes that this word, when combined with the verb here, means “wantonness.” The word order has been flipped in this translation, but in Hebrew “their horror” is fronted in the clause, emphasizing the horror the Covenant LORD will bring. *BHRG*, 47.2.

against them¹⁴⁹ because I called¹⁵⁰ and there was no answerer.¹⁵¹ I spoke¹⁵² and they did not hear.¹⁵³ And they did evil¹⁵⁴ in my sight¹⁵⁵ and that in which I do not delight they chose.¹⁵⁶

A/C: n/a

BHRG: n/a

Gesenius: 29f; 126i

J-M: 143g; 158b

IBHS 39.3.4

¹⁴⁹ **against them** (v. 4): The **בְּ** preposition here is used in the disadvantageous sense and has thus been rendered “against” rather than “to.” Cf., Isa 63:10. Waltke and O’Connor, 11.2.10. [205]

¹⁵⁰ **I called** (v. 4): “I called” is to be understood not as a one-time occurrence, but as a summation of the Covenant LORD’S gracious dealings with the people. Thus, the perfective aspect is in focus rather than a punctiliar action.

¹⁵¹ **and there was no answerer.** (v. 4): Translated here is the particle of non-existence + a participle (הַנִּזְהָרֶת). The particle of non-existence “denies the existence of a substantive,” which, in this case, is the immediately following participle. See Arnold and Choi, 4.4.1. It is not to be understood that an answerer literally did not exist, but that no one chose to respond to the Covenant LORD’S call.

¹⁵² **I spoke** (v. 4): The verb here is a common verb in the Hebrew Bible. It is simply noted here that “spoke” is a parallel to “called” in the prior line.

¹⁵³ **and they did not obey.** (v. 4): Lit, “and they did not hear.” This phrase is often idiomatic for obedience. Such is the intention here and it has been rendered accordingly. It could likewise be rendered “they did not pay attention to Me.” This further explains the people’s choosing of their own way. It is in direct opposition to who they ought to have been (Deut. 6:4-6). Kenneth T. Aitken, “עָמַשׁ,” *NIDOTTE* 2:175–81.

¹⁵⁴ **And they did evil** (v. 4): The *waw* here is most likely used as an epexegetical to clarify the meaning of the two preceding clauses. See Arnold and Choi, 4.3.3d. [158] “Evil” refers to wickedness and is used here as a summation of the people’s actions. Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, “עַל, עַלְלָה,” *HALOT* 3:1252. It is in direct contrast to the good that the Covenant LORD requires (Isa 5:20; 33:15).

¹⁵⁵ **in my sight** (v. 4): Lit. “in my eyes.” This is a common idiom throughout the Hebrew Bible and in the English language. It is another anthropomorphism (Isa 66:1).

¹⁵⁶ **and that in which I do not delight they chose** (v. 4): While making for a slightly awkward English translation, the order of the Hebrew has been maintained here in order to bring about the emphasis intended by the text. The emphasis clearly falls on what the Covenant Lord does not delight in rather than merely on the people’s choice. “That” has been added in order to smooth out the English. The verb (עַמְדָה) has been rendered as a present tense in English in order to represent the Covenant LORD’S immutability. The Covenant LORD’S non-delight is in opposition to the people’s delight in 66:3. Just as the *waw* in the clause mentioned above (footnote 51) is an epexegetical *waw*, so also is the occurrence of the *waw* in this clause. This clause furthers and clarifies the meaning “they did evil in my sight.”

APPENDIX B: NEW TESTAMENT CITATION OF ISAIAH 66:1–4 (ESV)

Acts 7:47–50

47 But it was Solomon who built a house for him. **48** Yet the Most High does not dwell in houses made by hands, as the prophet says,

49 “Heaven is my throne,
and the earth is my footstool.
What kind of house will you build for me, says the Lord,
or what is the place of my rest?
50 Did not my hand make all these things?”

APPENDIX C: EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR A UNITED ISAIANIC PROPHECY

External evidence is seldom cited in the debate concerning the composition of Isaiah due to the paucity of important historical documents. Indeed, there is no external evidence¹⁵⁷ that the Book of Isaiah was ever anything but a unity. The best extant evidence for the ancient text of the Book of Isaiah (other than the MT) is the Great Isaiah Scroll. The Great Isaiah Scroll is important because it is a document nearly 1200 years older than the Leningrad Codex that contains all 66 chapters of the Book of Isaiah.¹⁵⁸ Thus, it both serves as a boundary marker for the latest possible date for the Book of Isaiah and provides an ancient witness to the unity of the text. Since it dates to the mid-second century BCE, the Book of Isaiah had to have been a unity prior to the mid-second century BCE. Most scholars believe that the book was formed into a unity sometime during the fifth or sixth centuries, though a date as late as the second century has also been posited.¹⁵⁹ Intriguingly, the Great Isaiah Scroll does not show any typographical divisions within the book of Isaiah, which would be expected if the Book of Isaiah were a conglomeration of

¹⁵⁷ I.e. There are no mss. showing a division between the various “books” of Isaiah as purported by modern critics.

¹⁵⁸ The Leningrad Codex dates to around the 11th century, is representative of the MT, and is the text on which the modern BHS is based.

¹⁵⁹ Pfeiffer dated the unification of the supposed parts of Isaiah to around 200 BCE. Leon J. Liebreich, “The Compilation of the Book of Isaiah,” *JQR* 46.3 (1956): 259. Hays reflects a late sixth to fifth century view of the composition of the book. Hays, “Isaiah,” 398.

prophetic material. In fact, the Great Isaiah Scroll shows the exact opposite.¹⁶⁰ Given that the ancient scribes were precise in their work, it is illogical to suppose that the scribes forced together books by different authors into one volume, excising the authorship ascriptions that, presumably, would have been present.¹⁶¹ Others suppose that the individuals who wrote Isaiah 40–66 were subsequent prophets carrying on an Isaianic tradition, which could explain why the Great Isaiah Scroll lacks any division in its text.¹⁶² However, there are historical problems with this claim, not least of which being that a prophet was not formed in a school but called by the

¹⁶⁰ If the book of Isaiah was made up of two or three different books of prophecies, then one would expect this to be reflected in the typography of the manuscripts. For instance, when copying the so-called “Book of the Twelve,” scribes consistently separated the different prophetic books by the use of three blank lines. This fact provides evidence that the ancient scribes knew how to reflect typographically the work of a multiplicity of authors even if those authors were combined into one scroll. (Daniel C. Timmer, “The Twelve,” in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*, ed. Miles V. Van Pelt (Wheaton: Crossway, 2016), 324.) This is intentionally avoided by the scribes who copied the Book of Isaiah. In the Great Isaiah Scroll (viewable online here: <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/isaiah>) one would expect to find some sort of break between Isaiah 39:8 and Isaiah 40:1 if there really were a break between these two sections of the Book of Isaiah. However, the Great Isaiah Scroll does not only lack a three line break between Isaiah 39:8 and 40:1, but Isaiah 40:1 begins on the very same line that Isaiah 39:8 ends. This provides strong evidence that the ancient scribes did not view Isaiah 1–39 and Isaiah 40ff as two (or three) different books but as one whole unit—and by implication, as will be seen, by one author.

¹⁶¹ Authorship ascriptions are present in each of the other fourteen prophetic books of the Old Testament which provides good reasoning to make this assumption. Kirkpatrick attempts to explain away the lack of authorship ascription to Deutero-Isaiah as follows: “A partial explanation may be found in the form of ancient books. The prophecy was annexed to Isaiah 1–39, in order to form a volume approximately equal in size to those of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets. If it was anonymous, it would soon come to be ascribed to Isaiah.” A.F. Kirkpatrick, 363. But why would the scribes want to do this? What is gained by combining Isaiah 1–39 with chs. 40–66 if the two sections are by different authors? The books contained in the Old Testament vary greatly in length. There is ultimately no reason to conclude that this would have been done, especially in light of the expensive nature of scrolls.

¹⁶² That is, Isaiah was the leader of the Jerusalem School of Isaianic Prophecy. This, of course, would also explain why there are no authorship claims in the latter parts of the modern text of Isaiah.

Covenant LORD into his role and given words by God (Deut 18:20; cf. 2 Pet 1:20–21). Thus a school or prophets or a tradition of prophecy to which individuals add for centuries is biblically impossible.¹⁶³ The best explanation for the united typography of the Great Isaiah Scroll is that the Book of Isaiah was always one united work by a single author.

¹⁶³ There are other issues with the view of an Isaianic school as well. First, there is no historical evidence that such a school existed, unless, of course, one assumes the Book of Isaiah is sufficient evidence for such a claim. Second, where did the prophets live and who authorized their work? Did the Covenant LORD authorize these men to add to Isaiah's material? Is this not pseudonymity? The Pseudepigrapha provides ample evidence that the Jewish peoples were not fond of including pseudepigraphic work in their canon. It also shows that they knew how to tell if a text was written by someone other than the authorial ascription. Third, how did this school of prophecy continue to exist through so many years in exile? How was this school organized? And once again, if this school was so organized then why is there no evidence for it having ever existed? The questions continue. For more concerning the Isaianic school, see Richard L. Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter? Prophetic Inspiration in Recent Evangelical Scholarship," in *Evangelicals & Scripture: Tradition, Authority, and Hermeneutics* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2004), 167.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Joseph A. *Isaiah, Translated and Explained*. Vol. 2. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1981.

Allis, Oswald T. *The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy*. Philadelphia: P&R, 1950.

Arnold, Bill T., and John H. Choi. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Baker, David W. "Isaiah." *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*. Edited by John H Walton. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

Barrett, Charles K. *Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. 1 of *ICC*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1998.

Beale, G. K. "A Specific Problem Confronting the Authority of the Bible: Should the New Testament's Claim That the Prophet Isaiah Wrote the Whole Book of Isaiah Be Taken at Face Value?" Pages 123–59 in *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2008.

_____. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. NSBT 17. Downers Grove: IVP, 2004.

Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

_____. *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. Translated by William Pringle. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.

_____. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2008.

Chalmers, Aaron. *Interpreting the Prophets: Reading, Understanding and Preaching from the Worlds of the Prophets*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2015.

Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. 1st ed. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Delitzsch, Franz. *The Prophecies of Isaiah*. Translated by James Martin. Vol. 2 of *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.

Dresher, B. Elan. "Methodological Issues in the Dating of Linguistic Forms: Considerations from the Perspective of Contemporary Linguistic Theory." Pages 3–18 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 8. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012.

Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902. <http://archive.org/details/dasbuchjesaia01duhmgoog>.

Geiger, Gregor. "Participle: Biblical Hebrew." *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* 2:33–36.

Goldingay, John. "What Are Characteristics of Evangelical Study of the Old Testament?" *EvQ* 73.2 (2001): 99–117.

Hanson, Paul D. *Isaiah 40-66. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995.

Hays, Christopher. "Isaiah." *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Books of the Bible* 1:384–409.

Jacobs, Louis. "Ibn Ezra, Abraham." Pages 261–62 in *The Jewish Religion: A Companion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Subsidia Biblica 27. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.

Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012.

Kirkpatrick, A.F. *The Doctrine of the Prophets*. 1897 reprint. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958.

Kline, Meredith G. *Images of the Spirit*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999.

Koole, Jan L. *Isaiah III*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 1997.

Lee, Eunny P. "The Prophets: Isaiah." Pages 109–12 in *The Old Testament and Ethics: A Book-by-Book Survey*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Jacqueline E. Lapsley. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

Liebreich, Leon J. "The Compilation of the Book of Isaiah." *JQR* 46.3 (1956): 259–77.

Longman III, Tremper, and Raymond B. Dillard. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.

Mackay, John L. *Isaiah: Chapters 40–66*. Vol. 2. Carlisle, PA: EP Books, 2009.

Maastricht, Petrus van. *Theoretical-Practical Theology*. Edited by Joel R. Beeke. Translated by Todd M. Rester. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2018.

McConville, Gordon J. "Isaiah." Pages 1–44 in *Exploring the Old Testament: The Prophets*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2002.

Meade, David G. *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Mojola, Aloo Osotsi. "Name of God in Modern Non-Western Bible Translations." *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* 2:247–51.

Morales, L. Michael. *Who Shall Ascend the Mountain of the Lord? A Biblical Theology of the Book of Leviticus*. NSBT 37. Downers Grove: IVP, 2015.

Motyer, J. A. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1993.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Prophetic Perfect." *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* 3:279–80.

Oswalt, John N. *Isaiah*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.

Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Oswalt, John N. "The Implications of an Evangelical View of Scripture for the Authorship of the Book of Isaiah." Pages 273–91 in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015.

Peterson, David. *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Polhill, John B. *Acts*. NAC. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.

Pritchard, James B., ed. "Sennacherib (704–681): The Siege of Jerusalem." Pages 287–88 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1955.

Robertson, O. Palmer. *The Christ of the Covenants*. Phillipsburg, N.J.: P&R, 1985.

_____. *The Christ of the Prophets*. Abridged. Phillipsburg, N.J: P&R, 2008.

Rooke, Deborah W. "Prophecy." Pages 385–96 in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*. Edited by J. W. Rogerson and Judith M. Lieu. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Schultz, Richard L. "How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter? Prophetic Inspiration in Recent Evangelical Scholarship." Pages 150–70 in *Evangelicals & Scripture: Tradition, Authority, and Hermeneutics*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2004.

_____. "Isaiah, Isaiahs, and Current Scholarship." Pages 243–61 in *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith? A Critical Appraisal of Modern and Postmodern Approaches to Scripture*. Edited by James K. Hoffmeier and Dennis R. Magary. Wheaton: Crossway, 2012.

Seitz, Christopher R. "Isaiah 1–66: Making Sense of the Whole." *Reading and Preaching the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Christopher R. Seitz. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.

Smith, Gary. *Isaiah 40-66*. Vol. 15b of NAC. Nashville: B&H, 2009.

Smith, P. A. *Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah: The Structure, Growth, and Authorship of Isaiah 56-66*. Vol. 62 of *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*. New York: Brill, 1995.

Soulen, R. Kendall. *The Divine Name(s) and the Holy Trinity*. Louisville: WJK, 2011.

Timmer, Daniel C. "The Twelve." Pages 321–40 in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*. Edited by Miles V. Van Pelt. Wheaton: Crossway, 2016.

Van der Merwe, C. H. J., J. A. Naudé, and Jan Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Second edition. New York: T&T Clark, 2017.

VanGemeren, Willem A. "Isaiah." Pages 247–76 in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*. Edited by Miles V. Van Pelt. Wheaton: Crossway, 2016.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Waters, Guy Prentiss. *Acts*. EP Study Commentary. Grand Rapids: EP Books, 2015.

Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34 - 66*. Edited by David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, and John D. W. Watts. WBC. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.

Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Translated by David M. G. Stalker. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.

Williams, Ronald J., and John C. Beckman. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Williamson, H.G.M. "Isaiah, Book Of." Pages 364–78 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2012.

Witherington III, Ben. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Young, Edward J. *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Logos Bible Software. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Zewi, Tamar. "Nominal Clause." *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* 2:830–39.