

The section 32:15-20 is more difficult. The first part of the chapter is couched in general language and is therefore both uncertain and insignificant. But vs.9-14 appear to predict the captivity of Jerusalem, and its continued desolation until the end. A difficulty with this exegesis is that the phrase "days above a year" $\eta \gamma \omega \gamma \nu \pi \rho \nu$ means ~~"within a year"~~ "within a year" or thereabouts shall all this happen, although of course it did not happen until Nebuchadnezzar's day. It is hard to believe that the time determination is thus decisive because in 29:1 "he has already said add a year upon a year, let the feasts come round ~~and I will distress Ariel.~~" But immediately he promises deliverance, whereas here the prophet does not mitigate the woe. Delitzsch¹, however, here ~~says~~ says the prophecy is tacitly conditional and averted (we should say delayed) by Hezekiah's repentance. Alexander² favors the view that it means days above a year, but refers to the desolation of Jerusalem (literally) until "a total revolution shall take place in the character, and as a necessary consequence ~~of~~ in the condition, of the people." But he fails to explain how this can happen in a year. We agree rather ~~with~~ with Naegelsbach³ who also applies it to the fall of Jerusalem (cf. Ophel ~~vs. 14.~~ vs. 14.), but who says the time determination is merely an indefinite period of time beyond a year, as the prophet is manifestly indefinite in vs.15 where Naegelsbach says: "He sets the glorious Messianic last time over against the pernicious present ~~time~~, yet in a way that ~~perhaps~~ overlaps the long centuries that intervene and sees the future directly behind the present." We shall include this passage, vs. 15-18, therefore, in our list of eschatological passages.

- - - - -

1. Commentary in loc. (1st. ed.)
2. Commentary in loc.
3. Lange Commentary in loc.