

Babylon used in a perfectly literal and natural way. Why must we depart from that sense now? Alexander's reasons for not seeing literal Jerusalem here are that otherwise consolation was addressed to (1) those left behind at the captivity, or (2) ~~then~~ Jerusalem's inhabitants in exile. But we admit neither one. Jerusalem as a city is meant. She had suffered grievously, but now her captivity would be returned. Naegelsbach¹ and Delitzsch² agree with our interpretation, hardly mentioning the other possibility. In point of fact, ~~was~~ the warfare of the true church ended at the change of dispensations? Or was the Old Testament Church held in its iniquity until Christ's first advent? If one should say yes we would still ask, how was Jerusalem's full tale of suffering the basis of the Messiah's coming to deliver her from the Old Testament bondage? No, the suffering of chastisement in the captivity is the suffering which is completed, and Jerusalem will now be redeemed by Cyrus as the next few chapters show. And how can Alexander say that the Old Testament ceremony was a hardship due to Israel's defection when it dated in principle at least from man's first transgression, and we never knew another way? Alexander could just as well hold here also to the historico-grammatical exegesis of prophecy.

The next section, vs. 3 to 11, are rather obviously Messianic. Verses 3 and 4 are quoted in whole or in part in all the gospels. Verses 6 and 8 are quoted or alluded to in Jas. 1:10-11 and I Pet. 1:24-25, where Peter to the phrase "the Word of our God shall stand forever" expressly adds, "and this is the word of good tidings (i.e., the Gospel) which was preached unto you." The only question is our reference of the final part of the chapter. The argument there is general, really, and applicable to any of God's gracious acts, whether the return from Babylon of the Messiah's