

X-rays. Naegelsbach's argument is sounder than that, although it is a root used in modern Persian, it probably had a counterpart in Assyrian, and was in a sense international.¹ More recent research embodied in Brown, Driver, and Briggs' Lexicon substantiates Dr. Naegelsbach's conjecture.

We come next to a section that is Messianic in its reference no matter what view we take of its exact limits or exact interpretation. At least we shall refer all of chapter 42 to future times, and 43:8-21 to the Babylonian captivity. 43:1-7 is uncertain. The preceding section is an arraignment of Israel, and 43:1 begins with the adversative . But does it refer to a final regathering, or the return from Babylon? It must not be supposed that because we have argued for the historico-grammatical exegesis of prophecy that we believe all problems of prophetic interpretation to be easily soluble. On the contrary, this whole passage could be treated most easily if we abandon historico-grammatical exegesis and call the regathering of verses 5,6, and 7 the conversion of the Gentiles. Alexander does substantially this², arguing that it is demanded because the prophet does not say "bring back" in verse 5, but only bring (בָּרָא). Historico-grammatical exegesis is not so simple. As a matter of fact, in Deut. 30:1-5, where the curse of exile is given, the word "bring" is used in conjunction with other words indisputably ~~חָזַר~~ meaning "return" to refer to a return from exile (Deut. 30:5) (וְחָזַרְתָּ); and this verse Nehemiah quoted in prayer for the return, in Neh. 1:9 (וְחָזַרְתָּ). Delitzsch and Naegelsbach accordingly refer this section to a return from captivity. But is it from Babylon or from the diaspora? Possibly we cannot say here for sure. The figures of North, South, East, and West, favor the

1. Lange, Commentary, p. 443.

2. Commentary, in loc.