

zehnten Jahrhunderts bis auf die Gegenwart (1874–84, reprint 1962), and together with Harry Bresslau, *Der Fall zweier preussischer Minister, des Oberpraesidenten Eberhard v. Danckelmann 1697 u. des Grosskanzlers C.J.M. v. Fuerst 1779. Studien zur brandenburgisch-preussischen Geschichte* (1878). He was editor of the tenth volume of the series devoted to the documents of the Elector Frederick William of Brandenburg (1620–1688), *Urkunden und Actenstuecke zur Geschichte des Kurfuersten Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg. Auf Veranlassung Sr. koeniglichen Hoheit des Kronprinzen v. Preussen* (1880).

ADD. BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Bresslau, Preface to *Geschichte des preussischen Beamtentums*, 3:v-viii (biogr. and bibliogr. notes).

ISAACSON, JOSE (1922–). Argentinian writer, essayist, and lyric poet of Sephardic origin. Many of his works have received awards, including *Amor y Amar* (“Love and To love,” 1960), *Elogio de la poesia* (“Praise of Poetry,” 1963), *Oda a la alegría* (“Ode to Joy,” 1966), and his essay *El poeta en la sociedad de masas* (“The Poet in Mass Society,” 1969). Other noteworthy works were *Kafka: la imposibilidad como proyecto* (“Kafka: Impossible as a Project,” 1974) and *Cuaderno Spinoza* (“The Spinoza Notebook,” 1977) a philosophical poem on the apogee of 18th-century reason before the advent of the crisis of contemporary thought and the alienation of 20th century man. In 1980 he received the Latin American Prize for Intellectual Jewish Merit, conferred by the Latin American Jewish Congress. From the Jewish perspective Isaacson writes about the post-emancipation period and from the perspective of Argentine history; his literary production belongs to the most pluralistic and humanist tradition generated by Liberalism. Thus he appealed both to Jewish intellectuals and to the non-Jewish cultural world which appreciated his human, universal, and abstract values. He was president of the Argentine branch of the International Pen Club. From 1953 to 1970 he was board secretary of the Jewish-Argentine quarterly *Comentario*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: N. Lindstrom, *Jewish Issues in Argentine Literature* (1989). D.B. Lockhart, *Jewish Writers of Latin America. A Dictionary* (1997). L. Senkman, *La identidad judía en la literatura argentina* (1983). A.E. Weinstein & M.G. Nasatsky (eds.), *Escritores judeo-argentinos. Bibliografía 1900–1987* (1994).

[Jose Luis Nachenson and Noemi Hervits de Najenson]

ISAIAH (Heb. יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, יְשַׁעְיָהוּ; “Salvation of YHWH”), one of the eight books (as the Rabbis and the Masorah count them) of the *Nevi'im*, or Prophets, the second division of the Hebrew canon (see *Bible, Canon).

INTRODUCTION

Outside the Book of Isaiah itself, the prophet is mentioned in II Kings 19–20 and II Chronicles 26:22; 32:20, 32. He is called the son of Amoz, who is otherwise unknown. According to a tradition in the Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 10b), Amoz was the brother of *Amaziah, king of Judah. A contemporary of *Micah, Isaiah was preceded slightly by Hosea and Amos, both of whom preached in the Northern Kingdom.

The pseudepigraphical Ascension of *Isaiah relates that Isaiah was “sawn asunder” by the wicked *Manasseh (5:1ff., cf. also Heb. 11:37). A variation of this theme is found in the Babylonian Talmud (Yev. 49b), which relates that a genealogical record in Jerusalem reports the death of Isaiah by the hand of Manasseh: Isaiah was “swallowed by a cedar tree, and the tree was sawn asunder.” Also in the Jerusalem Talmud (TJ, Sanh. 10:2, 28c), Isaiah is said to have hidden in a cedar tree which was then “sawn asunder.” The tradition is therefore consistent that the prophet was martyred in the days of Manasseh.

For other biblical figures with the name Isaiah see Ezra 8:7; 8:19; Neh. 11:7; I Chron. 3:21; 25:3, 15; 26:25.

SURVEY OF VIEWS OF THE AUTHORSHIP OF ISAIAH. Ben Sira attests that by 180 B.C.E. Isaiah had already reached its present form (Ecclus. 48:17–25). This is corroborated by the Isaiah scroll discovered in the area of the Dead Sea which contains all 66 chapters of Isaiah (but see W.H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* (1964), who believes, on the basis of a gap following chapter 33 in the Isaiah scroll, that a literary division should be made at that point). On the basis of this evidence, it is highly unlikely that some portions of Isaiah date from the Maccabean period (see R.H. Kennett, *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology* (1910)). The New Testament speaks of the entire book as Isaianic: John 12:38 refers to Isaiah 53:7 by the formula “spoken by the prophet Isaiah” while the next verse, 12:39, refers to Isaiah 6:9, 10 with the statement “For Isaiah again said...” (see further E.J. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* (1958), 11ff.). According to *Bava Batra* 15a, Hezekiah and his colleagues “wrote” Isaiah. However, it was generally axiomatic among the rabbis that the Book of Isaiah was the work of one prophet, and they answered the apparent time discrepancy by attributing the latter chapters to the outcome of prophetic powers. Abraham ibn Ezra, anticipating modern criticism, hints that because chapters 40–66 of Isaiah contain historical material subsequent to the time of Isaiah, it is likely that these chapters were not written by Isaiah ben Amoz (see M. Friedlaender, *Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah* (1873), 170). Modern criticism began with J.B. Koppe’s observation, in the German edition of Lowth’s *Commentary* (1780), that chapter 50 may not have come from the prophet. In 1789, J.C. Doederlein denied the Isaianic authorship of chapters 40–66. Taking up the issue, J.G. Eichhorn and E.F.K. Rosenmueller defined the criteria for distinguishing between genuine Isaianic and non-Isaianic portions. By the middle of the 19th century, these views had a very wide following, although they were challenged by C.P. Caspari, J.A. Alexander, and, in his early years, F. Delitzsch. More and more scholars began to write on the subject, refining and correcting previous positions. Among these were G.A. Smith (1889) and B. Duhm, who, in 1892, labeled chapters 40–55 and 56–66 of the book Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah, respectively. In 1914, H. Gressmann applied the method of *Formgeschichte* to the study of Isaiah (in: ZAWB, 34 (1914), 254–97). This method, introduced by H. Gunkel and

H. Gressmann, is concerned with identifying the *Gattungen* (literary types) of a given book and placing them in their *Sitz im Leben* (life situation, historical context). C.C. Torrey maintained that chapters 34–66, excluding 36–39, were the work of one author, writing that “the paring process, begun with a penknife, is continued with a hatchet, until the book has been chopped into hopeless chunks” (*The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation* (1928), 13). There has been a trend toward synthesizing the methods of literary criticism and the methods of *Formgeschichte* in the manner of Childs’ *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis*, 1967. Y.T. Radday has attempted to utilize computers in determining the authorship of the work (Y.T. Radday, in: *Tarbiz*, 39 (1969/70), 323–41; idem, in: *JBL*, 89 (1970), 319–24; idem, in: *Computers and the Humanities*, 5 no. 2 (1970), 65 ff.). Radday’s work concludes that there was at least one other author for the second part of Isaiah. J.H. Hertz put the traditional Jewish viewpoint on this subject thus: “This question can be considered dispassionately. It touches no dogma, or any religious principle in Judaism; and, moreover, does not materially affect the understanding of the prophecies, or of the human conditions of the Jewish people that they have in view” (*The Pentateuch and Haftorahs* (1956), 942). For a more recent survey of Isaiah scholarship see J. Sawyer, *DBI* I, 549–54.

The virtually unanimous opinion in modern times is that Isaiah is to be considered the work of two distinct authors: First Isaiah (chs. 1–39) whose prophetic career in Jerusalem covers the years c. 740–700 B.C.E., and that of an unknown prophet (Deutero-Isaiah, chs. 40–66; see below) whose prophecies reflect the experience and events of the Babylonian Exile (c. 540 B.C.E.).

The beginning of (First) Isaiah’s prophetic career (6:1; “the year of the death of King Uzziah,” c. 740 B.C.E.) coincided with the onset of a highly critical period in the fortunes of both the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and the events of this period furnish the immediate background of Isaiah’s prophecies. The march of conquest of both Babylonia and Syria, launched by Tiglath-Pileser III upon his accession to the Assyrian throne (745 B.C.E.), raised a looming threat to the future independence and, indeed, to the very existence of both kingdoms. The coming to power of the usurper Pekah (736 B.C.E.) in Israel marked a concerted effort, in which he was joined by Rezin, king of Damascus, and a few other neighboring principalities, to throw off the yoke of Assyrian domination. Upon King Ahaz of Judah’s refusal to join the alliance, his kingdom was invaded by the leaders of the anti-Assyrian alliance who proposed to depose him and replace him with a pro-Aramean puppet, the “son of Tabeel” (II Kings 15:37; 16:5; Isa. 7:1 ff.). In that critical hour, in a meeting with the panic-stricken monarch, Isaiah urged the king to be confident and calm. Ahaz spurned the prophet’s quietistic counsel and, instead, sent an urgent appeal for help, accompanied by tribute, to Tiglath-Pileser (II Kings 16:7). Thus, the independence of Judah was surrendered. For Isaiah, the fateful act, while buying temporary security for Judah, ultimately invited disaster at the hands of its rescuer. King *Hezekiah (c. 715–687 B.C.E.), Ahaz’s son and successor

to the throne, cautiously stayed aloof, for a time, from abortive attempts initiated by Egypt to throw off the Assyrian yoke. Perhaps it was the insistence of the prophet on the futility of an alliance with Egypt that prompted this attitude; Isaiah dramatized his insistence by going about barefoot and naked for three years as a symbol of the fate that would overtake Egypt and its ally Nubia at the hands of the Assyrians (ch. 20). Some years later, internal troubles in Assyria apparently persuaded Hezekiah that, despite the prophet’s warnings and dire predictions (39:5–7), the hour was ripe to break the yoke of vassalage. Isaiah’s warning that dependence upon Egyptian aid could only lead to disaster went unheeded (31:3). In 701 B.C.E. Sennacherib invaded Palestine, after defeating an opposing Egyptian and Nubian force at Eltekeh. The countryside was quickly overrun (22:7), and much of its population deported. Soon afterward Jerusalem was besieged. Isaiah, prompted by his faith in the inviolability of Jerusalem, encouraged Hezekiah to refuse to surrender the city to the invader despite the threats and demands of Sennacherib’s high officer (36:4 ff.; II Kings 18:17 ff.). The prophet predicted that Jerusalem would not be taken and that God would “turn back the invader the way by which he came” (37:22–29). The siege of Jerusalem was lifted, an event credited to a divine visitation (37:36; II Kings 19:36) that devastated the camp of Sennacherib. (For Sennacherib’s account see Pritchard, *Texts*, 287–8; *COS* II: 302–3; L.L. Honor, *Sennacherib’s Invasion of Palestine*, 1926.) Though the political and military events of the prophet’s time, briefly described above, help to illuminate a number of passages in Isaiah (essentially, those already cited), the major portion of the book is devoted not to Judah’s foreign policy but to the inner state of the nation, its social order, and its religious situation. Isaiah’s career began at a time of growing prosperity that brought comfort and luxury. Material growth was accompanied by the territorial expansion of the Kingdom of Judah, achieved by military power cultivated by King Uzziah (II Chron. 26:6–15). The economic and political situation never seemed brighter. A national sense of complacent self-satisfaction and pride could hardly be avoided. Isaiah, however, saw that wealth had been purchased at the price of oppression. Corruption was rife in high places (1:23); the guilty were acquitted for bribes and the innocent were denied justice (5:23); the fatherless went undefended (1:23); the mansions of the rich contained the spoils of the poor (3:14); the poor farmer was evicted from his land to make room for the estate of the plutocrat (5:8). The aristocratic women of Jerusalem, in their elaborate attire and jewelry, especially served the prophet as target for his denunciations and predictions of doom (3:16–24). Foreign trade and imports apparently brought with them idolatrous religious practices and superstitions; at least, the prophet links the two (2:6–8) and he charges that “Everyone worshippeth the work of his own hands” (10:10 f.). The prophet does not repudiate the sacrificial cult carried out in the Temple; indeed, he seems to have been a frequent Temple visitor, for it is here that he receives the divine call to prophecy in a vision. However, sacrifice and oblations brought by hands “full of blood” are “vain” and an

“abomination” (1:11–15). If the divine demand “to seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow” (1:17) is heeded, “ye shall eat the good of the land”; if not, “ye shall be devoured by the sword” (1:19, 20). The coming of God in His fierce anger to punish Israel and the nations is a recurrent theme (5:15, 16, 24, 25; 9:14–19; 13:11–13; 30:27, 28; cf. 9:20; 10:4). Yet, the divine anger is but an instrument wherewith to humble the arrogant and punish the evildoers. Once it has accomplished its purpose, God will show His graciousness and mercy (10:25; 26:30; 30:18). The latter are presumably meant for the “holy seed” that will remain when the work of destructive purification has been fulfilled (6:13). Only a remnant of Israel shall return (8:18; 10:21, 22; Heb. *She'ar Yashuv*, the symbolic name of the prophet's son, 7:3). In addition to the concrete historical hope of the survival of a remnant, the prophet holds out an eschatological hope, one to be consummated at the end of days when the whole world will be transformed. Isaiah's eschatology is grounded in his faith in God's permanent attachment to Israel and to Zion (28:16). God's design for the history of the nations is to reach its fulfillment in Zion, to which the nations will repair to learn the ways of God and to walk in His paths (2:2–4, 5; 33:20; 28:16; cf. Micah 4:14). The denouement of history will see the abolition of war and the turning of the nations to peace. Closely linked to Isaiah's eschatology are his visions of the messianic figure. Sprung from the root of Jesse (father of David), he will be endowed with the spirit of God in its fullness. With unblurred vision, he will intervene on behalf of the poor and deliver them from their persecutors, establishing thereby a reign of righteousness and truth. Under his reign, even the ferocity of the wild beasts will be transformed into gentleness (11:1–10). In a similar passage, the prophet invests the messianic king with extraordinary traits, calling him “Wonderful in counsel... the everlasting father, the prince of peace” (9:5ff.). In summary fashion, the essential doctrines of Isaiah may be described as

- (1) an emphasis on the holiness of God;
- (2) a rejection of human schemes and wisdom as the means of working out the destiny of Israel and, in their stead, a total reliance on God;
- (3) an ardent faith in Jerusalem as the inviolable city of God and its proclamation as the future site of universal acceptance of the God of Israel by the nations;
- (4) the delineation of the messianic king under whose reign final justice and peace will be inaugurated;
- (5) the doctrine that only a remnant of Israel shall emerge out of the doom to be visited upon it;
- (6) the primacy of the moral dimension of the religious life without which ritual observance becomes an abomination in the sight of God.

Chapters 40–66 of the Book of Isaiah constitute the prophecies of an unknown prophet of the Babylonian Exile, commonly referred to as Deutero-(Second) Isaiah. Fairly widely accepted critical opinion (but with exceptions) attributes chapters 56–66 to a different prophet conveniently called Trito-Isaiah. (Since the essential ideas of these latter chapters

form a consistent whole with chapters 40–55, for purposes of this article they will be considered in conjunction with them.) The dramatic turn of events of his time, the impending conquest of Babylonia by Cyrus, the Persian king of Anshan (539 B.C.E.), to which the prophet alludes (45:1ff.; 47:1), enables the prophet's utterances to be dated with approximate accuracy to 540 B.C.E. In the light of the predicted downfall of Babylonia, and hence presumably an end to exile, the prophet's message to his people who are in despair over the ruin of Judah is, in the first instance, one of hope and consolation. He speaks in vivid terms of “the waste and desolate places, the land that has been destroyed” (49:19). Zion is a widow bereaved of her children (49:19ff.) or a barren mother without offspring (54:1; cf. 51:18–20). It was not only the thought of Zion in ruins that weighed heavily on the mind and heart of the prophet; hardly less oppressive was the fact that thousands of his fellow countrymen, owing to a variety of circumstances, had been widely scattered and were to be found at all points of the compass (43:5; 49:12, 22). To judge from repeated references, the exiles in Babylonia were subject to contempt and hostility (41:11; 51:7, 13, 23; 54:15). A pervasive despair and fear, coupled with a sense of abandonment by God, had overcome the exiles (40:27; 49:14; 50:1). Here and there, some, despairing of the God of Israel's power to deliver them (40:28; 45:24; 46:12; 50:2), had readily succumbed to the lure of Babylonian idolatry (44:17; 48:5). In the midst of the depressing situation, the anonymous prophet reaffirms with striking emphasis and clarity the ancient faith that the God of Israel is not only the creator of heaven and earth (40:26; 44:24; 45:7), but the ultimate arbiter of the destinies of the proud empires, to do with them as he would (40:15ff.). It was the God of Israel who directed history (43:12) and who, even now, was guiding the course of events in bringing overwhelming victory to Cyrus (41:2ff., 25). Incisively, he predicts the collapse of the idols of Babylon (46:1ff.) and sets forth again and again the exclusive divinity of the God of Israel besides whom there is no redeemer (43:10; cf. 44:24; 45:6, 18, 21; 46:9; 48:11ff.). True, Israel had sinned (43:27f.; cf. 48:1ff.), but divine wrath and punishment were things of the past, and God had freely pardoned Israel's sins (40:2; 44:22; cf. 48:9; 51:22; 54:6ff.). As expressions of God's love and His assurance that they had not been abandoned, the prophet employs a whole series of endearing epithets for Israel (43:7; 44:1, 5, 21; 51:4, 16; 54:17). In precise terms, the exiles would be released from Babylonia when that empire had vengeance wreaked upon it for its oppression of Israel (45:1ff.; 47:1ff.). It is Cyrus, heir to Babylonia's throne, who would let the exiles go free (45:13; 52:11ff.). The return to Zion would be led by God Himself (40:9ff.). The Temple would then rise upon a new foundation, and Zion would gain a new, incomparable splendor (54:11ff.). There would also be a vast ingathering of Israelites out of the lands to which they had been scattered (43:5f.; cf. 49:12; 51:11; 53:12). Non-Israelites would join the House of Israel in allegiance to its God (44:5). The prophet speaks warmly of the aliens who associate themselves with the faith of Israel and assures them that they will

receive an “everlasting memorial” (56:4–8). In a burst of exaltation at the thought of Israel’s forthcoming restoration, he sees Israel as supreme over the nations and the latter as subservient to it (43:3; 45:14; 49:22f.; 54:3). A group of passages in Second Isaiah (42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12) are known as songs of the Servant of the Lord. Around the question of the identity of the figure described in these passages, a vast literature has grown up. The preponderance of scholarly opinion inclines to the conclusion that the Suffering Servant is to be identified with the people of Israel and, at the same time, perhaps with an “individual who both represents the whole community and carries to its supreme point the mission of the nation” (H.H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel* (1953), 122). The mission of the servant is not only “to raise up the tribes of Jacob” but to be a “light to the nations” (49:6). His task is to set justice in the earth, bringing it forth in truth (42:3, 4), and to serve as liberator (42:7; see *Servant of the Lord).

[Theodore Friedman]

FIRST ISAIAH

Within this can be distinguished (1) the core, chapters 1–33, and (2) the historical appendix, chapters 36–39. The latter, a variant of II Kings 18:13, 17–20:19, does not purport to be by Isaiah, and was only copied from (a variant recension of) the Book of Kings and appended to Isaiah 1–33 because it tells about Isaiah. Even within chapters 1–33 there are some pericopes which are about, rather than by, Isaiah (e.g., ch. 20) and some which are neither by Isaiah nor about him. For the authentic utterances of Isaiah, the dating by the (not Isaian, but editorial) superscription 1:1 “in the reigns of Kings Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah of Judah” is reliable, and the modern student of Isaiah does well to add: “and of Kings Tiglath-Pileser (III, 745–727), Shalmaneser (V, 726–722), Sargon (II, 722–705), and Sennacherib (705–681) of Assyria.”

Divisions and Content of Chapters 1–33

The block Isaiah 1–33 falls into two main divisions of unequal length: A. The Diary, chapters 1–12; B. The Archive, chapters 13–33. The Diary has been so named by Ginsberg (1964) because despite deviations (which can be accounted for) its arrangement is chronological (c. 740–715 B.C.E.) in principle, with the result that when read in light of the most up-to-date knowledge of the relevant history it resembles a diary. The Archive, on the other hand, is a repository of prophecies of which only a minority at the end seem to be arranged chronologically.

THE DIARY, CHAPTERS 1–12. The Diary, Chapters 1–12, may be likened to a triptych with a narrow inner panel, chapter 6, and two broad outer panels, chapters 1–5 and 7–12, each of which is divided (horizontally or vertically, according to the reader’s preference) into two fields. Panel 1 dates basically from before the death of King Uzziah; Panel 2 – as 6:1 states – from “the year that King Uzziah died”; Panel 3 – as stated by 7:1 – begins in the reign of Ahaz, whether it continues into

the reign of Hezekiah depends on whether Ahaz’s reign was short (some date his death as early as 727, see below) or long (some have him live till 715). The somewhat detailed discussion which follows will serve as an introduction to the person, background, style, and outlook of Isaiah and will make possible considerable economies of space in the treatment of the Archive.

Panel 1, Field A, Chapter 1. *Ewald titled this chapter “The Great Arraignment.” More apt would be “The Great Exhortation” for it appeals for reform (vv. 16–18), and offers total remission of even grave past sins on condition of reform (18–20). S.D. Luzzatto pointed out that *Lekhu na* (note the precative particle *na!*) *ve-nivvakheḥah* (*we-niwwakheḥah*) can only mean “Come, let us reach an understanding,” since that is the only meaning that fits both here and in the only other undamaged passage in which the *nifal* of *ykh* occurs, Job. 23:7 (Gen. 20:6b is obscure). And escape is offered to everyone in Zion who reforms: verse 27: “In the judgment, Zion shall be saved (as in Job 5:20); in the retribution (so *zedakah* (*zedaqah*) is also to be rendered in 5:16; 10:22; 28:17), those in her who turn back.” Only the rebels and sinners will perish, verse 28. The implication is that they will be a minority. When it is noticed that nowhere else does Isaiah summon to repentance, but only expects it after an ever greater depopulation (even in 31:6, the continuation in the third person in the same verse and in the following one show that *shuvu* [imperative, “turn back!”] is to be emended to *we-shavu*, “The children of Israel will then turn back to him to whom they were so false”), it is clear that chapter 1 belongs exactly where it is, at the beginning of the book; only verses 5–9 (10?) have been added – by Isaiah – either after the extinction of the Kingdom of Ephraim in 722 or after Sennacherib’s invasion of Judah, his transfer of some of its territory to the Philistines, and his imposition of a heavy tribute on Hezekiah in 701. The fact that 1:2–20 (apart from the verses just mentioned) is Isaiah’s maiden composition may explain its heavy dependence on earlier models. The models in question are the Song of Moses and the message of Amos. Isaiah 1:2 may be said to summarize the whole of Deuteronomy 32:1–18. Isaiah 1:2a = Deuteronomy 32:1–4 minus the elaborate adornment: Let heaven and earth give respectful attention, for these are the words of no other than the Lord. Isaiah 1:2b = Deuteronomy 32:5–18 in a nutshell: children nurtured and reared (Deut. 32, less restrained, also uses five verbs of engendering, Deut. 32:6b, 18) by the Lord have defected from him. Isaiah 1:3 merely repeats the preceding thought: ox and ass acknowledge their master and feeder, Israel does not. In turning from heaven and earth to address Israel reproachfully, Isaiah 1:4 takes its cue from Deuteronomy 32:6, but two of its epithets are inspired by Deuteronomy 32:5: “corrupt children” (Heb. *banim mashḥitim*) goes back to Deuteronomy 32:5a, which even in its mutilated condition has preserved the elements *banaw* and *shihet* and which originally may have read very much like *banim mashḥitim yalad*, “He gave birth to corrupt children,” while *zera’ mere’im*, “brood of evildoers,” is

synonymous with Deuteronomy 32:5b, “a crooked and twisted generation.” Here the echoes of Deuteronomy 32 in content and diction cease, but its form persists through Isaiah 1:20. For just as in Deuteronomy 32 the speaker alternately utters his own “discourse” (*lekah, leqah*, verse 2), verses 1–18, 36a, 43, and introduces and quotes YHWH, verses 19–35, 36a–42, so Isaiah 1:2–20 gives the following alternation: Isaiah introduces and quotes YHWH, 2–3; Isaiah adds his own comment, 4–9 (but 5–9 were added by him later); Isaiah introduces and quotes YHWH, 10–18; Isaiah adds his own interpretation, 19–20. The idea of disloyal children is repeated in 30:1, 9. The last cited verse is preceded (30:8) by an introduction remarkably reminiscent of the introduction to the Song of Moses, Deuteronomy 31:19, for as the Targum, among other versions, realized, *l'd* in the former is to be vocalized *le-’ed*, “for a witness”; but in this case it is hard to decide which passage is dependent on which. As for the message of Isaiah 1:10–17 – the protest against the topsy-turvy scale of values applied to cult and justice – its dependence on Amos 5:21–25 is obvious, and the identical or equivalent elements can be picked out. The themes of the oppression of the poor and the subversion of justice occur again both in Isaiah and in Amos, and it is not difficult to recognize in Amos 2:6b–7a; 3:15; 5:11–12 the elements of Isaiah 5:8–10 (cf. 1:29–30, which speak not of cult gardens but of luxury gardens in view of verse 31 *he-ḥason... u-fo’alo* (“treasure... and he who amassed it”); 5:23, 10:1–2). Not dependent on either the Song of Moses or the words of Amos is the glorification of Jerusalem, Isaiah 1:21–27. Disappointed as he is in her present state, Isaiah firmly believes that she was a faithful city where justice dwelt in the past, and will be such again in the future. He may well have idealized the past unduly. Jerusalem’s judges had probably been officials appointed by the king ever since David’s conquest, and it seems that in the Ancient Near East it was understood that an official derived much of his income from the gifts of the private persons who needed his services. From the start, therefore, a judge was exposed to a powerful temptation (1) to be too busy to hear an action brought by a widow or an orphan, who could not afford to bring an adequate gift (Isa. 1:23), (2) not only to hear but also to favor a litigant who did bring such a gift. However, Isaiah is to be judged as a prophet, not as a historian. The initial impression of nobility of thought and language is confirmed by the following chapters.

Panel 1, Field B, chapters 2–5. Furnished with a superscription of its own, 2:1, this collection dates from a slightly later period than Field A, as explained above, but the last pronouncement in it, 5:25 ff., dates still from the reign of Uzziah, since the latest misfortune it speaks of as having already occurred (though it is not destined to remain the last) is the famous earthquake of Uzziah’s reign (Amos 1:1; Zech. 14:5). The pericope 9:7[8] ff., which begins its survey further back in history, also knows of later calamities as having already been endured: it comes to the earthquake in 9:18[19]a, and goes on in 9:18b–20a [19b–21a] to speak of Ephraim’s savage civil wars – see II Kings 15:9–16,

23–25 – and of its ensuing attack on Judah, for which see II Kings 16:5–6; Isaiah 7:1 ff. The date of this last event is 733, and if there were any merit to the argument that Isaiah 5:25 (with or without 5:26 ff.) belongs in the context of 9:7[8] ff. “because it has the same refrain” it would follow that Isaiah 5:25(ff.) likewise dates from 733. However, the said argument begs the question; for a stich that occurs only once is not a refrain, and in chapter 5 the stich “Yet his anger has not turned back, and his arm is outstretched still” (5:25b) occurs only once. No time need be wasted on R. Kittel’s egregious suggestion (*Biblia Hebraica*, 1929³, which is not peculiar to him) that the statement at the beginning of 5:25 to the effect that God’s anger has been roused against his people and that he has extended his arm to strike it, presupposes four previous occurrences of “Yet his anger has not turned back and his arm is outstretched still.” But it is also the opposite of probable that Isaiah contemplated repeating “Yet his anger has not turned back, etc,” and going on to depict still further slaughter either in Israel or in Judah at the time when he announced (5:26–29) the coming with uncanny speed “from the end of the earth” of a legendary nation of barbarians equipped with the fangs (for *wšg* [so the consonantal text] read *wšnym, we-shinnayim*), the voracity, and the irresistibility of lions. (The description no more contemplates a specific, real, nation – like the Assyrians – here than in Deut. 28:49–51; Jer. 5:15–17.) What more was necessary for making the land desolate (Isa. 6:11–12)? See also Panel 3, Field A.

Excursus: The Zion Vision, 2:2–4. This is one of the most remarkable pericopes in the entire Book of Isaiah. It reads as follows (verse 2): “In the days to come, the Mount of the Lord’s House shall stand firm above the mountains and tower above the hills; and all the nations shall gaze on it with joy. (3) And the many peoples shall go and shall say: ‘Come, // Let us go to the mount of The Lord,/to the House of the God of Jacob;// That he may direct us according to his ways,/And that we may walk in his paths’//For direction shall be forthcoming from Zion,/And words of the Lord from Jerusalem.// (4) Thus he will judge among the nations/And arbitrate for the many peoples,//And they shall beat their swords into plowtips/and their spears into pruning hooks://Nation shall not take up/Sword against nation;//They shall never again know war.’//The use of the verb “to direct” (*horah*) of the issuing of messages by the Lord and of the delivering of such messages by prophets is characteristic of Isaiah (9:14; 28:9, 26; 30:20 [bis]), and the use of the noun “direction” (*torah*) of messages from superhuman sources is even more characteristic of him (1:10; 5:24; 8:16, 20; 30:9). This is true of ad hoc prophecy that is characteristic of Isaiah, though occasionally emulated by Habakkuk (2:19). Not merely characteristically Isaian but specifically Isaian is the parallelism “direction//word of the Lord” (or, once, “utterance of the Holy One of Israel”): 1:10; 5:24. In this as in other matters (see below), Isaiah’s weaknesses lie in the field of practicality. Isaiah 2:2–4 is unmistakably Isaian not only in its diction but also in its ideology. For both its Zion-centeredness

and its concern that other nations beside Israel may be spared the horrors of war (contrast Lev. 25:18; 26:5; Jer. 30:10; 46:27; Hos. 2:20) are in line with much else. Although the prophecy occurs again in Micah 4:1–4, its uniquely Isaian “*Torah*//word of the Lord,” which has already been commented upon, makes it unlikely that it is the work of some anonymous genius who preceded both Isaiah and Micah; and both this feature and the ideological congruence with Isaiah and clash with Micah – who cancels the universalism of the passage in the very next verse (Micah 4:5) as well as in 5:7–8, and its Zionism (he was a provincial from Morashah, 1:1) in 3:12 – preclude the priority of Micah (see Kaufmann on Micah).

Panel 2, chapter 6. Both the rabbis and modern research regard this as Isaiah’s earliest prophecy (his “inaugural vision”); but Kaplan and Kaufmann have dissented, as have Milgrom, Knierim, and Schmidt. There is a new harshness here. God tells Isaiah to go and harden the hearts of “that people” (*ha-’am ha-zeh*, verses 9, 10) – the first occurrence of this deprecating designation; contrast “my people,” 1:3 (though God is here reproaching Israel); 3:15 – in order that it may not (*pen*) “turn back and be healed” (cf. 19:22). To Isaiah’s shocked question, “How long, O Lord?” – with which is to be compared Ezekiel’s horrified exclamation (Ezek. 11:13b), “Oh, Lord YHWH, You are completely destroying the remnant of Israel!” – YHWH replies, just as He does to Ezekiel (Ezek. 11:14–21), that a small remnant shall turn back to the Lord and be spared. Unless *we-hayetah levá’er* is moved, for purely stylistic reasons, to the end of verse 11, Isaiah 6:13 is to be rendered thus: “But while a tenth part still remains in it, it shall turn back (cf. *She’ar-yashuv* (Shear-Jashub), “a remnant shall turn back,” the name of the son with whom Isaiah appears, a year or two later, in 7:3; see also 10:21). For it shall be ravaged (*we-hayetah levá’er*) like the terebinth and the oak, of which stumps remain even when they are felled; its stump shall be a holy kindred.” The only interpolation in Isaiah 6 is verse 12a, “The Lord will remove the population,” which – referring to the Lord in the third person in the midst of a speech by the Lord – stems from a post-Exilic glossator who thought the prediction of devastation was a prediction of the exiling of the population to Babylonia (a century and a half later). In the inaugural visions Exodus 3:2–4:17; Jeremiah 1:4–9 (verse 9 makes this a vision); and Ezekiel 1:1–3:13, there are no participants but God and prophet (in the last cited vision the Lord does not address the creatures that bear His throne), and there is no call for a volunteer: the prophet is assigned his mission willy-nilly. The true analogue to Isaiah 6 is 1 Kings 22:17 ff.; in the former, however, the prophet is purged by a peculiar visionary rite (Isa. 6:6–7) so that he, as well as the celestial creatures of the Lord’s council, may participate (imitated in Zech. 3:4–7). No wonder he believes that not only he but also his unnamed wife (she is simply “the Prophetess,” perhaps herself a prophet, 8:3) and his children (8:11 ff., 18) – the last word in 8:16 is probably also to be emended to *ba-ye-ladim*, “in the children” – are something set apart from “the masses” (*rabbim*, 8:15)!

Panel 3, Field A, chapters 7–9. The Arameo-Ephraimite Attempt to Depose the House of David, 734–732. The Arameo-Ephraimite attack is the occasion for 9:7 [8]ff., whereas it is only the starting point of 7:1 – 9:6 [7], which in 8:23 [9:1] alludes to the Assyrian annexation of Sharon (in 734) and of Gilead and Galilee (732) as having already taken place (cf. 11 Kings 15:29). But 7:1–9:6 [7] was attracted to the vicinity of chapter 6 by the similarity of the openings 6:1 and 7:1. To the attempt to dethrone the Davidic dynasty, Isaiah reacted with the fury of a devout “legitimist.” For to him the divine election of the House of David was as axiomatic as the divine election of Zion (see above). Recalling Amos 4:6–12, in which his predecessor had traced a series of disasters which had failed to induce repentance in the Northern Kingdom, because of which he had threatened it with ominous vagueness (Amos 4:12), with something much worse than anything that had preceded, Isaiah first repeated the last two of the disasters to which Amos had already looked back and then paraphrased Amos’ threat for the future with appalling explicitness. For in Isaiah 9:7 [8] the Septuagint is unquestionably right in interpreting the consonants of the first two Hebrew words as *dever shillah* (“let[past tense] loose pestilence”), and Ehrlich in changing *we-nafal* to *we-negef* (“plague”). Isaiah 9:7[8] alludes to the same pestilence, and Isaiah 9:10–11[11–12] to the same military disaster(s), as Amos 4:10. For the military disasters, this identity is confirmed by Haran’s observation that Amos 1:6 speaks of Gaza (i.e., Philistia generally) handing over Israelite captives to Aram (so read for “Edom”). Then in 9:12[13], Isaiah paraphrases the final clause of Amos 4:10. Accordingly, Isaiah 9:13, 16a[14,17a] spells out the vague threat of Amos 4:12, and the beginning of it must be translated, “The Lord will exterminate from Israel head and tail, palm branch and reed, in one day.” After that, Isaiah 9:17–20[18–21] traces the stages in the fulfillment of this threat that have been realized between the time that Amos uttered it (see Amos 1:1) and Israel’s attack on Judah. Unlike Isaiah 5:25 ff., therefore, Isaiah 9:7[8] ff. resembles Amos 4:6 ff. in looking back on not one but a whole series of past blows, and so this passage (emphatically not Isa. 5:25 ff.) does, like Amos, employ a refrain. The roughly parallel block 7:1–9:6[7] has preserved the reason for this implacable attitude of Isaiah toward the sister kingdom: the purpose of the attack on Judah was to put an end to the reign of the Davidic dynasty in Judah, 7:6. Isaiah is convinced that Aram and Ephraim have thereby dug their own graves. That Judah will be ravaged by a cruel foe is the gist of 5:26 ff., which has already been dealt with, and presently Isaiah will substitute for this legendary people the Assyrians (8:7–8a); but the Davidic dynasty is inviolable. That its subjects are greatly outnumbered by those of either one of the two attacking kings makes no difference. The entire world outside the Davidic polity is a world without God, whereas YHWH is an integral part of the Davidic polity; and what could even all the nations in the world do against God? (8:8b–10 belongs between 7:9a and 7:9b; see *Immanuel.) But Judah – through its king Ahaz – must exhibit the same faith as Isaiah. If it solicits the aid of heathen Assyria, it

thereby implies that it does not credit the Lord with the ability to dispose of Aram and Ephraim unaided. (“You treat my God as helpless,” 7:13.) One obvious advantage of taking Isaiah’s own word for it, instead of imputing to him the astute diplomatic motive so dear to rationalists who like to believe that the prophets were rationalists like them, is that the same irrational reason explains why Isaiah later opposed enlisting the aid of Egypt in disposing of Assyria, whereas for this the rationalizers have to discover still another secret rational motive. The fact is that only in the latter case can the course advocated by Isaiah also be justified by practical considerations (though they were foreign to Isaiah’s thinking). Of the three premises of those who justify on practical grounds the policy advocated by Isaiah in the face of the Arameo-Ephraimite attack, two are at least doubtful: the premise that Tiglath-Pileser had not already imposed his suzerainty on Judah either when he defeated the *Uzziah-led coalition in 738 or when he swept into Philistia in 734; and the premise that although he had not moved betimes against the same *Pekah – who had perhaps been aided by the same *Rezin – when he rebelled against *Pekahiah, the presumably loyal son and successor of Assyrophile *Menahem, he would certainly, and without being solicited, attack Pekah and Rezin in time to save the House of David. The third premise is nonsense: that stronger powers do not subjugate weaker ones which do not either attack them first or solicit their protection! By procuring the aid of Assyria, Ahaz probably saved his dynasty and possibly his nation. Isaiah, however, bitterly confirmed his prediction of chapter 6, of an appalling devastation and added that the very power – Assyria – that Judah had hired to save her would be the instrument of her devastation (7:20). The best farmland (7:23, corresponding to the most hairy parts of the body, verse 20) would be reduced to thornbrakes infested by dangerous beasts. Just the marginal farmland, which could only be tilled with the hoe because too rocky for the plow (corresponding to areas of the body with scant hair), would escape infestation by dangerous beasts and would serve as pasture, the shrunken population being dependent on cows, sheep, and goats for its subsistence. (See also *Immanuel.) Chapter 8 begins, like chapter 7, with a piece of narrative; but unlike chapter 7 and like chapter 6, it is first person narrative. Isaiah’s wife bears him a son whom the Lord instructs him to name Maher- (to be vocalized rather *Mihar*?) Shalal-Hash-Baz, “Pillage hastens, looting speeds,” in token of the early plundering of two cities: “(4) For before the boy has learned to call ‘Father!’ and ‘Mother!’ the wealth of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria (6b) and the delights of Rezin and the son of Remaliah (the respective kings) (4b) shall be carried off before the king of Assyria.” Isaiah is also instructed to symbolize this fact by writing an “undertaking (*nws*, which in 33:8 is parallel to *’edim* [so manuscript 1QIsa^a] and *berit*; perhaps in both passages read *’mwn* [i.e., *emun*], since confusion of *sh* and *m*, which resemble each other in the Paleohebraic script [see *Alphabet] is frequent in First Isaiah) to Maher Shalal Hash Baz,” and having it formally witnessed. But as in chapter 7, Judah’s want of

faith must also be punished and through the same agent, Assyria. Unlike Aram and Israel, however, Judah would only be imperiled, not destroyed (8:5–8a). In this connection the opprobrious epithet “that people” is again applied to Judah (8:6), and twice more in 8:11, where Isaiah tells how, when the Lord singled him out (*be-hezqat* (*be-hezkat*) *ha-yad*, “when He grasped me by the hand”; cf. Isa. 45:1; Jer. 31:31[32]; Job 8:20), He warned him and his household not to walk in the path of “that people” (and here, as verse 14 makes clear, he means “both Houses of Israel,” both Ephraim and Judah) so as not to stumble like the masses (verse 15; *rabbim*, as e.g., in Mal. 2:8, means “the many, *hoi polloi*”). On 8:16 ff., see Ginsberg 1956, except that verses 20b–22 are to be arranged as follows: “(20b) For him who speaks thus there shall be no dawn. (21bc) Whether he turns upward, (22b) or looks downward (*el erez* = Aram. *la’ara’<lera’*), behold, distress and darkness with no day-break (reading *me’if* with 1QIsa^a), straitness and gloom with no dawning (read *mi-negoah*). (21a–bb) He shall walk in it wretched and hungry, and when he is hungry he shall rage and revolt against his king (better “kings”; vocalize *bi-mla-khaw*) and his divine beings.” The sense of 8:23[9:1] is “For if (read *lu* with 1QIsa^a) there were to be drawn for her that is in straits, only the former [king, i.e., Pekah] would have brought disgrace on the land of the Zebulunites and the land of the Naphtalites (read *erez ha-zevuloni we-erez ha-naftali*) but the latter [king, i.e., Hoshea] would have brought honor to the other side of the Jordan and Galilee of the nations.” In other words, the failure of Hoshea to regain the provinces lost by Pekah shows that the decree of the sack of Samaria (8:4) has not been revoked; its execution has merely been postponed, which dates at least 8:19–23 in the reign of Hoshea (732–725). Verse 5:30 (But on that day there will resound over him (i.e., over the subject of 8:20b–22, once he has learned to spurn his kings and his divine spirits) a roaring like that of the sea; and when he then looks down, behold, distressing darkness with light, darkness with dawn [*be’efah*]) belongs here and (in a manner analogous to 29:5bb–6) it creates a transition from 8:20bff. to 9:1ff. The latter’s message is: Following the final liquidation of the Northern Kingdom, its people shall enjoy freedom and happiness again – in a Davidic kingdom which shall again embrace them and be headed by a model king whose reign shall be blessed. Improved restoration and rendering of verses 5–6[6–7] are: “For a child has been born to us, a son has been given to us, and prosperity (?) has become the import of his name (read *shemo*). He has been named ‘The Mighty God is planning grace, the Puissant One of Jacob intends well being’ (*avir ya’aqov ’oseh shalom*), (6) in token of abundant prosperity and measureless well being, etc.” (Explanations: Meaning of *hmsrh* unknown. 1QIsa^a reads *המשורה*, perhaps cf. *משורה* “liquid measure.” *Avir Ya’aqov* is synonymous with and commoner than *Avir Yisra’el* [Isa. 1:24], which, however, is to be restored in 43:15. For the synonymous parallelism of *y’z* and *’sy*, cf. 5:19; 29:10. The root *’sy* also has this meaning in 5:12; 22:11; 32:6; 37:26. For *pele’* (“grace” see 25:1, and Psalms 88:11, 13; 89:6 and Qumran Hebrew.)

Panel 3, Field B, chapters 10–12. Isaiah 10:1–4a is a social protest in the style of 5:3–10. 4b is not a conclusion of what precedes – since 1–4a is not a recollection of a past blow but a threat of a future one. It is rather a repetition of the last clause of chapter 9 intended to serve as a link between the latter and the former (since its key words *af*, “anger,” and *yad*, “arm, hand,” occur again in 10:5). Since 10:16–19 is a threat against Israel (note, among other things, the resemblance of 10:16 to 17:4) and it originally followed directly on 9:16a [17a] (note, among other things, “in one day,” 9:13 [14] and 10:17), what originally stood in its present position may very well have been 14:24–27; note among other things the antithesis between the Lord’s purpose (*dimmiti*, 14:24) and Assyria’s purpose (*yedam-meh*, 10:7). Isaiah 10:5–15; 14:24–27 is a remarkable display of concern for the right of nations – not just Israel – to exist that is worthy of the man who authored 2:2–4; see above, panel 1, field B. The *terminus post quem* is given by the reference in 10:9 to the Assyrian annexation of Carchemish, which took place in 717 B.C.E. At the same time, verses 27b ff. can best be understood against the background of Sargon’s Arabian campaign of 715. The date of 10:5–15; 14:24–27 is therefore probably 716. Since the time when Isaiah assigned to Assyria the missions of liquidating the states of Aram and Ephraim and severely chastising Judah (see above), between ten and 15 years have elapsed, and he has been sickened by the ruthlessness (born, like every vice, of pride) of the Assyrian, who is not content to attack the nation he is commissioned to attack but conquers insatiably, and is not content to plunder (in accordance with 8:4; 10:6) but needs must annihilate (10:7), namely by expatriation (10:13bc; the Karatepe inscriptions confirm that *horrid* means “to exile [populations]”). Assyria has still to carry out its mission of chastising Judah (8:5–8a), but after that the “Lord... will punish the majestic pride, and overbearing arrogance of the king of Assyria” (10:12). And 14:24–27 tells us in what manner: (24) The Lord of Hosts has sworn this oath: “As I have designed, so shall it happen;/What I have planned, that shall come to pass://(25a) To smash Assyria in my land,/ To trample him on my mountain (i.e., in my country; vocalize *hari* in view of Isa. 11:9; 25:6, 7, 10; 65:25; Ex. 15:17; Ps. 78:54).” // (26) That is the plan that is planned/For all the earth;//That is what an arm is poised for/Over all the nation.//(25b) And off them his yoke shall drop,/And his burden shall drop from their backs.//(27) For the Lord of Hosts has planned,/ And who can foil it?//It is His arm that is poised,/And who can stay it?//In 10:27b ff. the prophet anticipates that the predicted imperilment of Judah by Assyria will take place by Sargon marching up the road from the Jordan Valley to Ai but turning southwestward before reaching Ai in order to advance on Jerusalem by way of Michmas and Geba. The only time when Sargon could be expected to march on Jerusalem by way of the Jordan Valley was when he was campaigning in, or returning from, North Arabia, in 716 or 715. The ravaged forest of verses 33–34 is, of course, no less than that in verses 17–18aa, 19 and in 9:17[18], the local population, not the invading army. In this passage, however, the ravaging is done

with the ax, not with fire, and stumps – including notably the stump of Jesse, 11:1ff. – can produce new crowns of foliage, and so they shall, 11:1ff. The stump of the tallest tree of all, “the stump of Jesse shall, in regenerating, produce a marvelous shoot; a prince with a charismatic gift of justice. For he shall be endowed with the charismas of wisdom, resourcefulness and valor, and piety (*da’at* being, as in Hos. 4:6; Prov 1:29, short for *da’at elohim/YHWH*, “devotion to, or mindfulness of, God/YHWH”). He shall know the rights and wrongs of a case by instinct, and destroy the wicked by his mere utterance. (For *ruah* (lit. “spirit”), “charisma,” cf. e.g., 11 Kings 2:8–9, 14–15; Hos. 9:7; Micah 3:8). Down to this point, the doctrine of the election of the House of David had merely asserted that his family would reign forever; here the attention is transferred from the perpetuity of the dynasty to the marvelous qualities of the individual ruler. One might therefore say that Isaiah’s concern, which has already been noted, about the social ills of his time, particularly the judicial oppression of the poor, has led him (most strikingly here but also in 9:5–6 (1–6) and 16:4b–5) to combine the peculiarly Judahite – really peculiarly Jerusalemite – doctrine of the perpetuity of the Davidic line with the common West Asiatic ideal of kingship as expressed in Israel’s wisdom literature (Prov. 16:21b; 20:28; 25:5b; 29:14). By taking this step Isaiah made possible the evolution of the post-biblical idea of “the *Messiah.” There followed visions of peace in the animal kingdom (at least within the borders of the Land of Israel, 11:9), the reconciliation of Judah and Ephraim under the Davidic dynasty (11:10, 13), and the reconquest of the dependencies of David (14); finally, the redemption of the Israelites exiled by the kings of Assyria.

THE ARCHIVE, CHAPTERS 13–33. This falls into three parts: I. The Book of Pronouncements (*Massa’ot*), 13–23, minus the two misplaced “*ah’s*” 17:12–14; 18:1–7 (place these after chapter 33); II. “The Isaiah Apocalypse,” chapters 24–27; III. The Book of *Ah’s*: 17:12–18:7, chapters 28–33. (30:6–7 is not a misplaced “pronouncement”; the first three words are corrupt for *bmšw’t* (Job. 30:3; 38:27) *hngb*, “in the wasteland of the Negev”).

The Book of Pronouncements. That there is no chronological arrangement here is easily demonstrated: 14:28ff. is dated “in the year that King Ahaz died,” for which the earliest possible identification is 727 B.C.E.; yet 17:1ff., which predicts a total and definitive destruction of Damascus, which was taken but not destroyed in 732, cannot date from later than 732 B.C.E. (note that the depopulation of Israel is also still in the future, 17:4–6). The arrangement is actually geographical, namely, in two arcs beginning at Babylon and ending in the West: (a) chapters 13–21 (Babylon, 13:1, 19; 14:4; Assyria, 14:24–27; Philistia, 14:28ff.; Moab, chapters 15–16; Damascus and Israel, 17:1ff. [on the two “*ah’s*,” 17:12ff.; 18:1–7, see above]; Egypt, chapter 19; Egypt and Nubia, chapter 20); (b) chapters 21–23 (Babylon, 21:1–10; Dumah, 21:11–12; Northwest Arabia, 21:13–17; Jerusalem, chapter 22; Tyre-Sidon, chapter 23). The material may be classified in four categories:

1. Definitely or probably Isaian. (i) 14:4b–21, a magnificent ode composed in the summer of 705, when the Assyrian defeat and the ignominious death of King Sargon seemed, even though they took place hundreds of miles northeast of “my land/my mountain” (14:24–25, see above) to be the fulfillment of Isaiah’s prediction of the crushing of Assyria and the liberation of “all the nations” (14:26, see above). (ii) 14:24–27 (dealt with above, under The Diary, Panel 3, Field B). (iii) 14:28–29, 30b–31 (32, 30a [read *be-kharo*, “in His – יַהְוָה’s, referring to 32b – pasture”] belong after 16:5). It would seem that Ahaz died in the same year as Tiglath-Pileser; in any case, not Ahaz but the latter, who invaded Philistia both in 734 and in 733, is the rod of him [i.e., Assyria] that beat Philistia. (iv) 17:1–11 clearly 733–732. (v) 19:1–15. In Isaiah’s time the nomes (districts) of Lower Egypt were governed by hereditary princes, which is why his contemporary Sennacherib speaks of defeating “the kings (plural) of Egypt.” In line with this is Isaiah’s reference to the nomes of Egypt as kingdoms (19:2). In addition, the rhythm and diction of 19:1–15 are typically Isaian; for the presumable occasion see on chapter 22. On verses 16ff., see below. (vi) chapter 22. The background of this chapter is the situation after the fall of Azekah to the Assyrians in 712 B.C.E., and the feverish preparations in Jerusalem for the eventuality of a siege (whose non-materialization is probably to be ascribed to timely submission). The main target of the Assyrians was Ashdod which headed a revolt of vassal states against Assyria in the years 713 and 712 until it was besieged and captured. As can be seen from Isaiah 20:4ff., the rebels hoped for help from Nubia and Egypt. Isaiah opposed Judah’s involvement for the same reason as he had 20 years earlier opposed soliciting the aid of Assyria against Aram and Israel: it signified that Judah relied on the might of heathen Egypt and Ashdod because it had no faith in the Lord’s ability to dispose of Assyria – as he surely would, in his own good time. (vii) 23:1–14. The diction is Isaiahs, and the period is the Assyrian one. (The corrupt verse 13 is to be restored something like this: The land of Kittim itself, which [this is one of the instances of the use of *zeh* as a relative pronoun] Sidonians founded – whose turrets they raised, whose ramparts they erected – is a people no more; Assyria has turned it into a ruin.) On verses 14ff., see below.

2. Not by but about Isaiah, chapter 20. The year of the Assyrian capture of Ashdod is 712 (see above on chapter 22). The account is in the third person, but it obviously contains a historical core. As already mentioned, Isaiah disapproved of his own people’s attempting to throw off the Assyrian domination with the help of Egypt and Nubia, and he was convinced that both Egypt and those who relied on her would come to grief. That he took off his clothes and sandals to dramatize – and thus quasi-magically effectuated – the ignominious end of Egypt that he predicted is entirely conceivable (cf. the Maher-Shalal-Hash-Baz sign, 8:3–4). That Isaiah’s regular attire was a loincloth, and that he went entirely naked and barefoot for three years are not impossible data; but they may be a distorted recollection that so long as the rebellion lasted he went

about in sack-cloth and sandals, and when Ashdod fell he took these off and went naked and barefoot for a while.

3. Definitely neither by nor about Isaiah. (i) 13:1–14:4a, 22–23. Both Isaiah 13 and Zephaniah 1:7, 14ff. announce a day of divine wrath and stress that it is close at hand, but only the latter likens it explicitly to a day of a private sacrificial slaughter, and feast of which one notifies one’s guests in advance and “has them cleanse themselves (ritually)” (*hikdesh, hiqdesh*, Zeph. 1:7; cf. *kiddesh, qiddesh*, Job 1:5, of having persons on whose behalf burnt offerings are made cleanse themselves ritually). Consequently it is only Zephaniah 1 that enables us to understand why the armies summoned by the Lord to execute the carnage of the day of His wrath are styled by him in Isaiah 13:3 “My ritually cleansed ones.” Moreover, the age of prophecies that Media would overthrow Babylon was the Babylonian age; Jeremiah 51 is an indication for Isaiah 13 and Isaiah 21:1–9; naturally, for it was the Median empire whose power balanced that of the neo-Babylonian until the year 550, when King Astyages of Media was defeated and captured by his vassal Cyrus of Anshan, the founder of the Persian empire. For 14:1–2, a comparison with Zechariah 1:12–16 is suggestive, and 14:3–4a, 22–23 are clearly an editorial framework from the Babylonian period to verses 14b–21, representing it as an Isaian prediction of what the Jews will say on the death of the Babylonian tyrant rather than as the expression of Isaiah’s own satisfaction – on the ignominious death of the Assyrian king, Sargon II, and the apparent collapse of Assyria, in 705 B.C.E. – that it is (see above). (ii) chapter 21.21:1–10 is to be judged in light of what has just been said about predictions about the fall of Babylon to the Medes, and a presumption is thereby created against the enigmatic “pronouncements” 21:11–12 and 21:13 ff. as well.

4. Tantalizing in-betweens. (i) The Moab Pronouncement, chapters 15–16 (with 14:32, 30a restored to its original position after 16:5, as indicated under 1). It seems equally clear that on the one hand the bulk of this composition must be old, and on the other, that it cannot be an Isaian composition pure and simple. As regards the basic text, its dating must take account of the fact that the Moabites are represented as fleeing southward from as far north as Heshbon and Elealeh. However, it is known (from the Mesha inscription) that Moab recovered (from the Israelites, who had dispossessed the Amorites) much of the anciently Moabite territory north of the Arnon; and when Israel was forced out of Transjordan, Moab may very well have emulated Ammon (Amos 1:13), so that the old suggestion, most recently defended by Rudolph, that the basic lament was composed on the occasion of Jeroboam son of Joash’s reconquest of Transjordan “from Lebo of Hamath to the Sea of the Arabah (i.e., the Dead Sea)” (II Kings 14:25) still has to be considered. For one has the impression that the old lament already had at 16:1 counsel to the Moabite refugees who have reached the southernmost point in Moab, Zoar (15:5), to cross over to Edom (Moab’s southern neighbor) and send messengers from Sela in Edom to Jerusalem requesting asylum; only 16:4b–5; 14:32, 30a; 16:6 seem to have been added

by Isaiah. In 4b–5 the speaker explains to Moab why asylum in Judah would be particularly desirable; “For violence (read *hamaz*, equivalent to *hamas*) has vanished, rapine is ended, /and marauders have perished from this land: //and a throne shall be established in goodness/in the tent of David//and on it shall sit in faithfulness/a ruler devoted to justice/and zealous (read *we-shoher*, Ginsberg 1950; *mahir* would require a different construction, see Prov. 22:29; 7:6) for equity.” But then in 14:32, 30a; 16:6 he reveals how this ruler will react to the Moabite’s petitions (14:32). “And what will he reply to a nation’s messenger?// That Zion has been established by YHWH; in it the needy of His people shall find shelter (14:30). In His pasture (read *be-kharo*, see 30:23b) such as are poor may graze/and such as are destitute may lie down secure.”// The immediately preceding sentence seems to imply that non-Israelites who seek asylum will be welcomed, but only if they are poor and humble. Verse 5 then explains – and it makes no difference whether the speaker is still the Davidic king or the poet who reports the former’s answer – why Moab is not welcome: “We have heard of Moab’s pride-/most haughty is he-//of his pride and haughtiness and fury,/and of the iniquity in him” (16:6). There is no such word as bad “falsehood,” or “prating.” *Baddaw* is the suffixed form of the preposition *bede* (Jer. 51:58; Nah. 2:13; Hab. 2:13; Job 11:3, and what *bdnm* is in the Eshmunazor inscription (Phoenician), line 6). Now if one takes the above translations bit by bit, it is not difficult to find striking parallels to every bit. 16:4b–5 is insistently reminiscent, in content and partly in diction, of 9:3–6 [4–7] and 14:32, 30a, reminiscent of 3:15, of 5:17 (especially if we emend וְרָעוּ כִבְשִׁים כֶּרְבִּיִּים, “and the lambs shall graze the pasture of the fat (rams), etc.” – but even also as it stands), and of 11:4a, 9a; while to 16:6 the closest single parallel is 10:7a, 12–15 (cf. 37:23–25), but see also 2:10–17; 3:16–17; 5:15–16; 28:1ff. Indeed, anyone who has not been struck by the importance in Isaiah’s thought of the doctrine that pride is the root and essence of wickedness has never done more than skim his book; cf. further 16:5b (reading *we-shoher* as above) with 1:17a (reading *shaḥaru zedeq* for the insipid “guide the robbed”).

(ii) and (iii) the prose, or mainly prose, appendices to the Egypt and Tyre Pronouncements, i.e., 19:16–25 and 23:15ff. The latter does not sound like Isaiah either in diction or in sentiments, but the former is occasionally reminiscent of Isaiah in its diction and is tantalizingly suggestive of events in Isaiah’s time by which they could have been suggested to Isaiah: 19:19–20 of the stele Tiglath-Pileser erected on the border of Egypt in token of his sovereignty over it, and verse 23 of Sargon’s forcible opening of Egypt to trade with Assyria. And certainly the universalism of 19:24–25 (“my [YHWH’S] people Egypt,” “Israel... third to Egypt and Assyria”) is worthy of Isaiah.

“*The Isaiah Apocalypse.*” (Isa. 24–27). It may be admitted that though the language and the ideas are often Isaian, frequent divergences from Isaiah’s style, spirit, and outlook argue that the resemblances are due to imitation of Isaiah rather than

Isaian authorship. On the other hand it is unwise to descend below the Babylonian exile, and at least the key passage 25:6–12 sounds like nothing so much as an assurance by an early seventh-century writer that Isaiah’s prediction 14:24–27 (translated above in connection with The Diary, Panel 3, Field B) of the liberation of the nations as a result of the Lord’s destroying Assyria by trampling it on “his mountains,” i.e., in the Holy Land, will yet come true. For consider what 25:1–6 says: It says that the Lord’s trampling of a certain entity “on this mountain” is going to result in a feast for “all the peoples” (verse 6) because of the destruction of “the shroud that is drawn over the faces of all the peoples and the covering that is spread over all the nations” (verse 7) and the “destruction of ‘death’ [i.e., the Assyrian killing of whole peoples, 10:7 (and 14:20, where “countries” and “peoples” should be read for ‘your country’ and ‘your people’ of MT)] forever and the wiping away of tears from all faces and the end of the reproach of peoples [so for MT’s “his people”] over all the earth” (25:8). – Let who will try to escape the conclusion that first, “this mountain” here is identical with “my mountain” in 14:25 (which stands in parallel with “my country,” – and means the Holy Land), and that, secondly, the entity that is to be trampled to death by the Lord on the said mountain must be, here as in 14:25, Assyria. Moab was never of such international importance. The received reading “Moab” might be taken as a cryptogram for “Assyria,” though *atbash*, the system by which *ššk* represents *bbl* in Jeremiah 25:26; 51:41 and *lbqmy* represents *kšdym* in Jeremiah 51:1, is of no use here. However, the better explanation of מוֹאָב is simply that it was a misreading for אַשּׁוּר (confusion of ב and ג was possible and occurred in all periods, and confusion of ש and מ was possible in the Paleohebraic script in which it has occurred a number of times throughout chapters 1–33. A well-known instance is אַמְרוּ for אַשְׁרֵי (“Happy is”; 3:10), Kaufmann has very plausibly emended עֲשֶׂה לַעֲמִיד (“your Maker”; in 2:6); Another possibility is to read אַמּוֹן (with the surmised meaning “undertaking” [cf. *amanah*]) for אַנּוּשׁ in 8:1; 33:8. Further תַּשׂא is to be emended to אַתָּם (read אַתָּם וְאֱלֹהֵיהֶם (“and their idols along with them”)) in 2:9, שִׁמְלֵה לְמִים (“clothing,”) in 3:1, and the inapposite שִׁיר of 33:12 to שִׁמְרֵי (“brambles”; the מ omitted by haplography after the ש which it resembled in the Paleohebraic script) so as to parallel קוֹצִים, cf. 32:13. (The resemblance between *m* and *š* in the Protohebraic script also played a part in the loss of a *m* in *mšlwh*), 11:14, and in the double writing of the *m* in *wmmšltk*, 22:21, for *wmš’ntk*.) As has been shown, we must now add *mw’b*, 25:10, for *šwr*; but we must also add, in the same verse, *khdwš tbn* for *khdwš mtbn* (the *m* is a ditogram of the preceding *š* and *md(w)šh* for *mdmnh*). For the sense required is not the remarkable “as a pile of straw chips [the meaning of *matben* in the Mishnah] is threshed to bits in a dunghill” (?; as a common noun *madmenah* is not otherwise attested) but “as straw chips are threshed to bits in threshing (21:10).” This confusing of *m* and *š* does not extend to Deutero-Isaiah. Consequently the incorporation of “the Isaiah Apocalypse” in the Book of Isaiah antedates that of Deutero-Isaiah. Consequently, though “Assyria” in our verse may conceivably

refer, as e.g., in 52:4, to the neo-Babylonian empire and date from after 605, it cannot refer to the Persian Empire and date from after 539. Finally, the meaning of 25:11 is, “Then he will spread out his hands in their (i.e., the Assyrians’) homeland as a swimmer spreads out his hands to swim, and he will humble their pride along with their citadels (read *armenotaw*). Yea, the secure fortification of their walls (read *homotaw*) he will lay low and humble, will raze to the ground, to the very dust.” Of course the same – Assyrian or Babylonian – cities are meant in 26:5–6; 27:10.

The Book of “Ah’s,” chapters 28–33, 17:12–18:7. The background of 30:1ff. and 31:1ff. is obviously Judah’s negotiations with Egypt for aid in a contemplated or ongoing revolt against Assyria’s suzerainty, and the only doubt is whether the revolt in question is that of 713–712 against Sargon or that of 705–701 against Sennacherib. Skinner still favored the former because of 30:4 (which could be read immediately after verse 2) “For his [Pharaoh’s] officers are present [read *yihyu?*] in Tanis [in the eastern Delta], and his monarchs [read *melakhaw*] reach as far as Heracleopolis magna [in Middle Egypt].” That would be a fair description of the eastern and southern limits of the realm of Tefnakhte and Bocchoris, the Pharaohs of the 24th Dynasty, whose residence was Sais in the western Delta and whose rule was terminated in the year 710. If correct, this would mean (so Skinner) that there is no evidence that Isaiah again condemned the policy of attempting to win independence from Assyria with the help of heathen allies during the revolt of 705–701, at the end of which he definitely encouraged Hezekiah, 37:5, 38:6. If chapters 30–31 are nevertheless dated, as with the majority of critics, to the revolt of 705–701, 30:4 must be regarded as formulaic. The Masoretic Text’s *malakhaw*, “his messengers,” cannot be made to refer, along with “his officers,” to Hezekiah’s delegation (where is Hezekiah mentioned?). That the displaced block of “Ah’s” 17:12–18:7 belongs after chapter 33 is suggested by the similarity between 33:21–23 (we shall be as inaccessible to enemies as if surrounded by an impassable sea) and 17:12–14 (the multitudes of our enemies may create a tumult like that of the seas, but they shall be terrified into flight by the roar of YHWH (like the primeval waters, Ps. 104:5–9)). Chapter 33, for its part, seems to date from after the final subjugation of Judah in 701 (Judah’s past and future situations (3–6 and 10ff. respectively) are enviable, but the present (7–9) deplorable). There is thus no obstacle in the way of regarding the arrangement of the entire Book of “Ah’s” as basically chronological.

THE HISTORICAL APPENDIX, CHAPTERS 36–39. It is of course nothing but a parallel version of II Kings 18:13–20:19, mostly shorter (the most important omission is Hezekiah’s abject surrender, II Kings 18:14–16) but with Hezekiah’s Psalm, Isaiah 38:9–20, added. It relates three incidents in which Isaiah played a part: (1) the deliverance of Jerusalem, chapters 36–37; (2) Hezekiah’s illness and recovery, chapter 38; and (3) the visit of the ambassadors from Babylon, chapter 39.

(1) Within the first, two versions of the manner of Jerusalem’s deliverance have been combined: (a) 36:2–37:9a (plus *wa-yishma*^s), 37–38; (b) 37:9b (minus *wa-yishma*^s)–36. The former is full of circumstantial details and virtually dispenses with miracles: Sennacherib, at Lachish, sends the *Rabshakeh (it is a title, not a proper name) with a force to Jerusalem to demand that its people surrender so that they can at least eat decent food and drink decent drink while awaiting Sennacherib’s inevitable return to carry them off into an exile which is also tolerable, instead of continuing to put up with the terrible conditions of siege that they are enduring. The Rabshakeh deliberately shouts this, in the Judean language, to the men on the walls of Jerusalem and over the heads of the Judahite officials – their names and offices are given – who were sent out to parley with him in Aramaic. Hezekiah then sends a delegation to Isaiah, who sends back an assurance that a disquieting report will compel Sennacherib to withdraw to his own country, where he will fall by the sword. Returning to Sennacherib, the Rabshakeh finds that he has already moved northward to Libnah, which is to the north of Lachish, because of a report that King Tirhakah of Nubia is advancing upon him. Sennacherib, as a matter of fact, withdraws all the way to his capital Nineveh, and there (some 20 years later but telescoped in the narrative; see *Adrammelech) two of his sons assassinate him; another son, Esarhaddon, succeeds him on the throne. The other version (37:9b–36), on the other hand, is short on details and long on the miraculous: Sennacherib sends anonymous messengers with a written demand of surrender, addressed not to the people but to Hezekiah and supported by the argument not that YHWH Himself has sent the Assyrians because Hezekiah has offended Him but that the Lord is helpless to save him. Isaiah spontaneously sends Hezekiah a reassurance that Sennacherib will never even lay siege to the city but will return to his homeland, and that night an angel of the Lord kills 185,000 men in the Assyrian camp. Although this second account is manifestly farther removed from actual history than the first, it contains in 37:22b–29 what sounds, in thought and in diction, like a genuine Isaian composition. As for the first account, either it refers to an (unlikely) second invasion of Judah by Sennacherib which, occurring after the year 697, the last one that is covered by his annals, is unattested by any Assyrian source, or else its divergences from the course of events in 701 (Tirhakah was then not yet king of Nubia but only a boy who had never left Nubia; Sennacherib did not retreat from Lachish to avoid the advancing Nubian army but met and defeated the Nubian and Egyptian forces at Eltekeh—which is north of Lachish and even of Libnah—apparently before advancing further south and dispatching a force to Jerusalem. See *Hezekiah, *Sennacherib.

(2) Hezekiah’s illness and recovery. The legendary sun miracle had an antecedent in the reign of Ahaz, as the rabbis guessed from 38:8; see *Immanuel.

(3) The visit of the ambassadors from Babylon, chapter 39. Since Merodach-Baladan, who had been driven out of Babylon by Sargon in 710, returned on the latter’s death in

705 from the Chaldean country by the Persian Gulf to reign in Babylon again until expelled in 703 by Sennacherib, and then successfully eluded him in the southern marshes, the visit by a delegation from the leading anti-Assyrian of the east to the leading anti-Assyrian of the west is presumably historical, but hardly the conversation between Isaiah and Hezekiah reported in 39:3–8.

[Harold Louis Ginsberg]

CHAPTERS 34–35

Chapters 34–35 of Isaiah constitute an independent unit. Chapter 34 contains a prophecy of wrath and destruction of the nations in general and Edom in particular, and chapter 35 deals with the Redemption of Israel and the Return to Zion. Since the beginning of modern biblical criticism scholars have held that chapters 34–35 do not relate to Isaiah son of Amoz, either in terms of content or style, and even certain conservative critics do not attribute them to Isaiah son of Amoz. There is no consensus, however, regarding their inclusion within prophetic units, or their exact time. Some scholars suggested joining these chapters to Isaiah 13–14 and regarding them as the product of a single author (Gesenius); some suggested joining them to Jeremiah 50–51 and regarding them as the product of a single author (Ewald); but the majority tend to relate them to Isaiah 40–66 (but esp. Torrey, who not only related them to Isaiah 40–66 but maintained that originally 34–35 were joined to, and served as, an introduction for 40–66; Steck regards 34–35 as a redactional bridge between First and Second Isaiah when the book was almost complete; the later account of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah, chapters 36–39, was added to them). Most critics tended to attribute them to the time of Deutero-Isaiah, i.e., the second half of the sixth century B.C.E., but some date them later, to after the time of Malachi, i.e., the middle of the fifth century B.C.E. (M.H. Segal), while still others dated them even later, to the fourth century (Pfeiffer). The injunction to “search in the book of Yahweh, read! Not one of these failed” (Isa. 34:16) points to the existence of a collection of written prophecies of destruction that have now materialized (Cf. Blenkinsopp a.l. 454).

Together with the question of the placing and dating of these chapters, scholars also began to doubt that these two chapters are a single unit, and some of them distinguished between them. Graetz was the first (1891) who separated them, attributing chapter 35 to Deutero-Isaiah. He regarded it as an integral part of Deutero-Isaiah and even inserted it into chapter 51 between verses 3 and 4. As for chapter 34, he attributed it to Jeremiah. When a distinction began to be made between Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah (see below), some scholars joined chapter 35 to 40–55, which are seen as part of Deutero-Isaiah (see Olmstead), while some joined it to 56–66, which are seen as part of Trito-Isaiah (Scott). Actually only the dating of these chapters, but not their relation to any particular prophet, can be determined. These two chapters are only part of a multifaceted literature which grew and flourished after the destruc-

tion of the First Temple and before the Return of the Exiles, of which Isaiah 40–66 are but the most important part. It was concerned, on the one hand, with announcing the downfall of Babylon the destroyer of Judah and the downfall of Edom the ally of Babylon, and, on the other, with announcing the Redemption of Israel and the Return to Zion. The contents of Isaiah 34–35 bears witness to their time of origin, i.e., after the destruction of Judah and on the eve of the Return to Zion (between c. 580 and 540 B.C.E.). The acts perpetrated by Edom against Judah during the period of the destruction, which were denounced by the prophets (Ezek. 35; Obad.) and poets (Ps. 137; Lam. 4:21–22), are still very much in the mind of the prophet and his audience and are expressed here with extreme wrath (cf. Isa. 63:1–6). Edom is the people whom God has doomed (34:5). The time is a “day of vengeance for the Lord, a year of recompense for the cause of Zion” (34:8), and perhaps there is also an allusion to the destruction of Edom (which also took place in the sixth century). The anticipated and desired destruction of Edom is total, in accordance with the literary tradition of maledictions against breakers of alliances (see esp. Hillers' work, but his attribution of the chapter to the time of Isaiah son of Amoz has been criticized in terms of historical background). Chapter 35 completes the picture and expresses the yearning for the Redemption of Israel and the Return to Zion which will follow the downfall of Israel's enemies. In light of its subject and content it is related in terms of content and style to Isaiah 40–66.

DEUTERO-ISAIAH

DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN CHAPTERS 1–39 AND 40–66. Hints of a dichotomy between chapters 1–39 and chapters 40–66 of Isaiah are to be found even in medieval Jewish Bible exegesis (see e.g., *Ibn Ezra, Ibn *Gikatilla, and others). The question of the dichotomy between these chapters was revived at the beginning of modern biblical research, in 1775, by the German scholar J.Ch. Doederlin, and since then the dichotomy has been generally maintained as an incontrovertible fact. This differentiation between the two groups is based on a conclusive combination of historical, conceptual, stylistic, and linguistic evidence. One of the characteristics of chapters 40–66 is the scarcity of historical data and the vagueness of the historical background. However, some distinctly historical information (such as the two explicit references to Cyrus, 44:28; 45:1), and the mention of Babylon and the Chaldeans (43:14; 47:1; 48:20), and reflections of the historical background (the Exile and Redemption, the return to Zion and Jerusalem, the exiles and their “joiners”), attest another background which is more than 150 years later than the time of Isaiah son of Amoz. Similarly, there are conceptual differences between the two groups. For example, in the first part the idea of rebuke is predominant, while in the second consolation is the major idea; in the first part there are central motifs such as the idea of the remnant, of the end of days, and of the future king, while in the second these are not mentioned; and, in contrast, the central

idea which dominates the second part, the “Servant of God,” is neither mentioned nor hinted at in the first. Furthermore, despite important similarities of diction, there are clear and distinct differences between the two parts, which prove that not only were these two parts not written by the same person, but they are not even products of the same period. It appears that there were a number of reasons for joining chapters 40ff. to the group attributed to Isaiah son of Amoz. The first and decisive reason was apparently the intention of the editors of the Prophets to conclude them with chapters of comfort. An additional reason is that despite the differences between the two parts in language and style, there is some relationship between them. Another contributive factor was the paucity of historical data in chapters 40–66. Although they did sense that the two groups were from different periods, the editors’ faith in the prophet’s ability to envision the distant future allowed them to overcome this difficulty. This view is still held in certain circles, especially fundamentalists. Although the distinction between the two parts has been accepted in biblical research as a fact, several writers in the 20th century have maintained the unity of the book and have attempted to disprove most of the arguments of those who distinguish between the two parts (Zlotnick, Kaminka, et al.).

Structure of 40–66 and its Composition. Critics of the Book of Isaiah have raised the question of whether chapters 40–66 all stem from a single prophet or are the products of two, three, or more prophets. B. Duhm was the first to divide these chapters into two blocs (40–55 and 56–66). According to him, the two blocs are distinct in historical background, conceptual content (attitude to ritual, polemic against the Samaritans), language and style, and place and time of authorship. The first bloc belongs to “the Second (Deutero-) Isaiah,” who lived during the time of Cyrus, while the second bloc, 56–66, belongs to another prophet whom he called “the Third (Trito-) Isaiah,” who lived in Jerusalem close to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. This differentiation into two blocs and two prophets was accepted, with various modifications, by many scholars – E.S. Sellin and Elliger held that the “Third Isaiah” was a disciple of the “Second” and edited his prophecies, that he lived at the end of the sixth century, the time of Haggai and Zechariah, and that the prophecies were written in Jerusalem. Some scholars follow Duhm in maintaining that the group is divided into two blocs, but they hold that it is impossible that chapters 56–66 were the work of one author and were produced during the lifetime of one prophet. Rather, they maintain that there are in this bloc prophecies from different periods, differing, however, in the times they assign to the prophecies. Some limit the period of time reflected in these prophecies to that between Ezekiel and Ezra-Nehemiah (Cheyne, Smith, Kittel). Some expand it to the period from the seventh to the third centuries B.C.E. (Budde, Volz, Eissfeldt). Other scholars, such as Glahn, Klausner, Segal, Kaufmann, and Haran, defend the unity of chapters 40–66. Kaufmann made the greatest attempts to disprove the arguments of those who maintained

division into blocs and into separate prophets or prophecies, by determining that the historical background of chapters 40–66 is explicitly before the building of the Second Temple. He also emphasized that these prophecies contain no reflection of what befell those who returned from the Babylonian Exile to Palestine. Kaufmann concluded that these prophecies date from before the building of the Second Temple and their location is in Babylon. Segal also supported the unity of the book and its author, but unlike Kaufmann he held that the background reflected is that of Palestine. M. Haran has argued for the unity of the book and the author, but not of the place, as did Segal and Kaufmann. It is Haran’s opinion that chapters 40–48 originated in Babylon. In the return to Palestine, which the prophet had foretold, he too returned to Jerusalem with the exiles, and chapter 49 on reflects the Palestinian background. This is expressed especially in these chapters in which there is a direct address to Jerusalem (49:14–26; 51:17–23; 54:1ff.; 60:1ff.; 62:1–9). More recent study has moved in the direction that chapters 56–66 do not come from one hand or one time period (Blenkinsopp (2003), 59).

SONGS OF THE SERVANT OF THE LORD. In dividing chapters 40–66 into two blocs and two authors, Duhm also maintained that there are additions and editing of other authors in both blocs. The word ‘*eved*, “slave,” “servant,” occurs 20 times in chapters 40–55 (once in the plural in 54:17). In 13 of these instances the servant is Israel the people. From the first bloc, 40–55, Duhm first separated four poems which he called “Songs of the Servant of the Lord,” maintaining that they are by a different prophetic personality, not by Deutero-Isaiah. The four songs according to Duhm, are (1) 42:1–4; (2) 49:1–6; (3) 50:4–9; and (4) 52:13–53:12. According to Duhm and his followers, the servant is not Israel, but an idealized figure who is predestined by God for a function on account of which he suffers greatly. (Although “Israel” is found in most versions of Isa. 49:3, it is inconsistent with the mission to Israel in 5–6, and is probably a gloss; see Blenkinsopp, a.l. 297–98.) Some scholars who agree with the isolation of the “Songs of the Servant of the Lord” and their unity of content did not accept Duhm’s method of dividing them and rightly added to what is called the first song, 42:1–4, verses 5–7 of the chapter, whose subject matter is similar to that of the preceding verses. Some scholars consider verses 1–9 as a unit, despite the differences in person and approach. Similarly, verse 7 is added to what is called the second song, 49:1–6, and there are some scholars who attribute to it even some of the following verses. There is also doubt about the inclusion of what is called the third song, 50:4–9, among the other songs. It seems that there are verses outside these four songs which may be identified with verses of the four songs, both in terms of content and in terms of style (e.g., 41:8; 42:1–25; 44:1–2, 21–22, 26; 50:10; 51:16; 61:1–3). Furthermore, a detailed analysis of the language and style of what are called the “Songs of the Servant of the Lord” within the other chapters shows no differences among them (see Ch. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, 1956²). In

consequence, it has been argued that any distinction between these units and their contexts is somewhat arbitrary (cf. also Haran). The “servant” of Duhm’s fourth song (52:13–53:12) received special attention because of the New Testament’s identification of him with Jesus (directly in Acts 8 8:26–40 and implied elsewhere, e.g., Mark 10:45).

LITERARY UNITS IN 40–66. The analysis of the boundaries and scope of the literary and prophetic units that comprise chapters 40–66 has gone through several stages. The stage that preceded Gunkel and Gressmann recognized a prophetic unit of the length of a chapter or more. Skinner, for example, divided the first section, chapters 40–48, into six units, each of which was delivered at a different time, and whose order reflects the prophet’s reactions to the events of his time. Budde regarded chapters 40–66 as a planned book which included four prophecies with a prologue and epilogue. This was followed by the approach associated with Gunkel, who originated the method of “form criticism.” Gunkel maintained that the prophetic books are composed of small units of separate “oracles,” which were joined together by editors. He determined the limits of the units by the formal criteria of opening and conclusion. Gressmann applied this method of Gunkel to Deutero-Isaiah, and in his literary analysis (1914) attempted to prove that chapters 40–55 are composed of 49 small independent units. Gressmann also classified the prophecies into about 12 “types,” comprising nine prophetic *Gattungen* and three non-prophetic ones. This method played a major role in German biblical criticism. Koehler distinguished 70 units in chapters 40–55, while Volz distinguished 50 units (apart from the “Songs of the Servant of the Lord”). Mowinckel divided these chapters into 41 units (excluding the “Songs of the Servant of the Lord”), while Begrich pointed to the existence of more than 70 units. The protagonists of the small unit attempted to discover the system according to which these units were arranged. Mowinckel stated that these small prophecies, which were at first separate, were later organized according to the principle of “key words” (*Stichwörter*). Similar words or expressions appeared at the beginnings and ends of prophecies and served the editors as guides. Sometimes this principle of verbal associations was combined with, or varied by, conceptual associations. In the third stage there appeared a reaction to the method of *Gattungen* and small units, and several scholars attempted to show that the prophetic units are longer. Kaufmann strongly rejected the “form critical” method and maintained that “the error of this approach is the confusion of the formal or typological unit with the unit of composition.” An author can fashion his creation out of many separate units formally joined together, which nevertheless combine into one composition. Kaufmann holds that Mowinckel’s theory of “key words” is a mechanical approach which is unacceptable. The verbal linkings are not a matter of technical arrangement, but rather a phenomenon of composition: it is the author, not an editor, who is fond of such associations and more than once strains the meaning of a word in order to be able to

repeat it. Kaufmann maintains that the prophecies in Isaiah 40–66 – both the units of the books and the separate prophecies within each unit – are arranged chronologically. According to him there are 14 prophecies in the first unit, 40–48; in the second unit, 49–57, he counts about 20 prophecies; while in the third unit, 58–66, he finds nine prophecies. According to him the traditional division into three sections is primary and reflects the stages in which these prophecies came into being. Similarly Muilenburg maintains that the literary units are large. According to him section 40–48 contains 14 prophecies (the same number as that of Kaufmann but with minor divergences). He maintains, however, that the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah are made up of strophes which are joined in various ways by means of openings and conclusions, and, in this way, Muilenburg sought a formal structure in each and every prophecy. Haran affirmed the system of the long prophetic units, but according to him the criterion for the division of the prophecies has to be based not on formal mechanics but rather on the context of the individual cycles: formal linguistic considerations can be added subsequently by way of confirmation. The construction of the complete prophecies is accomplished by linking a concatenation of short sections, each of which contains a new idea or a new poetic image. The combination of the separate parts results in a kind of sum total of ideas and images, subjects and motifs, which is repeated several times throughout the first division 40–48. Each consecutive set of strophes which approaches a sum total makes up a whole literary unit. Each image or motif serves as a typical component of a prophecy, while the total prophecy is made up of a set which includes most of the components. It is not necessary, according to Haran, that the internal order of the components be uniform. The prophet can combine the typical components in a different order every time. There is a certain consistency in the total content of the set but not within the arrangement of components within it. The number of prophetic units in division 40–48, according to Haran, is 10, including the satirical lamentation for Babylon in chapter 47. More recent work (see Sweeney 1993, Sawyer) has focused on redactional analysis that studies the connections between the prophetic speeches and the extant prophetic book at the literary level, with the goal of explicating independent literary layers, the original foundation, and added-on layers not only in Deutero-Isaiah but in the entire canonical book (Kratz, Steck, Vermeylen). Other approaches are those of Baltzer, who views chapters 40–55 as liturgical drama, and Lau, who understands chapter 56–66 as a composite collection of texts brought together as “scribal prophecy” by scholars working within circles of transmitters of prophetic tradition.

CONCEPTUAL ASPECTS. *Exile and Redemption*. The Book of Ezekiel attests the frame of mind of the exiles of Judah and Jerusalem. The depression and despair of the exiles are expressed in the words of the people in the vision of the dry bones: “Our bones are dried up and our hope is lost” (Ezek. 37:11). This same pessimistic view of the relationship between

the people and its God and of the future of the people persisted among the exiles. Some time (about 20 years) later, when the prophet who is called Deutero-Isaiah appeared, he found that the people believed that God was “hiding His face” from them and that their case was hopeless: “Why do you say, O Jacob, and speak O Israel, My way is hid from the Lord, and my right is disregarded by my God” (40:27). Against the background of this depression and despair, the prophet of comfort and encouragement arose and, like Ezekiel in his later years, he began at the outset of his career to comfort and encourage the exiles of Judah and Jerusalem and breathe new life into them. He brought the people tidings of the end of the time of wrath and the beginning of God’s goodwill. The sin of Jerusalem was expiated, since she had atoned doubly for all her transgressions. The prophet tirelessly wove into all his early prophecies (40–48) words of comfort and tidings of redemption, describing God as the creator and director of history who has erased the guilt of His people and is about to redeem them from the captivity and exile, by both natural and supernatural means, according to His will and power. Despite the miraculous and eschatological nature of the described redemption, it is no mere consolation for the end of days but is rather based on, and connected with, current events. In the same way that God, the guide of history, created Babylon “to punish His obedient people, to destroy Jerusalem, and burn its Temple, so He has set up Cyrus” to promote the redemption of the Israelite people, to rebuild Jerusalem, and reestablish its Temple (44:28; 45:13). The prophet proclaims that the time has come for Babylon and Chaldea to be punished (43:14; 46:1; 47:1ff.), and actual events serve as proof of the truth of his words. The defeat of Babylon by Cyrus is seen as evidence that just as God fulfilled the “first promises” (probably the fall of Babylon; see Haran, *Bein Rishonot le-Ḥadashot*, 1963), so he will fulfill the “new promises” – the tidings of redemption, of the revival of the people, and of their return to Zion. The description of the redemption is not limited to the redemption of the people but includes also the redemption of Judah and Jerusalem. The redemption of the forsaken Jerusalem, the forgotten and widowed, the “bereaved and barren” (49:14, 21), is described in poetic and hyperbolic terms. She will shake herself out of the dust of her mourning, she will put on her power and her glory, her justice and her salvation will be seen by the nations and the kings, she will draw exiles to her from all corners of the land until there will not be room to contain them, and all the nations will stream to her to render her honor and glory (see 49:14–26; 51:17–23; 52:11ff.; 54:1ff.; 60:1ff.; 62:1ff.). Actually, the dreams of redemption foretold by the prophet were not fulfilled and realized, and there is, in fact, a discrepancy between the redemption as envisioned by the prophet and the actual Return. Apparently the prophet was among the first returnees, fulfilling what he had foretold. From Jerusalem he called on the people still in exile to forsake their exile (52:11). Although Jerusalem, the holy city, did not become the mother city of all the lands and nations, the returnees did rebuild its ruins.

Comfort and Rebuke. Prophecies of comfort and salvation predominate among the prophet’s first prophecies, especially in the first section, chapters 40–48. The sin of the people was forgiven and the transgressions erased and pardoned, but even these first prophecies contain a tone of rebuke. Together with the notion that the sin was forgiven because they had paid “double for all their sins,” there is the view that God pardoned the transgressions of Israel and would not bear their sins in mind not because of Israel’s merit but for the sake of God’s name (43:25). The words of comfort and tidings of redemption apparently did not arouse within Israel the anticipated reaction, and for this they are rebuked by the prophet (see 42:18–20; 43:8; 46:9–13). The wrathful rebuke, which is not merely implied but elaborated, is contained in the last chapter (48:1–11) of the first group, which is replete with prophecies of comfort, and which is also intended for those of little faith. Beginning with chapter 50, the prophet appears as an instrument of rebuke, and the rebuke overshadows the element of comfort. The subjects of rebuke are many and varied: he repeats his rebuke against those of little faith (chapter 50), against the forsaking of God (51:12–13). Whether or not chapters 56–66 are the words of this prophet, rebukes continue against the wicked among the people (chapter 56), against giving priority to ritual over social morality (chapter 58), against social transgressions (chapter 59), and against idolatry (chapter 65).

The Servant of the Lord. The biblical descriptions of the Servant are not unequivocal – he is sometimes portrayed as an individual, either biographically or autobiographically, while at other times he appears as a collective figure, identified with the People of Israel. This lack of clarity gave rise to varied and ramified interpretations among both Jews and Christians in all generations. The methods of interpreting the image of the Servant of the Lord have varied. The Servant has been seen as an individual personality, as a collective, and as a figure of myth with associated ritual. The individual approach is based on the assumption that what is written about the Servant is a description of an individual figure. Those who adopt this method disagree about the identity of this figure. In attempting to identify him, they identify him variously, as a figure from the past (the historical approach); as a contemporary of the prophet, including possibly the prophet himself; as one whom the prophet envisions as destined to appear in the future (the eschatological approach). These methods are intimated in early interpretations, and explicitly stated and argued in modern studies and commentaries. Numerous varied and strange proposals have been advanced concerning the identification of the Servant of God with historical figures from the Bible. The Servant was identified with various kings of the House of David and their descendants, whose biographies include some feature or features suggestive of the Servant, such as – among the Kings – Uzziah’s leprosy, Hezekiah’s dangerous illness, Josiah’s untimely death despite his righteousness, or Jehoiachin’s captivity. Among the post-Exilic members of the House of David with whom he is identified are Zerubba-

bel, the object of unfulfilled messianic hopes, Eliezer (a scion of the House of David, 1 Chron. 3:23), and Anani (last in the list of the Davidic line, 3:24). Other individuals with whom the Servant of the Lord has been identified were selected from among the prophets: e.g., Isaiah son of Amoz, who, according to the *aggadah*, was killed by Manasseh; the much-suffering Jeremiah; or Ezekiel, who bore the burden of the sin of the House of Israel (Ezek. 4:4–8). Still others are historical figures such as Moses or Job. According to the biographical approach, the prophet was describing a contemporary figure, known to himself and his listeners. The figures proposed for identification were Cyrus, Zerubbabel, or an anonymous person. Some maintained that the prophet was describing himself, or that he was being described by a disciple. According to the eschatological approach, the Servant of God is the destined redeemer, the Messiah. The approach is found at first in Targum Jonathan (“my servant the Messiah,” at 52:13), but it has left few traces in Jewish exegesis, in contrast to its important role in Christianity, which identified the Servant of God with Jesus (beginning with the New Testament; see above). According to the collective method of interpretation, the Servant is Israel. If there are any personal elements in the description they are merely allegorical. It is explicitly stated in a number of places that the Servant is Israel (see e.g., 41:8; 44:1, 2, 21; 45:4; 59:1). While there are some who maintain that this refers to all of Israel, the real Israel, this is difficult since the real Israel is sinful and the Servant, free of sin. Therefore the Servant is identified with an ideal Israel, not the Israel of the present but the Israel of the future. Some adherents of the collective method hold that it is not all of Israel which is being referred to, but rather an elite within Israel, and there are varied opinions regarding the nature of this elite. Some maintain that it refers to the prophets, while others maintain that it refers to the priests. Still others speak of an undefined minority, “the righteous of Israel,” and there are some who see the Servant as a visionary figure, the symbol of the righteous Israel. According to the mythological method, in portraying the figure of the Servant of God the prophet utilized a mythological figure, ignoring certain mythological traits and adopting several other characteristic traits. The image is that of a god who died and is resurrected, like the god Tammuz or Adonis (Baal). The central part of the Songs of the Servant of the Lord, 52:13–53:12, basically corresponds to the hymns sung during the Mesopotamian ritual of mourning the death of the god. According to this view there existed in Israel the ceremony of mourning for Tammuz and there was also the “bemoaning of Hadadrimmon in the plain of Megiddo” (Zech. 12:11) which is assumed to have originated in the tragic death of Josiah at Megiddo (11 Kings 23:29). These two wailing rites were combined into one ceremony and served as the basis for the description of the figure of the Servant of the Lord. Thus, the description of the Servant was influenced by a historical figure (Josiah) and a mythological figure (Tammuz). This method was associated with the Scandinavian school of myth and ritual. The “individual approach” and the “collective ap-

proach” are both plausible. It is, however, possible to interpret what is written about the Servant of the Lord in other ways. Some point to a lack of firm distinction in Hebraic thought between the particular or the individual – the prophet – and the general or the many – the people. Such fluidity could give rise to prophecies having both an “individual” and a “collective” style, i.e., the prophet Deutero-Isaiah, like his predecessors Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, saw himself as a symbol of, and an “exemplar” and model for, the people. His personal life was interwoven with the life of the people, the private domain became commingled with the public, and events from his personal life were interpreted by him as allegories of the people. There was also an opposite process, i.e., the image of the Servant of the Lord refers both to the prophet and to the people. At times, the individual type of description predominates, while at others, the collective style is prominent, referring also to Jacob and Israel. In the same way that the preceding prophets had interpreted their private and family lives as a sign and model for the people, so biographical details of the prophet were interwoven with the description of the Servant. The above hypotheses are based on the assumption of a unified conception of the Servant on the part of a writer or editor, which is far from certain.

Israel and the Nations. The relationship between Israel and the nations had political significance as well as religio-social significance. With the political victory of Babylon, Judah lost its political and territorial framework, and there was a danger that, as in the case of other nations, Israel’s loss of a state would lead to its loss of religious identity, and that the people would assimilate among the nations. In the face of this danger, the prophet called Deutero-Isaiah played a decisive role in the crystallization of a well-informed national-religious group and the later crystallization of Judaism. Earlier biblical writings stressed monolatry, the principle that Israelites must serve Yahweh alone, but left open the possibility that other gods existed and might be worshipped by gentiles (Ex. 20:3; Deut. 4:19). It is in Deutero-Isaiah, followed by Trito-Isaiah, that we find for the first time a militant full-blown monotheism that denies the existence of all other gods but Yahweh, and calls gentiles to his service (Isa. 42:8; 43:10–11; 44:6–8; 45:5–7, 18–22; 46:9; 49:6; 56:1–8; 66:21–3). The victorious, conquering gods, the advanced material culture, and the impressive idolatrous ceremonies of Babylon constituted a danger that the exiles in Babylon would be attracted to assimilation. This prophet described in harsh polemic and with mockery and loathing the practices of idolatry and its followers (e.g., 40:17, 26; 44:6–20). He placed Israel vis-à-vis the gods of the nations, emphasizing the opposition between them. Israel and its God are lined up against the nations and their gods for “battle” and judgment. Opponents who strive and contend against Him rise up against Israel (41:11–12; 45:24). Some of the nations taunt and revile Israel (49:7; 51:7) and some of them blaspheme the name of the God of Israel (52:5). This religious-national battle recurs a number of times. But this is only for the present.

Chapters 40–66 are replete with the faith that the law of God will be disseminated by His Servant, Israel, among the nations which will be led from darkness to light. Israel will be “a light (or rather, ‘a salvation’) unto the nations” and Jerusalem will be the place of God’s shining glory to which all the nations will stream with song and praise. They will emerge from spiritual darkness to the light which will shine for them in Zion. In Israel’s redemption the world will also be redeemed and in the end of days all men will come to bow down before God (66:23). Traces of the envisioned end of days were already seen at this time. Israel’s presence among the nations gave rise to the phenomenon of the “joiners” (chapter 66) who forsook idolatry and joined the religion of Israel. Questions were raised with regard to their status within the people of Israel and its future. The prophecies found in Isaiah 40–66 confront these problems and provide a positive response.

[Isaac Avishur]

IN THE AGGADAH

Amoz, the father of Isaiah, was also a prophet, for “when the name of the prophet’s father is given, the father was likewise a prophet” (PĀRE 118; Lev. R. 6:6). Isaiah came from Jerusalem, for “whenever the city of a prophet is not specified, he hailed from Jerusalem” (Lam. R., proem 24, beginning). An ancient *aggadah* reports that Amoz and Amaziah, king of Judah, were brothers (Meg. 10b.). “Because Isaiah was the king’s nephew, he used to chastise Israel” (PĀRK, 117). Isaiah uttered words of censure at the very outset of his prophecy. When the call came to him (Isa. 6:8), God said to him, “Isaiah! My children are obstinate and troublesome, are you ready to be beaten and degraded by them?” (PĀRK, 125). As he stood bewildered he uttered words saying, “I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips” (Isa. 6:5), whereupon the Holy One blessed be He said to him, “You are permitted to say ‘I am a man of unclean lips,’ since you are your own master, but are you the master of My children that you refer to them as a people of unclean lips?” He was punished on the spot; Isaiah 6:6–7 are interpreted to mean that his mouth was scorched (PR 33:150), for having transgressed “Slander not a servant to his master” (Prov. 30:10). When Sennacherib besieged Jerusalem, Shebna and his companions wished to submit and conclude peace with him: “King Hezekiah, afraid lest the Holy One blessed be He be with the majority, was told by Isaiah, ‘It is a conspiracy of wicked men, and a conspiracy of wicked men is to be disregarded’” (Sanh. 26a; cf. Isa. 8:12). When Hezekiah fell ill and was told by Isaiah that he would die (II Kings 20:1) because of his refusal to beget children, he attempted to justify himself by explaining that it had been foretold to him that he would beget a wicked son; whereupon Isaiah proposed to him that he marry his daughter in the hope that a worthy son would result from the union. In spite of this, however, only a wicked son was born to him (TJ, Sanh. 10:2, 28b–c). Of that wicked son, Manasseh, it is written that he “filled Jerusalem (with blood) from one end to the other” (II Kings 21:16). Scripture is silent as to the victims of

Manasseh and the reason for his killing. According to Josephus (Ant., 10:38) “Manasseh killed all the righteous men among the Hebrews, nor did he spare even the prophets, everyday putting some to death.” Many *aggadists*, however, see Manasseh’s blood spilling as confined to Isaiah alone (TJ, Sanh. 10:2, 28c). According to the *aggadah* Manasseh accused Isaiah of being a false prophet. Isaiah, knowing that whatever he said in his defense would not be accepted, said nothing, both to absolve Manasseh and his people from the responsibility for deliberately murdering a prophet, and to prevent his blood from bubbling like that of the prophet Zechariah. Isaiah’s silence was regarded as a confession and he was sentenced to death. When the sentence was about to be carried out, however, he uttered the ineffable name and was swallowed by a cedar tree. The tree was sawn, but the saw was powerless against Isaiah’s body, which had become like a pillar of marble. One organ, alone, his mouth, was vulnerable, because of its having uttered the words, “And I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips.” As a result, when the saw reached Isaiah’s lips, he died (Yev. 49b).

[Elimelech Epstein Halevy]

Christian View

For discussion of the Christian use of Isaiah see *Immanuel, and Servant of the Lord (above).

IN ISLAM

Slightly altering the version in II Kings 18:13–21 the authors Tabarī and Tha’labī, related that Sha’yā (Isaiah) ibn Amašya (Amaziah) (!) the prophet was sent during the reign of Zedekiah (Zedekiah) to lead the king along the righteous path and to warn the people of Israel to repent. Allah sent the Assyrian king Sennacherib with a force of 600,000 soldiers against them. At the command of God, Sha’yā informed the king that his death was imminent and that he should make his will and appoint a successor. Zedekiah prayed to Allah, who lengthened his life by 15 years and also delivered him from Sennacherib. Sennacherib’s army was annihilated and only he and five dignitaries and scribes escaped to a cave, where they were found by the king of Judah. Sennacherib confessed that he had heard of God, even before he left his country, but weakness of his mind had prevented him from reaching the right conclusion. The king of Judah let Sennacherib and his scribes circle the Temple for 70 days, giving them two loaves of bread made of barley daily. He sent Sennacherib home, according to God’s command, in order that he might serve as a sign of warning. However, Tabarī (p. 381) also knew the correct name of the king, which was Hezekiah. In their tales on Isaiah, Umāra and Tha’labī quote paraphrases of his prophecies (ch. I, etc.). After Hezekiah, his son Manasseh ruled for 55 years (II Kings 20:21–21:1). Tabarī also knew of Amon and Josiah, who reigned after Manasseh. Concerning Isaiah’s end, Tabarī and Tha’labī relate that the people of Israel persecuted him for his prophecies and rebukes and that he escaped into a tree. Satan however held the fringes of his garment, which thus could be seen from without. They then brought a saw and

cut through Isaiah. This tale was handed down by Wahb ibn Munabbih; its Jewish source is evident.

[Haïm Zew Hirschberg]

IN THE ARTS

The prophecies of Isaiah have found stronger echoes in art and music than in literature. In the 12th-century Anglo-Norman *Jeu d'Adam* Isaiah is one of the Old Testament prophets consigned to Hell after submitting reluctant evidence to the truths of Christianity; and he also figures in the medieval *Ordo Prophetarum*. Thereafter, Isaiah played only a minor part in literature until the 19th century, when the French writer Victor Hugo produced an appreciative sketch in his apocalyptic study *William Shakespeare* (1864; Eng. tr. 1864). The first Jewish writer to deal with the theme was Abraham *Mapu, the creator of the modern Hebrew novel; his *Ahavat Ziyyon* (1853, *In the Days of Isaiah*, 1902) was remarkable less for its characterization than for its Haskalah ideas and local color. *Ahavat Ziyyon* enjoyed amazing success and was translated into several languages, including no less than three English versions. Mapu later wrote another historical novel set in the times of Isaiah, *Ashmat Shomeron* (1865–66). In the 20th century, various plays were devoted to the subject. A modern Jewish treatment of the theme was *Der Novi* (1955; *The Prophet*, 1955), a novel about Deutero-Isaiah by Sholem *Asch.

Isaiah was represented by artists from early Christian times onward and owed his great popularity in the Middle Ages to three biblical passages thought to foretell the Incarnation and Nativity. More than any other prophet, Isaiah benefited from the cult of the Virgin. The passage, “the young woman shall conceive and bear a son” (Isa. 7:14), was seen as a prediction of the birth of Jesus. Even in the oldest surviving representation of the prophet, a second-century mural from the catacomb of Priscilla, Rome, Isaiah is shown seated opposite the Virgin and Child. Another prophecy, that of the “twig” that “shall grow from the roots of Jesse” (Isa. 11:1), gave rise to genealogical trees purporting to trace the ancestry of Jesus to the house of David. The distinguishing symbols of Isaiah in art are these “Jesse Trees” or one of his prophecies inscribed on his phylactery. Scenes from the life of Isaiah are found in Byzantine and premedieval art. Figures of the prophet often appear among the sculptures of 12th-century French Romanesque churches such as Vézelay and Moissac. The most striking example is the tempestuous swirling image from the abbey church at Souillac. There are also 13th-century sculptures of Isaiah in the great Gothic cathedrals of Chartres, Amiens, Burgos, and Bramberg. At the same period, his image adorned the wing of a painted “life of Christ” by the Sieneese artist Duccio (1282–1319). In the 15th century, Isaiah appeared chiefly in painting and sculpture. Naturalistic sculpture by Claus Sluter adorns the fountain of the Chartreuse at Dijon. Renaissance treatments of the subject include a round painting by Perugino (Nantes Museum); and figures of Isaiah from the fresco by Raphael in Sant’ Agostino, Rome, and from the Sistine Cha-

pel ceiling by Michelangelo. A painting of the subject by Fra Bartolommeo is in the Uffizi Galleries, Florence. The German Renaissance artist Matthias Gruenewald included a figure of Isaiah in his painting of the Annunciation, which forms part of his Isenheim altarpiece in the Colmar Museum. Although the subject later lost favor, the 18th-century artist Tiepolo painted a figure of Isaiah for the ceiling of the Archbishop’s Palace in Udine. Artists have also illustrated a number of episodes from the Book of Isaiah. There is an amusing painting called *Isaiah Rebuking the Women of Jerusalem* (on Isa. 3:16ff.) by the 19th-century English artist *Salaman. Isaiah’s vision of God enthroned amid the Seraphim (Isa. 6:1–4) was quite a common theme in Byzantine and medieval art (see *Cherubim and *Seraphim). The purification of the prophet’s lips with a burning coal (Isa. 6:5–7) is illustrated in premedieval and medieval manuscripts, including the 15th-century breviary of the Duke of Bedford (Bibliothèque Nationale); in murals; and in the 13th-century stained glass of La Sainte Chapelle, Paris. The visits of the prophet to the dying Hezekiah and the miraculous prolongation of the monarch’s life (Isa. 38:1–8) are treated in an eighth-century fresco at Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome, where Isaiah is shown standing by the bedside of the sick king. The rabbinic tradition that Isaiah met his death by being sawn asunder in the hollow of a cedar is illustrated in various murals, including a sixth-century Coptic fresco, and in medieval sculpture and manuscripts.

In music, composers have dealt either with the “Triple Sanctus” or with the inspiring figure of the prophet himself. The “Thrice Holy” acclamation of the angels in the vision of Isaiah (Isa. 6:3) is the main text of the *Sanctus* section of the Roman Catholic mass; it is followed by the jubilant *Hosanna in excelsis*, the mystically interpreted *Benedictus*, and by a repetition of the *Hosanna*, the combination having been adapted from Matthew 21:9, Mark 11:9–10, and John 12:13. It has 21 traditional (“Gregorian”) chant melodies dating from the tenth to the 13th centuries. In some of these, the initial “*Sanctus*” is rather florid and its reiterations are expressed in progressively rising phrases. This restrained attempt at word painting was carried much further in the *Sanctus* of the mass compositions, which date from the 14th century onward. Although these works naturally reflect the varieties of individual expression and the style of their era, certain conventions in the setting of the *Sanctus* can, nevertheless, be identified. The angelic acclamation is interpreted either as an outpouring of sweet sounds, often by two or three high solo voices (as in most of the 16th-century works), or as a mighty thundering of massed praise (as in Bach’s *Mass in B Minor*). The *Sanctus* in Beethoven’s *Missa Solemnis* (1823) is an exception, since it begins with a whispered stammering of awe. All composers take advantage of the differences in mood suggested throughout the sequence of *Sanctus*, *Hosanna*, *Benedictus*, and *Hosanna*. For the Protestant liturgy Martin *Luther created the rhymed “German Sanctus” (*Jesaia dem Propheten das geschah*, 1526), the melody of which is also attributed to the reformer. There are two settings by Bach of simple chorale tunes, based on

the “Gregorian” melodies, with the Latin or German (*Heilig, Heilig, Heilig*) text. The many works for concert performance based on extended passages from the Book of Isaiah include Antonio Caldara’s oratorio *Le profezie evangeliche d’Isaia* (1729; text by A. Zeno); Granville Bantock’s *Seven Burdens of Isaiah* for men’s choir *a cappella* (1927); Willy Burkhard’s oratoria *Das Gesicht Jesaias* (1933–36; première 1936); Alexandre *Tansman’s oratorio *Isaïe le prophète* (1951); Bernard Rogers’ cantata *The Prophet Isaiah* (1954; published 1961); Robert *Starter’s *Ariel, Visions of Isaiah* (1959); Bohuslav Martinů’s cantata *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (première in Jerusalem, 1963); and Ben Zion *Orgad’s *Isaiah’s Vision*. Another modern work was Jacob *Weinberg’s *Isaiah* (1947), an oratorio for solo voices and chorus with organ accompaniment and trumpet obbligato. The first part of Handel’s oratorio *The Messiah* (première in Dublin, 1742), for which the text was compiled by Charles Jennens, contains so many passages from Isaiah (beginning with “Comfort ye, comfort ye my people”) that it may almost be considered an Isaiah oratorio. Some of the most striking parts of Brahms’ *Deutsches Requiem* (1857–68), for which the composer himself compiled the text from the Old and New Testaments, also originate in this biblical book. Settings of single verses or brief passages for liturgical or concert use are numerous. There are also traditional tunes from the various Jewish communities, ḥasidic melodies, and modern Israel folksongs.

[Bathja Bayer]

BIBLIOGRAPHY: O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, an Introduction* (1965), 301–30, 754–56, contains copious bibliography on all aspects of Isaiah; (a) Medieval Jewish: Rashi; David Kimḥi, ed. by L. Finkelstein (1926); Ibn Ezra, ed. by M. Friedlaender, 2 vols. (1873–77, reprint 1964); (b) Modern: S.D. Luzzatto (Italian translation and Hebrew Commentary; 1855–67, reprint 1966); J. Skinner (*The Cambridge Bible*, rev. ed. 1915, reprint 1958–60); O. Procksch (Ger., 1930); E.J. Kissane (Eng., 1941). Other Works: M. Dyman (Haran), in: *BJPES*, 13 (1947), 7–13; H.L. Ginsburg, in: *Tarbiz*, 20 (1949), 29–32 (also publ. in *J.N. Epstein Jubilee Volume*, 1950); idem, in: *JBL*, 69 (1950), 51–60; idem, in: *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume* (1953), 245–59 (Eng. sect.); idem, in: *Eretz Israel*, 5 (1956), 61–65 (Eng. sect.); idem, in: *Oz le-David* (Ben Gurion, 1964), 335–50; idem, in: *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Papers 1* (1967), 91–93; idem, in: *Conservative Judaism*, 22, no. 1 (1967), 1–18; idem, in: *JAOS*, 88 (1968), 47–53, also publ. in *Essays in Memory of E.A. Speiser* (1968); idem, in: *VTS*, 17 (1968), 103 n. 2; R. Knierim, in: *VT*, 18 (1968), 47–68; E.G. Kraeling, in: *JBL*, 50 (1931), 277–97; J. Milgrom, in: *VT*, 14 (1964), 164–82; H.M. Orlinsky, in: *Essays in Honor of Herbert Gordon May* (1970), 206–36; W. Rudolph, in: *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver* (1963), 130–143; H.M. Schmidt, in: *VT*, 21 (1971), 68–90; H. Tadmor, in: *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 12 (1958), 22–40, 77–100; M.M. Kaplan, in: *JBL*, 45 (1926), 251–59; Kaufmann Y., Toledot, 3 (1947), 147–256, 293–318; W. Rudolph, in: D.W. Thomas and W.D. McHardy (eds.), *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to G.R. Driver...* (1963), 130–43; M. Haran, in: *VT*, 17 (1967), 266–97; idem, in: *iej*, 18 (1968), 201–12; B.S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (1967); See also bibliography, *Immanuel. CHAPTERS 34–35: H. Graetz, in: *JQR*, 4 (1891/92), 1–8; A.T. Olmstead, in: *AJSLL*, 53 (1936/37), 251–3; C.C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah* (1928), 103–4, 279–304; idem, in: *JBL*, 57 (1938), 109–34; M. Pope, *ibid.*, 71 (1952), 235–43; W. Caspari, in:

ZAW, 49 (1931), 67–86; P. Wernberg-Moeller, *ibid.*, 69 (1957), 71–73; D.R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets* (1964); DEUTERO-ISAIAH: A.B. Ehrlich, *Mikra ki-Feshuto* (1901); S. Krauss, in: A. Kahana (ed), *Sefer Yeshayahu* (1904); B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaya* (19224); J. Skinner, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, chs. XL–LXVI (1917); C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah* (1922); K. Budde, *Das Buch Jesaya* (1922); E. Koenig, *Das Buch Jesaya* (1926); H. Odeberg, *Trito-Isaiah* (1931); P. Volz, *Jesaya II Kapital 40–66* (1932); D. Yellin, *Ḥikrei Mikra* (1939); E.J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah* (1943); J. Muilenburg, *The Book of Isaiah*, chs. 40–66 (1956), 381–773; C.R. North, *The Second Isaiah* (1964); N.H. Tur-Sinai, *Peshuto shel Mikra*, 3 (1967); J.L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* (1968); C. Westermann, *Isaiah*, 40–66 (1969). SELECTED STUDIES: Y. Zlotnick, *Aḥdut Yeshayahu* (1928); A. Kaminka, *Mehkarim*, (1938), 1–89; N. Raban, in: *Tarbiz*, 14 (1943), 19–26; Ch. R. North *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (1956²), incl. bibl.; A. Neubauer and S.R. Driver, *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpretations* (2 vols, 1970); P.A.H. De Boer, *Second Isaiah’s Message* (1956); S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (1956), 187–257; Kaufmann Y., Toledot, 4 (1960), 51–156; M. Haran, *Beyn Rishonot le-Ḥadashot* (1963); idem, in: *VTS*, 9 (1963), 127–55; H.H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord* (1965¹); W. Zimmerly and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (1965 rev. ed.); H.M. Orlinsky and N.H. Snaith, *Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah* (1967). IN THE AGGADAH: Ginzberg, *Legends*, index. IN ISLAM: Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, 1 (01357H), 378–82; Thaḥabī, *Qiṣaṣ* (1356⁴), 271–81; ‘Umāra ibn Wathīma, *Qiṣaṣ*, Vatican, Ms. Borgia 165, fols. 106v–110f. **ADD. BIBLIOGRAPHY:** P. Machinist, in: *JAOS*, 103 (1983), 719–37; O. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr...* (1985; additional publications on Isaiah apud Blenkinsopp 2003, 117–18); J. Vermeylen (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah* (1989); C. Seitz, in: *ABD*, 3:472–88 (with bibliography); idem, in: *JBL* 115 (1996), 219–40; M. Sweeney, in: A. Hauser and P. Selow (eds.), *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies I* (1993), 141–62; idem, in: *Isaiah 1–39* (1996); R. Kratz, *Kyros im Deuteropjesaja-Buch...* (1993); W. Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56–66...* (1994); M. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah* (critical edition; 1995); J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39* (AB; 2000; bibliography 115–67); *Isaiah 40–55* (AB; 2000; bibliography, 127–74); *Isaiah 56–66* (AB; 2003; bibliography, 93–126); K. Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (Hermeneia; 2001); R.G. Kratz, in: *Review of Biblical Literature* (bookreviews.org; 03/2003), 1–8. IN ISLAM: B. Levine, in: *Iraq* 67 (2005), 411–27.

ISAIAH, ASCENSION OF, early Christian apocalypse, containing the Jewish apocryphon *the Martyrdom of *Isaiah*. The *aggadah* about Isaiah’s violent death was already known at the beginnings of Christianity (see Acts 8: 34). Thus the Jewish apocryphon was expounded by Christians as early as in the first century of Christianity. Of the Greek original only a papyrus fragment is extant and parts of Latin, Slavonic, and Coptic translations have been preserved. The whole work exists only in an Ethiopic translation. The apocryphal description of Jesus’ birth, life, and resurrection (11:1–21) is a later interpolation lacking in the Latin version and in the three Slavonic versions. In the Christian part of the book Isaiah is described as a seer according to the spirit of apocalyptic literature. His violent death is regarded as revealing the coming of Jesus and the early history of the Church (3:13–31). This passage and the following chapter (4) containing a description of the *Antichrist are very important witnesses for the oldest Christian history and beliefs. The author sees inter alia the degeneration of contem-