THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE REFRAINS IN IS. 2:6-21

KEMPER FULLERTON
OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

In vs. 6-8 and 12-16 we have, as has long been recognized, either two poems, or two parts of the same poem. The latter view is, as I believe, distinctly preferable. Each of these parts can be organized without serious difficulty except at v. 6 into three quatrains as follows:

I

THE SINS OF THE NATION

a

v. 6 For he hath rejected his people,[1]
. . . . . the house of Jacob;
For their land is full of traffickers,
With the sons of strangers they bargain.

b

v. 7 Their land is full of wealth,[2]
And there is no end to their treasures;
And their land is full of horses,
And there is no end to their chariots.

c

v. 8 And their land is full of idols,
(And there is no end to their images);[3]
To the work of their hands they bow down,
To that which their fingers have made.

[1] Read 3d person with LXX.

[2] Strike out וזהב and take כסף in its more general sense of money or wealth.

[3] St. c has at present only three lines. The last two form a couplet. The first has no parallel. Duhm's conjectured line has both exegetical and rhythmical arguments in its favor.

II

The Judgment of The Day of Jahweh

d

v. 12 For Jahweh of Hosts hath a day
Over all that is proud and exalted,
Over all that is lifted up and lofty.
. . . . . .[4]

e

v. 13 Over all the cedars of Lebanon,[5]
And over all the oaks of Bashan;
v. 14 And over all the mountains that are lofty,
And over all the hills that are high.

f

v. 15 And over every tower that is high,
And over every fortified wall;
v. 16 And over all the ships of Tarshish
And over every . . . .[6] of delight.

It will be observed how clearly the poetical analysis into quatrains agrees with the exegetical analysis of the thought sequence in the two parts. In part two, the doom of Jahweh's day is announced, first in general terms (st. d). In the second stanza four particulars from the realm of nature are singled out, and in the third, four particulars from the sphere of man's handiwork. In part one, quatrains b and c are given to the two thoughts of material prosperity (st. b) and of idolatry (st. c). The present form of v. 6, however, is both exegetically and rhythmically unsatisfactory. Does v. 6 refer to a religious abuse, sorcery, magic, as v. a suggests, or to intercourse with foreign

[4] St. d is at present only three lines. The principle of parallelism does not so imperiously require a fourth line here as in the case of st. c, but since the last two stanzas are clearly quatrains it is probable that st. d is also. ושפל of v. 12b is certainly incorrect and some such word as גבה must be substituted. The LXX has the doublet *καὶ μετέωρον καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται*. The first is clearly the original.

[5] Strike out הרמים והנשאים. Due to dittography.

[6] So far as I know, no satisfactory explanation of שכיות has as yet been propounded.

nations, as v. b seems to suggest? The phrasing of both these clauses is also most awkward and improbable. The rhythm and the parallelism are equally disorganized. When the remainder of the poem is examined, we expect to find one thought in v. 6 clearly expressed, and we expect to find it rounded out in a quatrain. Conjectural emendations must be based on these two premises. The best emendation yet suggested is Gray's, which sees in v. 6 a reference only to trade relations with foreigners[7] and which I have adopted above. Part I is then a denunciation of foreign intercourse, with its usual accompaniments of material prosperity leading to self-confidence and idolatry, a typical prophetical thought-sequence and one which is thoroughly Isaianic.

When the two parts are examined in their relationship to each other they are clearly seen to be two parts of the same poem. They are organized in exactly the same way into three quatrains each, they are in the same rhythm, and the second part is necessary to complete the thought of the first part which it does in a most effective way. In the first part we have the sin and in the second the judgment.[8] It is also to be carefully noticed that each part begins in the same way with a 'for.' The first 'for' in v. 6 has nothing to which to attach. Commentators are generally agreed that something, now lost, once preceded v. 6. But what was it? If our analysis of the poem is accepted it could not have been a preceding stanza, for that would disorganize the symmetry of the two parts. The second 'for,' v. 12, cannot easily attach to the first part directly. Nor does it do so in the present form of the text. It is at this point that we arrive at the question of the refrains. After each of the two parts of our poem there is a collection of verses which, because of their repetition and position, appear to be in the nature of refrains. Thus vs. 9 and 10 after the first part correspond almost exactly in thought and partly in expression to vs. 17 and 19 after the second part. But on closer examination there is discovered something decidedly queer about these refrains. Thus v. 11 is a repetition of v. 9, and v. 21 is a repetition of v. 19, but neither v. 11 nor v. 21 occupies a position appropriate to a refrain. They recur too quickly after their corresponding verses, vs. 9 and 11. Only

[7] For particulars see his commentary.

[8] Duhm's contention that we have here fragments of two different poems (vs. 6-10, 18 f. and 11-17) in different meters(!) is wide of the mark.

v. 10 intervenes between vs. 9 and its duplicate, 11, and v. 10 is itself apparently a refrain! V. 20, it is true, which intervenes between v. 19 and its duplicate, v. 21, introduces some new material, but this is not enough to account for so speedy a recurrence of the same thought. Again, while vs. 9 and 10 are combined together, their equivalents, vs. 17 and 19, are separated by the curiously abbreviated verse 18. Finally, while the thought and general expression of vs. 9 and 10 are found three times, each time there is a rather remarkable variation in detail. The questions at once arise, Are all of these repetitions original or are they in a measure accidental? Again, is the variation in form intentional or is it also accidental? As if the problem were not already sufficiently complicated, we find still another variation upon v. 9 in 5:15 f.

Is there any legitimate way out of these entanglements? The parallel verses fall into two groups, (1) vs. 9, 11, 17 and 5:15 f.; (2) vs. 10, 19 and 21. For purposes of ready comparison their variations are represented in the following table:

GROUP I.

(1)		וישח	אדם	וישפל	איש
(2)		וישח	אדם	וישפל	איש
(3)		וישח	גבהות האדם	וישפל	רום אנשים
(4)			עיני גבהות אדם	ישפל וישח	רום אנשים
(5)			עיני גבהים	תישפלנה	
(6)				ואל תישא להם	
(7)				ביום ההוא	
(8)			" "	" "	
(9)	ויגבה יהוה צבאות במישפט והאל הקדוש נקדש בצדקה				

GROUP II.

(1)	בוא ב	צור	והטמן	בעפר
(2)	ובאו בניערות צרים			ובמחלות עפר
(3)	לבוא בנקרות הצרים			ובסעפי הסלעים
(4)	מפני פחד	יהוה		ומהדר גאנו
(5)	" "	"		" גאונו
(6)	" "	"		" "
(7)	-	-		
(8)	בקומו לערץ הארץ			
(9)	" "	"		

I propose to examine the several positions of these verses and then their variations in phraseology.

A

Their Positions

(1) To begin with, the present position of 5:15 f. is impossible. The whole passage, vs. 14-17, is badly disorganized. The recurrence of the 'therefore,' v. 14, immediately after the 'therefore,' v. 13, is suspicious. We would expect a 'woe' to intervene (cf. the relationship of v. 8 to vs. 9 f. and vs. 11 f. to v. 13). There would seem to be a gap between vs. 13 and 14. This inference is confirmed by the feminine suffixes in v. 14. These point to an antecedent preceding v. 14 which is now lost. This antecedent was almost certainly the name of some city (Zion?). V. 14 states that all the glory and wild revelry of it is to disappear into Sheol as into the greedy maw of some huge monster. V. 17 on the other hand describes a pastoral scene. Undoubtedly the two scenes in vs. 14 and 17 are thought of in contrast. Where once all the bustle and tumult of a great city was, there only the shepherd and his flocks now wander. The same thought is beautifully worked out in Browning's Love among the Ruins

Where the quiet colored end of evening smiles, miles and miles,
O'er the solitary pastures where our sheep half asleep,
Tinkle homeward through the twilight, stray or stop, as they crop,
Was the site once of a city, great and gay, so they say.

Now between these two pictures vs. 15 f. intrude in the most unfortunate way. That they are an intrusion is not only clear from the discordance of their thought, but also from the discordance of their syntactical structure (a point strangely ignored by commentators). The ורעו of v. 17 undoubtedly carries on the וירד of v. 14. The intervention of the imperfect forms with waw consec. in vs. 15 f. clearly betrays these verses as an insertion. If vs. 15 f. do not belong here, where do they belong? The answer is obvious. They must belong to chap. 2. But the fact that this refrain is found elsewhere in such an impossible connection is a danger signal indicating the badly corrupted state of the text in this part of Isaiah.

(2) If we turn to chap. 2 we at once meet with another indication of the same thing. V. 22 is not in good connection with what precedes and is wanting in the LXX even down to the time of Origen.[9] These two instances of corruption should put us on our guard when we come to the examination of the refrains themselves.

(3) We have already seen that the repetition of v. 21 so soon after its equivalent in v. 19 is difficult to understand. From the literary and artistic point of view it is anything but satisfying. From the exegetical point of view it is still less so. Vs. 19-21, as they stand, seem to say that *'they'* (apparently the idols of v. 18) shall enter into hiding before the terror of the Lord (v. 19), whereas in that day *mankind* shall cast their idols away to the moles and to the bats in order to enter into hiding before the terror of the Lord (vs. 20 f.). V. 19 after v. 18 suggests that it is the idols that hide themselves; vs. 20 f. suggest that men throw their idols away in order to hide themselves.[10] These contradictory statements about the idols hiding themselves away and men casting away their idols in order to hide themselves away, surely cannot be original. On the other hand if 'men' are taken as the subject of v. 19 as well as of v. 20, we would have the same thing said over again in a most ineffective way. But the final and convincing proof that we are dealing with a thoroughly secondary text at vs. 20 and 21 is the fact that v. 20 is *pure prose* and that, too, of the most atrocious kind. The reader who cannot see this had better abstain from any further attempt at a correct understanding of the

[9] Cf. Field's Hexapla for evidence.

[10] Hans Schmidt in his Commentary on Isaiah in *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments* suggests that the idea in vs. 18 f. is Isaiah's first sketch of his thought, the idea in vs. 20 belonging to his revision. The first idea, that the idols themselves flee away, may have been suggested by the popular ideas of the Day of Jahweh in which Jahweh was to triumph over the other gods. The second revision corresponded to Isaiah's own convictions of the nothingness of the idols! An instructive illustration of the vacuities into which the exegetical irresponsibilities of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* finally empty. Gunkel, and especially Gressmann, brilliantly suggestive and creative as they are, have much to answer for in the way of ignoring at times the fundamental principles of sound exegesis. This interpretation of Schmidt is simply the revival of the Keil-Hengstenberg method of exegesis in the interest of a new dogma.

text of this chapter, and should be content to cast in his fortunes with the moles and bats.[11] The recognition of the prose character of v. 20 is the indispensable preliminary to a proper appreciation of the problem of the refrains. If v. 20 is prose it certainly does not belong here. It is probably a marginal comment upon v. 18 by the same hand which inserted 31:7.[12] But if v. 20 is eliminated, it is at once obvious that v. 21 cannot follow immediately on v. 19. It has no literary function in the poem. It is therefore, further, equally obvious that v. 21 must be simply a textual variant to v. 19. Accordingly, so far as their position is concerned, vs. 20 and 21 may both be left out of consideration in determining the relationship of the refrains to the poem. The only question that can be raised is what claim to consideration has v. 21 as a variant reading.

(4) After the elimination of vs. 20-22, vs. 17-19 are left as the concluding refrain or refrains of the second part. To these verses, as we have seen, vs. 9 and 10 correspond as the concluding refrain or refrains of the first part. But this leaves v. 11 hanging in the air. It, too, has no conceivable literary function in the organism of the poem. The inference is unavoidable. Just as v. 21 is a variant to v. 19, so v. 11 is a variant to v. 9. But v. 11 in form is more nearly akin to v. 17. May not v. 9 and v. 17 also be variant readings of what was originally the same refrain? This leads us to our second main question. What was the original *form* of the refrains?

II

Their Forms.

Let us look first at the variations in our second group. (1) Of the three variants in this group the last, v. 21, is certainly to be rejected. The infinitive construction, 'to go' (לבוא), is due to the attempt to construe v. 21 with v. 20 and must be rejected

[11] This is said with the full knowledge that Sievers actually attempts to scan v. 20. Such a procedure creates a profound distrust of his metrical analyses so far as the Old Testament is concerned.

[12] Whether both 2:20 and 31:7 depend upon 30:22, which is in a passage thoroughly un-Isaianic in character, or whether the one who is responsible for them wrote the entire section 30:19-26 himself does not concern us at present. The same hand is probably to be detected again at 17:7 f.

when v. 20 is rejected. Again, the 'holes of the dust' נחלות עפר) of v. 19 is to be preferred to 'the clefts of the rocks' of v. 21. The former phrase is a difficult one and נחלות is an ἅ. λ. The phrase of v. 21 is a conventional substitute for the more difficult one. Here, if anywhere in the O. T., the principle of the harder reading may be applied.[13] Finally 'the caves of the rocks' (מערות צרים of v. 19 is to be preferred to 'the caverns of the rocks' (נקרות הצרים of v. 21. The word נקרה is found again only at Ex. 33:22 and the phrase would seem to be an intentional reference to that passage (cf. also the definite article with צרים in both passages as against the anarthrous צרים of v. 19). V. 21 must be regarded, not as the original form of the refrain, not even as a text corruption, but as a literary gloss upon v. 19, intended, partly to relieve a difficult reading, partly to remind the reader of Ex. 33:22.

12 As between v. 19 and v. 10 the choice is not quite so certain. Yet I think the original reading is reasonably probable. The perfect ובאו of v. 19 can scarcely be correct. It suggests the improbable thought that the idols themselves are to hide in the caves. Neither is the infinitive absolute form at v. 10 likely. The LXX reads imper. pl. באו at v. 10 and undoubtedly this is to be read also at v. 19 as is generally recognized. The preceding ו of v. 19 belongs to the verb of v. 18 as is seen again in the LXX (so Marti). The last clause of v. 19b 'when he riseth to shake the earth' is also found at v. 10 in the LXX and belongs there as it adds greatly to the effectiveness of the refrain. With these changes made in both verses there remains the choice between v. 10a and v. 19a. The rhythm of the two variants differs. In form 1 it is 2 x 2 or 4; in form 2 it is 3 x 2. The 3 x 2 rhythm of form 2 seems to be preferable since the next line of the refrain in both vs. 10b and 19b (forms 4 and 5) is also 3 x 2. In that case the הטמן of form 1 is probably to be rejected. It came into the text when the original form 2 was abbreviated. It is impossible to account precisely for this reduction, though it was probably due to pure accident. A similar phenomenon will meet us in the second group of refrains. On the basis of the above suggestions the original form of the

[13] The LXX has adopted the easy phrase out of v. 21 into v. 19 along with the more difficult one, though it is at present in the wrong position.

refrain now represented by the variants in vs. 10, 19 and 21 will be:

Enter ye into the caves of the rocks, and the hollows of the dust,
From before the terror of Jahweh and the splendor of his majesty,
When he riseth to shake the earth.

(3) When we turn to the variants of the first group it is clear that form 4 can at once be dismissed from our calculation. It is grammatically impossible and the position of וישח is opposed to the evidence of the first three forms. It is also rhythmically defective as it is 4 x 3.

(4) That form 4 is incorrect is further proved by form 5. This form at present is the parallel line to form 2. But a weaker parallel could hardly be imagined. It is clear that form 5 was meant to be a correction of the grammar and style of form 4. The intolerable expression עיני גבהות is smoothed off into עיני גבהים and the verb properly emended to the fem. to agree with עיני. The insertion of the word עיני has occasioned the difficulty. This was probably a marginal note reminiscent of Ps. 131:1 or Is. 3:16. It is an old concordance reference just as נקרת is at v. 21. After it had come into the text an attempt was made in form 5 to emend the corruption along wrong lines. Accordingly both forms 4 and 5 may be dismissed from consideration.

(5) Form 6 may also be dismissed with confidence. It now stands as the parallel to form 1. But the parallelism is an impossible one. No one has been able to account in any satisfactory way for this sudden ejaculation. It was an attempt to get some meaning out of the תשפלנה which had become illegible in some manuscript containing form 5 (cf. Marti).

(6) Of the three variations between forms 1 and 2 on the one hand and 3 on the other, the future forms of the verbs in form 3 are distinctly preferable to the historical forms in forms 1 and 2. The future forms are in agreement with the general theme of the poem which is looking forward to the Day of Jahweh. The choice between אנשים of form 3 and איש of forms 1 and 2 is not quite so certain. On the one hand it might be thought that the singular is in better parallelism with אדם

and that the plural is an unnecessary attempt to indicate the collective force of אדם. On the other hand, when once רום is introduced, the plural form becomes rhythmically almost necessary. Hence our decision upon this variation will be conditioned upon our decision with regard to the next variation. Shall we choose the longer form of form 3 or the shorter of forms 1 and 2? Here taste is probably to be the final arbiter and tastes differ. To me the shorter form is colorless, the longer form more forceful in expression and more rhythmical. It is also supported by form 4 and impliedly by form 5.

(7) But there is another half to this refrain represented by forms 7, 8 and 9. Form 9 departs in a very striking way from the other two. In order to decide between these variants the curious v. 18 of chap. 2 must be considered. When its relationship to v. 17 is examined its originality becomes very questionable. When it is said that Jahweh is exalted alone, with whom is Jahweh contrasted? With men or with other gods? If v. 17 is read by itself the contrast would be with men. When v. 18 is introduced the contrast would seem to be with the idols. In other words v. 17a and v. 18 haul at v. 17b in different directions, and the thought becomes correspondingly uncertain. Doubt is at once raised as to the originality of v. 18 in the present connection. This doubt is confirmed by the fact that v. 18 is missing after v. 11 and also at 5:15 f. In 5:15 f. the 'alone' לבדו of v. 17 is also missing and a new thought is introduced, namely, wherein Jahweh is exalted; in equity and righteousness. Thus between forms 7 and 8, on the one hand, and 9 on the other there is an important variation not only in expression but in thought also. Which of these forms is to be preferred? Which is in better agreement with the subject and temper of the poem? If we recur to our analysis of the poem we discover one reference to idolatry (st. c). But this reference is incidental. The emphasis of the poem, taken as a whole, is upon the proud, materialistic civilization which has been set up and in which men trust. This comes out especially in Part II in which there is no reference to idolatry at all. The contrast suggested by the poem is not between Jahweh and the idols but between Jahweh and the pride of man. This thought of the poem would be satisfied by v. 17 as it stands, without v. 18. But the ethical note sounded in 5:15 f. is so thoroughly Isaianic and expressed

in so classic a form that it is tempting to hold that this is the original form of the refrain. It is not the mere exaltation of Jahweh, as contrasted with the pride of man which is to be humbled, that Isaiah wishes to emphasize, but his ethical exaltation which gives to the day of Jahweh its truly prophetical and ethical character. The thought is of Jahweh, the Holy One of Israel, of his equity and his righteousness. Over against the materialistic civilization which Isaiah sees around him, puffed up with pride but laden with iniquity, the prophet sounds this great refrain just as the Seraph song in chap. 6 is brought into contrast with the people unclean of lips who violate Jahweh's sanctity. But since לבדו is not found in 5:16 and would have no place in it either exegetically or rhythmically it follows inevitably, if form 9 is adopted, that the לבדו of forms 7 and 8 must be eliminated. It may then be held to have come into 2:17 when v. 18 was added and from there worked back into v. 11.[14] We have already noticed that v. 20 is also concerned with idols and the suggestion was made that it was a marginal gloss upon v. 18. But now v. 18 itself turns out to be a gloss. I suggest that the textual history of vs. 17-21 was something as follows. V. 18 was originally a marginal note designed to establish a contrast between the refrain and v. 8. When it came into the text the original form of the refrain itself became corrupted and לבדו was added to make the exact nature of the contrast still clearer. The prose verse, v. 20, was a still later marginal comment upon v. 18 after v. 18 had established itself in the text. When v. 20 finally followed v. 18 into the text it brought along with it the variant v. 21 which probably stood by it in the margin. All this is of course conjectural but it is well within the bounds of textual possibilities.[15]

[14] The phrase ביום ההוא would probably come in along with לבדו . The phrase, though not wanting in original prophecies of Isaiah and in agreement with the present propheey, is most frequently found in spurious passages. It is rejected by Marti and Gray, though still defended by Duhm because of v. 12.

[15] Marti and Gray both take v. 18 as a part of the refrain and supply it after v. 11. Duhm inclines to hold that v. 18 is a fragment of a lost strophe and is to be separated from v. 17. Ehrlich has observed that לבדו probably points forward to v. 18, but all these writers fail to notice the double reference of the לבדו in the present text and to draw the obvious critical conclusion from this fact.

If the above criticism is adopted the first refrain will have been reduced to something like the following form:

The haughtiness of man shall be bowed down,
And the exaltation of man humbled:
And Jahweh of Hosts shall be exalted in equity,
And the Holy God sanctified in righteousness.

But here a difficulty arises. The first of these couplets is 3 x 3, the second is 4 x 4. Is this change in rhythm likely? Would we not do better after all to remain by the form in 2:17 and 11 (eliminating ביום ההוא) in which case the refrain would consist of a regular three-toned tristich? This view would involve the originality of לבדו. At this point opinions will probably differ. For the reasons already assigned I prefer to take the form of the refrain in 5:16, even at the expense of a difference in meter. But it is not a difficult task to reduce 5:16 to the 3 x 3 rhythm if one were disposed to do so. The נקדש is quite unnecessary and has a suspicious smack of 29:23, a spurious verse. If it is rejected, then צבאות may be rejected from the parallel line.[16] I shall venture to follow this suggestion though freely admitting in this case the purely conjectural nature of the correction. We have now secured a double refrain standing after each part of our poem in the following form:

The haughtiness of man shall be bowed down,
And the exaltation of man shall be humbled,
And Jahweh shall be exalted in equity,
And the Holy God in righteousness.
Enter into the caves of the rocks, and the hollows of the dust,
From before the terror of the Lord and the splendor of his majesty,
When he riseth to shake the earth.

What is to be clearly recognized is that we have here a *double* refrain. The first is a quatrain in the three-toned rhythm. The second is a tristich composed of a couplet in the 3 x 2 rhythm with a concluding three-toned line. Now, while it is not impos-

[16] So Duhm followed by Sievers. There is also another possibility. We may be dealing in the present case with an intentional variation. The first refrain may have had the two forms, first of v. 17 and second of 5:16. The latter being the concluding refrain may be supposed to roll out in the fuller 4 x 4 rhythm.

sible that these two refrains may have been thus coupled together originally, there is no necessary inner connection between them.[17] In fact each refrain would gain in impressiveness if it stood out independently. The last step in our reconstruction is due to the acute observation of Marti. When once v. 11 is removed as a corrupted variant, v. 10 in the emended form, instead of belonging to the concluding refrain of Part I, can now be regarded as the opening refrain of Part II. No more effective introduction can be thought of. It furnishes also the explanation of the 'for' at v. 12. But this at once suggests that the same refrain once stood before v. 6, for we have seen that the 'for' of v. 6 also demands that something should precede but that this could not very well have been another stanza. The refrain in v. 19 in its emended form, instead of originally occupying its present position, must be transposed and placed before v. 6. This is an assumption no more violent than the actual fact of the transposition of the refrain to the utterly impossible position of 5 : 15 f. It is clear that we are dealing in the present case with a text that has suffered most seriously, and not an assumption has been made in the foregoing, with the possible exception of the reduction of 5 : 16 from a 4 x 4 to a 3 x 3 rhythm, which is not based on sound exegetical and text-critical principles and which is not necessitated by the obvious corruptions of the present text. Duhm's criticism of what he terms Marti's *Gewaltsamkeiten* in the reconstruction of the poem, the general lines of which have been followed in the above, is unjustifiable. What I have attempted to do is to support Marti's brilliant reconstruction (followed by Gray) by a fuller critical and exegetical apparatus than either of these writers was able to make use of in the limitations of a commentary, and also to add at certain points to the precision of their results. The length to which this paper has extended will be amply justified, even though no startlingly new points of view are advanced, if the reader can be induced by it to rest more securely in Marti's restoration, for it permits one of the noblest poems of the master stylist of the Old Testament to stand out in something like its pristine splendor and impressiveness, Isaiah's Dies Irae.

[17] A possible rhythmical connection could be established if the second couplet were allowed to stand in the 4 x 4 rhythm as at 5: 16. Then there would be a progress from the 3 x 3 through the 4 x 4 to the 5 x 5 rhythm.