

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

THE INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH 8 5-10

KEMPER FULLERTON

OSKELIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE section in Isaiah's prophecies, 8 5-10, is a veritable nest of grammatical, exegetical, and critical difficulties. This is most unfortunate, since in it the mysterious name, Immanuel, again occurs, and it is obvious that some sort of relationship, more or less intimate, must therefore exist between this passage and 7 14. In the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* for July, 1918, the writer discussed the data for the interpretation of Immanuel furnished by 7 1-17. But no solution of the problem of Immanuel can be regarded as final until the data in 8 5-10 are also examined. The present discussion is therefore intended as a supplement to the former one. Further, in view of the fact that no exhaustive treatment of 8 5-10 has been attempted, so far as I know, since Giesebrecht's famous essay in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* of 1888, a renewed consideration of it in all its various phases may not be untimely. The passage falls into two sections, vs. 5-8a and vs. 9-10, with a clause (v. 8b) intervening whose exact relationship to the other verses is ambiguous.

PART I

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF 8 5-8a

Three questions in these verses call for discussion: 1) the identification of 'this people' (v. 8a); 2) immediately connected with this, the critical origin and significance of v. 8b; and 3) the exact implication of the phrase 'it shall reach even to the neck' (v. 8a). In answering these questions there are really but two

methods to follow. Either the text is to be received as it stands, in which case the logic of it must be allowed to operate more freely than commentators are usually inclined to permit, or it must be regarded as revised, in which case the logic of the revision, and, conversely, the logic to be applied to the elimination of the secondary elements must be more frankly faced than is usually done. Compromise measures, here as elsewhere in Isaiah, afford no permanent satisfaction or sense of security.

I

The real key to the passage lies in the identification of 'this people.' If vs. 5-9a are examined by themselves, there are two and only two clues to the identification. These are found in what is said of it in v. 6. Two things are predicated of it: 1) that it rejoices with Rezin and Remaliah's son (Pekah, cf. II K. 15 27), and 2) that it has rejected the waters of Shiloah. The first of these statements is evidently figurative; the second is as evidently to be taken literally. It is the part of sound exegesis to start with the non-figurative statement, all the more so because it seems to connect the passage with the known historical background in which the other oracles in cc. 7 and 8 were spoken.¹

A. The bearing of v. 6b on the identification of 'this people'

If v. 6b is accepted as it stands, the obvious way to construe it is to take *mesos* as the construct of a substantive used here as a verbal noun, and 'eth as a preposition in the sense of *cum*, and to translate 'a rejoicing with Rezin and Remaliah's son.'²

¹ Cf. 7 1-9; 8 1-4; and 2 Kings 16.

² A reexamination of the *verba gaudendi, sus, samah, gil* and 'alaz, and of the nominal derivatives from the same roots shows that the object or occasion of the joy is always introduced by prepositions or causal clauses, never by the accusative. These four verbs are found about 240 times, and about 110 times (exclusive of causal clauses) with the object or occasion of the joy introduced by a preposition. The only two passages outside of Is. 8 6 alleged in behalf of the construction with the accus. are Is. 85 1 and 85 18. The first of these is un-

In that case v. sb can only refer to those who sympathize with Rezin and Pekah. Now at the time of the events described in cc. 7 and 8 these rulers were following an anti-Assyrian policy, while Ahaz, on the contrary, was pro-Assyrian. Thus the Syro-Ephraimite coalition and Judah were brought into violent collision.² Under these circumstances those who rejoice with Rezin and Pekah must belong to one of two groups, either to an anti-Assyrian party in Judah itself, or to Israel.

1) That there might have been a party in Judah at this time which favored an anti-Assyrian policy³, and therefore sided with the Syro-Ephraimite alliance and opposed the policy of Ahaz cannot be regarded as in itself theoretically improbable. The situation created by the advance of Tiglath-pileser into Syria and Palestine was calculated to give rise to sharp differences

doubtedly corrupt. At 65 18, granting that the relative is an accus. and not a mistake for וְעִם בָּר (so Marti, after Graetz and Cheyne), it is unsafe to argue from this to the construction of the *verba gaudendi* with nouns (Cf. König, *Syntax*, p. 18). Out of some 173 occurrences of the nominal stems of these four words there are only 13 (15?) instances in which the cause of the joy is indicated. In 12 of these it is introduced by prepositions. In the 3 remaining instances the construct relation is employed; but at Prov. 17 6 the genitive is not the equivalent of a simple objective genitive, but of the construction with בְּ after the verb (cf. Job 31 25; Ps. 35 10), and at Ia. 13 2—Zeph 3 11 the genitive does not really denote the cause of the joy (see commentators). It is probably only a curious accident that in the more than 400 occurrences of the above *verba gaudendi* and their derivatives the preposition עִם in the sense of *cum* is found only at Ia. 8 6 and 66 10. But in the latter case the meaning seems to be assured and probably finds an analogy in the construction of וְעִם with עִם at Ps. 50 8, to which Ewald and Knobel long ago called attention. That עִם means *cum* at Ia. 8 6 may be regarded as practically assured. The construct, וְעִם , need occasion no real difficulty in spite of Gray's doubts (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 130. 1, König, *Syntax*, p. 415).

² 2 Kings 16; Ia. 7 1-10, and Tiglath-pileser's inscriptions.

³ So Gesenius (Ges), Ewald (Ew), Stade (*Gesch. I.* 596), Kuenen (*Eint. II.* 42), Wilke (*Jesaja und Assur*, p. 28). The references here and hereafter are to the works in the Bibliography appended to my article on *Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah* (JBL XLI pp. 4 ff.). The abbreviations there used will be added at the first occurrence of the various works referred to.

of policy in Judah under Ahaz, just as it is known to have done at various times in Israel and the Philistine towns. But the fatal objection to the theory that an anti-Assyrian party is here referred to, that is, a party favorable to Rezin and Pekah and opposed to Ahaz, is the phrase, 'this people.' It is clear from 7 2ff. and especially from 8 11ff., where the very same phrase occurs again, that the mass of the people sided with Ahaz. If Isaiah had wished to refer to a small group within the nation opposed to Ahaz, he would not have done it by the phrase 'this people.' At v. 11ff. he *does* refer to a small group (this time his own followers) and he distinguishes it very clearly from 'this people,' that is, the people as a whole. Similarly, if he had intended to refer at v. 6 to a group within the nation, he would never have called it 'this people.' He would have distinguished it from them. 2) Accordingly, if v. 6b is retained unchanged, 'this people' must be identified with Israel.⁵ This conclusion is further supported by another consideration. The description of the onswEEPing Assyrian flood would seem, at least at first sight, to require a distinction between 'this people' (v. 6a) and Judah (v. 8a). The flood is said to come 'upon them' (עליהם), i. e. upon 'this people,' and then to overflow its banks and pass on (תלך) through Judah. Judah is the climax. 'This people' suffers in the initial stages of the flood, but Judah is its high-water mark. The phrase, 'upon them,' unquestionably suggests such a distinction.⁷ Thus the identification of 'this people' with Israel would seem to be demanded by any fair exegesis of the data thus far considered. But what, then, it may be asked, is the force of the statement that 'this people' has rejected the waters of Shiloah (v. 6a)?

⁵ So Jerome *Commentar. in Jesaiam*, Ed. Migne Patrol. Latina Vol. 24, p. 119; De Dieu (cited in Cheynes *Commentary*); Diestel in Knobel (Kno); Nägelsbach (*Der Prophet Jesaja*); Cheyne (Che) in his *Commentary*, a view subsequently abandoned in his *Introduction* (p. 37, n. 1, see below).

⁶ Cf. 1 Sam. 10a.

⁷ When Bredenkamp (Brdk) seeks to avoid this conclusion by bringing Judah at v. 8a into contrast with Israel at vs. 1-4, instead of with 'this people,' he is violating every sound principle of exegesis. For the above argument cf. especially Diestel in Kno., but also Delitzsch (De) and Che.

B. Bearing of v. 6a upon the identification of 'this people'

The exact phrase, 'the waters of Shiloah,' is found only here.⁹ There can be no question, however, that it refers to the irrigating system that is fed by the only known spring in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, the present Fountain of the Virgin.⁹ This spring issues at the base of the southern spur of the temple mount on which the original City of David once stood. It is at the bottom of a rather deep cave. Its flow is intermittent and not very great, and its waters, conducted through conduits for the most part underground, were largely concealed from view even as early as Isaiah's day. This being the location and nature of the spring,¹⁰ 'the waters of Shiloah' can be interpreted in two different ways. a) As a spring which issues from the base of the hill upon which the City of David was built, it might symbolize the Davidic dynasty.¹¹ b) Or it might symbolize in its gentle, inconspicuous

⁹ But cf. Neh. 3 15.

⁹ So substantially all commentators since Jerome. The differences among them concern only the question whether the phrase alludes more particularly to the spring itself, or to the pool of Siloam into which it now empties, or to the celebrated tunnel through which the pool is fed, or to the still earlier conduits which led from the spring along the southernmost slope of Ophel, extensive sections of which have been recently discovered. The last identification is the correct one. (Cf. Capt. Weill, *La Cité de David*).

¹⁰ Jerome's description is as follows: "Siloë autem fontem esse ad radices montis Sion, qui non jugibus aquis, sed in certis horis diebusque ebulliat, et per terrarum concava et antra saxi durissimi cum magno sonitu veniat, dubitare non possumus, nos praesertim qui in hac habitamus provincia." It will be seen that Jerome lays emphasis upon its position, *ad radices montis Sion*, and its intermittent and underground character. The description is quite rhetorical and in particular the *cum magno sonitu* must be taken *cum grano salis*, just as Elisha once used a little salt in connection with another spring!

¹¹ This interpretation goes back to the Targum: "Because this people rejected the kingdom of the house of David who ruled over them in quietness as the waters of Shiloah which flow in quietness." It has been followed by a number of modern commentators. The point of the comparison with the still-flowing waters lies either in the greatly weakened political condition of the dynasty (Ges. *Stade* I. 596, and see for older

flow Jahweh himself, a spiritual and unseen power, whose temple stood upon the mount from whose "roots" this fountain bubbled forth.¹²

1) But if 'this people' is Israel, in what sense did Isaiah think that Israel had rejected the waters of Shiloah? Does he think of political apostasy or of religious apostasy, or is the phrase to be regarded as a vague, undefined generalization? a) A vague generalization, to begin with the third possibility, as if Isaiah were only criticising the general attitude of Israel toward Judah,¹³ is not what we would expect in this situation. The crisis that was developing was altogether too dangerous. At that time the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition was carrying on a vigorous campaign against Ahaz and in the course of it actually laid siege to Jerusalem.¹⁴ It was not a time for generalities. Furthermore, v. 6b suggests that the prophet had something very definite and concrete in mind. This clause, as we have seen, undoubtedly refers to the anti-Assyrian policies of Rezin and Pekah. It would seem natural to hold that v. 6a is also to be given a concrete application. We would expect it to refer, not simply to a general attitude, but at least to a general attitude that is manifested in some very concrete and realistic way. b) By the same token, v. 6b would suggest that v. 6a should be interpreted to refer to the political opposition of the coalition to the Davidic dynasty. But the verb *ma'as* (to despise or reject) is a curious one to use in this connection.

commentators Hackmann, p. 69, n. 1) or, more spiritually, in the gentle, peace-loving temper of the Davidic rule (Ew., Kno., Wilke, p. 26). Vitrings sees in the comparison a direct reference to the dynasty, but takes the dynasty, itself, as a symbol of the kingdom of God. H. Schmidt refers the figure to Jerusalem, which seemed very weak to 'this people' as compared with Assyria, but which Isaiah looked upon as the throne of Jahweh.

¹² So the great majority of commentators: Hitzig, Giesebrecht (Gies.), Brdk., De., Dillmann (Di) Kittel (Ki., in the sixth ed. of Di.), Duhm (Du), Hackmann (Hack. p. 69f.), Marti, Gray, Kuehler (Ku. p. 35), Guthe (in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des A. T.*, Ed. 4); Cheyne (*Commentary*) combines both references, to the dynasty and to Jahweh.

¹³ Cf. the allusions of Amos to 'the pride of Jacob' (6: 8; 8: 7).

¹⁴ 2 K. 16: 5; Is. 7: 1-9.

The very aggressive activities of the Allies are by no means adequately reflected in the statement that they *rejected* the waters of Shiloah. The expression in itself would more naturally refer, on the supposition that 'this people' is Israel, to the ancient schism between Israel and Judah,¹⁵ Yet it is most unlikely that Isaiah would have assigned as a reason for the coming Assyrian invasion this old grievance which Judah had against its sister kingdom. For two centuries the Schism had been an accomplished fact. The political situation was altogether too tense for Isaiah to bring this rather academic accusation against Northern Israel. c) Finally, to interpret the rejection of the waters of Shiloah as referring to the religious apostasy of Israel from Jahweh is equally unsatisfactory. In what did this apostasy consist? How did it manifest itself? The worship of Israel was a Jahweh worship just as much as the worship of Judah was. Yet the phrase 'to reject the waters of Shiloah' would seem to draw a distinction between them. Does Isaiah imply that only at Jerusalem, where the waters of Shiloah refer, *ex hypothesi*, to Jahweh as worshipped in the temple on Mt. Zion, is the true worship? In that case v. 6a would appear to be an attack upon the calf-worship of Israel as contrasted with the true worship of Jahweh at the temple. But there is not a hint anywhere else in Isaiah's prophecies that he attacked the calf-worship as contrasted with the temple worship. Undoubtedly he denounces the idolatry of the Northern Kingdom; but he denounces the idolatry of Judah also.¹⁶ He is equally impartial in his condemnation of the ethical degeneracy of the two kingdoms.¹⁷ But if it had been Isaiah's purpose to explain Israel's destruction by Israel's apostasy in the sense in which the prophet thinks of that apostasy elsewhere, namely

¹⁵ Cf. especially 1 K. 12:16; Is. 7:17.

¹⁶ Cf. 17:10 (against Israel) and 2:ff. (against Judah). The allusion at 17:10 is to the Adonis worship which seems to have been imported into Israel at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition. For the 'pleasant plants' see the "Hymn to Adonis" in Theocritus, *Idyl.* XV, in which the poet refers to "delicate gardens arrayed in baskets of silver."

¹⁷ Cf. 29:1-4, an oracle against the drunkards of Samaria, and 29:7-12, an oracle against the drunken priests and prophets of Jerusalem; or compare 9:7-20 (against Israel) with 2:6-3:24 (against Judah).

as an apostasy in fundamental morals and religion, it is questionable whether he would have described it as a *rejection* of the waters of Shiloah, for this phrase, if interpreted religiously and not politically, unavoidably suggests the distinction between the cult at Bethel and the cult at Jerusalem, provided 'this people' means Israel. We thus arrive at the following disconcerting conclusion: If we start from the assured meaning of v. 6b, which is, exegetically, the proper method to pursue, and identify 'this people' with Israel, we find ourselves in difficulties with the phrase 'to reject the waters of Shiloah.' To interpret the verb *ma'as* as describing a general attitude of contempt on the part of Israel for Judah does not seem to fit into the historical situation, which calls for a more specific accusation. To interpret it of religious apostasy is opposed by v. 6b and suggests trains of thought unlikely under the circumstances in which the words were spoken. To interpret it of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition, though supported by v. 6b and not impossible, is difficult. One would expect Isaiah to use a different verb in such a connection. It is noticeable that commentators who identify 'this people' with Israel have never paid any attention to the subtle difficulties in the way of this interpretation occasioned by the statement that it rejected the waters of Shiloah.¹⁸ But it may readily be admitted that if there were no other formidable objections to the identification of 'this people' with Israel and no rival theory to be considered,

¹⁸ They interpret it primarily politically, but of course with a spiritualizing application. According to Jerome, Israel prefers to be subject to Resin and Remaliah's son rather than to the stock of David. But *juxta anagogen*—and then he sails off upon the uncharted seas of the allegory! Diestel refers in general terms to the fact that Israel despises the weak Davidic dynasty and is proud of the alliance with Damascus. Nägelsbach spiritualizes: "The weak brooklet . . . represents the unobservable nature of the kingdom of God in the period of its earthly humility." But he continues: "The nation Israel . . . looks down contemptuously on the kingdom of Judah as on a weak-flowing brooklet (here the political aspect of Judah is in mind), and meanwhile with proud complacency rejoices in its own king and in the alliance with the Syrian king. This haughtiness shall not escape the avenging nemesis." Cheyne's interpretation in his commentary is even vaguer and more generalized.

the difficulties in the way of this identification need not be considered overwhelming. They awaken grave suspicion, but they are not necessarily fatal. It is next in order to examine the rival identification.

2) If v. 8b is, for the moment, ignored, the phrase, 'to reject' the waters of Shiloah, very strongly favors the identification of 'this people' with Judah. Only when this identification is made does the phrase gain a meaning which is at once precise, illuminating and vitally connected both with the historical situation in which the words were spoken and with Isaiah's fundamental religious message. It is no longer necessary to resort to a generalization of the meaning of the phrase. It must now refer either to the political or religious apostasy of Judah. That it refers to the former, that is, to opposition to the Davidic dynasty at that time is very unlikely. In that case we would be confronted with the same old difficulties encountered in connection with v. 8b. The phrase cannot imply a party in Judah because, as we have seen, 'this people' cannot be limited in this connection to a group within the nation. But to hold that the people of Judah as a whole were opposed to the Davidic dynasty is again to fly in the face of 7 1-9 and 8 11 ff. Further, it is most unlikely that Isaiah would assign as a reason for the Assyrian invasion of Judah the opposition of the people to the Davidic dynasty at the very moment when he himself was in the hottest conflict with that dynasty.¹⁹ On the other hand, if the phrase is interpreted of religious apostasy and this people is identified with Judah,

¹⁹ Cf. 7 10-17 and Gies p. 244 ff. Wilke's view that Isaiah was resisting a popular demand to join the anti-Assyrian Syro-Ephraimitic coalition and was attempting to win adherence to the peace-policy of the Davidic dynasty (pp. 28-30) throws away the most important clue we have for the interpretation of cc. 7 and 8 for the sake of 8b. This clue is the pro-Assyrian policy of Ahaz (2 K. 16). To this policy Isaiah was firmly opposed. Instead of the prophet attempting to dissuade the people from an anti-Assyrian policy, every datum in cc. 7 and 8 except 8b indicates that he was doing his utmost to allay the popular *fear* of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition in order to prevent both court and people from appealing to Assyria for help. Unfortunately, Isaiah's efforts were in vain.

the interpretation of v. 8a becomes at once intelligible and significant. The great alternative presented to Ahaz in c. 7 was whether he would believe in Jahweh's power to save, or trust in other means, namely in Assyria. Would he trust in the things seen and temporal, or in the things unseen and eternal? The gently flowing, partially concealed fountain of Shiloah, upon which Jerusalem depended for its watersupply, is the fitting symbol of the unseen, spiritual presence of Jahweh, upon which Jerusalem was to depend, as contrasted with the mighty volume of the Euphrates, symbol of the impressive material power of the world empire of Assyria. The passage, thus interpreted, expressed the very heart of Isaiah's message and is in beautiful accord with what he taught in c. 7 and again in the great crisis of 701.²⁰ It is also significant that in 8 5-8a, just as in these other passages, Isaiah points out that this false material help upon which they rely with such confidence, whether Assyria or Egypt, will be the means of their final undoing. It is the idea of punishment in kind. This striking lesson would be entirely lost if 'this people' were identified with Israel, for Israel was opposed to Assyria.

We have thus arrived at a sharp alternative. On the one hand, v. 8b, which has an unequivocal political reference, demands that 'this people' be identified with Israel. In that case the phrase 'to reject the waters of Shiloah' while not theoretically impossible to interpret, admits of no really satisfactory explanation. On the other hand, if 'this people' is Judah, 'to reject the waters of Shiloah' can be given a meaning, very beautiful in itself, appropriate to the known historical situation, and consonant with the fundamental religious convictions of Isaiah. While, at first sight, it may seem unnatural to take the flexible symbol which is theoretically capable of several meanings as the basis of the identification of 'this people,' rather than the inflexible, literal statement in v. 8b, which is capable of only one meaning, nevertheless the instinct of the vast majority of commentators is certainly sound at this point, and 'this people' must be identified with Judah. The following arguments confirm this conclusion:

²⁰ Cf. especially 80 1-7, 18; 81 1 ff.

a) If 'this people' in v. 6 a does not mean Judah, then the invasion of Judah in v. 8 is left unexplained. The sequence of thought would be: Because this people, i. e. Israel, has sinned, it will be inundated, and Judah will be submerged! The Assyrian invasion of Judah would thus be mentioned as only incidental to the invasion of Israel. Nothing could be further from Isaiah's thoughts at this time. Judah was to be punished for its own sins.²¹ b) Again, the phrase itself in the mouth of Isaiah naturally refers only to Judah, the people among whom he was prophesying, unless the context specifically demands another reference.²² In the present chapter 'this people' clearly refers to Judah at vs. 11 f. The preceding context (vs. 1-4), though referring to Israel, cannot determine the identification of 'this people' in v. 6, for in vs. 1-4 Damascus as well as Israel is spoken of, and it is arbitrary to refer 'this people' to only one of the two nations mentioned in vs. 1-4: c) Lastly, the parallelism of c. 8 with c. 7 strongly favors the identification of 'this people' with Judah. Just as 8 1-4 corresponds exactly with 7 1-9 in its threat of destruction of Israel and Damascus, so 8 5-8 a would correspond to 7 10-17 in its threat of the destruction of Judah.²³

But if 'this people' is Judah, then two consequences follow. a) V. 6 b as it stands is impossible, and b) עֲלֵיהֶם ('upon them,')

²¹ 7 10-17. Cf. Dillmann.

²² In the nine passages outside of our present one in which the phrase 'this people' occurs in Isaiah 1-39, it refers to Judah in all but one. At 9 15 it occurs in a prophecy unquestionably delivered against Israel. But this verse is under the gravest critical suspicion. (See the article on "Isaiah's Prophecy against Ephraim," *AJSL*, April, 1916, pp. 14-16). The possible reference to Chaldea at 23 12 is not quite analogous, and the passage is also very doubtful. It may be added that, wherever עַל with a suffix is defined by the context, it again always refers to Judah. In other cases, when undefined by the context, it probably refers to Judah, though at times, especially in spurious passages, it may include both kingdoms. In any case it never refers to Israel alone; except, possibly, at 5 25. But the reference to Israel at 5 25 is conditioned upon the supposition that this passage originally belonged at c. 9 (which is altogether probable) and that the text is in order (which is by no means so certain).

²³ Cf. Bredenkamp. For the evidence against the identification of 'this people' with Israel drawn from textual criticism, see what follows.

v. 7 a), which, as we have seen, suggests very definitely a distinction between 'this people' (v. 6 a) and Judah (v. 8), becomes very suspicious. On the assumption that 'this people' is Judah, vs. 5-8 a would certainly gain in perspicuity if 'upon them' were omitted. The description would no longer suggest that the flood, after coming 'upon them,' i. e. upon 'this people,' would then pass on through Judah, with the almost unavoidable inference that 'this people' and Judah are to be distinguished; but it would suggest that the flood, after rising above all its channels, would irresistibly pass on through Judah.²⁴

It is clear that v. 6 b in its present form and 'upon them' in v. 7 a go together. They combine to suggest the identification of 'this people' with Israel. If 'this people' is Judah, it is necessary either to emend v. 6 b, or reject it (and עַל־הֶמָּה along with it) as glosses. So far as the original meaning of the passage is concerned it makes no difference which method of relieving the difficulty is chosen. So far as the critical history of the passage is concerned it makes very considerable difference.²⁵ Accordingly we turn to consider the second crucial question in the interpretation of vs. 5-8 a, namely the critical origin of v. 6 b.

²⁴ It is interesting to observe with what increasing suspicion עַל־הֶמָּה has been regarded in recent years, since the identification of 'this people' has become the established premise for explaining this passage. Marti, Gray and Guthe (in Kautzsch⁴) reject it, Marti and Gray on the ground that it is a superfluous interpretation of 'this people' (!), Guthe on the ground that it *unnecessarily anticipates* v. 8. Gies. (p. 233), Staerk (*Das Assyrische Weltreich*, pp. 50, 201), and Hans Schmidt emend to עַל־הֶמָּה on the basis of the LXX. This last suggestion is unfortunate. The LXX is very paraphrastic just at this point and introduces the second plural four times in vs. 6 and 7 without any warrant. It certainly affords no foundation for the proposed emendation. Giesebrecht's arguments for the LXX reading are entirely unconvincing.

²⁵ The attempts made to reconcile v. 6 b with its context, if 'this people' is identified with Judah, are abortive. Alexander (*Commentary on Isaiah*, 1865) supposes that v. 6 b refers to the joy at the retreat of Rezin and Pekah ('eth taken as sign of the accus.): "The particle 'eth simply denotes the occasion of the joy. The more definite idea of rejoicing over is suggested by the context" (!). This theory has been more recently advanced by Buhl (*ZKWL*, IV. 238, cited in Dillmann).

II

The usual method hitherto adopted to reconcile v. 6b with the identification of this people with Judah is to emend the text.

A. On proposed emendations of v. 6b

1) The favorite emendation, originally proposed, I believe, by Hitzig, is to regard ~~וַיִּמְד~~ as a misreading for ~~וַיִּמַ~~, and to assign to the latter the meaning of 'melt before' in the sense of 'despair.'²⁶ At first glance this gives a satisfactory contextual meaning to v. 6b, but the objections to it are overwhelming. a) In the first place, while the verb occurs 21 times, it is found but once in the *kal* and then in a very doubtful passage (Is. 10 19).²⁷ b) In the dozen cases where this verb is

But the object of joy in this sense is always introduced by the prepositions *ב* (most frequent), *כֹּ* ('against') or even *א*. Further, the extreme artificiality of this explanation is apparent. Equally unconvincing is Dillmann's view. He takes 'eth as the preposition, but interprets the joy with Rezin and Pekah as the joy in the same things in which Rezin and Pekah rejoice, namely in human instrumentalities (!). In the sixth edition, revised by Kittel, this unhappy explanation is abandoned. Equally ineffectual are the attempts to preserve the present text by identifying 'this people' with both Judah and Israel (so Vitringa, in effect, Lowth, Schelling, Rosenmüller, Eichhorn, De.). Delitzsch proceeds to parcel out the various statements in vs. 6-8a between Israel and Judah. 'Rejection of the waters of Shiloah' is the sin of both kingdoms; v. 6b refers to the special sin of Israel; v. 7a states the punishment of Israel; v. 8 the punishment of Judah. This is only a variation upon Sebelling's view (cited in Ges.). Delitzsch himself admits that an interpretation which would permit of a reference of 'this people' to Judah would be welcome. Cheyne (*Commentary*) follows along the lines of Delitzsch.

²⁶ So Hitz., Brdk., Barth (*Beiträge*, p. 9, n. 1), Du., Marti, Di-Kit., Ku. (p. 33), Staerk (p. 201), Che. (*Intro.* p. 37, n. 1). It is significant that Cheyne abandons his former identification of 'this people' with Israel (or with Israel and Judah) after he adopts the emended text, an interesting evidence that the unemended text clearly suggests such an identification.

²⁷ It is conjectured that the *kal* is adopted in the present instance for the sake of the play on ~~וַיִּמַ~~ (Hitz., Du. et al.). But ~~וַיִּמַ~~ already expresses such a play without the necessity of departing from the *usus loquendi*.

used as a metaphor for fear, i. e. is given a psychological application, it is accompanied by the word 'heart.'²⁸ The verb by itself would thus not seem to be applicable to a state of mind. c) The construction of **סָס** in the sense of 'despair' with the accusative (eth) of the ground of despair,²⁹ also departs from the usage. In the four (five) instances in which the cause of the melting is assigned, it is introduced by **מִמֶּנִּי** or **מִלִּמֶּנִּי**. At Is. 34 3 where **מִן** is used the sense is slightly different.³⁰ d) In view of the usage, the unanimous testimony of the ancient versions to the reading **מִשִּׂישׁ** in the sense of 'rejoice' can also be confidently urged against the proposed emendation. e) Finally, the construction of the entire clause is impossible. The sentence is introduced by the conjunction **כִּי יַעַן**, which properly governs the finite verb **בָּסָס**. But **סָס** after this conjunction is a grammatical *non sequitur*, whether construed as an infin. cst.,³¹ or as an infin. abs.³² Of the very large number of cases in which **כִּי יַעַן** or **יַעַן אֲשֶׁר** or even **יַעַן** alone is followed by a finite verb, in not one is the sequence continued by any sort of infinitive or by a verbal noun.³³ f) Finally, apart from all these

²⁸ 2 Sam. 10 17 is no real exception, for 'heart' is found here, though it is not the subject of the verb.

²⁹ So Hitz., Barth, Brdk.

³⁰ Hitzig, with the approval of Barth, cites Job. 81 24, where **יַעַן** is construed with the accus., as support for **סָס** with the accus. But the construction in Job is unique and by no means free of suspicion. In the four other cases where the reason for the fear is expressed after **יַעַן**, it is introduced again by **מִמֶּנִּי** or **מִן**. (At Job. 13 25 the meaning of the verb is different.) When the object of the fear is introduced the high. is used (Is. 29 23, cf. 8 18). Duhm frankly admits the incorrectness of the construction of **סָס** with **מִן** and accordingly proposes the further emendation of **מִן** to **מִמֶּנִּי** (so also Marti, Che. [in *Intro.*], Di.-Kit., Staerk) or less accurately to **מִן** (Du.³). Duhm supposes that when **סָס** was understood as **מִשִּׂישׁ** the preposition was changed to agree with the new meaning. But the question may fairly be asked whether the presence of **מִמֶּנִּי** in the original text would not have prevented the supposed misunderstanding.

³¹ So Hitz., Kno., Di., who make **סָס** depend on **יַעַן**.

³² So Marti, Di.-Kit., Brdk., Staerk.

³³ Duhm feels this difficulty and in editions^{1, 2} deletes **כִּי יַעַן** out of **כִּי יַעַן** and emends **בָּסָס** to the infinitive, thus agreeing with the proposed **סָס**. In Ed.⁴ he reverses the process, retains **כִּי יַעַן** and emends **סָס** to the perfect, which betters the alliteration with **בָּסָס**.

grammatical difficulties, the meaning of the clause as emended is by no means exegetically satisfactory. The fears of the people along with their positive rejection of the waters of Shiloah would be assigned as a reason for their punishment. This weakens rather than increases the force of v. 5 a. Elsewhere Isaiah seeks to allay their fears.³⁴ In view of these wellnigh insuperable difficulties the proposed emendation of v. 5 b must be regarded as unsatisfactory. It is one of those ingenious conjectures which at first sight captivate the hard-pressed exegete but which prove in the end to be will-o-the-wisps, leading him off into false paths.

2) The attempt has been made in recent times to get along with rejecting only the phrase 'Rezin and the son of Remaliah' as a gloss.³⁵ מַשְׁכָּח, emended to מַשְׁכָּח is now attached to the preceding line and coordinated with הַלְלִים לַמֵּי as a further characterization of the waters as faintly flowing.³⁶ But apart from the very grave grammatical difficulties involved in this

³⁴ 71-2; 81-4.

³⁵ Gies. (pp. 227 ff.); Burkitt (*JTAS*, Vol. 12, p. 294); Popper (*Studies in Biblical Parallelism*, p. 348); and cf. Gray, but with modifications.

³⁶ So Gies.; Popper suggests either this emendation, or, on the basis of the present text, calls attention to the Arabic *mustawish* which, according to Lane, means "water not to be seen or hardly to be seen, by reason of its remoteness from the surface of the ground." (Cf. also Burkitt for the use of Arabic analogies). But the construction of the word after the participial phrase, whether it is read as the noun, מַשְׁכָּח, or as the infinitive, מַשְׁכָּח, is very harsh. In the former case Popper construes it either as depending on the ל in הַלְלִים, or as an adverbial acc. In the latter case it is construed either as an infin. abs. (Gies.), or as an infin. cst. (Burkitt, Popper). Mi. 6 8, urged by Giesebrecht as an analogy to the infinitive abs. after the part. in the present case, is wide of the mark, and the examples given in König, *Syntax*, § 220 a (Joah. 6 12; II Sam. 16 17 b; Is. 22 17 b; and Jer. 23 17) afford no analogy and, besides, are corrupted texts. Is. 60 14, urged by Burkitt and Popper in favor of the infin. cst., is hardly more convincing. Gray suggests that מַשְׁכָּח is either a corrupt variant to מַשְׁכָּח, or an isolated fragment. Bredenkamp's idea that הַלְלִים לַמֵּי and the corrected מַשְׁכָּח are, both of them, qualifications of 'this people' may be mentioned in passing as a literary curiosity. It is based on the assumed correctness of Jerome's *cum magno sonitu* (see above, n. 10) and the fact that מַשְׁכָּח, if applied to the 'waters,' would contradict the ancient Father.

suggestion, it breaks down completely when the rest of the clause is considered. This is regarded as a gloss to 'the waters of Shiloah.'³⁷ But how in the world did a glossator ever hit upon the idea of explaining the waters of Shiloah as an allusion to Rezin and Pekah? To regard this as "a question of subordinate interest"³⁸ is altogether too simple a way out of the difficulty. It is supposed that the gentle stream was taken by the glossator as a symbol of the weaker power of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition as contrasted with the Euphrates which is the symbol of the mighty power of Assyria. Because the people has despised this smaller power in their reliance upon the Assyrian help, therefore they will be punished by Assyria!³⁹ But that even the *äusserliche Art rabbinischer Exegese*, to which Giesebrecht adverts, can have been guilty of turning the sacred Spring "at the roots of Mount Zion" into a symbol of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition is quite inconceivable. That is the last thing a later glossator would do. Accordingly, it is impossible to get along with the rejection of only the part of v. 5b which follows ~~וְיָשׁוּב~~. This is wantonly to substitute, in the endeavor to interpret the passage, an insoluble difficulty for what may prove to be a helpful clue.

But if v. 5b, in its present form, cannot be harmonized with the context, if it cannot be satisfactorily emended so as to agree with its context, and if it cannot be saved even in part, there is nothing to do but to reject it in its entirety.⁴⁰

³⁷ So Gies., Burkitt, Gray, Guthe and Popper. Popper speaks of it as "an appositional gloss," but does not tell us to what it is in apposition!

³⁸ Gies.

³⁹ So Gies. and Burkitt. This unhappy explanation was advanced long ago by Steudel (cited in Gesenius). Neither Giesebrecht nor Burkitt refer to Steudel, and it would appear that they had arrived at this strange conceit independently.

⁴⁰ So Cube (1785-'86, cited in Ges.); Olshausen (1826, cited in Di.); Gray (substantially); Skinner (*Isaiah*, in Cambridge Bible Ed.); Hans Schmidt.

B. On the significance of v. 6b considered as a gloss

The clause was no doubt originally a marginal comment, intended to explain, not the waters of Shiloah, which is absurd, but the *rejection* of the waters of Shiloah. This rejection, says the glossator, is equivalent to taking sides with Rezin and Pekah. The peculiar word **וְעַלֵּם** was no doubt chosen as a play upon **עַלְמָה**, as has often been pointed out. That v. 6b is a gloss is finally confirmed by the following considerations in addition to the historical, exegetical, and grammatical difficulties in the way of accepting it as original which have already been mentioned. a) Since the time of Cube it has been felt that the clause, "the king of Assyria and all his glory," in v. 7 is a gloss.⁴¹ It interrupts the figure of the flood in vs. 7a and 7b in a most unfortunate way. Other such glosses in the neighboring chapters are 'the king of Assyria' at 7 17, 20, the date at 7 8,⁴² and particularly 'Rezin' at 9 10. These instances show clearly that these chapters have been glossed and support the view that v. 6b is a gloss. b) Finally, when once both v. 6b and the gloss in v. 7 have been struck out, the passage, vs. 5-8a, gains very greatly in smoothness and force. The softly flowing waters of Shiloah and the mighty river Euphrates are brought into the sharpest and most telling antithesis, and the whole passage becomes completely intelligible.

But now a question arises of great importance for our purpose. What was the purpose of this gloss? Did it have what may be called simply an antiquarian interest, or did it have a dogmatic interest? In view of the other glosses mentioned above, the former would seem to be more probably its original interest. But was it understood simply in an antiquarian sense after it became incorporated into the text? At this point the significance of the associated phrase, 'upon them,' must be considered. When the two phrases are combined, the result is to enforce a sharp distinction between 'this people' and Judah, and to identify 'this people' with Israel. But this means that

⁴¹ So Ges., Hitz., Kno., Du., Marti, Che., Skinner, Gray, *et al.*

⁴² Probably the earliest datable gloss in Isaiah.

the guilt has been diverted from Judah to Israel.⁴³ Was this result a purposed result? In that case, what may well have been originally only a marginal note appended in an antiquarian interest may have later, after incorporation in the text, taken on a dogmatic interest. The slight addition of 'upon them' is all that is needed to give to the gloss this significance. Can this suspicion be confirmed? The answer to this question must be deferred.⁴⁴

Thus far two questions have been discussed with reference to vs. 5-8a: 1) the identification of 'this people,' which is the primary question; and 2) the literary quality of v. 5b. Is v. 5b original or a gloss, and, if a gloss, what is its purpose? Before passing on to vs. 8b, 9-10 there is a third question which calls for answer.

III

Is there any limitation placed upon the punishment of Judah at v. 5b? Does the phrase, 'it shall reach to the neck,' imply that while Judah is almost submerged it is not quite submerged? Does it emphasize the greatness of the disaster or does it suggest a basis of hope? If a strictly logical (or anatomical) analysis of the figure is applied to it, the expectation

⁴³ It is singular how the significance of the combination of v. 5b and 'upon them' in v. 7a has been ignored by the great majority of commentators. It can only be explained by the fact that the correct identification of 'this people' with Judah has so engrossed the attention that the very obvious implications of the present text have been overlooked except by a very few scholars. But Jerome long ago drew the natural inferences from v. 5b and 'upon them' when he identified 'this people' with Israel.

⁴⁴ I call attention to the fact that if the original text of v. 5b was approximately what the emendations reviewed above suppose it to have been, the same question arises: How did the original text which permitted no identification of 'this people' with Israel come to assume its present form which requires such an identification? Was this due to accidental corruption, or was there a dogmatic purpose at work? Those who prefer to emend v. 5b rather than to reject it must answer this question.

of ultimate escape can undoubtedly be deduced from it.⁴⁵ But does the rhetorical character of the passage permit of such an inference?

1) The verb 'reach' is coordinated with the other verbs of vs. 7 and 8 and, like them, depends upon the 'therefore' of v. 7a, which in turn depends upon the reference to apostasy in v. 6a. Because they have rejected the waters of Shiloah, therefore Jahweh will bring the Euphrates, which will overflow, pass on, and *reach to the neck*? This last clause is a climax, not an antithesis. If an antithesis were desired, it would be expressed in some other way.⁴⁶ 2) But, it may be asked, why did not Isaiah use an unequivocal expression if he desired to indicate the completeness of the destruction? Here a stylistic peculiarity of the prophet is to be noticed, namely, his method of emphasis by understatement. When he warns at 5 10 that a ten-acre vineyard will yield a bath and an homer of seed an ephah, the thought is directed not upon what they *do* yield but upon what they do *not* yield. The figure is chosen to picture the desolation of the land. Similarly, at 17 8 the two or three berries in the topmost boughs of the olive tree are not a symbol of hope, as is sometimes supposed, but of the stripped condition of the tree.⁴⁷ It is the *irony* of these understatements which lend to them their power. 3) Finally, if the phrase 'reach to the neck' was intended to suggest a limitation of the punishment, we would expect a reason for this to be given. A reason for the punishment is given. Why not, then, a reason for its limitation? Accordingly, the view of the great majority of commentators must be adhered to,

⁴⁵ Delitzsch, Skinner, and Meinhold all find a basis of hope in the phrase. "Judah is not wholly submerged" (Ski.). "Granted the existence of a Saviour (Immanuel!), the *possibility* of salvation is still present" (De.). "The water reaches to the neck, but only to the neck. Then God comes to the help of his own" (Meinh., *Der Heilige Rest*, p. 114).

⁴⁶ Cf. Amos 9 8b.

⁴⁷ If an exegete doubts this, let him take a day off from his study and go out nutting on some frosty Autumn morning. Compare, also, Amos 8 12 and 5 3. It is curious how Meinhold, while accepting this interpretation for 17 8ff. (Cf. also his interpretation of 7 2ff., pp. 108 and 99, n. 1) fails to recognize it for 8 8a.

which subsumes v. 8a under what precedes as a threat, and interprets 'up to the neck' as expressing the climax of the danger.⁴⁸ But is not such a reason for the restriction of the punishment actually given in what follows? Is not the land to be saved because it is Immanuel's land? This question leads us to the investigation of vs. 8b-10. But before this is taken up, a brief summary of results thus far obtained is in order: 1) 'This people' is Judah. 2) It has forsaken Jahweh (the 'waters of Shiloah') in pursuing its pro-Assyrian policy. 3) But the very power to which it appeals will prove its undoing. It will be engulfed in a vast flood of disaster. 4) But the present form of the text, by the incorporation of v. 8b and the phrase 'upon them,' suggests that the burden of guilt is to be shifted from Judah to the Northern Kingdom.

PART II

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF 8 b-10

In the interpretation of these verses it will be best to consider vs. 9-10 by themselves before taking up the very obscure allusion in v. 8b.

I

On vs. 9-10.

The meaning of these verses is perfectly clear, though the text is not above suspicion.⁴⁹ In them the nations of the earth

⁴⁸ Ges., Hitz., Kno., Di., Di-Kit., Brdk., Du., Marti, Schmidt. Compare also 30 28, a secondary passage, but almost certainly dependent upon the figure in 8 a. The allusion at 30 28 to the neck expresses threat and only threat. The fact that the prophecy is directed against Assyria makes that clear.

⁴⁹ 1) The exact meaning of וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ is not quite certain. The Targum seems to take it from וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ, in the sense of 'unite' or 'associate together'. Others regard it as the equivalent of וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ ('be broken') or amend it to וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ ('shout the battlecry'). The majority of scholars explain it from וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ ('be angry' or 'rage'). So far as the verb itself and the general meaning of the passage are concerned, this last explanation is reasonably adequate. 2) But the parallelism, if any one of the above meanings is

are challenged to do their worst. They can effect nothing for "God is with us." The challenge is a universal challenge.⁵⁰ If these verses are attached directly to vs. 5-8a, one can hardly imagine a greater contradiction.⁵¹ a) To say that Judah will be overwhelmed by Assyria in such disastrous fashion as is pictured in vs. 5-8a and then to add that though the nations of the earth may rage as they will, they will be able to effect nothing, is to make in the same breath two essentially irreconcilable statements. It is Jahweh himself who is responsible for bringing the Assyrian flood upon Judah. How, then, can the nations be defied on the ground that he is on Judah's side? The fact of a punitive invasion due to God's wrath against Judah's apostasy in vs. 5-8a and the feeling of *absolute security* from invasion due to God's protecting presence in vs. 9-10 are quite incompatible. It is impossible to effect a transition between the two thoughts by the phrase 'up to the neck,' as if that meant 'up to the neck, but only up to the neck.' We have seen that this interpretation puts a limitation upon the terribleness of the punishment whereas the clause is intended to *emphasize* its terribleness. It is equally illegitimate to

adopted, is defective. Accordingly the verb has been emended after the LXX to וָיָדָע ('know it'). So Lowth, Che., Marti, Gray, Guthe. This undoubtedly smooths the parallelism but at the expense of the nervous vigor of the passage. The two imperatives are intended to stand in opposition to each other as they do in v. b. Popper would emend still more drastically and read, "Hear ye peoples altogether" (וְשָׁמְעוּ עַמֵּי כָל עוֹלָם). Wellhausen, on the contrary, would preserve וָיָדָע ('rage') and correct וְרָגְזוּ to וְרָגְזוּ. This betters v. a, but the anticipation of וְרָגְזוּ in v. b condemns it. Staerk (*Das Assyrische Weltreich*, p. 199 f) rejects the first two clauses of v. a (see below). Meinhold emends וְרָגְזוּ to וְרָגְזוּ, deletes the duplicate clauses in v. b (except וָיָדָע) and secures the following:

"Rage ye peoples and be broken
Gird yourselves all ye far corners of the earth and be broken."

The effect of this is to reverse Staerk's reconstruction. For still another attempt, see below.

⁵⁰ So most Commentators, e. g. Ew., Brdk., De., Di., Di-Kit., Gies., Marti, Gray, Skinner, H. Schmidt.

⁵¹ It is only equalled by the contradiction between 29:1-4 and 5:2 (*Vicopoints*, p. 58, n. 126), and, as we shall see, it is produced by much the same methods and with a similar end in view.

restrict the outburst of faith in vs. 9-10 in any such petty way. Is it really to be supposed that the feeling of security in these verses can be so toned down as to permit of its reconciliation with the nations submerging Judah up to the neck?⁵³

b) Further, these verses are in as fundamental conflict with what follows as with what precedes. A connection would be possible between vs. 9-10 and 11-13 if the following paragraph stopped at v. 13. But, unfortunately, it does *not* stop there. It reaches its climax and real significance at vs. 14-15, and with these verses vs. 9-10 are in as flat contradiction as they are with vs. 5-8a. Defiance and the feeling of security are as much out of place before vs. 14-15 as they are after vs. 5-8a.⁵³

2) The difficulties of vs. 9-10, construed as a general challenge to all the nations, are so great that some scholars have held that the challenge has either primary or exclusive reference to Syria and Israel.⁵⁴ In favor of this is the fact that at 7 4-9 Isaiah did hurl his challenge at these two nations, and the further fact that the language in the two passages has a remarkable similarity.⁵⁵ But the challenge to the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition after the prophecy of the devastation by Assyria is meaningless *in this connection*. What is the object of hurling defiance at these two petty kingdoms on the strength of Jahweh's presence when the prophet had just threatened Judah with the far worse Assyrian invasion?⁵⁶ In c. 7 the defiance to Syria and Israel stands first, and the subsequent threat

⁵³ Meinhold's attempt to effect a transition from vs. 5-8a to vs. 9-10 through the clause 'up to the neck' in the way above indicated, and his inference that the promise in vs. 9-10 is not to the nation as a whole, but only to the Remnant (*Der Rest*, p. 114 ff.) is, so far as I am able to see, totally opposed to the rhetorical character of the passage.

⁵⁴ Cf. Gies. p. 235-248 for the above arguments. It is true that the ׀ (v. 11) seems to connect with what immediately precedes, and most scholars see in the experience of v. 11 the reason for the confidence in vs. 9-10 (so Hitz., Ew., Kno., DL, Di-Kit., Meinh., Du.). But in view of the argument advanced above, it may be doubted whether ׀ is original. It is omitted by Lxx and S. The connection sometimes proposed with vs. 5-8a is not altogether satisfactory.

⁵⁵ So Ges., Hitz., Kno., Du.

⁵⁶ Cf. especially 7 5, 7.

⁵⁷ Cf. Brdk. and Gies.

of Assyrian invasion can be readily accounted for by the change in the situation. Isaiah had promised Ahaz deliverance from the coalition in order to soothe his fears and keep him from throwing himself into the arms of Assyria. But he warned him that if he did not believe a worse fate would befall him. When Ahaz rejected the prophetic assurance, then came the prophecy of doom (7 14-17). Even the repetition of the promise of relief from the allies after Ahaz had made the great refusal in c. 7 can be fairly well explained.⁵⁷ But in c. 8 the announcement of doom before the prophecy of deliverance, *though in the fulfilment the doom was to follow the deliverance*, has no meaning whatever. The only proper position of vs. 9-10, interpreted as a challenge to the Allies, is before vs. 5-8a, in other words parallel to 8 1-4 or, better, to 7 4-9. But not only is the position of vs. 9-10, interpreted as a challenge to the coalition, impossible, the wording of v. 9 forbids such an interpretation. Not Syria and Israel, but the ends of the earth are here addressed.⁵⁸ Accordingly, if vs. 9-10 are taken by themselves, they cannot be directly attached to vs. 5-8a without a most violent contradiction resulting. But can a modulation from the threats in vs. 5-8a to the promises in vs. 9-10 be effected by v. 8b?

II

On v. 8b.

This clause has always been an exegetical crux. Three questions call for attention: 1) the antecedent of the suffix in **לְבָנָיִם**, 2) the antecedent of the suffix in **בְּרָצִים**, 3) the construction and significance of **לְבָנָיִם**. Is it to be regarded as

⁵⁷ Cf. 7 16 and my comments on this verse in "Immanuel," *AJSL*, 1918.

⁵⁸ Knobel held that 'the peoples' referred to Syria and Israel, but 'the far corners of the earth' referred to peoples who were summoned to witness the defeat of these peoples. The address to 'the peoples' was a challenge; the address to the 'far corners of the earth' was an exhortation. Though this view has been revived by Duhm, it is anything but convincing. There is nothing in v. 9 really to suggest that two different groups are addressed, the aggressors and the witnesses of the aggression.

a phrase, as in v. 10b, or as a proper name? If the latter, with whom is Immanuel to be identified?⁵⁹

A. Whose wings are referred to?

1) From the time of the Targum and Jerome 'wings' has often been interpreted as the wings of the Assyrian army.⁶⁰ But nowhere else in the O. T. is כנף found in this military sense. Further, this would imply a technical use of the term which is not consonant with פתח, for the latter word suggests that we are dealing with a real metaphor here and not a faded out one. Finally, if the word is taken in the technical sense of *alae*, or an army's flanks, the lapse into the literal reference to Assyria after the finely worked out metaphor of the flood becomes very abrupt and unpleasant from a literary point of view. The suffix would have to refer to the actual army of Assyria which lies behind to metaphor of the river. This is stylistically bad.

2) To avoid this stylistic difficulty other scholars hold that the metaphor is still retained, and the wings are the various streams which break away from the main mass of the flood and distribute themselves through the land.⁶¹ But again there is no analogy to this use of the word 'wings', and the figure in its present mode of expression is not at all a convincing one.⁶²

⁵⁹ I pass over the rather difficult grammatical construction of the clause, for, though harsh, it is not without analogy. Cf. König, *Syntax*, p. 459, for the construction of the fem. pl. subj. with singular masc. verb. כנפן is a. l.; Ezek. 9s is corrupt. The construction is equivalent to extended or expanded wings.

⁶⁰ Cf. כנף, Ezek. 12 14, 17, 31; 88 1, a word found only in these passages and usually explained from an Assyrian root meaning wing. Compare also the technical use of the Latin *ala* (so Ges., Hitz., Ew.). This view probably goes back to the LXX in which *παραμβολή* is frequently the equivalent of the Hebrew פתח. (Otley, *Isaiah according to the Septuagint*.)

⁶¹ So Kno., Brdk., De., Che. (*Com.*)

⁶² The coincidence cited by Cheyne from Wordsworth's *Descriptive Sketches*,

"So shall its waters from the heavens supplied
Brood o'er the long parched lands with Nile-like wings,"

3) In the view of most recent commentators there is an abrupt change of figure, and the reference in v. 8b is no longer to a flood, but to a bird. But then the question arises: What kind of a bird? Is it a bird of prey⁶³ or a protecting bird?⁶⁴ On the first view, v. 8b continues the threat of invasion in vs. 5-8a; on the second view, the thought of hope is suddenly introduced. Against the metaphor of a bird of prey may again be urged the intolerable abruptness of the change of figure. There is now no antecedent at all for the suffix in **רַבִּיב**. The mind must be supposed to have disengaged the Assyrian army from the metaphor of the flood, then to have thought of it as changed into a bird (a thought which is unexpressed!) and then, after this metamorphosis, to proceed gaily on with a reference to 'its wings'. All this is quite unworthy of Isaiah's stylistic powers. Furthermore the last word in the verse (Immanuel), whether it is regarded as a name or a phrase, suggests that v. 8b is to be taken with what follows and given a consolatory sense. But in that case all connection with what precedes is lost. If 'wings' does not refer to the Assyrian army, or to the Assyrian flood, or to the Assyrian pictured as a bird of prey, there is no explanation for it to be found in the present context, and we are driven to the conclusion that at v. 8b we are dealing either with a misplaced fragment or a gloss. The former alternative would seem to be more probable than the latter, for **רַבִּיב** is no more intelligible as a gloss than it is as a part of the present text. As if these difficulties were not already enough, there remain the perplexities connected with the suffix in 'thy land' and the significance of Immanuel. These must be considered together.

is an odd one, but can hardly be used to bolster up an ancient text whose correctness is open to suspicion. In his *Introduction* Cheyne explains v. 8b in a different way.

⁶³ So Di-Kit., Du., Che. (*Com.*) Skinner, H. Schmidt.

⁶⁴ So Che. (*Intro.*), Marti, Gray. Cf. Ps. 17 s; 36 s. Popper avoids the abrupt change of metaphor by a very doubtful expedient. He takes **רַבִּיב רַבִּיב** as an independent line and translates: "and spread to its farthest ends"(!)

B. Whose land is referred to and what is the significance of Immanuel?

1) On the basis of the Hebrew, Immanuel has been taken as a proper name. In that case 'thy land' is Immanuel's land. This is the natural interpretation of the present text. But what is the significance of such an address? This will depend, in a measure, upon the significance of Immanuel. a) In accordance with one of the many interpretations of 7 14, Immanuel has been identified with a son of Isaiah, and 'thy land' given the sense of 'thy fatherland'.⁶⁵ V. 2b is then supposed to add a still further touch to the desolation to be wrought; Isaiah's own child is to be involved in it. But such an allusion would divert the attention from the significance of the prophecy for the people as a whole, whom Isaiah was addressing and endeavoring to influence, to its significance for the Prophet's own family. This is most unlikely. Moreover, this interpretation falls with the interpretation of Immanuel in 7 14 upon which it is based. Immanuel at 7 14 cannot be Isaiah's son. b) Again, Immanuel has been identified with the Messiah.⁶⁶ In that case 'thy land' is better taken as the kingdom of the Messiah than as his fatherland, though of course the latter view is possible. The implication of the Messiah's land in the coming disaster is again supposed to emphasize its greatness (v. 2b interpreted as threat). The attempt to subsume the apostrophe to Immanuel under the preceding threat, if he is identified with the Messiah, is more satisfactory than when he is identified with Isaiah's son. The thought of the *desecration* of Messiah's land might be supposed to wring this cry from the prophet's heart, and, as we shall see, this thought may really be intended by the present text.⁶⁷ But it has its own difficulties. Is Immanuel already born? Nothing in cc. 7 and 8 indicates it. If not, is it likely that Isaiah would thus apostrophize some Messiah of

⁶⁵ So Ges., Hitz., Kno. Cf. Gen. 12 1; Jonah 1 s.

⁶⁶ So Calv., Ew., De., Di., Di-Kit., Che. (Com.), Marti, and Du. (if text is retained), Skinner, H. Schmidt.

⁶⁷ For Immanuel as a part of the preceding threat, see Ges., Hitz., Ew., De., Di., Di-Kit., Che. (Com.), Schmidt.

the future? Further, the name is undoubtedly interpreted in a good sense at v. 10. To hold that at v. 8b it is intended to reinforce the preceding threat when at v. 10 it so clearly is interpreted as a ground of encouragement is, to say the least, confusing. This leads us back to the fundamental difficulty of the passage. c) Granted that Immanuel, whether Isaiah's son or the Messiah, could be subsumed under the preceding threat in the way above indicated, how is the transition to the unqualified hopes in vs. 9-10 effected? Here all scholars who hold to the present text assume that the *sound* of the name itself recalls to Isaiah's mind the good hopes attached to it. *The transition to hope from threat is one of psychological revulsion.* Here again the theory which identifies Immanuel with Isaiah's son is at a distinct disadvantage as compared with the theory which identifies him with the Messiah. Gesenius and Knobel weakly suggest that the prophet wishes to divert the thought from the more gloomy distant future, shadowed by the invasion of Assyria, to the happier immediate future, in which the discomfiture of Syria and Israel (vs. 9-10) is foreseen. Just what the prophet expected to accomplish by this pleasant diversion in the midst of his warnings does not appear. Hitzig frankly admits that vs. 9-10 are out of connection with the preceding threats, and suggests that the challenge in them was not due to the occurrence of the name Immanuel, but to some development in the camp of the Coalition!⁶⁸ Those who identify Immanuel with the Messiah hold that the thought of the desecration of the Messiah's land calls out either a feeling of indignant protest or a cry for help from the prophet, and in this protest or appeal, expressed in the apostrophe to Immanuel, the hope and defiance in vs. 9-10 are born.⁶⁹ George

⁶⁸ It is interesting to observe how the identification of Immanuel with Isaiah's son hangs together with the identification of the 'peoples' in vs. 9-10 with Syria and Israel. The mention of Isaiah's son might conceivably agree with a challenge to these petty kingdoms, but hardly with a defiance to the far corners of the earth!

⁶⁹ So Ew., De., Che., Di., G. A. Smith. Skinner and H. Schmidt imply the same kind of a transition, though they separate vs. 9-10 somewhat more sharply from vs. 5-8.

Adam Smith gives this view its classic formulation: "At the sound of the name which floats in upon the floods of invasion like the ark on the waters of old (the simile is Professor Smith's, not the prophet's) Isaiah pulls together his distraught faith in his country and, forgetting her faults, flings defiance at his foes." Nothing could better illustrate than this sentence the danger of attempting to patch up faulty connections in ancient texts by means of rhetoric. Could Isaiah be led to substitute an all-inclusive promise (vs. 9-10) for an all-inclusive threat (vs. 5-8) because he happens to recollect that this threat involves the Messiah's land? Was Isaiah the kind of a man thus to forget Judah's sins at the magic sound of a name, though he had referred to them in the very protasis of the sentence which is supposed to end with the apostrophe to Immanuel? After saying that Assyria, like a vast flood, will submerge Judah to the neck because of its sins, does the thought that Judah is after all Immanuel's land call forth such a feeling of indignation in him that he is immediately able to reverse himself and announce that the nations can effect nothing at all? For my part, I cannot believe that a man of Isaiah's profound moral earnestness would compromise himself in any such way.

2) The difficulty of explaining Immanuel in this context, if he is Isaiah's son or the Messiah, has led many scholars to construe the word as a phrase and not as a proper name.⁷⁰ In that case it cannot be taken with 'thy land,' but must go with what follows. But this leaves the second person suffix ('thy') hanging in the air. a) It has been referred to Judah.⁷¹ This is unlikely. Judah has all along been spoken of in the third person (vs. 5-8 a). Why this sudden change to the second person?⁷² b) Duhm feels this difficulty and emends ך in ךַּלְמָא to ךַּ.

⁷⁰ Brdk., Mein., Gies., Du.,^{1,2} Marti, Gray, Popper, Guthe. For this may be urged the LXX (Contrast LXX at 7 14). But see below.

⁷¹ Brdk., Gies., Popper.

⁷² Giesebrecht, having emended 'upon them' to 'upon you' in v. 7a, holds that the second person in v. 8b is due to this emended second person in v. 7, while the singular ('thy') instead of the plural ('you') is due to the intervening mention of Judah(!) Popper tacitly emends to the third person ('his land') without giving explanations.

This simple expedient was a source of great relief to hard-pressed exegetes,⁷³ but is as unwarranted as the similarly ingenious emendation at v. 8b.⁷⁴ It breaks down on the strictly text-critical evidence. Both B and A, though they take Immanuel as a phrase and, in accordance with that, read וְיָדָע ('know it') at v. 9, still retain the ך . *This is the strongest evidence of its originality.* Further, if ך were emended to כ , we would expect an article with כָּמֶן .⁷⁵ Exegetically, also, this emendation presents serious difficulties. If the preceding part of the clause is a threat, no connection between it and the phrase, 'for with us is God,' can be established.⁷⁶ Such a connection is found, however, if v. 8b is regarded as a figure of a protecting bird.⁷⁷ But this only postpones the difficulty. For whether we take vs. 9-10 alone, or vs. 8b with them, in either case no suitable connection can be found with vs. 5-8a. At this point Duhm's criticism strangely halts. He retains vs. 9-10 in their present context and identifies the 'peoples' in v. 9 with

⁷³ It is followed by Marti, Che. (*Intro.*), and Gray. Gray calls attention to the fact that כ is at times written defectively in North Semitic inscriptions. Meinhold emends ך to the adversative ו .

⁷⁴ Duhm abandoned it, himself, in his third edition. The real reason which led Duhm originally to suggest it was his view of Immanuel at 714. Immanuel in that passage, according to Duhm and the many who have followed him, was no definite child, but any child who might have been born about that time. Of course, if the child is an indefinite child, he would scarcely have been addressed in the intimate way implied at 85b. For a criticism of this view of Immanuel see the writer's article, Immanuel, *AJSL*, 1918. In the present discussion, it will be observed, I have avoided as far as possible relying upon data drawn from 714. I have wished to examine the text apart from any theories or prepossessions drawn from 714.

⁷⁵ Generously supplied by Guthe. The anarthrous כָּמֶן at v. 9 and Jer. 841, urged by Meinhold (p. 114, n. 2f.) in support of כָּמֶן without the article at v. 8b, is not analogous. In these other passages the 'earth', generally, is spoken of, but at v. 8b the particular land of Judah is in mind.

⁷⁶ Duhm, accordingly, rejects Immanuel in both v. 8 and v. 10 as glosses. They were added by some one interested in eschatology who saw in the creature referred to in v. 8b some dragon endangering the Messiah (Rev. 1213ff.). This unconvincing idea is retained in the third edition, but now Duhm rejects the whole of v. 8b.

⁷⁷ So Che. (*Introd.*), Marti, Gray.

Syria and Israel.⁷⁸ As this has been shown to be highly improbable, the final conclusion seems unavoidable that vs. 9-10 or, better, vs. 8 b-10 are not original in this context.⁷⁹ But in that case we are left with a new problem on our hands. If these verses are not original here, where did they come from?

C. The origin and significance of vs. 8b-10

1) Giesebrecht advanced the theory that vs. 9-10 along with Immanuel in v. 8b, construed as a phrase, came out of a later period of Isaiah's life. Isaiah is supposed to have entertained very gloomy views of the future at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic war (cf. 7 17 ff. and 8 5-8) but when, subsequently, the historical conditions changed, his views of the future changed with them and became more hopeful. He then revised his earlier threatening prophecies by appending to them sunnier prophecies out of happier times.⁸⁰ This theory of Giesebrecht has played a very useful part in the interpretation of Isaiah, for it concentrated the attention upon the many strange sequences in the book in which doom is followed by hope. But it has fulfilled its mission and, I think, may now be dismissed. If the attempt is made to carry it through

⁷⁸ See note 54. Schmidt also appears to retain vs. 9-10 in their present connection, though he treats them as an independent oracle. But since he retains Immanuel at v. 8b as a personal name of the Messiah, his view of the independent character of vs. 9-10 seems hardly tenable.

⁷⁹ It makes no difference in principle whether only vs. 9-10 are removed, or vs. 9-10 along with Immanuel v. 8b, or with the whole of v. 8b. But it does make some difference in the attempt to solve the problem of the origin of these verses.

⁸⁰ 12 12-14 is cited as a direct analogy to our present passage. This is added to the gloomy prophecy, 17 1-11, coming out of the Syro-Ephraimitic period, in precisely the same way as 8 9-10 is added to 8 5-8. Another strikingly similar prophecy is 14 24-27. This theory of a revision of Isaiah's prophecies by the prophet himself was advanced by Sørensen in 1885 in his little monograph, *Judah und die Assyrische Weltmacht*, the importance of which in the interpretation of Isaiah has been too often overlooked. Cheyne in his *Introduction*, (p. 88 ff.), followed Giesebrecht's application of this theory to 8 9-10, and again very distinctly associated the verses with 17 12-14 and 14 24-27.

with any consistency, as Giesebrecht tried to do in his *STK* article and in his *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, it results in attributing to Isaiah a method of revision as petty and artificial as could well be imagined.

2) If vs. 9-10 really are by Isaiah, it is much more likely that their present position is due to a reviser. The purpose of the revision cannot be questioned for a moment. The cancellation of the preceding threat in vs. 5-8a is too obvious not to be intended. But when once the hand of the reviser has been admitted, the next question which inevitably arises is whether vs. 9-10 are, after all, by Isaiah.

3) Stade seems to have been the first to call their genuineness in question, along with his attack upon 17 12-14, 14 24-27 and 29 7.⁶¹ All these passages belong to the so-called "many nations" passages. In their *motifs* they are very closely related to the Gog prophecies of Ezekiel. On the other hand, they are usually found in contexts in Isaiah which cast the gravest suspicion upon them. It would take us too far afield to attempt a detailed criticism of this group of prophecies. Suffice it to say that if the present text of vs. 9-10 is retained, I believe there is no help for it but to reject the verses as spurious. They certainly do not belong here, and when grouped with the other "many nations" passages they are found to be in a company of very doubtful literary reputation. The close connection in phraseology with 14 24-27 is particularly noticeable.⁶²

⁶¹ *ZATW*, 1883, pp. 1-16; 1884, p. 260, n. 1. He has been followed by Hackmann (p. 69, n. 3f.), Marti (with inclusion of v. 8b), Porter (*JBL*, 1896, p. 31f.), and Gray.

⁶² I may add that the most fruitful method by which to arrive at a probable conclusion concerning this group of prophecies is first, to study them in their contexts (which has often been done) and then, to examine the Ariel prophecy (29 1-8). The secondary nature of vs. 5-8 can in my opinion be established without question (See: *Viewpoints*, p. 58, n. 125f.). From this vantage-point the criticism of the related prophecies becomes much simplified. It is most interesting to observe what concessions to Stade Duhm makes in the third edition of his commentary as compared with the first, with regard to the "many nations" passages. It is also a great pleasure to see that Professor Budde rejects 8 5-10 and apparently along with them the related passages

4) Professor Porter suggests a very interesting variant upon the usual critical treatments of vs. 8b-10. He rejects vs. 9-10 with Stade, but holds to v. 8b, *including Immanuel*, in the sense of a threat. Immanuel is taken in the sense assigned to it by Professor Porter at 7 14 as expressing the false confidence of Ahaz.⁶³ A reviser mistook the real force of Immanuel in this connection, supposed it had Messianic significance, and accordingly appended vs. 9-10. This is perhaps the simplest method of solving the difficulties at vs. 8b-10 and, as I share Professor Porter's views of Immanuel at 7 14, would fit very well into my own speculations. Yet the fragmentary character of v. 8b, the impression one gets from the occurrence of the name Immanuel that it is really to be taken with what follows and that the figure in v. 8b is, therefore, a figure of a protecting bird rather than a bird of prey strongly incline me to another theory which is undoubtedly far more complicated, but has, as it seems to me, certain distinct advantages.

5) Porter's theory suggests that the clue to the explanation of the passage is to be found in the proper interpretation of Immanuel at 7 14. Popper also seeks the explanation of the passage in its association with 7 14, but along an absolutely different line. He holds that vs. 9-10 together with Immanuel in v. 8b, treated as a phrase, originally stood after 7 10-14, 16 and are the formal interpretation of the name Immanuel. This means that Immanuel at 7 14 must be taken in a good sense; and that the prophecy as a whole is one of happy omen (7 17 is significantly detached from it!). Until I am persuaded that Professor Porter's and my views of the real significance of 7 10-17 are incorrect in their main contentions, I feel that Popper's theory, ingenious and attractive though it is, cannot be accepted.

6) If we review what we have been able to pick up on our rather toilsome journey through the difficult territory of 8 5-10,

(ZATW, 1923, p. 171). This concession is all the more welcome in view of the fact that in his very valuable review of my *Viewpoints* he disagrees with some of the most fundamental positions which I seek to defend.

⁶³ *JBL*, 1896, pp. 19-36. This view of Immanuel was defended at length in my article, *Immanuel*.

we find ourselves in possession of the following facts: a) The fact of revision in vs. 5-8a; b) the fact that, though this revision probably began in an antiquarian interest, it ended in a dogmatic one, namely in a shift of the responsibility for the invasion of Judah from the shoulders of Judah to the shoulders of Israel; it was the sin of Israel that merited the Assyrian scourge; c) the fact that vs. 9-10 are in fundamental contradiction with the preceding threats in vs. 5-8a; d) the fact that this contradiction cannot be harmonized by means of v. 8b in any satisfactory way; e) the fact that v. 8b is itself fragmentary and is more probably to be taken with vs. 9-10 than with vs. 5-8a. f) From these facts the conclusion was drawn that vs. 8b-10 also owe their present position to a reviser. We are now able to appreciate the relationship of the reviser's work at vs. 8b-10 to the revised text of vs. 5-8a. By the addition of vs. 8b-10 the subtle suggestion made in the emended text of vs. 5-8a is carried out still further. We have seen that while 'this people' originally referred to Judah, through the addition of v. 8b and 'upon them' in v. 7a, its identification with Israel was made possible. It is because of Israel's sins, not Judah's, that the Assyrian flood pours over them. That being the case, Judah cannot be finally submerged. Israel shall perish but Judah is Immanuel's land. The desecration of Immanuel's land, unmerited by Judah, calls forth the challenge, enlarged to a world-wide challenge, in vs. 9-10. The theory of the passage which sees in the apostrophe to Immanuel a cause for the revulsion of feeling in vs. 9-10 is *justified by the present text, and at the same time it is clear that the present text means to identify Immanuel with the Messiah*. But this cannot be the original meaning of the passage. The fact of revision in vs. 5-8a is too certain. And the fact that, by the addition of vs. 8b-10, the intent of the revision in vs. 5-8a is carried out still more completely proves that the whole passage has been revised in a thoroughly eschatological interest; Israel shall perish, but Judah, the Messiah's land, can never be finally destroyed.⁶⁴ It

⁶⁴ Many years ago, before I became acquainted with Jerome's identification of 'this people' with Israel, I adopted the view of the sequence of thought in vs. 5-10 suggested above, and I still believe that

is astonishing how scholars have failed to recognize the plain intent of the passage. It can only be accounted for by the fact that the identification of 'this people' with Judah has become (quite rightly) so assured a promise that it has blinded the eye to the actual suggestions of the present text. But when once the intention of the present text is realized, and at the same time the impossibility of its representing the original meaning of Isaiah is seen, the conclusion inevitably follows that the passage must be drastically criticised. I repeat what was said in the beginning: Either the text must be received as it stands, in which case the logic of it must be allowed to operate more freely than is usually done; or it must be regarded as revised, in which case the logic of the revision must be more frankly faced than is usually done. The entire essay has been an attempt to prove the thoroughgoing character of the revision and the motive which led to it. *If this is once admitted, then, conversely, everything in the present text which seeks to identify 'this people' with Israel and Judah with Immanuel's land, must be eliminated as secondary if we are to understand what Isaiah originally meant to say. Compromise measures will not avail.* V. 8b, 'upon them' in v. 7a, Immanuel in v. 8b, 'all ye far corners of the earth' in v. 9a, and the present position of vs. 8b-10 are all due to redaction.

7) But there is one last question which calls for an answer. If vs. 8b-10 did not originally belong here, what was their provenance? Were they written by the reviser *ad hoc*? In view of his observed methods in vs. 5-8a, and in view of the fragmentary character of v. 8b, this is not probable. In the present form of their text vs. 8b-10 have the closest affinity both in style and thought with the 'many nations' passages, especially 17 12-14 and 14 24-27. On the other hand, through Immanuel they also have some sort of direct connection, either originally or through revision, with 7 14. We have seen how some scholars hold that vs. 8b-10 reflect the later eschatology

this is the view which the present form of the text is intended to suggest. Just recently I lighted upon Diestel's note in Knobel on v. 8b to the following effect: "Judah falls into the greatest danger, but God is with him and does not permit him to sink *though Ephraim perishes.*"

and, in their present form, I believe this to be the case. But is there some old *logion* of Isaiah at the base of them? I incline to think there is. Here it is necessary to consider the relationship of vs. 8b-10 to the one passage not yet considered, namely 7 2-9, especially to vs. 5 and 7. The relationship in phraseology and thought to these verses is as close as it is to 14 24-27. It was this close affinity which seems to have led the older interpreters to find in 8 9-10 a challenge to Syria and Israel. I do not believe they were altogether misled by this affinity. But the present text of vs. 9-10 cannot be restricted to a challenge to these two nations. But is the present text sound? The defect in the parallelism has already been noted. How may it be best remedied? I suggest that 'all the far corners of the earth' is an intrusion,⁸⁵ and that one of the two duplicate clauses in v. 9b should also be deleted.⁸⁶ V. 9 would thus be reduced to two lines corresponding to v. 10, and the passage would read as follows:

And the expanse of His wings
 Shall fill the breadth of thy land.⁸⁷
 Rage ye peoples and be broken,
 Gird yourselves and be broken;
 Take counsel and it shall be destroyed,
 Propose a plan and it shall not stand;
 For God is with us.

This gives an excellently constructed metrical text and one entirely consonant with 7 1-9, though in glaring disagreement with the present position of the poem. I therefore venture to suggest that vs. 8b-10 in this more original form are the fragment of an oracle which was originally spoken at the same time as 7 4-9, quite possibly just after this prophecy, as a gap has often been felt to exist between v. 9 and vs. 10ff. The passage would express the prophet's faith in the country's deliverance from Israel and Damascus and would be an appropriate

⁸⁵ So Staerk. See above, n. 49.

⁸⁶ So Meinhold. See above, n. 49.

⁸⁷ A fragmentary couplet expressing encouragement (a protecting bird). For the omission of Immanuel, see below.

encouragement to Ahaz before the king's refusal. But if vs. 8b-10 are transferred to the position suggested, it is clear that an apostrophe to Immanuel is out of the question, for the Immanuel prophecy with its reference to a boy who was to bear this name had not yet been delivered. Immanuel cannot, therefore, have been used as a personal name if the passage is transferred to the proposed new position. On the other hand, as a phrase it is redundant; the phrase at the end of v. 10 is quite sufficient. That view still remains the most probable one which holds that Immanuel, treated as a name, in accordance with the almost certain intention of the present text at v. 8b, belongs, together with the phrase 'all ye far corners of the earth', to the revision, and came into the text when vs. 8b-10 were transferred to their present position. The editor noted the phrase at v. 10 (standing originally before 7 10ff) and the name at 7 14, which he understood Messianically. He combined phrase and name together in the present text of vs. 8b-10, and by joining these verses with the present revised form of vs. 5-8a he produced the results recorded above. One interesting circumstance aided him in this process of revision. If Immanuel is not original in v. 8b, we have seen that the suffix in 'thy land' is left undefined. Yet it is vouched for by the textual testimony. If vs. 8b-10 are transferred to the neighborhood of 7 1-9, there can be no real doubt who was the person addressed. It was Ahaz. But vs. 8b-10 were fragmentary. The reviser took advantage of this to identify the person addressed with the Immanuel of 7 14.

The advantages of this theory, complicated though it is, are considerable. a) An historically satisfactory identification of the person addressed in 'thy land' is now secured. It is Ahaz. b) In the position assigned to these verses before 7 10ff they prepare the way for the Immanuel prophecy at 7 14. The phrase at the end of 8 10 suggested to Isaiah the name at 7 14. But the prophet gave it a new meaning in the second oracle. What was originally said by way of encouragement now becomes a guarantee of doom. The irony which I believe is found in the name Immanuel as used at 7 14 becomes all the more biting if the name is a play upon the phrase, 'for

God is with us', used originally in a good sense. c) The combination, in the present text of vs. 8b-10, of the phrase at v. 10 (in its original position preceding 7 10) and the name itself at 7 14 is just the kind of a combination which we might expect a reviser to make. d) Finally, the question may be raised whether the challenge to Israel and Damascus in the original form of vs. 8b-10 was not the starting-point for such a prophecy as 14 24-27. Just as one later reviser made it the basis for an enlarged challenge in the present form of 8 9-10, and thus adapted it to the later eschatological views, so the author of 14 24-27 seems to have manipulated it in the same way. *The vigorous language in which Isaiah once challenged Syria and Israel furnished a kind of paradigm for the later eschatology.*⁸⁸

I am fully aware that the above suggestions are purely speculative. Yet I would remind any who may object to them on that score that no solution of the passage thus far offered is free from speculation. In the nature of the case only relative probability can be attained. But whether my own very tentative explanation of the original position and significance of vs. 8b-10 is adopted or not, I think it may be maintained with reasonable confidence that 8 5-10 is a classic example of a drastically revised passage, and that any one who would venture to argue from the probable meaning of Immanuel in v. 8b to the meaning of Immanuel in 7 14 may be likened unto the man who builds his house upon the sand. The flood at v. 5-8a will as effectually destroy his argument as the rains and the floods destroy the house in the parable.

⁸⁸ This is the element of truth in Duhm's position. He sees in vs. 9-10 the germs of the later eschatology. But because he holds to the present form of the passage, he makes Isaiah the creator of this eschatology.