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Abstract

This thesis examines, from a canonical perspective, the thematic relationship between the three royal oracles in Isaiah 1-39 (7:14; 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9) and the four Servant Songs in Isaiah 40-55 (42:1-9; 48:16-49:12; 50:2-51:16; 52:13-53:12), in search of the holistic intention of the book of Isaiah. Many scholars have argued that under new historical situations and authorial intentions, the royal hopes in Isaiah 1-39 are transformed into expectation for the Servant from Isaiah 40 onward. However, these views are problematic in that they rely solely on assumptions as to the historical intentionality of the prophets. Therefore, paying attention to the overall intentions of the book as a whole, the present study argues that both the royal oracles and the Servant texts remain significant in the eschatological realm, complementing each other to generate the unique messianic expectation of the book as a whole.
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INTRODUCTION

The book of Isaiah (hereafter Isaiah to distinguish from the prophet) has inspired many throughout the centuries. Early Christians were especially convinced that the gospel of Jesus Christ was revealed throughout this book. However, this Christian conviction has been questioned after the establishment of the historical-critical guild in Old Testament studies. With an emphasis on philological and ‘scientific’ methodologies, historical-critical scholars aimed to obtain a single, concrete historical reality behind a specific biblical text as the ultimate goal of their exegesis. As a result, they tended to ignore or deny traditional interpretations of Scripture. In particular, this methodology eventually displaced the phenomenon of prophecy from both the final presentation of the prophetic books and other scriptural writings in the Old Testament. Here the main concern became the prophets’ authorial intentions, since the “pure” messages of the prophets were frequently believed to be paramount to the Israelite religion.

In response to the extreme privilege granted to prophecy, Gerhard von Rad, in his Old Testament Theology, attempted to maintain a more balanced view, interpreting the Prophets in relation to the Law. Nevertheless, even von Rad took isolated (i.e. non-canonical) studies of individual prophecies for granted; he sought a way to uphold the connections between the Law and the Prophets in his concept of “tradition,” something that lies behind the texts, rather than in the canonical texts themselves. Eventually, von Rad’s “tradition history” approach also faded as subsequent studies vigorously continued to pursue the “historical” prophets. Consequently, perspectives on the “holistic” message of the prophets began to be overshadowed by numerous theories about individual prophets’ authorial intentions, even though these two do not necessarily contradict each other, as we shall discuss below.

---

1 B. S. Childs, The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).
3 C. R. Seitz, Prophecy and Hermeneutics: Toward a New Introduction to the Prophets (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 75-92, esp. 81-82.
5 “Holistic,” in respect of Isaiah, concerned with the totality of its content and the significance of its sixty-six chapter presentation as a whole.
With this trend of focusing on authorial intention, many scholars, following Bernhard Duhm, began adopting a “tripartite” reading of Isaiah, which soon became normative in Isaian studies. According to Duhm, the book’s parts had different authors with particular intentions. Thus, unlike Jewish and Christian tradition, which viewed Isaiah as a unified testimony, this modern historical approach stressed thematic differences between various parts of the book. Here, the primary intention of study was to ascertain the causes of those differences, investigating the intentions of each prophet in the three divisions of the historical document now called Isaiah.

However, recently, a number of scholars have found this ‘independent reading’ of Isaiah inadequate and have attempted to retrieve a unified message of Isaiah through the use of various methods (e.g., canonical, synchronic, redactional, and synchronic-diachronic approaches). Their works have highlighted several recurring themes in Isaiah, such as “Zion,” the pairing of “righteousness” with “justice,” and Israel’s “blindness” and “deafness.” These studies have helped readers of Isaiah to perceive, without neglecting the historical aspects of the text, harmonious continuity between the message intended by Isaiah the prophet and the one revealed through Isaiah as a whole.

However, a serious challenge remains for those who seek to recover the holistic view of Isaiah’s message, since what the advocates of the tripartite reading emphasised so strongly—the apparent shifts in themes—seem to be still unresolved. In particular, the thematic change from the royal oracles in Isaiah 1-39 to the diverse themes revolving around the Servant of the Lord

---

6 B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaja übersetzt und erklärt (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901).
11 U. Berges, Das Buch Jesaja: Komposition und Endgestalt, HBS 16 (Freiburg: Herder, 1998). Although Berges’ term ‘diachron reflektierte Synchronie’ (533) is an ambitious attempt, his synchronic analysis seems to involve too precise a historical contextualisation of the text.
12 Seitz, Zion’s Final Destiny; Berges, Das Buch Jesaja.
in Isaiah 40-66 demands further explanation. In order to account for the shift in royal promises, which are prominent in Isaiah 1-39 (Isa. 7:14; 8:23-9:7; 11:1-5; 16:5; 32:1-8),\(^{15}\) and then suddenly absent after chap. 40, a common approach is to impute this difference to the varying historical backgrounds and authorial intentions of the texts.

This methodology considers the royal promises in Isaiah 1-39, which presumably originated from the time of the Davidic kingdom, to have been modified or transformed under the new historical circumstances of Isaiah 40-55, namely, the Babylonian exile.\(^{16}\) Therefore, although the theme of royal promise does not appear in the later chapters, some argue that its basic principles or functions continue even after chapter 40, but guised in a different form, such as the Servant, Israel, or the nations.

A prominent example of this view is found in H.G.M. Williamson’s work, which proposes that the royal promises originally prophesied by the prophet Isaiah, such as 11:1-5 (and perhaps also 32:1-5 and 9:1-7),\(^{17}\) were reinterpreted and transformed in the process of the book’s formation. Thus, they exist as variations of Isaiah’s vision of Davidic kingship.\(^{18}\) Based on this historical-critical assumption, Williamson argues that, in Isaiah 40-55, Isaiah’s vision of kingship was conceptualised as a set of principles or functions, which was then applied to certain individual or groups, such as the Servant, Israel, or the nations.\(^{19}\) The modified version of Isaiah’s royal oracle in Isaiah 40-55 was then further developed, resulting in both the Servant-like figure of Isaiah 61:1-11 and the servants of the Lord sharing the governing function envisioned in the original oracle.\(^{20}\) Williamson does not seem interested in the precise identity of each salvific

---


\(^{18}\) Ibid., 206-207 et passim.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 113-166.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 167-202.
figure; rather, he focusses particular attention on the roles and functions which the figures assume.21

Although Williamson’s approach is insightful, two points appear problematic. Firstly, Williamson seems to explain everything by historical causality; according to his historical analysis, only “the role”22 which the rulers of Israel in the pre-exilic period performed continued after exile. However, this conclusion fails to account for the persistent “messianic”23 idea found in post-exilic writings such as Haggai (2:23) and Zechariah (4:1-14; 9:9-10; cf. 12:7-13:1).24 Also, this line of argument in effect forces the readers of Isaiah always to be cognisant of the “evolution” of the royal oracle theme, an idea completely foreign to the book itself.25

Secondly, Williamson does not pay much attention to the literary context in which the “variations” of Isaiah’s royal oracles are now located in the final form of Isaiah. For example, Williamson overlooks that Isaiah 11:1-5 is followed by an eschatological cosmic vision (11:6-9) and by the image of the second Exodus in the coming age (11:10-16), both of which are prominent themes in chaps. 40-66. Thus, in the light of the overall literary form of Isaiah, one should examine the significance of the fact that the royal expectations of chaps.1-39 are now combined with diverse themes including Creation and Exodus.

In contrast to Williamson’s redactional approach, Antti Laato’s work provides a fresh view on the royal promises and their relationships to Isaiah 40-66. Unlike Williamson, Laato attempts to read Isaiah “synchronically” (what he calls an “ideological” reading).26 Therefore, he emphasises the connection between the messianic hope and the second Exodus in Isaiah 11 and writes that “Isa. 11:10-12:6 continues the messianic passage in 11:1-9; in the light of other Old Testament texts this combination of the advent of the Messiah with the new exodus is intentional.”27

---

21 Ibid., 206.
22 Ibid., 206.
23 I use this term to refer not to any strict, historical-critical definition but to describe a general idea of a royal salvific figure.
26 Laato, “*About Zion I Will not Be Silent,*” 6-12.
27 Ibid., 131-132.
Moreover, Laato argues that this striking conjunction of the messianic vision and the new Exodus continues even after Isaiah 40:

The expectation of the advent of the Messiah following the new exodus receives special treatment in Isaiah 40-55. Since the historical situation behind Isaiah 40-55 did not correspond to the expectations in Isaiah 11-12 the messiah of Isaiah 11 was dismantled and his function was transferred, on the one hand, to the Persian king, Cyrus, and, on the other, to the loyal servant Israel.\(^{28}\)

While this analysis is intriguing, the very same criticism already levelled against Williamson’s position also applies to Laato’s view. Laato also holds an evolutional view, claiming that the function of Messiah was dismantled, and then forged anew into the image of Cyrus and the Servant. This is an idea which is foreign to Isaiah’s vision.

Others, such as Willem A. M. Beuken and Klaus Baltzer, similarly interpret the meaning of the relationship between the royal oracles in Isaiah 1-39 and the new themes such as the Servant in chaps. 40-66. According to these scholars, the royal promises in Isaiah 1-39 were invalidated or transformed into different forms of expectations after chap. 40 due to the new historical situation behind Isaiah 40-66.\(^{29}\) They emphasise the historical background and authorial intentions in each of the book’s divisions, but one should perhaps begin by asking whether or not the Babylonian exile of chaps. 40-66 is an indispensable hermeneutical element in Isaiah.

According to Brevard S. Childs and Christopher R. Seitz, the historical background of chaps. 40-66 should not be overemphasised. Rather, the “theological” message of those chapters and its relationship to other parts of Isaiah deserves greater attention. Through this process, one should pursue the intention of Isaiah as a whole.\(^{30}\) This approach does not overlook or negate the various intentions of the prophecies’ original authors, but it does perceive the authorial intention as being reflected in the final form of Isaiah.\(^{31}\) In this light, then, without denying the post-exilic origin of the book’s final form, a different explanation for the relationship between the royal hopes in chaps. 1-39 and the various themes related to the Servant in chaps. 40-66 becomes

\(^{28}\) Ibid., 132.


possible. We may seek to discover how the important themes in each major part of *Isaiah* (chaps. 1-39 and 40-66) are related to each other, and contribute to its unified vision in the context of the book’s final form.

This viewpoint is partially present in Randall Heskett’s rigorous and unique study of the messianic themes in *Isaiah*. In his thorough examination of the messianic texts of *Isaiah*, including the royal oracles (7:14; 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9) and the text of the Suffering Servant (52:13-13:12), Heskett attempts to uncover how the originally non-messianic texts obtained a messianic perspective by means of later editorial activities. Heskett’s study seems to imply that each messianic text in *Isaiah* interacts with the others, engendering the overall messianic vision. However, Heskett himself does not explicate the precise relationship between these various visions.

As has been discussed thus far, the challenge of listening to the holistic message of *Isaiah* is still ongoing, especially in regard to how we may explain the relationships between different themes in the book. Therefore, to join in this endeavour, the present study aims to examine the relationship between two major themes in *Isaiah*, i.e. the royal oracles in Isaiah 1-39 and the mission of the Servant in Isaiah 40-66, in the context of the final form of the book. I will argue that the main subject of Isaiah 40-66, the mission of the Servant, is not a revision of the Davidic hope in Isaiah 1-39, but is a unique promise of God. Nevertheless, this theme is complementary to the vision presented in the first part of *Isaiah*; it awaits, together with the royal expectation, its eschatological fulfillment.

More precisely, my contention is that chaps. 1-39 and 40-66, which await the coming of the new David and the new Moses respectively, interact with each other, producing a unified “messianic expectation” in *Isaiah*. Indeed, that chaps. 1-39 hold the hope for the new David and chaps. 40-66 anticipate the coming of the new Moses have already been pointed out by some previous scholars, notably George W. Coats. However, Coats did not speak of these two hopes interacting. Thus, the present study aims to build on Coats’ foundations in order to explore the unified messianic vision in *Isaiah*.

---

In order to demonstrate my thesis, I employ the “canonical” method of interpretation. By “canonical,” I refer to a hermeneutical attitude which appreciates the final form of the Old Testament writings and the history as it is presented in these writings. In this approach, both the human authorial intentions and the intentions residing in the scriptural canon are regarded seriously, as the final form of the canon inherits and manifests both aspects. Therefore, the canonical interpretation seeks the “intention” of the Old Testament by appreciating the “inspiration” of both the original human authors and the fixed, final text.

In addition, a canonical approach aims to describe the process of the transmission of God’s Word from human authors to the final form of the text. However, the present study will not occupy itself with a precise diachronic delineation of this process, since the canonically-presented history takes precedent over any historical hypothesis. Rather, the main task of

---


35 This canonically presented history displays a figural nature, revealing the textual configuration in Scripture. To explain this “figural” textual association in Scripture, Erich Auerbach’s definition of “figural interpretation” is helpful: “Figural interpretation establishes a connection between two events or persons in such a way that the first signifies not only itself but also the second, while the second involves or fulfills the first. The two poles of a figure are separated in time, but both, being real events or persons, are within temporality. They are both contained in the flowing stream which is historical life, and only the comprehension, the intellectus spiritualis, of their interdependence is a spiritual act” (E. Auerbach, Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature, trans. by Willard R. Trask [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953], 73, quoted and modified in light of the original German texts by J.D. Dawson, Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002], 147-148). This is usually described by the term “typology,” which is distinguished from “allegory,” as the latter is considered to blur the historical reality of the biblical testimonies while the former retains the significance of history. So, for example, the merging of the two dispensations in the biblical testimony, such as the exodus from Egypt and the exodus from Babylon, is described by the term “typology,” whose emphasis on history is foreign to allegory. However, as some scholars have pointed out (e.g., F. Young, “Typology,” in Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder, ed. by Stanley E. Porter, et al. [Leiden: Brill, 1997], 33-34), the conventional distinction between typology and allegory is being found increasingly difficult to maintain. For this reason, the term “figural,” employed by both Auerbach and Seitz (C. R. Seitz, Prophecy and Hermeneutics, 8-9), conveniently captures the configurative character of the biblical text regardless of the subject of a scriptural text (historical, cosmological, biographical, etc.). Nevertheless, the word “typology” still seems to hold the potential for conveying the connotation that the scriptural events miraculously relate to one another to show God’s plan. There are various views on the nature of figuration/typology in Scripture. For instance, it can be explained via a literal-critical categorisation, as Auerbach and Northrop Frye have argued (N. Frye, The Great Code: The Bible and Literature [Toronto: Academic Press Canada, 1983]; see also Laato, “About Zion I Will not Be Silent,” 6-12). Others employ the popular biblical-theological concept ‘Heilsgeschichte’ (von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2 vols.) or stress an interpretative “technique” of the Israelites (Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985]). Although none of these views is without defect, they are still helpful in that they can uncover the intertextual configurations in Scripture. In sum, the present study focuses on the canonical presentation of Isaiah in order to uncover the figural/typological logic revealed in its message, yet without denying the book’s historical development.


37 Ibid., 80-81.

38 Ibid., 81.
canonical interpretation is to be attentive to the text’s final form, which bears the imprint of the entire process of the transmission of the Word. As a result, adopting the conventional separation between “diachronic” and “synchronic” dimensions of the biblical texts would be inappropriate for the present study, since this division fails to represent the complex relationship between the dynamism and the fixedness of God’s Word.

Bearing this complexity in mind, my argument will take three steps. Chapter one examines the hope for a Davidic king in Isaiah 1-39, focusing on the function of Hezekiah on the literary level. I will conclude here that Hezekiah functions as a token for the eschatological expectation for the new David. Chapter two highlights the significant connection between Moses and the Servant in Isaiah 40-66, concluding that, while the “historical” Servant likely is an anonymous prophet, the Servant Songs further anticipate the eschatological new Moses. Chapter three then argues that the Davidic hope and Mosaic expectations found in each major part of Isaiah are not contradictory or separate themes, but are complementary representations of Isaiah’s harmonious message. This will be demonstrated by discussing how Mosaic and Davidic elements converge in each major division of Isaiah. Consequently, Isaiah 1-39 and 40-66 can also be considered complementary, each contributing to the unified vision of Isaiah, namely, the hope for a messianic figure. Thus, the Davidic and Mosaic expectations are each uniquely significant but thoroughly interactive.

Let us briefly expound on the meaning of Mosaic elements/themes in Isaiah, as this issue is also important in acknowledging the complex relationship between the book’s diachronic and synchronic dimensions. The primary question is one of intentionality. To speak of ‘Mosaic elements’ in Isaiah, one might seek to determine whether the prophet(s) consciously utilised Exodus imagery in order to convey his (or their) message, or if later generations interpreted the prophetic words in ways that were not directly related to Exodus (i.e. in light of Exodus imagery which emerged after the prophet’s time). Stated differently, whose intention was it to evoke Exodus imagery, and how appropriate is it to “read in” Mosaic themes in Isaiah today?

According to most historical-critical approaches, the possibility is slight that the historical Isaiah himself intended to allude to the Exodus, since the Mosaic Law and the Exodus narratives are both believed to have emerged after the exile. Thus, recognising Exodus imagery in the

39 For one example of this view, see F. Crüsemann, “Der Pentateuch als Tora: Prolegomena zur Interpretation seiner Endgestalt,” EvT 49 (1989): 250-267.
language of *Isaiah* would be an imposition of a foreign idea onto its “original” message. In this diachronic reading, if any intertextuality between the Exodus and *Isaiah* were to be admitted, it would have to be considered an intentional addition through the process of canonisation by later generations who knew the Pentateuch. Through this paradigm, one can either focus on the diachronic dimension of the text and dismiss any reference to Exodus, or else emphasise the synchronic dimension in order to extract meaning from the intertextuality, but at the cost of neglecting the diachronic dimension.

However, the process of canonisation seems to involve more than just a simple compilation of written documents. In reality, the composition of the book of Exodus itself might have been influenced by the ministry of Isaiah the prophet. Isaiah’s words might have encouraged a deeper and richer understanding of the character of Moses and the event of Exodus, contributing to the development of the written Pentateuch, and thus strengthening the interconnections between the Law and the Prophet. A similar situation becomes apparent when discussing Pentateuchal themes in *Isaiah*. In the light of the highly complex development of the Old Testament canon and the mutual reciprocity of the texts, we see that a sharp and definite distinction between diachronic and synchronic approaches cannot be maintained as a helpful tool in Old Testament interpretation. Therefore, this canonical interpretation seeks to employ a more holistic approach, embracing both aspects of the texts by appreciating the final and canonised form of the scriptures. Accordingly, I will present the Mosaic elements in *Isaiah* (such as the concept of ‘torah’ and the Mosaic elements to the Davidic kings) as the products of the mutual interactions between the Law and the Prophets in the canonisation process.

---

40 Concerning the mutual interaction between the Law and the Prophets in the process of the canonisation, see S. B. Chapman, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation*, FAT-2 27 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

41 There are two major diachronic views concerning the meaning of torah in *Isaiah*. On the one hand, some scholars argue that “הָרָאוֹת” in Isa. 1-39 (such as Isa. 8:16, 20) simply means “instruction/prophetic teaching” (A. S. van der Woude, “Jesaja 8, 19-23a als Literarische Einheit,” in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: Festschrift Willem A. M. Beuken*, ed. by J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne, BETHL 132 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 134; J. Jensen, *The Use of Tora by Isaiah: His Debate with the Wisdom Tradition*, CBQMS 3 [Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1973]). Likewise, it is often argued that “הָרָאוֹת” in Isa. 40-55 (42:4; 21, 24; 51:4, 7) does not mean the Mosaic Torah but the prophetic or priestly instructions in general (C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL-LV* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964], 107-108, 118). On the other hand, others see the historical connection between “תּוֹרָה” in *Isaiah* and the Mosaic Torah. For instance, Sheppard writes, “[i]t is plausible that all the…later references to torah in Isaiah 1-39 may have had the Mosaic torah in mind originally (2:3; 8:20; 24:5), as do the references in 40-66 (42:4, 21, 24; 51:4, 7)” (G.T. Sheppard, “The Book of Isaiah: Competing Structures according to a Late Modern Description of Its Shape and Scope,” in *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. by E.H. Lovering Jr. [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992], 578). Likewise, Heskett holds a view that the references to “תּוֹרָה” in some texts in Isa. 1-39 (such as 8:20) had the Mosaic Torah in
The main texts for our examination are three royal oracles (7:14; 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9) in Isaiah 1-39 and the four “Servant Songs” (42:1-9; 48:16-49:12; 50:2-51:16; 52:13-53:12) in chaps. 40-66, although I will also incorporate other relevant texts both in and outside Isaiah (chiefly, Isa. 55:3-5; 65:25; Ps. 1; 2; 89; 90; and Zech. 6:9-15). These selected texts are appropriate to our purposes since the three royal oracles and the four Servant Songs are all closely juxtaposed within a narrow range (chaps. 1-12 and 40-55 respectively), in each major part of Isaiah (chaps. 1-39 and 40-66 respectively). This structure helps to frame the unified testimony among each group of texts in the context of the canonical form of Isaiah. Although there are other texts that are also relevant and important for our investigation (e.g., Isa. 4:2-6; 16:5; 19:20; 22:20-25; 32:1-8; 61:1-11), the extensive arguments required by those additional texts do not allow me to treat them in this relatively brief ThM thesis. However, I believe that my thesis can be demonstrated through the texts that I have selected, as this examination still covers a significant number and range of texts appropriate for our investigation.

mind (Heskett, Messiahism, 99). In my view, although both interpretations are not completely unacceptable, it is hard to explicate a single diachronic account of this issue in light of the mutual interactions between the Law and the Prophets in their process of canonisation.

Concerning the historical relationship between Moses and the Davidic kings, J. Nohrnberg, holds the view that the history of the Davidic kings engendered the image of Moses; thus, he believes that Moses “is…a projection of what Israel wished to see in itself” (J. Nohrnberg, Like Unto Moses: The Constituting of an Interruption [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995], 4). Contrary to this view, J. R. Porter contends that Moses in the biblical tradition is understood as the archetype of the Davidic kings (J. R. Porter, Moses and Monarchy: A Study in the Biblical Tradition of Moses [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963]). Thus, according to this view, the ideal image of the Davidic kings stems from Moses. In my view, both of these scholars seem to neglect the mutual interaction between the Law and the Prophets in the canonisation process and replace a historically complex canonisation process with a simple diachronic account.
Chapter 1
The Royal Oracles: Hope for the New David

1.1 Introduction

The royal oracles in the former part of Isaiah (i.e. Isa. 7:14; 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9; 16:5; and 32:1-8) are generally recognised as a significant part of Isaiah’s vision in Isaiah 1-39. Isaiah 7:14; 8:23-9:6; and 11:1-9, in particular, have been considered crucial by traditional interpreters, while historical-critical studies also acknowledge their importance. However, historical critics have raised unprecedented questions in regard to these oracles as they sought to examine each oracle’s specific historical setting and began to treat each oracle as an isolated entity.

Despite this tendency to atomise Isaiah’s vision, some also emphasise that these oracles, particularly Isaiah 7:14; 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9, are somehow related to each other, either historically or intertextually. Most commonly, for example, scholars argue that the later verses are the “rereading” or “relecture” of the earlier prophecies. For instance, pointing out that “to us” (9:5, לָחִי) is reminiscent of “God with us” (7:14, יְהֹוָה לְחֵן), J. Vermeylen argues that 8:23b-9:6 can be understood as a “rereading” of 7:14; other scholars, such as Ronald E. Clements and Wolfgang Werner, also employ the concept of ‘rereading’ or ‘relecture’ as they interpret the royal oracles in Isaiah.

To apply this hypothesis to our canonical reading, however, at least three of its aspects require careful assessment. First, while certain patterns of “rereading” can surely be observed on the textual level of the royal oracles, this does not automatically imply historical dependency.

---

43 In Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho, a lively first-century discussion on Isaiah’s messianic texts between Christians and Jews has been preserved. For more on the history of interpretation, see J. Manley, ed., Isaiah throughout the Ages (Menlo Park, CA: Monastery Books, 1995). Concerning the effort to study these royal oracles in Isaiah, see Heskett, Messianism.


45 R. E. Clements, “The Immanuel Prophecy of Isaiah 7:10-17 and its Messianic Interpretation,” in Old Testament Prophecy: From Oracles to Canon (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 65-77; Werner, Eschatologische Texte, 87-88. According to Werner, “relecture” is not nostalgia or mere repetition of the past but the faith to believe that the future event will surpass the past. In this regard, listening to the former writings (or scriptures) is considered significant (“Schriftgelehrsamkeit,” cf. Isa. 34:16).
Second, when focused too much and too narrowly on “rereading,” scholars tend to perceive only the historical evolution of “messianism” within Isaiah, overlooking the unified testimony of the Isaianic expectation for the future ruler; thus, the scholars mentioned above seem to take less interest in the holistic vision of Isaiah. Third, the concept of “rereading” seems to have only a limited capacity to capture and reflect the broader intertextuality in Isaiah.

Bearing these problems in mind, the concept of ‘rereading/relecture’ itself is helpful in highlighting the intertextual associations among the royal oracles in the present form of Isaiah. Therefore, applying this concept with care, the present chapter examines the canonical presentation of the royal oracles, particularly Isaiah 7:14; 8:23-9:6; and 11:1-9. The bulk of this section will consist of discussion on major challenges raised by former exegetes of the royal oracles, aiming to discover ways to read these oracles as unified testimony. In this process, I will underscore the importance of Hezekiah in the configuration of Isaiah’s canonical vision. My conclusion will be that, on the literal level of Isaiah, Hezekiah’s presence signals God’s promise of Isaiah 7:14 (“God with us”), foreshadowing the eschatological Davidic king in the coming age.

1.2 Hezekiah and his Function as Indicating an Eschatological Davidic Figure in theCanonical Form of Isaiah

1.2.1 Messianic Expectation and its Nature

In order to discern a continuous theme in the royal promises, we shall first examine the nature of the messianic expectation which they envision. Do the royal promises refer to some earthly hope, or do they point to an eschatological expectation? This question is more complicated than it may seem. In addition to the difficulty caused by a lack of consensus in defining terms such as ‘messianic’ and ‘eschatology,’ what makes an easy answer impossible is the mutuality which exists between “earthly” and “eschatological” hope.

However, from a historical-critical perspective, which aims to determine the original meaning of the royal oracles, scholars engage this challenge in basically two ways: either by emphasising the “eschatological” aspect of the messianic hope, or by emphasising its “earthly” aspect. Starting from this framework, the tendency of the first approach is to consider the oracles as

---

46 I define “eschatological” as roughly describing the spirit of a newer age, which differs from the previous age.
post-exilic products, while the latter is inclined to date the oracles as pre-exilic. In either case, the assumption is that “eschatological messianism” is a post-exilic production.

The messianic figure expected in the Old Testament is often thought to assume three roles: 1) the (Davidic) king; 2) the one who brings salvation; 3) the one whose coming is a sign of the “eschaton.”47 However a figure, who satisfies all the qualifications above, later frequently understood as “Messiah/The Anointed One” (מֶשָּׁא), cannot be found in the Old Testament. Therefore, it is widely assumed that the dawn of so-called “messianism,” with its “eschatological”48 scope, could only emerge after the exile, culminating in later Jewish and early Christian writings.49

Those holding to this assumption argue that the concept of “messianism” itself is ambiguous in the Old Testament, and criticise any “anachronistic” reading which projects a New Testament/Christian ideology back into the Old.50 Thus, from their perspective, there is no “pre-exilic Messiah/ messianic expectation” unless it refers to a realistic, historically grounded expectation for the Israelite monarchy.51

Therefore, the advocates of both pre- and postexilic views of the oracles’ origins deny the presence of a full-blown eschatological “messianism” in the Old Testament. Accordingly, those who hold to the pre-exilic origin do not perceive an “eschatological” nature in the awaited salvific figure(s). Instead, they either attribute the seemingly unfitting “eschatological/utopian”

48 Only a few scholars apply the Greek concept “eschaton” to the Old Testament “eschatology” (e.g., O. Plöger, Theokratie und Eschatologie [Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1962]). Most now agree that the clear distinction between the old age and the new age is a Hellenistic conception of post-Old Testament period; the existence of an well-developed “eschatological” conception in the pre-exilic period is rejected by the majority of scholars. However, many still agree that the beginnings of what later became a full-blown “eschatology” began in the Old Testament period, particularly in the exilic/post-exilic period (J. Lindblom, “Gibt es eine Eschatologie bei den alttestamentliche Propheten?” STh 6 [1972]: 79-114; G. Fohrer, “Die Structure der alttestamentliche Eschatologie,” ThLZ 85 [1960]: 401-420). See R. Smend, “Eschatologie II. Altes Testament,” TRE 10, ed. by Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982), 256-264.
50 Strauss, “Messias/Messianische Bewegungen I.,” 617-621.
51 For example, Hugo Gressmann writes: “Messias ist nur die monarchische Zuspitzung der Eschatologie; streicht man ihn aus der Verkündigung der älteren Propheten, so ist die notwendig Konsequenz, die Heilserwartungen überhaupt aus ihren Schriften auszumerzen” (H. Gressmann, Der Messias, FRLANT 43 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929], 280, quoted by Strauss, “Messias/Messianische Bewegungen I.,” 618).
part to the royal hopes of later editor(s)/author(s), or they simply do not recognise any “eschatological” element in Isaiah’s royal oracles at all.\textsuperscript{52}

Recently, however, scholars are beginning to rediscover the post-exilic character of some, if not all, of Isaiah’s royal oracles.\textsuperscript{53} Thus, Shemaryahu Talmon, for example, emphasises the conceptual progress within the Isaianic royal oracles from the pre-exilic ‘realistic hope’ to the post-exilic idealised vision:

It could be said that the structurally not directly connected but nevertheless consecutive three Isaiah oracles reflect in their juxtaposition the posited three stages in the development of the biblical [messianic] theme: historicity (Isa 7:14-16); ideation (Isa 9:5-6); idealization (Isa 11:1-10). That progressive dehistorization of the [messianic] notion appears in the oracles of the postexilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah concerning Zerubbabel, the last anointed of the Davidic line in the biblical era.\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{52} For example, Hans-Jürgen Hermisson sharply distinguishes Isaiah’s future expectation from an unrealistic/utopian view, since it takes the form of the criticism against the current corrupt condition, which should be transformed in the future (H.-J. Hermisson, “Zukunftserwartung und Gegenwartskritik in der Verkündigung Jesajas,” \textit{EvT} 33 [1973]: 72-76). The prophetic future expectation, Hermisson argues, is rooted in reality, not in the heavenly realm: “nicht im Himmel, sondern auf der Erde soll das kommende Reich Wirklichkeit werden” (73). Hermisson’s view implies that in the writings of the prophet Isaiah himself, there is no such thing as an “eschatological hope” which is detached from historical reality. Therefore, Hermisson separates the royal promise in Isa. 11:1-5 from the eschatological vision in Isa. 11:6-8 (9), ascribing the former to Isaiah himself and the latter to the later author(s) (59-60). Likewise, commenting on Isaiah’s concept of history, Hans Wildberger, who recognises the authorship of Isaiah in most of the prophecies of Isa. 1-39, including the royal promises, demonstrates that the “eschatological” phrases such as “on the latter days” and “on that day” do not necessarily indicate the existence of “eschatology”; rather, they simply mean “in the future” (H. Wildberger, “Jesajas Verständnis der Geschichte,” \textit{VTSup} 9 [Leiden: Brill, 1963], 89-117). According to Wildberger, Isaiah did not speak of the hope for a distanced future or the end of history; thus, there is no dichotomy or contrast between present and future (114). In stating this, Wildberger criticises von Rad’s typological reading of Isa. 11:1 (the expectation for the new David as the David \textit{redivivus}; see von Rad, \textit{Old Testament Theology II}, 170-171), which finds some “eschatological” significance in the text (“The prophetic teaching is… eschatological when the prophets expelled Israel from the safety of the old saving actions and suddenly shifted the basis of salvation to a future action of God” [von Rad, \textit{Old Testament Theology II}, 118]). According to Wildberger, this simply means that, \textit{in the near future}, a new ruler not of the linage of David’s house will emerge (Wildberger, “Jesajas Verständnis,” 114, n2). Wildberger concludes his analysis: “Jesajas Botschaft ist aber auf keinen Fall in dem Sinn eschatologisch, dass es ihm ein letztes Anliegen wäre, eine bestimmte Reihenfolge der zukünftigen Ereignisse aufzuziegen oder ein Gemälde zu malen von dem, was sein wird” (116). Although Wildberger nuances his criticism against von Rad in his later commentary, he is still convinced that Isa. 11:1-9 is not about the “eschatological” age sharply distinguished from present but rather speaks of “a future within this present era [, in which Isaiah lives]” (H. Wildberger, \textit{Isaiah 1-12}: A Commentary, trans. by Thomas H. Trapp [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991], 483).
\end{itemize}
Likewise, Clements, though not acknowledging the original messianic character of Isaiah 7:14, also sees a similar conceptual development in the Isaianic royal oracles (Isa. 9:1-6 = the accession oracle of either Hezekiah or Josiah; 11:1-9 = post-exilic expectations for the “idealised/eschatological” king). Otto Kaiser takes a step further and states that all royal oracles in Isaiah presuppose a post-exilic historical situation; thus, they all hold some “eschatological” character generated from the post-exilic period.

However, even this widely held assumption does not meet with universal assent. While post-exilic expectations are usually considered “eschatological,” some scholars argue for the “earthly” aspect of both exilic and post-exilic messianic expectations. For instance, J. J. M. Roberts contends that the exilic and even post-exilic messianic texts still hold out hope for the succession of the Davidic lineage, a vision anchored in historical and tangible reality:

Old Testament expectations of a new David are probably to be understood in terms of a continuing Davidic line. There is little indication that any of these prophets envisioned a final Davidic ruler who would actually rule for all time to come, thus obviating the need for the continuation of the dynastic line. The language of some of the prophecies is open to that interpretation, and such a reading was eventually given to them, but such passages as Jer 33:14-26 and Ezekiel 40-48 indicate that the dominant understanding was the “idealised” or “eschatological” understanding of such promises as late as the exilic period, and the repeated references to the [יו אֶֹבּ], “the house of David,” in Third Zechariah (Zech 12:7-12; 13:1) suggest that this interpretation remained dominant well into the postexilic period.

This view can be strengthened by Talmon’s observation. Although he recognises the trans-historical/utopian nature of later messianic expectation in Judaism, Talmon emphasises the historical “realism” inherent to the Jewish messianic concept in all ages:

The messianic era is not characterized by a total revamping of man’s nature and societal structures, nor of the constitution of the universe. Rather it is seen as a sublime re-enactment of the favorable conditions which obtained in the idealized period of the united monarchy under David and Solomon.

---

58 “The fundamental realism of biblical [messiah]-dom never ceased to inspire Jewish messianism also in the post-70 era” (Talmon, “The Concepts of Māšīaḥ,” 115).
In a similar vein, David G. Firth contends that a “crucial element in the messianic understanding of the prophets focused on the continuation of the reign of David, and in particular on a representative of David’s family who would provide a reign consistent with Yahweh’s promise to David.”⁶⁰ Thus, he surmises that even the texts presumably generated in the Persian era hold realistic expectations for the continuation of Davidic kingship.⁶¹

So far, therefore, historical-critical readings of the royal promises seem to display two tendencies: 1) emphasising the earthliness of the hope expressed by the royal promises, and thus tending to argue for a pre-exilic origin of these promises; 2) stressing other “eschatological” features of the royal promises, and thus supposing a post-exilic origin for these oracles. Both currents of thought are based on the assumption that the idea of “eschatological” expectation emerged during the post-exilic period. However, there are voices that challenge this generally accepted dichotomy and claim that the hope for an earthly ruler is strongly present even after the exile. This view, it should be noted, complicates the task of dating the Isaianic royal oracles, since, according to this assumption, the “earthly” character of the royal oracles no longer indicates their pre-exilic origin.

It is beyond the scope of the present study to further explore the problem of the dating of the Isaianic royal oracles, a task for which the arguments are extremely complex and little consensus seems to exist among scholars. However, the complex discussions in regard to dating raise a significant question for us: do “earthly” and “eschatological” hopes need to be perceived as two distinct expectations? Within the realm of historical criticism, whose focus is on the history behind the texts, thematic emphases (i.e. the eschatological/idealised king vs. the earthly ruler) are almost automatically connected to specific historical situations. In this process, the two kinds of expectation tend to be considered separately, though not completely divorced, since each idea presumably belongs to a different time period. Although some continuity between the two themes can be established by considering, as Talmon does, the idea of conceptual development from the pre to post-exilic period, the urge to favour one theme over the other seems inherent to this approach.

Therefore, although historical-critical readings of the royal oracles have rightly identified two distinct features of the royal promises, understanding the relationship between them remains an

---

⁶¹ Firth, “Messiah,” 541.
ongoing challenge. At this point, a canonical approach may provide a distinctive insight. From a canonical point of view, that the royal oracles in Isaiah hold the “eschatological” scope is undeniable, not only because of the “eschatological” nature of those oracles per se, but also because of Isaiah’s holistic message, which reveals God’s new dispensation sharply distinguished from the old age. This “eschatological” flavour in Isaiah is attested by several motifs, such as the theme of “the new things” (Isa. 40-55) and the creation of the new heavens and new earth (Isa. 65-66). 62

Isaiah as a whole may have developed its rich “eschatological” presentation in the context of a future-seeking atmosphere in the post-exilic period. Thus, as Otto Kaiser argues, Isaiah’s “eschatological” vision can be understood in the light of the post-exilic world. 63 However, as already indicated in the introduction to the present study, one needs to admit that the exilic/post-exilic historical background plays only a supporting role in light of the overall book. Also, when that historical context is explicitly presented, it seems to be there for a purpose: to contribute to the book’s theological/eschatological vision. 64 Thus, placed in the “eschatological” context of Isaiah, the royal promises in Isaiah 1-39, regardless of their date of origin, participate in the theological purpose of the book, anticipating the new reign instigated by the new king, who embodies the Lord’s kingship.

Nevertheless, the eschatological element in the royal promises is not detached from the earthly realm. Indeed, the canonical form of Isaiah shows that all the royal promises are loosely, if not completely, formed by the context of the Assyrian era at the end of the eighth-century.

62 In the next chapter, I will discuss the “eschatological” nature of the latter half of Isaiah.

63 Kaiser strongly argues that Isaiah as a whole reflects the development of the “eschatological” concept. According to Kaiser’s view, two similar historical catastrophes, i.e. the surrender of Israel to Assyria in 701 BCE and the final fall of Jerusalem in 587 BCE, are seen together in Isaiah and projected into the future. In this simultaneous gaze at two distant events, the earlier event in 701, which actually did not result in doom but was turned into salvation for those who believed in the Lord, became an “antitype” for the event in 587. This typological knowledge from history demands that the people of Israel, who went through the catastrophe in 587, to expect God’s ultimate salvation: just as the Lord saved Jerusalem through his instrument of judgement, Assyria, so will God deliver Israel in the future through even more severe judgement, including the destruction of the temple and the Babylonian exile. Thus, Kaiser rehearses, there is a movement from “geschichtliche Erfahrung” to “eschatologische Erwartung” in Isaiah. See O. Kaiser, “Geschichtliche Erfahrung und eschatologische Erwartung: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Eschatologie im Jesajabuch,” NZSThR 15 (1973): 272-285, esp. 281ff.

64 Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture, 325-327. However, Childs does not underestimate the historical significance of the message of Second Isaiah; as he writes, “Second Isaiah’s message was not a hyperbolic commentary on the events of the exile, nor did it arise simply from the imagination of a poetic spirit. Rather, these prophetic words faithfully testified to God’s will for Israel: ‘God and will come with might, and his reward is with him. He will feed his flock like a shepherd and will gather the lambs in his arms’ (40.10f.). Surely this is poetry, but it is also a word which bears testimony to God’s reality and his coming rule” (327). For further argument, see Seitz, “Provenance as a Factor in Interpretation” (unpublished).
Therefore, while the message of the coming kingship in the new age certainly is an anticipation of an “eschatological” time, which is sharply distinguished from the monarchical reign in Israel (Isa. 40-66), people’s experience of the Davidic kingship in the pre-exilic era is still foundational to that new dispensation (Isa. 1-39). In other words, the future hope for the new kingship and eschatological vision exist because of or on the basis of the faithful king in Judah, whose obedience to God had brought about deliverance from the Assyrian army.

Therefore, the messianic expectation in Isaiah, represented by the royal promises, seems to embrace two concepts that are not antagonistic but complimentary to each other. In other words, the canonical presentation of the royal promises in Isaiah puts the historical reality and the “eschatological” scope in a dialectical relationship. In this light, the complexity of the historical-critical arguments concerning the nature of the Old Testament “Messiah” can be understood as attesting to the dialectical nature of the messianic expectation and to the presence of multiple dimensions in the Isaianic royal texts. By handling this dialectic with great care and patience, one can appreciate the depth of messianic expectation in the canonical presentation of Isaiah.  

1.2.2 Isaiah 7:14

In order to demonstrate how this dialectical nature is embodied in specific passages, we now turn to specific issues in each royal oracle. We shall first discuss what is commonly called the Immanuel prophecy (Isa. 7:14). Two issues demand our attention here: the role of the Immanuel prophecy in the context of Isaiah 1-12, and the identity of the child to be born. The problem of the redactional aspects of both Isaiah 7:1-17 and 18-25 will be discussed in chapter four. Here I contend that the Immanuel prophecy is the most important of the three royal oracles, displaying both an expectation for the coming new David and an assurance of that expectation through a tangible sign, i.e. Hezekiah.

1.2.2.1 The Immanuel Prophecy in the context of Isaiah 1-12

---


In discussing the Immanuel prophecy’s role in the wider context of *Isaiah*, we must first evaluate the influential “Denkschrift” hypothesis (Isa. 6:1-9:6). This hypothesis is important for the present study because it emphasises the Isaianic authorship and unity of Isaiah 6:1-9:16. However, since this idea was introduced almost a century ago, it has received challenges and criticisms. Nevertheless, at least part of this hypothesis seems still valid and useful. Moreover, some arguments that emerged from this hypothesis can give us insight into our reading of Is. 1-12.

The “Denkschrift” hypothesis (or, “Isaiah Memoir”) was systematically proposed first by Karl Budde. Budde argued that Isaiah 6:1-9:6 was a unified testimony by Isaiah himself, written shortly after the Syro-Ephraimitic war. This “Denkschrift” has two distinct features: a) while the “Denkschrift” itself is a narrative, other materials around it are poetic or prosaic; b) the narrator of the “Denkschrift” employs the first-person singular, a feature not found elsewhere in Isaiah 1-39. Based on these observations, Budde argued that the “Denkschrift” was originally separate from other materials and had then been inserted into the middle of them, breaking the sequence of the original material. This insertion, according to Budde, caused two characteristic phrases which were originally placed together to appear in separate locations: a) the “woe” sayings of 5:8-10, 11-12, 18-19, 20, 21, 22-23 and 10:1-4a; and b) the declaration that the Lord’s hand is “still stretched out,” found in 5:25b; 9:12, 17, 21 and 10:4b.

Although Budde’s basic idea was generally accepted, his thesis was gradually challenged on several fronts. One of the major criticisms against Budde has been the observation that, contra

---


68 K. Budde, *Jesaja’s Erleben: Eine gemeinverständliche Auslegung der Denkschrift des Propheten (Kap. 6,1-9,6)* (Gotha: Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1928).

69 I follow the summary of Budde’s argument in Williamson’s work (*Variations*, 71-86).


Budde’s argument that the “Denkschrift” was Isaiah’s unified testimony because it was written in the first person singular, chap. 7 was evidently written in the third person singular (cf. Isa. 7:3, 13). Because of this, Williamson judges chap. 7, which contains the Immanuel prophecy, to be later material, and proposes that the Immanuel prophecy in chap. 7 should somehow be treated independently from its immediate literary context. However, Williamson’s view is also open to criticism, since a consistent use of grammatical person was not always considered crucial for the ancient writers, as Sigmund Mowinckel demonstrates. Thus, the view that chap. 7 was preserved among the “authentic” Isaianic materials in Isaiah 6:1-9:6 need not be abandoned on syntactic grounds.

However, there are other limitations to the “Denkschrift” hypothesis. Considering the dominant tendency to abandon Isaianic authorship of some part of Isaiah 6:1-9:6 and to assume a more complex editorial “Wachstum” of Isaianic materials in Isaiah 1-12, it is hard to justify the use of the term “Denkschrift,” since this now has such different meanings to different people. Furthermore, once one assumes an extremely complex formation process behind Isaiah, the sufficiency of the “Denkschrift” hypothesis to reflect the Isaianic materials’ active interactions, which supposedly existed in the formation process of the book and now manifest themselves as intertextual connections, comes into question.


72 “The conclusion of our lengthy discussion about the hypothesis of an Isaiah Memoir…was that 7:1-17 should be interpreted in the first instance somewhat in isolation from chapter 8, that it was likely to look back to chapter 6 rather than forward to chapter 8 for its primary point of reference, and that it was originally written considerably later than the surrounding first-person material” (Williamson, Variations, 102).


74 For instance, although employing the word “Denkschrift,” Wagner’s view on the “Denkschrift” is quite different from that of Budde. According to Wagner, on the one hand, the words of Isaiah in Syro-Ephraimitic war are found only in 7:2-8a, 9-14, 16-17; 8:1-4, 5, 6-8; these were later headed by Isa. 6:1-10 in the first half of the seventh century BCE, and were further expanded through secondary additions (Wagner, Gottes Herrschaft, 118-122, 125-205, 294). On the other hand, separated from this bulk of the Isaianic materials, Isa. 9:1-6 existed independently; Wagner considers this royal prophecy to originally stem from 725 BCE, the period of transition from Ahaz to Hezekiah, and later supplemented by Isa. 8:23aa’-b, which reflects the time of Josiah (208-246). These two parts were first connected in the post-exilic period through further editorial work (247-290). Considering Wagner’s thesis, it is unclear whether this kind of detailed redactional analysis, so different from Budde’s rather simple view (i.e. Isa. 6:1-9:6 was written by Isaiah), can still be called the “Denkschrift” hypothesis.
contrast with the description of Hezekiah in Isaiah 36-39.\textsuperscript{75} Most recently, Wolfgang Oswald has scrutinised the complex textual relationship between these two Isaianic materials, both from the perspective of intertextuality and literary analysis.\textsuperscript{76} Evidently, the traditional “Denkschrift” hypothesis lacks this kind of perspective on the mutual development of the Isaianic materials.

Despite all these weaknesses, some influential scholars, including Hermann Barth and Erhard Blum, generally accept the theory’s claim that Isaiah 1-12 achieved its final structure through modification and elaboration of the “authentic” material preserved in Isaiah 6-8.\textsuperscript{77} Hence, Budde’s argument is still considered, at least in part, valid today. Therefore, if the core of the “original” Isaianic testimony has indeed been preserved in Isaiah 6-8, this would indicate a striking fact: that even in the earliest testimony, “Immanuel” (God with us) was a significant part of the message of Isaiah son of Amoz. Moreover, this prophecy was, as Willem A. M. Beuken suggests, already interpreted in at least two different ways (Isa. 8:8 and 10);\textsuperscript{78} thus, we may assume that the message of Immanuel had been considered significant from the day of its inception. It is, then, natural to surmise that the Immanuel prophecy also plays a significant role both in the formative process and the present structure of Isaiah 1-12.

In this regard, a recent commentary by Beuken is indeed illuminating. This scholar recognises the important role of the Immanuel prophecy in the process of the formation of Isaiah 1-12 and renames the “Denkschrift” the “Immanuelschrift” (Isa. 6:1-8:18). According to Beuken, the original “Immanuelschrift” was composed by disciples of the prophet. This “first edition” of the “Immanuelschrift” was then expanded by two types of redactional works. The first was the “geradlinige Erweiterung” (linear expansion), which comprises the prologue (Isa. 5:1-7) and the epilogue (8:19-9:6) of the “Immanuelschrift.” The second was the “ringförmige Erweiterung” (concentric expansion), which further refashioned the original message of the “Immanuelschrift”


\textsuperscript{76} W. Oswald, “Textwelt, Kontextbezug und historische Situation in Jesaja 7,” \textit{Bib} 89 (2008): 201-220. Oswald argues that Isa. 7 presupposes some texts in Isa. 36-37. Moreover, Isa. 7 is much earlier than the Hezekiah-Isaiah-narrative in Isa. 36-37. According to Oswald, Isa. 7 reflects the post-exilic situation in Judah. Thus, for example, Ephraim represents the Samaritans (Sanballat) and Damascus means the people in the trans-Jordan region (Tobiah and Geshem). Therefore, Oswald argues, the “coalition” in Isa. 7 means their cooperate opposition against the rebuilding of the temple (218-219). However, his historical contextualisation of chap. 7 seems problematic.


\textsuperscript{78} Beuken, \textit{Jesaja 1-12}, 51.
(5:8-30; 9:7-10:4). The former redaction is assumed to have been performed in the time of King Josiah and the latter expansion during the exilic period.79

Furthering his study, Beuken also attempts to discover synchronic significance in the “Immanuelschrift,” which, now extended to Isaiah 1-12, displays a unique message for the future. Therefore, he pays great attention to the present structure of Isaiah 1-12, whose overall theme is “Immanuel” (God with us), and around which all other materials were gathered. However, Beuken stresses the pluralistic voices retained from different redactional stages: while the judgement against Israel is inevitable (1:1-31; 2:6-4:1), it will not be the final verdict (2:1-5; 4:2-6), and the instrument of the judgement itself will be destroyed by the Lord (10:5-34) with the culmination of the future reign of the new king (11), and will be met with thanksgiving (12).80

Although scrutinising Beuken’s view on the “Kompositionsgeschichte” is beyond the scope of the present study, at least two positive implications for our reading of the Immanuel prophecy can be drawn from his work. First, building upon and adjusting Budde’s “Denkschrift” theory, Beuken contends that the two characteristic phrases (“woe” and “the Lord’s hand is still outstretched”) common to Isaiah 5:8-30 and 9:7-10:4 were intentionally placed around the “Immanuelschrift,” and thus retain structural significance in the final form of Isaiah 1-12. This runs counter to the earlier view that they were accidentally separated by the insertion of the “Denkschrift.”81

This argument implies that the Immanuel prophecy is now at the core of a theologically elaborated structure, in which the promise of God’s presence is bracketed by prophecies of judgement against both Ephraim and Judah. As Anderson observes, the chiastic structure of judgement and salvation “look[s] forward to the redemption that is not only on the other side of

79 Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 30-33.
80 Ibid., 50-52.
81 Although accepting Budde’s “interruption-model,” Anderson also attempts to find the editorial intention of the ring structure (5:8-30//9:7-10:4) (Anderson, “‘God with Us,'” 239-245). Likewise, Blum, who proposed that Isa. 1-11 contains the original testimony of Isaiah fashioned as a chiastic structural composition, demonstrated that the two characteristic phrases of both Isa. 5:8-30 and 9:7-10:4 were actually part of the Isaianic chiastic structure from the beginning, together with Isa. 6:1-8:16. See Blum, “Jesajas prophetisches Testament (Teil I),” 547-568; idem, “Jesajas prophetisches Testament: Beobachtungen zu Jes. 1-11 (Teil II),” ZAW 109 (1997): 12-29. Blum demonstrates that the characteristic phrases found in Isa. 5:8-30; 9:7-10:4 (what Blum calls “Kehrversgedicht”) somehow inherit “die amosische Geist.” Blum bases his argument on two grounds. First, both Amos 1:1 and Isa. 9:9 speak of the same “earthquake” (ca. 760 BCE.). Second, repetitive phrases similar to those in Isaiah are also observable in the book of Amos. These include הַרְסָפִּים יְהֹוָה , וַיַּלְשְׁנֵהּ יְהֹוָה (Amos 4:6b, 8b, 9, 10b, 11b), see Blum, “Jesajas prophetisches Testament (Teil II),” 12-21.
the Dies Irae but which is also being accomplished through divine judgement.” Therefore, granted that the present structure of Isaiah 1-12 developed from the “Immanuelschrift,” the text seems to highlight the unique theological message that God is with the people of Israel despite, or even through, the judgement against them.

Second, because the scope of Beuken’s “Immanuelschrift” theory is wider than that of the “Denkschrift” theory (Isa. 1-12), the Immanuel prophecy can now be interpreted in conjunction with the other two royal oracles (Isa. 8:23-9:6 and 11:1-9). In this enlarged perspective, Beuken attempts to reveal the relationship between the two royal promises (chaps. 9 and 11) and the Immanuel prophecy. According to Beuken, these three royal oracles illustrate three aspects of a single future king, since, in both Isaiah 9:1-6 and 11:1-9, the promise to the house of David, the phrase “God with us” (Isa. 7:14) is central:

Dass sich diese drei Figuren nicht isoliert zueinander verhalten, sondern unterschiedliche Aspekte des einen Heilsmittlers anzeigen, beruht auf der Bedeutung des Namens Immanuel: “Gott mit uns.” Denn diese Verheissung kehrt in den Thronnamen des Friedensfürsten zurück, die zum Teil exklusiv göttliche Titel beinhalten... Zudem wird Gottes Gegenwart für Israel im Geist JHWHs Wirklichkeit, der von Reis Isais Besitz ergreift (11,2-3).

Of course, Beuken does not dismiss the fact that each royal hope is rooted in a specific historical context, and he is reticent to speak of direct compositional interaction among these three oracles. Nevertheless, he states that they are surely bound together in the frame of the “früh-messianischen Erwartung eines königlichen Retters.” Therefore, Beuken’s analysis of the “Kompositionsgeschichte” of Isaiah 1-12 convincingly demonstrates the interactive relationship among the three royal oracles in the present structure of Isaiah. By stressing the centrality of the Immanuel prophecy in both the developmental process and the present form of Isaiah 1-12, Beuken’s study encourages one to recognise the inseparable link between the oracle for the house of David in Isaiah 7 and two similar prophecies (Isa. 9:1-6; 11:1-9) in the final form of Isaiah 1-12.

Therefore, we may conclude that the Immanuel prophecy was preserved in Isaiah 6-8 (or 6:1-9:6) as important and “authentic” words of Isaiah, which attracted further interpretation to be placed around the core words. Because of this pre-history of the present form of Isaiah 1-12, as

---

82 Anderson, ““God with Us,”” 243.
83 Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 52.
84 Ibid., 52.
85 Ibid., 52.
Beuken demonstrates, the Immanuel prophecy and its theological message play a major role in the present structure of Isaiah 1-12. Thus, though each oracle is rooted in its own historical context, the Immanuel prophecy gives a theological signification (God with us = God’s continuous commitment to the house of David) to the other two royal promises (Isa. 9:1-6; 11:1-9).

1.2.2.2 The Identity of Immanuel

Now we shall discuss the identity of the Immanuel. Since this has been a controversial topic not only within modern Old Testament studies but throughout the history of interpretation, a comprehensive review of the extensive debates concerning this issue is impossible in the present study.\(^{86}\) However, in order to locate our argument, we may briefly examine five significant interpretations.\(^{87}\)

First, Kaiser is representative of interpreters who claim that Immanuel is the “eschatological” messiah expected in the post-exilic period.\(^{88}\) Kaiser seeks to conform to traditional Christian interpretation by reading a supposedly foreign post-exilic situation into the present form of the Immanuel narrative. However, the scriptural canon clearly presents the narrative in the framework of the eighth-century historical event (the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis). Thus, Kaiser’s view does not seem to do justice to the literal meaning of Isaianic testimony.

Second, beginning in the nineteenth century, some have argued that “Immanuel” was a “Dankname.” According to this view, some mothers who had escaped the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis gave this name to their children as an expression of gratitude.\(^{89}\) However, there is no textual warrant in Isaiah to support this hypothesis; thus, this claim remains historical speculation, and inappropriate for a canonical reading.

Third, some consider Immanuel to be the faithful believers in Israel (the “remnant”) and the mother to be Zion. This interpretation has actually existed since 1850, if not earlier, and was

---

\(^{86}\) For instance, see the Dialogue with Trypho.


\(^{89}\) For a general summary of this position, see Kaiser, “Jesaja/Jesajabuch,” 648. According to Wegner, this view was proposed by Duhm and was followed by several later scholars (Wegner, An Examination, 115-116). It has also been accepted by some more recent scholars (H. Irsigler, “Zeichen und Bezeichnetes in Jes 7,1-17: Notizen zum Immanueltext,” BN 29 [1985]: 75-114; Wegner, An Examination, 122).
developed by Gene Rice in 1978.\textsuperscript{90} Most recently, Ulrich Berges has presented a modified version of this view. According to Berges’ monograph, the Immanuel prophecy stems from the post-exilic period, displaying the hope of the faithful “Knechtgemeinde” begotten by the daughter Zion: “Immanuel ist der Erstgeborene ‘vieler Brüder,’ wie anhand der Bilder vom unerwarteten Kinderreichtum Zions in 49,17-50,1; 54 und 66,7-14 unschwer zu erkennen ist.”\textsuperscript{91} Likewise, Beuken, though claiming that the Immanuel prophecy is Isaianic and emphasising its “messianic flavour,”\textsuperscript{92} believes that the collective interpretation suggested by Berges is a possible interpretation in light of the process of formation of the Isaianic corpus.\textsuperscript{93}

However, at least two objections can be raised against the collective interpretation of Immanuel. First of all, as M. Rehm rightly points out, Isaiah 8:8 depicts Immanuel as an individual king;\textsuperscript{94} a collective interpretation of Immanuel thus appears strained. Moreover, since the salient point of the text seems to involve the royal family in Judah (7:13), the woman addressed in v.14 is more likely to be a person related to the royal family.\textsuperscript{95} By connecting Immanuel with a certain group in Israel and evoking Zion as its personified mother, Berges seems to base his interpretation on narrowly selected texts, excluding others which would seem to counteract this view. In addition, as with Kaiser’s view, by reading a highly speculative view of the post-exilic situation back into the text, Berges diverges from the literal sense of Isaiah’s testimony.\textsuperscript{96}


\textsuperscript{91} Berges, \textit{Das Buch Jesaja}, 116.


\textsuperscript{93} Beuken, \textit{Jesaja 1-12}, 210-211.

\textsuperscript{94} M. Rehm, \textit{Der Königliche Messias im Licht der Immanuel-Weissagungen des Buches Jesajas}, Eichstätter Studien, NF 1 (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercher, 1968), 110. A summary of Rehm’s view is found in G. F. Hasel, \textit{The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah} (Berrien Springs: Andrew University Press, 1974), 295. Note also Buber’s statement: “Immanuel is the king of the remnant, from which the people will renew itself” (Buber, \textit{The Prophetic Faith}, 144). Thus, the focus on the remnant is appropriate only in so far as an individual, future Davidic king is the main topic of the Immanuel prophecy.

\textsuperscript{95} “Die bestimmte Artikel ‘die junge Frau’ sagt nicht mehr und nicht weniger, als dass sie in einer wie auch immer gearteten Verbindung zu Ahas steht” (Beuken, \textit{Jesaja 1-12}, 204). See also M. Buber, \textit{The Prophetic Faith} (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), 139.

\textsuperscript{96} For example, see Berges, \textit{Das Buch Jesaja}, 481-534, 547-551. Berges assumes that there was schism between the faithful community (“die Knechtgemeinde”) and the unfaithful group in the post-exilic community.
Fourth, Immanuel is sometimes interpreted as Isaiah’s literal son; the mother of the child would thus be Isaiah’s wife (Isa. 8:3). This interpretation seems more plausible than any of the arguments discussed above, since the prophet’s wife and her children seem to play a significant role in Isaiah 6-8. Indeed, not only contemporary scholars, such as J. J. Stamm and (in part) Clements, but also some ancient interpreters, including Jerome, Rashi and Ibn Ezra, stand behind this interpretation. However, the same criticism levelled against the previous argument also applies here: the Immanuel prophecy specifically focuses on the Davidic dynasty. Furthermore, as Robb Andrew Young frankly concludes, “[while] the other two children are explicitly stated to be sons of Isaiah, Immanuel is not, and this fact alone is telling.”

The fifth possibility seems to provide the most probable answer to our quest for Immanuel’s literary identity. This view considers the woman to be the wife of Ahaz and Immanuel as Hezekiah. This interpretation, already present in early Jewish interpretation, is strengthened by at least three supporting arguments. First, this interpretation fits with the context of the Davidic dynasty. Second, the contrast between Ahaz’s unfaithfulness (Isa. 7) and Hezekiah’s faithfulness (Isa. 36-39) naturally leads one to see a connection between Hezekiah and Immanuel, who is depicted as the “anti”-Ahaz. Third, the name of the child “עֲלֵיהֶם יְהֹוָה עִםָנוּ” (God with us) is strikingly close to the description of Hezekiah in 2 Kgs 18:7, where it is said that “[t]he Lord was with him” (יהוה נמנו). However, a criticism of this interpretation can be raised from an historical perspective: if the biblical testimony is historically reliable, Hezekiah was already born even before Ahaz was enthroned (2 Kgs 16:2; 18:2). Nevertheless, it can be argued that, in at least some parts of the
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97 For instance, see J. J. Stamm, “Die Immanuel-Weissagung und die Eschatologie des Jesaja,” ThZ 16 (1960): 439-455; Clements, “The Immanuel Prophecy,” 65-77. However, the latter study concludes that the present shape of Isaiah presents Hezekiah as Immanuel.
98 Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 204.
100 See this view represented in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho 44.1; 67.1; 71.3; 77.1-4.
101 Williamson’s comment can support my view: “In both passages the king is confronted with an invading army which is threatening Jerusalem (7:1; 36:2), that he is reduced to near panic (7:2; 37:1), and that Isaiah offers him a reassuring ‘fear not’ oracle (7:4-9; 37:6-7), backed up in each case by the offer of a ‘sign’ (7:11; 37:30; see too 38:7 and 22). Although in both narratives the king and city are spared, this is followed in the future (7:15-25; 39:6-7). A striking point of detail is the reference in both cases to the otherwise unknown ‘conduit of the upper pool on the highway to the Fuller’s Field’ (7:3; 36:2), which can hardly be coincidental. Alongside these similarities, however, there are marked contrasts between the ways in which the kings react: Ahaz, as we have seen, rejects the way to deliverance offered by the prophet, while Hezekiah follows the way of faith and is spectacularly delivered. On the basis of these, and other such comparisons, we may agree with those who have concluded that there is a conscious attempt to contrast the responses of the two kings, one negative and the other positive” (Williamson, Variations, 88, emphasis mine).
102 Seitz, Isaiah 1-39, 69-70; Young, Hezekiah, 187.
Old Testament narrative, the authors of the scripture are not obsessed with providing meticulous historical accounts. For example, as Young observes, precise chronological information is not provided at all for the northern kings and only sometimes for some southern kings, such as Abijam, Asa and Athaliah. Therefore, this chronological problem does not seem to pose a fatal threat towards understanding Hezekiah as Immanuel as the most likely candidate for Immanuel in Isa. 7:14, from both a canonical and literal point of view.

What, then, is the meaning of the statement that the child “Immanuel” was given as a “sign” (רשא)? Here, Brevard S. Childs’ explanation of the nature of “sign” in the Old Testament is helpful:

> Within the prophetic corpus, as distinct from the Priestly source of the Pentateuch (e.g., Gen. 9:12), a sign is a special event, either ordinary or miraculous, that serves as a pledge by which to confirm the prophetic word. The sign precedes in time the impending threat or promise, and prefigures the fulfillment by the affinity in content between the sign and its execution.

According to this definition, merely identifying the child in Isaiah 7:14 with Hezekiah does not sufficiently capture the future perspective embodied in the prophecy given through that “sign.” Since the text clearly indicates that “Immanuel” is to be a “sign,” and if Immanuel indeed refers to Hezekiah, then this oracle seems to imply that Hezekiah as “Immanuel” is a token which assures God’s continuous commitment to the house of David from the present (i.e. the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis) to the future (v.16). As Williamson stresses, this means that the Immanuel prophecy is not only about Ahaz and his heir during one time of crisis, but is also about the future of the entire house of David. Therefore, Hezekiah is a tangible assurance from God, an assurance that, both in the present time and in future ages, “God is with us.”

---

103 Young, Hezekiah, 186.
104 Childs, Isaiah, 65.
105 Williamson stresses that the issue at stake in the Immanuel prophecy concerns not only the individual Ahaz but also the entire house of David (v.13 חיה.דרוי變化) and the plural forms in vv.13-14 [לִבְּנֵי הָעִבְרִים] attest this point). Thus, this prophecy has a future scope (Williamson, “The Messianic Texts,” 251-252). In the future envisioning of the Immanuel prophecy, he argues, on the one hand, “a radical discontinuity with the present heirs of the Davidic family” is announced. On the other hand, it is also declared that the child promised to be born “represents continuity of a different sort, namely a continuity in terms of God’s provision of effective leadership for his people” (253). In saying this, Williamson assumes that the people of Israel sought a new form of leadership after the exile (Williamson, Variations, 111). However, Williamson’s historical contextualisation of the text seems speculative and overlooks the literal sense of the text.
Some scholars refer to this dialectic between present and future as “typological.” For instance, Charles Briggs argues that the Immanuel prophecy is not a simple future prediction, but offers the child “Immanuel,” born in Isaiah’s time, as a “sign” or “type” of the future “Messiah.” Thus, according to this view, even if Hezekiah was considered “Immanuel,” he was not the one who would fulfill the full-blown message expressed in the name. Rather, he was just a sign or a type of God’s future plan for the Davidic dynasty.

However, even if the future-oriented nature of the Immanuel prophecy were to be admitted, some may question a “typological” interpretation of this prophecy, since typology would seem to be an approach foreign to the immediate context of the Immanuel prophecy, and the concept of “Messiah/messianic” is not clearly indicated in the oracle. However, the existence of typological thinking in the Old Testament, and particularly in Isaiah, is widely recognised; thus, this general feature of the book seems to justify a typological interpretation of the passage in the service of hearing a holistic message of Isaiah.

Also, although there is no mention of “Messiah” in the Immanuel prophecy, the future perspective on the Davidic dynasty in the prophecy, according to Williamson, certainly has a “messianic flavour,” if not full-blown messianic expectation. Moreover, as has been stated in the previous analysis, the Immanuel prophecy is, in the present structure of Isaiah 1-12, not isolated from other royal prophecies. Therefore, its juxtaposition with the other two royal oracles engenders a messianic perspective, as Beuken, Seitz and Randall Heskett all argue.

Thus, the future orientation of the Immanuel prophecy seems to be inseparable from the messianic expectation inherent in the present context of Isaiah 1-12, and this prophecy seems to

---


107 Briggs, Messianic Prophecies, 196-197. Based on a similar typological scheme, S. H. Widyapranawa also claims that in Isa. 7:14; 9:1-6 and 11:1-9, Hezekiah is depicted as a type of the future Messiah to come (Widyapranawa, The Lord is Savior, 51-52, et passim).


typologically anticipate the coming king through the assurance of its historical hope, i.e. Hezekiah. In other words, acknowledging the connection between Immanuel and Hezekiah “is not primarily nostalgic or memorializing in nature… [rather, w]hat Hezekiah is as king, how he conducts himself, becomes a type for later kings to follow.”111 Thus, “Hezekiah becomes Immanuel,”112 a sign or foretaste of God’s vigorous commitment to the house of David, which is to be realised by the new kingship, the new David (cf. 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9).

1.2.3 Isaiah 8:23-9:6

In this section, we shall briefly consider Isaiah 8:23-9:6. Including 8:23 in the analysis of the main body of the royal oracle (9:1-6) is important for our canonical interpretation of the three royal oracles, since it has been generally recognised as the introduction to the royal oracle ever since the study by Albrecht Alt.113 Particularly important are two aspects concerning this passage: a) the interpretative problem concerning Isaiah 8:23b; and b) the identity of the child. The important discussion on the relationship between Isaiah 8:23b-9:6 and 8:19-23a114 will be treated in chapter four. Overall, I intend to present the view that, while Hezekiah is portrayed as the “child” of the royal oracle, the temporal scheme of 8:23 and God’s promise to the house of David in 9:1-6 both serve to engender further hope for God’s commitment to the Davidic dynasty and both carry “eschatological” significance.

1.2.3.1 The Problem of Isaiah 8:23b

Isaiah 8:23b’s apparent ambiguity has troubled many scholars. After the description of the dark era to come in the future (8:19-22), 8:23b, which is preceded by a glimpse of hope in 8:23a, seems to speak of the beginning of a new age which culminates in the coming of a new ruler (9:1-6). However, the meaning of 8:23b within this dramatic sequence, and particularly the significance of its geographical data, is still debated among scholars. Recognising the problem, Albrecht Alt proposed that 8:23b was describing the military campaigns of Tiglath-pileser III in 732-734 BCE, functioning as an introduction to the accession oracle in 9:1-6. According to Alt, three geographical locations in the latter part of 8:23b correspond to a respective number of Assyrian provinces (“the way of the sea” = du’ru; “the other side of Jordan” = gal’azu; “the
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111 Seitz, Isaiah 1-39, 74.
112 Seitz, Isaiah 1-39, 71.
Galilee of the nations’ = *magidu*, which previously belonged to the northern Israelite tribes, particularly Zebulun and Naphtali.\(^{115}\)

Alt’s view on the historical background of 8:23b has gained a wide acceptance,\(^{116}\) but scholars still disagree over the interpretation of *הָאָדָם וַתִּכְבָּשׁ נַפְתָּלִי* and *יָרֵד הָאָדָם* (9:1) is translated as follows: “in the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zeb’ulun and the land of Naph’tali, but in the latter time he will make glorious the way of the sea, the land beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations” (RSV). However, *הָאָדָם וַתִּכְבָּשׁ נַפְתָּלִי* and *יָרֵד הָאָדָם* can also be interpreted as the subjects of the verbs (*דַּבְּרֶה* and *הָיָה* respectively). In this case, 8:23b speaks of rulers/kings and their respective treatment of the northern kingdom (“the former one…and the latter one…”).

Among those who support this interpretation, H. L. Ginsberg and Stuart A. Irvine contend that *הָאָדָם וַתִּכְבָּשׁ נַפְתָּלִי* refer to the northern kings, Pekah and Hoshea respectively.\(^{117}\) Joseph Blenkinsopp, however, argues that “the first” and “the second” refer to non-Israelite kings: the former to a Syrian king, either Hazael or Ben Hadad, and the latter to Tiglath-pileser III.\(^{118}\) In a modification of this view, A. S. Herbert argues that “the first” and “the second” indicates two different military campaigns instigated by Tiglath-pileser III. And from yet another angle, J.A. Emerton contends that *הָאָדָם וַתִּכְבָּשׁ נַפְתָּלִי* mean “everyone, from first to last.” Thus, he writes, “[t]he prophet may be referring to a single period of time, probably soon after Tiglath-pileser’s annexation of the northern region, and speaking of the trouble that the region suffers from everyone, that is, from all the foreigners.”\(^{119}\)
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\(^{115}\) Alt, “Jesaja 8,23-9,6,” 206-225.

\(^{116}\) One of the few exceptions is Barth, who argues that Isa. 8:23b-9:6 belongs to the time of Josiah. Although he does accept that 8:23b reflects the Assyrian occupation of the northern kingdom in 734-732 BCE, he sees the text as emphasising a hope for the unification of the northern and southern kingdoms in Josiah’s time. See Barth, *Jesaja-Worte*, 141-176.


\(^{119}\) Emerton, “Isaiah VIII.23,” 170. Emerton translates 8:23b as follows: “Now has everyone, from first to last, treated with contempt and harshness the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, the way of the sea, the region beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations” (170).
These scholars all interpret כהנים as kings (albeit of different kingdoms) partly because they translate השב罩 as “to make heavy/harsh.” Thus, from their perspective, 8:23b basically speaks of the escalation of military oppression against the northern kingdom. However, at least five objections stand against this interpretation of 8:23b.

First, as Emerton admits, “it has proved difficult to find two suitable historical occasions involving only the northern part of Israel, on the first of which the region was treated with contempt or leniently, and on the second of which it was treated harshly.” Second, the style of Isaiah 8:23b-9:6 stresses contrast between light /darkness and former /latter. Because of this stylistic characteristic, it seems more appropriate to translate השב罩 as “to treat the land with contempt” and השב罩 as “to glorify/honour,” as Beuken and J. Høgenhaven both suggest. Third, Wegner’s careful linguistic analysis suggests that when the root of השב罩 is used to refer either to nations or to people, it normally means “to honour.” Fourth, and also following Wegner, the paired roots השב罩 and השב罩 always serve to describe a contrast, not simple escalation. Fifth, השב罩 is commonly believed to mean “to treat with contempt,” and השב罩 “to honour.” Considering these factors, it is thus more probable that Isaiah 8:23b speaks of a contrast between two ages rather than between Assyrian or Israelite kings. This contrast is between the former time, a shameful period when Assyria invaded the northern kingdom (734-732 BCE) under God’s provision, and the latter time, the glorious age in the future when Ephraim will be released by God’s mighty hands from Assyrian bondage. Accordingly, the subjects of the two verbs השב罩 in Isaiah 8:23b should be God Himself (cf. Wegner and RSV).

---

123 See the following passages: 1Sam. 2:30; Isa. 23:9; Jer. 30:19 (Wegner, An Examination, 153).
124 See the following passages: 1Sam. 2:30; 2Sam. 6:22; 1Kgs 12:4, 10; Isa. 23:9; 2Chr. 10:4, and 10, including nonverbal forms (Wegner, An Examination, 152-153; idem, “What’s New in Isaiah 9:1-7?” in Interpreting Isaiah: Issues and Approaches, ed. by D. G. Firth and H. G. M. Williamson [Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009], 240).
125 F. Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah I, trans. by James Martin (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1884), 243-244; von Rad, Old Testament Theology II, 171-172, 243-244; J. D. W. Watts, Isaiah 1-33, WBC (Waco: Word, 1985), 130; Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 236-237; Young, Hezekiah, 152-156; Wegner, An Examination, 152-161.
126 Wegner, An Examination, 140, 142-143.
This contrast between two eras in Isaiah 8:23b seems to have its significance not only in its immediate context but also within Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 40-55) as a whole. As Williamson points out, it also resonates with the common Deutero-Isaianic phrases, “the former things”/“the latter things” and “the new things” (Isa. 41:21-29; 42:9; 43:16-19; 44:6-8; 46:9-11; and 48:3-16). This observation leads to a further insight into the subjects of the verbs discussed above. As Williamson states, examining this link between 8:23b and Deutero-Isaiah:

God himself is described as ‘the first and the last’ at 44:6 and 48:12 (‘I am the first and I am the last’), using the very two words which divide 8:23b into two halves. Isa. 41:4 is similar: ‘I, the Lord, am the first; and with the last [אחרית] I am He.’ This title for God appears to be without parallel; it is distinctive to Deutero-Isaiah. The possibility should, therefore, be considered that he took the relevant words in 8:23b as titles for God—that it was ‘the First’ (with a capital ‘F’) who brought the land into contempt and ‘the Last’ (with a capital ‘L’) who would eventually glorify it again. It will then have been this understanding which led him to coin his distinctive title.

If, as Williamson argues, “the former/latter” in 8:23b was interpreted as divine epithets in Deutero-Isaiah, then the subjects of the two verbs in Isaiah 8:23b could be the Lord in both cases.

Williamson’s analysis helps one to see the relationship between Isaiah 8:23b and the wider context of Isaiah as a whole. In the light of the holistic structure of Isaiah, therefore, the temporal scheme in Isaiah 8:23b can be interpreted not only in its historical context, but also in the broader message of Isaiah with its deep theological significance: God is the First and the Last, the one who is the ultimate cause of every historical event. Hence, a careful attention to the book’s wider context is desirable. To conclude, Isaiah 8:23b (-9:6) is not only rooted in a specific historical incident from the eighth century BCE, and not only displays hope for deliverance from actual bondage, but also contributes to Isaiah’s eschatological message, which proclaims the end of oppression and the inception of God’s new rule.

### 1.2.3.2 The Identity of the Child

Now we shall briefly discuss the identity of the child in Isaiah 9:1-6. According to the previous discussion concerning the historical background of Isaiah 8:23b, the most probable referent of

---

128 Williamson, The Book Called Isaiah, 69. Beuken’s interpretation is also interesting in this regard. He argues that, while the subjects of the verbs are “the former/latter time,” the Lord is “die theologisches Subjekt.” See Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 237.
129 Note also Beuken’s comment on Isa. 8:23b that “[d]er Vergleich beider Zeiten ist theologisch bedeutsam” (Jesaja 1-12, 244).
this oracle is Hezekiah. As Young has argued in his exhausting analysis of the “historical Hezekiah”:

The prophecy of Isa 8:23-9:6 was most likely composed between the first exile of the northern kingdom under Tiglath-pileser III in ca. 734-732 B.C.E., and the fall of Samaria in 720. The fact that Israelite chronology pinpoints the accession year of Hezekiah in 726 B.C.E. leaves little doubt that this monarch was the intended referent of the oracle.\textsuperscript{130}

However, just as with the case of the Immanuel oracle, discussed above, the relationship between Hezekiah and the child of v.5 is complex. A close analysis of Isaiah 9:1-6 shows two points that indicate the passage is speaking not only of Hezekiah, but also of a Davidic king who is to come in the future.

First, the names assigned to the child seem to carry the connotation of future expectation which is not fully embodied or realised by Hezekiah’s kingship. Especially important is the phrase “mighty God”. Scholars have been troubled by this expression, since it usually refers only to God (e.g., Isa. 10:21). In order to overcome this issue, several interpretations have been proposed.\textsuperscript{131} Some scholars understand Isaiah 9:5 as referring only to the Lord and not to the child.\textsuperscript{132} However, this interpretation seems improbable, because the text itself so clearly mentions the child. If the title was speaking of God, then, the relationship between God and the child must be explained. Another solution is to claim that the God-like name only suggests the special character assigned to the child (king); thus, the title “mighty God” refers not to the identity of the child, but only to a description of how God works through the bearer of his name.\textsuperscript{133} However, this view seems hardly tenable, since this title is explicitly used of God in

\textsuperscript{130} Young, \textit{Hezekiah}, 165. See also Blenkinsopp, \textit{Isaiah 1-39}, 249; Clements, \textit{Isaiah 1-39}, 108. There are also other options for the historical contextualisation of this royal oracle. Barth argues that Isa. 9:1-6 refers to Josiah (Barth, \textit{Jesaja-Worte}, 141-176). In a variant of this view, Beuken contends that, although Josiah is not depicted as the Messiah sought by Isa. 9:1-6, this royal oracle does reflect the high expectations for Josiah (Beuken, \textit{Jesaja 1-12}, 254-255). In a slightly different way, Wagner argues that Isa. 9:1-6 was spoken by Isaiah during the Assyrian crisis and envisioned as the hope for the future Davidic ruler (725 B. C. E.); in the time of Josiah, this prophecy was then expanded by 8:23b. Thus, according to Wagner, the royal oracle is framed by the Josianic perspective of the seventh century BCE (Wagner, \textit{Gottes Herrschaft}, 242-243). On the other hand, Kaiser rejects a pre-exilic dating and claims that Isa. 9:1-6 belongs to the post-exilic era (O. Kaiser, \textit{Jesaja 1-12} [5th ed.], 207-208).

\textsuperscript{131} Wegner offers a concise explanation of these hypotheses in \textit{An Examination}, 189-190.

\textsuperscript{132} This interpretation was common in traditional Jewish understanding and was revived more recently by the Italian Jewish scholar S. D. Luzzatto (\textit{Il Profeta Isaia volgarizzato e commentato ad uso degli Israeliti} [Paudua: Antonio Bianchi, 1867], 131-133). Although not many scholars adopted this view in Luzzatto’s time, some recent scholars have accepted it. See A. J. Motyer, \textit{The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary} (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 101-105; J. Goldingay, “The Compound Name in Isaiah 9:5(6),” \textit{CBQ} 61 (1999): 239-244.

\textsuperscript{133} For example, Beuken, \textit{Jesaja 1-12}, 253.
the surrounding context (Isa. 10:21) and an application to a human appears nowhere else in the Old Testament.

Therefore, limiting the referent either to God alone or to the child alone does not seem to provide a suitable solution. Wegner provides a useful way forward here when he suggests that the name “should be divided into two parallel units, each containing one theophoric element.”\footnote{134 Wegner, An Examination, 197.} Isaiah 9:5, therefore, can be translated: “a wonderful planner [is] the mighty God; the Father of eternity [is] a prince of peace.”\footnote{135 Wegner, An Examination, 197.} Wegner justifies this translation by pointing out “its similarity to the parallel structure in the name Mahershalalhashbaz.”\footnote{136 Wegner, An Examination, 197.} Therefore, according to Wegner, “mighty God” is a name, just like Mahershalalhashbaz, which is given to a child because of its theological significance. Thus, we may claim that the title “mighty God” is simultaneously both a divine reference and a doxological name given to the royal child.

Furthermore, the name granted to the child in Isaiah 9:5 is reminiscent of the hope expressed in Isaiah 7:14: both names given to the children, in the canonical context of Isaiah, seem to ensure the people’s ultimate deliverance from destructive power.\footnote{137 Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 52.} Because of this similarity in their functions and theological significance, the two names can be understood in similar fashion. Just as the name “Immanuel” (God is with us) can be understood as a sign of God’s unceasing commitment to the house of David (and even of the emergence of the new king, in conjunction with Isa. 9:1-6 and 11:1-9), so also, we may deduce, the long doxological name bestowed upon the child in Isaiah 9:5 also has a symbolic character, anticipating God’s wonderful plan in history and the everlasting peace to be realised by the new Davidic ruler. In addition, as Beuken indicates, this sign-name of Isaiah 9:5 contains an echo of the promise of God’s continual presence.\footnote{138 Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 52.} Therefore, as was the case with the Immanuel prophecy, identifying Hezekiah with the child of Isaiah 9:5 does not contradict or dampen the hope for the Davidic king to come; rather, this anticipation remains until “the zeal of the Lord of host will accomplish it” (Isa. 9:6).
The second argument for claiming that Isaiah 9:1-6 aims to display more than Hezekiah’s kingship is found in v.6, which describes the nature of the new kingship with a key phrase, יְדֵי הַשֵּׁם. Analyzing this phrase, Wegner writes,

This terminology is not commonly used of the Davidic dynasty…and there are two possible ways to understand it: either the throne of this ruler can be considered eternal because his successors will continue to reign after him, or this ruler will rule forever. It is not entirely certain which of these two ideas the author had in mind; however, he does not appear to envision any changes in this kingdom as his use of the phrases יְדֵי הַשֵּׁם and מִמְּחָינוֹת הָעָם indicates. This ambiguity helps to engender messianic expectations and suggests that this ruler is not simply another Davidic king, but the last Davidic king (emphasis original).^139

Therefore, considering that the name given to the child has an eschatological flavour and in light of the self-evident truth that no human king has fulfilled an everlasting reign, Isaiah 9:1-6 seems to carry both historical and theological significance. While the historical background of the royal oracle in Isaiah 9:1-6 appears to be the beginning of Hezekiah’s reign, the vision illustrated in this royal promise is not fully realised in Hezekiah’s reign. Hezekiah only appeared as a token of the future Davidic reign, which has no end. Therefore, like the Immanuel prophecy, this royal oracle also embodies visions of both earthly king and eschatological “Messiah.”

1.2.4 Isaiah 11:1-9

I shall now turn to an analysis of Isaiah 11:1-9 in order to demonstrate how 10:27-34 and 11:1-9 can be read as a sequence, with the former serving as an introduction for the latter. I will then argue that Sennacherib’s invasion in 701 BCE is reflected in this sequence. However, I will also contend that the emergence of the idealised ruler of 11:1-9 is presented in the canonical structure of Isaiah as an “eschatological” fulfillment of the Immanuel prophecy (God with us). Thus, while deeply grounded in the historical experience of Israel, the hope expressed in Is. 11:1-9 seems to carry an “eschatological” expectation for a “Messiah.” The problem of the literary relationship between 11:10-16 + 12:1-6 and 11:1-9 will be postponed until chapter four.

Let us first determine the role that 11:1-9 holds in Isaiah. Many scholars maintain that Isaiah 11:1-9 should not be read as an independent oracle. Kristen Nielsen, for example, has demonstrated that Isaiah 10:33-34 and 11:1-9 can be read together, connected by their tree imagery (10:33 [הָ֫לָּל הָ֫יְמִן]; 11:1 [ָלָּל הָ֫יְמִן]). In addition, Young points out two more reasons to read 10:33-34 and 11:1-9 together: the waw-consecutive form in 11:1 requires a preceding verb, indicating that the royal oracle actually begins with הנה in 10:33; and the references to the leaders of the nations (Assyria and Judah) in both 10:33-34 and 11:1-9. Thus, 10:33-34 seems to have originally been part of the royal oracle in 11:1-9.

As for the length of the oracles, some scholars have claimed to find an even longer sequence around the royal oracle. Wegner, for example, presents the following thematic chains in Isaiah 10-11: a) the destruction of Assyria is announced (10:16-19); b) this destruction leaves only the remnant of Israel (10:20-23); c) Assyria marches against Zion (10:28-32); d) God hews down Assyria (10:33-34); and e) the fall of Assyria leads to the new kingship of Israel (11:1-9). A similar thematic progression is also suggested by Peter R. Ackroyd. D.L. Christensen as well, though differing from Wegner on the interpretation of 10:33-34 (for Christensen, the one judged is Jerusalem/Zion, not Assyria), also sketches this logical sequence from chapters 10 to 11.

Concerning the origin of this loosely coherent structure in Isaiah 10-11 (or even extending into 12), scholars mostly agree that the larger unit of Isaiah 10:5-11:9 was achieved through several editorial redactions, while the original Isaianic unity of 10:33-34+11:1-9 is certainly plausible. It can be assumed, however, that the editorial works were completed quickly, and

---

140 It is intriguing that the ancient interpretations found in the writings of Qumran, 2 Baruch and the Gospels may have already realised or assumed this. See R. Bauckham, “The Messianic Interpretation of Isa. 10:34 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 Baruch and the Preaching of John the Baptist,” DSD 2 (1995): 202-216.
141 K. Nielsen, There is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah, JSOTSup 65 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 123-144.
142 Young, Hezekiah, 169-170.
145 Barth, (Die Jesaja-Worte, 54-76) and Wildberger (Isaiah 1-12, 456-457) also hold the same view. However, Wegner contends that the one who is judged by God is Assyria, not Israel (Wegner, An Examination, 230).
147 Nielsen, There is Hope for a Tree, 123-144, esp. 139; Barth, Jesaja-Worte, 54-76; Wegner, An Examination, 258-260.
148 Young, Hezekiah, 170.
that this juxtaposition of the series of short oracles (10:5ff. + 10:28-32 + 10:33-34 + 11:1-9) already came into being shortly after 701 BCE, as Nielsen conjectures.149

Supposing that these complex editorial works generated a coherent structure within Isaiah 10:5-11:9, we may inquire, from a canonical perspective, as to the meaning of the present structure. As a unit, this passage clearly embodies two aspects that are distinct yet inseparable. At one level, this passage is certainly a message specifically addressed to the audience in the time of Isaiah. In order to determine the historical occasion behind Isaiah 10:5-11:9, a survey of Isaiah 10:28-32 + 10:33-34 is most helpful, since these verses seem to relate a concrete historical event.

Wegner argues that the most probable historical background for Isaiah 10:28-32 is Sennacherib’s march against Jerusalem in 701 BCE.150 If this is the case, the subsequent scene in 10:33-34, which speaks of God’s judgement against Assyria, can naturally be understood to reflect Sennacherib’s failure to capture Jerusalem.151 However, though certainly oriented towards the future,152 the vision of 11:1-9 may also reflect the prophet’s expectation for Hezekiah, since the message of deliverance from Assyria (10:28-34) inevitably leads the audience to think of Hezekiah, who led Israel through this time of trial (Isa. 36-39). Although identifying the messianic figure in 11:1-9 with Hezekiah is not a common approach, Young

---

149 Nielsen, There is Hope for a Tree, 123-144.
150 Wegner, An Examination, 229. However, there are also some other competing views. For example, Wildberger believes that Sargon’s march against Ashdod in 711 BCE is the most probable historical situation behind Isa. 10:28-32 (Wildberger, Isaiah 1-12, 446-458). Partly agreeing with Wildberger, Clements states the following: “Since the details of the route would best fit the situation of 713-711, we may conclude that either this was the time of the original prophecy, or possibly that the prophet himself or his redactor has applied the knowledge of what happened in 701 BC to the later Assyrian threat of a march on Jerusalem, in 701” (Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 118-119).

151 Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 120. Clements deems this text to be “a further part of the Josianic Redaction of Isaiah’s prophecies, made in development of the prophet’s threat against Assyria (10:5-15)” (Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 121). Interestingly, however, Barth, who first proposed the Assyrian Redaction, believes that Isa. 10:33b-34 is an additional text which stems from the eighth century BCE; thus, for Barth, Isa. 10:33b-34 is not a product of the Assyrian Redaction (Barth, Jesaja-Worte, 63, 299).

152 Most scholars suppose that Isa. 11:1-9 looks forward to the idealised Davidic king in the future. See Wegner, An Examination, 253 and the bibliographic sources under n227 and 228. Among them, there are scholars who argue that Isa. 11:1 anticipates the future/eschatological Davidic king, since the “stock/cutting” (זג) clearly presupposes the cessation of the Davidic dynasty in the post-exilic period (for instance, see Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 121-123). However, as Wegner points out, “[the] meaning of ‘stump or trunk’ seems reasonable for זג in Isa. 11:1 since the parallel structure of זג and יבש תבב suggests that זג is closer in meaning to ‘stump’ than ‘cutting or stock.’” Thus, his interpretation suggests that “זג does not need to refer to a complete cessation of the Davidic dynasty but instead employs זג in the sense of ‘stock or cutting’ as a synonym for the house of David and therefore means that the house of Jesse will take root and grow” (Wegner, An Examination, 231-232).
provides strong support for this view. Thus, 10:5-11:9 seem to pronounce deliverance from the Assyrian threat of 701 BCE while exulting in Hezekiah’s wise kingship.

At another level, however, it is possible to interpret the present structure of Isaiah 10-11, particularly 10:28-11:9, as reflecting an “eschatological” vision. To begin, a close analysis of the text highlights the prominence of the “eschatological” character of Isaiah 10:28-34. Christensen argues, for instance, and without denying the possible prehistory of this passage, that 10:28-34 (or, 27c-34 in his judgement) depicts the eschatological or even apocalyptic march of the Lord as Divine Warrior against the city of Jerusalem. According to Christensen, the ambiguity concerning the course of the march allows room for an “eschatological” interpretation, because “[t]he precise route of the invader as set forth in this passage does not coincide with what we know of the Assyrian invasions, especially that of Sennacherib in 701.”

Additionally, Christensen goes on to argue that this passage’s climax, depicting God’s judgement against all those who are proud, including even God’s own people, forms an eschatological vision of “resurrection” of the Davidic kingdom:

[Even though the Destroyer has assembled his hosts against Jerusalem, there is yet hope. Yes, Yahweh will hew down those who exalt themselves—even his own people.

---

153 As far as I am aware, only Young holds the view that Isa. 11:1-9 is somehow related to Hezekiah (Young, Hezekiah, 180). Although there are only a few clues to support this view, one of the points which Young presents does seem convincing. He argues that the speech of the commander of Assyria (רַבְמַר [רַבְמֶר] (Isa. 36:5), who rebukes Hezekiah’s kingship, resonates with Isa. 11:2. For ease of comparison, the two texts are as follows:

Isa. 36:5:camel with the head of a man; a man with the head of a man.

(Do you think that empty talk is counsel and strength for war?)

Isa. 11:2:And the spirit of the Lord will rest upon him…the spirit of counsel and strength.

Concerning this connection, Young writes as follows: “Other than in the speech of the [רַבְמַר], the only occurrence of is in Isa 11:2, which claims that the shoot shall be imbued with . As the Isaian tracts of Sennacherib’s third campaign were intent upon accentuating the greatness of Hezekiah by inserting intentional connections back to Isa 7 and the meeting with Ahaz, it is not unreasonable that they tied into additional relevant material from this prophetic collection” (Ibid., 180, n109).

154 Christensen, “The March of Conquest,” 385-399. In order to stress that Isa. 10:28-34 is not about the march of the Assyrian army, Christensen argues that in v. 27c should be emended to “wasteland, wilderness,” which is depicted as “the end-point of the wilderness wandering” in Num. 21:20 and 23:28. Based on this, Christensen then conjectures that Isa. 10:27c-34 is rooted in “some sort of cultic procession from the vicinity of Gilgal to Jerusalem, which has been changed by Isaiah into Yahweh’s march of judgement to Zion in the van of enemy hosts” (389). Although I agree that 10:28-34 has some eschatological flavour, Christensen’s emendation of 10:27c (ḵĕl) is not convincing. Others suggest “Samaria” (Blum, “Jesajas prophetisches Testament [Teil II],” 19, n22). I would agree with Beuken, who seeks a way to read 10:27c as it is without emendation (v.27: “Es wird geschehen an jenem Tag: da weicht seine Last von deiner Schulter, sein Joch wird von deinem Hals weggerissen und der Jochriemen von der fett Vorderfront” [Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 273. 276, emphasis mine]). See also Blum’s view, which reads 10:28-34 as “metageschichtlich” (Blum, “Jesajas prophetisches Testament [Teil II],” 19).

Nevertheless, a root shall sprout from the stump of Jesse as Yahweh shall yet work a new creation in his day of ultimate vindication. The curious reference to the “stump of Jesse” suggests that the prophecy will be fulfilled in a “Regnum Davidicum Redivivum.” That is, a new David will appear who will delight in the fear of Yahweh and through whom Yahweh will accomplish his purposes among the nations. The thrust of the oracle as a whole, at least in its present expanded form, is clearly into the distant future in an eschatological sense.\textsuperscript{156}

Partly owing to Paul David Hanson’s argument,\textsuperscript{157} Christensen conjectures that this eschatological/apocalyptic vision of Isaiah 10-11 has its roots in “a visionary community of the exilic period.”\textsuperscript{158}

Although there is only scant evidence for Christensen’s historical contextualisation of the present structure of Isaiah 10-11, his claim that this structure contains a double entendre still seems sustainable: on the one hand, it recalls the miraculous deliverance from the hands of the Assyrians in 701 BCE; on the other, it looks forward to God’s new provision for the house of David in a distant future. In this dialectic between present and future, a typology similar to those in other royal oracles (7:14; 8:23-9:6) seems to be at work; Hezekiah is depicted as a token of God’s future commitment to the house of David.

However, there is a clear difference between 11:1-9 and the other two royal promises. While the latter stresses Hezekiah’s role as a bearer of “God with us,” a sign of God’s future provision to the Davidic monarchy, the former emphasises the “eschatological” fulfillment of this provision. Therefore, Isaiah 11:2 announces the undeniable presence of God (יהוה אלהי ציון), which is reminiscent of the promise in the Immanuel prophecy (God with us).\textsuperscript{159} Thus, in the present structure of Isaiah 1-12, 11:1-9 envisions the “eschatological” fulfillment of God’s presence in the Davidic dynasty promised in the Immanuel prophecy, whose fulfillment is ensured by the kingship of Hezekiah.

Therefore, the present shape of Isaiah allows one to read Isaiah 11:1-9 as a continuation of Isaiah 10:27-34. In this sequence, 11:1-9 can be interpreted as the “eschatological” fulfillment of the Immanuel prophecy, since the Spirit of God upon the coming Davidic ruler (Isa. 11:2) represents the presence of God promised in Isaiah 7:14, which overcomes the destructive power

\textsuperscript{156} Ibtd., 394-395.
\textsuperscript{158} Christensen, “The March of Conquest,” 394.
\textsuperscript{159} Cf. Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 52.
raised against Zion (10:27-34). However, at the same time, the introductory oracle in Isaiah 11:27-32 seems to be based on the Assyrian invasion of 701 BCE. Consequently, the subsequent triumph (depicted in Isa. 11:1-9) appears to be related to Hezekiah’s leadership during the Assyrian crisis. This dialectic between present and future indicates that the eschatological expectation for the new king in Isaiah 11:1-9 is rooted in historical experience, i.e. Hezekiah’s wise kingship, which enabled Judah to escape from Sennacherib’s threat against Zion.

1.3 Conclusion

The preceding analysis suggests that the three significant royal oracles in the former part of Isaiah (Isa. 1-39), particularly Isaiah 1-12, all serve a dual role in relating to Hezekiah and foreshadowing the coming of the “eschatological” Davidic king. In the Immanuel prophecy in 7:14, the emergence of Hezekiah and the name he bears (“God with us”) are provided as a token of God’s assurance for his future provision for the house of David through the coming of the new David. The subsequent royal prophecy in Isaiah 8:23-9:6 continues this typological dialectic between present and future. The inception of Hezekiah’s reign and the long title assigned to him in 9:5 (“a wonderful planner [is] the mighty God; the Father of eternity [is] a prince of peace”) confirms his role as a sign and further assures of God’s commitments.

The third royal oracle (11:1-9) significantly enlarges the scope of the eschatological vision for the Davidic kingship of the two previous oracles, while still being rooted in Hezekiah’s kingship. This historical kingship anticipates a fulfillment of the promise given to the house of David in 7:14 (“God with us”) since, in that day, the messianic ruler will reign with the full embodiment of God’s presence (cf. 11:2, where “the spirit of the Lord will rest upon him”). Therefore, we may conclude that, in the present structure of Isaiah 1-12, the three royal oracles as a whole balance a typological dialectic between present and future.
Chapter 2
The Servant of the Lord: Anticipation of the New Moses

2.1 Introduction

The four Servant Songs in “Deutero-Isaiah” (42:1-9; 48:16-49:12; 50:2-51:16; 52:13-53:12) have attracted interest not only from Old Testament specialists, but also by New Testament scholars, as is evident from the sheer existence of cross-disciplinary technical terms such as “Gottesknecht,” “Ebed-Jahwe-Lied” and “Stellvertretung.”161 The one who was largely responsible for this situation was the nineteenth-century biblical scholar Bernhard Duhm,162 who promoted a view of the four Servant Songs which was unique at the time. According to Duhm, the four Songs existed separately from Isaiah 40-55, until they were later inserted into this “Grundschrift.” Following his methodology, Duhm then identified the Servant as a person suffering from leprosy at the time of the prophet “Second Isaiah.”163

Following this “obsession in Duhmian reading of the Servant Songs… [to pursue] the identity of the servant,”164 subsequent scholars have proposed innumerable theories on the topic. In this quest for the most probable candidate for the “historical” Servant, the Servant texts were often separated from their immediate context (Isaiah 40-55) as emphasis was laid on the historical context behind the texts. For example, Odil Hannes Steck, accepting Duhm’s basic hypothesis, contends that, after 539 B. C. E., the Servant in the “Grundschrift” came to be identified with the people of Israel, while the “Knecht Jahwes” of the four Servant Songs refers to an anonymous prophet.165 Steck then proposes four intra-Isaianic reception stages from the post-exilic period through the Ptolemaic era (520-270 BCE), during which the four Servant Songs were received and interpreted differently through various redactions. In Steck’s view, the Servant was variously identified with Cyrus, Zion and the resettled Israel, depending on the historical situation of each reception stage.166

---

160 I use this term without making any historical claim about the text’s development, but merely to describe the bulk of the texts in Isa. 40-55.
162 Duhm, Das Buch Jesaja.
164 Ibid., 220.
Likewise, Berges, following Duhm, separates the Servant Songs from the “Grundschrift,” instead locating them in the redactional layers. Similar to Steck, Berges argues that, despite the Deutero-Isaianic texts’ original intention to identify the Servant with the entire nation of Israel, the redactors presented the Servant as the “Gola” community (in the first three Servant Songs) and later as Zion (in the fourth). Berges conjectures that those redactional activities occurred from roughly 539 to the middle of the fifth century BCE. 167 Similarly, Fredrik Hägglund, though focusing only on the fourth Song, briefly relates his view to Duhm’s earlier insight, concluding that “Isa 53 was…inserted [in the post-exilic period] as an explanation of how the people in the land, i.e. the ‘we’ should have received those who returned, i.e. the servant.”168

These efforts to discover the “original” historical figure/setting behind the Servant Songs are, in a way, continuations of the traditional quest within the history of interpretation (cf. Acts 8:34). However, modern scholars tend to neglect the immediate textual contexts of the Songs, focusing almost solely on locating redactional layers. In reading the Servant passages, this trend can be misleading rather than helpful, since, as Williamson points out, “conceptual differences” within Isaiah 40-55 might not automatically indicate different redactional stages.169 Given the lack of any concrete historical evidence, then, the literary connections between the Servant Songs and their immediate contexts rightly deserve more attention.170


167 Berges, Das Buch Jesaja, 358-413, 549.
168 F. Hägglund, Isaiah 53 in the Light of Homecoming after Exile, FAT 2, 31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 176. Thus, Hägglund accepts Hans M. Barstad’s argument that the addressee of the message in Isa. 40-55 was not the exiled Israelites in Babylon, but rather those who had already returned to Judah (Hägglund, Isaiah 53, 141-155). See H.M. Barstad, A Way in the Wilderness: The “Second Exodus” in the Message of Second Isaiah, JSS 12 (Manchester: University of Manchester, 1989). However, in my view, this does not do justice to the literal meaning of Isa. 40-55 since, whatever the “real/naked” historical situation behind the text might have been, the text clearly addresses people in Babylon, encouraging them to escape from that place (e.g., 52:11-12).
170 The most important criticism against Duhm is found in T. N. D. Mettinger’s work. See T. N. D. Mettinger, A Farewell to the Servant Songs: A Critical Examination of an Exegetical Axiom (Lund: Gleerup, 1983). In addition, Gordon P. Huguenberger (“The Servant of the Lord in the ‘Servant Songs’ of Isaiah,” in The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts, ed. by Philip E. Satterthwaite et al. [Carlisle:
A fact particularly worth noting is that the Servant Songs are placed in a web of Exodus-imagery and immersed in Exodus language. Therefore, from a canonical point of view, examining the allusions to Exodus may serve to help determine the identity of the Servant. In light of the link between the Exodus and the future deliverance from the oppressive empire in Isaiah 40-55, some argue that the identity of the Servant is closely related to Moses. For instance, von Rad, who points out several parallels between Moses and the Servant (such as the mission of allotting lands to the Israelite tribes, mediatory work, and vicarious suffering) and emphasises the theme of the new Exodus, believes that “it is very probable that, as with Deuteronomy, Deutero-Isaiah stood within a tradition which looked for a prophet like Moses.”

Likewise, Baltzer, in his recent commentary, departs from his former conviction that the Servant refers to Israel in the present form of Isaiah 40-55. Instead, he now holds that the Servant texts can be understood as a “‘memorial’ of Moses,” serving the entire “liturgical drama” of chaps. 40-55. In fact, this association of the Servant with Moses is not a new idea, but stems from Ernst Sellin, whose opinion has influenced various scholars, albeit in different ways.

Following the insights of the aforementioned scholars, I intend to argue here, on the one hand, that the Deutero-Isaiah does anticipate a “new Moses” in its eschatological scope. However, on the other hand, the Servant texts can also be interpreted within a historical scope as displaying both a collective (Isa. 40-48) and an individual figure (49-55). In order to demonstrate my case,

---


I will first discuss the chronological framework of Isaiah 40-55, according to which the Servant Songs are to be interpreted. I will then examine the four Servant Songs in order to demonstrate that the Servant inhabits both historical and eschatological scopes in this section.177

2.2 The Anticipation for the Servant of the Lord as the Second Moses

2.2.1 The Chronological Framework of Isaiah 40-55 (-66)

This section examines the chronological framework of Isaiah 40-55, focusing on the relationship between the “former things” and the “latter/new things.” Understanding this scheme is important for the present study, since the Servant texts are embedded in this framework. On this issue, Menahem Haran’s study serves as an appropriate starting point.178 Haran argues that the main meaning of the מַשֵּׁות is “prophecies which have been fulfilled,” citing several passages in Isaiah 40-55.179 According to Haran, however, it is unclear which prophecy the prophet refers to as fulfilled.180

Haran’s understanding of מְשֹׁות is as “the revival of Israel.”181 In other words, this primarily refers to Israel’s homecoming back to Jerusalem and the reconstruction of the temple.182 Thus, the term has an immediate, not a remote, future in view. As he writes,

the message of the revival [the new things] is not promised by this prophet for the remote future, but immediately. There is no ‘latter-day’ vision in his prophecies, but a clear feeling that the event is about to happen without delay, as if it were already standing at the threshold, the prophet himself being merely its herald.183

Although Haran’s systematic treatment of the issue is helpful, his definitions of מְשֹׁות and מַשֵּׁות seem too rigid. For Haran, the “former things” refers to fulfilled prophecies; however, actual past events in Israel’s history, such as the Exodus, can hardly be ignored, as Haran
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177 In this analysis, while recognising that the precise delineation of each Song is controversial, I will follow Baltzer’s “Abgrenzung” of the Songs. Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah. 19-20.
179 Ibid., 137.
180 Haran cites the following passages: Isa. 41:22, 26; 42:9; 43:9, 12; 44:7-8; 45:21; 46:10; 48:3-5, 14-16a. Although Haran emphasises the prophecies against Babylon (Isa. 13:1-14:23; 21:1-10), he does not think that those are the fulfilled prophecies. Ibid., 140.
181 Ibid., 140.
182 Ibid., 140-141.
183 Ibid., 141.
himself admits. Furthermore, Haran’s strict definition of the “latter/new things” fails to capture the vast vision of the “latter/new things” that Isaiah as a whole presents.

By contrast, Christopher R. North provides a more convincing argument. Without entirely contradicting Haran’s view, North proposes a more flexible definition. According to North, “[t]he terminus a quo of the רָאשֵׁת הָעַרְבָּה is the old Exodus; the terminus ad quem of the רָאשֵׁת הָעַרְבָּה is the new [Exodus].” As his argument unfolds, “it seems probable that the terminus ad quem of the רָאשֵׁת הָעַרְבָּה may be contemporary, or nearly so, with the terminus a quo of the רָאשֵׁת הָעַרְבָּה.” North considers this “contemporary” event related to both רָאשֵׁת הָעַרְבָּה and רָאשֵׁת הָעַרְבָּה to be “the victories of Cyrus up to the fall of Sardis in 547.” Thus, North, unlike Haran, interprets the “former things” and the “latter/new things” not as a single event or action, but believes that they entail a broader range of time. Consequently, North’s study implies that the “former things” even overlap with the “latter/new things.”

Furthermore, North suggests yet another temporal scheme, claiming that the fourth Servant Song (Isa. 52:13-53:12) displays an unprecedented newness, whose realisation is yet to come in the future: “[t]he עַלָּל הַלָּל הַיֵּה of liii. 1 lies still further in the womb of the future.” This opinion is in accord with Aage Bentzen, who also emphasises the theme of absolute newness in the fourth Servant Song. Although the two differ in details of their arguments, they both agree that the Deutero-Isaiah has an “eschatological” nature in its vision.

184 Ibid., 137.
186 Concerning the “former things,” North points out that, though not considered as Isianic texts, the prophecies in the first half of Isaiah (Isa. 13:1-14:23; 21:1-10) function as future prediction of the fall of Babylon, and that these prophecies, being רָאשֵׁת הָעַרְבָּה, were deemed to be fulfilled in the latter half of Isaiah (41:22; 42:9; 48:3) (North, “The ‘Former Things’ and the ‘New Things,’” 124-125). Likewise, many scholars point out the connection between the “former things” and the oracles in First Isaiah. See D. Jones, “The Tradition of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem,” ZAW 67 (1955): 226-246; Childs, Introduction, 328-330; Seitz, Zion’s Final Destiny, 199-202. In a slightly different way, Williamson argues that the temporal phrases (the “former things” and the “latter/new things”) in Deutero-Isaiah were influenced by Isa. 8:23b-9:6. See Williamson, “First and Last in Isaiah,” 95-108.
188 Ibid., 118.
189 Ibid., 124.
190 Ibid., 126.
191 Bentzen, King and Messiah, 57-58. The difference between North and Bentzen, however, is that, while the former believes that the newness in the fourth Servant Song is a third stage in Deutero-Isaiah’s temporal scheme (the first stage = “former things,” the second stage = “latter/new things”), the latter is convinced that the newness in the fourth Servant Song belongs to Deutero-Isaiah’s message of the “new things.” North, “The ‘Former Things’ and the ‘New Things,’” 126.
192 North states, “I find myself entirely in agreement with VOLTZ when he says...’Deutero-Isaiah is shot through and through with eschatology’” (C. R. North, “The Interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah,” in Interpretationes ad
However, while a few scholars acknowledge some “eschatological” aspect to Deutero-Isaiah,\(^{193}\) many are sceptical about employing a concept which is assumed to date from after the Old Testament writings.\(^{194}\) Nevertheless, Henk Leene suggests that there is a way to properly speak of the “eschatological” character of some Old Testament passages.\(^{195}\) First, Leene attempts to clarify the meaning of the word “eschatology/eschatological.” From his viewpoint, “[e]schatology presumes that God has a goal for people and the world. Representations of that definitive future action of God that enables him to achieve this goal are eschatological.”\(^{196}\) After discussing several issues related to eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah, he concludes,

I therefore believe that Deutero-Isaiah’s conception of the new may be called eschatological in the sense that it concerns a future in which Yhwh will attain his goal: the human answer to history. Without the new, history can only lead to the unmasking and shaming of humans. But this future answer is not exclusively prospective. In a certain sense it is already anticipated in the dramatic character of the servant Jacob-Israel changed by Yhwh’s word.\(^{197}\)

Leene’s statement is generally agreeable, if the “goal” which he speaks of is understood as a radically new thing which possesses some character distinct from the old age, as is clearly indicated in Isaiah 48:6-8.\(^{198}\)

Indeed, Deutero-Isaiah presents the “new things” as absolutely new future events, which are not necessarily restricted to the revival of Israel in the impending future. According to the message of Deutero-Isaiah, the “new things,” for instance, are not described as a simple homecoming from Babylon to Jerusalem, an event typologically analogous to the first Exodus. Rather,


\(^{195}\) Leene, “History and Eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah,” 223-249.

\(^{196}\) Ibid., 225-226.

\(^{197}\) Ibid., 235.

\(^{198}\) “From now on I will tell you of new things, of hidden things unknown to you. They are created now, and not long ago; you have not heard of them before today. So you cannot say, ‘Yes, I know of them.’ You have neither heard nor understood; from of old your ear has not been open” (Isa. 48:6-8, NIV).
surpassing by far the scale of the initial escape from Egypt, the “second Exodus” is described by proclamations such as “the Lord will bring your offspring from the east [תינכט]” (43:5), and “from the west I will gather you [נתחבצ]” (43:5).

Moreover, in the “second Exodus,” the Lord “will say to the north ‘Give [them] up! [לאמר]’” (43:6), “to the south ‘Do not withhold [them]! [לאמר אלד recherche]’” (43:6) and “Bring my sons from far away and my daughters from the end of the earth! [ניחה בניה ירח וחברות קָנָר]” (43:6). The ultimate purpose of these summons is to honour God (49:3). These themes of gathering people from everywhere and of the peoples’ worship are further elaborated towards the end of Isaiah with a grand climax: “And I, [because of] their actions and their thoughts, I will come [תבאה, qal, participle feminine singular] to gather all the nations and tongues and they will see my glory [והוא ירא אראכבו]” (66:18). Thus, the description of the “second Exodus” manifests an overwhelming grandeur, quite unlike anything that has happened in history.

Therefore, the “new things” in Deutero-Isaiah seem to be absolutely new in an eschatological sense: they do not simply indicate the imminent “revival” of Israel, although this event certainly marks the beginning of the “new things.” Through this eschatological perspective, even the great escape from Babylon can be considered part of the “former things,” since it is not a full realisation of Deutero-Isaiah’s grand vision of the escape from the oppressive powers.

This interpretation gains favourable support when the message of Deutero-Isaiah is read in conjunction with the conclusion of Isaiah. Borrowing from the analysis of Emmanuel Uchenna Dim, when the eschatological vision of the “new heavens and earth” is unfolded at the end of Isaiah (cf. Isa. 65:17), the “former things” (הראשונים) “stand for the whole created order,” including space and time. Thus, when the message of Deutero-Isaiah is seen in the wider context of Isaiah, literally “everything” would be counted as the “former things,” and only after
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199 Cf. Seitz, “Provenance as a Factor in Interpretation” (unpublished); E. U. Dim, The Eschatological Implications of Isa 65 and 66 as the Conclusion of the Book of Isaiah (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 313.
200 Another feature which suggests the absolute newness of Deutero-Isaiah’s vision is that the “new things” are depicted as the radical transformation of the order of this world (Isa. 65-66). Although this theme is not found in Isa. 40-55, the fact that Deutero-Isaiah stresses God’s work of creation suggests that Deutero-Isaiah already anticipates the theme of the “new creation” which concludes Isaiah. Cf. Dim, The Eschatological Implications, 317-319.
201 Ibid., 318.
everything had passed away would the “new things” emerge as part of the renewal of the world.\(^{202}\)

However, this radical newness envisioned in Deutero-Isaiah and throughout Isaiah is not completely separate from Israel’s experience. Although everything earthly would be “former things” within the eschatological framework, the former/earthly things certainly play an indispensable role in the temporal scheme of Isaiah. The co-existence of eschatology and earthly history can be considered analogous to what we have previously observed in our analysis of the royal oracles in Isaiah 1-12. Here two points can be advanced to demonstrate this dialectical relationship.

First, based upon the implications of North’s observation that the “former things” overlap the beginning, if not the fulfillment, of the “latter/new things,” the latter would somehow be dependent on the former, indicating their inseparable connection. Second, the study by Patricia Tull Willey and Benjamin D. Sommer shows Deutero-Isaiah’s dependence on the “former” things, i.e. old traditions/ scriptural texts, demonstrating that Deutero-Isaiah describes the “new things” not with innovative expressions, but by recalling and reiterating the “former things” such as Creation, Exodus, ancient psalms, and older prophecies.\(^{203}\)

Therefore, despite the radical nature of “the latter/new things” with its eschatological scope, these are inseparable from “the former things,” which are historical and earthly. Not only do “the latter/new things” depend on “the old things” as their foundation, but the significance of “the old things” is also interwoven with that of “the latter/new things,” as they await the completion of their purpose, which was not fully realised when they actually took place.\(^{204}\) Thus, when reading the Servant passages in Deutero-Isaiah, which are presented in the framework of the “former” and the “latter” things, special attention needs to be paid to both the differences and complementarity of those two elements, keeping in mind the dialectical nature of their relationship.

\(^{202}\) Dim enumerates and explicates several “eschatological” themes in Isa. 65-66: transformation of human society (Isa. 66:18-23); transformation of the human person (65:20); transformation of nature (65:17-25); universal scope of salvation (66:18-19); and final judgement (66:24). See ibid., 309-326


2.2.2 The Analysis of the Four Servant Songs

This section analyses the four Servant texts[^205] in light of the chronological scheme discussed above. The placement of the Servant Songs in the framework of the “former things” and the “latter/new things” suggests that the Servant Songs can also be interpreted according to this dialectical paradigm. While the Servant is anticipated as an eschatological figure, “he” is also depicted as distinct historical figures: Israel (in the first Song) and an anonymous prophet (in the other three Songs). These historical figures pass away with all other “former things,” but they still retain their significance as prototypes.

2.2.2.1 The First Servant Song (Isa. 42:1-9)

Keeping in mind that the Servant Songs reflect both historical and eschatological hopes, we shall first discuss the historical scope of the first Servant Song. The most likely candidate for the historical Servant seems to be Israel, on three primary grounds. First, this Song is situated among the texts which depict Israel/Jacob as a Servant (41:8; 44:1, 2, 21; 45:4; 48:20), as Peter Wilcox and David Paton-Williams point out.[^206] Among these, the parallel between 41:8 (cf. v.10) and 42:1 is particularly important[^207]:

> ואהשׁ תִּשְׂרָאֵל נְעֵמָי נְכֵּב אֶסְרָאֵל בַּחַרְיָה

(And you are Israel, my Servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen.)

> וְזֶה נְעֵמָי אַתְּמֵרְבּוּ בַּחַרְיָה רַעַת נְפֶשׁ

(Behold, my Servant, whom I uphold, my chosen one, in whom my soul delights.)

This correspondence strongly suggests that the Servant in Isaiah 41:1-9 refers to Israel.

The Greek translations, secondly, seem to implicitly acknowledge the link noted above, inserting “Jacob” and “Israel” into the translation of Isaiah 42:1: Ἰακωβ ὁ προῖς μου ἀντιλήψιμαι σύνοι Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς μου προσεδέξατο σύνοι ἡ ψυχή μου. Third, some scholars point out that the royal task of the Servant vis-à-vis the nations (illustrated in v. 1, “he will bring forth the judgement [משפט] to the nations” and in v.2, “I will keep you and give you as a covenant for the people [ܠܺܠܿܬܿܪܿܐ ܢܿܓܿܢ] and a light for the nations [ܠܿܠܿܪܿܚܿܐ ܛܿܪܿ]”) is uniquely

[^207]: See also Isa. 44:1.
tied to Israel, since, in Isaiah 55:4, Israel is said to have “kingship” over the nations. Thus, the present structure of Isaiah 40-55 allows us to confidently interpret the Servant of the first Song as Israel.

However, opponents of this hypothesis point out that Isaiah 40-55 depicts Israel’s mission as passive, while the first Song highlights the Servant’s active mission. Because of this, some scholars prefer to identify the Servant with Cyrus rather than Israel. Indeed, Cyrus is God’s shepherd (44:28, חרביניו,ח) and His anointed one (45:1, מְשָׁלךְ). However, this identification seems implausible, since the tenderness of the Servant described in Isaiah 42:2-3 hardly corresponds with the depiction of Cyrus in 41:25 (“he shall trample on rulers as on mortar, as the potter treads clay”).

How, then, is the dissonance between the active role of the Servant and the passive role of Israel to be explained? According to Wilcox and Paton-Williams, Israel’s active aspect can be attested outside the first Servant Song, despite her seemingly passive character. For example, in Isaiah 41:15-16, God tells Israel that He will make Israel into “a threshing sledge” (לחםשוד,ל), which will “thresh the mountains and crush them, and reduce the hills to chaff.” Moreover, God calls Israel to praise Him (43:21) and proclaims His salvation to the world (48:20). Therefore, the wider context presents Israel not only as a passive agent but also as an active “servant”.

Therefore, concerning the identity of the Servant in Isaiah 42:1-9, Wilcox and Paton-Williams write that:

there is a difference between the character of the servant within the first Servant Song and the character of servant Israel in chs. 40-48; but there is no difference of identity. In the first Servant Song the prophet looks forward to a time when passive Israel will take up his mantle once more, as Yahweh’s active servant among the nations. To this extent, the servant in 42.1-4 is indeed “an ideal rather than an actual figure” [as C. R. North

---

208 J. Jeremias, “ממשה im ersten Gottesknechtslied (Jes. XLII 1-4),” VT 22 (1972): 40-41; Wilcox and Paton-Williams, “The Servant Songs,” 87. However, I do not agree that the Davidic dynasty was “democratised” in Isa. 40-55 (cf. Chapter 3).


writes]. As Goldingay has it, “the picture of the servant [in 42.1-4] has become a role seeking someone to fulfil it.”

In other words, what is stated about the Servant in Isaiah 42:1-9 is an idealised vision of Israel. However, in reality, Israel cannot fulfill God’s calling, because her sins hinder her from being God’s true Servant.

Therefore, Israel’s failure to fulfill God’s calling, as well as the anonymity of the Servant in the first Servant Song, create room for an eschatological scope, a scope which leads one to anticipate the “new things” ( Isa. 42:9). The “new things” of Isaiah 40-55, as we shall see, are depicted as the new Exodus, which will be led by the new Moses. To participate in this vision, the first Servant Song ends with the Lord’s declaration concerning the “new things” in v. 9. This declaration, I argue, signals the anticipation of the new Moses, who will pick up and carry on the unfulfilled mission of Israel.

This connection between the eschatological Servant and the New Moses can be established because the first Servant Song is placed within the web of Exodus-images. For example, prior to the Song, the Lord promises in 41:17-20 that He will make the desert a place of abundant water and fresh greenery, a proclamation reminiscent of Exodus 15:27; 17:1-7 and Numbers 20:1-13.

In addition, immediately after the announcement of the “new things” in 42:9, the passage exhorts the people to “sing to the Lord a new song [שֶׁבֶר], his praise from the end of the earth” (42:10). This “new song” can be interpreted in relation to Exodus, as Shalom Paul writes,

Just as Israel sang to God when He parted the Reed Sea (Exod 15), so too they will sing as God leads them through the Syrian Desert to the promised land, and this time the

\[\text{\footnotesize \begin{align*}
\text{\small 213} & \text{ Wilcox and Paton-Williams, “The Servant Songs,” 88. Jörg Jeremias also contends that, in the first Servant Song, the Servant is depicted as “identisch” with Israel, but with important qualifications: “Jedoch besteht ein wesentlicher Unterschied zwischen beiden darin, dass Israel an seiner Aufgabe versagt, der Knecht sie mit Ausdauer bis zur Vollendung ausführt. Dann aber kann der Knecht nicht einfach Israel sein; die Parallelität der Darstellung wird vielmehr gewählt worden sein, um den Knecht als Verkörperung des ‘wahren Israel’ zu schildern. Die kollektive Deutung der Knechtslieder wäre dann in Anlehnung an Überlegungen H. W. Robinsons dahingehend zu modifizieren, dass der Knecht an Israels Stelle tritt und dessen unterfüllte Aufgabe ausführt. Am deutlichsten hat M. Buber diesen Sachverhalt gesehen: ‘Hier löst...der Ebed offenbar Israel so ab, dass Wesen und Werk, die diesem bestimmt waren, auf ihn übergeben...; zu Israel verhält er (sc. Der Ebed) sich wie die im Vollzug begriffene Aufgabe zur unvollzogen gebliebenen’” (Jeremias, “jpvm im Ersten Gottesknechtslied,” 41). However, note also that Jeremias thinks that interpreting the Servant as the idealised Israel cannot fully grasp the meaning of the first Song. He argues that another important aspect of the Servant in the first Song is the prophetisch aspect, which corresponds with the vocation of Deutero-Isaiah: “Aber die Auffassung vom Knecht als idealen Israel deckt nur einen Aspekt des Gottesknechtshehandeln. Die andere Seite seiner Aufgabe, die in allem Wesentlichen der Aufgabe Deuterosejasjas entspricht, ist die prophetische” (Jeremias, “im Ersten Gottesknechtslied,” 41).}
\end{align*} \]
mountains, the oceans, and the desert—all of nature, in fact—will join Israel in their joyous hymn of thanksgiving.\(^{216}\)

Israel sings a new song like the song of Moses at the Reed Sea, since the Lord Himself, being a “man of war” (אַשָּׁר מלחָהוּת, ‘asḥār melahuṭ), will bring the victory to His own people, just as the Lord revealed Himself as a “man of war” in the first Exodus (Exod. 15:3, אַשָּׁר מלחָהוּת).\(^{217}\)

Furthermore, the first Servant Song itself contains some Exodus imagery. In Isaiah 42:7, the Servant is said “to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, from the house of confinement [לַאֲלֹמָה מֶמְסָר אָסֵר אֵמוֹתִים כָּלָּה].” This expression closely resembles that in Ps. 68, which recollects the first Exodus (אָסֵר, ‘asēr), hiphil, followed by אֵמוֹתִים can be seen in Exod. 13:3, 14; 20:2; Deut. 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:5, 10).\(^{218}\)

Thus, the “new thing” in the first Servant Song appears to indicate a new Exodus prefigured by the “old thing,” the original Exodus from Egypt. In this context, then, the key figure would naturally be a new Moses, Israel’s new leader in the future. Therefore, when considered as an eschatological figure, the Servant is likely to bear the marks of Moses of old. Indeed, at least eight links between the Servant and Moses can be located in the first Servant Song. The first six consist of simple parallels, which are as follows: 1) In the Old Testament, a “servant” (рабו) refers most frequently to Moses;\(^ {219}\) 2) both Moses and the Servant are said to possess God’s Spirit (Num. 11:17ff.);\(^ {220}\) 3) the revelation of God’s name in Isaiah 42:8 resonates with God’s disclosure of his name at the burning bush (Exod. 3);\(^ {221}\) 4) both Moses and the Servant are called God’s “chosen one” (Isa. 42:1, הבורא; Psalm 106:23, הבורא);\(^ {222}\) 5) both Moses and the Servant have the responsibility to take care of foreigners (cf. Num. 11:4 with “a mixed crowd” [פר Erect in Isa. 42:1, 6);\(^ {223}\) 6) the repeated verb “to bring out” (התברא- hiphil) bears special

---

219 This attribution occurs approximately forty times. For example, the phrase “the servant of the Lord” (рабו ליהוה) is used in Deut. 34:5; Josh. 1:1, 13, 15; 8:31, 33; 11:12; 12:6; 13:8; 14:7; 18:7; 22:2, 4, 5; 2Kgs 18:12; 2Chr. 1:3; 24:6. Note that in eighteen out of twenty-three occurrences, this phrase is applied to Moses. For further lexical data, see Hugenberger, “The Servant of the Lord,” 129.
220 Ibid., 132.
221 Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 20.
223 Ibid., 132. However, although both Moses and the Servant have a responsibility to treat the foreigners/nations according to God’s decree, the way they treat them may differ slightly. Isa. 42:3 says that the Servant does not break the “bruised reed” (ולך דְּבֵר; the same phrase appears in Isa. 36:6 to describe Egypt (ברשה).
importance in both cases (the Servant’s mission is to “bring out” justice (מלשון) for the nations [Isa. 42:1, 3, 7], while Moses is called to “bring out” the people of Israel from Egypt [Exod. 3:10, 11, 12]).

However, in the next two parallels, the Mosaic Servant now takes on an eschatological scope in his mission: 7) although the missions of both the Servant and Moses are to establish “justice” (צדק) and to teach the nations with “Torah” (תוריה), the Torah that the new Moses will offer is not only for Israel, but, as Irmtraud Fischer stresses, also for the nations. Thus, the one who is expected here is, as Jörg Jeremias puts it, “Mose für die Völker,” 8) while Moses embodied the covenant with God by his mediatory work (cf. Exod. 24; 25:22), the Servant is presented by God not only as a “covenant of people” (Isa. 42:6, כovenant תעם) but also as the “light to the nations” (Isa. 42:6, אור ניסי). Considering these elements, the Servant in the first Song seems to anticipate a new Moses with eschatological characteristics.

Therefore, the previous discussion shows that the Servant represents both historical and eschatological figures: Israel and the New Moses. This conclusion brings us to the final

---

224 Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 20.
225 Cf. Exod. 18; 21:1; 24:3; Num. 11; 27:5; Deut. 1; 4:1, 13; 7:11-12; 10:4. See Hugenberger, “The Servant of the Lord,” 132; Jeremias, “im Ersten Gottesknechtslied,” 37-39; Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 42. Despite the reticence of some scholars to recognise the connection between “torah” in Isaiah and the Mosaic Torah (North, The Second Isaiah, 107-108), I would argue that there is some link between them not only from a diachronic perspective (Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 42-44) but also from a canonical perspective. For reasons why “torah” in Isa. 40-55 (42:4; 21, 24; 51:4, 7) can be understood in association with the Mosaic Torah, see my argument in the introduction.
227 Although the expression ‘to give/present as a covenant’ is nowhere used of the original Moses, it seems entirely apt to describe one whose role is modelled on Moses as the mediator of the covenant at Sinai (Ex. 24; 25:22). To obey Moses was to obey the covenant (Ex. 20:19; cf. 16:8; 17:2). Faith in Moses was commensurate with faith in the Lord of the covenant (Ex. 14:31; 19:9)” (Hugenberger, “The Servant of the Lord,” 134).
228 Given this dominant Exodus-typology and the role of the new Moses, however, what seems strange in the first Servant Song is the latter half of the Song, which suddenly speaks of God’s act of creation (Isa. 42:5). Notwithstanding the abrupt transition from the description of the Servant’s mission to the account of creation, this new theme serves to signal the beginning of the new age and even to highlight the eschatological scope of the first Servant Song. According to Ph. B. Harner, creation in Deutero-Isaiah actually “links together the old era of salvation history and the new era that is about to dawn,” and thus, “creation faith is more than merely a presupposition of II Isaiah’s message. It is an integral part of the proclamation that he makes to his people in exile” (Ph. B. Harner, “Creation Faith in Deutero-Isaiah,” VT 17 [1967]: 304). Thus, it may be assumed that the creation account in the first Servant Song functions to hint of God’s radical new action with its eschatological scope: the coming of the new Moses.
challenge in reading the first Servant Song. How can the new Moses, being an individual, embody the role of Israel, an entire nation?

Concerning this problem, Gordon P. Hugenberger provides an excellent observation. He emphasises that, in the book of Exodus, Moses, being a mediator between God and His people, represents the entire nation of Israel (Exod. 20:18-19) and makes a covenant with God on behalf of his people. Also, Moses can be seen as prefiguring the fate of Israel in at least three ways: (1) the “reeds” (םַפֵּשַׁת) of Exodus. 2:3, 5 prefigure the “Reed Sea” (רָם יָם) in 15:4; (2) Moses’ flight from Egypt (Exod. 2:15) prefigures Israel’s flight from Egypt; and (3) the theophany in the bush (הַנַּחַל) at Horeb in Exodus 3 prefigures the theophany at Sinai (판). 230

Furthermore, Hugenberger continues, there are three passages where God promises Moses that he will become a “new Israel.” In Exodus 32:9-10, the Lord says to Moses that he would become “the sole heir of that covenant,” i.e. “the new Israel.” As it is written, “I will make of you [Moses] a great nation” (שמות אַתָּךְ לְמִשְׁמֶרָה). Likewise, in Num. 14:12, God proclaims that He would strike the rebels inside the assembly and “make of [Moses] a nation greater and mightier than they” (שמות אַתָּךְ לְמִשְׁמֶרָה וְעָשֶׂם מִמְּנֶיךָ). 231

Therefore, the scriptural canon seems to depict Moses and Israel as inseparable. Moreover, Moses is presented as the one who is promised by God to be the new Israel. Therefore, we may conclude that the first Servant Song anticipates the new Moses becoming the new Israel, an eschatological completion of God’s promise to Moses formerly left unfulfilled. Thus, the message of the first Servant Song is twofold: the Song reminds the people of Israel, who at this stage are sinful and unable to obey God, of their call as God’s chosen people, and it also presents a hope for the new Moses who will truly respond to God’s call as “new Israel.”

2.2.2.2 The Second Servant Song ( Isa. 48:16-49:12)

We now turn to examine the second Servant Song. Following the previous section, I will first discuss the historical dimension of this text. Through this discussion, I shall demonstrate that the second Servant Song, being placed in the structurally transitional position of Isaiah 40-55, 232
displays a dramatic change from the previous Song. As if to fulfill the incomplete mission of Israel in 42:1-9, 18-25, an anonymous prophetic figure arises and receives a special commission from God as “new Israel.”

To begin our investigation, Isaiah 48:16 and its relationship to 49:1-6 deserve particular attention. On a literary level, the first person singular in 48:16 and the Servant speaking in the same voice in 49:1-6 apparently share certain connections. However, some commentators do not recognise this link since they either assume that the main unit of the second Servant Song is 49:1-6 or else claim that 48:16 did not originally belong to chap. 48.

However, considering the close juxtaposition of the two “I”-speeches (48:16; 49:1-6), a connection between the two can hardly be overlooked. Thus, the voice in 48:16 is most likely that of the Servant figure in 49:1-6. However, even in this case, the identity of the two “I”-voices is unclear. In response to this ambiguity, scholars have advanced numerous hypotheses. For instance, Reinhard Gregor Kratz argues that, through the latest redaction of Isaiah 40-55 in the middle of the fifth century BCE, the Servant Israel (more precisely, the “Gola” group returning from Babylon to Jerusalem) came to be depicted as the agent of both “I”-voices, since the presence of Israel dominates from Isaiah 48 to 49.

Although Kratz’s case is possible, several objections must be levied against it. First, he underestimates the strength of God’s reproach against Israel in Isaiah 48. In this negative context, 48:16 can hardly be read as illustrating the installment of this Israel as God’s chosen Servant. In addition, if Israel were the Servant, it would be extremely difficult to interpret 49:5, which speaks of the Servant’s mission to Israel. Furthermore, and most problematically of all, Kratz’ overly precise redactional deductions freeze the dynamism of the theme of the Servant throughout Isaiah 40-55. The present study, by contrast, acknowledges this dynamism as the key to understanding the second Servant Song.

---

233 Seitz stresses this point; see C. R. Seitz, ‘‘You are my Servant, You are the Israel in whom I will be Glorified:’ The Servant Songs and the Effect of Literary Context in Isaiah,” CTJ 39 (2004): 125ff.
237 Following Duhm’s basic thesis, Kratz argues that the “Servant” in the second Song, along with the other Songs, was originally identified with a kingly-prophetic figure before it was later incorporated in the Deutero-
The two “I”-speeches, I contend instead, are strategically embedded in the structural logic of Isaiah 40-55. Chaps. 48-49, then, as Wilcox and Paton-Williams, Childs and Seitz all observe, are situated at the transitional position of chaps. 40-55: before 49:7, the focus is on the Servant Israel and Cyrus, while the Servant’s first person singular is dominant after that point.\(^{238}\)

Considering this distinct structure, the Servant figure who speaks in the first person singular (48:16 and 49:1-6) is likely a new figure, neither Israel nor Cyrus, but an anonymous prophet.\(^{239}\)

However, the most serious obstacle to this interpretation is found in Isaiah 49:3: “And he said to me, ‘You are my Servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified!’” (אֶת-נַעֲלֵי אֲשֶׁר-יָדַע אֶת-מִשְׁפָּטֵי אֲשֶׁר לְעַמּוֹת לְעַמּוֹת אָדָם). To counter this problem, Harry M. Orlinsky conveniently eliminates “Israel” as a gloss.\(^{240}\) However, the strong evidence of Greek translations and Qumran manuscripts, all containing “Israel,” witness against Orlinsky’s proposal.

Thus, the mention of “Israel” in 49:3 must not be neglected. However, if “Israel” is read as a predicate (i.e. “You are my Servant, [and you are] Israel), instead of a vocative (i.e. “You are my Servant, [O] Israel”), the appearance of “Israel” does not hinder our interpretation. In this case, as Wilcox and Paton-Williams argue, 49:3 can be understood as a redefinition of Israel: now the speaker of the “I”-voice in 48:16 and 49:1-6 is named “Israel,” even though Israel still

---

\(^{238}\) Wilcox and Paton-Williams, “The Servant Songs,” 79-85; Childs, Isaiah, 377-379; Seitz, “‘You are my Servant,’” 125ff.

\(^{239}\) It is arguable that the voice of the first person singular is somehow related to the voice in 40:6, which is often understood as the call narrative of “Deutero-Isaiah” and is translated as “And I said, ‘What shall I cry?’” However, this reading cannot be supported by the Masoretic Text (משה): it is the rendering of the Greek translations (ἑνὶ τῷ ἔφασα). Furthermore, in light of the strong argument advanced by Seitz, this voice should be understood according to a divine council setting, not the call narrative (C. R. Seitz, “The Divine Council: Temporal Transition and New Prophecy in the Book of Isaiah,” \textit{JBL} 109 [1990]: 229-247). Thus, we may assume that the “I”-voice in 48:16, together with Isa. 49:1-6, signals a new thematic development in Isa. 40-55, emerging as the anonymous prophetic figure who now steps forward from behind God’s voice. At the same time, the “I”-voices in Isa. 48:16 and 49:1-6 are related to the preaching of God’s words in Isa. 40-48. See Seitz, “‘You are my Servant,’” 130-131.

\(^{240}\) Orlinsky, “The So-Called ‘Servant of the Lord,’” 79-89.
exists and has her own role to play.\(^{241}\) Thus, the Servant is not Israel proper, but an anonymous prophetic figure who \textit{embodies} the role of the Servant Israel.

According to this reading, the description of the roles that the Servant Israel (42:1-9) would assume in the context of 49:1-12 is understood not as a simple reiteration of the Servant’s mission, but as a vocational transfer/shift from “Israel the nation” to “Israel the prophetic individual” (42:4∥49:1 [mission for אֵלֶּה]; 42:3∥49:4 [establishment of נְבֵיהֶם]; 42:6∥49:6 [the Servant as נְעֵבָד נִבְרָע]; 42:6∥49:8 [the Servant as בְּרֵיחַ נֶפֶשׁ]).\(^{242}\) Obviously, there are parallels between the first Song and the second, and these parallels demonstrate the continuation of Israel’s responsibility for the nation as God’s chosen one.\(^{243}\) Since we have already argued that the first Servant Song expects the coming of the New Moses as New Israel, the one who continues the task of “Israel” in the second Song can also be understood in connection to that awaited Moses – the anonymous figure is now expected to fulfill the prophetic role of Moses (Deut. 18:18).

This Mosaic Servant, however, confesses his frustration (49:5), as Seitz argues, because the enormous task entrusted to Israel is now bestowed upon him.\(^{244}\) The Servant’s troubled mind and the greatness of the mission entrusted to him (49:6-7) suggest the likelihood of this anonymous individual not accomplishing his task. Thus, both the incomplete mission and the anonymity of this prophetic figure generate anticipation for the fulfillment of the Mosaic mission in the future.

This futuristic, or even eschatological, scope of the Servant’s mission is already signalled in 48:6-7 (“I will let you hear the new things [ותִּמְרָה] from now, the hidden things [ותִּמְרָה] which you have not known. Now they are created, not long ago…”). These verses indicate the emergence of the new Mosaic Servant (48:16 and 49:1-6) who will embody Israel’s role. Here, what will happen is repeatedly depicted as totally new, unknown to anybody. Thus, imbued with this eschatological perspective, I argue, the second Song also awaits the advent of the truly competent second Moses, whose coming was inaugurated by the anonymous prophet.


\(^{244}\) Seitz, “‘You are my Servant,’” 129.
This anticipation for the New Moses, once again, is rooted in the predominance of Exodus imagery in the immediate context of the second Servant Song. Just before 49:1-12, 48:21 recalls how the Israelites did not thirst in the desert because God caused the waters to flow out of the rock.\(^{245}\) Even more strikingly, as Baltzer emphasises, a literal translation of 48:21 reads, “He [God] let water from rocks flow for him [מָרֵiente>, namely, Moses].”\(^{246}\)

Furthermore, the Exodus imagery persists even after the second Song. However, this time those images are directly connected to the Servant and his mission in the new Exodus. According to Isaiah 49:8-10, the mission of the Servant, who is appointed as a ‘covenant for the people’ (v.8), is “to raise up the land, to make them inherit the desolate heritages, to say to the prisoners ‘Go forth!’ to those who are in the darkness ‘Come forth!’” (vv. 8-9). As in the first Song (42:7), a Mosaic role of saving the people from oppression is expected. Furthermore, as has been discussed in 2.2.1, the Mosaic Servant will gather up all the people in the diaspora, even those in an unknown land (\(םיֵיטֶן\)) (49:12). Combined with the statement that the Mosaic Servant will be a “light for the nations” (49:8), this imagery of the new Exodus indicates that the Servant’s mission is directed not only to Israel, but also to the nations.

Thus, considering this overwhelming scale of God’s salvation, an eschatological dimension is certainly present here. In addition, according to Childs, all the tasks entrusted to the Mosaic Servant in the new Exodus are framed by the messenger formula in v. 8 and create unity within vv. 1-13 as they generate the eschatological atmosphere:

\[
\text{The messenger formula in v. 8 links the oracle with vv.5 and 7 and thus functions to render the whole section (vv. 1-13) as one unified divine speech regarding the servant. The phrase “in an hour of favor” resonates with the “but now” of v. 5 and speaks of the eschatological moment of salvation in God’s time.} \(^{248}\)
\]

Accordingly, the Servant’s call and commission in the main body of the second Servant Song (48:16, 49:1-6) may also be understood through an eschatological perspective. First, although the second Servant Song is often said to be framed according to Jeremiah’s call narrative,\(^{249}\) this parallel indicates, I believe, not so much a direct connection between the Servant and Jeremiah

\(^{246}\) Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 302. Furthermore, Baltzer points out a connection between “desert” (\(ירַבְרָה\)) and “Horeb” (\(הָוֹרֶב\)).
\(^{247}\) Traditionally, this word was understood as China, but many commentators now interpret it as “Aswan.” See North, The Second Isaiah, 193; Childs, Isaiah, 384.
\(^{248}\) Childs, Isaiah, 386-387.
\(^{249}\) For example, both the Servant and Jeremiah are told that they are known by God while they were in the womb. See Isa. 49:1 and Jer. 1:5 and cf. North, The Second Isaiah, 186-187.
as between the new Servant and the new Moses, since Jeremiah also is presented as a prophet like Moses.\textsuperscript{250} Thus, the call narrative indirectly creates anticipation for the new Moses.

Second, the presence of God’s spirit upon the Servant corresponds with Moses’ holding God’s spirit (Num. 11:16-17). Third, the depiction of the Servant’s outstanding speaking ability (Isa. 49:2) resonates with Moses’ call narrative, in which God promises to bestow eloquence upon Moses (Exod. 3:10-12).\textsuperscript{251} Considering these, the second Servant Song seems to function within the realm of Exodus imagery, anticipating the new Exodus with the coming of the new Moses.

To conclude, the second Servant Song displays a rhetorical shift from the Servant Israel as a nation to the new Servant Israel as a prophetic individual. This emergence of the prophetic figure marks the beginning of what was expected in the first Servant Song (42:1-9) – the coming of the second Moses, who embodies and fulfills Israel’s mission. However, the inferred incompleteness of his mission and his anonymity necessitate a future fulfillment of the Servant’s mission and engenders the passage’s eschatological scope.

\textsuperscript{250} In Jeremiah’s call narrative, a parallel to Moses’ calling is clear from God’s words: “wherever I will send you [נהלך], you will go, and whatever I will command you, you will speak, do not be afraid of them, for I will be with you to deliver you” (Jer. 1:7-8/Exod. 3:10). In God’s calling of Jeremiah, as Patrick D. Miller states, “[t]here was certainly no escaping this calling” (P. D. Miller, “The Book of Jeremiah: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflection,” in The New Interpreter’s Bible, vol. VI [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001], 580), since he was destined to be a prophet even before he was born (Jer. 1:5). Therefore, in this inescapable divine commission, Jeremiah, as God’s servant, is demanded to speak whatever God places in his mouth (Deut. 18:17-18/Jer. 1:9-10) (cf. W. L. Holladay, Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-25, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986], 35). Furthermore, Jeremiah had already been told at his calling that Israel and the nations would be “against” him (Jer. 1:9). These words were realised in the course of Jeremiah’s mission: as Jeremiah lamented in his song, he was despised by people and his life was threatened (Jer. 11:18-21). The humble obedience to God’s will expressed in this song is reminiscent of Moses’ suffering for his people (cf. Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 64-66). As Seitz demonstrates, other figural connections between Jeremiah’s mission and Moses’ vocation are also established throughout the book (C. R. Seitz, “The Prophet Moses and the Canonical Shape of Jeremiah,” ZAW 101 [1989]: 3-27). Seitz first stresses that “Deuteronomy saw Moses as the first of the prophets” (Seitz, “The Prophet Moses,” 7), whose significance is reckoned in his intercessory work. These two Mosaic motifs, prophetic intercession and prophetic succession, can be seen as reflected in Jer. 15:1 (“The Lord said to me, ‘Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people’”). However, Jeremiah’s case is distinct, as he was forbidden by God to intercede (Jer. 7:16; 11:14; 14:11; 15:1) (Seitz, “The Prophet Moses,” 9). In addition, there are three further major associations between Moses and Jeremiah. First, Moses smashed the tablet written by God’s finger (Deut. 9:17), which was then recomposed (Deut. 10:1-2). Likewise, the scroll which recorded Jeremiah’s prophecy was burnt by the king (Jer. 36:23) and was later rewritten (36:32). The implication here is that God’s word cannot be thwarted despite obstacles (Seitz, “The Prophet Moses,” 14). Second, in the canonical movement of the Book of Jeremiah, “Ebed-Melech [the Ethiopian officer who rescued Jeremiah in Jer. 38:7-13] and Baruch are types modelled on Caleb and Joshua, who succeeded Moses’ role” (Seitz, “The Prophet Moses,” 17-18). Third, there is a striking contrast between Moses at the beginning of a line of prophetic succession and Jeremiah as the end of that succession (Seitz, “The Prophet Moses,” 15). Therefore, the link between the two suggests not only that Jeremiah is being illuminated as a new Moses but also that Jeremiah is presented as the end of the Mosaic succession of the prophetic office. In this light, then, the reminiscence of Jeremiah’s call narrative in the second Servant Song indicates expectation for the emergence of the new Moses, who is more competent than Jeremiah.

\textsuperscript{251} Hugenberger, “The Servant of the Lord,” 133.
2.2.2.3 The Third Servant Song (Isa. 50:2-51:16)

Now turning to the third Servant Song, the structure of Isaiah 40-55 suggests that this Song is not detached from, but is instead well situated in the dynamic movement within the four Songs. The third Song continues the historical scope of the previous Songs and anticipates the fruit of the Servant’s death (52:13-53:12). Therefore, I first intend to discuss historically that the same prophetic figure of 48:16 and 49:1-6 reappears in the third Song, preparing for both the theme of Servant’s suffering and of the Servant’s followers in the fourth Song.

The figure in the third Song can be understood as being identical to the individual in the former Song, for two main reasons. First, the voice in the first person singular, which continues from the second Song (Isa. 50:4-9), strongly suggests that the voice comes from the same individual. Therefore, as Childs writes, “[a]lthough the term servant is not used in vv. 4-9, the larger context, before and after, removes any possible doubt that the speaker is the servant.”\(^{252}\) Second, the theme of suffering (Isa. 50:6) also continues from the second Song (49:7); in both cases, the Servant’s suffering ends with assurance of God’s vindication (49:7; 50:7).

However, the third Song is not merely a continuation of the second, but introduces a thematic development concerning the Servant. For instance, Isaiah 50:10-11, I argue, anticipates the emergence of the followers of God’s righteous one (53:11) – the “servants” of the Lord (54:17). To further develop this view, Beuken’s study on 50:10-11 is especially helpful. While v.11 is commonly understood as condemnation against those who disobey the Servant (or God), the interpretation of v.10 is disputed, especially in regard to the subject of the verbs. The common way to understand v.10 is to either consider the Servant as the subject of all the verbs in v.10, or of all but the last two.\(^{253}\) However, against these interpretations, Beuken argues that someone other than the Servant should be the subject of all the verbs after “וַיֶּחֱצוּ.”\(^{254}\)

\(^{252}\) Childs, Isaiah, 394.


\(^{254}\) Beuken, “Jes 50, 10-11,” 170-175.
Thus, v. 10 is not about the Servant but about those who follow the Servant after his death. North renders the verse as follows: “Who is there among you that fears the Lord, obeying the word of his servant, that gropes in darkness and has no glimmer of light? Let him trust in the name of the Lord and firmly rely on his God.”

In order to support his case, Beuken points out that vv. 10-11 form-critically resemble the “Paränese” in the Psalms, in which the faithful are promised to be blessed by God, while the wicked are destined to destruction (e.g., Ps. 32:10; 145:20). According to his form-critical analysis, Beuken acknowledges two distinct parts in Isaiah 50:10-11: an encouragement to those who follow the Servant (v. 10) and a condemnation against those who disobey (v.11).

In addition, Beuken’s interpretation can be verified with a structural analysis of Isaiah 40-66, since the dichotomy Beuken observes in 50:10-11 is already present in the broader context of the book. The latter part of Isaiah highlights a serious schism between God’s faithful “servants” and the ones who disobey God (e.g., 65:13-16). Thus, although we should avoid being too speculative about the situation of the post-exilic community, we may safely conclude, based on textual evidence, that 50:10-11 signals the emergence of the “servants” of the Lord and those who oppose them in the latter half of Isaiah.

Thus far, we have demonstrated that the theme of the individual Servant in 48:16 and 49:1-6 continues in the third Song, and that the Song looks to the aftermath of that Servant’s death. However, along with its historical perspective, the third Song also picks up on the eschatological themes of the first two Songs, which revolve around the expectation for the coming Mosaic figure. Admittedly, the purely biographical appearance of the third Song leads to difficulties in extracting an eschatological message from this passage; however, I believe there is reason to state that the continuation of the eschatological perspective is present in the third Song as well.

In order to discern this eschatological aspect, the following statement demands special attention: “The Lord has given me a tongue of the disciples (literally, “those who are taught”)

---

257 Ibid., 178.
259 For example, Hanson’s study comes across as too speculative. See Hanson, The Dawn of Apocalyptic.
to understand how to sustain the weary with a word. Morning by morning, He wakes my ear to listen as the disciples ["ה餍דורים"] (50:4). What this passage entails can be understood in light of Is. 8:16, which says that Isaiah sealed “Torah” (חרדה) and the testimony in (ב) the “disciples” (ןדרים). “The disciples” (ןדרים) here are depicted as embodying Torah.

Accordingly, as Fischer interprets 50:4, “Der Knecht wird durch die Begabung (50,4) offensichtlich ermächtigt, das Siegel zu lösen und auf Tor und Bezeugung zu hören.”

According to this interpretation, the role of the Servant is strikingly similar to that of Moses. As Moses received Torah and taught God’s people with it, the Servant is expected to recover Torah and also teach the nations with it. Therefore, the Servant’s mission is a continuation, in a way, of the old task given to Moses – but with a new and broader scope which awaits eschatological fulfillment.

Indeed, if we recall the parallels between the third Song and some “Paränese” in the Psalms, we can observe a parallel between Moses and the Servant in relation to Torah as well. Particularly in Ps.1, the faithful and the wicked are called according to their obedience or disobedience to Torah. If the encouragement to those who follow the Servant (50:10) and the condemnation against those who disobey (50:11) correspond to the form of that psalm, then there is a parallel between the Servant and Torah. Since Torah can be represented by Moses, there then seems to be a connection between the Servant and Moses.

Moreover, the text immediately before the speech of the Servant (Isa. 50:2) also suggests the Song’s anticipation of a Mosaic figure. After God reveals that Israel’s own sin caused the exile, a prophetic recollection of the events in the first Exodus immediately follows. In those events, Moses performed wonders/signs against Egypt (50:2), by God’s power. In this context of the Exodus, the phrase “there was no man” (50:2, אז אין אדם) indicates, I argue, anticipation for a Mosaic figure.

Ari Z. Zivotofsky’s study is valuable in developing my case. Zivotofsky surveys rabbinic interpretations of Moses’ act of murder in Exodus 2:11-12, concluding that the Rabbis did not interpret Exodus 2:12 “ויהיה כי איש ואשה לבראשית ולרדנאה” as Moses was looking “this way and that way to make sure that there was no man [יאש] around.” Rather, for them, “איש” meant not merely a “person,” but a “real man willing to take action.” Thus, early Jewish teachers understood Exodus 2:11-12

---

as “[Moses saw] that there was no man to stand up and take action.” An important point in Zivotofsky’s argument is that this unique interpretation of Exodus 2:11-12 is found not only in Rabbinic interpretation but, surprisingly, much earlier, in Isaiah.

The phrase ידוהי יאיה ואתה also appears in Isaiah 59:15-16, where it is understood as the Lord being displeased because “there was no judgment, and He saw that there was no man [איה ואתה] and wondered that there was no intercessor.” In this case, the phrase clearly refers to the absence of a competent person. Therefore, Zivotofsky writes, “Perhaps the prophet even had [the] story of Moses in mind, and compared God’s judgement and action with the behaviour of Moses. God also ‘looked around’ to see whether there was someone to intercede, a true man who would prevent such an evil deed, and He, too, came up empty-handed.”

Based on this connection between Exodus 2:12 and Isaiah 59:15-16, I argue that in the latter passage, God was seeking a “man” like Moses. Therefore, the canon seems to present Moses as “the man.” In a similar manner, we can argue that the Lord was searching for a Moses-like figure when He asks, “When I came, why was there no man?” in 50:2. This interpretation can be strengthened by: a) the Exodus-background of 50:2; b) the anticipation of the new Moses in the first two Servant Songs; and c) the clear search for a Mosaic figure in Isaiah 63:10-14. Thus, to recapitulate the argument, not only is Isaiah 50:2 a recollection of the Exodus narrative, but it also anticipates the new Moses, since the Lord is yet to find a man like Moses.

To conclude, the third Servant Song continues the scope of the “historical Servant” in the second Song and prepares to further develop this scope by depicting the polarisation of the faithful and the rebels. At the same time, the third Song also continues, with its anticipation for the New Moses, the eschatological scope of the first two Songs.

### The Fourth Servant Song (Isa. 52:13-53:12)

Finally, we reach the climax of the Servant Songs. In the fourth Song, the same historical scope of the Servant continues from the previous two Songs, with even more emphasis on the Servant’s biographical nature. Therefore, many scholars have focused on the historical
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263 Note the phrase “our report” (ויתמרש) in 53:1.
dimension of this Song, identifying the Servant as an Israelite king, the second Isaiah or Jeremiah. However, I contend that the Servant in this Song is the same anonymous prophet who appeared in the second and the third Songs, since the fourth Song continues, and even intensifies, the theme of the suffering Servant from the previous Songs.

However, although I do not intend to neglect this historical perspective, I argue that the eschatological scope is radically magnified in this Song. Here we can observe, for instance, a strong longing for the emergence of a Mosaic intercessor. Although specific references to Moses are absent, the Exodus imagery in the immediate context (Isa. 52:2-4, 10-12) suggests an implicit connection. This evocation of Moses, as is the case for other Songs, signals an eschatological hope. Moreover, the eschatological dimension of the fourth Song is attested by the anonymity of the Servant despite his extraordinary intercessory work. Thus, as Seitz writes, “[p]recisely in its commitment to silence, within the fabric of this moving scene of obedience and sacrifice, is constituted the eschatological power of the servant’s accomplishment.”

Four additional points seem to indicate the eschatological dimension of this Song. First, the climactic depiction of the Servants’ mission for the nations suggests eschatological implications. Although there is no explicit reference to the nations in this Song, the word “many” (דנהי) can mean “nations” (as “many nations” [נימ נביא] in 52:14 indicates), and that term forms an inclusio around the fourth Song (Isa. 52:14; 53:11, 12). Understood either quantitatively or qualitatively, clearly depicts the nations’ involvement in God’s salvation through the Servant’s redemptive death for the justification of “many” (53:12). Also, in light of the
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266 F. A. Farley, “Jeremiah and the ‘Suffering Servant of Jehovah’ in Deutero-Isaiah,” ET 38 (1926-27): 241-325; M. Schreiber, “The Real ‘Suffering Servant’: Decoding a Controversial Passage in the Bible,” JBQ 37/1 (2009): 35-44. Sommer points out that striking terminological links exist between the suffering of the Servant and Jeremiah’s passion (Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 64-66). Although this connection is undeniable, it does not mean that the Servant was Jeremiah. As stated earlier, considering that Jeremiah is depicted as a prophet like Moses, this link rather indicates that the fourth Song is indirectly seeking the new Moses.
canonical structure of *Isaiah*, this redemptive event through the Servant is at the heart of the eschatological vision of the nations’ worship found in the finale (66:17-24). With their sins redeemed, the nations can now join the holy congregation to worship the Lord.

Furthermore, when read in conjunction with other Songs, the vision involving the nations can be understood as the *culmination* of the Servant’s mission. The Mosaic figure, who was taught by God (50:4) and was commissioned to teach God’s “Torah” (42:2), now dies not only for Israel but also for the nations, in order to atone for their sins. He accomplishes this so that he can provide a perfect example of the priestly intercession taught in the Mosaic Torah. In this sense, this figure exhibits both didactic and priestly qualities. Obviously, these characteristics are reminiscent of Moses, but the Servant *qua* New Moses surpasses the historical Moses since the former gives up his own life for Israel and the nations.

Second, the intercessory death of the Servant also contributes to the eschatological scope of the Song. As some have pointed out, the mediatory work of the Servant further evokes Moses: just as Moses implored God to pardon Israel’s sins, the Servant exposes himself to God’s wrath for Israel’s sake. However, the Servant’s intercession is greater than that of Moses in two aspects. For one, Moses’ “vicarious” suffering in place of Israel is only subtly inferred. However, the Servant’s “vicarious” suffering is explicit and decisive (Isa. 53:8-12). The
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272 These offenses include worship of the Golden Calf (Exod. 32:11-13, 30-32; 34:8-9; Deut. 9:18-21, 25-29; 10:10; Ps. 106:23), the rebellion of Miriam and Aaron (Num. 12:11-12), the return of the spies (Num. 14:13-20), Korah’s rebellion (Num. 16:22), and the poisonous serpents (Num. 21:7). Cf. Chavasse, “The Suffering Servant and Moses,” 156.

273 Isa. 53:8: “because of the sin of my [or his] people” [מַעֲשֶׂה נַפְלֵי].

274 Cf. Exod. 32:31-32; Deut. 1:37; 3:23-26; 4:21-22. All these Deuteronomic passages state that God was angry with Moses because of the Israelites (together with the Levites), in Deut. 1:37, 1:38, and in Deut. 3:26, and in Deut. 4:21). Cf. Chavasse, “The Suffering Servant and Moses,” 155.

275 Whether or not the concept “vicarious suffering” is appropriate to interpreting the fourth Servant Song has been much disputed. For example, Orlinsky severely condemns those who apply this concept to the fourth Song, since it is foreign to the text itself (Orlinsky, “The So-Called ‘Servant of the Lord,’” 51-59). While reading Christian doctrinal concepts too much into the text may ruin the literal meaning of the fourth Song, “it is equally as important to assess a variety of modern options that dispute the presence of vicariousness in the chapter altogether” (Childs, *Isaiah*, 415). In the light of this judgement, Orlinsky’s statement that “[c]ertainly there is no evidence that he ‘suffered’ more than, say, Elijah, or Jeremiah, or Uriah or Job” (Orlinsky, “The So-Called ‘Servant of the Lord,’” 63) underestimates the theological scope of Isa. 40-55, which anticipates an unprecedented work of God. Thus, as Hermann Spieckermann observes, the literal meaning of the fourth Song points to the vicarious suffering of the
shocking statement that God “delighted to crush (תָּמָן, 53:10)” the Servant demonstrates the severity of the Servant’s work. For another, while both Moses and the Servant are depicted as men of humility (Num. 12:3 [חַיָּה נַחֲנוּ], Isa. 53:7 [חַיָּה נַחֲנוּ]), the Servant’s humility outstrips that of Moses. Moses, despite his humility, gains glorious fame, being remembered as the “man of God” (אֱלֹהִים אֵל, Ps. 90:1). However, the Servant is named the “man of suffering” (אֵל הַיָּדוֹ עָבַד, Isa. 53:3). Therefore, while the parallel between Moses and the Servant is apparent, the latter is not a mere reproduction of the former. This disparity suggests that the Servant’s task bears an eschatological significance which is not fully accomplished by the first Moses. This eschatological expectation for the new Moses becomes especially evident, as has been discussed, within the temporal scheme of the “former things” and the “latter/new things” of Isaiah 40-55. Furthermore, Isaiah does not depict the Servant’s intercession as a completed mission in the book’s wider context, even after the fourth Song. Although the Servant “interceded” between God and the “many” (אֶלֶף, 53:12), God still seeks another Mosaic figure, who is to implement the mediatory mission (59:16, cf. 63:11-14). Therefore, the fourth Servant Song seems to encourage an eschatological reading of the Servant Songs.

Third, the theme of the Servant’s exaltation, in Isaiah 53:10-12 and more notably in 52:13, signals the eschatological significance of the fourth Song. The beginning of Isaiah (2:11, 17) declares that in the Lord’s day, the people’s “arrogance” (רָאוּף) and “pride” (רָאשׁ) will be humbled and the Lord alone will be exalted. However, the Servant is also promised that he will be lifted “high” (רָאשׁ), raised (בֹּא), and brought very high (בֹּא כָּל הַיָּדוֹ) (52:13). These statements about the Servant are astonishing, because, as Wilcox and Paton-Williams observe, “[t]hroughout Isa. 1-66, the adjectives ‘exalted,’ ‘lifted up’ and ‘very high’


Although this part of Isa. 53:7 is often translated as “he was oppressed and afflicted” (NIV), I propose the rendering, following Barré, “he was maltreated, yet he was submissive.” Barré presents two reasons to support this translation: “A number of English translators render 53:7a: ‘He was oppressed, and he was afflicted.’ There are two problems with this translation. First, if the two verbs were correlative, one would not expect [כָּפָר] before the second verb. Waw + [כָּפָר] between the two verbs indicates an adversative rather than a correlative relationship between them: ‘He was hard pressed, but he…’ Second, the frequent translation of the niphal [כָּפָר], ‘afflicted’ can hardly be correct. When the toot [כָּפָר] appears in the piel and pual, and the few clear instances of the niphal mean ‘to show humility, humble oneself’ [e.g., Exod. 10:3]. In this passage the verb expresses the Servant’s meek response to harsh treatment: ‘He was maltreated, yet he was submissive.’ That [כָּפָר] has this sense here is clear from the following colon, ‘and (he) did not open his mouth,’ which similarly expresses refusal to protest or cry out against mistreatment” (Barré, “Textual and Rhetorical-Critical Observations on the Last Servant Song,” 16).
are virtually technical terms, applied almost exclusively to Yahweh." Therefore, in the fourth song, a distinguished characteristic of the Servant’s mission and God’s special commitment to the Servant are evident. In view of the entire book of Isaiah, the fourth Song portrays the Servant as far more than an ordinary human being, to say the least.

Furthermore, the phrase “he will see [his] offspring and he will prolong [his] days” (53:10, ימיו יראתי והארתי אראד) displays a meaningful disparity between Moses and the Servant. While Moses was not allowed to enter into the Promised Land and enjoy his life there, the Servant is promised a prolonged life despite his death. Although some nineteenth-century historical critics argued against the traditional Christian interpretation, which understands 53:10 as speaking of “resurrection,” some sort of “resurrection” of the Servant, as Childs points out, is most likely indicated, considering that the Song describes the Servant’s life after his death. However, the extraordinary character of “resurrection” implies that the passage refers not to an historical event, but to an eschatological vision.

Fourth, the aftermath of the Servant’s death seem to add eschatological flavour to the fourth Song: the Servant’s task is bequeathed to the followers of the Servant, who are described as servants, and Zion is transformed into the central place of worship. Concerning the former, the fourth Song clearly states that the Servant’s death is not the end of his mission but that the mission will be carried on by his “offspring” (53:10, רוחם) who are “justified” by the Servant’s vicarious death (53:11, קדישים). According to Beuken, the “justified offspring” of the Servant indicates his followers, the servants of the Lord, who occupy a significant place in chaps. 55-66. These “offspring,” as Seitz argues, go on to speak in the first person plural, testifying to the extraordinary mission of their master in embodying his virtue.

What is striking in this shift from the Servant to the servants is, as Seitz stresses, its likeness to the Mosaic era: just as Joshua’s generation carried on God’s promise of the land after Moses’ death, so also will the servants continue God’s work after the Servant ceases. However, the
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279 Childs, Isaiah, 419.
correspondence between the two events is not perfect: whereas Joshua’s generation died out completely, the servants’ age will be prolonged (Isa. 65:20), just as has been promised to the Servant (53:10). Moreover, this new generation is said to participate in the “everlasting worship” in the coming age (66:23).

Regarding Zion’s transformation into the central place of worship, we must note that the Servant’s death enables the servants’ entry into Zion (Isa. 54:1-17). Therefore, pursuing the parallel between Moses and the Servant, Zion can now be understood as representing the Promised Land. Indeed, Zion is a recurring theme in Isaiah and carries an eschatological connotation. For instance, Zion is mentioned in the beginning as a place where nations flow into to worship in “the house of Jacob’s God” (2:3). This eschatological vision, as Dim indicates, “is an anticipation of the latter part of the book.” Thus, although there is no explicit reference to Zion, the vision of the centre of worship for the servants and the nations from the corners of the earth (66:17-24) can be reasonably understood as implying the vision for New Zion. As a result, we can conclude that the servants’ entry into Zion is connected to the broader eschatological vision presented by the entire book.

In sum, while the historical scope of the fourth Song should not be neglected, a significant development of the eschatological theme is observable in this passage. This enlarged eschatological vision anticipates not only the coming of the new Moses, but also the emergence of the true disciples of the Servant and their worshipful life in the new Promised Land, Zion. Therefore, the fourth Song seems to be a crucial point in the thematic movement of Isaiah 40-66, stressing the culmination of Servant’s mission and the fruit of his “vicarious” death, and establishing an eschatological tone throughout.

2.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the four Servant Songs, which are meaningfully embedded in the literal context of Isaiah 40-55, display two primary aspects. On the one hand, the historical dimension points to the “historical” Servant, enabling the audience to see the thematic movement from the idealised Servant Israel (the first Song) to the individual prophetic figure (the other three Songs). On the
other hand, the eschatological dimension continually underscores the coming of the new Moses, who is expected to lead Israel as Moses did, but is also expected to surpass the original leader in many ways. I have argued that the fourth Song is the climax of this anticipation for the new Moses, extending its eschatological vision to the aftermath of the Servant’s death.

These two hermeneutical dimensions of the Songs, I argue, are situated in the temporal scheme of Isaiah 40-55 (66), namely, the transition from the “former things” to the “latter/new things.” While these two are certainly distinct, the historical reality of the former engenders eschatological hope for the latter. This temporal scheme is commensurate with the two hermeneutical dimensions of the Servant Songs discussed previously. The anonymous Servant died for his contemporaries, and his mission will ultimately become one of the “former things.” However, his mission generates eschatological hope for the “new things,” i.e. the coming of the new Moses, both because of his anonymity as well as the unprecedented nature of his work. Theconsummation of his work, the four Songs as a whole tell us, is yet to be realised in the future.
Chapter 3
Interactions of the Davidic Figure and the Mosaic Figure

3.1 Introduction

Thus far in the study, we have demonstrated that, while grounded in specific historical contexts, the three royal oracles in the former part of Isaiah and the four Servant Songs in the latter half of Isaiah all contain an eschatological perspective, anticipating the new David and the new Moses, respectively. Although the other relevant texts (4:2-6; 16:15; 19:20; 22:20-25; 32:1-8; 61:1-11) have been left untreated, the outcome of our analysis seems to sufficiently demonstrate that the expectations for the Davidic ruler in the former part of Isaiah are not “dismantled” in the latter part of Isaiah, as some scholars argue, but remain significant in the latter part of Isaiah along with the anticipation for the new Moses – all within the eschatological realm. Hence, in the canonical form of Isaiah, the three major royal promises of chaps. 1-39 and the Servant texts of chaps. 40-55 are presented not as contradictory but as complementary themes, generating a unified message of the messianic expectation of Isaiah as a whole.

In this chapter, therefore, we shall explore this thematic link between the expectation for the Davidic and the Mosaic figures. In doing so, I shall argue that Isaiah 1-39 and 40-66 together bear a holistic witness to the messianic figure, who embodies the characteristics of both Moses and Davidic kings. In order to demonstrate my case, I will first examine both the former part of Isaiah (the three royal oracles) and the latter part (the first and the fourth Servant Songs, as well as Isa. 55:3-5; 65:25), to demonstrate two points.

First, I will show that in the canonical context of Isaiah, the anticipation for the Davidic figure is linked to the Mosaic elements. Second, and conversely, the anticipation for the new Moses is connected to Davidic imagery. Third, I will strengthen my canonical argument by demonstrating that other scriptural passages reflect similar interactions between Mosaic and Davidic themes. Finally, I will argue that the Davidic hope of Isaiah 1-39 and the Mosaic hope of 40-66 do not contradict but interact with each other. This mutuality implies that the messianic expectation of
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287 Seitz also stresses that the royal oracles in Isa. 1-12 remain significant in view of the entire presentation of Isaiah: “Second Isaiah chapters are silent on the matter of restored Davidic kingship, not because Cyrus fills this role or the promises of David have been handed over to the wider populace, but because Isaiah’s prophecy remains in force. In other words, the lack of fulfillment of 11:1-9 within the larger presentation of the developing Book of Isaiah ensured that it remained God’s final will and intention, requiring no further comment or expansion.” Seitz, Isaiah 1-39, 110.
Isaiah is a future hope for someone who embodies the characters of both Moses and the Davidic rulers and for the new era inaugurated by this figure.

This mutuality exists because, as I have argued in the introduction, the canonisation process involving the Law and the Prophets involved mutual interactions between them rather than the sole dependency of one on the other. Therefore, it is almost impossible to explain the complex nature of the Pentateuchal themes in Isaiah from a solely diachronic perspective. For instance, the nature of torah in Isaiah cannot be classified as Mosaic or non-Mosaic strictly from a diachronic reading of Isaiah alone. From our standpoint, Isaiah’s torah could be a result of reflections on Mosaic torah combined with the prophet’s own later intentions and ideas. However, Isaiah’s torah could also have enriched others’ understanding of the Mosaic Torah, thus influencing the formation of the final form of the Pentateuch. The same situation can be perceived when discussing the Mosaic aspects of the Davidic king. Therefore, in this section, being aware of the limitations of relying solely on diachronic analysis, and with the broader process of canonisation in view, I attempt to grasp the dynamism of Isaiah’s message.

3.2 Interactions of the Davidic Figure and the Mosaic Figure

3.2.1 The Former Part of Isaiah (Isa. 1-39)

In order to demonstrate the mutual interaction between the hope for the new David and for the new Moses, I will first analyse the three royal promises and their immediate context in the former part of Isaiah (7:1-25; 8:19-9:6; 11:1-12:6). Before I examine these texts, however, I will briefly defend the appropriateness of acknowledging Mosaic overtones in the royal oracles, since this link is only uncommonly drawn.

At least five points can be raised to support my position. The first, and the strongest evidence of Mosaic elements in chaps. 1-39, is the evident commonality between the Davidic rulers and Moses elsewhere in biblical tradition. It is particularly important for our purpose to note that, as Scott W. Hahn observes, Hezekiah’s law-giving character is assimilated to that of Moses in the book of Chronicles. We have already demonstrated that, in all of the royal promises,
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Hezekiah plays a significant role in assuring of God’s continual commitment to the house of David.\footnote{The book of Chronicles displays numerous figural links between Moses and Hezekiah. As Scott W. Hahn observes, in the Chronicles’ Hezekiah-narrative, the word “הָאוֹרִים” (congregation) plays a significant role: “הָאוֹרִים,” was established at the night of the Passover (Exod. 12:3), and Hezekiah attempted to re-establish this liturgical congregation” (2Chr. 29:23, 28, 31, 32; 31:18). Examining this analogy, Hahn concludes: “Hezekiah’s Passover is described in ways that call to mind Israel’s origins in the exodus. Though Hezekiah is…portrayed as…a faithful son of David, there is a strong exodus subtext to the Passover episode and perhaps even some new-Moses typology at work.” As he implemented the renewal plan of the liturgical congregation, Hezekiah first invited the people of Judah, but also the northerners, by sending his words to warn them not to be “stiff-necked [לאָלָת אָבָם הָעָם] like their fathers but to yield themselves to God, so that God would “turn away [הָוָאָשׁ]” his “fierce anger [אָשָׁן מֹסֵי]” (2Chr. 30:8). Hezekiah’s words here parallel Moses’ intercession to “turn away [God’s] fierce anger [אמר מֹשֵׁה מֹסֵי יִתְנַשֵּׂא]” when God threatened to abandon his own “stiff-necked people [לאָלָת אָבָם הָעָם]” (Exod. 32:9, 12). According to Hahn, “[s]uch exact parallels in language can hardly be incidental.” Thus, Hahn points out that “[t]he Chronicler establishes a continuity between the original sin of the people at Sinai with the golden calf and the sins of the divided kingdom.” In this light, Hezekiah’s implementation of the Passover is seen as the restoration of the original vision of “the kingdom of priests” (Exod. 19:6), which broke down after the incident of the golden calf (Exod. 32). See S. W. Hahn, Kingdom of God as Liturgical Empire: A Theological Commentary on 1-2 Chronicles (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 17ff. The Hezekiah-Moses typology may also be found in the Hezekiah-narrative in both Isaiah and the book of Kings. Just as the messenger of the Lord (הוֹויוֹאָה הָעָם) struck the people of Egypt and enabled the people of Israel to escape the Egyptian army at the Reed Sea (Exod. 12:23; 14:19-20), so the messenger of the Lord also delivered Zion when besieged by the Assyrian army (2Kgs 19:35-37 // Isa. 37:36-37). Furthermore, God forbade both Moses and Hezekiah to see His further work (Exod. 34:1-8 // 2Kgs 20:1-3; Isa. 38:1-3); in Hezekiah’s case, however, God heard his plea (2Kgs 20:4-11; Isa. 38:4-9, 21-22) and allowed him to see “peace and security” (2Kgs 20:19; Isa. 39:8).}

Therefore, in their hope for Hezekiah as the law-giving king, the royal promises express their anticipation not only for a king but also for a person like Moses.

The other four arguments to justify the evocation of Moses in the former part of Isaiah can stated more simply: a) there seems to be an intertextual connection between the Song of Moses (Deut. 32) and the prologue of Isaiah (chap. 1);\footnote{The following studies all point out intertextual connections between the prologue of Isaiah and the Song of Moses (Deut. 32): M. O’Kane, “Isaiah: A Prophet in the Footsteps of Moses,” JSOT 69 (1996): 29-51; R. Bergey, “The Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.1-43) and Isaianic Prophecies: A Case of Early Intertextuality?” JSOT 28 (2003): 33-54; T. A. Keiser, “The Song of Moses: a Basis for Isaiah’s Prophecy,” VT 55 (2005): 486-500; S. M. Paul, “Deuteronomistic Influence on Deutero-Isaiah,” in Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed. by N. S. Fox et al. (Winona Lake: Eisenbraun, 2009): 219-227 (see also Paul, Isaiah 40-66, 47-50); A. Groenewald, “Isaiah 1:2-3, ethics and wisdom. Isaiah 1:2-3 and the Song of Moses (Dt 32): Is Isaiah a prophet like Moses?” HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies 67 (2011): 1-6.} b) the word “teaching” (הָהוּר) resonates with Mosaic Torah in the canonical context (e.g., 2:3; 8:20); c) the Exodus and the revelation on Sinai function as an important historical paradigm in Isaiah 1-39 (2:2-4; 4:2-6; 10:24-27; 11:10-16; 25:6-7, etc.); and d) Isaiah 19:20 seems to anticipate a Mosaic figure. Considering these points, the former part of Isaiah seems to pointedly refer to Moses; therefore, it is appropriate to further investigate the nature of the interaction between the Davidic figure and the Mosaic figure in the royal oracles. Now, let us turn to the actual analysis of these texts.
3.2.1.1  Isaiah 7:1-25

Here I argue that Isaiah 7:1-25, which contains the Immanuel prophecy, displays several elements of the future hope for the Mosaic figure intertwined with the expectation for the new David. Three thematic links between Isaiah 7:1-25 and the call narrative of Moses in Exodus 3-4 support this view. First, both passages combine God’s “sign” (or promise) that He would be with the recipient of that sign with various other “signs.” In the case of Moses, God’s assurance (or sign) “I will be with you” (Exod. 3:12, יָרֹד אֵל תֵּחַ֖ם) was given along with three other signs (Moses’ staff changing into a snake, his hand turned into a diseased hand, and his ability to change water into blood [Exod. 4:1-9]).

Likewise, to the house of David, the sign “God is with us” (Isa. 7:14, יָרֹד אֵל תֵּחַ֖ם) is given together with three other signs (i.e. Isaiah’s two sons and Isaiah himself [8:18]). These motifs of God’s presence among the people and a “sign” (יָרֹד) are both characteristic of “call narratives.”

291 There is no consensus on the meaning of the “sign” in Exod. 3:12. Some believe that the text which originally indicated the content of the sign was lost. For instance, Hugo Gressmann believes that the original sign was fire or smoke (H. Gressmann, Moses und seine Zeit: ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913], 46). Likewise, Georg Fohrer conjectures that the sign was the plagues narrated by the Elohist (G. Fohrer, Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus: eine Analyse von Ex. 1-15 [Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964], 39). However, some others believe the sign was not some supernatural “performance” by God for Moses, but rather related to a futurisitic perspective. For instance, Childs conjectures that, in the early stage of the call narrative’s formation, the sign meant the burning bush. However, in the text’s later transmission, the call narrative obtained a future perspective, i.e. Israel’s worship on Mount Sinai, and the burning bush “was seen as a prefiguration of Israel’s experience,” foreshadowing God’s self-revelation on Sinai (Exod. 19) (B. S. Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary, OTL [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1974], 60).

Likewise, though stressing that the sign was not given to Moses in the calling, other scholars also see some provisional/futuristic aspects to the sign. For example, according to Cornelis Houtman, the meaning of the sign is that “when Moses has returned with the people to the place of revelation, the proof of the divine mission has been given” (C. Houtman, Exodus, vol. 1, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament [Kampen: Kok Publishing House, 1993], 365). The following studies also present similar views: H. Shalom-Guy, “The Call Narrative of Gideon and Moses: Literary Convention or More?” JHS 11 (2011): 9; U. Cassuto, A Commentary of the Book of Genesis, Part II: From Noah to Abraham Genesis V 9—XI 32, trans. by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984), 36; M. Greenberg, Understanding Exodus (New York: Behrman House, 1969), 76. However, these studies seem to overlook an important aspect of the sign given to Moses: the relationship between the sign and God’s assurance that He will be with Moses. Midrash seems to identify the sign with God’s assurance of His presence (i.e. “I will be with you”) (Midrash Rabbah Exodus 3.4., see H. Freedman, Maurice Simon, and Judah J. Slotki, Midrash Rabbah [London: The Socino Press, 1939]). Likewise, Houtman, who finds a connection between the sign and God’s promise that He will be with Moses, writes that “the achievement of the goal [i.e. return to Sinai with the people of Israel] is not separate from the declaration ‘I am with you’ – the entire road, leading to conclusive proof, is also part of the demonstration of divine accomplishment and it, too, shows Moses that he is the one sent by YHWH” (Houtman, Exodus [vol. 1], 365). These arguments seem to strengthen the thematic connection between the call narrative of Moses and the Immanuel prophecy: just as God was with Moses and this was the sign to Moses, the house of David is promised that God will be with them, and that this is the sign to them.

292 The best example would be Gideon’s call narrative (Judg. 6:11-24): when God promised to be with Gideon (6:12, 16), Gideon demanded a sign (6:17). Furthermore, although lacking the word “sign” (יָרֹד), Jeremiah’s call narrative also displays this combination of the motif of God’s presence and a sign (Jer. 1). For discussions on call narratives, see R. Kilian, “Die Prophetischen Berufungsberichte,” in Theologie im Wandel,
Considering the scholarly consensus that most call narratives in the Old Testament are somehow linked to that of Moses, the Immanuel prophecy, which displays some characteristics of a call narrative, can be rightly understood to possess thematic links with Moses’ call narrative. Thus, recognizing these links, God’s promise to the house of David is reminiscent of God’s promise to Moses. In this sense, Moses is also evoked by the Immanuel prophecy.

Second, just as God assured that Moses would return to Sinai to worship the Lord with the people of Israel (Exod. 3:12), God lets “Shear-Jashub” (7:3) accompany Isaiah as a sign of the promise to the house of David that the remnant of Israel will “return to Yahweh in faith.” As Gerhard F. Hasel argues, the concept of “remnant” in Isaiah contains an eschatological perspective, anticipating the emergence of true worshippers of the Lord. This future remnant is promised the ability to worship God on the Mount Zion (Isa. 4:2-6; cf. Isa.

---


Concerning the typological link between the call narrative of Gideon and that of Moses, see Shalom-Guy, “The Call Narrative of Gideon and Moses,” 1-19. On the typological association between the call narrative in Jeremiah and that of Moses, see Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 26-31.


According to Stegemann, while the former holds political and negative connotations, the latter is theological and positive. This polarity, Stegemann argues, is not resolved in the present form of Isaiah, but the two meanings coexist. In order to preserve this polarity, Stegemann proposes an alternative translation of the name: “Wie die vorausgegangenen Überlegungen gezeigt haben, ist der Sinngehalt des Namens Schear-Jashub kaum eindeutig zu bestimmen. Daher scheint es angebracht, die Interpretation nicht einspurig auf eine Deutung festzulegen. Um diesem Sachverhalt gerecht zu werden, ist eine neutrale Übersetzung zu wählen, etwa: ‘(Nur) ein Rest kehrt zurück.’ Diese Version kann sowohl die Rückkehr eines Rests aus den bevorstehenden Kriegen als auch die Rückkehr, d. h. Umkehr einiger weniger zu Jahwe bedeuten” (Ibid., 175). Despite this polarity in “Shear-Jashub,” Stegemann claims that the name later became the “Ansatzpunkt” of the *theological* (not political) reinterpretation of the “Restgedanke”: “Während bislang von möglichen Ansatzpunkten für eine Weiterinterpretation gesprochen wurde, scheint es beim Namen Schear-Jashub sicher zu sein, dass an ihm eine Weiterführung der jesajanischen Verkündigung in Richtung auf eine Resttheologie angesetzt hat. Denn einmal enthält der Name ausdrücklich den Terminus ‘Rest’; zum anderen zeigt die in der Glosses 10,20f vorliegende Deutung, dass spätere Generationen den Begriff Schear-Jashub in theologischem Sinn (ein Rest Israels bekehrt sich zu Jahwe, seinem Gott) verstanden haben” (Ibid., 185). Although Stegemann’s interpretation is attractive, his view that Isa. 10:20-21 was written in a later generation is not convincing. Rather, as Hasel observes, it is more natural to consider that the “theological” meaning of the “remnant” in 10:20-21 stems from the prophet Isaiah himself (Hasel, *The Remnant*, 318-331).

Hasel writes that “Isaiah, his children, and his disciples are proleptic representatives of the eschatological remnant. They are a guarantee and pledge that everything the prophet has spoken will come to pass. They are a guarantee and pledge that Aram and Ephraim will experience destruction (8:1-4) and that Judah itself will not remain as a remnant after it had refused to return and believe in Yahweh (7:1-9). They are at the same time a guarantee and pledge that a remnant will emerge from the coming judgement. The eschatological remnant of the future will be composed of those who have returned to Yahweh in faith, from whom Yahweh has not hidden his face (8:17), but it will become an actual reality only during the purifying judgement of Yahweh which will sweep away all those who decided against faith and God” (Hasel, *The Remnant*, 300-301).
Therefore, just as Moses led the Israelites in worship, the one who will embody God’s sign “Immanuel” will rule over the remnant in the future, presenting himself as the true worshipper of the Lord and wisely choosing God’s way (7:15).

Third, in both passages, a salvific figure is expected to lead the Israelites to the “Promised Land.” In the call narrative of Moses, God promised Moses that He would lead the Israelites to the “land flowing with milk and honey” (Exod. 3:8). Interestingly, similar phrases appear also in Isaiah 7:15 (עֲבוּדֵי ה' בְּפִיו [curds]/הַיָּם [honey]) and 7:22 (אֲבוּדֵי ה' בְּפִיו - [milk], [curds]/הַיָּם [honey]). Although some regard these descriptions as indications of the land’s devastation or desolation, in the light of the thematic connections between the Immanuel prophecy and the call narrative of Moses, these phrases most likely possess some connection to the Promised Land and thus hold a positive connotation.

Cornelis Houtman’s comment, in referring to Hugo Gressmann’s work, verifies this point: “I prefer to regard milk and honey [in the Old Testament] as pars pro toto of the good gifts of the land. It is not strange that as such they occur in depictions of the messianic age and belong to the gifts of which the gods have a bountiful supply, and which were given to them (but not in Israel) as sacrifices.”

However, while these foods seem to represent agricultural abundance in Isaiah 7:15, the subsequent oracles in Isaiah 7:18-25 do depict them in the context of the land’s desolation.

---

297 Buber states, “Immanuel is the king of the remnant, from which the people will renew itself” (M. Buber, The Prophetic Faith, trans. by Carlyle Witton-Davies [New York: Macmillan Company, 1949], 140).
298 Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah, 86; Heskett, Messianism, 94.
299 From the context of Isa. 7:15, “curds/milk and honey” clearly hold a positive meaning. Usually, this verse is translated as “[h]e will eat curds and honey when he knows to refuse the evil and to choose the good” (Wegner, An Examination, 90). However, this translation is problematic, since no chronological aspect is found in v. 15 itself, as Beuken observes: “Der Infinitiv לְרָכֲבָת לְרָכֲבָת ist durch die LXX [pr…n] und Tg [ב] zeitlich wiedergegeben, aber ein finales Verständnis [Sym; Vg: ut sciat] past besser in den Kontext... Der zeitliche Aspekt kommt erst in V 16 zum Zuge” (Ibid., 184). If this translation is correct, then, it stresses some mysterious aspect of these food items: they give understanding to those who eat them. In light of this view, we can even surmise that these foods can enlighten those who do not understand God’s ways (cf. 1:3; 6:9). Therefore, we may conclude that 7:15 particularly underscores the supernatural power of “curds and honey,” the “holy foods” (Buber, The Prophetic Faith, 140).
300 H. Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905), 209ff.
301 For instance, Beuken writes, “Dass diese Verse ein notdürftiges Leben beschreiben und nicht etwa die (messianische) Zeit des Überflusses, beweist vor allem der Ausdruck ‘am Leben erhalten’ [Isa. 7:21, יְתוּמָה]...Das Fehlen von Herden, die zum Fortbestand von Familien notwendig sind..., sowie die scheinbare Unmöglichkeit, sich von den Früchten des Landes zu ernähren..., veranschaulichen den bitteren Mangel. ‘Sahne’...und ‘Honig’...
Nevertheless, the image of devastation, which may be connected historically either to the devastation of Israel after 722 or to that of Judah after 587, need not be understood to attribute a negative meaning to “milk and honey.” As Childs states:

In the four concluding eschatological oracles (7:18-19, 20, 21-22, 23-24), devastation is spelled out in different imagery with the dominant theme being the return of briars and thorns in the place of pasture. In v. 21 the devastation is such that a man struggles for a subsistence level of life with a young cow and two sheep. Yet right at this point, the meaning of the imagery shifts. These few pitiful animals produce such an abundance of milk that all those survivors who are left now feast on curds and honey. The ancient sign of blessing, ‘a land flowing with milk and honey’ (Josh. 5:6), returns for the remnant of the land. The meaning is the same in v. 15. The sign of Immanuel is also the pledge of blessing. Within the same short period of time the blessing anticipated in the name will be visible for the faithful who believe in the messianic rule of God. The language of curds and honey testifies to the selfsame new eschatological reality as that of the great joy of the harvest in 9:3 (2), or of the earth ‘full of the knowledge of the Lord as water covers the sea’ (11:9).
In other words, only the “remnant” can perceive—in the midst of apparent devastation—the vision of agricultural abundance in the Immanuel prophecy. Thus, drawing on Child’s insight, it can be conjectured that in the Immanuel prophecy, curds/milk and honey represent the eschatological vision of the new Promised Land in the age of “the messianic rule of God.”305 There, the remnant of Israel, guided by “Immanuel,” is promised to enter into this place, just as the people of Israel were once guided by Moses to enter the Promised Land.

Therefore, we have seen that Exodus imagery and Mosaic visions permeate the Immanuel prophecy, the promise of a royal figure.306 Accordingly, the awaited Davidic figure of the Immanuel prophecy can be understood as someone who shares in the character not just of a king but also of Moses. Moses was commissioned by God to deliver the people of Israel for worship of the Lord and to guide them to the Promised Land. The Davidic figure, who is expected to embody God’s sign, “Immanuel,” also will rule over the faithful “remnant” of Israel which comes back to worship the Lord, leading them to the new Promised Land where the faithful can enjoy the abundance of “curds/milk and honey” despite the bitterness of their new circumstances. Thus, the eschatological expectation for the Davidic rule we demonstrated in 1.2.2.2 can be understood as being intertwined with anticipation for the coming new Moses.

3.2.1.2 Isaiah 8:19-9:6

Concerning Isaiah 8:19-9:6, three things can be pointed out in order to justify the evocation of Moses. Here again, the Mosaic characters seem to be intertwined with an eschatological, Davidic hope. First, the “latter [time]” in v. 23 is reminiscent of the “latter/new things” in the latter half of Isaiah. Since the adjective “latter” has, as we have already discussed (2.2.2), strong eschatological connotations, which anticipate the coming of the New Moses, the presence of this phrase in v.23 seems to indicate this royal oracle’s connection to an eschatological, Mosaic hope.

305 Childs, Isaiah, 68.
306 Two more minor points can also be adduced as evidence for the connection between the Davidic figure expected in the Immanuel prophecy and Moses. One is the juxtaposition of Egypt and Assyria in Isa. 7:18. The mention of Egypt seems awkward if this description is understood as strictly historical, since “[i]n 735 B. C. Egypt was not so much of a threat to Judah and would not be for many years to come” (Oswald, The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39, 216). Thus, Wildberger supposes that Egyptian reference was not original (Wildberger, Isaiah 1-12, 321-322). However, Egypt and Assyria are juxtaposed in Isaiah to create some “typological” illustrations (e.g., 10:24-27; 52:4-6). Thus, we may conjecture that 7:18 attempts to establish some link between Egypt as the oppressor in the time of Moses and Assyria as the new “Egypt” in the age of “Immanuel.” Thus, in light of this analysis, it is possible to see some link between the Davidic figure expected in the future and Moses. Likewise, and as another point, a further allusion to the Exodus is also apparent. Just as the original deliverance from Egypt depended on stillness (Exod. 14:13-14), so the deliverance from Syria and Northern Israel/Assyria also depends on stillness (Isa. 7:4; 30:15, and cf. 32:17).
Second, the command in Isaiah 8:20 urges the believer of the Lord to consult “Torah” (תורה) rather than “necromancers, familiar spirits who chirp and mutter” (v. 19, כלאהאבות ולא שדנין). This “Torah” (and even the one in v.18) resonates with the Mosaic Torah in this canonical context. Therefore, in view of the wider context of Isaiah, we may reasonably consider the coming age predicted in v. 23 to be inseparably connected to the coming of the new Moses.

Third, the events which are to be realised through the coming Davidic king in Isaiah 9:3 are illustrated by the analogy of the Exodus. As J. Alec Motyer observes, key terms used in v. 3 – “yoke” ( Lauderdale, Lv. 26:13), “burden” (פצלה, Exod. 1:11; 2:11; 5:4-5; 6:6-7), “shoulder” (שפכו, Ps. 81:6), and “oppressor” (נ PRESS, Exod. 3:7; 5:6, 10-14) – all recall Israel’s suffering in Egypt.

Furthermore, an even more striking fact is that these terms also appear in 10:24-27, which depict Assyria’s oppression as a recapitulation of the bondage of Egypt in the ancient days:

Isaiah 9:3

For the yoke of their burden [谕ו של מצהל], the staff [משל] on their shoulder [שמחים], the rod [משלה] that oppressed them, you have shattered as on the day of Midian.

Isaiah 10:24-27

Therefore, thus says the Lord of hosts: "do not fear the Assyrians, O my people, who dwell on Zion, when they strike you with the rod [משל] and raise its staff [משה] against you, just like the Egyptian did. For in a little while the indignation will cease and my wrath will be directed to their destruction." Then, the Lord of Hosts will stir up the whip for them, just like the Lord struck Midian at the rock of Oreb, and he will raise his staff [משה] upon the sea, just like he did in Egypt. On that day, its burden [谕ו] will depart from your shoulder [שמחים] and its yoke [谕ו] from your neck, and the yoke [谕ו] will be destroyed because of fatness.

307 The historical background depicted in Isa. 8:19-22 is still debated. On the one hand, Clements believes that this text describes the situation after the Babylonian exile (Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 102-103). On the other, Wegner writes that “vv. 19-22 indeed describe the Exile of the Northern Kingdom in 722 BCE” (Wegner, An Examination, 202-203). Although Wegner’s view is attractive, I would suggest that there is a connection to the reign of Manasseh, Hezekiah’s successor. Just as Isa. 8:19 anticipates the time when the people of Israel will rely on “necromancers, familiar spirits who chirp and mutter” (v. 19, כלאהאבות ולא שדנין). Manasseh consulted “the necromancer and the familiar spirits” (2Kgs 21:6, כלאהאבות ואילו רכתי). Thus, it can be assumed that vv. 19-22 “predict” the coming hardship in the reign of Manasseh. In light of this view, then, v. 21, which speaks of the people’s distress (“they will curse their king and their gods”), may illustrate the historical suffering under the reign of Manasseh.

These parallels between Isaiah 9:3 and 10:24-27 leads us to read the former passage in light of the latter. Corresponding words in 10:24-27 relate to the Exodus imagery of the concise statements of 9:3. From this canonical perspective, the one who is to come as the new David can be understood as someone who will crush the bondage of Assyria, just as the Lord shattered the yoke of Egypt through Moses’ staff and defeated the army of Midian through Gideon. In other words, Isaiah 9:1-6 seems to claim that the coming Davidic figure who is expected to defeat the Assyrian power partakes of the character of Moses and Gideon.

These two figures, moreover, are not separate but are ultimately coequal. Although Isaiah 9:3 clearly has Gideon in mind, we must remember that the book of Judges depicts Gideon as the one who inherits the character of Moses. Therefore, I argue that the emphasis of 9:3 is not on the person of Gideon per se, but on his Mosaic disposition, which will also be manifested in the coming Davidic figure.

This Davidic figure, as we have discussed, has two referents: an earthly king and an eschatological king. According to our previous investigation, this earthly king is most likely Hezekiah. When we read Isaiah 9:3 and 10:23-27 together, we see that God enabled Hezekiah to triumph over the Assyrian soldiers through the miraculous work of the “messenger of the Lord” (37:36, מַשָּׂאֵל) just like the days of the Exodus (Exod. 14-15). Here, Hezekiah is described as, in some sense, the new Moses. However, as already discussed, Hezekiah, who embodies the character of Moses, is a token of the endless reign of the Davidic kingdom (cf. 9:6). Thus, through an eschatological perspective, the royal oracle of 9:1-6 still anticipates the “new David,” who partakes of Moses’ qualifications.

In light of this analysis, we may conclude that the final form of Isaiah presents the Davidic figure anticipated in 9:1-6 as someone who embodies the characters of Moses. Clothed with a Mosaic character, this Davidic figure will arise in the “latter age” (8:23) to shatter the yoke of the destructive power and release the captives, just as Moses did (9:3, 10:24-27). Furthermore, when read with the latter half of Isaiah, particularly the Servant Songs (e.g., 42:4), the emergence of this Davidic/Mosaic figure can be understood as an inception of the new age. In this new age, not only Israel but also the nations will listen to God’s Torah, which was once sealed (8:16) but will now be opened by this messianic figure despite the world’s darkness (cf. 8:20-22).

3.2.1.3 Isaiah 11:1-12:6

As the last of the three royal promises, we shall examine Isaiah 11:1-12:6, which concludes chaps. 1-12. I contend that in 11:1-12:6, all of the Mosaic elements of the preceding two royal oracles now come to full fruition. In this unit, the emphasis on the “spirit” (רוּחַ) should not be overlooked, as this is a strong signal indicating the Mosaic disposition of the eschatological Davidic figure (Isa. 11:1-2//Num. 12:26). Furthermore, v. 4, which speak of the eloquence of the Davidic figure (“and he will strike the earth by the rod of his mouth” [ודָא אָדָם עַל הָגֶרֶם]), demands special attention, since this, too, implies a connection between Moses and the Davidic figure. Moreover, the Davidic figure’s character recalls the similar disposition of the Servant in 49:2: “he made my mouth like the sharpened sword” (这一点 פֶּה הֶנְאוֹת). As I have argued in the previous chapter, this description in 49:2 is reminiscent of Moses’ call narrative, in which God promised Moses the ability to speak (Exod. 4:11-12). Thus, the power of speech described in Isaiah 11:4 can also be linked to Moses.

Additional connections to Moses at the conclusion of Isaiah 1-12 are observable not only in the description of the Davidic figure’s disposition but also in the depiction of what this figure will accomplish. This becomes clear when Isaiah 11:1-10 is read in the overall context of Isaiah 1-12. This passage, I argue, displays several intertextual links to 1:1-4:6, particularly 2:1-5 and 4:2-6. By examining these textual interconnections, we see that the whole body of Isaiah 1-12 is immersed in Exodus imagery, generating anticipation for the new Mosaic era.

First, 11:1-10 speaks of the “remnant” of Israel with the phrase “root of Jesse” (11:10, יֵ֖שָׁנָּח יְשֵׁש). As Childs writes, this remnant seems to be depicted as “the new messianic society, which participates in the new age of salvation and peace.” Likewise, 4:2-6 also deals with the messianic community with a Hebrew word, נְ֣גֶשׁ (“branch”), which is elsewhere used to depict the messianic figure himself (Jer. 23:5; 33:15; Zech. 3:8; 6:12). Second, this “messianic society” partakes of righteousness (תִּדְמָ֖רָה) and faithfulness (סָמְתָּה), which the Davidic figure will effect (11:5). The same theme appears in 1:26, where the city of Jerusalem, purified by the

311 Childs, Isaiah, 105-106.
312 Concerning the meaning of the “branch” in Isa. 4:2, Beuken writes, “Der ‘Spross JHWHs’ zielt auf die gottesfürchtige Bevölkerung ab, die JHWH zusammen mit ihren Früchten im Land heranwachsen lässt” (Beuken, Jesaja 1-12, 126). Although Beuken is reticent to see the link between “branch” and the messianic idea, it is certainly possible to see some messianic concept in the context of canon, as Childs argues (Childs, Isaiah, 36).
judgement of God, is depicted as the “city of righteousness and faithfulness” (Jerusalem: קִרְיַת אֲדָמִין). Third, 11:9-10 further suggests that this community will be formed on “my holy mountain” (יַעַר קְדֹשִׁי, 11:9), presumably on Mount Zion, and that the nations will come to join this community (11:10). 2:1-5 illustrates a similar eschatological vision, in which Zion is exalted (נַעֲשֶׂה) by God and the nations are said to take pilgrimage there (2:2). Fourth, 11:9-10 states that the people will obtain the “the knowledge of the Lord” (דִּבְרֵי ה’), since the “glory” (חַגִּיד) of God is revealed to them. In similar manner, the prologue of Isaiah also describes “glory” (חַגִּיד) resting on Zion (4:2) and proclaims that the Lord will “teach” the nations “His ways” (2:3).

It should be noticeable here that these four significant themes framing Isaiah 1-12 – namely, the messianic community/remnant, its righteous and faithful characters, Zion as the place where the nations will gather, and the knowledge of God revealed to them through God’s glory – are all redolent of the age of Moses. After their escape from Egypt, the Lord revealed His glory on Mount Sinai (Exod. 19) and revealed Himself to the people through His teaching (20:1-17). On Sinai, the people of God were formed as a community when they pledged that they would remain righteous and faithful to God through the observance of God’s ordinances (24:7f.).

Thus, the parallel between the Exodus narrative and Isaiah 1-12 is apparent. However, at the same time, the theme of the nations’ active involvement in the community of Israel, which occupies a significant part of Isaiah 1-12, was unknown to the people in the age of Moses. Therefore, there is also a clear dissonance between this vision of Isaiah and God’s dispensation in the Mosaic age.

These thematic links as well as differences together indicate, I argue, that chaps. 1-12 anticipate the new Mosaic age that the Davidic “Messiah” will enact, further extending Moses’ glory to the unprecedented hope of the nations’ involvement in the Lord’s worshipping community. This argument can be further strengthened by pointing out two more connections between Moses and the conclusion of Isaiah 1-12.

The first additional point of contact is the description of the second Exodus in 11:11-16. Note that v. 11 says, “on that day, the Lord will reach out his hand a second time [מָשָׁל] to reclaim the
remnant of his people.” Although various interpretations of [שנים] has been proposed, this verse probably refers to the second Exodus, as Hasel writes:

It seems to be significant that there is a correlation between the days of God’s future action and the days of God’s past action for Israel in vs. 16… The context makes clear the fact that the first time in which Yahweh recovered his people was the exodus deliverance to which vs. 16 refers. The ‘second time’ then refers to a new action of God which corresponds to the exodus deliverance.314

However, while Isaiah 11:11-16 is clearly reminiscent of the first Exodus, it is not a mere repetition of the past; rather, the second Exodus outstrips the first because all the faithful remnant will be gathered by God from the four corners of the earth (vv. 11-12). This unprecedented character of the future Exodus resonates with a very similar vision in 43:5-6, as I mentioned in the previous chapter.

Next, we can point out that the Exodus theme in Isaiah 11:11-16 continues in 12:1-6, indicating two things. For one, the speaker of 12:1-6, who uses the first person, is most likely to be the kingly character referred to by the royal oracle of Isaiah 11.315 For another, however, the figure also bears the mark of Moses, since Isaiah 12:2 follows almost the exact wording of the Song of Moses, sung after the people’s deliverance from the Egyptian armies (Exod. 15:1-18).316

In addition to this close parallel, it is worth noting that both songs employ words with the root “גאר” (to rise, to be high) (Isa. 12:5//Exod. 15:1, 21). Moreover, and in terms of a broader connection to the Exodus theme, Ackroyd notes that 12:3 “could continue the exodus theme of

---

313 Ever since Duhm, many scholars have supposed that Isa. 11:11 “refers to a second ingathering of exiles after the first return had taken place in the days of Zerubbabel and Ezra” (Hasel, The Remnant, 341). However, as Hasel rightly points out, there is no focus on Babylon in vv. 11-16. Thus, Hasel claims Isaianic authorship of vv. 11-16: “[t]he enumeration of territories in vs. 11b seems to be related to the two main places of Assyria and Egypt…Pathros and Cush seem to refer to Egypt. Elam, Shinar, and Hamath were tributaries of Assyria. The fact that Babylon is neither specifically mentioned nor clearly intimated is the most serious obstacles to a post-exilic date for the passage under discussion. Those considerations make a pre-exilic date more probable than a date when the name Babylon could not have been omitted. If there is then no other way to interpret this passage but to go back to pre-exilic times, the time of Isaiah is no more impossible than the time of Jeremiah” (Ibid., 344-345).

314 Ibid., 341.


316 Ibid., 37.
verse 2 by alluding to that of water from the rock, though it may be proper to see here also a reference to the water rituals of Tabernacles.”

It thus becomes evident that Isaiah 12:1-6 is immersed in Exodus imagery. With this Exodus theme as a link indicating a continuation from Isaiah 11, we see that the speaker of Isaiah 12:2 is the same Davidic king present in Isaiah 11. Since we have already argued (1.2.4) that the Davidic king in Isaiah 11 should be understood as an eschatological figure, we may conclude that this figure embodies characters of both a Davidic king and Moses. In him, these distinct elements reside in harmony.

However, Archibald L. H. M. van Wieringen’s has proposed a different view, arguing that the first person singular voice in Isaiah 12:2 is either that of Isaiah or God. Nevertheless, the links between the other two royal oracles and Moses strongly suggest that the eschatological Davidic king, who is assimilated to Moses, is offering a thanksgiving song to God as the climax of chaps. 1-12, just as Moses offered his song to God when the Egyptians were defeated at the Reed Sea.

A close study of the thanksgiving song of Isaiah 12:1-6 and Moses’ song of Exodus 15:1-18, however, also reveals some important differences. Most significantly, the theological scope of the former seems to far exceed that of the latter. The song in Isaiah 12:1-6 speaks of salvation through the judgement (v.1), which is not present in Moses’ song. Furthermore, while both songs have the nations in view (Isa. 12:4//Exod. 15:14-15), the song offered by the “Mosaic king” in Isaiah seems to expand this theme, singing, “let this [what the Lord has done] be known [말לד יאדויא] to all the earth [כל הארץ]” (Isa. 12:5).

Thus, Isaiah 12:1-6 seems to depict a future thanksgiving song of the Mosaic king which resembles Moses’ song at the Reed Sea but also expands the scope theologically and even eschatologically. Therefore, as the epilogue of Isaiah 1-12, chaps. 11-12 display the culmination of the Mosaic theme which develops across the three royal oracles of chaps. 1-12. Thus, as the result of this canonical study, we can confidently assert that Isaiah presents the eschatological Davidic king as a Mosaic figure.

---

317 Ibid., 37. Pointing out a further connection to the Exodus theme, Ackroyd writes: “In relation to the root [חֹנַה] we might also consider the possible degree to which the name [חונן], in view of its links to exodus and land themes, might have contributed to the development of [חונן] usage in Isa. xl-lixvi, though the name of Joshua itself hardly occurs outside the books from Exodus to Joshua” (Ackroyd, “Isaiah I-XII,” 39, n66).
319 Here I follow the emendation of BHS.
3.2.1.4 Conclusion

To conclude, our analysis of the relationship between the royal hopes in Isaiah 1-39 and the figure of Moses has demonstrated that the eschatological Davidic figure is assimilated to Moses throughout the first part of Isaiah. Just as Moses did before him, the eschatological David figure of the three royal oracles will release the captives from the oppressive power (Isa. 9:1-6; cf. 11:11-16) and lead the faithful “remnant” to the new Promised Land (Isa. 7:1-25). It is particularly worth noting that these Mosaic themes culminate in the third royal oracle (11:1-9) and the subsequent texts (11:10-12:6) reiterate several Exodus themes found in the prologue, chaps. 1-12. This indicates that chaps. 1-12 as a whole proclaim the new, eschatological Davidic king as the harbinger of the new Mosaic age and the figure who will embody Moses’ character. Thus, Isaiah 1-39 seems to anticipate “Messiah,” who assumes the character of both Moses and David.

3.2.2 The Latter Part of Isaiah (Isa. 40-66)

We now turn to the analysis of the latter part of Isaiah, examining whether the Servant, the new Moses, is also linked to the Davidic king within the book’s eschatological dimension. As we begin our investigation, it is worth noting that some scholars have already claimed, in various ways, that the Servant partakes of some royal characteristics. The fact that Moses is sometimes depicted as king in the Pentateuch (cf. Exod. 4:20; Num. 11:12; 27:15-23; and Deut. 33:3-5) also seems to verify the relevance of this examination, which sees the Servant and Moses as inseparable. Thus, in the following analysis, we will study Isaiah 40-66, particularly

---


321 Though the notion of Moses as a king is not commonly recognised, there are several texts which indicate his kingly character. First, Exod. 4:20 says that Moses was holding the “staff of God” (ץלמה אלוהים); as John Lierman observes, a staff is often used as an Old Testament image to indicate a ruler’s sceptre (cf. Ezek. 19:11, 14; Ps. 110:2) (J. Lierman, The New Testament Moses: Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion, WUNT, 2 Reihe, 173 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 79-80). This royal sceptre, “the staff of God,” is highly significant, since it is given to Moses to perform his kingly reign over the people of Israel. In this light, Moses’ sin at Meribah, which is stressed in the Pentateuch (Num. 20:12, 24; Deut. 32:51), can be understood as the “illegitimate use” of his staff: Moses “did it [striking the rock by his staff] without the approval or instruction of God” (J. L. T. Kok, The Sin of Moses and the Staff of God: A Narrative Approach [Aspen: Can Gorcum, 1997], 163). Thus, this rock-striking incident seems to function as a negative “type” in the Old Testament: just as Moses failed to obey God, so too did most of the kings of Israel. Second, in Deuteronomy 33:3-5, Moses’ royal/kingly character becomes even clearer: “They sat down at your feet, and everyone shall receive your instruction. Moses commanded us a law, the possession of the assembly of Jacob. He was king over Jeshurun [בני ישיון] when...
the first and the fourth Servant Songs (Isa. 42:1-9; 52:13-53:13), together with two other passages (55:3-5; 65:25), in order to further understand the connection between the Mosaic Servant and the Davidic figure.

### 3.2.2.1 The Servant Texts (Isa. 42:1-9; 52:13-53:12)

In our analysis of the Servant Songs, we must pay close attention to Isaiah 42:1-9 and 52:13-53:12, since these texts clearly display the intertextual connections to the royal oracles in Isaiah 1-12. Concerning the former, Sommer points out striking terminological and thematic links between the royal oracle in 11:1-10 and the first Servant Song in 42:1-9:\(^{322}\)

---

\(^{322}\) Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 84-85. The translation is Sommer’s.
A branch will go forth (רָכָּב) from the trunk of Jesse… and YHWH's spirit (רוּהִי) will rest on him—a spirit (רוּהִי) of wisdom and understanding, a spirit (רוּהִי) of counsel and might, a spirit (רוּהִי) of knowledge and awe before YHWH…He will not judge (שׁפָּות) merely by the sight of his eyes (שׁמֶל), nor will he decide cases merely by what his ears hear (לֹא לֵמשׁׁמֹר). He will judge the poor righteously, and he will decide the case of the humble of the land (רַנָּא) in justice...Righteousness will be the clothing he wears, and truthfulness (תְּמוּנָה) his garment...And on that day, the enduring root of Jesse will be a standard for nations (מַעְלֶה); peoples (נִדְרָה) will seek him out, and his rest shall be glorious (כָּבוֹד).

Behold My Servant, whom I support; My chosen one…I have given My spirit (רוּהִי) to him, so that he might send forth (רַכָּב) justice (שׁפָּות) to the nations (מַעְלֶה). He does not cry out...he does not make his voice heard (לֵאמָה)... He would not break even a crushed reed, nor would he extinguish a dim flame; he puts forth (רַכָּב) justice in truth... The distant coastlands look towards his teaching. Thus says the God YHWH, who created the heavens...and spread forth the earth (רוּחַ) and its inhabitants, who gives breath to the people (לְכֹל) on it and spirit (רוּהִי) to those who walk it: I, YHWH, called you in justice (ברָכָה), and I took your hand. I created you and made you a covenant-people, a light of nations (נִשְׂמָה) by opening the eyes (תֵּשַׁבֵּח) of the blind and taking (רַכְּחָל) the prisoners out of the jail. I am YHWH; that is My name, and I shall not give My glory (רַקְבָּה) to another.

This comparison shows obvious correspondences between the two texts. In both passages, a salvific figure receives God’s Spirit, judges his people justly and protects the weak. Moreover, each depicts an awaited figure who has a role for the nations and each implies that the nations will come to obtain the knowledge of God through the work of this ideal figure. In addition to these parallels, there is a further connection between the Mosaic Servant and the Davidic figure: the Mosaic Servant will be “light for the nations” (Isa. 42:6, עָרָץ נוֹז) and will deliver “those who sit in the darkness” (42:7, יָשָׁב בְּשֵׁם), just as the Davidic king in chap. 9 is said to shine as the “great light” (9:1, אָרָּה דְּרוֹר) in the “darkness” (9:1, שֵׁם) and to be hope for “those who sit in the valley of death” (9:1, רְשֵׁב בְּאָרָּה עַל מַשָּׁם, שֵׁם) 324.

The significance of these correspondences between the first Servant Song and the two royal oracles lies, I contend, on the canonical/synchronic level. Isaiah 42:1-9 “quotes” 9:1 and 11:1-10. Through this “quotation,” I argue, the first Servant Song generates the implication that the anticipated new Moses partakes of the Davidic character. In this regard, my view differs from

323 The same phrase (עָרָץ נוֹז) also appears in Isa. 49:6.
that of Sommer. Although Sommer rightly points out that “Isaiah’s promises regarding the monarch are not simply dropped,” he goes on to claim that “the promises Isaiah vouchsafed to the Davidic line now apply to the people as a whole,” since, according to Sommer, the Servant in Isaiah 42:1-9, who is assimilated to the Davidic figure, is identified with “the nation Israel.” Consequently, Sommer concludes that the specific hope for the Davidic king in chaps. 1-39 is absent in chaps. 40-66.

Here I must disagree with Sommer, since I believe that anticipation for the new Davidic ruler is still operative in the first Servant Song. In the history of Israel, Isaiah’s royal oracles were never regarded as “false prophecies” which did not come to fulfillment (cf. Deut. 18:21-22); rather, the people of Israel seem to have retained them as important prophecies which still await consummation in the age to come, as Seitz keenly observes. In this light, supposing, as Sommer does, that the two royal oracles quoted in the first Servant Song were reinterpreted, after Israel experienced disappointment, to invalidate the royal oracles of chaps. 1-39, is highly problematic from a canonical perspective. Such a reading disregards the overall significance of the royal prophecies in chaps. 1-39; canonical neglect of the former prophecies would severely contradict the bold claim in Isaiah 41:8 that, “The word of our God will stand forever.”

Moreover, I would further contend that Sommer’s concept of “nationalisation” does not fully capture the eschatological depth of the first Servant Song. In this regard, I have already argued that what is at stake in 42:1-9 is the eschatological hope for the ideal Israel, as an individual rather than a nation—the new Moses, who will embody the role of Israel. From this perspective, then, I argue, that the eschatological expectation for the new David was preserved, without being transformed, with the eschatological hope for the new Moses.

Therefore, the prophecies about the new David in chaps. 9 and 11 are not weakened by being incorporated into the vision of the Mosaic Servant. Rather, I contend that the Davidic hope and the Mosaic hope are neither mixed nor separated. Considering the message of Isaiah as a

---

325 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 86.
327 Also cf. Isa. 55:11 “My word which goes out from my mouth does not come back to me empty, but will accomplish what I desire and achieve the purpose for which I sent it.”
328 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 86.
329 The same point can apply to the relationship between the Davidic hope and the Mosaic hope in Isa. 1-39, which was previously discussed.
whole, the expectation for the new David in the two royal oracles in chaps 9 and 11 remain, in the first Servant Song, informed by eschatological anticipation for the new Moses. The Servant, partaking of the role of the new David, and filled with God’s spirit, is said to be light for those who sit in the darkness. This Servant judges his people justly, protects the lowly and proclaims the knowledge of God to the nations.

Concerning the fourth Servant Song (Isa. 52:13-53:12), the resonance with the royal oracle in Isaiah 11:1-10 is once again striking. As Sommer writes,

Isa 11.1-10 share vocabulary items with Isa 52.13f.: חָרֶם ("root," 11.1//53:2), יד ("knowledge," 11:2//53:11), and יִתְנֶה ("infant" in Isa 11.8, but “sapling” in Isa 53.2 via word play). The connection may seem meager; but the link between the servant and the Davidic described in 11 is known from 42.1-9, which bolsters the probability that this passage also depends on Isaiah 11. In both Isaiah 52-53 and Isaiah 11 the nations have a role as spectators (11.10, 53.15); in both the central figure brings justice tempered with mercy (11, passim; 53.11-12).330

While Sommer does not develop the implication of this link, Hägglund further articulates the significance of this connection. After demonstrating that יִתְנֶה and יד are used in Isaiah 53:2 to describe the nation Israel, Hägglund concludes that “the hope for the tree has changed from hope for Israel through the Davidic dynasty to hope through the assembling of the dispersed.”331

Here, Hägglund is stating nearly the same view as Sommer’s in regard to his analysis of the link between the first Servant Song and the royal oracle in chap. 11. However, I would reemphasise, that the eschatological expectation for the Davidic king in Isaiah 53:2 is not lost. As stated above, the royal promises in chap. 1-39 are not invalidated in chap. 40-66, chiefly because the Old Testament does not view them as “false prophecies.” Moreover, as I have previously argued, the Servant in this Song refers not, as Hägglund and Sommer assume, to Israel as a nation but more likely to the figure of Moses.332 The Servant, therefore, should be understood as the

330 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 95.
331 Hägglund, Isaiah 53, 134.
332 As stated above, the fact that the final presentation of Isaiah displays the royal oracles as significant prophecies indicates that they are not considered “false prophecies,” but visions still awaiting future fulfillment. In this light, then, the “quotation” of the word חָרֶם from Isa. 11:1-10 in the fourth Servant Song can be understood as a restatement or reassurance of the promise that the Davidic figure will emerge in a coming age. This point, of course, does not preclude the view that חָרֶם in Isaiah holds a communal aspect (11:10), which Hägglund prefers to stress in relation to 53:2. However, the idea that the messianic connotation of the חָרֶם was completely invalidated as the word was reinterpreted by the community seems extreme. Rather, just as the earthly hope for the Davidic monarchy is inseparable from the eschatological expectation for the messianic figure, the messianic aspect and the communal aspect of חָרֶם are indistinguishable in the canonical presentation of Isaiah. In this way, hope for the
eschatological new Moses, who embodies the role of the nation Israel. Through this new Moses, the Davidic hope is preserved.

To conclude, then, our analysis of the two Servant Songs suggests that, despite the prevailing view that the hope for the Davidic king was transformed into hope for Israel as a nation, the expectation for the Davidic king is still integral, from a canonical perspective, to at least the first and fourth songs. These two Servant Songs display the expectation for the eschatological Mosaic Servant, who embodies the role of the Davidic king.

3.2.2.2 Isaiah 55:3-5

Although not one of the Servant texts per se, I argue here that Isaiah 55:3-5 also displays an important, albeit indirect, connection between hope for the Mosaic Servant and hope for the Davidic king. This key text is one of the few after chap. 40 which clearly speaks of the Davidic kingship. In investigating the text, we must first ask how chap. 55 relates to the theme of the Servant.

A key to answering this question lies with the identity of the addressee in chap. 55. Although the message is commonly understood as being addressed to all Israel, we must consider the thematic shift after chap. 53 from the Servant to the servants (see sections 2.2.2.3 and 2.2.2.4). Since, in this context, the servants now play a central role, they the most likely recipients of the message. Although he does not use the phrase “servants of the Lord,” this view is underscored by Richard J. Clifford’s analysis. Accordingly, if God mainly speaks to the servants in chap. 55, and since the servants are depicted as those who participate in the mission of the Mosaic Servant, with its eschatological scope, the content of chap. 55 seems to be deeply connected with the theme of the Mosaic Servant.

Based on this logic, it is indeed striking, on the one hand, that the themes of the Mosaic Servant and the Davidic king converge, though indirectly, in Isaiah 55:1-3. As Childs writes, “the role of

Davidic king can still be considered intact in the fourth Servant Song. Contrary to Hägglund’s argument, what is at stake in the fourth Servant Song is not only Israel but also the individual new Moses, who will embody and consummate the role of the nation Israel. Therefore, the word והנה seems to be ambivalent (i.e. communal and messianic) in meaning. Thus, in this individual new Moses, hope for the new David is preserved in the fourth Servant Song without being entirely conflated with or separated from the Mosaic hope.

333 For instance, see Williamson, Variations, 118.
334 Clifford writes, “the offices [of the house of David] are not simply transferred to the people as a whole, but only to those who obey the divine word to return” (R. J. Clifford, Fair Spoken and Persuading [New York: Paulist Press, 1984], 192).
the Davidic covenant in chapter 55 is a strong indication that already within Second Isaiah a link between the imagery of the servant and the messianic Davidic rule has been formed.”

Given the juxtaposition of these two themes, it must now be asked how they relate. In order to pursue this question, the meaning of 55:3-5 needs to be expounded.

Scholars commonly argue that Isaiah 55:3-5 displays the phenomenon of “democratisation” of the Davidic hope, and consequently minimise, in many cases, the importance of Davidic expectations after chapter 40. However, it is not clear whether Isaiah 55:3 can adequately be explained by such a modern concept. Blenkinsopp, for one, is sceptical about this approach, for “it is difficult to understand why this analogy [between the Davidic covenant and the new covenant with Israel in Isa. 55:3] would be used if the author was not persuaded of the permanence of Yahveh’s commitment to David and the dynasty.”

Likewise, Seitz argues that Isaiah 55:3 does not serve to “transfer” the Davidic role to the people but rather as a “paradigmatic illustration,” signifying that “the role of David vis-à-vis the nations now [has] implications also for the people, who shall call nations they once knew not, as did David according to the Psalter [Ps. 18:44].”

Based on these two scholars’ insights, I argue that Isaiah 55:3-5 does not indicate “transfer” of the kingship from the house of David to lay Israelites, as the concept of “democratisation” would imply. Rather, what 55:3-5 really projects is a future vision that the followers of the Mosaic Servant will share in the mission of the Davidic figure. Accordingly, the role of the future Davidic king, which is illustrated by the three royal oracles of chaps. 1-12, is not transformed into the role of the servants, as most scholars claim. Rather, just as the Mosaic Servant remains as he is, while his role is partly shared by his followers (53:10, “he [the Servant] will see offspring and have long life”), so also the kingly office remains intact, along with the role of the servants. That the Davidic hope is still intact in chap. 55 is strongly supported by Seitz’ argument concerning the “false prophecy:” i.e., since the scriptural

____________________
335 Childs, Isaiah, 437.
336 For instance, see Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 470-471; D. Meade, Pseudonymity and Canon, WUNT 39 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1986), 34.
338 Seitz, “Royal Promises,” 156. Note that Childs also stresses that the royal hopes in Isa. 1-39 were not “repudiated” in Isa. 40-55, although he also holds that the royal promises were “extended and transferred to the mission of the servants of the Lord in the new world order depicted by the prophet” (Childs, Isaiah, 437).
339 Here I draw upon Heskett’s argument from his Messianism, 268.
canon does not regard the royal promises to be “false prophecies,” we cannot presume that Isaiah presents them as no longer valid.\textsuperscript{340}

If the servants are not \textit{replacing} the mission entrusted to David to witness the Lord, then Isaiah 55 seems to present the servants as the “coworkers” in the Davidic mission—but what kind of mission is it? According to Clifford, the Davidic mission shared by the followers of the Mosaic Servant is to witness to God’s glory among the nations (55:4, “behold, I have made him as a witness to the peoples” [יֶעַרְבִּים נַעֲמָה]).\textsuperscript{341} This mission actually exceeds the earlier expectation of the Davidic age, since the passage anticipates that “the nations that do not know you will run to you [יְנוּ מֵאַרְצֵי אֶלֶף יָדָא]” (55:4).

Moreover, the fruit of the servants’ mission, promised in Isaiah 55:4, closely resembles the description of the hope for the new David in 11:1-10, which is to be realised through the “the root of Jesse,” i.e. the “remnant,” or what Childs calls the “messianic society.”\textsuperscript{342} God’s chosen ones, who enjoy the justice established by the Davidic messiah, will become “a banner for the peoples” and “the nations will seek it [אלֶף יוֹם יְהוָה]” (11:10). Therefore, this intertextual connection between chaps. 55 and 11 suggests that the followers of the Mosaic Servant, who is said to continue the David’s role as a witness (55:3-5), are expected to realise the same vision that is entrusted to the “remnant” of Israel (11:10).

Evidently, then, the theme of “remnant” is manifest in Isaiah 55. This hope, which is mainly related to the hope for David is also inseparable from the hope for the new Moses manifest in the works of the Lords’ servants. Therefore, we may conclude that the twin hopes, for the new Moses and for the new David, indirectly converge in chap. 55, with the theme of the servants as

---

\textsuperscript{340} In this regard, although Laato’s comment seems to engage in excessive historical speculation, it is still helpful: “[T]here is no need to read Isa 55:3-5 where [יְהוָה נַעֲמָה] is interpreted as applying to the people as a tract that excludes all messianic hopes. One additional reason for not taking this view is that about twenty years later messianic expectations ran very high when Zerubbabel was appointed the governor of Judah. There is no reason to suppose that the religious circle behind Isa 40-55, which certainly knew of the high messianic hopes which prevailed among the people[,] attempted to convince the people that they and they alone were the inheritors of every promise hitherto given to the dynasty of David. A second argument is found in the fact that messianic expectations play a very important role throughout the Book of Isaiah…There is good reason to assume that the religious group behind Isa 40-55 was not only familiar with these expectations but also regarded them as legitimate for the future of the people. On the basis of these arguments I believe it is best to view the promise concerning [יְהוָה נַעֲמָה] in Isa 55:3-5 as two dimensional. On the one hand, it refers to the people’s return to Judah as a messianic act which leads to the restoration of Judah. On the other hand, it is guarantee for the people that the messianic era will dawn upon those who express their loyalty to YHWH by returning to Judah” (A. Laato, \textit{The Servant of YHWH and Cyrus: A Reinterpretation of the Exilic Messianic Programme in Isaiah 40-55}, ConBOT 35 [Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksel International, 1992], 244-245).

\textsuperscript{341} Clifford, \textit{Fair Spoken and Persuading}, 192.

\textsuperscript{342} Childs, \textit{Isaiah}, 105-106.
mediating link. While both main hopes remain distinct and valid, the servants—followers of the Mosaic Servant—will continue Moses’ mission while also sharing and even extending the witnessing role of David.

3.2.2.3 Isaiah 65:25

Here I argue that Isaiah 65:25, also not a Servant text, displays another indirect connection between the hope for the Mosaic Servant and that for the Davidic king. The verse is relevant to the present study because it “quotes” the previous royal prophecies. Isaiah 65:25a references 11:7, “the lion will eat straw like the ox” [אִישׁ בְּנֵי לֹא נִקְרָע אֲמַלָּם], and 65:25b references 11:9, “they will not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain” [ָלָּא יַאֲמִרֵי הַלּוֹא נִקְרָע אֲמַלָּם קְרָדֶשׁ].

Moreover, Isaiah 65:25 is indirectly but inseparably connected to the theme of the Mosaic Servant. Like chap. 55, the main focus in chap. 65 seems to be on the servants of the Lord, who are said to participate in the mission of their master, the Mosaic Servant. Most notably, the phrase ‘my servants” (שְׁבָרִים) appears six times in chap. 65 (65:8, 9, 13, 15). Also, the statement in Isaiah 65:23, “they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord” (יְהֵיבֵרֵי יְהוָה הַמַּעֲשָׂה, see also v. 9), recalls Isaiah 53:10 (“he [the Servant] will see offspring [ָדֹר] and have long life”). The word “seed/offspring” highlights the “servants” as an important theme in chap. 65, since, according to Beuken and Childs, the term is used to signify the servants.

This focus on the servants of the Lord is intertwined with the vision of the new creation, which engenders expectation for the inception of the new dispensation (65:17-25). Thus, it becomes

---


344 Beuken, “The Main Theme of Trito-Isaiah,” 76-81, esp. 81 (“TI has developed the most original message of his predecessor about the Servant of YHWH in a no less original way by pointing out the oppressed of Zion as the offspring of that figure, the servants of YHWH”). See also Childs, Isaiah, 538.

345 According to Schultz, four themes in Isa. 65 resonate with the Genesis-narrative, generating hope for the new creation: “creating the new heavens and new earth (v. 17—Gen. 1.1), extended life span (v. 20—Gen. 6.3),
apparent that the themes of the Mosaic Servant and the Davidic king meet again, in the theme of these “servants.” Childs argues for this point, observing that “in Third Isaiah the imagery of the servants of Yahweh from Second Isaiah (54:17) has been joined with that of the imagery of the messianic age of First Isaiah.”  

However, despite this indirect convergence of the Mosaic and Davidic themes, the lack of explicit reference to a Davidic king has led many scholars to conclude that the royal hope is no longer intact in Isaiah 65.  

Nevertheless, we must ask whether the mere absence of certain terms truly indicates the diminishment or even dissolution of the royal promises. By reading Isaiah holistically, we can see that the quotation of 11:6-9 in 65:25 also conjures up the context of 11:6-9, specifically the royal hope in 11:1-5, casting messianic overtones onto an otherwise “Mosaic” passage. Therefore, as Childs comments, “the repeated assertion that messianism was limited only to First Isaiah is an underestimation of its resonance within the whole book of Isaiah in its final form.”

Finally, I propose that the vision of the new creation in chap. 65 should be understood as a reassurance of the messianic peace (Isa. 11:6-9), which is the “[result] of the messianic reign,” as Richard L. Schultz points out. Accordingly, the messianic quotation in 65:25 indicates that God’s new creation, which will be received by His servants, is itself a fruit produced by the reign of the eschatological Davidic king. Therefore, we may conclude that the Davidic hope and Mosaic hope again converge through the “servants” theme of chap. 65.

the unified emphasis on the vegetation diet of the animals (v. 25—Gen. 1.20), and the reference to dust as the serpent’s food (Gen. 3.1, 2, 4, 13 and especially v. 14)” (Schultz, The Search for Quotation, 254). Particularly worth noting is Isa. 65:25’s reinterpretation of the curse on the serpent in the Genesis-narrative. Regarding this, Schultz writes, “The use of דָּעִית (serpent) in Genesis may explain its use in Isa 65:25 instead of פָּרָע (cobra) נַחַלְתָּא (viper) as in 11.8. If Isa. 11.8 reflects Gen. 3.15, the cessation of enmity between the serpent’s seed and the woman’s seed, 65.25 reflects a peculiar interpretation of Gen. 3.14. Whereas other curses are reversed, the ‘curse’ of Gen. 3.14 is continued, now not representing humiliation and submission (cf. Mi. 7.7, Isa. 49.23, Ps. 72.9) but rather a literal, harmless non flesh diet” (Schultz, The Search for Quotation, 254). More about this issue of the curse on the serpent in Gen. 3 and the reinterpretation of it in Isa. 11 and 65, see Steck, “…ein kleiner Knabe kann sie hüten,” 104-113; idem, “Die neue Himmel und die neue Erde,” 349-365; J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “The Intertextual Relationship between Isaiah 65,25 and Isaiah 11,6-9,” in The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A. S. van der Woude’s 65th Birthday, ed. by F. García Martínez, A. Hilhurst et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 31-42.

346 Childs, Isaiah, 437. Concerning his view on the relationship between the Servant and the servants, see Childs, Isaiah, 430-431.

347 Note that even many of those who pay careful attention to the larger structure of Isaiah are reticent to find Davidic hope in chap. 65. See Dim, The Eschatological Implications, 321-322; Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 249-250, n40.

348 Childs, Isaiah, 539.

349 Schultz, The Search for Quotation, 253.

350 Ibid., 255-256.
Together they illuminate the “messianic peace” of the followers of the Mosaic Servant, which will be realised through the coming of the Davidic king.

3.2.2.4 Conclusion

Despite the dominant view that the Davidic hope is transformed into something different in Isaiah 40-66, the present investigation has demonstrated that this hope is still intact with and through the anticipation for the eschatological new Moses. Furthermore, the theme of the “servants” serves to connect the Davidic and the Mosaic expectations. Therefore, just as we observed in the former part of Isaiah (chap. 1-39), the expectation for the Davidic figure and that for the Mosaic figure do not contradict each other. Rather, Isaiah as a whole seems to proclaim a single eschatological hope, in which both Davidic and Mosaic anticipations have unique and meaningful functions.

3.2.3 Other Texts in the Old Testament

The examination thus far suggests that, in Isaiah, the Mosaic hope and the Davidic hope do not contradict but complement each other. The dynamic relationship between the two can also be observed in other Old Testament passages. Within the realm of “canonical interpretation,” examining our findings against the wider background of the scripture canon is appropriate. Thus, in this final section, I will point to the confluence of the Mosaic and the Davidic themes in texts outside Isaiah in order to strengthen the integrity of my claim that these two themes converge in Isaiah.

At least three passages outside Isaiah display an interaction between Mosaic and Davidic themes. First, in the vision of the book of Zechariah, the expectations for the priest, Joshua, and those for the “Branch” (גֵּרְמָן) are juxtaposed (Zech. 6:9-15). If, as George W. Coats assumes, Joshua’s priestly office is understood as related to Moses (cf. Ezr. 3:1)\(^\text{351}\) and the “Branch” as indicating a Davidic figure (possibly related to the hope for Zerubbabel),\(^\text{352}\) we perceive here a messianic vision similar to that which we have discovered in Isaiah.\(^\text{353}\)

---

\(^{351}\) Coats, Moses, 208.

\(^{352}\) Cf. A. R. Peterson, Behold Your King: The Hope for the House of David in the Book of Zechariah, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 513 (New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 114-120. Peterson stresses that the “Branch” indicates a future Davidic figure. However, it seems impossible to separate the hope for a future
Second, in the book of Psalms, the encouragement to keep the Law (הָוָּדוּר, הָוָּדוּר) in Ps. 1, is followed by a description of the Davidic messiah (“his anointed” מַשָּׁחְתֵּן) in Ps. 2:2. If Ps. 1 and 2 were originally read together, following an ancient argument, the collocation of Ps. 1 and 2 may indicate a confluence between Mosaic and Davidic themes at the very beginning of the Psalms. This view is likely in light of the thematic continuity between the two psalms. Firstly, as Jerome originally pointed out, the phrase “blessed are those who…” (בָּרוֹעִים) frames the two psalms (Ps. 1:1; 2:12). Secondly, the verb “to murmur” (וְיִמְּרֵהוּ in Ps. 1:2) appears in both psalms, describing both the just man meditating on the Torah in Ps. 1 and the unjust pondering a vain thing in Ps. 2 (וְיִמְּרֵהוּ in Ps. 2:1). Thirdly, as Rolf Rendtorff observes, “both [Ps. 1 and 2] are speaking about the opposition of the ‘righteous’ and the ‘wicked.’” Thus, it is highly probable that Ps. 1 and 2 are together offering a unified message in which the Mosaic and Davidic themes converge.

Third, an additional connection between the Davidic and the Mosaic hopes seems to occur in the Psalter, a curious juxtaposition of a lamentation for the collapse of the Davidic dynasty in Ps. 89 and the subsequent intercession of Moses in Ps. 90. Although this connection is intriguing, most scholars dismiss the interactive relationship between these two psalms. For instance, though focusing on ‘intertextuality’ within the book of Psalms and recognising the interaction between Psalms 89 and 90, Beth LaNeel Tanner claims that, in the context of the entire book of Psalms, the psalm of Moses in chap. 90 signals transition, rather than continuity, from Israel’s

---

353 Coats, Moses, 208. Against the dominant view that Zech. 6 originally spoke of Zerubbabel, whose name was replaced by Joshua when the former disappeared, James C. VanderKam convincingly argues that the word “crowns” (משֶׁשִּׁים, plural form) in v. 11 clearly suggests that the text intends to present two rulers, i.e. Joshua and the “Branch.” See J. C. VanderKam, From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile (Minneapolis: Fortress Press; Asen: Van Gorcum, 2004), 38-42, esp. 38, n145.

354 Jerome conjectures that a superscription to Ps.1 is missing because the Jewish people originally read Ps. 1 and Ps. 2 together: “Aliiter: apud Hebraeos et primus et secundus unus est psalmus, quod in apostolorum quoque Actibus conprobatur” (See Hieronymus [Jerome], Commentarioli in Psalmos: Anmerkungen zum Psalter, trans. and ed. by Siegfried Risse, Fontes Christiani 79 [Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2005], 71). According to Jerome, this view is further attested by some New Testament manuscripts which refer to Ps. 2 as “the first Psalm” (τὸ πρῶτον ψαλτήριον, Acts 13:33).

monarchical age to the time of a “new wilderness.” Consequently, Tanner does not recognise the theme of Davidic hope after chap. 89, and judges that Psalms 90 supersedes Psalms 89.\(^{356}\)

In my judgement, this view is problematic in that it overlooks the simple fact that “David re-emerges in Psalm 101 to sing of… God’s loyalty and justice, the two matters called into question on his behalf in Psalm 89.”\(^{357}\) In this light, then, it is more reasonable to think that the Davidic hope is not abandoned in Psalms 89, but remains an eschatological hope. The Davidic hope, I would suggest, is not only still intact in Ps 89 but also interacts with Psalms 90. At least three further points support this view.

Firstly, the lamentation over God’s abandonment of the house of David in Psalms 89:47 (נְדֵרַת) is continued by Moses in Psalms 90:13 (נְדֵרַת), giving an impression that Moses is interceding for the house of David. Next, the “servants” seem to be a prominent theme (נְדֵרַת occurs in Ps. 89:51 and Ps. 90:13) in both psalms. And thirdly, the theme of Torah in Psalms 89:31 (תֵּרָת) anticipates the subsequent Mosaic psalm. Therefore, Psalms 90 does not seem to signal a transition in Israel’s history, as Tanner and others suppose. Rather, the Davidic hope in Psalms 89 and the Mosaic hope in Psalms 90 seem to enhance, rather than deny, the relevance and significance of the other.

Thus, these examples from the broader context of the Old Testament display certain interactions between the Mosaic and the Davidic themes. In all of these cases, the two subjects are closely juxtaposed. This analysis, thus, has proven that our argument concerning the relationship between the Mosaic and Davidic hopes in Isaiah is consistent with how the wider context of the Old Testament canon presents those themes.

### 3.3 Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, I have demonstrated that, in both Isaiah 1-39 and 40-66, the Davidic hope and the Mosaic hope come together, both contributing to the messianic expectation of Isaiah as a whole. In the former part of Isaiah (chap. 1-39), the eschatological Davidic ruler is assimilated with the Mosaic figure through the employment of Exodus imagery in the three royal oracles (chaps. 7, 9 and 11) and their immediate contexts. The latter part of Isaiah similarly intertwines the Davidic and Mosaic hope through either quotation of or allusion to the

---

\(^{356}\) B. L. Tanner, *The Book of Psalms Through the Lens of Intertextuality* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 98-100

\(^{357}\) Seitz, “Royal Promises,” 164
royal oracles of chap. 1-39. This convergence, I have argued, should not be considered merely integration or simple amalgamation/fusion; the two hopes are neither confused nor separated. Rather, the relationship of these twin expectations can be described as dialectical, complementing each other and contributing to the messianic vision of Isaiah as a whole.
CONCLUSION

In this conclusion, I will briefly restate the outcome of the present study and expound on the meaning of Isaiah’s messianic expectation in the context of the Old Testament, especially in regard to the complex relationship between the Law and Prophets. Throughout my investigation, I have demonstrated that the theme of the Servant of the Lord in chaps. 40-66 is not, as many scholars argue, a mere revision of the hope expressed in the royal oracles in the former part of Isaiah (Isa. 1-39). Rather, I have argued that both the royal prophecies in chaps. 1-39 and the Servant texts in chaps. 40-66, while rooted in the earthly realm, both entail eschatological significance. Through this vision of future hope, the two seemingly contradictory or separate hopes are united, while each retaining its uniqueness: the royal oracles anticipate the coming of the New David, and the Servant Songs look to the New Moses.

In order to demonstrate the harmony among these two parts of Isaiah, I have shown that these eschatological hopes are not separate, but closely interact with each other, yet without being confused. Therefore, the two groups of passages actually point to a single figure, a figure who embodies the characters of both David and Moses. This individual, I believe, can rightly be identified as the messianic figure, to whom Isaiah as a whole testifies.358

The mutuality between the Mosaic and the Davidic hopes in Isaiah, together with similar phenomena observed in other scriptural passages (see 3.2.3), suggest that the Old Testament presents the relationship between the Law and the Prophets as more interactive and vibrant than former scholarship has often estimated. Julius Wellhausen, to list one example, influentially placed the prophets over and against the Law: the “pure” religion of the prophets, in his view, lost its authenticity through the legalism of Judaism.359 However, rather than conceiving of a

358 In fact, if the three royal oracles in Isa. 1-12, in which we have observed both Davidic and Mosaic elements, were originally given by Isaiah, this multi-faceted hope for the messianic figure might well have been present in the original words of the prophet. If this were true, although the messianic expectation is often believed to have emerged only after the exile, we might then conclude that the bond between the Mosaic hope and the Davidic hope imprinted in the final form of Isaiah had already existed in the pre-exilic period.

359 J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel: with a Reprint of the Article “Israel” from the Encyclopedia Britannica (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973), 411-425, esp. 423-425, et passim. A tendency to reduce the importance of the Law in the Old Testament is observable among some contemporary scholars. For instance, a recent monograph written by John H. Sailhamer states that “the laws are part of the narrative technique” to show “what God required of Israel” (J. H. Sailhamer, The Meaning of the Pentateuch: Revelation, Composition and Interpretation [Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009], 558-559). Thus, Sailhamer concludes that what is important in the Pentateuch for Christian readers is not the interpretation of each regulation but the essence of the
hostile relationship between the two, the present investigation encourages us to acknowledge their interactivity and mutuality.

In fact, and commendably, some scholars are already working with this perspective. For instance, Stephen B. Chapman demonstrates that the relationship between the Law and the Prophets was *mutually interactive* during the process of the “canonisation” of the Old Testament. In doing so, Chapman revises the classical three-stage “canonisation” model, which posits rigid stages and dismisses any interaction between the Law and the Prophets. In addition, Jon D. Levenson rejects the idea that the Davidic covenant replaced the Sinitic covenant (Levenson ascribes this notion to the Church), stating that “the relationship between Moses and David, Sinai and Zion, remains pluriform” in the Bible. Together with these scholars, the outcomes of the present study also point to the need for reconsidering the relationship between the Law and the Prophets.

Our journey of exploring the messianic vision of *Isaiah* ends here. Although this topic deserves more thorough and more comprehensive treatment, the present study has partly unveiled the depth of eschatological expectation for the coming of the messianic figure. The eschatological vision presented in *Isaiah* does not exclude or neglect any word spoken by the Lord. Rather, gathering up all the words of God, *Isaiah*’s vision enables believers to behold the amazing unity in the message of God’s commitment to His creation through His own Word. Indeed, as it is written, the word of God “does not return [to Him] empty” but “accomplishes what [He] wills and succeeds in the thing for which [He] sent it” (Isa. 55:11).

---

360 Chapman, The Law and the Prophets.
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