Isaiah 11:10-16 and Its Historical Background

by Seth Erlandsson

[This article, which originally appeared in Swedish, was translated by Dr. Siegbert Becker.]

I. The Research Situation and the Statement of the Problem

E. F. Rosenmueller was one of the first biblical scholars who gave expression to a certain doubt about the authenticity of Isaiah 11:10–16.[i] But it was not until 1883 that the opinion that Isaiah 11:10–16 was a secondary addition in the book of Isaiah won more general acceptance. B. Stade in that year published a treatise on Micah 4:5[ii] which concluded (p 16) with a short argumentation to show that Isaiah 11:10–16 was the result of "later editorial work." Stade advanced the following three arguments: a) Verses 11 and 15–16 allude to "the *Urgeschichte*" which played a great role in Deutero-Isaiah. b) "The countries which are given as the location of the diaspora in verse 11 likewise point to a time long after Isaiah." c) Since chapter 12 is inauthentic, and 11:10–16 have a close connection with chapter 12, this section must also be inauthentic.

Verse 11 with its description of a worldwide diaspora became in the subsequent period the chief argument for a late dating of Isaiah 11:10–16. The question of whether parts of the text, above all else the countries listed in verse 11, could be later emendations of an older, more general copy, and therefore useless as an argument for the dating of the whole section, was not raised until later. O. Procksch, who referred to Stade's argument, denied the possibility that Isaiah 11:10–16 could be a revision of an Isaianic original.[iii] G. B. Gray finds "the general impression of a wide dispersion of the Jews" as decisive for a postexilic dating[iv] of the whole section without raising the question of whether this impression might have been created through a later interpolation. Bentzen maintains very curtly that verses 11ff are "clearly secondary."[v]

The theory that older versions went through successive reworkings through the constant updating of the texts in new situations has in the meantime little by little gained acceptance. This theory has exegetical consequences and makes the dating of Isaiah 11:10–16 more complex. R. B. Y. Scott speaks about "supplementary material representing the burning faith of fifth- or fourth-century Judaism."[vi] J. Bright thinks that "it is entirely possible that some of the material is older,"[vii] and G. Fohrer maintains that verses 11–16 show "how later and earlier prophetic words developed (*nachgewirkt haben*)."[viii]

Thus the question has arisen how it is possible with the greatest possible certainty to distinguish between "later and earlier prophetic words," between an earlier original and later interpolations. Since we do not have access to an earlier unedited version and a later one that has been edited, we are entirely dependent on internal criteria.[ix] The period between the origin of the text and the oldest known manuscripts is very long and gives occasion for many theories about what might have happened to the texts during that time. Hertzberg[x] has given more definite examples to support the theory that the prophetic texts have been expanded with more precise details, supplementary reinterpretations and corrections as a result of updating in view of later developments. His judgment of what belongs to the original version and what is a result of later updating rests in its entirety on the interpretation he gives to the final redaction. The exegesis which he gives is far from generally accepted. Thus Hertzberg judges, for example, Isaiah 22:9b–10a to be "a typical gloss," intended to clarify the text of Isaiah,[xi] which is, to say the least, a debatable opinion. G. von Rad points in his *Theologie des AT* to Hertzberg's article and emphasizes more strongly that the texts through updating are expanded and reworked.[xii] But he presents no new basis of judgment which will enable us more objectively to determine what is original and what is reworked or added. Although we are still moving on very uncertain ground, von Rad presents this theory as if it had been objectively verified: "This productive process by which the text was handed down (*Traditionsprocess*) one can observe step by step in the prophetic books."[xiii]

The examples which von Rad adduces are just as disputable as Hertzberg's. Isaiah 23 is according to von Rad an example of how "an older oracle against Sidon by a few additions finally was referred to Tyre."[xiv]

But this judgment is far from certain.[xv] Isaiah 22:15–25 according to von Rad demonstrates "three distinct layers of accretion,"[xvi] a judgment which again rests on a debatable exegesis of the text.[xvii]

As an example of later revisions as a result of "ever new interpretative work on the tradition,"[xviii] Isaiah 11:10–16 plays a prominent role. "Verses 10ff of chapter 11 give us a desirable insight into the later history of a Messianic prophecy," says Hertzberg (p 118). Von Rad sees verses 11 and 16 as the oldest layers in the prophecy,[xix] the very parts which Stade pointed to as evidence for the inauthenticity of the texts. Gray, on the contrary, considered verses 9–11 to be an interpolation between verses 1–8 and 12–14.[xx] As we have seen above, verse 11 above all has been decisive for the dating and interpretation of Isaiah 11:11–16. "The enumeration of the places in which the exiles are dispersed argues a date much later than the time of Isaiah," maintains the otherwise conservative E. J. Kissane.[xxi] Here, it is thought, the discussion is about a dispersion, which became a reality only after the fall of Jerusalem.[xxii] Out of a postexilic dating of verse 11, the rest of the details in the text have received a more precise interpretation. The word שנית in verse 11 presupposes a first deliverance. According to Fohrer this earlier deliverance has reference not to the deliverance out of Egypt, but the deliverance of the exiles from Babylon by Cyrus.[xxiii] Gray maintains that "Assyria" in verses 11 and 16 "may refer to the Persian Empire,"[xxiv] while J. Lindblom considers "Assyria" to be a reference to "the Seleucid kingdom."[xxv] The determination of what is meant by "Assyria" thus rests completely on the date one gives to the prophecy. Verse 13, which speaks of enmity between Judah and Ephraim, reflects, according to B. Duhm, the conditions "at the time of the militant Alexander Jannaeus."[xxvi] Hertzberg comments very briefly on verse 13 with the words: "thus a settlement of the disagreements between Judah and Samaria."[xxvii] According to Procksch verse 14 must be "clearly a picture of the future (*ein reines Zukunftsbild*)," "for in the time of the Maccabees Judah and Ephraim were not allied,"[xxviii] and the expression בני־קדם has reference, according to Duhm, to "the Arabs under Aretas,"[xxix] etc.

A dating of the whole section, verses 10–16 or verses 11–16 on the basis of the listed countries in verse 11 and the impression of a worldwide diaspora which is created thereby, has in the meantime been brought into question through the idea that this listing can be a later expansion of an older text.[xxx] Koenig maintains that the mention of Assyria in verse 11 and 16 may point to an older original and that "all the following places were added later," with the possible exception of Egypt.[xxxi] This opinion of Koenig is shared by many researchers after him. Scott, for example, sees "the word following *from Egypt* in verse 11" as a typical example of a complementary addition.[xxxii] V. Herntrich therefore draws the following conclusion: "The dating of the section must remain uncertain," since it is possible that many of the names in verse 11 are "addition or expansion."[xxxiii]

In dating the whole section, 11:10–16, one must thus take account of the fact that details in the text, which seem to reflect a later time, can be a later addition, and therefore cannot serve as the basis for a general dating of the content in the whole prophecy. It is therefore necessary to try to come to a more certain determination about what is a later addition and what is original. But in that case we are still completely dependent on internal criteria and all the subjectivity that this implies. It will therefore be necessary to clarify what can be more definitely gathered out of the text and what must be classified as only a possible interpretation. A fixed theory cannot function as a refuge from difficulties, real or apparent, eg., by declaring them to be later additions, before one makes an earnest attempt to solve the difficulty in its present context.[xxxiv] On the other hand, one must certainly seek to avoid artificial harmonizations. But before we go into a closer examination of the content of Isaiah 11:10–16, we must examine the text linguistically.

II. Linguistic Commentary on Isaiah 11:10–16

11:10 שרש ישי stands as an absolute nominative at the beginning of the sentence and thus becomes emphasized powerfully. In verse 10b this expression is once more taken up through a pronoun (אליו). This syntactic nicety occurs also, eg., in Isaiah 1:7b (זרים אכלים אתה אדמתכם לנגדכע) and 9:1b (ישבי בארץ צלמות אור נגה עליהם).[xxxv] מנוחה is translated by the Vulgate with *sepulchrum eius*, a translation which F. Delitzsch called "*Zusarmmenhangs- und geschichtswidrig*."[xxxvi] The translation of the Vulgate can be

explained as a consequence of the early Christian exegesis of ܣܢܐ (signum) as a reference to the cross of Christ. מנוחה certainly has reference to Zion, cp Psalm 132:8, 14.

11:11 After the verb נוסיף and before ידו one would have expected לִשְׁלֹחַ. But since ידו is followed by another inf. c., namely לקנות, the omission of the verb שלח is accounted for. The expression שלח ידו is so common, that שלח can be omitted as self evidently understood, just as, vice versa, יד can be understood after the verb שלח (Ob 13).

שנית "a second time" makes the more general יוסיף more precise.[xxxvii] שנית is very commonly emended to שְׂאֵת.[xxxviii] In this connection reference is made to Isaiah 49:22, which has the expression ...ידי אשה as a parallel to the phrase ארים נסי. Support for this emendation can be found also in the LXX, which translates with the words προσθήσει κύριος τοῦ δεῖξαι τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ. However, τοῦ δεῖξαι can be inserted to fill out the brachylogy. The rest of the versions (Vulg., Pesh., Targ., Aquila, Symm.) support the MT and even 1 QIs[a] has שנית which fits very well into the context in order to emphasize the parallel with the first exodus.

So far as the lands listed in verse 11b are concerned, the LXX deviates greatly from the MT and 1 QIs[a], which agree. The word order in the Hebrew manuscript, "Egypt, Pathros, and Cush," is not found in the LXX, which has βαβυλωνίας in place of פתרוס in the Hebrew manuscript. Presumably this is the LXX translation for the שנער of the Hebrew text, which thus is placed in a more prominent position in the text of the LXX. Aquila agrees with the MT and 1 QIs[a] (φεθρους). When, furthermore, the LXX has the translation καὶ ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἐξ Ἀραβίας, that is presumably a result of the attempt of the LXX translators to interpret and update the text on the basis of the prevailing situation, in which the Egyptian and Eastern diaspora predominated.[xxxix] Aquila, Symm., and Theod. agree with 1 QIs[a] and the MT and have σενααρ (שנער) and αιμαθ (חמת). The איי הים of the MT is not translated in the LXX, but the words are found in 1 QIs[a] and are translated in the Vulgate and Peshitta. In his Hexapla, Origen adds καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν νήσων τῆς θαλάσσης to the text of the LXX. The Targum of Isaiah reads מחדו "from India" and מבבל, "from Babylonia," where the Hebrew text has מכוש and משנער. Otherwise it follows 1 QIs[a] and the MT. The Peshitta agrees with the Hebrew text except for one point. The ומשנער of the Hebrew text is rendered in the Peshitta with "and from Seir."

11:12 נדחי ישראל means "Israel's outcasts." נדחי is a nipf. ptc., which Koenig derives from the verb דהה.[xl] Gesenius gives instead the verb נדח, but if this derivation is correct the *dagesh* has fallen away because of the following guttural. Parallel to this expression stands נְפֻצוֹת יהודה, which means "the dispersed of Judah." נפצות is the niph. ptc. fem. of פוץ. It is striking that the masculine form is used for the "outcasts" of Israel and the feminine for the "dispersed" of Judah. The point of view can hardly be this that in regard to Judah only the dispersed women are spoken of. Bentzen explains the change in gender by saying that the author thus wished to give expression to the comprehensiveness (of the dispersion)[xli], while Procksch thinks that the author had Israel's *tribes* in mind when he wrote נדחים and behind the feminine form נפצות lies the idea of the devastation of the *cities* (בנות) of Judah.[xlii]

11:13 קנאת אפרים must mean "the envy of Ephraim." קנאת with the objective genitive occurs only in the positive meaning of "eagerness for something" (26:11; Ps 69:10).[xliii] צררי יהודה must also allude to those in the northern kingdom, who attack Judah, since a suffix or a genitive after צרר elsewhere always is objective (cp Am 5:12; Ps 143:12). The Targum also interprets יהודה as the object of צררי: "They that oppress them that are of the house of Judah."[xliv] Verse 13a thus contains a synonymous parallelism, while 13b has an antithetic parallelism with a chiastic word order. Verse 13ba corresponds thus to 13aa, but 13bb is not parallel to 13 ab.

11:14 The vocalization of the MT, בְּכָתֵף, instead of בְּכֶתֶף, can be caused by the fact that בכתף with a recessive accent could easily lose its final ף when the word is spoken, since the following word begins with a פ. Compare Psalm 132:10, where the MT vocalizes פני משיחך אל־תָּשֵׁב with the accent on the last syllable. כתף denotes the Philistine coastal lands (see, eg., Jos 15:11, which has the phrase כתף עקרון). The term כתף,

furthermore, fits very well into the picture of an eagle who plunges headlong on his prey. Judah and Ephraim come like a flying eagle from the elevated hill country down upon the Philistine "shoulder." The Targum separates בכתף from the Philistines and takes it with the verb as an indication of the close cooperation between Ephraim and Judah ("as one shoulder").[xlv]

The LXX deviates greatly from the MT and 1 QIs[a] as well as from the remaining versions. Instead of the Hebrew בכתף פלשתים ימה the LXX has ἐν πλοίοις ἀλλοφύλων θάλασσαν. Furthermore, the LXX adds a πρῶτον after "Moab" and a πρῶτοι after "Ammonites." "Edom" is separated from "Moab" and instead joined with כני־קדם, which is translated with τοὺς ἀφ᾽ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν, a translation which occurs also in verse 11. משלוח ידם means "object of the reach of their hand," that is, their sphere of influence. משמעתם means "their dependents." The word also occurs on the Mesha stone, line 28: "all Dibon has become משמעת, " that is, a tributary country.[xlvi]

11:15 החרים is usually emended to החריב. This emendation is supported by the LXX (ἐρημώσει), the Vulgate (desolabit), the Peshitta and the Targum (וייביש). 1 QIs[a] on the other hand has החרים, which is a *lect. diff.* Aquila, Symm. and Theod. also had a copy with the verb חרם, since they translate with ἀναθεματίζειν. Koenig follows the MT and translates: "and to place under the ban, i.e., to consecrate to destruction" and he believes that the assertion that החרים does not fit together with the object is "unjustified."[xlvii] Bearing in mind the evident allusions to the Exodus in the text, one would expect a verb with the meaning "to divide." Just as JHWH divided *yam-suf,* so He shall once more divide the Egyptian gulf (the Gulf of Suez). Now the root חרם can also have the meaning "divide," and therefore KBL probably is correct when it gives the meaning "cut off, separate" for חרם in Isaiah 11:15.[xlviii]

בעים רוחו is translated by the Septuagint with πνεύματι βιαίῳ The word βιαίῳ is used by the LXX also in Exodus 14:21, where it describes how a strong east wind brought it about that the waters divided in two. The Hebrew text in Exodus 14:21 has the phrase רוח קדים עזה, which is translated by the LXX with ἐν ἀνέμῳ νότῳ βιαίῳ. The LXX's translation of בעים with βιαίῳ can thus be influenced by the Exodus text and does not necessarily imply that the LXX followed a different reading than בעים. This applies also to the Vulgate, which has the translation *in fortitudine spiritus sui.* On the basis of the LXX and the Vulgate and the fact that the word עזה is used in Exodus 14:21, many have emended עים to עצֶם. 1 QIs[a], however, has בעיים רוח and supports the tradition of the MT. The meaning of the word עים has still not been finally determined, since we are here faced with a *hapax legomenon.* Delitzsch has seen a connection between עים and the verb חמם, "to glow," via חום־־עום. Some support for the meaning "glowing" is brought in a general way besides by the Arabic root *gym,* which can have the meaning "to have a burning thirst, to be heated inwardly." For the present, however, it is difficult to go beyond conjecture.[xlix]

לשאר... אשר ישאר מאשר כאשר ... (v 16) gives a fine example of alliteration between שא and אש. The alliteration is used also in verses 10 and 11, and is also there based on the sh-sound. Verse 12 is introduced with the alliteration נשא נס, which is then followed by two verses in chiastic arrangement. Also verse 13a is constructed chiastically. A rhyming sentence ending is found, among others, in verse 15.

III. Exegesis of Isaiah 11:10-16

Verse 10 harks back to verse 1 by means of the cue word שרש ישי, which occupies the emphatic position at the beginning of the sentence. In verse 1 a shoot from the root of Jesse and a sapling which shall grow up out of its roots is spoken of (משרשיו), and in verse 10 the root itself is mentioned. שרש is certainly here used metonymically, just as in 14:30 as "cause for effect, a sprout from the root or something similar."[l] This picture evidently is a reference to the royal tree of David, of which only a root will remain. But on that day, ביום ההוא, the royal tree shall once more become important through the coming Son of David who will

become a banner for the people. He will draw the heathen to Himself, and they will seek counsel from Him. The place where the new Son of David will live and be enthroned shall be כבוד, "glory."

Verse 10 is generally viewed as a postexilic oracle, primarily because of its relationship to what follows.[li] But the oracle itself contains nothing which clearly connects it with postexilic times. Bright holds correctly that "the date of 10 will depend on its interpretation."[lii] The idea of a Davidic king who shall rule over the various peoples of the world is not a late idea as such, but on the contrary, it is found in many preexilic psalms in the Psalter (see, eg., Ps 2:8; 18:43–45; 72:8–11; and 89:28). As Duhm already held, verse 10 only paraphrases what is found in Isaiah 2:2–453[liii] and "is essentially the same."[liv]

The expression שרש ישי forms an effective contrast to the portrayal of the world power of Assyria, which in 10:33–34 is portrayed under the picture of the vast forest of Lebanon. Delitzsch has very strikingly pointed to this contrast: "But while this Lebanon of world power will be cast down, never to rise again, the house of David renews itself; and while that power, when it has reached the pinnacle of glory, will suddenly be humiliated, this kingdom, when it has come into the greatest danger of perishing, will suddenly be exalted."[lv] In verse 10b the chief components of Isaiah 1–12, David and Zion, are coupled together (והיתה מנוחתו כבוד). Through the linking formula והיה ביום ההוא[lvi] the ground is prepared for the reference back to verse 1 and at the same time the fact that the prophecy speaks of the future is underscored.

Verses 11–16 constitute the immediate answer to a question which is raised by verse 10: If now the new dynasty of David after its decay shall once more be set up, and the new David shall be a king who will draw the *heathen people* to Himself as their counsellor, what will then become of David's son's *own people*, which is on the one hand divided and on the other dispersed to various places? The answer is given in verse 11: It is not only the heathen to whom the new times of salvation shall apply. Also JHWH's own people (עמו), which in verses 12ff is described as both *Israel and Judah*, shall be the object of JHWH's deliverance, and the division shall be removed (v 13). The fantastic course of events associated with the first exodus shall be repeated (vv 11, 15–16). That the first exodus does not refer to the release from Babylon through Cyrus but to the deliverance out of Egypt through Moses is clearly indicated in verse 16. Besides, the words דו and דנא (see Ex 15:16) point back to the exodus tradition. Just as the coming deliverance is painted against the background of the first exodus, the coming Davidic kingdom is portrayed against the background of the old, verse 14.

The Countries Listed in verse 11

It is striking that in the list of countries in verse 11 Assyria is mentioned first and that Assyria alone is named in verse 16, which refers back to the content of verse 11 according to the pattern of circular composition. If the deportations of the Babylonian Captivity had been presupposed, one would have expected to find Babylon mentioned in this place, but Babylon is conspicuous by its absence from this text. Not Babylon but Assyria was historically viewed as the great scatterer of both Israel and Judah (see v 12). It is standard custom to associate texts which refer to an exile immediately with the Babylonian Captivity in the beginning of the sixth century. The remark of R. W. Rogers in regard to Isaiah 11:11ff may be said to be typical: "No such dispersion appeared near to Isaiah's time, but it did occur after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C."[lvii] The Babylonian exile, however, was of limited scope and involved a removal to a few areas in Babylonia, where the Jews could live in complete freedom. The Assyrian deportations on the other hand were of completely different dimensions and in all likelihood involved a real dispersion throughout the whole of the Assyrian world empire. This we can say on the basis of what we know about the deportation policies of the Assyrians.[lviii]

Excursus: If one goes through the content of the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings, in order to study their deportation policies, one gains a very clear picture of how systematically the Assyrian tyrants tried to prevent new attempts at revolt. From the lists of the number of deportees which are found in the inscriptions, it can be concluded that the foremost revolutionary countries Media, Elam, S. Babylonia, and Israel-Judah suffered worst.[lix] Tiglath-pileser III claims to have deported 65,000 Medes in one of his campaigns.[lx] Concerning Israel (*Bit-Humria*) he claims no

specific figure but he says quite generally, "all of its people … I carried off to Assyria. Pakaha, their king they deposed and I placed Ausi' (Hoshea) over them as king."[lxi] Neither does 2 Kings 15:29 give any figure, but it says quite generally that Tiglath-pileser led the people away to Assyria. Where in the Assyrian empire, it does not say, but according to Assyrian practice they were carried to the area, which in turn had been struck by the decree of deportation. According to 2 Kings 17:6 and 18:9ff deportations also occurred in the time of Shalmaneser V, in which Israelites came to Hala, Haber, and the cities of Media. It is noteworthy that the cities of Media are spoken of, since it was just the Medes who were deported from their cities in large numbers. Sargon records that he in several campaigns deported from S. Babylonia 16,490 and 90,580 persons and from Elam 7,500 and 12,062. Concerning Israel he says, "I surrounded and captured the city of Samaria; 27,290 of the people who dwelt in it I took away as prisoners."[lxii] Sennacherib says concerning his conquest of Hezekiah's Judah: "Forty-six of his strong walled towns and innumerable smaller villages in their neighborhood I besieged and conquered … I made to come out from them 200,150 people, young and old, male and female, … and counted them as spoils of war."[lxiii] To which part of the Assyrian empire these deported Jews were carried, he does not say. But it is surprising that just before his campaign to Palestine, Sennacherib had made an incursion into southern Babylonia and from there he says that he deported 208,000 persons, a number which agrees very closely with the number of captives from Judah. It is therefore a plausible conjecture that a large number of Jews were taken to southern Babylonia just at that time.

It is therefore anything but irrelevant to speak about "the outcasts of Israel" and the "dispersed of Judah" in the time of Isaiah.

Egypt

The mention of Egypt in verse 11 appears natural in connection with the deportations under the Assyrians. Assyria and Egypt were, as we know, the two chief combatants in the last part of the seventh and the beginning of the sixth century. That is reflected also in Isaiah 18–19; 30:1–7; and 31:1–3. The chronicles of Shalmaneser, Sargon, Sennacherib and Esarhaddon concerning their expeditions to the west again and again speak of Egypt's continual attempt to break the Assyrian yoke with the aid of the states of Palestine, and Tiglath-pileser says in one of his inscriptions, "Ibi-bi'ilu I appointed to be agent (overseer) in Egypt (*Musri*). The weapon of Assur I set up therein … An image of my royal self I made and set it up there, as a fitting (monument) of the power and might, which in the name of Assur, my lord, I established over the lands … "[lxiv] The triad *Misraim-Pathros-Kush* is of interest. Misraim denotes lower Egypt, Pathros (p.t.r'j "the southern country") denotes upper Egypt, and Cush, Ethiopia or Nubia. This threefold division is spoken of already at the time of the end of the Hyksos empire and at the time of the rise of Ahmose about 1600, but in actuality the three countries were separate. But just about 716 the Ethiopian Shabaka united the three lands under his control. There is therefore no reason to separate Pathros and Cush from Misraim and to declare these two names as out-of-date in Isaiah's time. It can also be noted that when Esarhaddon conquered Egypt, he used this threefold designation of Egypt and called himself "king of the kings of Musur, Paturisu and Kusi."[lxv]

But in addition verse 11 also says that a part of JHWH's people find themselves in Egypt. From that, however, the conclusion cannot be drawn that verse 11 must be from postexilic times. Similar information is found also in the book of Hosea. Hosea 11:11 "presupposes more than diplomatic delegations to Egypt and Assyria (so 7:11). It seems that at least groups of the population worthy of mention are found in foreign lands, in connection with which we might well think of a greater flight to Egypt parallel to the Assyrian deportation."[lxvi] Compare the warning word in Hosea 9:3 and 6.

At different times Egypt served as a place of refuge from oppression for the inhabitants of Palestine. That was the case already at the time of David and Solomon (see 1 Kgs 11:14–25; 26–40). We know also that many Jews took refuge in Egypt in connection with the Babylonian invasions (Jr 43). It is therefore very likely

that the tremendous visitations under Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, Sargon, and Sennacherib prompted many people from Israel and Judah to seek refuge in Egypt, particularly since Egypt at that time offered the Palestinian states its support in the fight against Assyria.[lxvii]

Elam, Shinar, Hamath, and 'iyye hayyam

These names conclude the list in verse 11 and they are all territories which are often named in the Assyrian inscriptions in connection with the devastations of the Assyrian kings. *Elam* was incorporated into the Assyrian empire by Sennacherib, and its inhabitants were deported by him in great numbers, also to Samaria. It is therefore very likely that deported Jews came also to Elam in order to fill the empty places left by the Elamites. Shinar is the same as S. Babylonia, the country where the great cities of Babel, Erech, and Accad were situated.[lxviii] (On its role in the deportation policies of Assyria, see above.) *Hamath* was, next to Damascus, the most important city and kingdom of the Aramaeans. The city lay on one of the main highways between Asia Minor and Egypt, and it was centrally located in the great kingdom around the river Orontes, which bore the same name. Tiglath-pileser made great havoc in Hamath and from 720 it became an Assyrian province. On an inscription in Nimrud Sargon tells about how he deported the people of Hamath.[lxix] The *lands of the sea* ('iyye hayyam) refers to the lands and islands in the northeastern part of the "Sea," that is, the Mediterranean. "The Sea" was the limit for the Assyrian assaults in the west. Thus Tiglath-pileser, for example, speaks about how he conquered "19 districts of Hamath, together with the cities of their environs which (lie) on the *shore of the sea* (author's emphasis) of the setting of the sun."[lxx] Sometimes "the coast of the sea" is a very broad concept in the Assyrian inscriptions, and not only the northern part of the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, but also Cyprus and many islands are included in the term. Thus we read in one of the inscriptions of Esarhaddon: "A grand total of 22 kings of the Hittiteland, the *seacoast* and the (islands) in the midst of the sea, all of them," that is, "Tyre, Judah, Edom, Moab, Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron, Gebail (Byblos), Arvad, Samsimuruna, Beth-Ammon, Ashdod,—Twelve kings of *the seacoast* (emphasis by author)."[lxxi]

In conclusion we can say that all the names in Isaiah 11:11 fit very well into the political situation which obtained in the last part of the seventh century. It is also typical that the LXX translators had a certain difficulty with this verse, since the situation which is reflected in the Hebrew text no longer obtained and the situation after the fall of Judah came into the foreground. The Hebrew text had not been altered to fit better into the later situation. Isaiah 11:11 does not once mention Babylonia, but at the time of the LXX translators the diaspora in Babylonia dominated. Just as the LXX translated לדמשק מהלאה in Amos 5:27 in an interpretive way with "to Babylonia" by application to the deportations of Nebuchadnezzar, so Isaiah 11:11 also was translated very freely to fit into the eastern diaspora. Thus the tripartite Misraim-Pathros-Cush is out-of-date and was lost in the translation. Instead the eastern diaspora is emphasized together with Egypt. καὶ βαβυλωνίας was inserted after the mention of Egypt (possibly on the basis of שנער which appears later in the Hebrew text). חמת and איי הים did not fit into the eastern diaspora but had to drop out or be interpreted in the later situation in favor of a translation which harmonized with what was then known (ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἐξ Ἀραβίας). Compare also the Targum, which has "from India" instead of מכוש and the more precise "from Babylonia" instead of the older משנער.

The Relation between Israel and Judah

When the banner is raised for the heathen, this is also the sign for the gathering again of Israel and Judah. The banished tribes of Israel (נדחי ישראל) and those who had been scattered abroad from the cities of Judah (נפצות יהודה) shall be gathered together from the four corners of the earth (v 12).[lxxii] It is therefore a question of the entire people of JHWH (cp יחדו in v 14). The great scandal in the history of Israel was the decay of the united kingdom of David through the schism between Ephraim and Judah, see Isaiah 7:17; 9:20f. This schism had been clearly demonstrated in connection with the devastations of Assyria and the Syro-Ephraimitic

war (ch 7). "The relation of Ephraim and Judah had been one of jealousy and harassment (11:13) just in Isaiah's time."[lxxiii] The question of why the term קנאת אפרים (v 13) was chosen is difficult to answer. It is possible that traditions such as Judges 8:1ff have played in as well as the tradition concerning the action of Jeroboam of Ephraim, which led to the fatal schism. The term צררי יהודה can very well be interpreted against the background of the events of the Syro-Ephraimitic war. But when JHWH again gathers His people, the old division shall be taken away (cp Ho 2:2; 3:5; Eze 37:15ff) and together (יחדו) they shall have part in the new kingdom of David, which will bring with it a new relationship to the surrounding peoples (vv 13, 14).

A New Kingdom of David

Verse 14 delineates clearly the new kingdom as "an ideal reconstituted Davidic kingdom, uniting Judah and Ephraim, just as they were of the old historical David kingdom."[lxxiv] All the people named in verse 14 had relations with the kingdom of David.[lxxv] David succeeded in subduing the *Philistines* (2 Sm 5:17ff; 8:1) and he conquered and took spoils from the *people of the East*: Aramaeans (who according to Gn 29:1 are called בני־קדם) (2 Sm 8:6f, 11f; 10) and Amalekites (who are joined with the בני־קדם according to Jdg 6:3; 7:12; 8:10) (2Sm 8:12). Also the three sister nations, *Edom, Moab*, and the *Ammonites* had been brought under David's scepter and are considered together in Isaiah 11:14 (cp LXX, which counts Edom with the בני־קדם). A proclamation of the restoration of the kingdom of David is found also in the epilog of the book of Amos, 9:7–15, where the new Davidic kingdom is portrayed against the background of the actual situation, with the kingdom of David in ruins (1:3—2:16).[lxxvi] Procksch holds with regard to the importance of the David traditions for the composition of Isaiah 11:13f: "By itself verses 13f could very well belong to a preexilic picture of the future."[lxxvii]

The Exodusmotif

Verses 15–16 echo verse 11 and take up once more the motif of the exodus. JHWH shall part the Gulf of Suez and swing His hand over the Euphrates, all the while allowing His mighty (?) wind to blow, just as at the first exodus. Thereby a way will be prepared for the dispersed remnant, which shall be able to pass through the Gulf of Suez and also through the Euphrates, which shall be divided into seven streams. We call attention to the fact that verse 16 names only Assyria, even though verse 15 also speaks of a parting of the Gulf of Suez. That appears to show that it is a dispersion which is brought about by the Assyrians which form the background of the oracle. We have also seen that the countries mentioned in verse 11 all have a relation with the Assyrian empire's political activity in the end of the seventh century, and therefore verse 16 in reality says the same thing concerning which verse 11 gives more detailed information. The connection with the first exodus is further emphasized at the close of verse 16 with the words ...ביום עלתו מארץ מחרים כאשר, which very fittingly lead over to the two salvation hymns (12:1–3; 4–6), which shall follow the second exodus, just as the first exodus was followed by the song of Moses and Miriam (Ex 15).

The exodus motif points also to the connection with the rest of Isaiah 1–12 which we have already briefly touched on. Also in Isaiah 4:5 and 10:24, 26 there are allusions to the exodus traditions. The word הנער (v 15) is used also concerning the Euphrates in 7:20 and 8:7. Hamath (v 11) is mentioned in 10:9 and on the whole the discussion of salvation from Assyria fits very well into the larger context, which is composed of chapters 7–12. The expression נאש נס (v 12) corresponds directly to 5:26 (cp 13:2; 18:3) and it contrasts with the judgmental function of the banner in 5:26ff. The same holds true of the expression דרש אל (v 10), the positive application of which in this place contrasts to the efforts of the people to seek counsel from spiritists and soothsayers in 8:19. Other typical Isaianic expressions are שאר ,סור ,נס ,מסלה and הניף יד.[lxxviii]

Summary

As, among others, O. Eissfeldt maintained, it is inescapable "that Isaiah, from the very beginning, believed in a remnant that would be saved from the coming catastrophe."[lxxix] See, eg., Isaiah 7:3; 10:20–22 and 28:5 (cp Amos 5:15b and 9:8b). Isaiah 6:11ff deals with deportations of the populations of both the northern and southern kingdoms on a large scale. Isaiah 7:17ff presupposes future deportations by Assyria. Isaiah 10:5ff makes it clear that Assyria is the rod of JHWH's anger, with which JHWH must punish His people for their apostasy, which is depicted in 9:7—10:4, as well as in other passages. But the wrath will have an end (10:25) and Assyria shall be struck by judgment as a consequence of its pride (10:12ff). The darkness will be turned into light through the birth of a new son of David with divine attributes, who shall establish an eternal kingdom (9:1ff and 11:1ff). Isaiah 11:11ff makes clear that those who have been deported from the northern and southern kingdoms will not be neglected in this redemption. Just as the heathen shall have a part in it (2:2–4; 11:10, 12a), so shall also the survivors in the dispersion be brought back by a second exodus into the empire of the new David. This idea of a return from the dispersion we meet also in Hosea 11:11 (cp Ho 9:3 and 11:5f), where, just as in Isaiah 11:11, a rescue from Assyria and Egypt is mentioned.

We have seen that Isaiah 11:10–16 in its entirety can very naturally be interpreted against the background of events of Isaiah's time in connection with the Assyrian visitation. The really great dispersion and exile happened in Isaiah's time, and the countries mentioned are all in existence just at that time. Just as in the rest of Isaiah 1–12, so the history of Zion and David are a factor also in Isaiah 11:10ff. The new kingdom is depicted as a restoration of the kingdom of David (cp Am 9:8ff). Just as "the other prophets refer to the Exodus repeatedly" (eg. Amos, Hosea, Micah),[lxxx] so it is not at all unexpected to find allusions to the Exodus traditions also in Isaiah, see 4:5; 10:24, 26; 11:11, 15, 16; 12; 14:1ff etc.[lxxxi]

Hertzberg maintained that Isaiah 11:10ff gives us "a desirable insight into the developing history (*Nachgeschichte*) of a Messianic prophecy,"[lxxxii] and von Rad has used Isaiah 11:10ff as one example among others of the revisionary and interpretive effect of updating. He says: "This productive process by which the story is handed down to posterity (*produktive Traditionsprozess*) can be followed step by step in the books of the prophets."[lxxxiii] Our analysis of Isaiah 11:10–16 has not been able to lend any weight to the correctness of this position. Support for a separating of the text into layers is wholly and alone dependent on exegesis, and exegetical support for identifying later reworkings or additions to Isaiah 11:10ff are especially subject to question. On the other hand, the translation of the LXX in verse 11, as well as the interpretation of the Targum, in some way (see above) points to the fact that later one had to wrestle with a text which had not been altered to bring it into line with subsequent developments. A Hebrew text with out-of-date allusions had been handed down, and it therefore appeared to the translators to be difficult to bring it into conformity with the known facts. The Alexandrian Jews, who, among others, in their attitude on the question of the canon demonstrated greater freedom than the Jews in Palestine, saw themselves compelled to make an updating translation (cp the LXX translation of Amos 5:27). In my dissertation[lxxxiv] I have tried to show that the updating of Isaiah 13f to bring it into line with the new situation did not lead to an addition with more precise information in Isaiah 13f, but instead gave impetus to an entirely new oracle, namely, Jeremiah 50f. This oracle constantly uses phrases and expressions from Isaiah 13f, but at the same time distinguishes itself completely from Isaiah 13f by a number of more precise details, which clearly connect the prophecy with the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

The theory of "a slow enrichment of the prophetic tradition"[lxxxv] through a constant updating clearly needs to be more thoroughly examined and it cannot, on the basis of the examples presented up to the present time, axiomatically be made the basis for exegesis. So far as Isaiah 11:10ff is concerned, it can hardly serve as a classroom example of the revisionary effect of updating. On the contrary, in this case the LXX testifies to the fact that the Hebrew original has not gone through a revisionary updating in order to make it correspond better to a later historical situation.

---

[i] E. F. Rosenmueller, in his *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum* III (1791–93).
[ii] Bernhard Stade, "Weitere Bemerkungen zu Micha 4.5," *ZAW* III (1883), 1–16.
[iii] Otto Procksch, *Jesaja* I (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1930), p 157.

[iv] George B. Gray, *The Book of Isaiah* I-XXXIX (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), p 225.

[v] Aagge Bentzen, *Jesaja* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1944), p 102.

[vi] R. B. Y. Scott, *The Book of Isaiah Chaps. 1–39, The International Bible* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1956), V, 251.

[vii] John Bright, "Isaiah I," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (Camden, N.J.: T. Nelson & Son, 1962), p 499.

[viii] George Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Zuerich: Theoligischer Verlag, 1966), p 172.

[ix] Cp the examples of these problems in my dissertation *The Burden of Babylon* (1970), pp 60ff.

[x] H. Hertzberg, "Die Nachgeschichte alttestamentlicher Texte innerhalb des Alten Testaments, " *BZAW* LXVI (1936), 110–21.

[xi] Hertzberg, p 113.

[xii] Gerhard von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962), II, 58f, 178.

[xiii] von Rad, p 58.

[xiv] von Rad, p 59.

[xv] See *The Burden of Babylon*, pp 97ff.

[xvi] von Rad, p 59.

[xvii] See *The Burden of Babylon*, pp 96f.

[xviii] von Rad, p 58.

[xix] von Rad, p 58.

[xx] Gray, p 223.

[xxi] Edward J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah* (Dublin: Brown and Nolan, 1941), I, 145.

[xxii] So e.g. *The Jerusalem Bible* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), p 1161.

[xxiii] Fohrer, p 171.

[xxiv] Gray, p 226.

[xxv] J. Lindblom, "Der Ausspruch ueber Tyrus in Jes. 23, " *ASTI* IV (1965), 69f.

[xxvi] Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1902), p 82.

[xxvii] Hertzberg, p 118.

[xxviii] Procksch, p 158.

[xxix] Duhm, p 83.

[xxx] It is a little surprising that those scholars who more than others have stressed that the prophetical texts have been brought up-to-date by interpolations have made no serious attempt to apply this theory to Is 40–66. C. C. Torrey, however, has been close to this theory, when he has pointed out that there are five direct allusions to Babylon and Cyrus, which have been decisive for the date given to the *entire* text and that almost all of ch. 40–66 might be ascribed to a Palestinian context, if these allusions could be eliminated as later additions, *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation* (New York: Scribner, 1928), pp vii-viii. W. A. Wordsworth has pointed out the importance of the word *lekoraesh* in 44:28 and 45:1 for the entire ch. 40–66. He finds it incredible that a prophet who so strongly polemicizes against idolatry at the same time can apply to a worshipper of Marduk the title "my shepherd" and JHWH's "anointed." By amending *lekoraesh* to *leka resh*, to which he gives the interpretation "the crushed" and which he refers to Hezekiah, Wordsworth holds that it is possible to understand the entire section, ch. 40–66, in the light of the events 700–690 b.c., *En Roeh* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1939), pp 327ff. R. K. Harrison has recently put forward the idea that the mentioning of Cyrus in 44:28 and 45:1 is an interpretative addition, made by "a post-exilic copyist," *Introduction to the OT* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), p 794. As a support for this theory he remarks that these two passages are the only ones where Cyrus is named by name and that "they are found in such close proximity."

[xxxi] Koenig, *Das Buch Jesaja* (1926), p 166; cp p 169.

[xxxii] Scott, p 251.

[xxxiii] V. Herntrich, "Das Buch Jesaja, " *ATD* XVII (1950), 216.

[xxxiv] Cp *The Burden of Babylon*, pp 61f. The theory of successive growth might not determine the exegesis beforehand, but it is the exegesis that has to be primary in relation to this theory and if necessary correct it.

[xxxv] See further Koenig, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p 165. cp Procksch, who characterizes v 10 as "kein schoener Satz" because of this position at the beginning of the sentence, *Jesaja* I, p 157. Procksch also says that v 10 is "metrisch undeutlich" and "stilistisch schwerfaellig."

[xxxvi] Franz Delitzsch, *Commentar ueber das Buch Jesaia* (Leipzig: Doerffling und Franke, 1889), p 196.

[xxxvii] Bentzen holds that שנית is "redundant beside יוֹסִיף, " *Jesaja* I, p 102. Thereby Bentzen ignores the conscious accentuation on a *second* exodus against the background of the first, which stands as a prototype for the wording of the message in vv 11, 15–16.

[xxxviii] See, eg., *Biblia Hebraica*[3], *app. crit.*

[xxxix] See further below. R. R. Ottley held that ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν corresponds to חמת of the MT, since חמה is a poetic word for "sun," *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (1906), II, 169.

[xl] See Koenig, *Hebraeisches und aramaeisches Woerterbuch zum AT* (1910).

[xli] Bentzen, p 103.

[xlii] Procksch, p 158.

[xliii] Cp Delitzsch, p 197.

[xliv] J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (New York: Oxford, 1949), p 42. Cp Lindblom, who gives the translation "The hostility of Judah," *Profeten Jesaja* (1965), p 27.

[xlv] E. J. Young does the same in *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), I, 394: "And they shall fly shoulder to shoulder upon the Philistines towards the sea."

[xlvi] E. Ullendorff renders משמעת more freely with "under my authority," "The Moabite Stone," *Documents from OT Times*, ed. D. W. Thomas (1958), p 197.

[xlvii] Koenig, Jesaja, p 167.

[xlviii] KBL follows G. R. Driver, who refers to akk. *haramu* "to cut off, cut through," *JTS* XXXII (1931), 251.

[xlix] Fohrer gives the translation "in der Machtfuelle seines Geistes, " *Das Buch Jesaja* I, p 171, and Lindblom "in his spirit's mighty power," *Profeten Jesaja*, p 27. H. L. Ginsberg renders "with the shovel (?) of His wind" in "Gleanings in First Isaiah," *Kaplan Jub. Vol.* (1953), p 249, and thereby agrees with Y. Kaufmann's emendation of בעים to בִּיעַת, see *Toledot, ha-emunah hay-Yisre'elit* VI, p 220, note 74. The Targum interprets רוחך as referring to the prophetical word: "by the word (*Memra*) of his prophets," Stenning, p 42.

[l] Koenig, *Jesaja*, p 165. Cp the LXX, which "sinngemaess" translates שרשך in Is 14:30 with τὸ σπέρμα σου.

[li] Duhm designated vv 9 and 10 as "Redaktorenzusaetze" (p 81). A. Dillmann-R. Kittel held that v 10 was "schwerlich jesajanisch, " *Der Prophet Jesaja* (Leipzig, 1898) p 119. Von Rad states that v 10 is added later to 11:1ff in order to apply the text to "die Heidenwelt" (p 59).

[lii] Bright, p 499.

[liii] Duhm, p 81.

[liv] Herntrich, p 217.

[lv] Delitzsch, p 191. R. J. Marshall points out in regard to the word שרש in this context: "One cannot deny to the prophet the possible insight into a judgment upon the monarch and a restoration to follow, "The Unity of Isaiah 1–12, " *LQ* XIV (1962), 26.

[lvi] Regarding this formula, see *The Burden of Babylon*, pp 71ff.

[lvii] R. W. Rogers, "Isaiah," *The Abingdon Bible Commentary* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1929), p 646.

[lviii] See i.a. D.J. Wiseman, "Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia," *Documents from OT Times* (London: T. Nelson, 1958), pp 46–83, and D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* I–II (Westport, Ct: Greenwood, 1926–27).

[lix] Cp *The Burden of Babylon*, pp 86ff. Of course we sometimes have to take into account exaggerations in statements about the number of deported people.

[lx] *ARAB* I, par. 795.

[lxi] *ARAB* I, par. 816.

[lxii] Wiseman, p 60.

[lxiii] Wiseman, p 67.

[lxiv] *ARAB* I, par. 819.

[lxv] *ARAB* II, par. 575.

[lxvi] H. W. Wolff, "Dodekapropheton 1: Hosea, " *BK* XIV:1 (1961), 254.

[lxvii] Ginsberg deserves to be quoted here: "Just as the final struggle of Judah with the Babylonians was followed by a voluntary migration of Judaites to Egypt (Jr 43) in addition to the deportation to Babylonia, so no doubt many Ephraimites fled their conquered land and their partly looted and destroyed homes for neighbouring countries, especially Egypt. Besides, war itself, apart from permanent conquest, produces refugees and displaced persons (cp Jr 40:11). The Syro-Ephraimite War and the concomitant attacks upon Judah from the south (2 Ki 16:6; 2 Chr 28:17) and west (2 Chr 28:18) may have driven many Judaites to migrate; still more may Sennacherib's occupation (2 Ki 18:13)—and, as we know from his records, destruction and alienation—of so many Judean towns," *Kaplan Jub. Vol.*, p 250.

[lxviii] The derivation of the name *Shin'ar* from Sumer must be considered to be uncertain, see Wiseman, *The New Bible Dictionary* (1967), p 1178.

[lxix] *ARAB* II, par. 137.

[lxx] ARAB I, par. 770.

[lxxi] ARAB II, par. 690.

[lxxii] The expression "from the four corners of the earth (מארבע כנפות הארץ) is a very common designation of the Assyrian empire in Assyrian inscriptions. Tiglath-pileser III calls himself *sar/sar4 kib-rat erbettiti*, Sargon II *sar/sar4 kib-rat arba 'ii* and Sennacherib *sar/sar4 kib-rat erbettiti/ti*. The expression is old and is used already by Naram-Sin of Ackad, who calls himself *sar ki-ib-ra-tim ar-ba-im*, see M. -J. Seux, *Epithetes royales Akkadiennes et sumeriennes* (1967), pp 306f.

[lxxiii] Ginsberg, pp 250f.

[lxxiv] Ginsberg, p 258. See also, eg., Dillmann-Kittel, p 121, Bentzen, p 104, and Herntrich, p 131.

[lxxv] "Die hier genannten Feinde sind dieselben, welche auch David bekaempfte und besiegte, " F. Feldmann,*Das Buch Isaias* (Muenster, 1925), p 160.

[lxxvi] See A. Carlson, who holds that 9:7ff gives "a genuine manifestation of the main intention, which characterizes and carried off also the judgment oracle in Amos," and that the epilogue in Amos is "original and genuine," "Profeten Amos och Davidsriket," *Rel. O. Bib*. XXV (1966), 74f.

[lxxvii] Procksch, p 159. See also Dillmann-Kittel, p 121, F. Buhl, *Jesaja* (21912), p 169, and Bentzen, p 104.

[lxxviii] See, eg., Dillmann-Kittel, p 120.

[lxxix] Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das A.T.* (Tuebingen: Mohr, 1964), p 428.

[lxxx] Th. C. Vriezen explains all the allusions to the Exodus in Isaiah as secondary, and so he has to ask the following rhetorical question: "Why Isaiah is such an exception among his contempories, … is not an easy question to answer," "Essentials of the Theology of Isaiah," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (1962), p 129.

[lxxxi] Regarding Is 14:1ff, see *The Burden of Babylon*, pp 119ff.

[lxxxii] Hertzberg, p 118.

[lxxxiii] von Rad, p 58.

[lxxxiv] *The Burden of Babylon*, pp 154ff.

[lxxxv] von Rad, p 58.