And His Name Shall be Called…

Selected Text-Critical Problems in Isaiah 9 Between the Masoretic Text and the Qumran Isaiah Scrolls

Janet Safford

This is an abbreviated version of a paper which was submitted to Prof. Chaim Cohen ז"ל as a seminar paper. He advised me to submit it to the annual National Association of Professors of Hebrew conference, where I presented this paper on June 25th 2014 under the title, "Philological problem in the Book of Isaiah in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The case of MT Isa 9 vs. 1QIsaᵃ, 4QIsaᶜᵉ."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (between 1946-1956 in the eleven caves of Qumran along with the discoveries at Murabba'at in 1951, Wadi Seiyal and Nahal Hever in 1952, and Masada between 1963-65) inaugurated a new era in the study of Hebrew Bible, the Hebrew language, late 2nd Temple Judaism and early Christianity. One of the most important impacts of this prolific profusion of information has been in the area of textual criticism. Text critical scholars used to have to rely on a hypothetical reconstructed v*orlage* of the various LXX codices along with early Latin, Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic translations, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Peshitta and various medieval era tomes in order to analyze variant manuscripts and readings of the Massoretic Texts (MT).[1] These treasure troves of Judean Desert texts (which date from approximately 250 BCE to 135 CE) suddenly provided the earliest Hebrew witnesses (by over 1,000 years)[2] to the most 'original' Biblical texts which no longer exist today.[3] Whatever information that might be gleaned through reconstructing a hypothetical Hebrew *vorlage* from ancient translations pales in comparison to the attestation and witness the scrolls found in Qumran can provide for attestation to the best reading of the Biblical Hebrew texts.

However, despite the proliferation of data which the Dead Sea Scrolls provide, scanty attention has been bestowed upon their potential instrumentality in dealing with problems of textual criticism. Instead, most scholars who engage with the Dead Sea Scrolls use them to prove the reliability of the transmission of the Massoretic Texts, the translation of the LXX, or to understand the historical *sitz im leben* and theological trends in Second Temple Judaism.[4] While scholars have produced monolithic catalogues of textual variants amongst the DSS texts themselves (and in comparison with the MT texts),[5] the time has now come to critically examine each of these variants and systematically determine if each bona fide alternative tradition is superior to, inferior to, or equal in quality to the MT texts and subsequently to use the best reading to further our understanding of the most original reading of the text. The purpose of this paper is to make slight headway in the vast ocean of unchartered waters of textual criticism through a punctilious examination of Isaiah chapter 9 serving as a test-pilot example.

---

[1] For a discussion of the various Masoretic Texts and Proto-Masoretic Texts, especially the *Ben Asher* Tiberian Masoretic tradition (which is usually what scholars are generally referring to when they say 'Masoretic Text') see Tov, Emanuel. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, *2nd* revised edition.
Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001. Pp. 22-79.

[2] With the possible exception of the Nash Papyrus which (discovered in 1902 in Egypt) dates to the 2nd century BCE. The Nash Papyrus contains a synthesis of the Decalogue (Deuteronomy 5 and Exodus 20) as well as the שמע (Deuteronomy 6:4-5).

[3] Obviously, as Emanuel Tov points out, "Since no textual source contains what could be called 'the' biblical text, a serious involvement in biblical studies clearly necessitates the study of all sources, including the differences between them" (Tov. Emanuel, Textual Criticism Pg. 2). While we will never be able to perfectly reconstruct the 'original' Biblical texts we can attempt to find, reconstruct and evaluate the oldest and best witnesses to the 'original' texts. Also, since many Biblical texts themselves likely underwent long periods of redaction and editing, it is perhaps inaccurate to speak at all of 'original' versions, but rather 'best readings.'

[4] See Emanuel Tov's discussion on *The Contribution of the Qumran Texts to Biblical Research.* Textual Criticism Pg. 177.

[5] See , for example, Ulrich, E. The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum) Leiden: Brill, 2010.

METHODOLOGY FOR TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Fortunately, many methodological navigational tools and principles are available to help guide scholars along the way as they endeavor to plot out the best reading of a Biblical passage.

1. First, all extant fragments and texts pertaining to the passage to be analyzed, (in the case of this paper; Isaiah 9) must be tracked down. Preferably the fragment itself or high resolution photographs of the fragments should be examined along with transcriptions.[6] All fragments must be carefully compared with each other so as to isolate all individual variants and differences without preference being given to any source.[7]

2. After isolating all differences and variants they should be classified thus:

   a. **Insignificant differences:** These differences are merely orthographic in nature and are not relevant for textual criticism.[8]

   b. **Significant differences** (SD): These are differences which are *not* exclusively orthographic in nature, but they also do *not* cause a difference in meaning. This includes Aramaisms, and differences in morphology and phonology.

   c. **Significant variants** (SV): These are variants which cause a difference in *meaning* in the texts. For textual-criticism these are the most important variants and it is the significant variants in Isaiah 9 which this paper is going to focus on.

3. After all SVs have been identified it is then the task of the text-critic to determine which of the variants is the **preferred variant,** i.e. the best reading. In this paper *lectio dificilior* and the *Held Method* of Comparative Semitic Philology will be used to determine the preferred variants.

---

[6] In the case of this paper the primary sources for photographs and transcriptions of the Qumran Isaiah texts came from: <u>Discoveries in the Judean Desert</u> and <u>The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a a New Edition</u> (Donald W. Parry & Elisha Qimron. (Brill: Leiden, Netherlands, 1998) and the high resolution photographs of the 1QIS^a scroll from the "Digital Dead Sea Scrolls" website: http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/isaiah .

[7] Some scholars virtually always judge in favor of the MT reading over the DSS reading merely because they deem the MT to be a more reliable text (see for example, Williamson, H. G. M. <u>Isaiah 1-5</u>. (ICC) Edinburg, 2006 and Wurthwein, Ernst <u>The Text of the Old Testament: And Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica</u>. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1995. Pp 116-117). However, even if the MT is statistically more reliable (see Tov, E. *Textual Criticism,* Pp. 298-300), each variant must be judged by its own merit. This is one of the few times a scholar must be reminded, "**DON'T** consider the source."

[8] For example, Qumran Hebrew has a tendency towards excessive use of *scriptio plena,* eg. לוֹא instead of לֹא, כיא instead of כי, or רואש instead of ראש or the 2nd masculine singular ending of perfect verbs ending in ה e.g. דברתה (you spoke) instead of דברת (you spoke), which have identical pronunciation and meaning, but different spellings. See קוטשר, יחזקאל <u>הלשון והרקע הלשוני של מגילת ישעיהו השלמה ממגילות ים המלח</u>. הוצאת ספרים ע"ש י"ל מאגנס, introduction to האוניברסיטה העברית, ירושלים, 1959.

HELD METHOD FOR COMPARATIVE SEMITIC PHILOLOGY

The principle of *Lectio difficilior melior*[9] is critical in helping to determine the best reading, but only upon the condition that each version under consideration is compatible grammatically, syntactically and lexically within its context.[10] In order to make this proper judgment call of which reading is the best (and usually also the most difficult) reading the meanings of all variants must first be fully understood. When the meaning of words is dubious or obscure, the seven principles of the *Held Method* for comparative Semitic Philology currently form the best system for determining the semantic range of a word.[11]

Perhaps the most unique defining characteristic of the Held principles of comparative Semitic philology is that etymology comes *last* and is utilized in defining the boundaries of the semantic range of a word ONLY in the case that an exhaustive examination of all internal evidence[12] is insufficient to derive the full meaning and range of a word. Unlike most Biblical exegetical methods, the Moshe-Held method of comparative Semitic Philology is bases on the principle that even when the internal Biblical evidence is insufficient, this internal evidence is ALWAYS more important than the etymological evidence.[13]

---

[9] "*The more difficult reading is better*" also often referred to as *lectio dificilior potior / praeferenda / praevalet / praestat.* Scholars of the Enlightenment era (most prominently Johann Albrecht Bengel) attempting to find the urtext of the New Testament made huge progress in the field of text criticism when they reckoned for the first time that scribes have a tendency to replace archaic, enigmatic, odd and unusual words or sayings with more usual and more logical words or saying instead of *vice versa.*

[10] See Tov, E. Textual Criticism Pg. 302-305 for a discussion of and possible problems regarding *lectio dificilior.*

[11] See Cohen, Chaim. "The 'Held Method' for Comparative Semitic Philology." JANES 19 (1989), 9-23; Cohen, C. "New Directions in Modern Biblical Hebrew Lexicography." ed. C. Cohen et. al. Birkat Shalom - Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul Volume 1. Winona Lake, 2008. 441-473.; Cohen, C. "The Meaning of צלמות 'Darkness': A Study in Philological Method." Fox, M. V. ed. Texts, Temples and Traditions (M. Haran Festschrift). Winona Lake, 1996. 287-309.; Cohen, C. "A Philological Reevaluation of Some Significant DSS Variants of the MT in Isa 1-5." Muraoka, T. and Elwode, J. F. Diggers at the Well. Leiden: Brill, 2000. 40-55.
Much of the Moshe Held principles for Comparative Semitic Philology were developed gradually by Assyriologysts (such as B. Landsberger) during the Pioneer years of comparative philological research on newly discovered and deciphered Semitic languages such as Akkadian and Ugaritic. Moshe Held, while undertaking the daunting task of compiling an Ugaritic lexicon, methodologically enumerated five principles to guide lexicographers in properly defining the semantic range and boundaries of words.

[12] Internal evidence is essentially the *sitz in leben* of a word: Is the word in parallelism to another word? What is the context of the passage? What would it make sense for this word to mean?

[13] Early schools of Semitic philologists (and many contemporary Semitic philologists) first focused on etymology and cognate words in order to attempt to ascribe to an enigmatic word or *hapax legomenon* connotations and denotations. However, anyone who has studied modern Indo-European languages knows just how dangerously misleading false cognates can be. For example: In Spanish *estoy embarazada* means *I am pregnant* and not *I am embarrassed* which in Spanish is *me avergüenza. A ganga* is a *bargain* not a *gang* which is a *pandilla.* If something is *largo* it is *long* not *large,* which is *grande* which does not mean *grand* which in Spanish is *magnífico. Ropa* is *clothing* not a *rope* which is *cuerda* which should not be used for the word *cord* which is *cable. Atender* means *to serve / take care of* and not to *attend.* If you want to say you *attended* class or a lecture you would use the verb *asistir* which does not mean *assist* which in Spanish is *ayudar.*

SEVEN BASIC PRINCIPLES:[14]

Principle One: Distinguish the difference between semantic equivalences and etymological equivalences. Chaim Cohen (quoting Held's notes) defines this principle as one which places "Special stress on disclosing the meaning of words by means of the inductive method rather than the use of the etymological one"[15]

Principle Two: Distinguish between special poetic language and everyday language.

Principle Three: If possible, place an emphasis on evidence which can be derived from poetic parallelism

Principle Four: Place a critical focus on "interdialectical distributions"

Principle Five: Classify each word according to its usage in literary genres.

Principle Six: After etymological comparisons are made they must be checked by placing them in parallel usage in parallel contexts to determine if the etymological equivalence is also semantically equivalent. If the etymological equivalence does not also have semantic equivalence then from a philological point of view it is dubious whether the comparison should be pursued.

Principle Seven: Pursue semantic equivalents and identical semantic developments of terms even if they are not etymological equivalents.

---

[14] The following seven principles enumerated in this paper closely follow the outline of a hand-out Dr. Chaim Cohen distributed to the students in his class "Philological Problems in the Book of Isaiah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In this hand-out Dr. Chaim Cohen out-lined the seven basic principles of the Held Method for comparative Semitic philology which are elaborated upon in detail in his paper "The 'Held Method' for Comparative Semitic Philology."

[15] Cohen, "Held Method" P. 10.

SETTING OF ISAIAH 9

Isaiah 7-10 deals specifically with the Syro-Ephraimite crisis, a series of events recorded not only in Biblical texts (eg. 2 Kings 15:29-30, 37; 16:2-9, & Chron. 28) but also in ancient Assyrian annals, especially those of Tigleth-Pileser III. In 735 B.C.E. the leaders of Aram-Damascus (Syria) and the northern Israelite kingdom (often merely referred to as Ephraim) contrived to form a coalition of small city states to oppose the mighty Assyrian empire. Most scholars assert that the Syro-Ephraimite war "is recognized by all to have been fought by Rezin [of Damascus] and Peka [king of Israel] about 733 B.C. in order to consolidate their forces before the impending Assyrian attack."[16] However, as Oded points out, "If the primary aim of Damascus and Samaria was to form an alliance of states against Assyria, it is not clear why they should weaken themselves by a prolonged war against Jerusalem, thereby exposing their northern flank to the Assyrian forces."[17]

While it is uncertain exactly what instigated the Syro-Ephraimite war, Isaiah advises king Ahaz not to take any actions (such as war) "at the end of the conduit of the upper pool on the highway to the Fuller's Field"[18] (perhaps implying that Ahaz is inspecting the water reservoir because he expected Israel and Syria to attack). Isaiah castigates Ahaz for seeking help (or at least considering seeking help) from the Assyrian king instead of trusting in G-d.[19] Thus, Isaiah 9 opens with Israel (specifically the lands of Zebulun, Naphtali, parts of Galilee, the Jezreel plain and the Transjordan) destroyed and exiled and Judah with a king who does not trust in G-d.

---

[16] Albright, W. F. "The Son of Tabeel (Isaiah 7:6)," <u>BASOR</u> 140 (1995) Pp. 34-35.
See also (Miller, J.M. and J.H. Hayes. <u>A History of Ancient Israel and Judah</u>. 2nd edition. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1988. Pp. 323-337) who write that the war was fought "to achieve through military force what they had to acquire through other means – a ruler in Judah who would join, support, and contribute to the anti-Assyrian coalition."

[17] Oded, B. "The Historical Background of the Syro-Ephraimite War Reconsidered." <u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u> 34 (1972), Pp. 153. Oded argues that the Syro-Ephraimite war started as early as the reign of Jotham (see 2 Kgs 15:37) because Uzziah (Jotham's father) had annexed all of the Trans-Jordan away from Israel and Damascus. He therefore sees the war as an attempt to "dislodge Judah from Transjordania" and to prevent further expansionism by invading Judah and replacing the Judaian king with "the son of Tabeel" (Isa. 7:6). Oded argues that when Tiglath-Pileser III invaded and defeated Uzziah, Israel and Damascus saw this as the propitious time to form an anti-Judean coalition.

[18] Isaiah 7:3 JPS translation

[19] 2 Kings 16: 7-9 portrays Ahaz as plundering the temple and the palace in order to pay Tigleth-Pileser III to come and save him. It is unclear whether or not Ahaz was already a vassal of Assyria from the time of Tigleth-Pileser's first series of westward campaigns in 738 (see Cogan and Tadmor, <u>2 Kings</u> P. 191) and thus acted as a loyal vassal by reporting a rebellion and asking for help. Or, perhaps Ahaz did not become a vassal until he saw Tigleth-Pileser pillaging Philistia in 734 or even waited until after the defeat of Damascus by the Assyrians in 732 (see Miller and Hayes, <u>A History of Israel and Judah</u> P. 345).

Table 1 (ALL SIGNIFICAN DIFFERENCES IN ISAIAH 9)

Verse	Masoretic Text Reading	Qumran Reading	Significance / Comments
3	הַחִתָּתָ	והחתת (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[20] *vav-conjunctive*
3	הַחִתָּתָ	הח[תות]תי (4QIsaᶜ)	SV
3	מִדְיָן	מדים (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[21]
5	הַמִּשְׂרָה	המשורה (1QIsaᵃ)	SV
5	וַיִּקְרָא (& 4QIsaᶜ)	וקרא (1QIsaᵃ)	SD
5	שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם	שר השלום (1QIsaᵃ)	SV
6	הַמִּשְׂרָה	המשורה (1QIsaᵃ)	SV
6	כִּסֵּא	כסה (1QIsaᵃ)	SD: ה as Final Mater Lectionis for a/e instead of MT א
6	אֹתָהּ	אותו (1QIsaᵃ)	SV[22]

---

[20] Kutscher found over 200 instances in which there was a substitution consisting of either an addition or subtraction of a *vav* between the DSS Isaiah scrolls and the MT Isaiah (see Kutscher, P.422). Kutscher writes regarding the *Vav-Conversive* that "A radical change occurred in Rab. Hebr. in respect to the use of these four forms [וקטל יקטל ויקטל קטל]. Whereas in the Bible, the perf. and imperf. are not clearly differentiated in respect to time, and these forms may to a certain extent—depending on the context—serve as either (the future in particular), and continued action is expressed by the *waw* conversive + the opposite form, Rab. Hebr. lost this use entirely. Further, even the usage of the simple form underwent a decisive change, since in Rab. Hebr. the imperf. form indicates future time exclusively and the perfect form, past time exclusively…. [by the time of] Chron. we find the *waw* conjunctive gradually replacing the *waw* conversive…It would seem to me that this process is also discernible in the Isaiah Scr. Like the author of Chron., our scribe seems to have preferred the *waw* conjunctive to the *waw* conversive. He also tended to use the imperf. form to indicate future time and the perf. to indicate past time exclusively. The substitutions in [Isaiah] are to a large extent attributable to this tendency" (Kutscher, E. Y. The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaᵃ). Brill, Leiden, 1974. P.351). In the case of the DSS variation, והחתת would have to be a vav-conjunctive (instead of conversive) because the rest of the previous verbs in this pericope describing G-d's actions are in the past tense without a conversive vav. *Lectio dificilior* would thus suggest that והחתת is the preferred reading; however the initial vav could easily have been dittography from the final vav in the preceding word בו.

[21] Written Μαδιάμ in the LXX. According to Watts, 1QIsaᵃ and "the Greek appears to have been the normal pronunciation for Midian" (Watts, J. D. W. Isaiah 1-33, Revised edition World Biblical Commentary. Nashville, 2005. P. 131). However, Kutcher has shown that interchanges between ם and ן in final position are very frequent in the DSS, late Hebrew and Judeo Aramaic of the 2ⁿᵈ Temple period and onward (Kutscher, E. Y. Studies in Galilean Aramaic. Ramat-Gan 1976. Pp. 58-65). Kutscher also points out that the LXX occasionally writes *Madiam* with a *nu* (*Madian)* and always when *mu* is not the final letter in Greek the word contains a *nu* (eg. Μαδιανειτη in the dative case). Josephus and also Arabic sources always write Madian with a *nun* (Kutscher, Language P. 108). Kutscher therefore (unlike Watts) reads מדין as the preferred variant and argues that the variation in the DSS is probably a *hyper-correction;* "Scholars have already remarked that in Galilean Aramaic, final ם frequently becomes ן… Concerning the chronology: taking the Palmyra inscription which dates from the second cent. CE as our point of departure, and working back through the Jerusalem inscriptions and the Sept. transliterations, we reach the time of the Book of Nehemiah where שלון = שלום in iii 15. Thus the form מדים, as well as its Greek transliterations are seen to be neither more nor less than *hyper-corrections* made by someone who was aware that many words which were pronounced with a final "ן" by a final "ם". Hence he would sometimes mistakenly replace a final "ן" by a final "ם" even in instances where the correct spelling really was "ן" (Kutscher, Language, P.61). However, whether or not מדין or מדים is the better reading, both pronunciations clearly represent the same word and are thus a significant difference, and not significant variant.

6	וּלְסַעֲדָהּ	ולסעדו (1QIsaᵃ)	SV
7	אֲדֹנָי	Tetragramaton (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[23]
8	וְיָדְעוּ	וירעו (1QIsaᵃ)	SV[24]
9	שְׁקָמִים (& 1QIsaᵃ)	שוקמי]ם (1QIsaᶜ)	SD
11	בְּכָל	ובכול (1QIsaᵃ & 4QIsaᶜ)	SD[25]
11	יָדוֹ	ידיו (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[26] Dialectical Orthographic difference ו = יו
12	עַד	על (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[27]
13	יוֹם	ביום (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[28]
13	וְאַגְמוֹן	אוגמן (1QIsaᵃ)	ID[29]

[22] Kutscher writes, "Most of the gender substitutions are founded on different exegeses, and it is usually difficult to determine which reading is superior. For example ix 6; … אֹתָה ולסעדה MT = על כסא דויד ועל ממלחתו להכין אותו ולסעדו the Scr.'s construction is dependent on כסה, whereas that of the MT on the word ממלכתו" (Kutscher, <u>Language</u> p.392).

[23] Kutscher writes, " לא זה דבר קרה לי :הכתבה מתוך העתקה על מעיד הדבר אין ,אגב .מתמיה החילוף אין ,היא אחת שהקריאה מאחר ".התרגומים מן דבר ללמוד אפשר כי ,סבור איני– .מספר העתקה בשעת אחת
קוטשר, יחזקאל <u>הלשון והרקע הלשוני של מגילת ישעיהו השלמה ממגילות ים המלח</u>. הוצאת ספרים ע"ש י"ל מאגנס, האוניברסיטה העברית, ירושלים, 1959 ע"ם 164.
Kutscher also writes that it is common for the MT to have אדני instead of the Tetragramaton and lists several instances in which he found 1QIsaᵃ to have this variation: (Isaiah 6:11, 7:14, 9:7, 21:16 and 28:2). Again Kutscher writes, "החילוף על לתמוה אין ,היא חד שהקריאה כיוון" (182 ע"ם קוטשר).

[24] This is a substitution of roots from ידע to ירה. Both of these roots are found in both Tanakic and Rabbinic Hebrew. I agree with Watts and Kutscher that ידע fits the context much better. Watts writes, "The use of ידע in Isaiah is significant and the problem of knowing and understanding is so important that it is doubtful that a variation could be expected. Further, the sense of "know" is vital to this passage. The pf with *waw* indicated a concomitant fact with the first verb. God's sending his 'word,' its 'falling' on Jacob, and the people's 'knowing' of it are central to the meaning of the passage" (Watts, <u>WBC</u>, P. 140). Kutscher writes, "The verb ירע = 'to fear' does, it is true, exists, but does it fit the context? Prof. H.A. Ginzberg orally expressed the opinion that the Scr.'s reading is superior. –The Sept. renders γνωσονται, Pesh. וندעون—both = MT" (Kutscher, <u>Language</u>, P.246).

[25] See Kutscher's chapter on "Vav Copula" Kutscher, <u>Language</u> Pp. 414-427. Kutscher lists over 200 substitutions and comments that "it is obviously difficult to determine in the vast majority of instances, which reading is superior. The Scr. has a markedly greater tendency towards 'syndetic constructions' than the MT" (Kutscher, <u>Language</u> P. 422). Kutscher does point out that sometimes the syndetic construction can cause changes in meaning and he cites Isaiah 9:3 and 9:19 as examples.

[26] While it looks like this is a significant variant (changing the singular *his arm* to *his arms*), this is actually a significant difference. Kutscher writes, "We find Scr. ידיו נטויה = MT ודו נטויה v 25, as well as several other similar instances; Scr. ריקה נפשיו = MT נפשו xxix 8, Scr. אסרחדון בניו = MT בנו xxxvii 38, Scr. כובע ישועה בראושיו = MT בראש (referring to G-d) lix 17; as well as the opposite: Scr. באלמנותו xiii 22, נגשו iii 12, *et mult. al.* where the MT has the ending יו… What is the significance of this phenomenon? The solution has been suggested both by Prof. Z Ben-Hayyim and by H. Yalon,: in Samar. Hebr. יו– (aw) became *o*; thus דבריו was pronounced = דברו" (Kutscher, <u>Language</u> P.51).

[27] See Kutscher <u>Language</u> Pp. 403-410 in his chapter on "Interchanges of Prepositions." Kutscher writes that it is rare to find the verb שב taking the preposition עד instead of על. However, שב עד does indeed occur in Number 35:28, Judges 6:18, and 1 Chron. 5:9. Both constructions are therefore possible, but *lectio difficilior* would suggest that שב עד is probably the preferred reading.

[28] See Kutscher <u>Language</u> Pp. 403-410 in his chapter on "Interchanges of Prepositions."

[29] Kutcher has shown that in all instances in which the word אגמון appears in the MT, in the DSS it appears as אוגמן. Kutcher therefore argues that this variation is not a chance, but shows that the scribe pronounced the ending as אוגמן in accordance with the קֻטלָן pattern, for example שֻׁלחָן. This is therefore probably an Aramaism. See Kutcher,

16	יִשְׂמָח	יחמ'ל (1QIsaᵃ)	SV[30]
16	יָדֹו	ידיו (1QIsaᵃ)	SD
17	גֵּאוּת	גיאות (1QIsaᵃ)	SD
18	בְּעֶבְרַת	מעברת (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[31]
18	נֶעְתַּם	נתעם (1QIsaᵃ)	SV
18	אֶרֶץ	הארץ (1QIsaᵃ)	SD
18	וַיְהִי	ויהיו (1QIsaᵃ)	SD[32]
19	עַל	ועל (1QIsaᵃ)	SD
19	זְרֹעֹו	זרעיו (4QIsaᵉ)	SD
19	יֹאכֵלוּ (& 4QIsaᵉ)	ויאכל (1QIsaᵃ)	SV
20	בְּכָל (& 4QIsaᵉ)	ובכול (1QIsaᵃ)	SD
20	יָדֹו	ידיו (1QIsaᵃ)	SD

ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICAN VARIANTS

וקרא vs. וַיִּקְרָא(1QIsaᵃ)
שר השלום vs. שַׂר־שָׁלֹום (1QIsaᵃ)

MT	1QIsaᵃ
כִּי־יֶלֶד יֻלַּד־לָנוּ בֵּן נִתַּן־לָנוּ וַתְּהִי הַמִּשְׂרָה עַל־שִׁכְמֹו וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמֹו פֶּלֶא יֹועֵץ אֵל גִּבֹּור אֲבִיעַד שַׂר־שָׁלֹום	כי ילד יולד לנו בן נתן לנו ותהי המשורה על שכמו וקרא שמו פלא יועץ אל גבור אבי עד שר השלום
For a child has been born to us, a son has been given to us and the **misra** will be on his shoulder and he **called** his name:[33]

Wonderful planner [is] the mighty G-d, the father of eternity [is] a prince of peace | For a child has been born to us, a son has been given to us and the **misora** will be on his shoulder and he **will call** [or called] his name:

Wonderful planner [is] the mighty G-d, the father of eternity [is] **the** prince of peace. |

Language P. 365. I have included this Insignificant Difference in the chart because even Kutcher is not certain that this is merely a dialectical form.

[30] Kutscher writes, "MT ישמח …ix 16 = על כן על בחוריו יחמ'ל. The parallel part of the verse is ואת יתומיו ואת ולמנותיו לוא ירחם. The combination חמל + רחם is found again in Jer. Xiii 14; xxi 7; and it is undoubtedly quite fitting. On the other hand it has already been recognized that שמח = [Arabic cognate śmẖ] = היות רחמן ('be merciful'), which is found only here in the entire Bible.—The vocalization with a *śin* does seem difficult, but this needs not necessarily have been an error" (Kutscher, Language, P.237).

[31] See Kutscher Language Pp. 403-410 in his chapter on "Interchanges of Prepositions."

[32] See footnote 30

[33] Verse 5 is usually translated, "and his name will be called,"(in line with the LXX translation). Such a translation would usually necessitate a *niphal* of *qara* but in the MT text the pointing is clearly that of a *qal vav-conversive* imperfect masculine 3ʳᵈ person singular.

Isaiah 9:5 is one of the most enigmatic and hotly debated passages in the Tanak and has engendered diverse scholarly (as well as theological) opinions regarding issues of coherency, authenticity, historical context, interpretation and especially translation. Isaiah 9:5 has always presented translators and commentators with problems; Who is the child and when was he / will he be born?[34] To whom has he been born and who called him by this name?[35]

The Talmud Bavli, in *Sanhedrin 94a*, expounds that all of the names in verse 5 refer in one way or another to Hezekiah. Rashi, however, (perhaps following the Talmud Bavli's *Derech Eretz Zuta 'On Peace'* or perhaps in reaction to Christian appropriation of the titles[36]) writes that just the name "Prince of Peace" refers to Hezekiah and the rest of the names refer to The Holy One Blessed Be He, " **ויקרא שמו :**
הקדוש ברוך הוא שהוא מפליא עצה ואל גבור ואבי עד, קורא שמו של חזקיהו שר שלום, כי שלום ואמת יהיה בימיו"
(And his name will be called**:** The Holy One Blessed Be He, who is Wonderful in Counsel, Mighty G-d, Eternal Father, called the name of Hezekiah 'Prince of Peace,' because there will be peace and truth in his

---

[34] On the one hand, it has been asserted that the passage of Isa 9:5-6 merely portrays a future *ideal and imaginary* Davidic king, contrary to the historical reality of its composed time. This assertion is based on mainly one of three assumptions: 1) many scholars have argued that the passage of Isa 9:1--6 was written in the post-exilic period when there existed no Judean king [see for example, Marti, Gray and Fohrer assert this: see Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 390-1; Gray, Isaiah I-XXVII, 167; Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1-39, 248.]; 2) No one has succeeded in persuasively harmonizing the actualization of the hopes in Isa 9:1-6 with any time in human history; 3) it is difficult to accept that the divine titles in 9:5b can be applied to a certain historical figure. Some scholars do maintain that an actual Judean king is being named and that the most likely candidates are **Ahaz** (743-727 B.C.E.) [supported by Hayes/Irvine], **Hezekiah** (727-698 B.C.E.) [supported by Alt and Lindblom] and **Josiah** (640-609 B.C.E.) [supported by Vermeylen and Barth]. Scholars who reject Hezekiah as the historical king being mentioned do so based on the argument that Hezekiah ascended to the throne in 715 B.C.E., after the destruction of Northern Israel, on the basis of 2 Kgs 18:13 ("In the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah, King Sennacherib of Assyria came up against all the fortified cities of Judah and captured them."). With this chronology, the child in Isa 9:5-6 cannot stand for Hezekiah since the pericope of Isa 8:19-9:6 obviously does not allude to the time after the fall of Samaria of 722/21 B.C.E and thereafter. However, more recent research on the year of Hezekiah's accession to the throne reveals that Hezekiah was enthroned in 727 B.C.E, on the basis of 2 Kgs 18:9-10, 2 Kgs 18:2 and Isa 14:28-29 (see Tadmor, "Part II. The Period of the First Temple,The Babylonian Exile and the Restoration", 136 and 139; Cogan and Tadmor, II Kings, 228; Hayes and Hooker, A New Chronology for the Kings of Israel and Judah, 66-80). Additionally, it is worthwhile to mention that the most synonymous theophoric kingly name to the divine title, אֵל גִּבּוֹר in Isa 9:5b (either 'the Mighty God' or 'God is mighty/strong/a hero/a warrior' or 'God's hero/warrior') is חִזְקִיָּה (either 'the Lord is strong/my strength' or 'the Lord strengthens').

[35] It is not easy to verify the identity of the speaker in Isa 9:5-6 although the vital clue for it may be found in the two mentions of לָנוּ (9:5a, 'to us'). Many scholars have proposed their own understandings of the identity of לָנוּ in 9:5a. For example, von Rad identifies לָנוּ as the deity who proclaims a king's coronation and his coronation titles, but without any explanation about the plurality of the first-person plural objective pronoun (see von Rad, "Das judäische Königsritual" in Gesammelte Studien Zum Alten Testament, 212-3). Alt (1950) asserts the identity of לָנוּ as the heralds from the Judean royal court, who is to be sent to the land of Zebulun and Naphtali in order to announce the deliverance by God through the accession of a new Judean king (see Alt**,** "Jesaja 8, 23-9, 6: Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag" *in Festschrift, Alfred Berthole, zum 80 Geburtstag: gewidmet von Kollegen und Freunden*, 45-6). Wildberger argues that the speaker in Isa 9:5-6 can be considered as the people in the palace of Jerusalem in the narrow sense and, at the same time, as the people as a whole, who proclaim the birth of a royal child (see Wildberger, Isaiah 1-12, 401). J.J.Roberts attempts to argue that it has to be the divine council of the Lord and justifies his argument by referring to Egyptian coronation inscriptions (see Roberts, "Whose Child is This?: Reflections on the Speaking Voice in Isaiah 9:5", 127-8).

[36] Staub, J. J. *"A Review of the History of the Interpretation of Isaiah 8:11-9:6"* in Jewish Civilization: Essays and Studies . Brauner, R. A. (editor). Philadelphia. Reconstructionist Rabbinical College Press. 1979. P. 103.

days)."[37] Radak has almost an identical *pirush* as Rashi's, " הקב"ה שהוא פלא יועץ ואל גבור אבי עד, קרא שם היל הזה שר שלום בעבור כי המשרה תהיה לו ולא יעבד מלך אחד." (The Holy One Blessed Be He who is the Wonderful Counselor, Mighty G-d, Eternal Father, called the name of the child 'Prince of Peace' because he will have the *misra* and he will not worship another king [i.e. the king of Assyria cf. 2kings 18:7]."[38]

The *Artscroll Mesorah* follows Rashi in translating verse 5 by rendering it into English as follows:

> "For a child has been born to us, a son has been given to us, and the dominion will rest on his shoulder:
> the Wondrous Advisor; Mighty G-d,
> Eternal Father, called his [Hezekiah's] name Sar-shalom [Prince of Peace]."[39]

> The JPS version translates verse 5;
> "For a child has been born to us, a son has been given us. And authority has settled on his shoulders. He has been named:
> 'The Mighty G-d is planning grace;
> The Eternal Father, a peaceable ruler.'"[40]

ICC:	Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty G-d,	
	A Father for ever, Prince of Peace	
Anchor Bible:	Marvelous Counselor, Hero Warrior	
	Eternal Father, Prince of Peace	
Otto Kaiser:	He who plans wonders, Mighty G-d,	
	Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace	
Wildberger:	Planner of wonders, G-d's Hero	
	Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace	
WBC:	Wonder Counselor, G-d Hero	
	Father of Future, Prince of Peace	

Apart from the JPS all major English versions of the Bible follow the
KJV translation:
> "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called:
> Wonderful, Counseller, The mighty God,
> The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."

Aside from being unclear who the child in verse 5 is, why is this passage so difficult to translate? First of all, הַמִּשְׂרָה is a hapax legomenon.[41] Second, the subject of וַיִּקְרָא is absent and the pointing in the MT.

---

[37] My translation of Rashi from ישעיהו -מקראות גדולות הכתר גן-אילן רמת-בר 'אוני. 1996.

[38] My translation from ישעיהו -מקראות גדולות הכתר גן-אילן רמת-בר 'אוני. 1996.

[39] עם פירוש רש"י, רד"ק, מצודת ישעיה ישעיה :נביאים אחרונים Scherman Nosson & Zlotwitz Meir (editors) The Milstein edition דוד ומצודת ציון. The ArtScrol Series^tm. Mesorah Publications, Ltd. Brooklyn, N.Y. 2013.

[40] Berlin Adele and Brettler Marc (editors). The Jewish Study Bible . Jewish Publication Society Tanakh translation. Oxford University Press. New York. 2004.

[41] The LXX translates this word as ἀρχὴ (rule/power/sovereignty) and most subsequent translators have followed this exegesis. BDB posits that הַמִּשְׂרָה comes either from the hypothetical root שרה or שרר (to act as a prince) and that משרה might therefore mean "rule, dominion." HALOT similarly writes that שרה is perhaps a by-form of שרר and that שרה probably comes from *šarrat* (feminine construct form of the Akkadian word *šarratum- queen*) which comes from the Akkadian word for king- *šarrum*. HALOT's line of reasoning seems to be: Many masculine words become feminine when abstracted (for example, מלך is *king* but מלוכה is *rule, government, royalty*). In the same manner, when שר (prince) becomes משרה [or preferably מִשְׂרָה, which is perhaps how the variation in 1QIsa^a should

clearly necessitates a *qal* vav conversive imperfect 3rd masculine singular even though it seems like it needs to be read passively like all major English translations ('his name will be called'), the LXX (καλεῖται), the Targum (וְאִתְקְרִי) and the Vulgate (*vocabitur)*. Also, as Watts points out in WBC, "The perfects that have characterized the verses since 8:23 give way to consec. imperfects and finally to inf in v 6."[42] Watts nicely sums up the third problem commentators have, "Versions were at a loss to translate these titles."[43]

I will start with the problem of ויקרא (he called) vs. וקרא (he will call) because it has a simple solution. Kutscher found over 200 instances in which there was a substitution consisting either of an addition or subtraction of a *vav* between the DSS Isaiah scrolls and the MT Isaiah (see Kutscher, P.422). Kutscher writes regarding the *Vav-Conversive* that,

"A radical change occurred in Rab. Hebr. in respect to the use of these four forms [וקטל יקטל ויקטל קטל]. Whereas in the Bible, the perf. and imperf. are not clearly differentiated in respect to time, and these forms may to a certain extent—depending on the context—serve as either (the future in particular), and continued action is expressed by the *waw* conversive + the opposite form, Rab. Hebr. lost this use entirely. Further, even the usage of the simple form underwent a decisive change, since in Rab. Hebr. the imperf. form indicates future time exclusively and the perfect form, past time exclusively…. [by the time of] Chron. we find the *waw* conjunctive gradually replacing the *waw* conversive…It would seem to me that this process is also discernible in the Isaiah Scr. Like the author of Chron., our scribe seems to have preferred the *waw* conjunctive to the *waw* conversive. He also tended to use the imperf. form to indicate future time and the perf. to indicate past time exclusively. The substitutions in [Isaiah] are to a large extent attributable to this tendency"[44]

---

be read if the vav of מ שׁורה is a *shureq vav* instead of a *holem vav*] it comes to mean *princely-rule / princeship / princely-government*. The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (TDOT) also ascribes the etymology of the word שר to the Akkadian *šarrum* "king," *šarratum,* "queen," and *šarrutum,* "kingdom." The TDOT explains the interchange of the š with s as being partly a result of Aramaic influence. However, as TDOT points out, there is a problem with this etymology because "in West Semitic, *śar* rarely refers to the king, whereas in Akk. *šarrum* refers not to an official, but to the king himself" (Botterweck, Johannes, G. Ringgren, Helmer. Fabry, Heinz-Josef (editors). Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Cambridge. (Translated from German by Douglas W. Stott) 2004. P.193). After several months of analyzing this hapax legomenon I have [for now] given up trying to determine which is the preferred reading משרה or מ שׁורש, but because of its context it is clear that the misra/misora placed on the shoulder of a ruler is metaphorically an indication of the ruler's authority or responsibility of ruling. Both שבם and כתף (two words for 'shoulder') are used physically for bearing concrete burdens and metaphorically for bearing abstract burdens—including rulership (see respective BDB articles). Additionally the verb סעד in וּלְסַעֲדָהּ בְּמִשְׁפָּט (to support/sustain/establish it in justice) strengthens this point. I owe thanks to Chaim Cohen for pointing out that סעד has "precedent both in Prov 20:28 having clearly to do with the rulership of the king and in Old Aramaic, the eighth century BCE (time of Isaiah) inscription of King Panamu I where in KAI 214:15, 21, the phrase ויסעד אברו means "and maintains power" referring to the king's fervent hope that one of his sons would succeed him and maintain his kingdom." For a discussion of the root שר see also Cohen, "The 'Held Method'" P.15.

[42] Watts, J. D. W. Isaiah 1-33, Revised edition World Biblical Commentary. Nashville, 2005. P.131. Watts follows the English versification of the text instead of the Massoretic—his verse 6 is the MT. verse 5.

[43] Ibid. P. 131

[44] (Kutscher, E. Y. The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa[a]). Brill, Leiden, 1974. P.351).

According to Kutscher it is normal (and even expected) for a *qal vav-conversive imperfect 3ʳᵈ masculine singular* verb in Tanakic Hebrew to become a *qal vav-conjunctive perfect 3ʳᵈ masculine singular* verb in Rabbinic Hebrew **with identical meanings!**[45]

<div align="center">

(1QIsaᵃ) שַׂר־שָׁלֹום .vs שר השלום

</div>

It is hard to imagine that a simple definite article can change the whole meaning of a sentence and solve a debate which has been going on for over fifty year, but that is exactly what I will show by proposing that the reading of the scroll שר השלום is a better reading than the MT שר שלום.

Chaim Cohen showed that In Isaiah 6:3 that the DSS variant which lacked the additional 3ʳᵈ קדוש was the preferred reading and partially based his argumentation upon the syllable count of the verse in question.

<div align="center">

מְלֹא כָל־הָאָרֶץ כְּבֹודֹו   קָדֹושׁ קָדֹושׁ קָדֹושׁ יְהוָה צְבָאֹות (MT has 11 then 9 syllables)

מלא כל הארץ כבודו   קדוש קדוש   יהוה צבאות (DSS has 9 then 9 syllables)

</div>

In a similar way, in Isaiah 9:5 the syllable count of the child/king's is perfect in the DSS variant.

<div align="center">

אֲבִיעַד שַׂר־שָׁלֹום   פֶּלֶא יֹועֵץ אֵל גִּבֹּור (MT has 7 syllables, then 6 syllables)

אביעד שר השלום   פלא יועץ אל גבור (DSS has 7 syllables, then 6 syllables)

</div>

MT	Syllables	DSS
פֶּלֶא יֹועֵץ אֵל גִּבֹּור	7	7 פלא יועץ אל גבור
אֲבִיעַד שַׂר־שָׁלֹום:	6	7 אבי עד שר השלום
קָדֹושׁ קָדֹושׁ קָדֹושׁ יְהוָה צְבָאֹות	11	9 קדוש קדוש יהוה צבאות
מְלֹא כָל־הָאָרֶץ כְּבֹודֹו:	9	9 מלא כל־הארץ כבודו

Simply having a perfect syllabic count does not automatically determine the preferred reading, but having the definite article does solve the huge problem of how best to translate the name. Similar to the parallel structure of the name Maher-shalal-hash-baz,

מהר	שלל	חש	בז
פלא יועץ	אל גבור	אבי עד	שר השלום

---

[45] Kutscher also writes, "Sometimes the scribe changed the form from קטל to יקטל, omitting the *waw*: thus והיה וממת עתיד, xxxiii 6 became יהיה; instead of ויקרא שמו, found in the Masoretic Text, ix 5, the Scroll has ויקראו שמו (but he did not change the preceding verb). In instances of this sort, too, the scribe sometimes omitted the *waw*…" (Kutscher, P.42). I checked and rechecked the Isaiah scrolls very carefully several times and could not find the variation ויקראו that Kutscher cites, but only the variation **וקרא**.

Wegner argues that the name must be translated:

> Wonderful planner   [is] **the** mighty G-d;
> The Father of eternity [is]   **a**   Prince of Peace.[46]

Wegner himself points out that the one flaw in his argument is that F.I. Andersen has shown that a predicate also must be definite in a theophoric name.[47] However, it happens to be definite in 1QIsa[a]! If we read the name as a four part name then we can also use this to also solve the half a century old argument about whether or not the name is modeled after the five-fold Egyptian coronation titulary.

      Many commentaries and journal articles today are still in a heated debate with each other over whether or not the phraseology of Isaiah 9:5-6 reflects the announcement of a <u>king's enthronement/coronation</u> or the <u>birth of a royal child</u>. Von Rad in his 1947 article 'Das judäische Königsritual', was the first to conclude that Isaiah 9:5-6 is the only example of a complete list of the Judean coronation titles in the Old Testament, which reflects the fivefold Egyptian coronation titulary.[48] In 1950 A. Alt embraced von Rad's idea of a fivefold Egyptian reminisque coronation titulary but further added that the phraseology of the birth of a child in Isa 9:5-6 must also be taken as one of adoption of a king as the son of G-d at the coronation ceremony.[49] However, just because Egyptian pharaohs were always given a fivefold Egyptian coronation title upon accession to the throne does not mean that Judean kings were given a fivefold Judean coronation title on their coronation day. Yet this is precisely what many scholars today insist on finding in Isaiah 9:5-6; a non-existent 5th name of the king! After Von Rad (1947) asserted that the 4 names in Isaiah 9:5 reflect the fivefold Egyptian enthronement titles,[50] Alt (1950) "found" that fifth name in the damaged לְמַרְבֵּה at the beginning of 9:6.[51] Meanwhile, Schunck (1973) attempted to identify the 5th name as "שופט עולם".[52] Wildberger argued that לם in לְמַרְבֵּה of v. 6 is a dittography of שָׁלוֹם at the end of v. 5 and, therefore, there is no need to consider לם as a part of the fifth name.[53] In its place, he maintained that "רָב הַמִּשְׂרָה" (great in sovereign authority) is the fifth coronation title corresponding to a title of Amenhotep IV, that is "Great in Kingship in [Karnak]."[54] The argument for a hypothetical five-fold Judean coronation enthronement title is based largely on the argument that the usage of the Mem-soffit in the middle of a word is impossible and must represent a missing word, i.e. the 5th coronation title. However, the usage of the Mem-soffit in the middle of a word has been well

---

[46] Wegner, P.D. "A Re-Examination of Isaiah IX 1-6" in <u>Vetus Testamentum</u> 42, (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 111.

[47] Ibid. P. 111.

[48] Von Rad, "Das judäische Königsritual" in G. von Rad, <u>Gesammelte Studien Zum Alten Testament</u>, (München : C. Kaiser, 1958), 212 = G. von Rad, "Das judäische Königsritual", in <u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u> 27/4 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1947), 216 = G. von Rad, "The Royal Ritual in Judah", in G. von Rad, <u>The Problem of the Hexateuch and other Essays</u>, translated by Rev. E. W. Trueman Dicken, (New York: MaGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), 230.

[49] Alt, "Jesaja 8, 23-9, 6: Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag" in <u>Festschrift, Alfred Berthole, zum 80. Geburtstag: gewidmet von Kollegen und Freunden</u>, 42-3.

[50] von Rad, "Das judäische Königsritual" in <u>Gesammelte Studien Zum Alten Testament</u>, 212.
For the example of the fivefold titulary of Thutmose I, Thutmose III, Hatshepsut and Ḥaremḥab, see Breasted, <u>Ancient Records of Egypt</u> Vol. *2*, 25, 62 and 93; Breasted, <u>Ancient Records of Egypt</u> *Vol. 3*, 17.

[51] Alt**,** "Jesaja 8, 23-9, 6: Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag" in <u>Festschrift, Alfred Berthole, zum 80. Geburtstag: gewidmet von Kollegen und Freunden</u>, 39-43.

[52] Schunck K. D, "Der Fünfte Thronname des Messias (Jer. Ix 5-6)" in <u>Vetus Testamentum</u> *23*, (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 108-110.

[53] Wildberger <u>Isaiah 1-12</u>, 387 and 405.

[54] Ibid**.,** 405; Breasted, <u>Ancient Records of Egypt</u> *Vol. 2*, 384.

documented by Shaul Libermann as occurring during the late Second Temple period and possibly even the early Mishnaic period.[55] Additionally, if we are to presume a 5ᵗʰ name, then the parallelism of the four names and syllabic count, which I demonstrated earlier, immediately disappears. To conclude, it is difficult to confirm the existence of five titles in v. 5. Consequently, any attempt to reconstruct the fifth name appears to be merely hypothetical and conjectural, until one could find textual sources to undeniably support it.

Therefore, I propose two things:
1) (like Wegner) that "the whole name should be divided into two parallel units each containing one theophoric element"[56] and one semi-theophoric element
2) that the name should best be understood in parallel to Near Eastern sources rather than Egyptian.

Holladay argues that the names of the Child should be considered theophoric:

> "…most Israelite personal names are *theophoric:* …So I suggest that the marvellous king is not *called* 'mighty God' or 'Father forever,' but that the middle titles of his throne-names are theophoric…Thus the king bears theses names: "Planner of wonders; God the war hero (is) Father forever; prince of well-being"[57]

I agree with Holladay that it is best to consider the names of the child/king as being theophoric. However, Holladay only considers <u>the middle two names</u> (mighty G-d, everlasting father) as being theophoric, but not the first and last name ('Wonderful Counsellor' and 'Prince of Peace') as being theophoric.

I, however, wish to show that not only are the middle two names theophoric, but the first and perhaps the last name are also essentially theophoric, in that they describe the angelic like, semi-divine beings who can stand in the company of G-d's heavenly court.

פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ:
Regarding the first title of פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ, it should be mentioned that in spite of the ambiguity of the syntactic and grammatical construction of פֶּלֶא and יוֹעֵץ, their combination is attested in Isa 25:1 (עָשִׂיתָ פֶּלֶא עֵצוֹת) and 28:29 (הִפְלִיא עֵצָה).[58] It should also be noted that every instance of the root פֶּלֶא in the Bible refers to G-d (or perhaps an Angel, or an action that is too great for man to do) except for instances in Daniel,[59] Sam[60] and Lam 1:9.[61] See, for example, the following verses: Gen 18:14, Exo 3:20, 15:11, 34:10, Deut

---

[55] שאול ליברמן, "כתובת עוזיהו ותורתן של ראשונים" בתרביץ (כתב עת): למדעי הרוח, כרך ד, (ירושלים: האוניברסיטה העברית, תרצ"ג), 292-93.
[56] Wegner, Paul, D. "A Re-examination of Isaiah IX 1-6." <u>Vetus Testamentum 42, 1</u> (1992): 103-112. P.110-111.
[57] Holladay, W.L. <u>Scroll of a Prophetic Heritage</u> (Grand Rapids, 1978). Pp. 108-109, as cited in Wegner, "A Re-Examination" P.109.
[58] Wildberger, <u>Isaiah 1-12</u>, 403.
[59] Dan 8:24, 11:36 and 12:6. The 1ˢᵗ two uses of the word פלא in Daniel are all describing horribly bad actions of foreign kings upon the Jews. So atrocious are the actions that they are difficult to imagine being possible, and thus they are described as being פלא. These foreign Babylonian kings will consequently be punished by G-d via an Angel with פלא actions in Dan 12:6 to right the wrong of their פלא actions.
[60] 2Sam 13:2 describes the evil inclination which overcame Amnon to have sex with his half-sister that he became sick because it seemed to him too פלא to be able to have his virgin sister. In this instance, *pele* denotes how impossible it is in Amnon's eyes to do what he wants that he becomes sick. And amazingly, David describes his love with Jonathan as being *pele* and transcending the bounds of normal love with a woman (2Sam 1:26).
[61] Lamentations 1:9 refers to how terribly/extraordinarily far into sin and hopeless destruction Jerusalem has descended 'with none to comfort her.' Even though it is non G-d who did the פלא action in this verse, it is clear that Jerusalem is in such a helpless position that it will take a פלא action of G-d to restore her.

17:8,[62] 28:59, 30:11 Josh 3:5, Jud 6:13, 13:18,19 Ps (over 30 times פלא is found in Psalms referring to G-d's wondrous actions) Isa 25:1, Jer 21:2, 32:17, 27, Micah 7:15, Zech 8:6, Job 5:9, 9:10, 10:16, 37:5,14,16 42:3, Nehem 9:17, 1ˢᵗ Cron 16:9,12,24, and 2ⁿᵈ Cron 2:8.[63] As Schunck in TDOT writes:

> "To determine the basic meaning of the root *pala*', we must rely on its occurrences in the OT… The texts all deal with extraordinary phenomena, transcending the power of human knowledge and imagination…the texts do not deal with circumstances presented simply as being extraordinary, but rather with certain goals impossible for humans to attain by their own devices."[64]

In examining every instance of *pele* in the Bible, in the few instances in which it refers to human actions, it almost always refers to something un-imaginably bad: **1)** a catastrophic action of a foreign king directed against Israel for which G-d will need to intervene with a *pele* action to save His people (Dan 8:24), **2)** catastrophic situation which Israel descends into because of sin (lam 1:9)   **3)** sin which is so great that it will lead to a person's destruction 2Sam 13:2.

However, in the dozens of instances in which *pele* is associated with G-d's actions, the action is miraculously salvific. It is thus perhaps rather poignant that the word has a bad connotation when associated with kings in the Bible and the Assyrian king reigning during the time of Hezekiah was Tiglath-Pileser whose name in Hebrew is תִּגְלַת **פִּלְאֶסֶר** (whose name in Hebrew could feasibly be read to mean 'you found תגלת a wonderful פלא ruler שר=סר'). While it is impossible to prove that Isaiah was playing in the פלא in Tiglath-אפּלאsar's name, it seems too coincidental to be random that most synonymous theophoric kingly name to the next divine title, אֵל גִּבּוֹר in Isa 9:5b (either 'the Mighty God' or 'God is mighty/strong/a hero/a warrior' or 'God's hero/warrior') is חִזְקִיָּה (either 'the Lord is strong/my strength' or 'the Lord strengthens'). When we consider that when Manoach enquired of the Angel of the L-rd what his name was, the angel responded לָמָּה זֶּה תִּשְׁאַל לִשְׁמִי וְהוּא־פֶלִאי "Why do you ask my name? It is פלא Wonderful" (Judges 13:17-18), to Isaiah's audience it would have been very poignant to say "His name was called פלא."

While *pele* is clearly most appropriately associated with G-d, but יועץ can be associated with both a king and G-d. Micah 4:9, for example, provides an example of expressing a king as יוֹעֵץ by means of

---

[62] Deut 17:8 "If a case is too פלא for you to decide (כי יפלא ממך) , be it a controversy over homicide, civil law, or assault -- matters of dispute in your courts -- you shall promptly go to the place that the LORD your God will have chosen." In Deut 30:11 G-d tells the Israelites that his commandments are not so פלא that they cannot fulfill them. This means that if G-d's commands were פלא then man could not possibly do them, which means that פלא is something which is too difficult for an ordinary human to do and thus is an action associated with a super-human, i.e. a divine-being. A human council cannot determine what to do and have to seek a court with the help of G-d.

[63] While 2 Cron 2:8 does not refer a wonderful action of G-d it does refer to how wonderful G-d's house is, and thus refers to G-d rather than a human.

[64] TDOT, P. 534 under the heading פלא

poetic parallelism.[65] However, *pele-yoetz* together in Hebrew always refers to G-d and a few passages even insist that a human *cannot* serve as a counselor to G-d.

(Isa 40:13-14) מִי־תִכֵּן אֶת־רוּחַ יְהוָה וְאִישׁ עֲצָתוֹ יוֹדִיעֶנּוּ: אֶת־מִי נוֹעָץ וַיְבִינֵהוּ וַיְלַמְּדֵהוּ בְּאֹרַח מִשְׁפָּט וַיְלַמְּדֵהוּ דַעַת וְדֶרֶךְ תְּבוּנוֹת יוֹדִיעֶנּוּ
Who can fathom the Spirit of the Lord, or instruct the Lord as his counselor? Whom did the Lord consult to enlighten him, and who taught him the right way? Who was it that taught him knowledge, or showed him the path of understanding?

(Job 15:7-8) הֲרִאישׁוֹן אָדָם תִּוָּלֵד וְלִפְנֵי גְבָעוֹת חוֹלָלְתָּ: הַבְסוֹד אֱלוֹהַ תִּשְׁמָע וְתִגְרַע אֵלֶיךָ חָכְמָה:
Are you the first man ever born? Were you brought forth before the hills?
Do you listen in on God's council? Do you have a monopoly on wisdom?

It is clear that פלא יועץ inside of its Biblical context is a term which is theophoric and describes G-d more than it describes a king. Describing the Judean king (presumably Hezekiah) as a magnificent counselor (even though Isaiah insists no human can serve as a counselor to G-d) also has semantic equivalence in Neo-Assyrian coronation inscriptions, in which the Assyrian king is clearly named as *a counselor-man* (*māliku amēlu*) by the divine council of gods at his coronation. For example, the Neo-Babylonian Myth of the Creation of the King Lines 30'-36' says:

> ᵈ*ea pâsu īpusma iqabbi ana* ᵈ*bēlet-ilī amātu izakkar* / ᵈ*bēlet-ilī bēlet ilāni rabûti attīma* / *attīma tabnîma lullâ amēlu* / *pitqīma šarru māliku amēlu* / *ṭābi ubbihī gimir lānišu* / *ṣubbî zīmīšu bunnî zumuršu* / ᵈ*bēlet-ilī iptatiq šarru māliku amēlu*

> Ea made ready to speak, said to Belet-ili, "Belet-ili, you are the mistress of the great gods, you are the one who made the human-man. Fashion a king, a **counselor-man**, adorn his whole body with excellence, see to his features, make fair his body!" Belet-ili fashioned the king, the **counselor-man**.[66]

The Neo-Assyrian Coronation Hymn of Ashurbanipal, Lines Rev. 15-16 read:

> *puhrāma ilāni ša šamê u kaqqiri kalīšun* / *kurbāma* ᵐ*aššur-bāni-apli šarru māliku amēlu*
> Gather, all the gods of heaven and earth, bless king Ashurbanipal, the **counselor-man**![67]

In Gilgamesh Tablet 1 line 295-300 Gilgamesh relates a dread he had about Enkidu to his mother and declares:
> "O Mother, by Counselor Enlil's command
> may a **great counselor** [maliku rabi] fall to me
> I will obtain a friend, a counselor,
> A friend a counselor I will obtain!"[68]

---

[65] F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, "Micah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary"*:* The Anchor Bible Vol. 24E, (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 443, 445; J. M. P. Smith, W. H. Ward and J. A. Bewer, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel": The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1965), 91.

[66] For Text Edition and German Translation: refer to W.R. Mayer, "Ein Mythos von der Erschaffung des Menschen und des Königs," *Orinetalia* NS 56 (1987), p. 57, 30'-36'. For and English translation, refer to: B.R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, 3ʳᵈ ed., Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 2005, pp. 495-497 (As cited by Weissert at the 16ᵗʰ World Congress of Jewish Studies).

[67] For Text Edition and English Translation refer to: A. Livingstone, *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea* (State Archives of Assyria 3), Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1989, pp. 26-27, rev. 15-16. (As cited by Weissert at the 16ᵗʰ World Congress of Jewish Studies).

[68] My translation from Akkadian

In these lines the semantic equivalence between *wonderful counselor* and *great councellor* is almost perfect. In the Gilgamesh epic Enkidu serves as a near equal foil to Gilgamesh who himself is part god. It is also noteworthy that Enlil is called a Counselor and that Gilgamesh asks Counselor Enlil to give him a great counselor. It is a common epithet of lesser gods in the Mesopotamian pantheon to be called a counselor. For example:

> The epithet of Ishtar of Arbela, daughter of Ashur and Mullissu (=Ishtar of Nineveh) is: *mālikat ilāni abbīša* = "counselor of the gods, her parents."

> The epithet of Nusku of Harran, son of Sîn is: *mālik ilī rabûti* = "counselor of the great gods."[69]

Therefore, in Assyrian and Babylonian theology, to refer to a king as a great counselor was to refer to the king as being among the lesser gods who can stand in the court of the greater gods and offer counsel. In a similar fashion, to call the Judean king *wonderful counselor* is thophoric in that it describes G-d's actions as a wonderful counselor, but it also elevates the king to the status of the angel named פלא whom Manoach talks to in Judges 13:18, an angel who as a member of the heavenly host stood in G-d's heavenly court as a counselor. In a just a small handful of places in the Tanak, the king is described as a member of the divine family and divine titles are conferred upon him, which suggests a certain amount of Ancient Near Eastern influence.[70]

אֵל גִּבּוֹר:

אֵל גִּבּוֹר is clearly theophoric, in that it can refer to none other than G-d himself. In the Tanak the phrase הָאֵל הַגָּדֹל הַגִּבֹּר, which is analogous to אֵל גִּבּוֹר, is only used for G-d (Dt 10:17, Jer 32:18, Neh 9:32). The exact same divine name אֵל גִּבּוֹר again appears in Isa 10:21 and cannot possibly allude to anyone other than G-d.

אביעד

אביעד is also clearly theophoric and says something *about* G-d rather than the king. In all examples in the Tanak of a father-son relationship between G-d and a king, G-d is always depicted as the father (for just a few examples: 2 Sam 7:14, Ps 2:7 and Ps 89:27-28). It should also be pointed out that the semantically equivellent Ugaritic expression to אֲבִיעַד, i.e., אב שנים (the eternal father), which is found in the Baal Cycle, is a title of G-d and only G-d (אל).[71] Frank Cross writes regarding this epithet of El, "In *Ugaritica V* a new text has been published which gives to 'El the familiar biblical epithet *melek 'olam*, 'eternal king.' A similar liturgical name of 'El is *malku 'abu šanima,* 'king, father of years.' This in turn is reminiscent of biblical '*el gibbor 'abi 'ad*."[72]

---

[69] As presented by Weissert at the 16ᵗʰ World Congress of Jewish Studies

[70] For the biblical examples for this assertion, see Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel Worship *Vol. 1*, 50-61.

[71] H. L. Ginsberg (ed. & trans.), The Ugarit Texts , (Jerusalem: 1936), 29, 54, 58.

[72] Cross, F.M. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic P.16.

שר השלום:

שר השלום is reminiscent of the divine epithet of HaSh-m in Judges 6:24 'Yahweh is peace' = יְהוָה שָׁלֽוֹם

וַיִּ֧בֶן שָׁ֛ם גִּדְעוֹן֙ מִזְבֵּ֙חַ֙ לַֽיהֹוָ֔ה וַיִּקְרָא־ל֖וֹ יְהוָ֣ה שָׁל֑וֹם עַ֚ד הַיּ֣וֹם הַזֶּ֔ה עוֹדֶ֕נּוּ בְּעָפְרָ֖ת אֲבִ֥י הָעֶזְרִֽי

The Captain of the L-rd's army שַׂר־צְבָא־יְהוָה tells Joshua (just like G-d told Moses) to remove his sandals because "the place you are standing is holy ground" (Joshua 5:14-15).

In poetic parallelism, Daniel 8:10-11 portrays a super-human demonic being (probably representing Antiochus IV) as opposing the 'host of heaven,' also called 'the chief of the host.'

וַתִּגְדַּ֖ל עַד־צְבָ֣א הַשָּׁמָ֑יִם וַתַּפֵּ֥ל אַ֛רְצָה מִן־הַצָּבָ֥א וּמִן־הַכּֽוֹכָבִ֖ים וַתִּרְמְסֵֽם
הַתָּמִ֔יד וְהֻשְׁלַ֖ךְ מְכ֥וֹן מִקְדָּשֽׁוֹ:הוּרַם] [הֵרִים(וְעַ֨ד שַֽׂר־הַצָּבָ֜א הִגְדִּ֗יל וּמִמֶּ֙נּוּ֙
It grew as high as the host of heaven and it hurled some stars of the host to the ground and trampled them
It vaunted itself against the very chief of the host; on its account the regular offering was suspended (JPS)

While the word שר never refers directly to G-d in the Tanak, it does refer to a person or angel in a high, often transcendent position only subordinate to G-d.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICAN VARIANTS ANALYZED

Chapter and Verse	Masoretic Text Reading	Qumran Reading	Preferred Reading
9:5	שַׂר־שָׁלֽוֹם	שר השלום(1QIsa^a)	1QIsa^a
9:8	וְיָדְעוּ֮	וירעו(1QIsa^a)	MT. Scribe mistook ד for ר
9:16	יִשְׂמָח	יחמ'ל(1QIsa^a)	MT. Scribe changed a word uncommon for his day to a more common word

Works Cited:

Abegg, M. et al. eds. <u>The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible</u>. New York, 1999.

Abegg, M. et al. <u>The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Volume 1: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran, Part 2</u>. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Abegg, M. Jr. <u>The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible</u>. New York, 1999.

Alden, Robert, L. ""Chiastic Psalms (I): A study in the Mechanics of Semitic Poetry in Psalms 1-50." <u>Journal of Evangelical Theological Cociety</u> (2008): 12-28.

—. "Chiastic Psalms (II): A study in the Mechanics of Semitic Poetry in Psalms 51-100." <u>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</u> (2009): 191-200.

Alt, A. "Jesaja 8, 23-9, 6 Befreiungsnacht und Droenungstag." Baumgartner, Walter (ed.). <u>Festschrift, Alfred Bertholet, zum 80. Geburtstag: gewidment von Kollegen und Freunden</u>. Tuebingen: Mohr, 1950. 29-49.

Armitage, David, J. "Rescued Already? The Significance of עניתני in Psalm 22,22." <u>Journal of Biblical Studies, Vol. 91</u> (2010): 335-347.

Bartelt, A. H. <u>The Book around Immanuel - Style and Structure in Isaiah 2-12</u>. Winona Lake, 1996.

Baumgartner, W. & J. J. Stamm et al. <u>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. 5 Volumes</u>. Leiden, 1994-2000.

Baumgartner, W. & J. J. Stamm. <u>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</u>. Leiden, 1994-2000.

<u>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u>. Stuttgart, 1983.

Blenkinsopp, J. <u>Isaiah 1-39, Anchor Bible</u>. New York: Random House, Inc, 2000.

Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H., & Fabry, H. <u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</u>. Grand Rapids, 1974-2006.

Botterweck, Johannes, G., Ringgren, Helmer and Fabry, Heinz-Josef. <u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</u>. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

Breasted, J.H. <u>Ancient Records of Egypt Vol. 2</u>. London, 1988.

Brown, f., Driver, S., & Briggs, C. <u>The Brown-Driver--Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</u>. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc. , 2007.

Brown, William, P. "The so-called refrain in Isaiah 5:25-30 and 9:7-10:4." <u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 52:3</u> (1990): 432-443.

Carlson, R. A. "Anti-Assyrian character of the oracle in Is 9:1-6." Vetus testamentum, 24:2 (1974): 130-135.

Chambers, T. W. "The Everlasting Father." Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis , 1:2 (1881): 169-171.

Childs, B. S. Isaiah: a Commentary. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Clines, D. J. A. The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew. Sheffield, 1993-2011.

Cogan, M., and Tadmor, H. II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, The Anchor Bible Vol. ii. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1988.

Cohen, C. "A Philological Reevaluation of Some Significant DSS Variants of the MT in Isa 1-5." Muraoka, T. and Elwode, J. F. Diggers at the Well. Leiden: Brill, 2000. 40-55.

Cohen, C. Biblical Hapax Legomena in the Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic. Montana, 1978.

Cohen, C. "New Directions in Modern Biblical Hebrew Lexicography." al., ed. C. Cohen et. Birkat Shalom - Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul Volume 1. Winona Lake, 2008. 441-473.

Cohen, C. "The Enclitic-Mem in Biblical Hebrew: Its Existence and Initial Discovery." Sefer Moshe - The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume. Vinona Lake, 2004. 231-260.

Cohen, C. "The 'Held Method' for Comparative Semitic Philology." Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society 19 (1989): 9-23.

Cohen, C. "The Meaning of צלמות 'Darkness': A Study in Philological Method." Fox, M. V. ed. Texts, Temples and Traditions (M. Haran Festschrift). Winona Lake, 1996. 287-309.

Cross, Moore, Frank. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. London: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Davidson, Robert. The Vitality of Worship. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

De Waard, J. A handbook on isaiah. Winona Lake, 1997.

Driver, S. R., Plummer, A. & Briggs, C. A. The International Critical Commentary: A critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXVII. Edinburgh, 1969.

Frederik, Moriarty, L. "The Emmanuel Prophecies." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 19:2 (1957): 226-233.

Friedlander, M. The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on isaiah. New York, n.d.

Frisch, A. "Jewish Tradition and Bible Criticism: A typology of Israeli Orthodox Approaches to the Question of Deutero-Isaiah." Jewish Studies Quarterly 18 (2011): 259-287.

Gesenius, W., E. Kautzsch, & A. E. Cowley. Hebrew Grammar. Oxford, 1910.

Ginsberg, H. L. "Some Emendations in Isaiah." Journal of Biblical Literature 69 (1950): 51-60.

Ginsberg, H. L. The Book of Isaiah - A New Translation. Philadelphia, 1973.

Gitay, Y. Isaiah and His Audience - The Structure and Meaning of Isaiah 1-12. Assen, 1991.

Goldingay, John. "The Compound Name in Isaiah 9:5(6)." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 61 (1999): 239-244.

Gray, G. B. The Book of Isaiah 1-27: International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, 1912.

Hayes, Hooker&. A New Chronology for the Kings of Israel and Judah and its Implications for Biblical History and Literature. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988.

Herbert, A. S. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: Chapters 1-39. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Hess, Richard, S. Studies in the Personal Names of Genesis 1-11. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Jenni, E. & C. Westermann. Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament. Peabody, 1997.

Jeshurun, George. "A note on Isaiah 9:5." Journal of Biblical Literature, 53:4 (1934): 384-385.

Jouon, P. & Muraoka, T. A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. 2 Volumes. Roma, 1991.

JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh. Philadelphia, 2005.

Kaiser, O. Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary (Second Edition, Completely Rewritten). Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.

Klein, Ernest. A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language . Jerusalem: Beatrice and Arthur Minden Foundation & the University of Haifa, 1987.

McClellan, William, H. "El Gibbor." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 6:3 (1944): 276-288.

Mercer, Samuel Alfred Browne. "Isaiah 9:1-2." Anglican Theological Review, 2:2 (1919): 152-153.

Oswalt, J. N. The book of Isaiah 1-39: NICOT. Michigan, 1986.

Parry, Donald, W. & Qimron, Elisha, P. The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa) A New Edition. Koln, Netherlands: Brill, 1999.

Rignell, Lars, G. "A Study of Isaiah 9:2-7." The Lutheran Quarterly 7 (1955): 31-35.

Roberts, J. J. M. "Whose Child is This? Reflections on the Speaking Voice in isaiah 9:5." Harvard Theological Review, 90:2 (1997): 115-129.

Schunck, K.D. "Der Funfte Thronname des Messias (Jes ix 5-6)." Vetus Testamentum 23 (Leiden: Brill) (1973): 108-110.

Slotki, I. W. <u>Isaiah: Hebrew Text & English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary</u>. London: Soncino Press, 1970.

Staub, J.J. "A Review of the History of the Interpretation of Isaiah 8:11-9:6." Brauner, R.A. (ed.). <u>Jewish Civilization: Essays and Studies</u>. Philadelphia: Reconstructional Rabbinical College Press, 1979.

Tadmor, H. "The Period of the First Temple, The Babylonian Exile and the Restoration; Part II." (ed.), Ben-Sasson. <u>A History of the Jewish People Vol. 1</u>. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Tov, E. <u>Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 2nd revised edition</u>. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Ulrich, E. & Flint, P. W. <u>The Isaiah Scrolls (1QIsaa and 1QIsab)</u>. Clarendon: Oxford, 2010.

von_Rad. "Das Judaeische Koenigsritual." <u>Theologische Literaturezeitung 27/4</u> (1958): 205-213.

Watts, J. D. W. <u>World Biblical Commentary: Isaiah 1-33</u>. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1985.

Wegner, Paul, D. "A Re-examination of Isaiah IX 1-6." <u>Vetus Testamentum XLEE, 1</u> (1992): 103-112.

Wiklander, B. <u>Prophecy as Literature - A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to Isaiah 2-4; CB</u>. Stockholm, 1984.

Wildberger, H. <u>Isaiah 1-12, Continental</u>. Minneapolis, 1991.

Williamson, H. G. M. <u>Isaiah 1-5: International Critical Commmentary</u>. Edinburgh, 2006.

<u>מקראות גדולות- הכתר- ישעיהו</u>. אוני 'בר-רמת רמת גן-אילן, 1996.

קוטשר, יחזקאל <u>הלשון והרקע הלשוני של מגילת ישעיהו השלמה ממגילות ים המלח</u>. הוצאת ספרים ע"ש י"ל מאגנס, האוניברסיטה העברית, ירושלים, 1959