

Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **The Prophet and the Book**

Name of Author: **Barton, J.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Isaiah 1 – 39. Barton, J.**

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **Sheffield Academic Press.**

Pages scanned: **13 - 27**

Course of Study (Module name and number): **The Book of Isaiah TRDL7050**

Name of Designated Person

authorising scanning: *E. L. Hamb*

Date authorised: 17.05.17.

Moodle/Powerpoint

THE PROPHET AND THE BOOK

The prophet Isaiah lived in Jerusalem in the eighth century BC, some time between 750 and 700, and prophesied during the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah—perhaps also under Jotham's predecessor Uzziah, as the first verse of the book claims (see Milgrom). The book that bears his name was to become one of the most important in the prophetic collection. In Judaism it supplies nearly half the readings from the prophets in the synagogue liturgy. Its importance in Christianity can be seen from the New Testament, where no other prophetic book is quoted anything like so often. For the earliest Christians it formed, together with Genesis and the Psalms, the effective core of the Old Testament.

But the relation between the prophet and his book is one of the most vexed questions in biblical studies. There is such widespread agreement that chs. 40–66 are the work of a later prophet or prophets that this will not be discussed here at all—‘Second’ and ‘Third Isaiah’ (Isa. 40–55 and 56–66) are the subject of other volumes in this series. (How the three collections came to be formed into one book, and what ‘message’ if any that book conveys as a finished product, will be discussed below (in Chapter 6), since this is one of the current focal points in the study of the book of Isaiah).

But the removal of chs. 40–66 does not mean that in chs. 1–39 all is plain sailing. The vast majority of commentators agree that by no means everything in these chapters can derive from the prophet Isaiah himself, because there are passages—sometimes extensive ones—that refer to periods

later than that of his prophetic activity. It is usual in biblical study to refer to passages that do go back to the prophet as 'authentic' or 'genuine', and to those that do not as 'inauthentic' or 'secondary'. As we shall see, these terms must not be taken as expressing value judgments, only historical hypotheses about who wrote which parts of the prophetic books. But in none of the prophets is the question of 'authenticity' so difficult as in Isaiah. Scholars have spent a great deal of time—some may think, an inordinate amount of time—in trying to solve it.

On a superficial level a survey of what commentators have said about this question can in fact induce despair, or perhaps exasperation, that there is so little agreement. The two extremes are represented by the recent work of J.H. Hayes and P. Irvine, who hold that everything in 1-39 except for 34-35 and the stories in 36-39 goes back to the prophet Isaiah himself, and O. Kaiser's commentary, whose starting point is that there is no *prima facie* reason for thinking anything in the book 'genuine', and which in fact treats only a few core passages as Isaianic.

But there are many positions between these. Clements, for example, sees a large Isaianic core, but thinks this was expanded at subsequent points, especially through a major redaction in the time of Josiah (broadly following Hermann Barth). However, he treats as authentic passages such as the 'messianic' oracle of 9.2-7, which a commentator such as Kaiser would regard as almost self-evidently a later addition. Wildberger is considerably more conservative than this, though without approaching the root-and-branch avoidance of thinking any passages inauthentic that is to be found in Hayes and Irvine. But he does, for example think that 2.2-4 is by Isaiah, where many commentators regard it as a late insertion into the book (it also occurs in Micah [4.1-4] with only minor variations). This, with 9.2-7, tends to be quite an accurate indicator of commentators' attitudes towards questions of authenticity. Thinking these passages Isaianic often goes with a rather conservative attitude, a feeling that what is in Isaiah 1-39 should be thought of as deriving from Isaiah unless there are good reasons to the contrary. Those who think such oracles inauthentic often regard the Isaianic

origin of the book's contents as an open question, to be decided on the merits of each case and with no 'benefit of the doubt' being given. Often this difference correlates with the difference between thinking that it *matters* (theologically) that Isaiah wrote at least substantial parts of the book that bears his name, and thinking, non-committally, that it is simply an interesting question whether he did or not.

Partly, then, for such theological reasons, and partly because of the diversity that is bound to prevail in any enquiry as complex as this, commentators differ very widely about authenticity. Anyone approaching the critical study of Isaiah 1-39 for the first time is likely to feel that almost any verse could be by almost anyone and come from almost any period. This can be discouraging.

But there is really more agreement between commentators than this may suggest. While there is probably nothing in the book on which all scholars agree, the overall picture is far from chaotic. Most disagreements are about matters of detail, and there is a considerable consensus on many aspects of the book and its authorship. We may consider this under four headings.

The Shape of the Book

There is fairly general agreement on how best to divide up Isaiah 1-39. Of some prophetic books commentators disagree widely about where one section ends and the next begins, and even about how larger sections are to be broken down into individual oracles. This is particularly noticeable, for example, in the study of Hosea. But in the case of Isaiah there is broad agreement at least about the main blocks of material, and quite a wide consensus even about the smaller units within these blocks. As Willis shows, a certain amount depends on just what constitutes a 'block' (or section, or pericope)—the more minutely we subdivide, the more room there is for disagreement. But so long as we use a broad brush, the following basic outline (which is close to the analysis in the commentary by R.B.Y. Scott) would not be very contentious.

- 1 *Introductory Collection of Oracles from Various Periods*
- 2–12 *Oracles about Judah and Jerusalem*
 - 2–5 Oracles of judgment and salvation
 - 6–8 The call of Isaiah and his prophecies in the time of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition
 - 9–11 Oracles about the Assyrians
 - 12 A psalm celebrating deliverance
- 13–23 *Oracles against Foreign Nations*
 - 13–14 Oracles about Babylon
 - 15–16 Oracles about Moab
 - 17 Oracles about Damascus
 - 18–19 Oracles about Egypt
 - 20 Narratives about Isaiah and his oracles concerning Egypt
 - 21 Oracles about Babylon
 - 22 Oracles in the time of the 'Assyrian crisis'
 - 23 Oracles about Tyre
- 24–27 *The 'Isaiah Apocalypse'*
 - Oracles of judgment and salvation about an unidentified city
- 28–31 *Oracles Mainly about the 'Assyrian Crisis'*
 - 28 Oracles about the fate of Israel and Judah
 - 29 Oracles about the fate of Jerusalem
 - 30–31 Oracles about the anti-Assyrian alliance with Egypt
- 32–33 *Oracles about Human and Divine Kingship*
- 34–35 *Oracles of Judgment on Edom and Salvation for Israel*
- 36–39 *Narratives about Isaiah*
 - 36–37 The history of the 'Assyrian crisis'
 - 38–39 An account of Hezekiah's illness, his prayer and his alliance with Babylon

Some of the divisions are clearly marked in the text. Chapter 2, for example, begins with a title 'The word which Isaiah son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem'. There are formal similarities between the parts of some sections, with chs. 13–23 consisting of a series of poems beginning 'The oracle concerning...', and oracles in chs.

28–31 beginning 'Woe...' And (though this is a little more subjective) there is a strong unity of style in, for example, chs. 24–27, which sets them off from the rest of the book. In principle this division, or something like it, might be agreed to equally by a reader who thought everything in the book came from Isaiah, or by one who thought that nothing did. But in practice it does tend to provide an agreed framework within which reasoned decisions can be made about where authentic material is to be found.

Secondary Material

Without ruling out the possibility of genuine oracles of Isaiah in any part of the book, there is widespread agreement that some sections are not very likely to contain much that goes back to the prophet:

(a) Chapters 24–27 are usually called 'the Isaiah Apocalypse'. This is because they are thought to resemble the 'apocalyptic' works common from about the third century BC onwards, represented in the biblical canon only by Daniel and Revelation, and perhaps also in sections of Joel and Zechariah. If it is true that apocalyptic came into being long after the Exile, and that these chapters of Isaiah belong to that genre, then obviously they cannot come from Isaiah himself. Not all commentators agree about this, but it is a widely held opinion.

(b) Chapters 36–38 are almost identical with 2 Kings 18–19, the account of the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 BC, though there are slight discrepancies. As with any such duplication of material in the Bible there are at least three possible explanations: Kings borrowed from Isaiah; Isaiah borrowed from Kings; both borrowed from a common source. Most (but not all) scholars think that the book of Isaiah took this section from Kings, which was probably written in the sixth century BC. In that case it clearly cannot go back to the prophet himself. In any case it should be noted that these chapters speak of Isaiah in the third person. People do sometimes write about themselves in the third person—Julius Caesar's memoirs of the Gallic Wars, for instance, say 'Caesar marshalled the army...Caesar advanced' and so on.

But it is probably simpler to explain these chapters as the work of a historian. Of course they may still contain historically accurate material *about* Isaiah, even though not coming *from* him.

(c) The oracles against foreign nations in 13-23 are something of a rag-bag of material, probably from a number of different periods. Some of them seem plainly to refer to events later than the lifetime of Isaiah. This is clearest in the case of the anti-Babylonian oracles (13-14). In the time of Isaiah Babylon was not a major world power: the threat to the small nations of Syria-Palestine came from the Assyrians, whom the Babylonians would not overthrow and replace until the late seventh century. On the assumption that hostile oracles against Babylon presuppose a time at which it was a danger to Judah, they cannot come from Isaiah.

Against this it can be argued that the nations denounced by the prophets were not always the current enemies of Judah or Israel (this is true, for example of the oracles against the nations in Amos 1-2), and that it is perfectly conceivable that Isaiah could have foreseen the rise of Babylon to take the place of Assyria as the oppressor of his people. This could be argued either on the grounds of his superior knowledge of the military situation (likely enough if he was an official royal adviser, as some think), or on the grounds that he received a divine revelation of the future beyond what could have been known by natural means. The latter argument wipes out all considerations of historical plausibility, of course. But by the kinds of criterion we would use in dating any other ancient document, the anti-Babylonian oracles do not seem likely to be by Isaiah. When the rest of Isaiah 13-23 is examined in the same way, only the material about Egypt (18-19) seems to have a plausible context in Isaiah's prophetic career—and some would think even that doubtful.

(d) Chapters 34-35 form a rather puzzling section. Many commentators treat it as a single unit: an oracle against the Edomites, Israel's enemies, followed by a prophecy of the glorious restoration of Israel itself. However, there is a wide divergence in style between the two chapters. Chapter 34

talks of Yahweh's combat with the powers of evil in heaven, in a way perhaps even closer to apocalyptic literature than is the 'Isaiah Apocalypse' (see above). Chapter 34, on the other hand, is highly reminiscent of Isaiah 40-55—so much so that some think it is by Deutero-Isaiah, maybe even separated artificially from Isaiah 40 when 36-39 were inserted into the book. Arguments that bring 24-27 down into the post-exilic age have the same effect on 34, and the resemblance to Deutero-Isaiah makes it likely that 35 is no earlier than the sixth century. If the two chapters were combined before they became part of the book of Isaiah, they could form an extremely late addition—much later than Deutero- or Trito-Isaiah.

(e) Chapters 32-33 are a mysterious collection, rather neglected by commentators. Here arguments about dating and authenticity tend to become very subjective. For example, the oracle against the 'complacent women' in 32.9-14 can be compared with 3.16-26 (and with Amos 4.1-3), and pronounced appropriate to the mid-eighth century, when Isaiah's prophetic activity began (in the 740s or 730s). At this time the citizens of Jerusalem still felt untroubled by the threat of Assyria, and enjoyed life with no thought for the future. On the other hand, the continuation of the oracle in vv. 15-20 speaks of the outpouring of God's spirit in a way we associate with post-exilic hopes (cf. Joel 2.28-29). Perhaps a genuine oracle of Isaiah has been 'updated' by the addition of the prophecy about the spirit; or perhaps the whole chapter is a later addition.

The effect of considerations such as these is to leave us with a small core of passages in which the authentic message of the prophet Isaiah can reasonably be sought. The core consists primarily of Isaiah 1-12 and 28-31, though we must not ignore possible fragments of Isaianic material in other chapters, such as 18 and 32. This is not to say that everything in the core is authentic, only that there is probably little authentic material anywhere else.

It should be stressed again that the question of 'authenticity' is not primarily an evaluative question. It is not a judgment on the *quality* of the material in Isaiah 1-39, as though oracles judged 'inauthentic' were being thrown

into the waste paper basket. It has to be admitted that commentators sometimes have conveyed this impression, but there has been a massive swing against such value judgments in the last twenty years or so. We shall look in Chapter 6 at the recent interest in reading Isaiah 1-39 (or indeed Isaiah 1-66) as a unified whole, in which all the components are of equal value. But to say that the inauthentic parts of the book are important is not to say that they are authentic. The historical question of which sections go back to Isaiah cannot be resolved by thinking about the quality of the different sections, but has to proceed by looking at the evidence the text gives us about its original context and date. There is room for plenty of honest agnosticism about such matters, and the fact that responsible scholars like Kaiser on the one hand and Hayes and Irvine on the other can differ so widely is a reminder that our evidence is much less substantial than we might wish.

Isaiah's Distinctive Message and Style

So far I have stressed the 'negative' aspect of the question of authenticity. Much of Isaiah 1-39 turns out on inspection to be rather unlikely to come from the prophet himself, because it reflects the concerns of a later age. It is equally important to emphasize that very few commentators (not even Kaiser) think that the authentic material is so slight that we attain to no real knowledge of Isaiah at all. Many of the sections that could be authentic, because they seem to reflect the situation in eighth-century Judah, also display a distinctive style and a coherent set of concerns which make it very likely that they go back to a single source; and if this source is not Isaiah, it is hard to know who it can be. As we shall see in the next three chapters, prominent among these concerns are:

1. the political life of Jerusalem, and the policies of its kings and their governments, during various crises caused by the aggressive intentions of other middle eastern powers;

2. the ethical behaviour of people in Judah and Jerusalem—mainly but not exclusively the ruling classes;
3. what the future held for the nation, and whether this depended on possible changes in either ethical behaviour or political decisions.

There are important intractable disagreements among scholars about the third of these concerns, and especially about how far Isaiah predicted that God would one day shower untold blessings on the people—and if so, whether or not this would depend to any degree on their own response to him. But material in Isaiah 1-39 falling into the other two categories, 'political' and 'ethical' prophecy, is treated as authentic by nearly all writers on Isaiah 1-39.

With some passages there may be uncertainty about the exact date when Isaiah uttered them—hardly surprising at this distance from the prophet! But to take just one chapter, ch. 5: virtually everyone thinks that the 'Song of the Vineyard', a clever denunciation of the social injustices in Jerusalem (5.1-7), the 'woes' with their distinctive interpretation of the failings in Judaeon society (5.8-25), and the prediction that the merciless Assyrian army will one day invade Judah (5.26-30), are a genuine record of Isaiah's own message. Isaiah emerges from the book as such a highly original and distinctive figure, that generations of critical readers have felt more than compensated for the 'loss' of the inauthentic sections—especially since they are not lost at all, but can be read as the work of later writers or prophets, who may also fully repay our study.

The Composition of Isaiah 1-39

Once we have decided, so far as possible, which parts of Isaiah 1-39 go back to the prophet himself and which are secondary, there still remains the task of working out how they all came to be combined, to make the book we now have. Here there is certainly disagreement, but most scholars adhere to one of only two models, and most probably see some truth in both of them.

Prophetic Schools

The first model (seen in the work of Jones and Eaton) ascribes great importance to the existence of disciples of the prophet. It is widely assumed that the great prophets must have had disciples; for as soon as we move away from thinking of the prophets as writers and see their original message as essentially oral, we need some explanation of how their words came to be remembered and recorded at all. Many scholars think that the complex transmission of the prophetic books, with layer upon layer of later material added to the original core of the prophets' own words, came about because each prophet's disciples came to form a kind of school. They made disciples themselves, and taught them the prophet's words together with their own additions to these. This process was repeated in each succeeding generation, until the prophetic book was stratified like an archaeological site. All the material claimed (not without reason) to go back ultimately to the named prophet, yet most of it was in reality the work of successive generations of his 'school'.

We know that in much later times the teachings of rabbis were transmitted like this. Teachers would utter sayings they themselves had composed 'in the name of their own teacher or of *his* teacher, and would join these on to genuine sayings of some ancient authority, until discovering the actual date and authorship of any given saying became almost impossible.

It is not inconceivable that the prophetic books developed in this way. Isaiah may be a particularly good example, since it actually refers to 'disciples' of the prophet (8.16) to whom he entrusts a collection of his oracles to be treasured up until the time of their fulfilment, when his message will be vindicated. One of the most prominent proponents of a 'school' of Isaiah has been J. Vermeylen, whose major work on the subject attempts to trace the whole history of the school in minute detail. S. Mowinckel's traditio-historical approach also tended in this direction, though the circle of 'traditionalists' was rather more widely conceived. The theory has the merit of accounting for the complex and composite character of the book of Isaiah, and of the prophetic books in general, while still explaining the fact that the whole collection was

felt to be linked to the original named prophet.

The weakness in the idea of a prophetic school is its extremely hypothetical character. Apart from the one verse in Isaiah already mentioned (8.16), the prophets never refer to their 'disciples'. Furthermore, it is difficult to imagine what kind of social reality 'schools' of the disciples of the prophets could have had in Israel and Judah. How and where might their members have lived? Were they in effect 'prophets' themselves, or 'laymen'? Did they survive the Exile of the sixth century, and when did their work end? Satisfactory answers to these questions have been hard to find.

Scribal Editing

The alternative model thinks more in terms of the activities of *scribes* in Israel and Judah. Scribes had the task of copying any documents which had come to be of national importance. But on occasion they probably added to such documents as they saw fit. Once prophetic books existed even in a rudimentary form, they were at the mercy of the scribes who copied them, and may well have become a repository for ideas that had no specifically prophetic origin.

On this model we still need an explanation of how there came to be prophetic books in the first place, if the prophets themselves did not write. We know that Jeremiah had a secretary, Baruch (see Jer. 36.4), who seems to have been a scribe rather than a 'disciple' of the prophet. But should we argue: Jeremiah had a secretary, so perhaps all the prophets did? Or: Jeremiah *tells* us that he had a secretary, so it was probably unusual? It is impossible to be sure. But however prophetic books came to be compiled in the first place, once they existed their further expansion and editing may well have been a primarily scribal activity—the elaboration of a written text, not the collection of fresh (oral) prophecies. It was characteristic of ancient scribes to modify and add to the text they were copying, but not to rewrite it consistently in the way we might do in producing a second or third edition of a book, and this will account quite well for the often very complicated arrangement of the text in prophetic books. We need not posit generation after

generation of disciples in a prophetic 'school'.

Such a gradual accumulation of material has been well described by McKane, writing on Jeremiah. He refers to a prophetic book as a 'rolling corpus'—like a snowball, which expands by picking up and incorporating new material into itself as it goes on its way. The 'scribal' model for understanding Isaiah 1-39 has been favoured especially by Ackroyd and Blenkinsopp. It makes most sense against the background of a more general theory about the editing, revision and interpretation of the Old Testament books. M. Fishbane provides such a theory, an account of 'inner-biblical interpretation', which shows that the prophetic books were subject to the same processes of redaction and reworking as the books of the Pentateuch, or the historical books.

Perhaps there are elements of truth in both ways of thinking about the composition of Isaiah 1-39. There do seem to be early small collections—for example, the so-called *Denkschrift* ('memorandum'—cf. Lescow) of chs. 6-9—which may have been put into their present form very early indeed, by close associates of Isaiah even if not by the prophet himself. At the same time, all the sections of the book include expansions which are probably 'scribal' in origin. These expansions originated during the redaction of Isaiah, just as is the case for secondary passages in other prophetic books—there is nothing distinctively 'Isaianic' about them. Some of them reflect the thinking of the exilic Deuteronomist 'school', which worked over many prophetic texts and was no closer to Isaiah than to any other prophet (see Perlitt). The Deuteronomists were certainly not 'disciples' of Isaiah, but it is from them that the narratives of 36-39 mostly derive, and their hand can probably be seen behind other insertions.

Some sections of the book may have originated not as expansions of existing words of Isaiah, but as the oracles of quite independent prophets: this may well be true of the anti-Babylonian oracles in 13-14. Such oracles must have had an independent transmission, probably quite unconnected with any school of Isaiah, until the day when a scribe decided to add them to the scroll of Isaiah. H.G.M. Williamson has suggested that the compiler of Isaiah

1-39 was in fact Deutero-Isaiah, the author of 40-55. If this is so, then material in 1-39 which resembles 40-55 must be seen not as scribal glosses to Isaiah, but as fully original prophecies by Deutero-Isaiah. They acquired their attribution to Isaiah when Deutero-Isaiah added them to the book, at the same time as he was attaching his own sixteen chapters of prophecy to it. To make the picture more complex still, we should remember that there are in any case similarities of theme between 1-39 and 40-55, and the (otherwise very rare) title of God, 'the Holy One of Israel', is common to both (and to 56-66). On the 'school' theory, Deutero-Isaiah might well be seen as a distant disciple of Isaiah, who knew Isaiah's oracles because they had been preserved in 'Isaian' circles for nearly two centuries.

A widely accepted hypothesis about Isaiah 1, first put forward by G. Fohrer, illustrates the complicated and fascinating course of the book's composition (see Willis for an alternative, but I believe weaker, explanation). Even a superficial reading of Isaiah 1-2 is likely to raise the question why the book seems to start twice, with rather similar 'titles' in 1.1 and 2.1. Fohrer suggested that ch. 2 was originally the beginning of an early edition of the book of Isaiah—not necessarily comprising the whole of 2-39 or even 2-12; and that ch. 1 was added subsequently. That is why it needed a fresh heading, since the original beginning of the book now became ch. 2. This clearly implies a scribal redaction of the book, operating at a literary, not an oral, level.

On the other hand, Fohrer did not think that the oracles in ch. 1 were themselves the invention of scribes. On the contrary, he thought most of them were authentic oracles of Isaiah. The editors had joined them together in their present order, and prefixed them to an existing 'book of Isaiah', but they had not made them up. They were to be seen as a carefully chosen *representative selection* of Isaiah's words, arranged not chronologically but thematically, and providing a short digest of the main themes of the rest of the book.

So, for example, 1.5-9 presupposes the 'Assyrian crisis' of 701 BC, with Jerusalem besieged in the midst of a devastated countryside, whereas 1.10-15 comes from a much earlier time, when Jerusalem still enjoyed considerable prosperity—

possibly before 730. The two oracles are linked by the catchphrase 'Sodom and Gomorrah' (1.9–10), but they had quite different origins.

Just how deliberate the editing of the book was is a difficult question. Most commentators in the past have not seen quite so much design in many later chapters as Fohrer found in ch. 1. But in recent years (see Chapter 6, below) there has been a swing towards seeing 1–39 as a much more carefully structured whole, designed to convey a coherent message—and one which may have little to do with the intentions of the original words of Isaiah. Isaiah's prophecies have been made, by the way they have been ordered, into the vehicle of a quite different set of meanings.

Further Reading

On questions of date and authenticity in Isaiah 1–39 the 'maximal' view (virtually everything is by Isaiah) can be found in

*J.H. Hayes and S.A. Irvine, *Isaiah the Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times and his Preaching* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987).

The 'minimal' view is represented by

O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12* (London: SCM Press, 1972 [2nd, completely revised edn 1983]) and *Isaiah 13–39* (London: SCM Press, 1974 [second edn 1980]).

In between are

*R.E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980).
H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 1–12* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965–72), *ET Isaiah 1–12: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991); *Jesaja 13–27* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974–78); and *Jesaja 28–39* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978–82).

On the shape of Isaiah 1–39, see

*R.B.Y. Scott, 'The Book of Isaiah, 1–39', *IB*, V, pp. 149–381.
J.T. Willis, 'The First Pericope in the Book of Isaiah', *VT* 34 (1984), pp. 63–77.

On the identification of secondary material, see discussion in Scott and Kaiser, and the Further Reading suggested in Chapter 5 ('After Isaiah') below.

For the 'prophetic school' theory about the origin of Isaiah 1–39, see

D.R. Jones, 'The Traditio of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem', *ZAW* 67 (1955), pp. 226–46.

*J.H. Eaton, 'The Origin of the Book of Isaiah', *VT* 9 (1959), pp. 138–57.
S. Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition* (Oslo) 1946.

For theories of scribal editing, see

*P.R. Ackroyd, 'Isaiah 1–12: Presentation of a Prophet', *Congress Volume, Göttingen 1977* (VTSup, 29; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), pp. 16–48.

J. Blenkinsopp, 'Fragments of Ancient Exegesis in an Isaiah Poem (Jes. 2.6–22)', *ZAW* 93 (1981), pp. 51–62.

M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

For further discussion of theories about composition, see

H.G.M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); more fully discussed in Chapter 5 below.

Other works referred to in this chapter

J. Milgrom, 'Did Isaiah Prophesy during the Reign of Uzziah?', *VT* 14 (1964), pp. 164–82.

J. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique* (2 vols.; Paris, 1977; a detailed working out of the 'prophetic school' hypothesis—see also the review by R.J. Coggins, *JSOT* 13 (1979), pp. 74–75).

T. Lescow, 'Jesajas Denkschrift aus der Zeit des syro-ephraimitischen Krieges', *ZAW* 85 (1973), pp. 315–31; on the origins of Isaiah 6–9.

L. Perlitt, 'Jesaja und die Deuteronomisten', in V. Fritz, K.F. Pohlmann and H.-C. Schmitt (eds.), *Prophet und Prophetenbuch: Festschrift für Otto Kaiser zum 65. Geburtstag* (BZAW 185; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), pp. 133–49; argues for a 'deuteronomistic' editing of all the prophetic books).

G. Fohrer, 'Jesaja 1 als Zusammenfassung der Verkündigung Jesajas', *ZAW* 74 (1962), pp. 251–68; Isaiah 1 as a summary of Isaiah's teaching.

W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, I (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986).