

University of Groningen

The Role of Syntax in the Versification of Is 65

Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. van

Published in:

A Prophet on the Screen: Computerized Description and Literary Interpretation of Isaianic Texts

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1992

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. V. (1992). The Role of Syntax in the Versification of Is 65: 13-25. In *A Prophet on the Screen: Computerized Description and Literary Interpretation of Isaianic Texts* (pp. 118-147). VU University Press.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

THE ROLE OF SYNTAX IN THE VERSIFICATION OF IS 65:13-25

- J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten -
Groningen

1. Introduction

In this article we start with the arrangement of Is 65. We will give a summary of the *status questiones*. Hereafter we will concentrate our study on the second part of the chapter: Is 65:13-25. By means of a description of the prosodic, syntactic and semantic data of the text, we shall try to find a sound arrangement of the text in colons, lines, strophes and stanza. Questions at the background of this study are to what extent the poetic and syntactic structures are interrelated and whether the rules for the poetic arrangement of a text can be formalized in a way that they can be filed into a database.

2. The structure of Is 65

Is 65:13-25 is part of a larger piece of text, namely Is 65. As for the genre, this chapter can be considered an alternation of words of judgement and of salvation. The classical prophecy announced both judgement and salvation to all the people. In Is 65 this form has been changed in a way that judgement is announced to the wicked and salvation to the faithful. In this way, the prophet establishes distinction among the people.

Because of the alternation of words of judgement and of salvation, Is 65 is structured as follows¹:

¹ J. FISCHER, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Ein textkritische Studie* (BZAW 56), Giessen 1930; K. ELLIGER, *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja* (BWANT 4/11), Stuttgart 1933, 32ff.; J. MUILENBURG and H.S. COFFIN, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 40-66*, in: *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 5, Nashville 198236 (=19561), 381-773; G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Jesaja* (3 Vol.) (ZBK), Zürich 1960-64; C. WESTERMANN, *Das Buch Jesaja. Kapitel 40-66* (ATD 19), Göttingen 1966, 316-326; K. PAURITSCH, *Die neue Gemeinde: Gott sammelt Ausgestossene und Arme (Jesaja 56-66)* (AnBib 47), Rome 1971, 171ff.; E. SEHMSDORF, *Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Jes 56-66*,

1-7: *Words of Judgement to the Wicked* (1-5: accusation; 6-7: verdict)

8-10: *Words of Salvation to the Faithful*

11-12: *Words of Judgment to the Wicked* (11ab: accusation; 12a: verdict; 12a β -b: accusation)

13-16: *Juxtaposition of Words of Salvation to the Faithful and of Judgement to the Wicked*

17-25: *Words of Salvation to the Faithful*

First we would like to deal with the question how the separate genre critical parts of Is 65 form together a unity. Exegetes give several answers.

Elliger (1933) considers Is 65 as three prophetic sayings (v. 1-7, v. 8-12 and v. 13-25) linked up with each other, because a messenger formula is used in v. 8a α ' (כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה) and in v. 13a α (לִכֵּן כֹּה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה) and a concluding formula in v. 7a α " and in v. 25b β (אָמַר יְהוָה). Each saying has an introduction and a conclusion, and can thus be distinguished from each other. The first saying (v. 1-7) does not open with a messenger formula, but it does have a concluding formula in v. 7a α . This saying contains the first word of judgement. The second saying (v. 8-12) does open with a messenger formula, but lacks a concluding formula. It consists of a word of salvation (v. 8-10) and a word of judgement (v. 11-12). The last saying (v. 13-25) has both an introductory and a concluding formula. It contains the juxtaposition of words of judgement and of salvation (v. 13-16) and words of salvation (v. 17-25). The second and the third saying, which are both introduced by a messenger's formula, agree with one another in nature. Both have the connection of words of salvation to the servants and words of judgement to the wicked (auditors).

Pauritsch (1971) isolates v. 1 and v. 24 from the context and attributes these to the redactor, who made his theological conception of this chapter clear. He regards v. 25 as a apocalyptic addition. V. 2-23 forms a unit composed of three strophes: v. 2-10, v. 11-16 and v. 17-23. The first two strophes (v. 2-10 and v. 11-16) are parallel of structure. The first part of each strophe dilates upon the auditors' present situation (v. 1-7 and v. 11-12: accusation and verdict), while the second part of each strophe contains promise and hope for the servants (v. 8-10 and v. 13-16). According to Pauritsch the emphasis is always on the second part of the strophe, which is therefore always introduced by the messenger's formula. The third strophe is a detailed description of the

ZAW 84(1972)517-576; P.-E. BONNARD, *Le Second Isaïe. Son disciple et leurs éditeurs. Isaïe 40-66* (EB), Paris 1972, 458-477; A. SCHOORS, *Jesaja* (BOT IX), Roermond 1972, 377-383; P.D. HANSON, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, Philadelphia 1975, 134f. 143f.; R.N. WHYBRAY, *Isaiah 40-66* (NCeB), London 1975, 266-279; R. MARTIN-ACHARD, *L'espérance des croyants face à la mort selon Ésaïe 65,16c-25 et selon Daniel 12,1-4*, *RHPPhR* 69(1979)439-451.

tidings of hope and promise.

Bonnard (1972) distinguishes two parts in Is 65: v. 1-12 and v. 13-25, which he subdivides as follows: v. 1-12 consists of v. 1-7 (the rebels) and v. 8-12 (the servants and the rebels), whereas v. 13-25 consists of v. 13-16a β (the servants and the rebels) and v. 16b-25 (the servants). Bonnard points out the chiasmic arrangement of the material of Is 65, in a sense that the second subdivision of the first part (v. 8-12) and the first subdivision of the second part (v. 13-16b) are both characterized by a juxtaposition of the words of salvation and of judgment, whereas the first subdivision of the first part (v. 1-7) only contains words of judgment, which correlates with the second subdivision of the second part (v. 16b-25), containing only words of salvation.

Hanson (1975) points out a number of stylistic details which make a close connection between the several genre critical parts of Is 65. In the first place, he draws attention to the inclusion of v. 1-2 and v. 10b. The contrast with respect to the content causes this inclusion: a rebellious people" (v. 2a": עַם סוֹרֵר) "who did not ask for me" (v. 1a': לֹלֵא שְׁאַלֵנוּ), whereas "I was ready to be sought" (1a': נִדְרַשְׁתִּי), is contrasting with v. 10b: "for my people who have sought me" (לְעַמִּי אֲשֶׁר דְּרָשׁוּנִי). V. 1 opens with a form of the verb שָׂרַד, while v. 10 ends with it. Thus the first part (v. 1-7: words of judgement to the wicked) and the second part (v. 8-10: words of salvation to the faithful) are connected.

In the second place, Hanson indicates the connection between the second (v. 8-10: words of salvation to the faithful) and the third part (v. 11-12: words of judgement to the wicked). The connection is shown in the following contrast:

- | | | | |
|----|------|---------------------------------|---|
| A | 9a" | יִרְשׁ הָרִי | (an inheritor of my mountains) |
| B | 10b | לְעַמִּי אֲשֶׁר דְּרָשׁוּנִי | (for my people who have sought me) |
| B' | 11a' | וְאַתֶּם עֲזַבְתֶּם יְהוָה | (but you who forsake the Lord) |
| A' | 11a" | הַשְׁכַּחְתֶּם אֶת־הַר קְדְשִׁי | ((but you) who forget my holy mountain) |

There is a contrast with respect to content between A and A' as well as between B and B'. Besides, the way the different elements are spread over the lines shows a chiasmic structure.

Hanson also points out the contrast between v. 12a β and v. 24. V. 24 ("Before they call I will answer, while they are yet speaking I will hear") is a literal reversal of v. 12a β ("Because, when I called you did not answer, when I spoke, you did not listen"). Thus, in this description of the structure of Is 65 by means of stylistic facts, Hanson indicates the close connection between the five genre critical parts.

We have pointed out that Pauritsch singles v. 1 and v. 24 out from the context and relates these to one another, whereas Hanson indicates the contrast between v. 12 and v. 24. We would emphasize the relationship between these three lines (v. 1, v. 12 and v. 24). They form, so to speak, the frame-

work of the text dealing with the relationship of God and his audience.

3. Some questions with respect to the structure of Is 65:13-25

Is 65:13-25, which we will restrict to, is syntactically speaking a unit. It consists of direct speech, containing an introductory (v. 13a) and a concluding formula (v. 25b β). From a genre critical point of view, this unit consists of two parts. The first part (v. 13-16) consists of the juxtaposition of words of judgement and of salvation, whereas the second part (v. 17-25) purely consists of words of salvation. The structure of the second part gives some problems. Exegetes does not agree with respect to its beginning and its ending. The problems with the definition of the units are connected with the fact that here the classic form of the oracle is no longer recognizable.

3.1. The position of v. 16b

Some exegetes regard v. 17 as the opening of the second part and v. 16b falling within the previous part. V. 16b forms the conclusion of v. 11-16 [K. Pauritsch (1971); A. Schoors (1972)], of v. 13-16a β [J. Fischer (1939); W. Kessler (1960)] or of v. 15-16b [J. Muilenburg (1956); G. Fohrer (1964)]. According to others, however, either v. 16a [Elliger (1933)] or v. 16b is the beginning of a new pericope (v. 16b - 23/25) [C. Westermann (1966), P.-E. Bonnard (1972); E. Sehmsdorff (1972) en R.W. Whybray (1975)]. R. Martin-Achard (1979) considers v. 16b as a link between v. 13-16a and v. 17-25. It concludes the preceding and introduces the following part. This is also pointed out by Pauritsch and Hanson.

The problems of the position of v. 16 turns up in the commentary of Hanson (1975). When reading his comment on the text, one cannot get away from the impression that he interchanges a number of structures. He calls v. 13-25 a separate unit (blessing and curse)², but he calls v. 17-25 a unit as well (the new epoch)³. Besides, Hanson seems to count v. 16b as belonging to the preceding part (v. 13-15), while on the other hand he brackets v. 16b and v. 17-25 together⁴.

Westermann (1966) goes explicitly into the position of v. 16b. The word ׁו at the beginning of v. 16b has both a causal and a concluding function. With respect to the *content* v. 16b fits in completely with v. 17-25, and not with v. 13-15. According to Westermann, Is 65:1-16a β is characterized by the

² HANSON, *o.c.*, 154.

³ HANSON, *o.c.*, 155.

⁴ HANSON, *o.c.*, 157.

contrast between the wicked and the servants and by the destiny of both groups, whereas Is 65:16b-25 would involve a different antithesis: the distress of the past compared to the salvation to come. Westermann intends to maintain the causal character of the word כִּי that opens v. 16b, by placing the cry for joy in v. 18a even before v. 16b.

Sehmsdorff (1972) too counts v. 16b as part of v. 17-25. In his study of the redaction history Is 56-66 he gives a description of the structure of Is 65:16b-25, based on the content of the text. The first part of tekst Is 65:16c-25 includes v. 16b (I. v. 16b-19: *Promise*; 16b: forget the former troubles), and its content is linked up with v. 17b (and the former things shall not be remembered).

3.2. The position of v. 24-25

The end of the second part of Is 65:13-25 is also problematic. Does this unit end in v. 23 [Pauritsch (1971); Whybray (1975)], in v. 24 [Westermann (1966); Sehmsdorff (1972); - with some hesitation: Bonnard (1972); Martin-Achard (1979)], or in v. 25 [Elliger 1933]; Fohrer (1964)]?

Elliger (1933) considers Is 65:13-25 as a separate prophetic saying with an opening formula (v. 13aα: אָמַר יְהוָה) and a concluding formula (v. 25bβ: אָמַר יְהוָה).

Westermann (1966) suggests that, originally, v. 17a and v. 25 did not belong to the oracle Is 65:16b-25. The creation of a new heaven and a new earth is given concrete form to in the creation of "*Jerusalem to be a rejoicing, and her people a joy*" (v. 18b). The creation of a new world only involves Jerusalem and Juda. According to Westermann this is a contradiction. This means that either the author has not been aware of this contradiction, or the opening text of v. 17a and the conclusion of v. 25 (by a later redactor) have changed the original oracle of salvation to Jerusalem and Juda into an apocalyptic portrayal.

Pauritsch (1971) isolates v. 1 and v. 24 from the context, and regards these as the redactor's addition in order to make the theological conception of this chapter clear. He regards v. 25 as an apocalyptic addition and v. 2-23 as a unit, composed of three strophes: v. 2-10, v. 11-16 and v. 17-23.

Hanson (1975) points out the contrast between v. 12cd and v. 24. V. 24 ("Before they call I will answer, while they are yet speaking I will hear") is a literal inversion of v. 12cd ("Because, when I called, you did not answer, when I spoke, you did not listen").

The arguments to link up v. 16 as a whole of just v. 16b with the previous or the the following text, mostly concern the *content*. The arguments to link up v. 24-25 with v. 16b/17-23 also concern the content, and are focussed on the genesis of the chapter. Whybray (1975) points out that a structure with respect to the content may come into conflict with a syntactic structure. V.

16b, for instance, is *thematically* more linked with the following than with the preceding text, but *syntactically* the verse is isolated⁵.

We think it useful to define the structure of Is 65:13-25 not only with respect to content, but with respect to other textual data as well. In our opinion, a text is not merely structured by facts concerning content and theme. The whole of rhythmic, grammatical-syntactic and semantic elements of a text is essential for the nature of its composition⁶.

4. Analysis of prosodic, syntactic and semantic data of Is 65:13-25

In this article, we shall try to find a convincing structure of Is 65:13-25 by means of the prosodic, syntactic and semantic information of the text. The position of v. 16b and of v. 24-25 form the starting point of our investigation. One can either consider v. 16b a part of the preceding text (v. 13-16a β), or include it in the following (v. 17-25). The demarcation at v. 13 (and not, for instance at either, v. 14 v. 15 or v. 16) is made for prosodic and syntactic reasons. In the syntactic hierarchy of the clauses there is a new starting point at v. 13, and therefore v. 13 belongs to a higher level than the preceding lines. V. 13b-25b are imbedded in v. 13a. They can be read without interruption. We will account for this in the continuation of this article.

We start from a description of the hierarchy of the clauses, which we have formulated in dialogue with the *Werkgroep Informatica*. We will also try to apply several achievements put forward by Harm van Grol in his inquiry into the versification of classical Hebrew⁷. Elsewhere in this volume, Van Grol explains the function of syntax in the versification of Hebrew poetry. I will follow Van Grol's method as far as possible.

⁵ Anyway, Whybray's solution, following Westermann, (to place v. 18a before v. 16b), seems too easy in our opinion.

⁶ The need to include all textual information in a structuration of the text is urgently argued by H.W.M. VAN GROU, *De versbouw in het klassiek Hebreeuws. Fundamentele verkenningen. Deel een: Metriek*, Amsterdam 1986. Doctoral thesis Katholieke Theologische Universiteit Amsterdam. Cf.: J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN, *Het breukvlak tussen de tweede en de derde Jesaja. Het verband van Jes 56:1-8 met Jes 55:1-13, mede tegen de achtergrond van de middeleeuwse Joodse uitleg*, Amsterdam 1984 (thesis KTUA), 109ff. Hanson gives the prosodic elements of Is 65, but as it contains no further clarification, the account keep floating in the air.

⁷ Here I want to refer particularly to H.W.M. van Grol's dissertation (see n. 6).

4.1. The text of Is 65:13-25

We start the presentation of our investigation into the prosodic and syntactic structure with a reproduction of Is 65:13-25 in a colometric and strophic structure. This structure is, in fact, the outcome of our research. Apart from the reproduction of the text, we will give the accentual pattern of each line:

4	לכן כה־אמר אדני יהוה	13aα
3+2	הנה עבדי יאכלו / ואתם תרעבו	13aβ
3+2	הנה עבדי ישתו / ואתם תצמאו	13aγ
3+2	הנה עבדי ישמחו / ואתם תבשר	13b
4+3+3	הנה עבדי ראנו משוב לב / ואתם תצעקו מכאב לב / ומשבר רוח תילילו	14
4+3+3	והנחתם שמכם לשבועה לבחירי / והמיתך אדני יהוה / ולעבדיו יקרא שם אחר	15
3+3	אשר המתברך בארץ / יתברך באלהי אמן	16aα
3+2	והנשבע בארץ / ישבע באלהי אמן	16aβ
3+3	כי נשכתו הצרות הראשנות / וכי נסתרו מעיני	16b
2+2+2	כי־הנני בורא / שמים חדשים / וארץ חדשה	17a
3+3	ולא תזכרנה הראשנות / ולא תעלינה על־לב	17b
2+2+2	כי־אם־שישו / וגילו עדי־עד / אשר אני בורא	18a
2+2+2	כי הנני בורא / את־ירושלם גילה / ועמה משוש	18b
2+2	וגלתי בירושלם / וששתי בעמי	19a
3+3	ולא־ישמע בה עוד / קול בכי וקול זעקה	19b
3+4	לא־יהיה משם עוד עול ימים / וזקן אשר לא־ימלא את־ימיו	20a
4+4	כי הנער בן־מאה שנה ימות / והחוטא בן־מאה שנה יקלל	20b
3+4	ובנו בתים וישבו / ונטעו כרמים ואכלו פרים	21
3+3	לא יבנו ואחר ישב / לא יטעו ואחר יאכל	22a
4+4	כי־כימי העץ ימי עמי / ומעשה ידיהם יבלו בחירי	22b
2+3	לא ייגעו לריק / ולא ילדו לבהלה	23a

4+3	/ כי רזע ברוכי יהוה המה / וצאצאיהם אתם	23b
4+4	/ והיה טרם־יקראו ואני אענה / עוד הם מדבים ואני אשמע	24
4+4+3	/ זאב וטלה ירעו כאחד / ואריה כבקר יאכל חבן / ונחש עפר לחמו	25a
3+2	לא־ירעו ולא־ישחיתו / בכל־הר קדשי	25b
2	אמר יהוה	25c

Following Van Grol's investigation, our research of the prosodic structure of Is 65:13-25, with special attention paid to the relation of the clauses, will be carried out in four stages. We will go through the text four times, each time on a different prosodic level: 1. the operation from clause into colon (section 4.2); 2. the operation from colon into line (section 4.3); 3. the operation from line into strophe (section 4.4) and 4. the operation from strophe into stanza (section 4.5).

4.2. The first operation: from clause into colon

Van Grol lists a number of fundamental rules for the operation from clause into colon. These rules involve the number of stresses in each clause and the syntactic hierarchy of the clauses. Before starting the very operation, we should bring up the accentuation and the syntactic hierarchy.

4.2.1. The syntactic hierarchy and the accentual pattern

We present the syntax of Is 65:13-25 according to their hierarchy and the number of accents in each clause. After the reproduction of the syntactic hierarchy, we shall discuss the problems of this hierarchy and of the accentuation.

<i>Number of accents</i>	<i>The syntactic hierarchy</i>	
1	לכן	13.1
3	כה אמר אדני יהוה	13.2
3	הנה עבדי יאכלו .	13.3
2	ואתם תרעבו . . .	13.4
3	הנה עבדי ישתו .	13.5
2	ואתם תצמאו . . .	13.6
3	הנה עבדי ישמחו .	13.7
2	ואתם תבשר . . .	13.8

4	הנה עבדי ראנו משוב לב	14.1
3	ואתם תצעקו מכאב לב	14.2
3	ומשבר רוח תילילו	14.3
4	והנחתם שמכם לשבועה לבחירי	15.1
3	והמיתך אדני יהוה	15.2
3	ולעבדיו יקרא שם אחר	15.3
1	אשר	16.1
2	המתברך בארץ	16.2
3	יתברך באלהי אמן	16.3
	ו	16.4
2	הנשבע בארץ	16.5
3	ישבע באלהי אמן	16.6
3	כי נשכחו הצרות הראשנות	16.7
3	וכי נסתרו מעיני	16.8
6	כי הנני בורא שמים חדשים וארץ חדשה	17.1
3	ולא תזכרנה הראשנות	17.2
3	ולא תעלינה על לב	17.3
2	כי אם שישו	18.1
2	וגילו עדי עד	18.2
3	אשר אני בורא	18.3
6	כי הנני בורא את ירושלים גילה ועמה משוש	18.4
2	וגלתי בירושלים	19.1
2	וששתי בעמי	19.2
6	ולא ישמע בה עוד קול בכי וקול זעקה	19.3
4	לא יהיה משם עוד עול ימים	20.1
1	וזקן	20.2
3	אשר לא ימלא את ימיו	20.3
4	כי הנער בן מאה שנה ימות	20.4
4	והחוטא בן מאה שנה יקלל	20.5
2	ובנו בתים	21.1
1	וישבו	21.2
2	ונטעו כרמים	21.3
2	ואכלו פרים	21.4
1	לא יבנו	22.1
2	ואחר ישב	22.2
1	לא ישעו	22.3
2	ואחר יאכל	22.4
4	כי כימי העץ ימי עמי	22.5
4	ומעשה ידיהם יבלו בחירי	22.6
2	לא ייגעו לריק	23.1
3	ולא ילדו לבהלה	23.2
4	כי רזע ברוכי יהוה המה	23.3
3	וצאצאיהם אתם	23.4
1	והיה	24.1

1	טרם יקראו	24.2
2	ואני אענה	24.3
2	עוד הם מדבים	24.4
2	ואני אשמע	24.5
4	זאב וטלה ירעו כאחד	25.1
4	ואריה כבקר יאכל תבן	25.2
3	ונחש עפר לחמו	25.3
1	לא ירעו	25.4
4	ולא ישחיתו בכל הר קדשי	25.5
2	אמר יהוה	25.6

4.2.1.1. The stresses

The rhythm of Trito Isaiah is known to be problematic. It seems to be more irregular than that of the other prophets. It includes colons of four accents, as well as colons of two accents. Still, we involve the metrical details in our investigation.

The number of stresses of each clause is reproduced in the column next to the text. The following rules apply to the accentuation⁸.

In nearly all clauses we can apply the base rule, that each graphic unit in the TM counts for one word and that every word has one stress.

Monosyllabic words are more complicated. For those a number of specific rules have been formulated:

1. A particle is counted along with the next following noun, verb or particle ~~are counted~~ as a word-complex, if at least one of the two is monosyllabic. A word-complex is a group of words joined together and bearing one accent. The following examples may be noted in Is 65:13-25: 6x לא (20.1, 20.3, 22.1, 22.3, 23.1, 25.4), 7x כי (16.7, 17.1, 18.1, 18.4, 20.4, 22.5, 23.3), 1x על (17.3), 2x את (18.4, 20.3). The same applies for טרם (24.2). We regard טרם as a monosyllabic word.

2. A constructive or adjective word-group is viewed as a word-complex under the condition that the first word is monosyllabic and the word-group does not exceed four syllables, or under the condition that the second word is monosyllabic and the word-group does not exceed three syllables. The following forms in Is 65:13-25 may be noted in the first category: 15.3 (שם אחר), 19.3 (קול בכי), 20.1 (עול ימים), 20.4 (בן מאה), 20.5 (בן מאה), 25.5 (הר קדשי); the following in the second category: 14.1 (מטוב לב), 14.2 (מכאב לב), 18.2

⁸ See: VAN GROL (1986): 144f.; Cf.: H.W.M. VAN GROL, Classical Hebrew Metrics and Zephaniah 2-3, in: W. VAN DER MEER - J.C. DE MOOR (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOT 40), Sheffield 1988, 186-206.

(עדי עד).

4.2.1.2. The syntactic hierarchy

Clause 13.1-2 forms the introduction to the text. Clauses 13.3 - 25.5 are embedded in clauses 13.1-2. In clause 25.6, the text returns to the level of 13.1-2. Clauses 13.1-2 and 25.6 form as it were the framework of the text.

Clauses 13.3-14.3 form the first sequence of clauses, connected by a combination of coordination and embedding. There is a clause relationship between 13.3, 13.5, 13.7 and 14.1. They are connected by coordination. These clauses are formally identical. Identity regards the words and their parts of speech used between the clause. There is also clause relationship between 13.3 and 13.4, 13.5 and 13.6, 13.7 and 13.8, 14.1 and 14.2, and 14.2 and 14.3. The two clauses are each time connected by the conjunction ׀. Clauses 13.3-14.3 show a stereotype pattern in which each clause is introduced by הנה עבדי (13.3; 13.5; 13.7; 14.1), while each second clause is introduced by ואתם (13.4; 13.6; 13.8; 14.2). The meaning of each second clause is adversative to the first clause. At the end of the sequence, we find a variation on the pattern, in a sense that clause 14.3 can be seen as a chiasmic extension of clause 14.2. The unity of this sequence is reinforced by the fact that these are all compound nominal clauses (CNC), the verbs in which are invariably imperfects. The use of the adverbium הנה, the pronomina and suffixes of the first and second person, as well as the use of the imperfect, indicate an elocution, involved in the actual situation of the speaker⁹.

The next sequence of clauses (clauses 15.1-16.6) is embedded in the preceding clauses. The alternate use of הנה and ואתם is abandoned clause 15.1. The clause type changes also. Here the CNC (clauses 13.2-14.3) gives way to the verbal clause (VC). The verbal form changes also. In clause 15.1 we find a perfect consecutive instead of the imperfect. This possibly indicates a result¹⁰. Thus, we interpret clause 15.1 as a result of clauses 13.3-14.3. Strictly speaking, clause 15.1 is connected with clause 14.3 by the conjunction ׀. However, the clauses 13.2-14.3 form a unit. Therefore, we interpret clause 15.1 as the result of 13.2-14.3 together.

Clauses 15.2 and 15.3 provide some difficulty. In 15.2 there is a change of subject. Up to clause 15.2, the subject is either *you* or *my servants*, whereas in clause 15.2 this is changed into אנני יהוה. As a result, in clause 15.3, we also see the suffix change from עבדי into עבדיו. A second difficulty is formed by the object suffix in clause 15.2: 2nd sg. The question is, what does this

⁹ See: W. SCHNEIDER, *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch*, München 1974, par. 52.4.

¹⁰ SCHNEIDER, *o.c.*, section 48.3.4.1.

singular suffix refer to. So far, it was a matter of plural groups: **עֲבָדָי** and **עַבְדֵי** servants). The singular, therefore, is odd. A solution could be the interpretation of clause 15.2 as direct speech. This would make clause 15.2 the context of the curse in 15.1: "May the Lord JHWH slay you!" In that case, clause 15.2 would be embedded in clause 15.1, and the suffix 2nd sing. would refer to **בְּחִירִי** (my chosen). This makes clause 15.3 an adversative to 15.1 and 15.2 together. This interpretation is contradicted by the fact that in this clause the verbal form is a perfect consecutive and not a jussive. It is therefore likely to interpret clause 15.2 (together with clause 15.3) as an adverbative clause in relation to 15.1. In that case clause 15.2 is coordinate to 15.1. The suffix 2nd sing. is referring to *you* (pl) in clause 15.1. Clause 15.3 is coordinate to clause 15.2. The coherence of clauses 15.1-3 reads as follows: In that situation (namely that of clauses 13.3-14.3), you will leave your name as a curse for my chosen, *but* the Lord JHWH will slay you, *while* he will call his servants by another name. In consequence, the supposed curse of clause 15.2 boomerangs those who leave their names as a curse.

Clauses 16.1-6 are embedded in clauses 15.1-3. Strictly speaking, clause 16.1 (**אֲשֶׁר**) links clauses 15.3 and 16.2-3 together, while clause 16.4 (**וְ**) forms the link between clauses 16.5-6 and 16.2-3. As subject clauses, 16.2 and 16.5 are embedded in clauses 16.3 and 16.6 respectively. The compound clause 16.1-3 is coordinate to the compound clause 16.4-6.

Clauses 16.7-8 return to a higher textual level than clauses 15.1-16.6. They are connected to the **וְהִנֵּה**-clauses 13.3, 13.5, 13.7 and 14.1. **וְ** may be interpreted as a confirmation, an exclamation. If this is correct, the clauses are a commentary on clauses 13.3-14.3. If so we could speak of a coordinate relationship of clauses 16.7-8 and 13.3-14.3. However, it is also possible to interpret **וְ** causative or consecutive. In that case, it would be more likely that 16.7-8 are embedded in clauses 13.3-14.3. Clause 16.7 and 16.8 are connected by coordination.

Clause 17.1 has a different subject from clauses 16.7-8. Besides, in clauses 16.7-8 the passive character (*nif`al*-forms of the verb) changes into an active character. The use of hnh makes a connection between 17.1 and 13.2-14.3. Therefore, clause 17.1 probably returns to a higher syntactic level than 16.8¹¹.

Clauses 17.2-18.3 are embedded in clause 17.1. They include the result of the action, described in clause 17.1. Clauses 17.2-18.2 are connected by coordination. Clauses 18.1-2 are to be interpreted adversatively in relation with clauses 17.2-3. After the denials of clauses 17.2-3, clause 18.1 introduces the adversion (**כִּי - אִם**) It is, however, significant that the adversative clauses contain an imperative form of the verb. Clause 18.3 is embedded in clauses 18.1-2. It forms a relative clause, introduced by **אֲשֶׁר**.

¹¹ If **וְ** in the clauses 16.7-8 has an exclamative function, this would put clause 17.1 on the same level in the textual hierarchy as clauses 16.7-8.

Clause 18.4 returns to the level of clause 17.1. Both clauses have the same syntactic structure: **כִּי הִנְנִי בֹרֵא** followed by two objects.

Clauses 19.1-25.5 are embedded in clause 18.4. These clauses are the result of the action, described in 18.4. Clauses 19.1 and 19.2 are connected by coordination. Clause 19.3 is connected with clauses 19.1-2 by the conjunction **וְ**. The subject and the verbal form change in clause 19.3. Yet clause 19.3 may be interpreted as coordinate to clauses 19.1-2. Clause 20.1 is coordinate to clause 19.3. Clause 20.3 must be interpreted as a complementary embedded clause in 20.1. Clause 20.4 returns to the level of clause 20.1. Clause 20.5 is coordinate to clause 20.4. Clause 21.1 is coordinate to clause 20.5. The main clauses of 20.1-23.4 are connected by coordination, while, in addition to this, clause 21.2, 21.4, 22.2 and 22.4 are embedded as consecutive clauses in the preceding main clauses (21.1, 21.3, 22.1 and 22.3 resp.)

Now the question is, in what way clause 24.1 (**וְהִיא**) is connected with the preceding clauses. In case of embedding, the clauses 24.1-5 forms the result of the preceding text (clauses 18.4-23.4). Another option is the return of clause 24.1 to a higher level in the syntactic hierarchy than clause 23.4. This would imply a separation between clauses 23.4 and 24.1. In that case, 24.1 cannot be the result of the preceding, but must be coordinate. Anyhow, the function of **וְהִיא** is, from a syntactic point of view, both introductory and articulate. It characterizes a text as a perspective text¹². Clauses 24.2-24.5 are linked together by an alternation of coordination and embedding.

Clauses 25.1-5 return to the level of clause 24.1. Finally clause 25.6 returns to the level of clause 13.1-2. It forms the end of the part.

4.2.2. The actual operation

After having entered into the problems of accentuation and syntactic hierarchy, we can carry out the first operation, that from clause to colon. For this purpose, Van Grol states the following fundamental rules:

1. A clause with two, three or four stresses is regarded as a colon.
2. If a clause has more than four stresses, it forms two colons of two, three or four stresses, divided according to the metrical restriction and syntactical hierarchy.
3. If a clause has one stress, it forms a colon, together with another clause of one, two or three stresses, or with two other clauses of one stress each, which are connected with it, either by coordination or embedding or both, while the other, theoretically possible, connection is excluded by the absence of embedding or coordination, or by prevailing complementary embedding over coordination or of coordination over different kinds of embedding.

¹² SCHNEIDER, *o.c.*, section 48.3.4.5; 49.3.1.2; 5.2; 54.1.2.

As several exegetes regard the text of Trito Isaiah as metrically irregular, it is debatable if we may use its metric details as a criterion for the division of lines and strophes. We take as a basic assumption that metrical information as such can never be a criterion for a division of lines and strophes. It can only be used in connection with other criteria.

- *The first rule* is obvious. Clauses with two, three or four stresses are regarded as colons. This is usually the case.

- *The second rule* concerning the division of clauses with more than four stresses, occurs three times in Is 65:13-25:

Clause 17.1: **כִּי־הֲנִי בּוֹרָא / שָׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים / וָאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה** 6:2+2+2

The syntactical hierarchy permits two divisions. To let one of them prevail over the other (**כִּי־הֲנִי בּוֹרָא שָׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים / וָאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה** or **כִּי־הֲנִי בּוֹרָא / שָׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים וָאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה**), would conflict with the rule of *metrical restriction* (4+2 of 2+4), which implies that the colons of strophe does not vary more than one metrical unit. Yet in Trito Isaiah a division of 4+2 (or, not very likely, 2+4) seems to be within the bounds of possibility, due to the frequently occurring combination of colons of four and two stresses.

Clause 18.4 **כִּי הֲנִי בּוֹרָא / אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם גִּילָה / וְעַמָּה מְשׁוּשׁ** 6:2+2+2

The syntactical hierarchy permits two divisions. If we let one of both divisions (**כִּי הֲנִי בּוֹרָא אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם גִּילָה / וְעַמָּה מְשׁוּשׁ** or **כִּי הֲנִי בּוֹרָא / אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם גִּילָה וְעַמָּה מְשׁוּשׁ**) prevail over the other, we come into conflict with the rule of metrical restriction (4+2 of 2+4).

Note the observation with regard to clause 17.1.

Clause 19.3 **וְלֹא־יִשְׁמַע בְּהַ עוֹד / קוֹל בְּכִי וְקוֹל זַעֲקָה** 6:3+3

The syntactical hierarchy also seems to permit a division between **בְּכִי** and **וְקוֹל**. This division also realize a grammatical balance, in a sense that each colon contains an object. This division however, conflicts with the metrical restriction (4+2). Therefore we choose the division 3+3. Note the observation with regard to clause 17.1.

- *The third rule* the combination of clauses with one stress, occurs five times:

Clause 16.1+2 **אֲשֶׁר + הַמַּתְבָּרֵךְ בָּאָרֶץ** 1 + 2 : 3

Complementary embedded clauses, because clause 16.1 is incomplete. A combination of clause 16.1 and 15.3 is not possible.

Clause 20.2+3 **אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֹא אֶת־יָמָיו + וְזָקֵן** 1 + 3 : 4

Complementary embedded clauses, because clause 20.2 is incomplete. A combination of the clauses 20.2 and 20.1 is possible (coordination), but complementary imbedding comes before coordination.

Clause 21.1+2 mJTB WNBW + WBCJW 2 + 1 : 3

Simple embedded clauses. Clauses 21.2 and 21.3 cannot be combined; clause 21.3 returns to a higher level in the syntactic hierarchy.

Clause 22.1+2 לא יבנו + ואחר ישב 1 + 2 : 3

Simple embedded clauses. Clauses 22.1 and 21.4 cannot be combined; Clauses 22.2 and 22.3 cannot be combined; clause 22.3 returns to a higher level in the syntactic hierarchy.

Clause 22.3+4 לא יטעו + ואחר יאכל 1 + 2

Simple embedded clauses. Clauses 22.3 and 22.4 cannot be combined; Note the observation with regard to clause 22.2.

Clause 25.4+5 ולא ירחיקו בכל־הר קדשי + לא ירעו 1 + 4 : 5

Coordination. Clauses 25.4 and 25.3 cannot be combined. The proposed combination conflicts with the prosodic rule that a colon can have two, three or four metrical units, but not five. We solve this problem by, after combining clauses 25.4 and 25.5, taking up the rules for clauses with more than four stresses: לא ירחיקו בכל־הר קדשי / לא ירעו 5:3+2. Also semantically, this is the most obvious categorization, because בכל־הר קדשי is a circumstantial clause both for לא ירעו and ולא ירחיקו.

4.3. The second operation: from colon to line

For the operation from colon to line, Van Grol has formulated four rules:

1. If two colons are connected by a relationship between sentences, by coordination or by embedding, they form a bicolon or, together with the next colon a tricolon, in case the next colon is not connected with the one that follows but with the former colons.

2. If in a sequence of colons with coordination and/or embedding, there is a choice of bicolon and tricolon, complementary embedding prevails over coordination and coordination over a different kind of embedding.

3. If in a sequence of five colons or more with coordination, there is a choice of bicolon and tricolon, the arrangement is determined by the exclusive grammatical balance.

4. If a colon is in no way grammatically connected with another colon, it forms a monocolon. In all other cases, we should at first disregard the possibility of a monocolon, as monocolons are tied to position and function and very rare.

13a α monocolon: לכן כה־אמר אדני יהוה

V. 13a α returns to a higher syntactical level than v. 12 (end), It can therefore not be combined with that colon. V. 13a α cannot be combined to form a tricolon, as v. 13a β , v. 13a γ , v. 13b and v. 14 represent an exclusive grammatical balance. As a monocolon, v. 13a α functions as an in-

roduction to the following text.

13a β bicolon: הנה עבדי יאכלו / ואתם תרעבו

Embedding. The first and second colon are connected by ו (with adversative meaning). Opening of the first line: see v. 13a α . End of the line: v. 13a γ ' returns to a higher syntactic level than v. 13a β ", so the two cannot be connected. The exclusive grammatical balance between v. 13a β , 13a γ and between v. 13b and v. 14 also determines the choice to combine these colons to one line.

13a γ bicolon: הנה עבדי ישתו / ואתם תצמאו

Embedding. Cf. v. 13a β .

13b bicolon: הנה עבדי ישמתו / ואתם תבשרו

Embedding. Cf. v. 13a β .

14a tricolon: / ומשבר רוח תלילו / ואתם תצעקו מכאב לב / הנה עבדי ראנו משוב-לב

Double embedding. End of the line: v. 15 is embedded in v. 13a β -14. The lines of v. 15 are connected by coordination. Coordination prevails over embedding. Besides, vs. 14a" and v. 14a' are chiasmatically connected. Cf. v. 13a β .

15a tricolon: / ולעבדיו יקרא שם אחר / והנחתם שמכם לשובעה לבחירי / והמיתך אדני יהוה /

Coordination. The combination of the second and the third colon can be seen as adversative to the first colon. Note the discussion on the syntactical hierarchy of the text (section 4.2.1.2). Opening of the line: see v. 14. End of the line: the colons of v. 16a are connected by complementary embedding, whereas v. 16a α is embedded in v. 15. Complementary embedding prevails over coordination and other kinds of embedding.

16a α bicolon: אשר המתברך בארץ / יתברך באלהי אמן

Simple complementary embedding (v. 16a α ' is the subjectclause of v. 16a α ").

16a β bicolon: והנשבע בארץ / ישבע באלהי אמן

Simple complementary embedding (v. 16a β ' is the subjectclause of v. 16a β ").

16b bicolon: כי נשכתו הצרות הראשנות / וכי נסחרו מעיני

Coordination. Opening of the clause: v. 16b returns to a higher syntactic level than v. 16a β . End of the clause: v. 17a returns to a higher syntactic level than v. 16 β . Moreover the colons of v. 16b form an exclusive grammatical balance and the colons of v. 17a form a complete clause.

17a tricolon: כי-הנני בורא / שמים חדשים / וארץ חדשה

One clause.

17b bicolon: ולא תזכרנה הראשנות / ולא תעלינה על-לב

Coordination. Opening of the line: v. 17a forms one clause. End of the line: v. 17b' and v. 17b" form an exclusive grammatical balance, which cannot be combined with v. 18a'.

18a tricolon: כי-אם-שישו / וגילו עדי-עד / אשר אני בורא

Coordination and embedding. Opening of the line: see v. 17b. End of the line: v. 18a" and v. 18b' cannot be combined because v. 18b returns to a

higher syntactic level.

18b tricolon: **כי הנני בורא / את-ירושלם גילה / ועמה משוש**

One clause.

19a bicolon: **וגלתי בירושלם / וששתי בעמי**

Simple coordination with exclusive grammatical balance. Opening of the line: the coordination of the colons is stronger than the embedding of v. 19a in v. 18b. End of the line: apart from the exclusive grammatical balance of the colons of v. 19a, v. 19b forms one clause which cannot be combined with v. 19a".

19b bicolon: **ולא-ישמע בה עוד / קול בכי וקול זעקה**

One clause.

20a bicolon: **לא-יהיה משם עוד עול ימים / וזקן אשר לא-ימלא את-ימיו**

Embedding.

20b bicolon: **כי הנער בן-מאה שנה ימות / והחוטא בן-מאה שנה יקלל**

Coordination with exclusive grammatical balance.

21a bicolon: **ובנו בתים וישבו / ונטעו כרמים ואכלו פרים**

Simple coordination with exclusive grammatical balance.

22a bicolon: **לא יבנו ואחר ישב / לא ישעו ואחר יאכל**

Coordination with exclusive grammatical balance.

22b bicolon: **כי-כימי העץ ימי עמי / ומעשה ידיהם יבלו בחירי**

Coordination End of the line: the colons of v. 23a form an exclusive grammatical balance, and cannot be combined with v. 22b".

23a bicolon: **לא ייגעו לריק / ולא ילדו לבהלה**

Coordination with exclusive grammatical balance.

23b bicolon: **כי רזע ברוכי יהוה המה / וצאצאיהם אתם**

Coordination. End of the line: the coordination of the colons of v. 23b prevails over the embedding of v. 24 in v. 23b. Moreover, in clauses 24.1 and 24.2, we find complementary embedding.

24 bicolon: **והיה טרם-יקראו ואני אענה / עוד הם מדבים ואני אשמע**

Embedding. In the first colon of v. 24, there is a double embedding, the former of which is complementary. The second colon of this line shows simple embedding. End of the line: v. 24b" cannot be combined with v. 25a', because v. 25a' returns to a higher syntactic level.

25a tricolon: **זאב וטלה ירעו כאחד / ואריה כבקר יאכל תבן / ונחש עפר לחמו**

Coordination. Opening of the line: v. 25a returns to a higher syntactic level, so it cannot be combined with v. 24b". End of the line: the second colon of v. 25b is complementary embedded in the first colon. Complementary embedding prevails over coordination.

25b α - β ' bicolon: **לא-ירעו ולא-ישחיתו / בכל-הר קדשי**

Complementary embedding. End of the line: v. 25b β " returns to a higher syntactic level.

25b β " monocolon: **אמר יהוה**

V. 25b β " returns to a higher syntactic level than v. 25ba-b' (it returns to

the level of v. 13a). V. 25ba-b' and v. 25bβ" cannot be combined. V. 25bβ" cannot be combined with Is 66:1 either. So, here we must speak of a monocolon. This monocolon represents the end of a piece of text.

4.4. The third operation: from line to strophe

For the operation from line to strophe, Van Grol has formulated five rules:

1. If two lines are connected by coordination or embedding, they form either a two-line strophe or a three-line strophe with the one that follows, providing the latter is connected with the preceding and not with the following lines.

2. If in a sequence of lines, connected by coordination and/or embedding, the third line is connected with the preceding line as well as with the fourth, it is a matter of two-line strophes, provided the fourth and fifth lines are not connected.

3. If in a sequence of lines, connected by coordination and/or embedding, we have the option of two and three-line strophes, complementary embedding prevails over coordination and coordination over other kinds of embedding.

4. If in a sequence of five or more lines, connected by coordination, we have the option of two and three-line strophes, the division is determined by exclusive grammatical balance.

5. If a line is in no way connected with another line, it forms a one-line strophe. In all other cases, we should be very careful with the nomination of one-line strophes, as they are tied to position and function and quite rare.

strophe 1 13aα לכן כה־אמר אדני יהוה

V. 13aα forms a monocolon. In the operation from colon to line, we have separated this colon from v. 13aβ. The exclusive grammatical balance of v. 13aβ, v. 13aγ, v. 13b and v. 14 determines the exclusion of v. 13aα from this sequence. Thus, it forms the first strophe of Is 65:13-25, consisting of only one line. This is functional, as v. 13aα forms the introduction of a larger piece of text.

strophe 2 13aβ הנה עבדי יאכלו / ואתם תרעבו

13aγ הנה עבדי ישתו / ואתם תצמאו

strophe 3 13b הנה עבדי ישמחו / ואתם תבשר

14a / הנה עבדי ראנו משוב לב / ואתם תצעקו מכאב לב /
ומשבר רוח תילילו

V. 13aβ-14a form a sequence of lines, which are connected by coordination and exclusive grammatical balance. The lines have a stereotype pat-

tern, opening the first colon of each lines with **הנה עבדי** and the second colon with **ואתם**. The third colon of v. 14 is a variation on this pattern in a sense that it continues the second colon of v. 14 in a chiasitic way. A slight demarcation can be made between v. 14 and v. 15. The lines of v. 15a-16aβ are connected with v. 13aβ-14 by embedding, but embedding is a looser connection than coordination. Besides, v. 15-16aβ form no part of the grammatical balance of v. 13aβ-14. V. 15a abandons the stereotype pattern (ydb(hnh in first colon and MT)w in the second colon) and the verb form changes. In v. 13aβ-14 we find just imperfectives, whereas v. 15a opens with a perfect consecutive. The clause type changes also: CNC in v. 13aβ-14, VC in v. 15a'.

V. 13aβ-14 would form a four-line strophe. However, this conflicts with the prosodic rule, putting that a strophe consists of one, two or three lines. We can apply the above mentioned second rule for the operation from line to strophe to the division of these four lines: It reads as follows: if in a sequence of coordinated lines, the third line (in this case v. 13b) is connected with both the previous lines (v. 13aβ-c) and the fourth line (v. 14a), which is not connected with the fifth (v. 15) though, it is a matter of two-line strophes. Therefore, we have split up these four lines (v. 13aβ-14a) in two two-line strophes: v. 13aβ-13aγ and v. 13b-14a. This division is supported by the semantic details of the text. The contradiction of "to eat/to drink" and "to hunger/to thirst are only found in the second strophe (v. 13aβ-13aγ), while the third strophe (v. 13b-14a) is dominated by a different contradiction: to rejoice/to sing for gladness as opposed to being ashamed/crying out for pain of heart/wailing for anguish of spirit.

The arrangement of the third strophe (v. 13aβ-14a) conflicts with the rule of metric restriction as formulated by Van Grol. For in this strophe, we find a colon of two metrical units as well as one of four metrical units (3 + 2/4 + 3 + 3). However, the total of prosodic, syntactic and semantic details are evident for the above mentioned division and outweigh the rule of metrical restriction.

strophe 4 15 והנחתם שמכם לשבועה לבחירי / והמיתך אדני
 יהוה / ולעבדיו יקרא שם אחר
 16aa אשר המתברך בארץ / יתברך באלהי אמן
 16ab והנשבע בארץ / ישבע באלהי אמן

In v. 15 the stereotype pattern of colons and lines of v. 13aβ-14 is abandoned. The opening of this strophe does remind of the previous strophes by sound association: the opening words of the colons of the lines of v. 13aβ-14 (**הנה** and **ואתם**) seem to have been joined together in the opening words of v. 15 (**והנחתם**).

The lines of this strophe are connected by a combination of embedding and coordination. V. 16aβ is coordinated to v. 16aα, while together these

lines are embedded in v. 15a by אשר. We notice the semantic relation between v. 15 (שבועה and שבע). The suggested strophe (v. 15-16aβ) conflicts with the rule of metrical restriction, because this strophe includes a colon of four as well as one of two metrical units (4 + 3 + 3/3 + 3/2 + 3). However, prosodic, syntactic and semantic data of the text would produce a prosodically less regular image, and in addition, the division would conflict with other textual information.

strophe 5 16b כי נשכחו הצרות הראשנות / וכי נסתרו מעיני

For two reasons v. 16b cannot be connected with strophe 4. In the first place, v. 16b returns to a higher level in the syntactic hierarchy and secondly, according to the prosodic rules, a four-line strophe is not possible. Neither can v. 16b be connected with the next strophe (v. 17a-18a), because v. 17a returns to a higher syntactical level than v. 16b. That's why we presume v. 16b is a one-line strophe. This is within the possibilities of prosodic rules, if at least the line has a distinct function at the opening or at the end of a piece of text. V. 16b forms the end of v. 13b-16aβ, and is a commentary on (or a summery of) v. 13b-14. At the same time, it has a close semantic relationship with the following part of the text. Thematically, the *troubles* return in v. 20a, v. 22a and v. 23a. See also *hurt* and *destroy* in v. 25bβ. הראשנות as well as שכח (to forget) occur in v. 17b. Thus, v. 16b functions as a hinge in the text of Is 65:13-25. It both concludes v. 13-16aβ and prepares v. 17-23. It is a postscript as well as a title.

strophe 6 17a כי־הנני בורא / שמים חדשים / וארץ חדשה
 17b ולא תזכרנה הראשנות / ולא תעלינה על־לב
 18a כי־אם־שישו / וגילו עדי־עד / אשר אני בורא

The strophe forms a sequence of clauses, connected by a combination of embedding and coordination. In v. 18b the text returns to a higher syntactic level. The coordinating lines v. 17b and v. 18a are embedded in v. 17a. They describe the result of the action in v.; 17a, first in a negative (v. 17b) and then in a positive way (v. 18a). Within the strophe we can point out a balance between v. 17a and v. 18a, in a sense that in v. 17a we find the suffix 1st sg and the participle ברא, and in v. 18a the pronoun 1st sg and the participle ברא. Furthermore the two objects in v. 17a balance with the two verbs in v. 18a. Besides, the strophe balances with the next strophe, both with respect to content and style.

strophe 7 18b כי הנני בורא / את־ירושלם גילה / ועמה משוש
 19a וגלתי בירושלם / וששתי בעמי
 19b ולא־ישמע בה עוד / קול בכי וקול זעקה

The lines of this strophe are connected by a combination of embedding and coordination. V. 19a and v. 19b together, are embedded in v. 18b.

They describe the results of the action, described in v. 18b. According to the rule for textual hierarchy that coordination prevails over embedding, we should take into account the possibility to make a demarcation between v. 18b and v. 19ab. Due to its return to a higher level in the textual hierarchy, v. 18b cannot be combined with the preceding line. This would result in a one-line strophe. However, one-line strophes are rare and must have a distinct function in the text (see rule 5 of the operation from line to strophe). It is therefore preferable to combine v. 18b with v. 19ab. In fact, this is the application of the first rule of the operation from line to strophe.

The unity of the strophe is confirmed by data with respect to content. V. 18b and v. 19a are connected by parallels: most words of the second and third colon of v. 18b return in a different order and form in v. 19a. The pattern is: A (ab) B(cd) // A'(ba) B'(dc). The structure of this strophe is comparable with that of the preceding strophe. After the description of an act of God (v. 18b; cf. v. 17a), follows a description of the results of this act in a positive (v. 19a; cf. v. 18a) and a negative way (v. 19b; cf. v. 17b). In this strophe as well as in the preceding one, we find passive forms of the verb in lines which describe in a negative way the results of the acts of God.

strophe 8	20a לא־יְהִיָּה מִשֵּׁם עוֹד עוֹל יָמִים / וּזְקַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֵא אֶת־יָמָיו 20b כִּי הִנֵּעַר בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יְמוֹת / וְהָחוּטָא בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יִקְלַל
-----------	---

The lines of this two-line strophe are connected by coordination. Like in the last two lines of the preceding strophe, the results of the acts of God are described first in a negative way (v. 20a), and then in a positive way (v. 20b). The strophe forms a semantic unit. It deals with the life span of the people. This theme comes up for the first time in Is 65:13-25 at this particular place and thereafter it does not occur until v. 22b. In each colon of this strophe, we find an expression of time. In the first line, we see a form of the word יוֹם (day): הַיָּמִים (v. 20a') and יָמָיו (v. 20a"). In the second line we see the word שָׁנָה (year): בֶּן מֵאָה שָׁנָה (v. 20b' and v. 20b"). In the first colons of both lines we find words with respect to a person of an early age: עוֹל יָמִים (v. 20a) and הִנֵּעַר. (v. 20b)

strophe 9	21 וּבִנּוּ בֵתִים וַיִּשְׁבוּ / וּנְטַעוּ כֶרֶמִים וְאָכְלוּ פֵרִים 22a לֹא יִבְנוּ וְאֲחַר יֵשֶׁב / לֹא יִטַּעוּ וְאֲחַר יֵאָכֵל
-----------	---

The lines of the ninth strophe are connected by coordination with exclusive grammatical balance. Each colon has two verbs. Besides, the recurring pattern of each colon is a main clause followed by a consecutive subordinate clause. Also semantically, this strophe forms a close unit. Here the subject "work" comes up for the first time and after

this it is repeated, be it in other words, in the second colon of v. 22b. The use of words in strophe 9 confirms the unity of the strophe. In both lines we find the same verbs (גנה, ישב, אכל). Like the preceding strophe, this one describes the results of the acts of God in v. 18b, first in a positive (v. 21) and then in a negative way (v. 22a).

strophe 10 22b כי-כימי העץ ימי עמי / ומעשה ידיהם יבלו בחירי
 23a לא ייגעו לריק / ולא ילדו לבהלה

The lines of this strophe are connected by coordination. The strophe opens with a NC. Here the themes *life span* and *work*, both come up in chiasitic order (ab//b'a': life span-work // work-life span). The results of Gods interference in v. 18b are first described in positive words (v. 22b) and then in negative words (v. 23a).

strophe 11 23b כי רזע ברוכי יהוה המה / וצאצאיהם אתם
 24 והיה טרם-יקראו ואני אענה / עוד הם מדבים
 ואני אשמע

The lines of this strophe are probably connected by embedding (see the discussion in section 4.2.1.2). Like the preceding one, this strophe opens with a NC. In both lines, we find the personal pronoun 3rd pl.: הֵמָּה (v. 23b') and הֵם (v. 24b). After the both positive and negative descriptions of the results of the act of God in v. 18b, this strophe is exclusively positive.

strophe 12 25a זאב וטלה ירעו כאחד / ואריה כבקר יאכל תבן /
 ונחש עפר לחמו
 25ba-b' לא-ירעו ולא-ישחיתו / בכל-הר קדשי

The lines of this strophe are connected by coordination. In v. 25b β ", the text returns to a higher syntactic level. Although v. 25b β " ends up with a one-line strophe, in this case this can be justified, as v. 25bb" forms a conclusion of a larger piece of text. The unity of this twelfth strophe (v. 25ab) is strengthened for reasons of an intertextual nature. V. 25ab is a (partial) quotation of Is 11:6-9.

strophe 13 25b β " אמר יהוה

See the discussion under strophe 11. The question is though, whether we should call such a short piece of text a strophe (cf. v. 13a).

4.5. The stanzas

In the division of stanzas of Is 65:13-25, we leave the opening colon (v. 13a α : לכן כה אמר אדני יהוה) and the concluding colon (v. 25b β "': אמר יהוה) aside. These colons function as the opening, respectively the con-

clusion of Is 65:13-25, but are not relevant for the division of strophes and stanzas.

The following scheme represents the text in prosodic structure, the last column indicating the metric structure: [s] = strophe en [S] = stanza.

13aα	לכן כה־אמר אדני יהוה	
13aβ	הנה עבדי יאכלו / ואתם תרעבו	sSI
13aγ	הנה עבדי ישתו / ואתם תצמאו	
13b	הנה עבדי ישמחו / ואתם תבשר	s
14a	הנה עבדי ראנו משוב לב / ואתם תצעקו מכאב לב / ומשבר רוח תילילו	
15	והנחתם שמכם לשבועה לבחירי / והמיתך אדני יהוה / ולעבדיו יקרא שם אחר	sSII
16aa	אשר המתברך בארץ / יתברך באלהי אמן	
16ab	והנשבע בארץ / ישבע באלהי אמן	
16b	כי נשכחו הצרות הראשנות / וכי נסתרו מעיני	s
17a	כי־הנני בורא / שמים חדשים / וארץ חדשה	sSIII
17b	ולא תזכרנה הראשנות / ולא תעלינה על־לב	
18a	כי־אם־שישו / וגילו עדי־עד / אשר אני בורא	
18b	כי הנני בורא / את־ירושלם גילה / ועמה משוש	s
19a	וגלתי בירושלם / וששתי בעמי	
19b	ולא־ישמע בה עוד / קול בכי וקול זעקה	
20a	לא־יהיה משם עוד עול ימים / וזקן אשר לא־ימלא את־ימיו	sSIV
20b	כי הנער בן־מאה שנה ימות / והחוטא בן־מאה שנה יקלל	
21	ובנו בתים וישבו / ונטעו כרמים ואכלו פרים	s
22a	לא יבנו ואחר ישב / לא יטעו ואחר יאכל	
22b	כי־כימי העץ ימי עמי / ומעשה ידיהם יבלו בחירי	sSV
23a	לא ייגעו לריק / ולא ילדו לבהלה	
23b	כי רזע ברוכי יהוה המה / וצאצאיהם אתם	s
24	והיה טרם־יקראו ואני אענה / עוד הם מדבים ואני אשמע	
25a	זאבוטלה ירעו כאחד / ואריה כבקר יאכלתבן / ונחש עפר לחמו	sSVI
25ba-b'	לא־ירעו ולא־ישחיתו / בכל־הר קדשי	

25bβ" אמר יהוה

Is 65:13aβ-25bβ' consists of six stanzas of a quiet regular structure, with regard to the prosody. Stanza III finds itself in the centre of the text. It is a stanza of two three-line strophes. This long six-line stanza is surrounded by four stanzas of four lines each. Stanza I (v. 13aβ-14), stanza IV (v. 20a-22a) and stanza V (v. 22b-24) each consist of two two-line strophes. Stanza II (v. 15-16) consists of a three-line strophe and a one-line strophe. Only the last stanza of the text (v. 25) is shorter and consists of only one two-line strophe.

Stanza I (v. 13aβ-14) consists of lines which are highly identical in structure. The colons are ordered by means of a stereotype pattern, which only appears in the first stanza. The colons are alternately introduced by 'הנה עבד' and 'ואתם'. Only v. 14a" shows a slight deviation. This can be accounted for by the concluding function of this colon.

Stanza II (v. 15-16) abandons the characteristic structure of the first stanza, although its opening is linked up with this first stanza by sound association: MTxnhw combines hnh and MT). This stanza is less regular than the other stanzas. The second strophe of this stanza (v. 16b) is shorter than the first (v. 15-16a). Moreover, the function of v. 16b seems to pass the limits of this stanza. It concludes stanzas I-II (v. 13aβ-16a) and introduces stanzas III-VI (v. 17a-25b).

Stanza III (v. 17-18a) is clearly a unit. The two strophes of this stanza are connected by a semantic balance, showing the pattern ABC A'C'B'. The symbol A is indicative to lines describing an act of God, introduced by בורא כִּי הֵנִי ("For behold, I create": v. 17a and v. 18b). The symbol B is indicative to lines, describing the results of this act in a negative way and is introduced by וְלֹא. The events do not longer take place. The symbol C, at last, is indicative to lines describing the positive results of the act of God. And act of rejoicing of the people (v. 18a) and of God (v. 19a). The element A does not occur but in this stanza, whereas the elements B and C occur in the following stanzas as well.

Stanza IV (v. 20a-22a) contains two themes, each of them covering a separate strophe. In strophe 8 (v. 20a-b) we find the theme *span of life*, while in strophe 9 (v. 21-22a) we find the theme *work*. In the following stanzas these two themes together covers one strophe. In this stanza the elements B and C of stanza III are worked out in detail. The negative description of the results of the act of God (element B) is found in v. 20a and v. 22a; the positive description (element C) in v. 20b and v. 21. Thus, this stanza shows a chiasmic ordering of the lines: BC-C'B'.

Stanza V (v. 22b-24) forms, with regard to the syntax, a unit, sofar as both strophes open with a NC, introduced by כִּי (v. 22b' and v. 23b). This NC includes an utterance about the people. The rest of the text is a description of the result of this utterance: pleasure out of work, no efforts to no avail, no production of children to be brought in ruin (v. 22b"-23b); before they call and speak, God will answer and hear (v. 24). The unity of this stanza is confirmed by two semantic lines. The first line runs from *tree* (v. 22b: יָדָעַי) via *seed* (v. 23b: זֶרַע) to *offspring* (v. 23b: יִצְאָאֲיָדָהָם: also sprout; shoot). The second line runs from *my people* (v. 22b) via *my chosen* (v. 22b) to *the blessed of the Lord* (v. 23b). The themes *span of life* and *work* occur in strophe 10 (v. 22b-23a): in v. 22b' and 23a" we find the theme *span of life* and in v. 22b" and v. 23a' the theme *work*. Like stanza VI, this stanza elaborates the elements B and C of stanza III. The negative description of the results of the act of God (element B) is found in v. 23a; the positive description (element C) in v. 22b and v. 23b-24. Thus, the elements B and C in this stanza show an ordering according to the pattern CBC". In this stanza, the positive description prevails.

Stanza VI (v. 25) consists of only one strophe. It is shorter than the other stanzas. This can be explained for by its concluding function. Besides, the intertextual connection between this stanza and Is 11:6-9 might be responsible for its somewhat isolated position from the rest of the text.

In the following scheme, we summarize the devision of stanzas in Is 65:13-25:

<i>Stanza</i>	<i>strophe + number</i>	<i>element ABC</i>
	1 (13aα)	
I	2 (13aβ-aγ)	2
	3 (13b-14)	2
II	4 (15-16a)	3
	5 (16b)	1 (B)
III	6 (17-18a)	3 ABC
	7 (18b-19)	3 A'B'
IV	8 (20)	2 B'C'
	9 (21-22a)	2 C'B"
V	10 (22b-23a)	2 C"B"
	11 (23b-24)	2 C'"

VI	12 (25)	2
	13 (25bβ")	

In a previous article we have, by means of some stylistic details, pointed out the close unity of Is 65:17-23¹³.

In this text, which has a clear-cut structure, three frequently recurring elements can be pointed out. Sigla A points at lines in which an incidence of intervention by God is described, introduced by **כִּי הִנְנִי בּוֹרֵא** ("For behold, I create": v. 17a and v. 18b). Sigla B points at lines in which an event is described which does not take place anymore, introduced by **לֹא** or **וְלֹא**. The negation is each time repeated twice (v. 17b; v. 19b-20a; v. 22a; v. 23a). Finally, sigla C points at lines which are introduced by **כִּי** (in v. 18a: **כִּי־אֵם**), in these an event is described which is contrary to that in B (v. 18a; vv. 20b-21; v. 22b; v. 23b).

Examining the structure, it is remarkable that element A only occurs twice, whereas the elements B and C occur four times each. Besides it strikes that the elements A, B and C are twice as long in v. 18b-21b (A',B',C') as the same elements in the rest of the text (1 line :: 2 lines).

The stylistic division of the text according to these semantic elements gives occasion to the supposition of a division in strophes of Is 65:17-23, which is different compared to the one we found above through prosodic and grammatical and syntactical data:

I	A (v. 17a)	B (v. 17b)	C (v. 18a)
II	A'(v. 18b-19a)	B'(v. 19b-20a)	C'(v. 20b-21)
III	B"(v. 22a)	C"(v. 22b)	
IV	B'''(v.23a)	C'''(v. 23b)	

However, this alternative structure of Is 65:17-23 according to the most obvious semantic information, also present us with a few problems:

1. Sigla C points at lines which are introduced by **כִּי**. The question is, however, whether we should class **כִּי־אֵם** (v. 18a) with **כִּי** (v. 20b; v. 22b; v. 23b). Moreover, the lines of sigla A are also introduced by **כִּי** (v. 17a and v. 18b: **כִּי הִנְנִי**).

2. Sigla C includes the description of an event which is contrary to that in B, we said before. However, we should ask if this is right. See, for instance, the sigla B' (v. 19b-20a) and C'(v. 20b-21). V. 20b' might be considered

¹³ J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN, The Influence and Development of Is 65,17 into 1 En. 91,16, in: J. VERMEYLEN (éd.), *The Book of Isaiah. Le Livre d'Isaïe. Les oracles et leurs relectures. Unité et complexité de l'ouvrage* (BETL LXXXI), Leuven 1989, 161-166.

a contradiction of v. 20a', but which is the contradiction in the other colons of C' in relation to the colons of B'?

3. The return of the text to a higher level in the syntactic hierarchy in v. 20 (לָל), which causes a syntactic demarcation with the previous clause, has been disregarded in this structure.

However, the recurring succession of two negations in Is 65:17-23 remains a striking detail: v. 17b (2x לָל), vs. 19b-20a (לָל/לָל), v. 22a (2x לָל) and v. 23a (לָל/לָל). This, plus the fact that the double negation is each time followed by כִּי (except for v. 18a (כִּי־לָל)) is however striking enough to at least consider a possible influence of such stylistic details in the structure of Is 65:13-25. Should we speak here of one structure beside another?

5. The position of v. 16b and v. 24-25

In this article, we have tried to determine the structure of Is 65:13-25, by means of the prosodic, the syntactic and the semantic details of the text. So far, little is known about the function of the syntactic hierarchy in the structure of texts. Therefore, further discussion into the syntactic hierarchy of Is 65:13-25 is most advisable. We are uncertain about a few points ourselves. A different decision as to specific points may cause a different structure of the text.

Now we return to the question about the position of v. 16b and v. 24-25 in this text.

5.1. The position of v. 16b

We have pointed out the uncertainty in the current studies about the position of v. 16b in the structure of this chapter. According to some, v. 16b belongs to the preceding text (v. 13-16a), according to others it forms the beginning of v. 17-23(25) (section 3.1).

We have shown that the two colons of v. 16b forms one line (section 4.3), and most probably also one strophe (section 4.4). Together with the preceding one (v. 15-16a), this strophe forms a stanza (see section 4.5). The description of the *syntactic hierarchy* of the clauses (section 4.2.1.2) explains that v. 16b belongs to a higher textual level than v. 16a. therefore, v. 16b and v. 16a are unlikely to form one strophe. V. 16b is connected with the הַהֲה־clauses of v. 13aβ-14. We were, however, not sure whether this was a connection by coordination or by embedding. Besides, as to syntax, we were not completely sure, if either v. 17a returns to a higher syntactical level than v. 16b, or both lines are on the same level. In the first case, it would be impossible for v. 16b and v. 17a to form one strophe, which in the second case they could indeed. As there are also prosodic arguments against a connection

of v. 16b and v. 17a, the categorization of v. 16b as one strophe seems to be the most likely option.

From a *semantic* point of view, v. 16b functions as the conclusion of stanza II (v. 15-16b) or of the two stanzas I and II (v. 13a β -16b). It is a commentary on and a summary of what precedes.

At the same time, v. 16b functions as an introduction to v. 17-25. It gives a summary of the contents of these verses. We can point out a number of semantic connections between v. 16b and v. 17-25: הַצְרוּת הַרְאֵשְׁנוֹת (the former troubles) anticipates on v. 17b; v. 19b-20a; v. 22a and v. 23a. Possibly, we should include v. 25b β " (שָׁחַת/יָרַע). Apart from v. 16b, in TJ this form of רָאֵשׁן (רְאֵשְׁנוֹת: fem. plur., plus the article) only occurs in v. 17c. Cf. שָׁחַח (to forget) v. 17b (וְלֹא תִשְׁכַּח / וְלֹא תִשְׁכַּח) and סָתַר (to hide) v. 19b (וְלֹא יִשְׁמַע בָּהּ עוֹד) and v. 20a (לֹא יִהְיֶה מִשָּׁם עוֹד).

Summarizing, we find that on the one hand, v. 16b is included in the prosodic structure of Is 65:13a β -16a. The line is linked to v. 13a β -14 on the level of syntactic hierarchy. Besides, v. 16b forms a strophe, and with the preceding strophe (v. 15-16a) the strophe is combined to a stanza. On the other hand, semantically speaking, v. 16b seems to run ahead of the events in v. 17-23. All this might be an indication for a hinge function of v. 16b. It concludes v. 13-16a and at the same time it introduces v. 17-23. It is a postscript to v. 13-16a, while at the same time it forms the title of v. 17-23 (25).

5.2. The position of v. 24-25

There is uncertainty concerning the place of v. 24-25 in the structure of this chapter. According to some neither v. 24 nor v. 25 belongs to the structure of Is 65:13-23. According to others it does belong to the structure of this chapter indeed (section 3. 2).

In the description of the *syntactic hierarchy* of the clauses (section 4. 2. 1. 2) we have pointed out that v. 25b β " returns to the level of v. 13a α . Together, v. 13a α and 25b β form the framework of v. 13ab-25b β . We were uncertain about the position of v. 24 in the syntactic hierarchy. Which is the connection of v. 24 with the preceding text? Could this be a case of embedding? If so, v. 24 describes the consequence of what precedes (v. 18b-23), and v. 24 and v. 23b might form one strophe. However, we may not ignore the possibility that v. 24 returns to a higher level in the syntactical hierarchy than v. 23b. This would imply a division between v. 23b and v. 24 and, as consequence, the impossibility of v. 23b and v. 24 forming one strophe. In section 4.3 we have shown that the colons of v. 24 form one line (bicolon), whereas the colons of v. 25 form three lines (tricolon, bicolon and monocolon). In section 4.4 we have suggested the possibility of v. 24 and v. 23b forming one strophe. The first two lines of v. 25 also form a strophe, while the last line of v. 25 (as a

strophe?) concludes the whole piece of text. V. 23b-24 form a stanza together with the preceding strophe (v. 22b-23a), while v. 25a-b β ' form the last stanza of the section as an independent strophe (section 4.5).

A different decision on the level of syntactic hierarchy may have its effect on the division in stanzas and strophes. If וְהִידָּהּ (v. 24a) returns to a higher syntactic level than v. 23b a combination of v. 24 and v. 23b is impossible. In that case a different strophe categorization of Is 65:22b-25 is possible: v. 22b together with v. 23b, and v. 24 together with v. 25. This would make v. 22b-25 consist of two three-line strophes. Together they form one six-line stanza.

In section 4.4 we have stated the arguments for the first mentioned division of strophes. For the alternative division we can give the following arguments:

1. The textual elements we have indicated by the sigla A, B en C (section 4.5) only occur in Is 65:17-23. This piece of text forms a close semantic and stylistic unit.

2. Two semantic lines connects v. 23b with v. 22b-23a. The first line runs from *tree* (v. 22b: דָּוַעַץ) via *seed* (v. 23b: זֶרַע) to *offspring* (v. 23b: וְצִאצִּיאוֹתֶיהָ). The second line runs from *my people* (v. 22b) via *my chosen* (v. 22b) to *the blessed of the Lord* (v. 23b). These semantic lines are not continued into v. 24. This might be an argument for the combination of v. 23b and v. 22b-23a in one strophe.

3. Elements of v. 24-25 have there counterpart in elements of Is 65, outside Is 65:13-25, namely v. 12 en v. 1: קָרָא: v. 1a β ; v. 12a β ; עֲנָה: v. 12a β ; דָּבַר: v. 12a β , vgl. v. 1ab (אָמַר); שָׁמַע: v. 12a β (cf. v. 19b); רָעָה / אָכַל / לָחַם: v. 10a (לָנוּה צֶאֱן; לָרַבִּץ בָּקָר), cf. v. 13a β - γ ; v. 21b; v. 22a; רָעָה: v. 12b; שָׁחַת: cf. v. 12b (חָפֵץ for contrast?). V. 1, v. 12 and v. 24-25 form the framework of Is 65. In this framework the relationship of God and his audience comes up explicitly. In the course of Is 65, the relationship between God and his audience seems to become more and more close. Here the contradiction in v. 12b and v. 25b β is particularly striking.

4. In a division in two three-line strophes together forming one stanza (v. 22b-23b and v. 24-25b) we notice the analogy in length with stanza III (v. 17-19): two strophes of three lines each. Also with respect to content, stanza III and v. 22b-25 have several things in common. In both stanzas the relationship of God and the people is given particular attention. In stanza III God makes Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy (v. 18b); God rejoices about the renewing of Jerusalem (v. 19a). In v. 19a" *my people* is mentioned, whereas in v. 22b both *my people* and *my chosen* are mentioned, in v. 23c *the blessed of the Lord* and in v. 24: *Before they call I will answer, while they are yet speaking I will hear*. The intermediate stanza (v. 20-22a) is much more detached in tone. It deals with the span of life of the people and their work.

There is also a connection between the complaint in v. 19b that will no longer be heard ("no longer will be *heard* the call of crying and the call of

weeping") and v. 24 ("Before they call I will answer, while they are yet speaking I will *hear*"). The complaint will no longer be uttered because God answers and hears, even before they call and while they are yet speaking. Besides, there is the similarity of *Jerusalem* (v. 18b and v. 19a) and *the mountain of my glory* (v. 25b).

Whichever division of v. 22b-25 is preferred, it may be clear that v. 24-25 are prosodically, syntactically and also semantically included in the structure of Is 65:13-25. Besides, these verses show connections, particularly with v. 1 and v. 12, which pass the limits of Is 65:13-25. V. 24-25 together with v. 1 and v. 12 form the framework of Is 65.

This is not the moment to go into the place of v. 25a more specifically; it should be discussed in its intertextual relationship with Is 11:9.2.

A PROPHET ON THE SCREEN
Computerized Description And Literary
Interpretation Of Isaianic Texts

edited by

E. Talstra
A.L.H.M. van Wieringen O.S.A.



VU University Press
Amsterdam 1992

The editors of the series APPLICATIO are:

Prof.dr. H. Leene / prof.dr. E. Talstra
Faculty of Theology of the Vrije Universiteit
De Boelelaan 1105
1081 HV Amsterdam
The Netherlands

The following titles have been published in the series APPLICATIO:

- 1 E. Talstra
II Kön. 3. Etüden zur Textgrammatik
isbn 90-6256-473-9 (1983)
- 2 A. van der Wal / E. Talstra
Amos. Concordance and Lexical Surveys
isbn 90-6256-264-7 (1984)
- 3 A. van der Wal
Amos. A classified Bibliography
isbn 90-6256-188-8 (1986) third edition
- 4 J. Bastiaans / W. Beuken / F. Postma
Trito-Isaiah. An exhaustive Concordance of Isa. 56-66, especially with
reference to Deutero-Isaiah. An example of computer assisted research
isbn 90-6256-185-3 (1984)
- 5 T. Mekking
De Romeinen en de dood (3 delen)
isbn 90-6256-146-2 (1985)
- 6 A. van der Wal
Nahum, Habakkuk
A classified Bibliography, with a special paragraph concerning
literature on the Qumran Commentaries on Nahum and Habakkuk
isbn 90-6256-662-6 (1988)
- 7 Computer Assisted Analysis of Biblical Texts
Papers read at the Workshop on the Occasion of the Tenth Anniversary
of the "Werkgroep Informatica" Faculty of Theology Vrije Universiteit,
Amsterdam November, 5 - 6, 1987
isbn 90-6256-758-4 (1989)
- 8 A. van der Wal
Micah
A classified Bibliography
isbn 90-6256-814-9 (1990)