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A difficult crux interpretum in the book of Isaiah has been the last verse in Isaiah's inaugural vision (Is 6:13). The fact that the famous St. Mark's Isaiah scroll from Qumran (1QIsa) reads b mh instead of the MT bm aside from another textual variant has led W. H. Brownlee, F. Hvidberg, S. Ivry, W. F. Albright and G. R. Driver¹ to extraordinary reinterpretations which make this text refer to a typical "high place." These reconstructions with their emendations are reflected in the NEB's rendering of Is 6:13 which follows the LXX in omitting the last clause, "a holy seed is its stump." The NEB reads thus:

Even if a tenth part of its people remain there,
they too will be exterminated
[like an oak or a terebinth,
a sacred oak thrown out from its place in a hill-shrine].

It should be noted that the omission of the last clause ignores its presence not only in the Targumim and Peshitta but particularly in 1QIsa which supports the MT providing superior textual evidence in favor of retaining "a holy seed is its stump." It is our purpose to discuss briefly major scholarly reconstruction of Is 6:13 before we proceed to discuss the Hebrew text phrase by phrase.

1. Emendational Reconstructions

As early as 1951 W. H. Brownlee attempted to reconstruct the Hebrew text of Is 6:13 with the aid of the reading mlkh and bmh of 1QIsa in place of the hepax legomenon bšlt and bm of

the MT. The reading hmh is associated with mšḥt, "a sacred column of a high place," and the phrase "and as the terebinth" is transposed to a position after mšlkṭ for the sake of poetic parallelism and metrical reconstruction. The translation he offers is as follows:

"And if there be yet a tenth in it,  
It in turn shall be for burning,  
As an oak when it is thrown down,  
and as the terebinth by the sacred column of  
a high place."²

Among the problems of Brownlee's reconstruction are the following: (1) The lack of textual or versitional support for his transposition of mšlkṭ and the separation of the phrase "and as a terebinth or as an oak."³ (2) The omission of the last phrase of 6:13 in 1QIs.³ (3) The rendering of hmh as "the sacred column of a high place."²

As a matter of fact Brownlee has pointed out in a more recent publication that the intended meaning of hmh is not related to the idea of a high place.⁴

In 1955 F. Hvidberg's article appeared with another translation for Is 6:13 also based on 1QIs⁶:

"Like the terebinth and the oak, that lie flung down (μυσλοεκόετ, see 1 Kgs. 13 vv. 24, 25, 28) upon the masseba in the bama. The holy seed is its (the bama's) masseba!"⁵

He interprets "the holy seed" by resorting to Is 17:10-11 and considers this term as an expression of Ba'āl's virility. The masseboth in the holy places and their holy seed are interpreted as the spirits of an alien god which shall be destroyed altogether.

S. Iwry also worked on the basis of 1QIs independently of both

² Brownlee, 297f.
⁵ Hvidberg, p. 99.
Brownlee and Hvidberg. He resorts to four emendations in his reconstruction (\([w]\)'śr[h] \([h]\)mšlkt \([m]\)mšbṭ hmḥ) and treats the last clause (\(zr' qdš msbṭh\)) as a later added gloss:

"Like a terebinth, or an oak, or an Asherah,
When flung down from the sacred column
of a high place."\(^6\)

With two emendations W. F. Albright recast this verse into a poetic form. He reads also 'šr[h] for 'śr, pluralizes mšbṭ and adds h so that he arrives at the following translation:

"Like the terebinth goddess and the oak of Asherah,
Cast out with the stelae of the high place."\(^7\)

Albright's own freedom with regard to his emendational reconstruction, with the omission of the entire last clause which is textually well supported, is quite surprising in view of his own verdict that "we may rest assured that the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, though not infallible, has been preserved with an accuracy perhaps unparalleled in any other Near-Eastern literature."\(^8\)

This representative survey has indicated that a number of recent scholars have dealt with the Hebrew text of Is 6:13 with an unusual degree of freedom. Emendations, transpositions, and omissions have been their rule. No communis opinio has been achieved. It seems, therefore, mandatory to discuss the individual phrases of Is 6:13 in some detail.

2. The Hebrew Text

The consonantal text of the first phrase of vs. 13 is w'wḏ bh 'šryḥ. The ordinal 'šryḥ, "tenth," an attributive adjective,\(^9\) is translated in the LXX with to epidekaton.

N. H. Tur-Sinai suggests the translation "a (group of) ten (men)" for 'šryḥ.\(^10\) But 'šryḥ is an ordinal and the context does not cor-

\(^6\) Iwry, p. 232.
\(^7\) Albright, VTS, 4, 255.
respond with that of Amos 5:3 or Gn 18:32 which is cited as proof for the suggested meaning.

Recently R. Fey commented on the “tenth” of our passage. According to his view vs. 13 refers to the destruction of the tenth part of the “field’s produce” (Feldertrag) based on Is 5:10. The idea that the “tenth” represents the “field’s produce” cannot be upheld. Contextually ‘šryḥ refers to the people of the land (h’rs, vs. 12). In vs. 11 the destruction of the cities and the land is described; vs. 12 refers to the removal of the people of which there will be a remnant. But vs. 13a indicates that even this small remnant (‘šryḥ) shall again be consumed.

In the second Hebrew phrase wšḥḥ wḥyth lb’r (vs. 13b) the Piel inf. cstr. of the verb b’r has been variously interpreted. The LXX translates eis pronomēn, “for foraging,” and Symmachus employs the synonym kataphoskēsin, “for a feeding.” This seems to point to the picture of animals grazing on the land. A number of scholars, however, take b’r in this text to mean “burning,” which is also the suggested meaning for this text by L. Köhler. On the other hand, it is to be observed with K. Budde, J. P. Seierstad, H. Wildberger and others that in

---

17J. P. Seierstad, Die Offenbarungserlebnisse der Propheten Amos, Jesaja und Jeremia (Oslo, 1946), pp. 107f.
both Is 3:14 and 5:5 b'r in the Piel is used for the "grazing" of animals in the vineyard (of Yahweh). Since in these two passages the object of b'r, "grazing," is Israel as represented by the vineyard, the same meaning of "consume, devour" seems appropriate also for 6:13.

The reference to trees in the phrase k'lh wk'lw (vs. 13c) is of great importance for the understanding of msbt in the next part (vs. 13d). If 'lh and 'lw are literal trees, then msbt, being part of the relative clause with šr, stands in thought-relation to 'lh and 'lw and cannot have the connotation of "stone-pillar" or "sacred column." The meaning of a "stump" or "root-stock" which is left standing after the felling of the literal trees would be the natural corollary.

Both Iwry and Albright felt the inconsistency in translating "sacred column" for msbt. Iwry defends his translation by stating,

In Canaanite cultic tradition Elt and Atrl are synonymous names for the same goddess. As trees they represent female deities, and frequently in the Bible they are found in conjunction with massêbôt and bâmôt. . . .

Albright is quick to point out,

Here we have first 'elah, literally 'the goddess,' Canaanite 'Elat, whose name is also coupled with that of Asherah in the Ugaritic epics. Her tree, par excellence, was the terebinth, to which her name came eventually to be applied in Hebrew. . . .

Only if 'lh and 'lw are interpreted as representing female deities is the translation "sacred column" for msbt justified.

As ingenious as this interpretation may seem, the comparison of 'lh and 'lw with 'Elat, Anath, or Astarte is unfounded. Neither


Iwry, p. 230.

Albright, VTS, 4, 255.

It is significant that in one of Albright's latest publications in which he
the LXX nor the Targum nor the Peshitta, much less the MT, provides any hint or even remotely suggests that such an interpretation is warranted.

Ivan Engnell's view is that 'lh and 'lwn refer to the ideological world of sacral kingship symbolizing the tree of life concept.\(^{24}\) He sees the msbt as embracing both the "Tammuz" figure and the king. A. Mackay suggests that 'lh and 'lwn refers to the male and female palm-tree pillar of the temple.\(^{25}\) A crucial problem pertains to the interpretation of Israelite concepts on the basis of cultic concepts of extrabiblical religions. It is imperative to investigate the way Isaiah uses 'lh. A passage which throws light on the meaning of the reference to 'lh and 'lwn in 6:13 is Is 1:29f. The term 'lh is employed in Is 1:29f. in a twofold sense. In vs. 29 Isaiah refers to the 'lh as a cult object in connection with the gardens of delight, the centers of idol worship. Albright has pointed out correctly that the oak was a cult object consecrated to the goddess Asherah.\(^{26}\) This cult object with its cult\(^{27}\) had become an object of the prophet's attacks.\(^{28}\) In vs. 30 Isaiah refers to 'lh again, but this time in a literal sense using the term as an object lesson for his people. Hence, it is clear that 'lh stands as a symbol for the cult and the people of Judah. The withering of the oak referred to in vs. 30 symbolizes the consummation of false religion and its ungodly followers.

This writer, therefore, suggests that 'lh and 'lwn in Is 6:13 are used with subtle reference to their cultic use but primarily as representing the people of Judah who follow the abominable practices of the Canaanites. The felling of the 'lh and 'lwn thus speaks of the deification of the "terebinth" and "oak" and citing biblical passages which refer to these trees no word is said about Is 6:13; see his Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan (Garden City, N.Y., 1968), pp. 180-191.

\(^{24}\) I. Engnell, The Call of Isaiah (Uppsala, 1949), p. 49.

\(^{25}\) A. Mackay, "The Sign of the Palm Tree," CQR, 126 (1938), 187-212.

\(^{26}\) Albright, VTS, 4, 255.


\(^{28}\) Wildberger, pp. 71f.
appears to be a picture of the destruction of pagan religion and the death of those who worship under the sacred trees.

Now we turn to the phrase 'šr bšlkt mšht bm. Both Iwry and Albright propose 'šrh for 'šr. This emendation is made for two reasons: (1) to make the text agree with the idea that vs. 13 is a descriptive statement of a "typical cultic bamah," and, (2) for the sake of poetry. What has been pointed out above, namely that no other manuscript in Hebrew, Greek, or Aramaic allows such an interpretation, must be repeated. The introduction of a "high place" does not fit the content of the message of Is 6. Emendation for the sake of poetry is highly subjective and is not in harmony with current views. Present-day scholars caution against emending a text to reconstruct its poetic form. Iwry argues that 'šr has no place in a poetical verse and that the final h was dropped because of haplology. However, Brownlee rightly defends the presence of 'šr rejecting Iwry's double emendation. It also has to be pointed out against Iwry that 'šr occurs indeed before a participle elsewhere in the OT (Gn 7:8; Dt 1:4; 3:2; 4:6).

Albright makes only two important emendations ('šr[h] and

29 Albright, VTS, 4, 255.
30 O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, An Introduction (New York, 1965), p. 59: "It is open to question whether in the grouping together of short verses or in the parallelism of the members in the long verses it is also possible to go further and to recognize metrical regularity as well. . . The utmost caution is necessary, especially in view of the fact that no traditions concerning Hebrew prosody have come down to us." See also S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (Cleveland, 1963), pp. 361ff.; G. Fohrer, "Uber den Kurzvers," ZAW, 66 (1954), 209; Arthur Weiser, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development (New York, 1966), pp. 24ff.
31 Iwry, p. 228, explains that the final h of 'šr(h) was dropped as it was read together with the article h of the Hophal participle hmšlkt, reading m instead of b. The h of the participle too was later lost.
32 Brownlee, Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls, p. 238 n. 4 states that "... it is a mistake to make an invariable rule out of the tendency of poetry to omit particles. They may sometimes be included for the very purpose of filling out the rhythmic value of a stich. For the use of 'šR in Isaianic poetry, cf. the following examples from the first eleven chapters: 1:29 (twice); 1:30; 2:20, 22; 5:5; 7:25; 11:16 (the last two passages being later additions). The double emdation which Iwry has to perform upon the word at 6:13 makes his results even less convincing."
in order to read poetry throughout. Yet, his translation still identifies the trees with fertility goddesses. These emendations and interpretations are based on purely subjective viewpoints. The following considerations will indicate why we are unable to accept them.

The expression *bšltk* which is made up of the prefix *b* and the Piel-type noun from *šlk* is a *hapax legomenon*. The form of *bšltk* may be considered either as a Piel inf. cstr. with a feminine ending\(^{33}\) or as a feminine singular noun. 1QIs\(^{a}\) has a different reading. Instead of *bšltk* St. Mark's Scroll has *mšlkt*, a Hophal part. fem. sing. To determine the original reading is difficult. The identical Hophal participial form appears four times in the Old Testament.\(^{34}\) The undisputed *lectio difficilior* is however MT's *bšltk* and its presence in the original text is likely to be understood as a Piel inf.\(^{35}\) It is interesting to note that in a number of places where the Hebrew has *b* with the Qal or Piel inf. the LXX invariably renders these constructions with *hotan* and the subjunctive mood.\(^{36}\) This also holds true for our text. It is there-

\(^{33}\) So Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965), I, 265. Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah,* p. 203, comments: "... *shalleceth* here does not refer to the act itself of felling or casting away, but rather to the condition of a tree that has been hewn or thrown down; though not to the condition of the trunk as it lies prostrate upon the ground, but to that of the root, which is left in the earth."

\(^{34}\) 1 Ki 13:24, 25, 28; Is 36:30.

\(^{35}\) Against this view, see John Sawyer, "The Qumran Reading of Isaiah 6:13," *ASThl*, 3 (1964), 113, who does not give an alternate suggestion except the assumption that the syntax could have been different in the original.

\(^{36}\) Compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ki 1:15</td>
<td><em>bprsḵm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:19</td>
<td><em>bqwwm</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:9</td>
<td><em>bswmw</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:25</td>
<td><em>bnpt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:13</td>
<td><em>bšltk</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hotan ekteinēte</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hotan anastēi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hotan apherōmai</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hotan ṭesōsin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hotan ekPesēi</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison indicates the consistency with which the LXX translators of Isaiah have rendered *b* with the infinitive with *hotan* and the corresponding subjunctive. The translation of the temporal *hotan* (when, whenever) for *b* is possible as *b* and the infinitive do have temporal meaning. See Oskar Grether, *Hebräische Grammatik für den akademischen Unterricht* (Glückstadt, 1955), p. 90.
fore possible that the LXX translators had *b*Lk* in their Vorlage instead of *m*Lk* and understood it as a Piel inf. estr. However, a comparison can be made between 1QIs* and Symmachus’ version. Both have feminine participles (*m*Lk*, *apobalousa*) and may reflect Targumic influence.37

The noun *m*Lb* appears again only in 2 Sa 18:18 where it means “standing-stone.”38 The LXX in Is 6:13 has *thék* , “monument,” for *m*Lb*. I. L. Seeligmann calls this a “coagulated equation” and explains it as being due to the scribe’s mechanical translation without consideration of the context or the current Greek idiom.39 Symmachus (*histatai*) has nothing to offer that would clarify the connotation of *m*Lb* in this context.

The relative clause ’ṣr *b*Lk* m*Lb* bm has all the indications of reference back to the species of trees mentioned before so that it is contextually inconsistent to translate *m*Lb* with “pillar,” “monument” or “standing-stone” of which no mention is made in vs. 13 or anywhere in Is 6. The broader connotation of *m*Lb* meaning “stem” or “stump” is therefore indicated by the context on the basis of the earlier references to trees. This contextual meaning seems to find support on the basis of an Akkadian cognate. V. Sawyer40 has pointed to a series of Akkadian terms such as

37 The Targum reads “like a terebinth and like an oak, which appear to be dried up when their leaves fall.” See John F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford, 1949), p. 23. Although Symmachus by translating *b*Lk* (*m*Lk*) with *apobalousa* comes much closer to the connotation of *Lk* than the LXX with *ekpeséi*, his translation seems to show Targumic influence. The whole clause reads, *hētis* *apobalousa* (*ta phylla*) *histatai monē*, “which having cast down the leaves stands alone.” Symmachus had most likely the Targum’s paraphrase of vs. 13 in mind and must have consequently understood *m*Lb* as meaning “leaves” or “branches” as derived from the Aramaic *ns*b, “to plant.”


39 I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden, 1948), pp. 48f., “The rather obscure phrase *hotan ekpeséi apo tēs thékēs autēs* which stands for ’ṣr *b*Lk* m*Lb* bm, is rooted in the coagulated equation of *m*Lb* with *thék* , gravestone, monument—with which the translator, was, of course, perfectly familiar.”

40 Sawyer, *ASThI*, 3 (1964), 113.
nanṣabu, mamṣabu, naṣabu, nenṣabu\textsuperscript{41} which refer to a "support," "post," or "stand" of wood or other material which he believes provides "some evidence for the traditional translation 'stump.'"\textsuperscript{42} The meaning of "stump" has many recent supporters\textsuperscript{43} as has the extended meaning "root-stock."\textsuperscript{44}

Another suggestion for the meaning of msbt is put forth by N. H. Tur-Sinai who on the basis of the Syriac reading nēṣbeteh in vs. 13 suggests the meaning "new planting."\textsuperscript{45} In Imperial Aramaic and in Syriac the nouns and verb derived from the root nṣb means "plantation, growth" and "to plant" respectively.\textsuperscript{46} Tur-Sinai's suggestion has been incorporated into a recent Hebrew lexicon as one of two possible meanings for msbt.\textsuperscript{47} It seems that the Syriac version put an extended meaning upon its rendering of msbt which implies that from the "trunk" or "stump" ("root-stock") of the trees which are fallen a new growth comes forth. This provides an indirect suggestion that the basic meaning of msbt in vs. 13 is indeed "trunk" or "stump" ("root-stock"). On the basis of contextual reasons and Semitic cognates the meaning "trunk, stump, root-stock" appears to have most support for msbt.

The concluding clause of vs. 13 has a significant variant in

\textsuperscript{41} W. von Soden, 
Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik (AnOr 33; Roma, 
1952), p. 31 par. 31b, indicates that the initial w is derived from the letter m when a root contains a labial.

\textsuperscript{42} Sawyer, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{43} S. H. Blank, "Traces of Prophetic Agony in Isaiah," 
HUCA, 27 (1956), 86 n. 12; H. S. Gehman, "The Ruler of the Universe, The Theology of 
First Isaiah," Int, 11 (1957), 270; E. G. Kraeling, Commentary on the Prophets 
(Camden, N.J., 1966), 2, 64; and others.

\textsuperscript{44} K. Budde, Jesajas Erleben (Gotha, 1928), pp. 22, 28; O. Procksch, Theologe des Alten Testaments (Gütersloh, 1950), pp. 192f.; Seierstad, Offenbarungserlebnisse der Propheten, p. 109; and others.

\textsuperscript{45} Tur-Sinai, Scripta Hierosolymitana, 8 (1961), 169.

\textsuperscript{46} C. F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest (Leiden, 1965), p. 184.

\textsuperscript{47} Holladay, p. 210, suggests for Is 6:13 either "bare trunk" or "new growth." In later Aramaic the meaning for msbh is "planting," see J. Levy, Chaldaisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim (Leipzig, 1867), p. 60.
1QIs*. Compare the following renderings of Qumran scroll and MT:

1QIs*: $msbh$ $bmh$ $zm$ $hqwd$ $msbh$

MT: $msbh$ $bm$ $zm$ $qd$ $msbh$

Two things ought to be noted: (1) Instead of $bm$ 1QIs* has $bmh$ and (2) there is a significant gap (6 mm) between $msbh$ and $bm$ which does not correspond with the MT. According to 1QIs* the last clause of our text begins with $bmh$. The gap sets $bmh$ $zm$ $hqwd$ $msbh$ off from the foregoing part of vs. 13 and points to the explanatory-like character of the last clause. According to Curt Kuhl these gaps serve as indications that new thoughts are introduced. If $bmh$ is to be read with $zm$ $hqwd$ $msbh$ then it cannot have the meaning of "high place" but can only mean "in/among them." The reading of "high place" which began with Hvidberg and Iwry is due to the unfounded rejection of $zm$ $qwd$ $msbh$, while they retain $bmh$ of the same clause to arrive at their arrangement and interpretation of the text. The last three words of vs. 13 which are present in both MT and 1QIs* are rejected without reason, but the 1QIs* reading of $bmh$ in place of $bm$ of MT is accepted!

A few additional observations are in order with regard to the last clause of Is 6: 13. Sawyer pointed $bmh$ as $hammeh$, a question, suggesting that the clause is to be translated, "Wherein is the Holy Seed? Its stump!" The fact is, however, that the adjective

48 It should be pointed out that $bmh$ in 1QIs* does in no way require the meaning of a cultic "high-place" (so Brownlee, Hvidberg, Iwry, Albright, Driver). Iwry, JBL, 76 (1957), 229, is forced to admit that "we cannot be absolutely certain that the word $bmh$ is not simply a longer form of MT $bm.$" Brownlee, Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls, p. 239, has moved away from his earlier view that $bmh$ refers to a high-place (VT, 2 [1951], 297f.). M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York, 1958), p. 148, points out that "the word taken to mean 'high place' may still at least equally well mean 'in them,' as the Masoretic text takes it."


50 For a critique of this omission, see Hasel, p. 237, n. 86.

51 Sawyer, p. 112. He is now followed by K.-D. Schunck, "bmh," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum AT, 1 (1973), 677, who also rejects the meaning of "high-place" for $bmh$ in Is 6:13.
in 1QIsa has the article (ḥqwdš) and that the noun it qualifies (zr') stands without the article. Was the h before zr' omitted because of haplography (ḥmḥ (h) zr')? Should the final h in ḥmḥ be read with zr' (ḥn ḥzr' ḥqwdš)? If the latter were the case, then the final h in ḥmḥ would be a scribal error of a wrong word division. There is no certainty whether we have here a scribal error of a wrong word division or haplography. If it is haplography, then the final h in ḥmḥ still does not make it refer to a “high-place” because a peculiarity of 1QIsa is an additional h after a pronominal suffix of the third person masculine and feminine plural. It is a characteristic of the “vulgar” text of 1QIsa and may not be a scribal error at all.

The last three words of the MT have been omitted in the LXX. However, other Greek versions do have these words: Symmachus has sperma hagion hē stasis autēs; Theodotion translates sperma hagion to stēlōma; and Aquila reads sperma hēgiasmenon stēlōsis autēs. Seeligmann thinks that these renderings represent the authentic Hebrew form.

What may be the cause of the omission of these last three words in the LXX? Already in 1923 Budde demonstrated that the omission of zr' qdsl ṣmbth in the LXX is due to homoioteleuton. The exegetes who desire to eliminate the last three words of the Hebrew text cannot claim the LXX for support. The fact that the last three words of Is 6:13 are present in both MT and 1QIsa, the Targum, Symmachus, Theodotion, Aquila, and Syriac (Codex

---

The Targum of Isaiah has the article with zr'; see Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, p. 23.

Supra, n. 48.

Is 34:7; 41:17, 27. Note the great number of additional examples cited by Iwty, *JBL*, 76 (1957), 228.


Seeligmann, pp. 63f.

Budde, *ZAW*, 41 (1923), 166ff. Cf. Iwty, p. 226, and especially Engnell, pp. 13-15, who has argued convincingly that on the basis of text-critical analysis “there is no doubt that the MT represents the authentic and right reading.”

So correctly Wildberger, p. 234.
Ambrosianus), but are omitted from the LXX only because of a scribal error, makes it certain that they are original. The unfounded rejection of the last three words of vs. 13 together with the unwarranted separation of ḫmḥ from the final clause in lQIs make the “emendational restorations” of the last verse of Isaiah’s inaugural vision unconvincing.

In addition to the textual evidence for the genuineness of the last clause, there are forceful arguments for its inclusion to be brought forth on the basis of the call genre which always has a word of reassurance (Is 6:11b-13). Stylistic considerations argue for the inclusion of the last clause as do traditio-historical considerations and the theological emphasis of the chapter. In short, we do not find any compelling evidence in favor of departing from the MT. On the whole lQIs supports the MT in an unusual fashion, although its two textual variants have given rise to a series of ingenious emendational reconstructions which have found their way also into the NEB but which are not even faithful to the reading of lQIs. The variety of reconstructions of Is 6:13 fall short of textual, stylistic, traditio-historical, theological, etc., support. On the basis of the foregoing discussion the following translation of Is 6:13 is suggested:

And though there is in it a tenth, in turn it shall be devoured; like the terebinth and the oak, of which at felling there remains a stump, a holy seed comes from its stump.


63 Hasel, pp. 242-248.