That Isaiah of Jerusalem often spoke of Yahweh’s demands in terms of righteousness and justice is undisputed. The list of “woes” which follow the song of the vineyard in Isa. v is a well-known example of this emphasis in his ministry. That these demands were often directed specifically at the leaders of the nation is also clear (e.g. Isa. iii 13-15). But there is another aspect of Isaiah’s message to the leaders which is also widely acknowledged. This concerns his message to the leaders to put faith and trust in Yahweh in the face of danger. Isa. vii 4-9, xxviii 16 and xxx 15 are the most commonly cited passages which illustrate this side of Isaiah. Thus we have, on the one hand, an Isaiah who preached Yahweh’s demands for works of justice and righteousness in society, and, on the other hand, an Isaiah who called for trust and faith in Yahweh. One may receive the impression that these are two unrelated emphases which arose in response to different historical circumstances encountered in the course of Isaiah’s long ministry. The purpose of this article is to suggest that Isa. xxx 15 connects these two aspects of Isaiah’s ministry.

There are three assumptions on which this suggestion relies. The first is that Isa. xxx 9-17 originates from Isaiah of Jerusalem. As this is a view accepted by most scholars, I shall not take time to defend it here. The second assumption, that Isa. xxx 15 is part of the same discourse which comprises at least verses 9-17, is less widely held. However, since many scholars do in fact consider this judgement to be correct,¹

¹ E.g. Duhm (pp. 218-19), Eichrodt (pp. 170-9) and Hogenhaven (pp. 204-5). More recently, Sweeney (pp. 390-1, 397) argues that verses 1-17 comprise one unit originating from Isaiah of Jerusalem.
I shall confine myself to only a brief discussion. Clements (p. 248) and Herbert (p. 172) assume that verses 8-17 are made up of two originally separate Isaianic oracles (8-14 and 15-17) which were secondarily placed together. This is argued from the form-critical observation that each (supposed) unit is complete in itself, consisting of both the accusation and the announcement of punishment. In addition, the quotation formula in verse 15 is taken as the start of a new section. Indeed, for this reason, Kaiser (p. 292 = German, p. 233) sees a break at verse 12 also and postulates three original units: 8-11, 12-14, and 15-17. However, in favour of taking at least verses (8)9-17\(^2\) as one connected discourse, the following may be considered. (i) The quotation formula does not always suggest an original separation from that which precedes (see, e.g., Isa. xxviii 16 and Jer. ix 12-14). (ii) The opening *kî* of verse 15 suggests a connection to the preceding verses. (iii) The conceptual contrasts of “turning aside (verse 11)/turning to Yahweh (verse 15)” and “trust in oppression (verse 12)/trust in Yahweh (verse 15)” suggest connections. (iv) The redactional setting in Isa. xxx is that of Judah’s appeal to Egypt for help (verses 2-3), made necessary, presumably, by her desire to rebel against Assyria. In fact, without the assumption of this context, it is debatable whether verses 15-17 can be satisfactorily understood. For instance, *‘al-sūs nānūs* in verse 16 can easily be taken in different ways: with the stress on “fleeing”, i.e. running away, or as symbolic of the security of wealth with “horses” being a reference to the trading caravans of merchants.\(^3\) Yet, surely, here it best refers to the horses of Egypt. Similarly, with regard to verses 9-14, Kaiser (pp. 292-3 = German, p. 233) is correct when he says that “it is clear that *vv. 12-14* cannot have existed in isolation, because the ‘word’ mentioned in *v. 12* must be sought somewhere outside these verses”. Not surprisingly, Clements (p. 248), who divides these verses into separate units, ends up by regarding them as belonging to the same general context. In short, these verses make good sense when placed in the same setting. Indeed, they reinforce one another and make their point more cogently when taken together. But if they belong to the same general context, there seems to be no clear reason why they should not also be taken as belonging to the same discourse. Therefore, I assume a context in which Yahweh is portrayed as opposed

\(^{2}\) Whether verse 8 belongs to the verses which precede or follow need not detain me here. On this, see Williamson, pp. 84-7.

\(^{3}\) Cf. Clements, p. 44, on Isa. ii 7.