

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in The Book of Genesis. Composition, reception, and interpretation. It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:
Schmid, Konrad
New Creation instead of new Exodus
Continuity and discontinuity: 180-198
Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014

URL: <https://www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com/4355/continuity-and-discontinuity>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: <https://www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com/>

Your IxTheo team

Liebe*r Leser*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:
Schmid, Konrad
New Creation instead of new Exodus
Continuity and discontinuity: 180-198
Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014

URL: <https://www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com/4355/continuity-and-discontinuity>

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

Diese Manuskriptversion wird im Einklang mit der Policy des Verlags Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht publiziert: <https://www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com/>

Ihr IxTheo-Team

Konrad Schmid

New Creation Instead of New Exodus

The Innerbiblical Exegesis and Theological Transformations
of Isaiah 65:17–25

1. The Literary and Historical Problem of “Third Isaiah”

The promise of a new heaven and new earth in Isa 65:17–25 is found in the larger section of Isa 56–66 – the section of the Book of Isaiah generally known as “Third Isaiah.” Bernhard Duhm introduced this artificial designation to scholarly discussion in the context of his 1892 Isaiah commentary as a label for the body of material in Isa 56–66.¹ Duhm recognized that these chapters made up a distinct unit within the second part of the Book of Isaiah (40–66), which itself should be seen as fundamentally separate from chapters 1–39. There is a clearly recognizable break between Isa 55 and Isa 56 that supports Duhm’s distinction: in contrast to the unconditional salvation oracles in Isa 40–55, judgment oracles return in chs. 56–66. Social and religious problems within the congregation now stand in the way of the final realization of salvation promised in Isa 40–55. These earlier chapters interpret the inbreaking of salvation as immanent, while Isa 56–66 identify several obstacles that hinder salvation from manifesting itself.

Isaiah 56–66’s ongoing literary allusions to Isa 40–55, as well as to the earlier chs. 1–39, probably do not point to the work of an independent prophet (i.e., “Third Isaiah”) whose oral prophecies stand behind Isa 56–66, as has often been, and continues to be suggested.² It is more likely that even the earliest layers of this textual body are the work of scribal tradents.³ Even

¹ Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (HK III/1; Göttingen, 1892; 5th. ed. 1968).

² Cf. Klaus Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesaja-Buch* (WMANT 62; Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1990); Paul Allan Smith, *Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah: The Structure, Growth and Authorship of Isaiah 56–66* (VTSup 62; Leiden/Boston, 1995); and many others.

³ Odil Hannes Steck, *Studien Zu Tritojesaja* (BZAW 203; Berlin/New York, 1991).; *idem*, “Autor und/oder Redaktor in Jes 56–66,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans; VTSup 70/1; Leiden/Boston, 1997), 219–59; Reinhard G. Kratz, “Tritojesaja,” *TRE* 34 (2002): 124–30; cf., though with a different emphasis, also Wolfgang Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56-66: Eine Untersuchung zu den literarischen Bezügen in den letzten elf Kapiteln des Jesajabuches* (BZAW 225; Berlin/New York, 1994); Burkard M. Zapff, *Jesaja* (NEB.AT 37; Würzburg, 2006); Judith Gärtner, “Erlebte Gottes-

Duhm himself considered this direction feasible: “It is certainly possible that Third Isaiah only composed his text as a continuation of Deutero-Isaiah.”⁴ It is very probable that the text complex of “Third Isaiah” (Isa 56–66) never existed as an independent composition, but was part and parcel of the Book of Isaiah throughout the various stages of its development. The compositional history of Isa 56–66 began as *Fortschreibung*, first of Deutero-Isaiah (the core texts in Isa 56–66 can be found in chs. 60–62) and then of the Isaiah tradition as a whole (successive addition of the texts in chs. 56–59; 63–66). Nonetheless, various texts and historical events outside the Isaiah tradition also played a role in the compositional history of Isa 56–66, especially in Isa 65:17–25, as I will argue below.

The considerations mentioned so far allow for a general determination of the date of composition for Isa 56–66. The existence of the textual material of Isa 40–55 – the *Vorlage* – forms the *terminus a quo*, and the oldest layer of this text complex emerges from the Persian king Cyrus’ bloodless capture of Babylon (539 B.C.E.), seen above all in Isa 45:1–2.⁵ The great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran – while diverging slightly from the masoretic version, but attesting most of Isa 56–66 – provides the *terminus ante quem*, as a witness to the “final form” from the end of the 2nd century B.C.E.⁶

2. The Promise of a New Heaven and a New Earth

Isaiah 65:17–25

כִּי־הֲנִי בּוֹרֵא שָׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים	17 For now I am creating a new heaven
וְאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה	and a new earth,
וְלֹא תִזְכְּרֶנָּה הָרָאשׁוֹנוֹת	and the former things will no longer be remembered,
וְלֹא תִעֲלֶינָה עַל־לֵב:	and they will no longer be considered (in your heart).

ferne: Drei schriftexegetische Antworten (Jes 58,1–12; 59,1–15a; 57,14–21),” in *Sieben Augen auf einem Stein (Sach 3,9): Studien zur Literatur des Zweiten Tempels: FS I. Willi-Plein* (ed. F. Hartenstein; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2007), 81–100.

⁴ Duhm, *Jesaja*, 390.

⁵ Cf. Konrad Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008), 132–37. On Rainer Albertz, “Darius in Place of Cyrus: The First Edition of Deutero-Isaiah (Isaiah 40.1–52.12),” *JSOT* 27 (2003): 371–83; cf. the critical response by Ulrich Berges, “Dareios in Jes 40–55? Zu einem Vorschlag von Rainer Albertz,” in *Berührungspunkte: Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt: FS R. Albertz* (ed. I. Kottsieper et al. AOAT 350; Münster, 2008), 253–66.

⁶ Cf. Kratz, “Tritojesaja,” 129.

כִּי־אֶמְשִׁישׁוּ וּגִילוֹ עַד־עַד אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי בּוֹרֵא	18 Rather, be glad and rejoice forever ⁷ in what I am creating!
כִּי הֲנִי בּוֹרֵא אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם גִּילָה וְעַמָּה מְשׁוּשׁ: וּגְלַתִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם וּשְׁשִׁיתִי בְעַמִּי וְלֹא־יִשְׁמַע בָּה עוֹד קוֹל בְּכִי וּקוֹל זַעֲקָה: לֹא־יִהְיֶה מִשָּׁם עוֹד עוֹל יָמִים	For now I am creating Jerusalem as a joy and her people as a delight. 19 And I will rejoice over Jerusalem, and I will delight in my people. And in her will not again be heard the cry of weeping or the cry of distress.
וּזְקֵן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמְלֵא אֶת־יָמָיו כִּי הֲנֵעַר בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יָמוֹת וְהַחֹטֵא בֶּן־מֵאָה שָׁנָה יִקְלָל: בְּנוֹ בָתִּים וַיִּשְׁבוּ וַיִּטְעוּ כְרָמִים וַאֲכָלוּ פְרִים: לֹא יִבְנוּ וְאֲחֵר יֵשֵׁב לֹא יִטְעוּ וְאֲחֵר יֵאָכֵל כִּי־כִימֵי הָעֵץ יָמֵי עַמִּי	20 There will no longer be an infant from there that lives only a few days, nor an old person that does not complete their lifetime, because a young man will be one that dies at a hundred years old, and whoever fails ⁸ to reach one hundred will be con- sidered accursed.
וּמַעֲשֵׂה יָדֵיהֶם יִבְלוּ בַחִירֵי: לֹא יִיגְעוּ לְרִיק וְלֹא יִלְדוּ לְבִהְלָה כִּי זֶרַע בְּרוּכֵי יְהוָה הֵמָּה וְצִאצְאֵיהֶם אִתָּם: וְהָיָה טְרַם־יִקְרָאוּ וְאֲנִי אֶעֱנֶה עוֹד הֵם מְדַבְּרִים וְאֲנִי אֶשְׁמַע: זֶאֱב וְטֹלָה יִרְעוּ כְּאַחַד וְאַרְיֵה כְּבָקָר יֵאָכֵל־תַּבָּן וְנָחָשׁ עֵפֶר לַחֲמוֹ	21 And they will build houses and dwell [in them] and plant vineyards and eat their fruit. 22 They will not build so that another might dwell, they will not plant so that another might eat, because the age of my people will be like the age of a tree, and the labors of their hands my chosen will enjoy. 23 They will not labor for nothing and not bear children for calamity, because they are the seed of the blessed by YHWH, and their offspring will remain with them. 24 And before they call, I will answer, While they are still speaking, I will hear. 25 The wolf and lamb will feed together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox, and the snake – its food will be dust.

⁷ Concerning the original intention of this imperative (which in the present divine oracle is directed toward the wicked, not toward the pious) cf. Odil Hannes Steck, "Der neue Himmel und die neue Erde: Beobachtungen zur Rezeption von Gen 1–3 in Jes 65,16b–25," *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (ed. J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne; BETL 132; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 351 n. 9.

⁸ For this translation see Koenen, *Ethik*, 174–75; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19B; New York, 2003), 21; Jacob Stromberg, *Isaiah After Exile: The Author of Third Isaiah as Reader and Redactor of the Book* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford, 2011), 53.

לא־יִרְעוּ וְלֹא־יִשְׁחָדוּ Evil and destruction will not be done
 בְּכַל־הַר קִדְשִׁי on my holy mountain
 אָמַר יְהוָה: says YHWH.

The promise of a new heaven and a new earth in Isa 65:17–25 is one of the most well-known texts in Isa 56–66. The works of especially W.A.M. Beuken and O.H. Steck have demonstrated that this passage should not be interpreted as an independent section, but instead as part of its context.⁹ This context consists – within the immediate framework of Isa 65–66 – of “five divine speeches that respond to the previous prayer of 63:7–64:11 and that, as scholarship has repeatedly shown, form a frame for the Book of Isaiah with its allusions to the beginning.”¹⁰ It is particularly important in this regard to recognize that Isa 65:17–25 is therefore only directed to those designated as pious in the previous section – the new heaven and new earth are reserved for them (Isa 65:9–10), while the wicked fall prey to judgment (Isa 65:11–12).¹¹

Scholars have often pointed out that Isa 65:17–25 did not formulate its ideas in isolation, but instead depends on numerous earlier texts. In terms of content, similarities have been detected in texts such as Zech 7–8, Ps 37, and also Deut 31–32.¹² Literarily speaking, Isa 65:17–25 is most closely associated with Isa 43:16–21; 11:6–9; Gen 1–3; Deut 6:10–11; and 28:30.

The following discussion investigates these points of literary contact. A further section will also include Qoh 1:9–11, a text that was most likely composed subsequently to Isa 65:17–25 and grapples deeply with it.¹³

⁹ Willem A.M. Beuken, *Jesaja 1–12* (HThKAT; Freiburg et al., 2003); Steck, *Studien*, 217–62; see also Smith, *Rhetoric*, 152.

¹⁰ Steck, “Himmel,” 350; on the dating of Isa 63:7–64:11 see, on the one hand Steck, *Studien*, 217–42; Johannes Goldenstein, *Das Gebet der Gottesknechte: Jesaja 63,7–64,11 im Jesajabuch* (WMANT 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2001) (end of fourth century B.C.E.); and on the other Hugh G.M. Williamson, “Isaiah 63,7–64,11: Exilic Lament or Post-Exilic Protest?” *ZAW* 102 (1990): 48–58; Jill Middlemas, *The Troubles of Templeless Judah* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford, 2005), 156–58; Jill Middlemas, *The Templeless Age: An Introduction to the History, Literature, and Theology of the “Exile”* (Louisville/London, 2007), 48; Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 5 n. 21; 30–32 (sixth century B.C.E.). For the purposes of this article it is sufficient to note that Isa 65–66 is a literary reaction to Isa 63:7–64:11.

¹¹ Cf. Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 54.

¹² Steck, “Himmel,” 354–55.

¹³ Cf. Thomas Krüger, “Dekonstruktion und Rekonstruktion prophetischer Eschatologie im Qohelet-Buch,” in *“Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit...”: Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen Weisheit*: FS D. Michel (ed. A.A. Diesel et al.; BZAW 241; Berlin/New York, 1996, 107–29); repr. in *Kritische Weisheit: Studien zur weisheitlichen Traditionskritik im Alten Testament* (Zürich, 1997), 151–72.

3. The Reception of Isaiah 43:16–21 in Isaiah 65:17–25

Several observations underline the interaction of the “Third-Isaianic” section Isa 65:17–25 with the Deutero-Isaianic text of Isa 43:16–21.¹⁴ First there is the connection through the phrase “no longer consider the former things” (prohibitive in Isa 43:18, imperfect in 65:17).¹⁵ Second, there is also the divine announcement of creating “something new” (in both texts formulated as *futurum instans*, that is, immanent). The conspicuous combination of these elements provides further support for assuming a literary relationship between the sections.

The close relationship between the two passages serves to highlight their differences. While Isa 43:16–21 juxtaposes the old and new *exodus*,¹⁶ Isa 65:17–25 compares the old and new *creation*. This difference shows that Isa 65 extends the mythical horizon of Isa 43 considerably. Isaiah 65 reaches beyond the foundational events of Israel’s salvation history to the

¹⁴ On the contextual connections see Jean-Daniel Macchi, “‘Ne ressassez plus les choses d’autrefois’: Esaïe 43,16–21, un surprenant regard deutéro-ésaïen sur le passé,” *ZAW* 121 (2009): 225–41.

¹⁵ Lau, *Prophetie*, 135 and others.

¹⁶ Hans Barstad disputes that there is a “new” or “second exodus” in Second Isaiah (*A Way in the Wilderness: The “Second Exodus” in the Message of Second Isaiah* [JSS Monograph 12; Manchester, 1989], 107–112; see the review of scholarship on this topic in Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, *For the Comfort of Zion: The Geographical and Theological Location of Isaiah 40–55* [VTSup 139; Leiden/Boston, 2011], 156–68). He admits, however, that Isa 43:14–21 and 48:17–21 constitute an exception (110 n. 286). In addition, he apparently distinguishes between “the accepted meaning of the phrase” [sc. “exodus text”] (*A Way in the Wilderness*, 108) which, he argues, does not provide an adequate literal understanding of the metaphor (“the return of exiles from Babylon through the desert to Judah, modeled on the ancient Israelite tradition of the flight from Egypt and the wanderings in the wilderness” [*ibid.*, 107]), and the “ingathering of the golah” (*ibid.*, 92). According to him, this “... is something quite different. If one should want to do so, one may, of course, refer to this ingathering from the golah as a ‘new exodus’. But then one should be well aware of the fact that this motif does not form a very important part of the message of Second Isaiah” (*ibid.*, 92). Interestingly, Barstad sees Isa 43:16–21 as a text about “new creation” rather than about “new exodus”: “In another text in Second Isaiah, Is 43:19, the particular motif of making roads in the desert, partly dealt with above, is combined with the motif of making streams in the wilderness. In this very illustrative text, these motifs, again, are combined with the well known Second Isaiah phraseology of making new things, clearly indicating that the metaphorical use of the roads and the streams in the wilderness is giving expression to the new prosperity of Judah, following the intervention and action of Yahweh. All of these different metaphorical allusions, consequently, are nothing but poetical variations of the same basic theme of the restoring of the nation and the bright and prosperous future of the Judeans. They are in fact, creation texts, bearing witness to the creation of the new nation; the new Judah!” (*ibid.*, 32–33). Barstad is certainly correct in stressing the poetic and metaphorical quality of the texts in question, but his contrasting of “strongly metaphorical”/“not concrete” suggests a mutual exclusivity that probably overdoes his point. In addition, he does not address the possibility of different layers in Isa 40–55 (see e.g. Reinhard G. Kratz, *Kyros im Deuterocesaja-Buch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55* (FAT 1; Tübingen, 1991).

creation of the world: the world's creation itself will be surpassed in the future acts of divine redemption.

What brings about this replacement? And by what means is it accomplished on the literary level? A closer look at Isa 43:16–21 helps to answer these questions by providing a solid foundation for investigating the transformation that takes place in Isa 65:17–25.

Isaiah 43:16–21

כה אמר יהוה	16 Thus says Yhwh,
הנותן בים דרך	who makes a way in the sea
ובמים עזים נתיבה:	and a path in the mighty waters,
המוציא רכב־וסוס חיל ועוזו	17 who brings out chariot and horse, army and strength,
יחדו ישכבו	they will lay there together,
בל־יקומו	they no longer will rise,
דעכו כפשתה כבו:	extinguished, quenched like a wick.
אל־תזכרו ראשנות	18 Remember not the former things,
וקדמניות אל־תתבננו:	the things of old – do not consider.
הנני עשה חדשה עתה תצמח	19 Look, I am doing a new thing, now it sprouts forth,
הלוא תדעוה	do you not perceive it?
אף אשים במדבר דרך	Indeed, through the wilderness I am making a way
בישמון נהרות:	and rivers ¹⁷ through the desert.
תכבדני חית השדה	20 The animals of the field will honor me,
תנים ובנות יענה	the jackals and the ostriches,
כי־נתתי במדבר מים	because I provide water in the wilderness, ¹⁸
נהרות בישמן	rivers in the desert,
להשקות עמי בחירי:	to give water for my people, my chosen ones,
עם־זו יצרתי לי	21 this people whom I formed for myself.
תהלתי יספרו:	They will declare my glory. ¹⁹

¹⁷ 1QIsa^a reads נתיבות “paths”; MT is preferable as the *lectio difficilior* and is likely the product of an *aberratio oculi*; cf. Ulrich Berges, *Jesaja 40–48* (HThK.AT; Freiburg et al., 2008), 291; also Karl Elliger, *Deuterjesaja* (BK XI/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974), 355; Macchi, “Choses,” 236 n. 38.

¹⁸ 1QIsa^a reads אתן, which is clearly *lectio facilior* (Elliger, *Deuterjesaja*, 343).

¹⁹ On the connection between vv. 20b–21 with the preceding section see Elliger, *Deuterjesaja*, 358–359; Klaus Kiesow, *Exodustexte im Jesajabuch: Literarkritische und motivgeschichtliche Analysen* (OBO 24; Fribourg/Göttingen, 1979), 67–68.

Understanding Isa 43:16–21 is complicated by the “heterodoxical” nature of the section. It can easily be divided into three sections. The first section (43:16–17) praises God in a hymn formed by participles, evoking images of the exodus from Egypt and the deliverance of Israel at the Sea of Reeds. The resumption of the exodus tradition is clear, “but the language and style of the portrayal shares remarkably little in common with the most well-known occurrences of the tradition in Exodus 14 and 15 beyond the basic conception and a few thematic expressions.”²⁰ Rather than relying textually on a written *Vorlage*, Isa 43:16–17 seems to reflect the remembered tradition, which is to be expected in the ancient Near Eastern and ancient Israelite scribal culture.²¹ However, Isa 43:16–17 transforms this tradition to fit with its own concerns: the human actors in the exodus narrative – Moses and Pharaoh – completely disappear in order to highlight God as the sole mover.

Following immediately after Isa 43:16–17, the second section (43:18–19) states directly that God’s actions in the past are no longer worth remembering because God will now perform a new and more wonderful deed. Finally, the third section (43:20–21) explicates this new thing and describes it in terms of a new exodus through the desert, during which water will not run short.²²

The text and its structure juxtapose the old exodus with the new to show that the former should no longer be recalled because it will be replaced by the latter.²³ It is somewhat surprising how Westermann, for example, comments on the content of this passage:

²⁰ Elliger, *Deuterocesaja*, 346; cf. also Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1985), 363–64; Macchi, “Choses,” 229 n. 13; Eberhard Bons, “Y a-t-il une typologie de l’Exode en Isaïe 43,16–23?” in *Typologie biblique: De quelques figures vives* (ed. R. Kuntzmann; LeDiv; Paris, 2002), 86–89; also Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (SBLDS 161; Atlanta, 1997), 28–33.

²¹ Cf. David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York/London, 2005); *idem*, “Mündlich-schriftliche Bildung und der Ursprung antiker Literaturen,” in *Lesarten der Bibel: Untersuchungen zu einer Theorie der Exegese des Alten Testaments* (ed. H. Utzschneider and E. Blum; Stuttgart, 2006), 183–98.

²² Øystein Lund, *Way Metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40–55* (FAT II/28; Tübingen, 2007), 191 (cf. 197), emphasizes that there is “little reason to narrow the use of imagery to concern only such a journey” [i.e. home from Babylon] but he admits that the “new life” envisioned by Isa 43:16–21 can “for some people also incorporate a journey home from Babylon.” Similarly Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19A; New York, 2000), 228.

²³ Tiemeyer (*Comfort*, 183) disputes that Isa 43:16–21 is “alluding to a Second Exodus out of Babylon” and, following Barstad (*Way*, 93–98, but see 110 n. 286), interprets the exodus motif “as a word of doom for Babylon.” This interpretation downplays the expression “to give water for my people” and is driven by her overall attempt to prove the exclusive Judahite origin of Isa 40–55. Nevertheless, also *Judahite* authors could have written about an exodus of former deportees out of Babylon.

Did Deutero-Isaiah really intend to say in this oracle that the new work of God and the concomitant new exodus would result in placing such a shadow over the former exodus that it should be forgotten in favor of the new, soon to be expected [one]? It would be very strange if Deutero-Isaiah, who held fast to the traditions of his people more than any other prophet, who repeatedly and insistently reminded them of God's great works in the past, who entrusts his people with the important charge of being God's witnesses to the undertakings of God with the gods of the nations, that is to bear witness to the trustworthy continuity between God's words and God's actions, his announcements and their fulfillments – it would be very strange if this very Deutero-Isaiah states here, 'forget what I did before and pay attention to it no more!'²⁴

Westermann likely has in mind texts such as Isa 46:9: "Remember the first things from ancient times: I am God and there is none other; divine, and nothing is like me." There is, however, a decisive difference between assertions such as Isa 46:9 and 43:16–21, as Berges correctly notes: "The 'new' is not related to Yhwh himself, but rather to his actions towards Israel as is the case in Isa 43:18."²⁵ The structure of 43:18–19²⁶ leaves little room to doubt that the old and new exoduses are not analogous according to Isa 43:16–21: the new exodus will make the old one obsolete. Following Berges, one can adduce the antithetical arrangement of the two verses:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| V.18aα: "Remember not" | – V.19aα: "See, I am doing" |
| V.18aβ: "Former things" | – V.19aβ: "New" |
| V.18bα: "Past things" | – V.19bα: "Now it sprouts forth" |
| V.18bβ: "Do not consider" | – V.19bβ: "Do you not perceive it" |

Westermann and other readers of his era were unwilling to consider the possibility that Isa 43:16–21 actually appears to imply that the old exodus had lost its redemptive power. But Isa 43:16–21 seems to be clear about this: God is creating something new, and this new thing is not analogically comparable with the former salvation event.

²⁴ Claus Westermann, *Das Buch Jesaja Kapitel 40–66* (ATD 19; Göttingen, 1966), 104–105. In fact, Elliger (*Deuterojesaja*, 353) also resists understanding the "the former" in relation to the exodus: "The meaning of 18 is really very general: leave the past to itself and focus on the future that I am now proclaiming." See also Kiesow, *Exodustexte*, 71–73 (with detailed discussion): "The earlier things are the suffering of the people – concretely, the demise of Jerusalem and the deportation." Similarly also Barstad, *Way*, 94–95 n. 233 ("With the 'former things' he simply refers to everything that was before and which led to the catastrophe of 587/586, including the punishment for the transgressions of the people [...]. With 'new things' he is simply referring to his own message: Yahweh has forgiven his people their sins, and they can now look forward to a bright future under his mighty protection."), and Macchi, "Choses," 234 n. 28. Cf. the discussion in Kratz, *Kyros*, 68 n. 240; Krüger, "Dekonstruktion," 155 n. 22; Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 92–93.

²⁵ Berges, *Jesaja*, 301.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 300.

This highly innovative conception does not, however, affect the nature of God's identity. Neither does it imply the abrogation of *every* previous act of redemption, which is especially clear with regard to the reception and re-working of the traditions of the ancestors in Isa 40–55.²⁷

How is one to interpret this extraordinarily negative evaluation of the traditional exodus narrative? Deutero-Isaiah's historical setting, after the demise of Judah and Jerusalem, appears as confirmation to the fact that the tradition of Israel coming up out of Egypt had lost its redemptive relevance. The former exodus from Egypt evidently set in motion a sequence of perdition that culminated in the loss of the land. The traditional exodus narrative could, therefore, no longer form the foundation for the relationship between Israel and its God. Isa 43:16–21 contends that there will be a new exodus, this time from Babylon, which will totally surpass the earlier one. First Yhwh himself will leave Babylon, and the people will then follow. This new exodus will form the basis for a new relationship between God and his people, so the theological memory of the former exodus can be abandoned and forgotten. It is worth noting that this new exodus will also include a "water miracle," yet not one that destroys the enemy like in Exod 14. On the contrary, God will provide water in the desert to satisfy his people.

One can be quite sure that the inspiration for this motif of a new exodus as a kind of procession arose from corresponding ritual events in Babylonian religion: the festive processions in Babylon in relation to the New Year's celebration (*akītu*-festival)²⁸ seem to be the model for the expected return of God and his people to their own land for the Deutero-Isaiah tradition.²⁹

²⁷ Cf. Odil Hannes Steck, "Deuterocesaja als theologischer Denker," *KuD* 15 (1969): 280–93; repr. in *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im Alten Testament: Gesammelte Studien* (TB 70; Munich, 1982).

²⁸ Cf. Beate Pongratz-Leisten, Ina Šulmi Īrub: *Die kulttopographische und ideologische Programmatik der akītu-Prozession in Babylonien und Assyrien im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (BF 16; Mainz, 1994). Barstad (*Way*, 18–19 n. 51; *idem*, "On the So-Called Babylonian Literary Influence in Second Isaiah," *SJOT* 2 [1987]: 90–110) is very skeptical about the assumption of such a background. See the comprehensive discussion in Tiemeyer, *Comfort*, 77–130. Her rebuttal of Ehring's interpretation of Isa 40:1–11 (Christina Ehring, *Die Rückkehr JHWHs: Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Jesaja 40,1–11, Jesaja 52,7–10 und verwandten Texten* [WMANT 116; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2007]) is, however, unconvincing (174–76).

²⁹ For a theological evaluation cf. Blaženka Scheuer, *The Return of YHWH: The Tension between Deliverance and Repentance in Isaiah 40–55* (BZAW 377; Berlin/New York, 2008), 143–45. Deutero-Isaiah interacts very differently with the ancestor traditions than with the exodus tradition. Because the ancestor story is rooted in the promise of the land, it is the lone salvation-historical tradition with abiding theological relevance. As a result these ancestor traditions are taken up and developed extensively (cf. Isa 41:8–10). By calling the people Israel by the name of their ancestors, Deutero-Isaiah activates the promise theology from the Genesis ancestral narratives that grant Israel ownership of the land through God's unconditional promise. Unlike the exodus tradition, the ancestor traditions provide orientation for attempts to come to terms with the catastrophe of the exile. See the still important discussion in Steck, "Deuterocesaja."

When compared with Isa 43:16–21, the theological profile of Isa 65:17–25 presents both similarities and differences. Like Isa 43:16–21, Isa 65:17–25 also juxtaposes old and new, but the topic is now creation itself. Unlike Isa 40–55, Isa 65:17–25 no longer differentiates *within* salvation history, but opposes old and new *creation*. While Isa 43:16–21 announces that “the former things will no longer be remembered,” such a call is no longer necessary in Isa 65:17–25 because the former things will sink into oblivion on their own.

In the further-developed situation of Isa 65:17–25, the antithesis between old exodus–new exodus is no longer sufficient. God’s new acts of redemption can only be understood in the context of an entirely new creation. It is crucial, however, to see that Isa 65:17–25 is not introducing a completely new topic, but is activating a theme that is central to the theological argumentation of Isa 40–55.

This theological position makes sense in light of the historical situation of Isa 65:17–25 in the 3rd century B.C.E. It seems to reflect the disappearance of a stable world order, as was the case during the Persian empire.³⁰ While according to the Priestly Code, one of the most prominent writings of the Persian period, creation had lost its status as “very good” (Gen 1:31) early on, the autonomy of cult and language nevertheless continued to guarantee a sufficient, if qualified, basis for life under the Persian empire. The collapse of this empire, which had an enormous intellectual and religious impact on ancient Judah, also meant the loss of this confidence in the creative order. This loss of confidence led to the notion that for creation to function sufficiently, it needed a foundational change of its very nature: Isa 65:17–25 formulates this change in terms of a new creation of heaven and earth. While not apocalyptic itself, this conceptualization does prepare the way for apocalypticism: Isa 65:17–25 does not yet speak of a new, second world to come,³¹ but of a renewal of this world. Furthermore, Isa 65:17–25 does not yet envision a resurrection of the dead, but considers the question of a long life.

4. The Reception of Isaiah 11:6–9 in Isaiah 65:25

As part of its vision of new creation, Isa 65:25 depicts a peaceful animal world in quite similar fashion to Isa 11:6–9. These verses belong to the larger context of 11:1–9, which Hermisson especially has shown to consist of various layers, namely the promise of the ruler in 11:1–5 and the follo-

³⁰ Cf. the summary in Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte*, 177–211.

³¹ On the doctrine of two ages see n. 48.

wing section concerning peace among animals in 11:6–9.³² The language of the latter section relies on both 11:1–2 and also Isa 1:3–4 (שחת/רעע).³³ The motifs of Isa 11:6–9, however, are idiosyncratic and do not directly belong to the tradition-historical context of royal ideology evoked by 11:1–5.³⁴ The strongest indication for this disunity is 11:4,³⁵ which speaks of the future ruler implementing justice. The contrast between this image and the paradisiacal, nonviolent vision of 11:6–9 shows that they could hardly belong to the same literary layer. The allocation of vegetarian food for carnivorous animals is reminiscent of Gen 1:29–30 (“P”), but also allows 11:6–9 to be understood “as an appendix that cancels a declaration such as Lev 26:22: ‘Then I will turn the beasts of the field loose against you so that they rob you of your children and wipe out your animals ...’”³⁶ One should probably date 11:6–9 later than the Priestly Document and the Holiness Code, and therefore no earlier than the middle of the Persian period.

Isaiah 11:6–9

וגר זאב עם־כבש	And the wolf will live with the lamb
ונמר עם־גדי ירבץ	and the leopard will lie down with the kid.
ועגל וכפיר ומריא יחדו	And calf, young lion, and fatling will be together, ³⁷
ונער קטן נהג בהם:	and a young child will lead them.
ופרה ודב תרעינה	7 And cow and bear will graze,
יחדו ירבצו ילדיהן	and their young will lie down together,
ואריה כבקר יאכל־תבן:	and the lion will eat straw like the ox.

³² Hans-Jürgen Hermisson, “Zukunftserwartung und Gegenwartskritik in der Verkündigung Jesajas,” *EvTh* 33 (1973): 59–61; cf. Hermann Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit: Israel und Assur als Thema einer produktiven Neuinterpretation der Jesajaüberlieferung* (WMANT 48; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977), 60–63; Odil Hannes Steck, “... ein kleiner Knabe kann sie leiten’: Beobachtungen zum Tierfrieden in Jes 11,6–8 und 65,25,” in *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und biblische Theologie: FS H.D. Preuß* (ed. J. Hausmann and H.-J. Zobel; Stuttgart, 1992), 104–109. Different, but unconvincing is Wolfgang Werner, *Eschatologische Texte in Jesaja 1–39: Messias, Heiliger Rest, Völker* (fzb 46; Würzburg, 1982), 48–49.

³³ Cf. Steck, “Knabe,” 106–107, 110ff; Erich Bosshard-Nepustil, *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1–39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch* (OBO 154 ; Fribourg/Göttingen, 1997), 212 n. 4.

³⁴ Cf., however, Erich Zenger, “Die Verheißung Jesaja 11,1–10 – universal oder partikular?,” in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah: FS W.A.M. Beuken* (J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne; BETL 132; Leuven, 1997), 146.

³⁵ On the text-critical problem see Hans Wildberger, *Jesaja: 1. Teilband: Jesaja 1–12* (BK X/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1972), 438; Erhard Blum, “Jesajas prophetisches Testament – Beobachtungen zu Jesaja 1–11,” *ZAW* 109 (1997): 27 n. 63; Beuken, *Jesaja*, 302.

³⁶ Steck, “Knabe,” 112.

³⁷ On the conjecture ימראו statt ומריא cf. Beuken, *Jesaja*, 302; J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “The Intertextual Relationship Between Isaiah 65:25 and Isaiah 11:6–9,” in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: FS A.S. van der Woude* (ed. F. García Martínez; VTSup 49; Leiden/Boston, 1998), 33 n. 7.

ושעשע יונק	8 And the nursing child will play
על־חר פתן	over the hole of the viper,
ועל מאורת צפעוני	and into the hole ³⁸ of the adder
גמול ידו הדד:	the small child will stretch out a hand.
לא־ירעו ולא־ישחיתו	9 Nowhere will one do evil or destruction
בכל־הר קדשי	on my holy mountain,
כי־מלאה הארץ	because the land is full
דעה את־יהוה	of the knowledge of YHWH,
כמים לים מכסים:	as water covers the sea.

While expressed differently, Isa 65:25 (זאב וטלה ירעו כאחד) opens with a declaration that mirrors the content of Isa 11:6 (וגר זאב עם־כבש), Isaiah 65:25 then goes on to use exactly the same formulation as Isa 11:7c (ואריה כבקר (יאכל־תבן)). The third strophe (ונהש עפר לחמו) unquestionably recalls Gen 3:14, but its language is quite distant from the Genesis statement: לחמו does not even appear there. The fourth stanza of Isa 65:25 is word for word the same as Isa 11:9a (לא־ירעו ולא־ישחיתו בכל־הר קדשי), except for the concluding אמר יהוה.³⁹

It is generally assumed that Isa 65:25 is patterned after Isa 11:6–9.⁴⁰ The contextual setting of each of the passages – the one in First Isaiah and the other in Third Isaiah – seem to argue self-evidently that Isa 11:6–9 is older than Isa 65:25. But their contexts in and of themselves do not yet form a solid argument. The extensively developed form of Isa 11:6–9 might be interpreted as the result of an expanding reception of Isa 65:25.⁴¹ However, the traditional conclusion is not only dependent on the redactional setting of Isa 65:17–25 in Isa 65–66, which is held to be a late text. A quite clear indicator of the direction of dependence is the interweaving of Gen 3:14 in Isa 65:25, which does not play any role in Isa 11:6–9. Genesis 3:14 is itself a relatively late text.⁴² Therefore, Isa 11:6–9 should be accepted as earlier, likewise Isa 65:25.⁴³

³⁸ The term itself is unclear, but perhaps it is concerned with the prescription of מערת? Cf. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 438; Beuken, *Jesaja*, 302.

³⁹ A helpful synopsis on translation can be found in Van Ruiten, “Relationship,” 33–34.

⁴⁰ Cf. the discussion in Steck, “Knabe,” 108–109; also Van Ruiten, “Relationship.”

⁴¹ Otto Kaiser (*Das Buch des Propheten Jesaja: Kapitel 1–12* [5th ed.; ATD 17; Göttingen, 1981], 240), for example, sees Isa 11:9 as a citation of material from Isa 65:25b and Hab 2:14, and Isa 11:6–8 as an expansion of Isa 65:25a. On this relation see Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 105–7.

⁴² The exact historical placement is disputed. Eckart Otto, “Die Paradieserzählung Gen 2–3: Eine nachpriesterschriftliche Lehrerzählung in ihrem religionshistorischen Kontext,” in *“Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit...”: Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen Weisheit: FS D. Michel* (ed. A.A. Diesel et al.; BZAW 241; Berlin/New York, 1996), 167–92, argues for a post-Priestly original for all of Gen 2–3. Kratz and Spieckermann suggest a post-Priestly date for the final form, cf. Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann, “Schöpfer/Schöpfung II,” *TRE* 30 (1999): 271–74; Hermann Spieckermann, “Ambivalenzen: Ermöglichte und verwirklichte Schöpfung in Gene-

What thematic guidelines did the reception of Isa 11:6–9 in Isa 65:25 follow? Apparently Isa 65:25 responds to Isa 11:6–9 in three ways: 1) the framing statements of the peaceful animal kingdom in 11:6–7 are used as a summary for this motif; 2) the material concerning small children in Isa 11:8 is omitted; 3) 11:9a does appear, while 11:9b does not.

The reason for the omission of Isa 11:8 in Isa 65:25 could be contextual or content related. It is possible that a further statement addressing small children was felt to be extraneous, given their appearance in 65:23. The theme itself may also have played a role: the motif of small children in eschatological texts can trigger messianic connotations that the author of Isa 65:25, given his theocratic worldview (cf. Isa 66:1),⁴⁴ wanted to avoid.

5. The Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Isaiah 65:17–25

The incorporation of material from Gen 1–3 in Isa 65:17–25, namely of Gen 1:1 in Isa 65:17 and of Gen 3:14 in Isa 65:25, is as palpable as the reception of Isa 43:16–21,⁴⁵ although scholars have traditionally been reluctant to date Isa 56–66 after P. One might suspect that the inclusion of the opening verse of Gen 1 and another from the concluding section in Gen 3 together suggest that Isa 65:17–25 intends to allude to the entire section of Gen 1–3.

The declaration about the snake in Isa 65:25, which serves to regulate the provision of food, clearly alludes to Gen 3:14, where the statement is a curse.⁴⁶ The combination of “create” with the direct objects “heaven” and

sis 2f,” in *Verbindungslinien: FS W.H. Schmidt* (ed. A. Graupner et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2000), 363–76. The universalization of the “Deuteronomistic” interpretation of Israel’s history (expulsion from the garden of Eden as consequence of humanity’s sin) and the radical transformation of traditional wisdom theology (“knowledge of good and evil” as a problem for human beings, cf. the opposite view in 1 Kgs 3:4–9) suggest a *terminus ante quem non* no earlier than the Babylonian Exile. See also the discussion in Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte*, 153–56.

⁴³ See also Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 102–107.

⁴⁴ Cf. Konrad Schmid, “Herrschererwartungen und -aussagen im Jesajabuch: Überlegungen zu ihrer synchronen Logik und ihren diachronen Transformationen,” in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy: FS H. Leene* (ed. F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra; ACEBT.S 3; Maastricht, 2002) repr. in *Prophetische Heils- und Herrschererwartungen* (ed. K. Schmid; SBS 194; Stuttgart, 2005), 73. On the non-reception of Isa 11:1–5 in Isa 65:25, see also Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 108–9.

⁴⁵ See especially Steck, “Himmel.” More cautious: Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 287. On the references to the Pentateuch in the later layers of the Isaiah tradition cf. Steck, “Knabe,” 109 n. 30. The term ברא is rooted very securely in Isa 40–48 (40:26, 28; 41:20; 42:5; 43:1, 7, 15; 45:7 [bis], 8, 12, 18 [bis]; 48:7), see Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 92 with nn. 22–23. For conceptual transformation regarding ברא between Isa 40–48 and Isaiah 65–66 see *ibid.*, 95–96.

⁴⁶ Van Ruiten (“Relationship,” 40–41) interprets the allusion to Gen 3:14 in Isa 65:25 in light of Mic 7:17 and Ps 72:9, viewing the snake as an enemy held in check (see also Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah*

“earth” points unquestionably to Gen 1:1. The possibility that the reader of Isa 65:17–25 is meant to keep in mind all of Gen 1–3 on account of the incorporation of material from the beginning and end of Gen 1–3 can neither be proved nor ruled out, but it is not unlikely.

There is little question that Gen 1–3 is taken up in Isa 65 and not the other way around. The mention of a “new” heaven and a “new” earth refers to something logically prior. Furthermore, Gen 1 can be attributed a comparatively secure absolute date as part of the Priestly Document, whose basic edition (*Grundschrift*) should be dated between 539 and 525 B.C.E.⁴⁷

In light of the later developments within Jewish apocalypticism, one should keep in mind that the notion of a “new heaven” and a “new earth” in Isa 65–66 is not to be understood as an example of the doctrine of two ages. This doctrine first appears in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, which were composed in the wake of the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. While the origins of apocalypticism have been placed in various historical settings (the earliest Enoch texts are attested in Qumran around 200 B.C.E.),⁴⁸ it seems that the notion of the two ages arose no earlier than the experience of the destruction of the Second Temple.⁴⁹

Such an intellectual background is irrelevant for the time of Isa 65:17–25’s composition. This text does not consider a “new creation” in the sense of a cosmological re-ordering of the world: heaven and earth manifestly remain in place as cosmic structures. It is instead the world order within the “old” creation that is “renewed” – one could also speak of a “renewed” creation.⁵⁰

The noteworthy themes taken from Gen 1–3 are easily recognizable. Yet this “new” creation is differentiated from the “first” creation by the permanence of its good original state: it will not fall prey to depravity (cf. Gen 6:11–12). It is also completely undergirded and constituted by blessing,

56–66, 290). However, the formulation of Isa 65:25 bears little similarity to Mic 7:17 and Ps 72:9, nor does this understanding fit the overall context of Isa 65–66.

⁴⁷ Albert de Pury, “P^g as the Absolute Beginning,” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (ed. T Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven, 2007), 99–128, esp. 125–28.

⁴⁸ Hartmut Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (2nd ed.; ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen, 1989), 495–509.

⁴⁹ Cf. the fuller discussion in Konrad Schmid, “Die Zerstörung Jerusalems und seines Tempels als Heilsparadox: Zur Zusammenführung von Geschichtstheologie und Anthropologie im Vierten Esrabuch,” in *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels: Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung* (ed. J. Hahn; WUNT 147; Tübingen, 2002), 183–206.

⁵⁰ Cf. the related discussion of the covenantal theme in Walter Groß, “Erneuerter oder Neuer Bund? Wortlaut und Aussageintention in Jer 31,31–34,” in *Bund und Tora: Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition* (ed. F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 92; Tübingen, 1996), 41–66.

while the first creation limited blessing to the sea creatures (and with certain limitations to the birds as well)⁵¹ and the humans (cf. Gen 1:22, 28). Finally, there is no possibility for negative influences at its edges: even the snake no longer lives under a curse.

All in all the conception of redemption in Isa 65:17–25 approaches that of a bucolic idyll. The imagined elements of this new creation are comparatively modest, being limited to permanent joy, the elimination of premature death (especially of children), enjoyment of the fruits of one's own labor, an intact relationship with God, as well as – and this is the only element that springs the bounds of a perfected life within given human experience – peace among animals.

6. The Reception of the Futility Curses of Deuteronomy in Isaiah 65:21–22

In addition to the above-mentioned motifs in Isa 65:17–25, all of which can be clearly identified as literary allusions to earlier texts, Isa 65:21–22 also contains further allusions to other biblical texts: “And they will build houses and live in them, and plant vineyards and eat their fruit. They will not build that another might dwell in, nor plant, that another might eat.” These verses in Isaiah clearly play off statements in Deuteronomy and cannot be understood without them. Most important are the futility curses in Deut 28, which – like the material of Deut 28 in general – follow ancient Near Eastern patterns.⁵²

Deuteronomy 28:30, 39–41

אִשָּׁה תֵּאָרֵשׁ	30 You will become engaged to a woman,
וְאִישׁ אֲחֵר יִשְׁגְּלֶנָה ⁵³	but another man will lie with her.
בֵּית תִּבְנֶה	You will build a house,
וְלֹא־תֵשֵׁב בּוֹ	but you will not live in it.

⁵¹ Cf. Martin Leuenberger, *Segen und Segenstheologien im alten Israel: Untersuchungen zu ihren religions- und theologiegeschichtlichen Konstellationen und Transformationen* (ATANT 90; Zürich, 2008), 386–87.

⁵² Cf. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford, 1972), 122; Hans-Ulrich Steymans, *Deuteronomium 28 und die adē zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel* (OBO 145; Fribourg/Göttingen, 1995), 183–84; cf. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 289. See also the discussion in Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 94.

⁵³ SamP and various other versions provide the more familiar – with the same meaning – יִשְׁכַּב עִמָּה.

כרם תטע ולא תחללנו:	You will plant a vineyard, but not enjoy its fruit.
	[...]
כרמים תטע ועבדת ויין לא-תשתה ולא תאגר	39 You will plant vineyards and dress them, but you will not drink wine nor harvest,
כי תאכלנו התלעת:	because the worm will eat it.
זיתים יהיו לך בכל-גבולך ושמן לא תסוך כי ישל זיתך:	40 You will have olive trees in your entire territory, but you will not anoint with oil, because your olives will drop off.
בנים ובנות תוליד ולא-יהיו לך כי ילכו בשבי:	41 You will have sons and daughters, but they will not remain yours, because they will go into captivity.

Within the context of the promise of a new heaven and a new earth, the appearance of the assurance of living in one's own house and the enjoyment of one's own fruit seems surprising: was this not normally the case under the world order of the "old" creation as well? The reversal was only threatened for cases of disobedience. What underlies this connection? It seems important to notice that Isa 65:21–22 plays off a cornerstone chapter of the Torah: the promise of Isa 65:17–25 attempts to highlight that, unlike under the world order of the "old" creation, it will no longer be possible for the good world order of the "new" creation to be subverted. Isaiah 65:17–25 appears to allude to opening and concluding sections of the Torah in a sort of "canonical" consciousness in order to formulate a new perspective that presents itself as an alternative that is equivalent to the Torah. In light of the statements regarding progeny in Isa 65:20, 23, it is noteworthy that this motif also appears in Deut 28:41, and the possible negative consequences of the Deuteronomic text are overcome in Isa 65:20, 23.

A reversal of the motif from Deut 28:30, 39–41 within Deuteronomy itself also appears in Deut 6:10–12, an expansion within the paranesis of Deut 6:4–9, 20–25.⁵⁴

Deuteronomy 6:10–12

והיה כי יביאך יהוה אלהיך אל-הארץ אשר נשבע לאבותיך לאברהם	When Yhwh your God brings you into the land that he swore to your ancestors,
---	---

⁵⁴ Cf. Timo Veijola, *Das 5. Buch Mose Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1–16,17* (ATD 8,1; Göttingen, 2004), 186.

ליצחק וליעקב	Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,
לתת לך	to give to you –
ערים גדלת וטבת	large, fine cities
אשר לא־בנית:	that you did not build,
ובתים מלאים כל־טוב	11 houses, full of all kinds of goods,
אשר לא־מלאת	that you did not fill,
וברת חצובים	hewn cisterns,
אשר לא־חצבת	that you did not hew,
כרמים וזיתים	vineyards and olive groves,
אשר לא־נטעת	that you did not plant –
ואכלת ושבעת:	And when you eat and become satisfied,
השמר לך	12 then watch yourself,
פַּן־תִּשְׁכַּח אֶת־יְהוָה	that you do not forget Yhwh,
אשר הוציאך מארץ מצרים	who brought you out of the land of Egypt,
מבית עבדים:	out of the house of slavery.

In the vision of Isa 65:17–25 Yhwh’s elect will still have to build their own houses and cultivate their own vineyards, but their use and enjoyment is assured.

7. The Reception of Isaiah 65:17–25 in Qohelet 1:9–11

In keeping with the inner-biblical observations of this paper, it can be added that Isa 65:17–25 was not some sort of final word in the evolution of inner-biblical interpretation of these motifs. It itself is taken up in the still later text of Qoh 1:9–11.⁵⁵

Qohelet 1:9–11

מה־יִשְׁהִיָּהּ הוּא ומה־שִׁנְעֵשָׂהּ	9 What has been will be again,
הוא שִׁיעֵשָׂהּ	and what has been done, will be done again:
ואין כל־חדש תחת השמש:	there is nothing new under the sun. ⁵⁶
יש דבר שיאמר	10 Is there something of which it might be said:
ראה־זה חדש	“Look, here is something new”?
הוא כבר היה לעלמים	It has already been, in the ages

⁵⁵ Cf. Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte*, 183–85.

⁵⁶ On the translation see Thomas Krüger, *Kohelet (Prediger)* (BK XX Sonderband; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2000), 110: “The statement is ambivalent, meaning either ‘there is nothing new *at all*’ or ‘there is nothing *completely* new.’” The context suggests that the second understanding is more probable.

אשר היה מלפננו: that were before us.

אין זכרון לראשנים 11 There is no memorial for the former things
 וגם לאחרנים שיהיו and also for the later things, which are yet to come,
 לא־יהיה להם זכרון there will be no memorial
 עם שיהיו לאחרנה: for those who come after them.

There is little doubt that Qoh 1:9–11 draws on the thematically related texts within the Isaiah tradition.⁵⁷ The theme of the “new” is introduced in such a way as to imply that Qoh 1:9–11 responds critically – almost mockingly – to Isa 43:16–21 and 65:17–25 with its polemics against the “remembrance” of the “former things” as well as the “later things.”

In its use of the Primeval History of Gen 1–11,⁵⁸ Qoh 1:9–11 to a certain degree opposes Isa 65:17–25 (as understood within the context of Isa 65): God’s world order remains constant. The “later things” will experience the same fate as the “former”: both vanish from memory. In fact, the fruits of eschatological redemption set out for the “pious” in Isa 65:13 are described by Qoh 3:13 (cf. 3:22; 5:17–19; 9:7–10; 11:7–10) as the essentials for life in the present world.

Isaiah 65:13

לכן כה־אמר אדני יהוה Therefore, thus says the Lord Yhwh:
 הנה עבדי יאכלו Look, my servants will eat,
 ואתם תרעבו but you will be hungry!
 הנה עבדי ישתו Look, my servants will drink,
 ואתם תצמאו but you will thirst!
 הנה עבדי ישמחו Look, my servants will rejoice,
 ואתם תבשו: but you will be put to shame!

Qohelet 3:13

וגם כל־האדם שיאכל And whenever any human eats
 ושתה and drinks
 וראה טוב and takes pleasure,

⁵⁷ Krüger, “Dekonstruktion,” 155; *idem*, *Kohelet*, 120–21 n. 35.

⁵⁸ Cf. *idem*, “Die Rezeption der Tora im Buch Kohelet,” in *Das Buch Kohelet: Studien zur Struktur, Geschichte, Rezeption und Theologie* (ed. L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger; BZAW 254; Berlin/New York, 1997), 173–93 repr. in *Kritische Weisheit: Studien zur weisheitlichen Traditionskritik im Alten Testament* (Zürich, 1997).

בכל-עמלו in all his toil
מתת אלהים היא: also this is a gift of God.

A small concession may possibly be made to the eschatological approaches in the formulation “nothing new *under the sun*” in Qoheleth. Strictly speaking, only the sub-solar region is addressed. However, Isa 65:17–25 is also only concerned with “newness” in the sub-solar regions of the world, suggesting that the cosmological framework remain constant. As a result the phrase “under the sun” should not be seen as a *reservatio mentalis* in Qoh 1:9–11 in opposition to Isa 65:17–25.

8. Concluding Reflections

Isaiah 65:17–25 presents a complex – and for this reason especially informative – example of inner-biblical interpretation in the Old Testament. On one hand, the text is anchored strongly within the Book of Isaiah itself. Special reference is made to the “Deutero-Isaianic” section of Isa 43:16–21, which it updates and radicalizes: God’s eschatological work will result in a new creation rather than merely in a new exodus for his people. Whether this new exodus in Isa 43:16–21 should be understood literally or figuratively is a matter of dispute (cf. nn. 21 and 22), but it need not be decided here. There is at least some consensus that the notion of an exodus of some Judeans from Babylon is *not excluded* in the vision of Isa 43:16–21. At any rate, it seems quite obvious that at least the *authors of Isa 65:17–25* understood Isa 43:16–21 to be contrasting an old and a new exodus.

The comparatively this-worldly description of redemption in the new creation in Isa 65:17–25 is, however, left behind through the inclusion of the fantastic element of peace among the animals. The presence of this very element may be explained by its rootedness in the previous Isaianic tradition: Isa 11:6–9.

The inner-Isaianic references should also be interpreted in light of the well-known fact that Isa 65–66 as a whole refers back to Isa 1. Apparently, Isa 65–66 arose as part a redaction of the book as a whole.⁵⁹ The “heaven” and the “earth” in 1:2 are juxtaposed with the “new heaven” and the “new earth” in 65:17 and 66:22. The expression פשע בי “to break with me” first appears in 1:2, where it refers to Israel. It then reappears at the very end of the book in 66:24. Here, however, the expression refers to the enemies of God. Zion’s desolation in 1:8 is juxtaposed with the wealth of its children in 66:8, 10. The polemics against the flawed worship on “New Moon” and

⁵⁹ Cf. Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 248.

“Sabbath” in 1:13–14 are contrasted at the end of the book with the expectation of worship of God by the nations on “New Moon” and “Sabbath” in 66:23. The juxtaposition of defective worship in 1:11–13 with correct worship in 66:20–21 also appears in a more general manner. The notion of the pilgrimage of nations can be found both in 2:2–4 and 66:12, 16. Finally, the image of a judgment of fire upon Judah in 1:31 (cf. 1:7) reappears as a judgment of fire upon God’s enemies in 66:15–16, 24.⁶⁰

The “new heaven” and the “new earth” in Isa 65:17–25 can be seen as the final station of the scribal development of the Isaiah tradition – at least in the opinion of the redactors who conceived Isa 65–66 as the conclusion of the Book of Isaiah.

Isaiah 65:17–25’s field of vision is not limited solely to Isaianic perspectives as seen in its references to prominent Torah texts. More precisely, according to the literary positions of the texts mentioned – Gen 1:1 and 3:14 at the beginning of the Torah and as part of the outer frame of Gen 1–3 as a whole, and Deut 28:30 at the end of the Torah – Isa 65:17–25 may intend to allude to the Torah as a whole. Apparently the Torah is viewed as regulative for the “old” creation, whose difficulties arise because its original “goodness” (Gen 1:31) included the possibility of its own perversion, which very quickly became a reality (Gen 6:12). The fact that Isa 65:17–25 alludes to the Torah as a whole attempts to show that the “new” creation and its world order are meant to be permanent, thereby making obsolete the interweaving of history and law found in the Torah.

⁶⁰ Cf. David M. Carr, “Reading Isaiah from Beginning (Isaiah 1) to End (Isaiah 65-66): Multiple Modern Possibilities,” in *New Visions of Isaiah* (ed. R.F. Melugin; JSOTSup 214; Sheffield, 1996), 188–218; Marvin Sweeney, “Prophetic Exegesis in Isaiah 65–66,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans; VTSup 70/1; Leiden/Boston, 1997), 465–66; Konrad Schmid, “Jesaja/Jesajabuch,” in RGG⁴ IV (2001): 451–56; Stromberg, *Isaiah*, 148–54 (see the discussion 148 n. 5).