

# ISAIAH

## ISAIAH 15:1-16:5 JUDGMENT ON MOAB

Moab is next on the list of nations that will experience the justice of God. Moab was established by the son of Lot who was a product of the drunken liaison he had with his daughters after Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed (Gen. 19:15-25), and his wife was slain by being turned into a pillar of salt (Gen. 19:26).

Genesis 19:37 <sup>37</sup>The firstborn bore a son, and called his name Moab [מוֹאָב]; he is the father of the Moabites to this day.

Moab was located on the east shore of the Dead Sea which was its western border. The rivers Arnon on the north and Zered on the south were the boundaries on those sides of the nation. Its territory encompassed about 30 miles by 30 miles, more or less at times, or 900 square miles, which is small in terms of a nation's total territory. On the east, the border was somewhat ill defined, but probably stopped where agriculture became no longer possible.

Based on Isaiah 14:32 which says nations will come to Judah seeking mutual aid covenants for protection, many theologians believe God is warning Judah not to align with Moab just as he warned them not to align with and Philistia. Moab and Philistia were going to suffer the same fate. After Moab was destroyed, the Moabites were going to seek refuge in Judah, but that was being discouraged by the prophet speaking on behalf of Yahweh. There is an element of sadness expressed by God revealing a warm regard for Moab that was not present in the prophecy of judgment concerning Philistia.

Moab and Israel had contentious relations as far back as the Exodus when Balak hired Balaam to curse Israel as they traversed the area (Num. 22-24). During the Exodus, Moab refused to allow the Israelites to journey through their nation (Judges 11:17-18), and Israel was commanded not to make war with them because God had given Moab to Lot's son as his possession (Dt. 2:9). Because Moab refused to allow Israel travel rights through their land during the Exodus, they were not to be allowed to enter the assembly of the Lord to the tenth generation (Dt. 23:3-4; Neh. 13:1-2). The Moabite women enticed the Israelite men to play the harlot with them (Num. 25) and therefore rebel against God. The Bible records a number of instances of warfare and the subjugation of one another to one extent or another throughout the history of the two nations up to the Assyrian and Babylonian conquests of Israel and Judah. Reuben and Gad claimed some land east of the Jordan that created the setting for territorial disputes between Israel and Moab. David completely subjugated them (2 Kings 8:2), but after Solomon, Israel controlled Moab only for a time. Eglon, the king of Moab, subjugated Israel for 18 years during the time of the judges until Ehud delivered them (Judges 3:15-30). There were problems with the Moabites when the Israelites began their return to Israel after the Babylonian captivity (Ezra 9:1; Neh. 13:1-2). Moab also had disputes with Ammon over territory.

There were periods of time when relations between Israel and Moab were not contentious. Israel and Moab were related through Abraham's nephew, Lot, but that

does not completely explain the somewhat friendly relationship because the Ammonites had the same relationship and the Edomites were related to them through Esau, Jacob's brother, and they did not have friendly relationships with Israel. Moab did sell the Israelites provisions at Ar (Dt 2:29) when they were at the northern border of Moab prior to moving into position to cross the Jordan into the Promised Land. Ruth was Moabite woman who became an ancestor of King David which places her in the line of Messiah (Ruth 4:16-22; Mt. 1:5).

The God of Moab, Chemosh, made inroads into Israelite society in defiance of God's commandment. The people of Moab were known as "people of Chemosh" (Num. 21:29), and Chemosh was a god of child sacrifice. Even Solomon built an altar to Chemosh which was most likely an effort to placate the Moabite women he married and used as concubines (1 Kings 11:1, 7). The Bible does not say that Solomon ever sacrificed any of his children on that altar, but the fact he built it at least implies that he did so. It certainly implies that his Moabite wives and concubines used that altar for its intended purpose. Solomon's altar to Chemosh was not removed until Josiah destroyed that altar during the reforms that he instituted several hundred years later (2 Kings 23:13). Presumably, the Israelite population was using the altar of Chemosh for its intended purpose as well.

In 1868, a German missionary found a stele called the Mesha Stone or the Moabite Stone. This stele was 3 feet 10 inches tall and 2 feet in width and contains 34 lines of text. It reads in part: "Omri was the king of Israel, and he oppressed Moab for many days, for Kemoš was angry with his land. And his son succeeded him, and he said - he too - "I will oppress Moab!" In my days he did so, but I looked down on him and on his house, and Israel has gone to ruin, yes, it has gone to ruin for ever! Omri had taken possession of the whole land of Medeba and he lived there in his days and half the days of his son, forty years, but Kemoš restored it in my days. And I built Ba'al Meon, and I made in it a water reservoir, and I built Kiriathaim" [[https://www.ancient.eu/Moabite\\_Stone\\_\[Mesha\\_Stele\]/](https://www.ancient.eu/Moabite_Stone_[Mesha_Stele]/)].

2 Kings 1:1; 3:1-27 speaks of this rebellion; however, it did not result in the victory Mesha claimed on this stele, in fact, the Israelites prevailed. Eventually, however, Mesha was able to extricate himself from being a tribute nation to Israel.

Probably because the King's Highway ran through it making it a very strategic location, Moab was constantly under assault from other people groups and nations. Arab tribes attacked them and over time they were invaded by the Assyrians and the Babylonians. They lost their national sovereignty in the sixth century B.C. and ceased to exist as a distinct people group by the second century B.C.

The prophet Zephaniah also predicted the destruction of Moab for their treatment of Judah, but it was also couched in a short-term and long-term prophetic format. The

conditions called for in the prophecy have never been completely fulfilled, and the context refers, in part, to the nations of the world and not just to Moab.

Zephaniah 2:9–10 <sup>9</sup>“Therefore, as I live,” declares the LORD of hosts, The God of Israel, “Surely Moab will be like Sodom And the sons of Ammon like Gomorrah— A place possessed by nettles and salt pits, And a perpetual desolation. The remnant of My people will plunder them And the remainder of My nation will inherit them.” <sup>10</sup>This they will have in return for their pride, because they have taunted and become arrogant against the people of the LORD of hosts.

Isaiah's prophecy concerning the judgment of Moab begins with a lament.

Isaiah 15:1 <sup>1</sup>The oracle concerning Moab [מוֹאָב]. Surely in a night Ar of Moab is devastated [שָׁדַד] and ruined [הָרַק]; Surely in a night Kir of Moab is devastated and ruined.

No one knows exactly when or what nation inflicted this destruction on Moab, although some attribute it to Assyria which was a problem for Israel and the rest of the region during this period of Isaiah's ministry. Assyria is the most likely culprit in terms of the preponderance of the evidence. We do know that it was going to take place within three years of the prophecy because that was the timeline provided by the Lord (Is. 16:14). Ar and Kir were the major cities in the nation. Ar, meaning “city,” was located on the southern bank of the Arnon river about 20 miles east of the Dead Sea on what was the northern border of the country. Kir was located at what is now Khirbet Karnak or Kerek, sources varied, although a current map indicates it may be Al-Karak, which is about 17 miles south of the Arnon River and 11 miles east of the Dead Sea. Kir refers to Kir-Hareseth, Kir simply meaning a wall or a fortified wall. Kir was apparently the capital of Moab during this time.

That these cities would be destroyed in a night indicates the destruction would come upon them suddenly, and the two mainstays of Moab's security would be gone. Kir was a rock fortress and the primary means of security for the nation. These two cities represent the whole of the nation; it is not just the cities that are destroyed. The nation is conquered.

Devastate, שָׁדַד, means to deal violently with, to despoil, or to devastate. It has the sense of complete destruction and irreparable damage. In the short-term, this does not mean the cities could not be rebuilt. Cities were often completely destroyed and rebuilt right on top of the destruction over and over again. Beit Shan provides a visual image of what these tells look like. That is the meaning of the “tells,” or mounds consisting of layer upon layer of destroyed and rebuilt cities. Ruined, הָרַק, means to cease, to cause to cease, to cut off, or to destroy. In terms of the sense being conveyed here, these two words are essentially synonyms, and the repetition is for emphasis.

Not unexpectedly, the effect of this devastation on the people is negative.

Isaiah 15:2–4 <sup>2</sup>They have gone up to the temple and to Dibon, even to the high places to weep. Moab wails over Nebo and Medeba; Everyone's head is bald and every beard is cut off. <sup>3</sup>In their streets they have girded themselves with sackcloth; On their housetops and in their squares Everyone is wailing, dissolved in tears. <sup>4</sup>Heshbon and Elealeh also cry

out, Their voice is heard all the way to Jahaz; Therefore the armed men [הַלְלִיךְ] of Moab cry aloud; His soul trembles within him.

People of Semitic origin are known for their outward displays of grief and this description of the pronounced grief of the Moabites is an example of that. Weeping, wailing, shaving the head and the beard, and wearing sackcloth are all examples of the ways that Near East culture displayed grief. Even the armed men were grieving. This does not refer to a standing army, it refers to armed citizens which represents the whole nation. They knew the extent of the danger and the destruction. They were so frightened at the presence of the conquering armies that they grew fainthearted—and no one wants an army, professional or militia, of frightened, fainthearted troops. This fear will be universal; everyone will be experiencing it. Their cries will be so loud that they will be heard from long distances.

Armed men, הַלְלִיךְ, refers, in this context, to men equipped for war, to put on a warrior's belt, gird or arm oneself, make ready for battle, invigorate, or make strong. It has the sense of taking up arms for battle, or preparing for a general state of military readiness. Certainly, the invading army was so much stronger than the Moabite defenders, they were quaking in fear. In those days, the men were expected to take up arms in defense of their nation. Moab was not a very large nation; whether or not they had a standing army, I don't know.

They resorted to their idols for comfort, but idols cannot provide comfort; they are deaf and mute and can do nothing to comfort anyone. The Moabites would go up to the high places that pagans favored for worship. The word translated "temple," בַּיִת, is actually the word for "house," but it was not unusual to refer to a temple as house, and there was a temple to Chemosh on Dibon.

Some of the places mentioned here were in the disputed territory north of the Arnon River; they were not all confined to the territorial boundaries located between the Arnon and Zered Rivers. Nebo was close to Mount Nebo which is the place of Moses' death north of the Arnon River. Nebo, Heshbon, Elealeh, and Jahaz were in the territory allotted to Reuben. Dibon was a city in the territory allotted to Gad. Zoar was south of the southern boundary at the south end of the Dead Sea in what was Edom and provided a place of refuge out of the country. The location of some of these places is simply unknown. Nevertheless, the Moabites were in all of them.

The first part of verse 5 relates to the anguish God expressed through the prophet at the judgment of Moab. There is no reason to believe Isaiah did not feel the same way.

Isaiah 15:5a <sup>5</sup>My heart cries out for Moab ...

The Moabite refugees were a concern of God.

Isaiah 15:5b–7 <sup>5</sup> ...His fugitives are as far as Zoar ~~and~~ Eglath-shelishiyah, For they go up the ascent of Luhith weeping; Surely on the road to Horonaim they raise a cry of distress over *their* ruin. <sup>6</sup>For the waters of Nimrim are desolate. Surely the grass is withered, the tender

grass died out, There is no green thing. <sup>7</sup>Therefore the abundance [יתרה] which they have acquired and stored up They carry off over the brook of Arabim.

Eglath-shelishiyah, עגלת שלשיה, means a three-year old heifer, or ox, which has led to some confusion. The KJV translated these words “an heifer of three-years-old.” The conjunction “and” is not in the text suggesting the words have some relationship to Zoar as though they referred to the same thing. Some theologians believe it is the name of a place or a city meaning “the third heifer.”

Other theologians, however, believe it refers to the strength and vitality of a three-year old ox. It was a three-year-old heifer that was used as one of the sacrificial animals in the Abrahamic Covenant ratification ceremony in Genesis 15:9. It may be a reference to Zoar as a strong city worthy of harboring refugees. In that case it would mean something like “Zoar, strong as a three-year-old heifer (or oxen).” The Septuagint has that sense reading, “... Zoar, for she is a three-year-old heifer.” The TANAKH reads, “... to Zoar, to Eglath-shelishiyah” which suggests places, either the same one or two different ones. What we do know is that the words do mean a three-year-old heifer, and they were meaningful to the original audience in relation to that definition. The *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* interprets it “to indicate a place, Eglath-shelishiyah” [s.v. “עגלה,” 644-645]. In terms of grammar, it may be Zoar, Eglath-shelishiyah as a reference to the same location. In the end, we have to admit that no one knows for sure exactly what these words mean in this context.

Nimrim, meaning “basins of clear water,” was a stream in northwest Moab flowing into the Jordan River north of the Dead Sea that provided the water for a productive agricultural industry in that area. According to this prophecy, the waters will become desolate and the vegetation will dry out and wither. The springs feeding this stream were almost certainly stopped up by the invading army which was a common military tactic during that era. The picture here is one of a green, and therefore well-watered and productive area, that loses its water and therefore dries up becoming a place lacking in productivity. Some theologians think the Nimrim was a wadi on the southern end of the Dead Sea, but the description seems to represent the spring fed stream to the north and the consequent fertility that resulted from the water supply.

As a result, the people flee south into Edom, carrying whatever they could of their wealth with them. This wealth is what they have worked for and accumulated over time as a product of their labor. This is a normal human reaction to escaping calamity. People try to take with them the things that matter to them, particularly their wealth. Presumably, one would need financial resources to continue living in a new place, often without a means of support at least for a time.

Isaiah 15:8–9 <sup>8</sup>For the cry [זעקה] of distress has gone around the territory of Moab, Its wail [יללה] goes as far as Eglaim and its wailing even to Beer-elim. <sup>9</sup>For the waters of Dimon are full of blood; Surely [כי] I will bring added ~~woes~~ upon Dimon, A lion upon the fugitives of Moab and upon the remnant of the land.

The cries will be heard across the land of Moab. Eglaim is in the southwest near the Dead Sea, and Beer-elim is in the northeast where the wilderness begins. The whole of the

nation will be expressing their grief. Both cry, זָעַקָה, and wail, יָלְלָה, refer to lamentation; the nation's mourning will not quickly come to an end.

Surely, כִּי, means indeed, surely, and truly; it is a marker of emphasis and strengthening a statement. What God is saying He will bring about, God is going to actually bring about. One attack will not be the end of it; others will follow and bring additional distress upon the people and their nation. The text does not actually say what it is that will be added upon Dimon; “woes” is not in the text. Whatever it is, it is related to blood in the water representing the fact there will be more death. The best translation may be “For I set on Dimon additions” (YLT) without trying to fill in what the text does not say. Even after that, those who survive will face more death from a foe depicted as a lion.

Some theologians want to portray the lion as the tribe of Judah, but there is no indication in the text or in the historical record that Judah attacked Moab at this time. That is an unwarranted imposition into the text based only the fact that Jacob, or Israel, described Judah as a lion (Gen. 49:9) during the blessing of his sons in Genesis 49.

Chapter 16 begins with an entreaty by Moab to Judah for protection.

Isaiah 16:1-2 <sup>1</sup>Send the ~~tribute~~ lamb to the ruler of the land, From Sela by way of the wilderness to the mountain of the daughter of Zion. <sup>2</sup>Then, like fleeing birds or scattered nestlings, The daughters of Moab will be at the fords of the Arnon.

For some time, Moab had been sending lambs as tribute to Israel (2 Kings 3:4), but they will break free from that obligation and then offer them to Judah in return for that nation's help in their crisis. “Tribute” is not in the text; that is what the lamb represents and the people of the time would have understood it that way, but the text does not specifically identify it as such. This is not the first time that Jerusalem has been called “the mountain of the daughter of Zion” (Is. 10:32); it is clearly a reference to the capital city of Judah where the Temple is located on Mt. Zion.

Sela is a place name meaning “rock,” but it may also mean rocky country or wilderness. Many theologians identify it with Petra or a nearby area in Edom, but others believe this is a reference to a rocky wilderness close to Moab and further north. The exact location is speculation, but it is obviously in the area.

The Moabites were described as birds forced out of their nest with no means of support; they were scattered and homeless, aimlessly fluttering about. The “daughters of Moab” may be a figurative way of referring to the citizens of Moab and not just to some women and children. Eventually, they gathered at the fords of the Arnon, that is to say, the northern border of Moab. This place is the closest they could get to Israel without trespassing into Israel without permission.

Moab asked the king of Judah for refuge.

Isaiah 16:3–4a <sup>3</sup>“Give us advice, make a decision; Cast your shadow like night at high noon; Hide the outcasts [חַיִּי], do not betray the fugitive [בְּרִי]. <sup>4</sup>“Let the outcasts of Moab stay with you; Be a hiding place to them from the destroyer.” ...

The Moabites accurately described themselves as outcasts and fugitives. War does that to people. It runs them out of their homes and leaves them with no means of support. It puts them in the position of relying on others for sustenance and for survival. Until they reach safety, they are, in many ways, in constant jeopardy.

Outcast, *נָדָה*, means to impel, drive away, or banish, referring to being expelled from a place of residence to another place. It has the sense of forcibly driving or pushing something away.

Fugitive, *נָדָד*, means to expel or chase away, to retreat, to flee, or to depart. It has the sense of fleeing, running, or moving away quickly so as to escape.

The picture here is one of a disorganized, frightened, desperate group of people who had to leave their homeland to avoid death. They are imploring their neighbor to take them in and provide them with a safe place to stay. The fugitives believe the shadow of Judah will cover them, hide them, and protect them from harm. There is no indication they were allowed to enter Judah.

Nondispensational theologians who recognize the Messianic importance of the following verse and a half force justification salvation into this verse. That is a spiritualization approach to interpreting this Scripture that results in forcing an unwarranted conclusion into it. Young's position is that Zion's counsel and covering in their shadow is insufficient; Moab needs deliverance. That's true, but the question is, is that what this Scripture is revealing? No; that is reading later New Testament revelation back into the Old Testament prophecy.

"But counsel and right decisions are not sufficient. Moab needs deliverance, and hence prays that Zion will act.... If there is to be deliverance Moab must be covered with Zion's shadow. Indeed, all who will find deliverance must be covered with Zion's shadow.... Once Israel used to flee to Moab. Now the picture is completely reversed, and Moab flees to Israel. The reference is to a spiritual conversion of this ancient enemy of God's people. Moab is not to be utterly wiped out. When the enemy comes in upon her, she is to look to God, who is to be found in Zion, and to come with supplication for deliverance. 'Hide me under the shadow of thy wing,' is the essence of her prayer, as it is also for all those who flee for refuge to Jesus" [Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah: A Commentary*, 3 vols., 1:462-463]. It is true that the Moabites need justification salvation, but that is not the subject of this verse; physical deliverance from death at the hands of an invading army is the subject.

The next verse and a half have not only a short-term application to the situation at hand, but they have a definite, long-term Messianic application to them.

Isaiah 16:4b-5<sup>4</sup>... For the extortioner has come to an end [*אֶפְסָה*], destruction has ceased, Oppressors have completely [*הִמָּחַד*] disappeared from the land. <sup>5</sup>A throne will even be established in lovingkindness [*חֶסֶד*], And a judge [*שֹׁפֵט*] will sit on it in faithfulness [*אֱמֶת*] in the tent of David; Moreover, he will seek justice [*מִשְׁפָּט*] And be prompt in righteousness [*קִדְקִי*].

Certainly, wars have started and ended, ruthless dictators and evil political systems have come and gone, but, in this age, they are always replaced. At the time of these words, the oppressor had not been defeated and the destruction had not ceased, although that would eventually happen at that point in history. However, when considered in the context of verse 5, there is meaning and application beyond this time in history.

End, **אָפּט**, means to be at an end, to be no more, to cease, to fail. It refers to being or to becoming nonexistent.

Completely, **אָמאָנג**, means to complete, to be complete, to finish, to conclude, to bring an event or activity to a successful end.

These words convey a sense of finality that has yet to take place.

The word “disappeared” was added by the NASB translators, along with the NET Bible and the LEB, to finish the thought of “completely.” Other words meaning essentially the same thing were used in other translations: “consumed” (NKJV, KJV, ASV, YLT), “vanished” (ESV, RSV, HCSB), and “perished” (TANAKH). When the Kingdom begins, there will no longer be any oppressors in not only Israel, but in the world. If any hint of such a one pops up, the Lord, who will be ruling from the tent of David with a rod of iron (Ps. 2:9), will immediately put a stop it. Until then, oppressors will be a continual problem in Israel and in the world, culminating in the ultimate oppressor, the antichrist.

Judge, **פּאַרשפּאַן**, means to judge, to govern; it refers to the process of to hear and to be the judge in a legal case. This judge was going to be a faithful judge. Faithful, **אָמאָנג**, means truth or faithfulness; it is frequently connected to justice and righteousness as it is here. Justice, **רעכטשאַפטיקייט**, is a legal term meaning a decision or a judgment; it refers to a determination of right and wrong on legal matters. Righteousness, **רעכטשאַפטיקייט**, means righteousness, honesty, justice, rightness; it refers to adherence to what is required according to a standard.

These words all refer to justice and doing what is right and true. No king in either Israel or Judah had ever perfectly displayed these attributes that will characterize and be fulfilled by this future king sitting in the tent of David.

All of the verbs used in this Scripture are perfect meaning they represent completed action. In terms of the future, they represent a prophetic perfect, that is, they are as good as completed even though they have yet to take place. From the standpoint of the prophet, these things are as good as done, because God will accomplish them.

At the time, there was a Davidic throne in Jerusalem. However, they had no idea that throne was going to be removed in the near future necessitating a reestablishment of that throne in the future—the far distant future. This future throne will be established in lovingkindness, **אָהבליב**, which is a loyal love, an unfailing kind of love, kindness, or goodness, often used of God's love that is related to faithfulness to His covenant. No Davidic king ever exercised the kind of lovingkindness this word implies. When Messiah assumes this throne, the full meaning of **אָהבליב** will be realized, but not until then. He will perfectly judge and until then no Davidic king ever fulfilled that role to perfection. Justice and



righteousness will be standard operating procedure in the Kingdom when the King sits on His throne.

Many theologians, primarily dispensationalists, although there are others, recognize the Messianic significance of these verses. Nondispensational theologians who recognize the Messianic truths revealed here, usually, and erroneously, relegate them to the Second Coming and the beginning of the eternal state rather than to the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom.

"It is not quite clear whether the Moabite delegation, in their flattering speech, described the actual conditions prevailing in Judah at that time, or whether they were speaking of the future. In any case, it is significant that the Moabites use terms which strongly reflect the Messianic expectations, nurtured by the faithful remnant in Israel and by Isaiah himself, centering around the Messianic king, who will sit upon the throne of David and execute justice and righteousness" [Victor Buksbazen, *The Prophet Isaiah: A Commentary*, 206].

Young related this revelation back to Isaiah 9:6 and says, "The throne is that of David upon which Christ sits" [Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah: A Commentary*, vol. 1, 1:464].

Fruchtenbaum also related verse 5 to Isaiah 9:6-7. "As if to reiterate his previous statement [Is. 9:6-7], Isaiah declares again that a throne will surely be established on the basis of God's loyal love. The One sitting on the Throne will be a member of the House of David Who will be characterized by truth. He will be the King and Judge, ensuring that justice is carried out—a justice springing from the righteousness of the King" [Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events*, rev. ed., 389].

"Moab would find security in Zion because extortion and destruction had ceased in Judah, and oppressors would no longer dwell there. A merciful, faithful, just, and righteous Davidic king would judge there. This is clearly a reference to Messiah's rule during the Millennium (cf. 9:1-6 [birth and reign of the Prince of Peace]; 11:1-9 [the righteous reign of the Branch]). Moab, then, will be one of the nations that comes to the mountain of God to seek his ways. This leap into the eschaton in the oracle extends Moab's desire to find security in Judah in Isaiah's day—far into the future" [Thomas L. Constable, *Thomas Constable's Notes on the Bible; Volume IV: Isaiah-Daniel*, 4:57].

The "tent of David" will need to be reconstructed. In Acts 15:16, James, quoting Amos 9:11, referred to the fallen tent of David that needed to be reestablished. This is the same tent of David that Isaiah referenced.

Amos 9:11 <sup>11</sup>"In that day I will raise up the fallen booth of David, And wall up its breaches; I will also raise up its ruins And rebuild it as in the days of old;

Acts 15:16 <sup>16</sup>AFTER THESE THINGS I will return, AND I WILL REBUILD THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID WHICH HAS FALLEN, AND I WILL REBUILD ITS RUINS, AND I WILL RESTORE IT,

“He [Isaiah] looks forward to the day when the oppression which has driven the Moabites into the Hebrews' arms will be brought to an end by that ideal ruler of the Davidic house. Because of his attachment to mercy, faithfulness, justice, and righteousness, oppression will not be able to coexist with him. He will offer a kind of security that will be more permanent than any heretofore known. This vision is clearly messianic, as comparison with 9:1-6 and 11:1-9 must show. Isaiah recognizes that Moab's hope is identical with Judah's. Both wait for a King of Israel who will somehow embody those traits which are in fact the character of God.... Moab is representative of the nations which will come to the mountain of God to learn his ways, ways which are incarnated in a person who is the true ruler of Israel” [John N. Oswalt, *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament: The Book of Isaiah, Chapters 1-39*, 343].