THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

The Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah in the MT and the LXX:
A Comparison of Their Portrayals of God

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the

School of Theology and Religious Studies

Of The Catholic University of America

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Sacred Theology

©

Copyright

All Rights Reserved

By

Paul Maillet

Washington, D.C.

2010

The Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah in the MT and the LXX: A Comparison of Their Portrayals of God

Paul Maillet, S.T.D.

Director: Christopher T. Begg, S.T.D., Ph.D.

This comparison of the portrayals of God in the Masoretic and Septuagint texts of the Servant Songs of Isaiah includes a discussion of the delimitation of the four songs, of text-critical issues, and of problems in translation. After the implied speakers and audiences are identified, those verses in which God is the speaker or referent are analyzed vis-à-vis their portrayal of God. The portrayals conveyed by the two forms of each song are then compared, and finally patterns in differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts are identified.

Although these Masoretic and Septuagint texts yield similar portrayals of God, differences emerge. The LXX texts contain fewer anthropomorphisms/anthropopathisms and depict God as more supportive of his Servant/Son than do the corresponding Masoretic texts. For example, in Isaiah 53, the MT depicts God as "crush[ing]" the Servant, whereas in the LXX the Servant's/Son's suffering is merely permitted by God, who quickly comes to his Servant's/Son's aid. The MT and the LXX texts address the problems of theodicy differently. The LXX focuses on the suffering as a divine discipline leading to wisdom while the MT gives equal weight to other explanations. For example, the Third Servant Song in the MT, unlike in the LXX, could lead the reader/listener to construe the Servant's suffering as a test of the Servant's faithfulness. While both the MT and LXX text of Isaiah 53 assert that the Servant's suffering benefits

others (identified only as "we" and "the many"), the MT, unlike the LXX, does so in terms of cultic imagery. The MT, unlike the LXX text, refers to the Servant's justification of "the many."

In general, the portrayal of God in the Septuagint text would appear more congenial to those Jews (and potential non-Jewish "God-fearers") influenced by Greek philosophy. It is impossible, however, to know how the LXX translator's *Vorlage* compared to the MT of the Servant Songs or—to the degree that the *Vorlage* was the same—which of the differences in meaning were intended and not the result of errors/ambiguities in translation.

This dissertation by Paul Maillet fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in biblical studies approved by Christopher Begg, S.T.D., Ph.D., as Director, and by Francis Gignac, D. Phil. and Joseph Jensen, S.T.D. as Readers.

Christopher Begg, S.T.D., Ph.D., Director

Francis Gignac, S.J., D. Phil., Reader

Joseph Jensen, O.S.B., S.T.D., Reader

To my parents

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations.. vii

Acknowledgments.. viii

Chapter One.. 1

- I. Background: The State of Questions Related to Isaiah's Servant Songs but Not Directly Addressed in This Dissertation 3
  - A. PI, DI, and TI and Their Relationship to One Another 3
  - B. The Question of Canonicity of LXX Isaiah 5
  - C. The Question of Textkanon.. 6
  - D. Research on DI 13
  - E. Research on the Servant Songs 14
  - F. Research on Isaiah 53 17
- II. The State of Questions Directly Related to This Dissertation 19
  - A. The Masoretic Texts.. 19
  - B. The LXX 19
  - C. Isaiah Texts at Qumran 24
  - D. Qumran Isaiah and LXX Isaiah vis-à-vis M Isaiah.................... 31
- III. Assumptions, Aims, and Method of This Study 34

Chapter Two: The First Servant Song.. 38

- I. Delimitation.. 38
- II. The Portrayal of God in MT Isa 42:1-9.. 43
  - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation... 43
  - B. Implied Speakers and Addressees 47
  - C. What Yhwh Says and Implies about Himself 50
  - D. What the Prophet Says and Implies about Yhwh....................... 68
  - E. Summary of the Portrayal of Yhwh in MT 42:1-9...................... 69
- III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isa 42:1-9 71
  - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation... 71
  - B. Implied Speakers and Addressees 75
  - C. What κύριος Says and Implies about Himself............................ 76
  - D. What the Prophet Says about κύριος 91
  - E. Summary of the Portrayal of κύριος... 91
- IV. Comparison of the Portrayals of God in the MT and LXX Texts of Isa 42:1-9...................................... 92
- V. Summary 94

Chapter Three: The Second Servant Song 96

- I. Preliminary Questions.. 96
    - A. Can 49:1-6 (or any pericope including 49:3) be Considered a "Servant Song"? 96
    - B. Delimitation of the Second Servant Song.................................. 98
- II. The Portrayal of God in MT Isa 49:1-13 103
    - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation.. 103
    - B. Implied Speakers and Addressees 110
    - C. What Yhwh Says and Implies about Himself 113
    - D. What Others Say or Imply about Yhwh 122
    - E. A Summary of the Portrayal of Yhwh in the Second Servant Song 126
- III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isa 49:1-13 128
    - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation.. 128
    - B. Implied Speakers and Addressees 132
    - C. What κύριος Says or Implies about Himself............................. 134
    - D. What Others Say or Imply about κύριος 140
    - E. Summary of the Portrayal of God in the LXX Second Servant Song 144
- IV. Comparison of the Portrayal of God in the MT and LXX Texts of Isa 49:1-13... 146

Chapter Four: The Third Servant Song 154

- I. Delimitation... 154
- II. Portrayal of God in MT 50:4-11 158
    - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation.. 158
    - B. Implied Speakers and Addressees 164
    - C. What Yhwh Says and Implies about Himself 166
    - D. What the Servant Says or Implies about Yhwh.......................... 171
- III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isa 50:4-11 176
    - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation.. 176
    - B. What κύριος Says or Implies about Himself............................. 180
    - C. What the παῖς Says or Implies about κύριος 181
    - D. Summary of the LXX Third Servant Song's Portrayal of κύριος.. 185
- IV. Comparison of the Portrayal of God in the MT and LXX Text of Isa 50:4-11 185
- V. Summary 191

Chapter Five: The Fourth Servant Song 193

- I. Delimitation of the Pericope 194
- II. The Portrayal of God in MT Isaiah 53 197
  - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation 197
  - B. Implied Speakers and Addressees 208
  - C. What Yhwh Says and Implies about Himself 209
  - D. What the "We" Say and Imply about Yhwh 219
  - E. Summary of the MT Fourth Servant Song's Portrayal of Yhwh 226
- III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isaiah 53 227
  - A. Text-critical Notes and Translation 227
  - B. Implied Speakers and Addressees 233
  - C. What κύριος Says and Implies about Himself 234
  - D. What the "We" Say and Imply about κύριος 242
  - E. Summary of LXX Isaiah 53's Portrayal of God 256
- IV. Comparison of MT and LXX 258
  - A. Similarities 260
  - B. Differences 262

Chapter Six: Conclusion 269

- I. Introduction 269
- II. Salient Similarities and Differences in the Portrayal of God in the Masoretic and Septuagint Texts of the Servant Songs 270
  - A. Areas of Similarity and Difference 270
  - B. Patterns within the Differences 278
  - C. Do These Patterns Reflect *Tendenzen* in LXX Isaiah Translator's Work as a Whole? 279
- III. Areas for Further Research 280

Bibliography 284

List of Abbreviations

Most of the abbreviations and sigla used in this dissertation are according to the "Instructions for Contributors to the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*" (*CBQ).* The following sigla are not found in the *CBQ* list. Most of the documents to which they refer are introduced and discussed in Chapter One of the dissertation.

A	Codex Alexandrinus
A′	readings peculiar to both A and miniscule MS 106
A-Q	joint readings of Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Marchalianus, and Codex Sinaiticus
ANE	ancient Near East
B	Codex Vaticanus
Bo	Bohairic (Coptic) translation
C	the Catena Group (MSS citing *Catena in XVI prophetas*)
DI	Deutero-Isaiah, i.e., Isaiah 40–55
L	Leningrad Codex B 19^{A}
L	recension of Lucian
M	proto-Masoretic Text
O	joint readings of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Venetus
OG	Old Greek translation, commonly referred to as the Septuagint
PI	Proto-Isaiah, i.e., Isaiah 1–39
Syr	Syriac (*Peshiṭṭa*) version
TI	Trito-Isaiah, i.e., Isaiah 56-66
TNK	Jewish Publication Society *Tanakh*, New Translation (1985)
TWOT	R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, eds. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament.* Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
Q	Codex Marchalianus
S	Codex Sinaiticus
Sa	Sahidic Translation, an incomplete Coptic version of Isaiah
Syh	Codex Syrohexaplaris Ambrosianus
V	Codex Venetus
α′	Aquila
θ′	Theodotion
σ′	Symmachus
οἱ γ	"the Three" (Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus)

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my professors, colleagues, friends, and family for the support they have given me in writing this dissertation. I am grateful to the Society of Saint Sulpice (of which I am a Temporary Member) for providing me with the Raymond Brown Scholarship, which made it financially possible to pursue both my S.T.L. and S.T.D. degrees. I am grateful to all of the biblical studies faculty and Semitics faculty at The Catholic University of America who have taught me during my licentiate and doctoral programs. I wish to make special mention of several professors whose assistance with the dissertation extended beyond the classroom. I remember vividly and gratefully the meeting with Fr. Frank Matera in which the original idea of the dissertation came into being. I will be forever grateful to Fr. Christopher Begg, my dissertation director, for many reasons, of which I will mention two: his generosity in giving of his erudition and his valuable time in promptly, patiently, and thoroughly reviewing the multiple drafts of this dissertation and offering innumerable suggestions for improvements; and for lending me an extraordinary number of books and articles pertinent to my research, including some very recent publications. Both of my readers, Fr. Frank Gignac, S.J. (with whom I was privileged to study both New Testament *Koine* and Septuagint Greek) and Fr. Joseph Jensen, O.S.B., have been painstaking in their attention to detail and enormously helpful in their critiques. For their generosity in giving of their time and expertise I am very grateful.

Members of the faculty at St. Mary's Seminary and University in Baltimore, where I have had the pleasure of residing in my final year of writing this dissertation, have also supported my efforts in important ways. Special thanks are due to Fr. Michael Barré, S.S., Professor of Sacred Scripture, whose assistance, especially in issues of translation, in proofreading, and in matters philological has been invaluable. I am grateful to Fr. William Miller, S.J., Associate Professor of Sacred Scripture; Fr. Renato Lopez, S.S., Assistant Professor of Sacred Scripture; and Fr. Dan Doherty, S.S. Assistant Professor of Pastoral Theology, all of whom helped me by proofreading.

Among my family and friends, I am most grateful to my parents, to whom I have dedicated this dissertation. My mother, whose love of the Bible motivated her to start an extraordinarily successful women's Bible study in the Diocese of Tulsa, has been an enthusiastic supporter of my graduate biblical studies and research. Sadly, as the result of several strokes during the time of my doctoral program, our conversations are labored and no longer go into detail about my work; nevertheless her spiritual support is evident, and her courage and faith in the midst of suffering are ever an inspiration. When my father is not faithfully attending to my mother's many physical needs, he has been always ready to serve as proofreader. A man of broad interests, love of Scripture and languages, and himself a recipient of a doctorate from Catholic University (D.S.W. '66), he has taken great interest in my research, and our numerous telephone conversations, peppered with many questions about the content of my work (born of his lifelong love of learning), have helped me to clarify my own ideas and have greatly mitigated the proverbial loneliness of dissertation-writing.

Finally, a word of thanks to two esteemed professors from my days as a seminarian at Mount Saint Mary's Seminary and two beloved uncles. All four offered encouragement to me as I began my dissertation but died before seeing me complete it. Sr. Joan Gormley was a wonderful Scripture teacher, who remained a friend and supporter as I followed in her footsteps by pursuing doctoral studies with a view towards teaching Old Testament as a seminary professor. Fr. Robert V. Zylla, O.S.C., who taught me moral theology during my seminary days and continued to minister to me as a spiritual director nearly until the day he died last summer, was the very best of spiritual guides, who helped me keep my spiritual bearings during the joys and challenges of my life as a doctoral candidate. My mother's brother Fr. John Hiltz, a diocesan priest who was active in ministry even in his retirement in California, was always eager to know the latest results in my research until his death in October 2009. And in one of my last conversations about my dissertation with my father's brother Charles Maillet, who died this past January, he mentioned in passing a Hebrew word that he somehow remembered learning long ago (interestingly, the Hebrew word was *lāmad*, "learn"). All four were faithful disciples, *limmûdîm,* imitators of the Servant. As they followed him in life and death, may they also share in his exaltation!

Chapter One: Current Research on Isaiah

The Servant Songs of Isaiah and especially Isa 52:13–53:12 (hereafter Isaiah 53) are variously cited as among the most contested[1] or most problematic[2] pericopes in the Old Testament (hereafter OT). This dissertation does not attempt to offer solutions to all of the problems long associated with the Servant Songs but rather brackets most of those questions and offers a different perspective. My purpose in writing is to compare the Masoretic Text (hereafter MT)[3] of the Servant Songs and the Old Greek (hereafter LXX)[4] version of the same pericopes, focusing not on the Servant but on the portrayal of God in each and then comparing these portrayals. I have not found anything written on this specific theme despite the vast extent of research on Isaiah, which shows no sign of waning.[5]

---

[1] Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001) 410.

[2] See Christopher R. North, *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL–LV* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964) 226; Michael Thompson, *Isaiah: Chapters 40–66* (Epworth Commentaries; Peterborough, England: Epworth Press, 2001) 100; and others.

[3] More precisely, I am interested in the "original" Masoretic Text or the proto-Masoretic text (M) insofar as it can be reconstructed. I assume, for reasons given later in this chapter, that the consonantal text of *BHS* is a more or less reliable witness to the text deemed "canonical" by rabbinical Judaism in the early centuries A.D.; the written vocalization and punctuation I assume are less so because of their later development.

[4] The term LXX is used in various ways. "The Seventy" or seventy-two, to the extent that there is an element of historicity to the legend recounted in the epistle of Pseudo-Aristeas, translated only the Pentateuch. Nevertheless, the name became associated with the translation of other Hebrew sacred writings, including the prophetic literature, and ultimately a specific collection of these and other Greek sacred writings. As explained below in the section on the LXX, I use "LXX" in conjunction with "Isaiah" ("LXX Isaiah") to mean what may be more precisely termed "the Old Greek translation of Isaiah" ("OG Isaiah") and likewise with portions of Isaiah (e.g., "LXX Isaiah 53"). I do so as a concession to convention.

[5] Works by Pierre Grelot (*Les poèmes du Serviteur: De la lecture critique à l'herméneutique* [LD 103; Paris: Cerf, 1981]) and Eugene Robert Ekblad, Jr. (*Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the*

This chapter will begin, by way of background, with a survey of some of the recent literature on important topics related to the Servant Songs that this dissertation will not otherwise address. It will first address topics pertaining to Isaiah as a whole: the state of the question of Proto-, Deutero-, and Trito-Isaiah (hereafter, PI, DI, and TI) and their relationship to one another; and the question of the canonicity of MT Isaiah and LXX Isaiah.

Next it will provide, as background, a survey of research on DI: the question of its authorship, the proposal that DI was composed as a liturgical drama, the status of the Servant Songs and their relation to the whole complex, and the debate over the identity of the Servant.

In a final section, I will survey recent literature on the state of other questions that more directly affect the governing assumptions of this dissertation: the Isaiah texts at Qumran and their relationship to MT and LXX Isaiah, research on the MT, and research on the LXX (and specifically on LXX Isaiah and LXX Servant Songs) considered as a text in its own right.[6]

Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study [Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999]) include detailed comparisons of the MT and LXX texts of the Servant Songs. In addition, Harald Hegermann (*Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta* [Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1954]) includes a comparison the MT and LXX texts of the Fourth Servant Song. None of these, however, focuses on the various texts' portrayal of God.

[6] The value of the LXX for text criticism of the MT has long been recognized, whereas recognition of the value of the LXX as a document in and of itself (and not simply as a witness to its *Vorlage*) is a more recent phenomenon in the academic guild. See for example the recent publications of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) and the *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009).

I. Background: The State of Questions Related to Isaiah's Servant Songs but Not Directly Addressed in This Dissertation

A. PI, DI, and TI and Their Relationship to One Another

Current scholarship, for the most part, accepts the division of the Book of Isaiah into three sections, PI, DI, and TI.[7] Although the existence of TI as a distinct unit was formerly debated, the present consensus is that TI, i.e., chaps. 56–66 "einen konzentrischen Aufbau hat, der mehrere unterschiedliche Inklusionen um einen Kern in 60–62 legte."[8] Its content clearly builds directly on DI; whether it builds directly or indirectly on PI is a matter of debate.[9] So accepted has been the three-part division that modern research until recent decades largely treated PI, DI, and TI as quite independent works.[10] The problem of how they came to be a single book has been more or less dismissed by many as an unsolvable riddle, perhaps even a matter of chance. In fact, interest in the very question of their unity was by all appearances on the decline in the 60s and 70s.[11]

In more recent decades, interest in the relationship between the three parts has resurged, especially in the area of intertextuality. Some hold that the author of TI knew DI, and that the author of DI knew PI. Some have argued that both the authors of DI and

---

[7] For a view that sees this division as far too simple, see Kristin Joachimsen, "Steck's Five Stories of the Servant in Isaiah lii 13-liii 12, and Beyond," *VT* 57 (2007) 208-28, here 217-18. In this dissertation, I take it for granted that Isaiah 53 is part of DI.

[8] Peter Höffken, *Jesaja: Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004) 91.

[9] Ibid., 93.

[10] Ibid., 27.

[11] Ibid., 28.

TI must have known PI. Others go further: "Kennzeichnend ist aber für einen bestimmten Strang der Forschung, dass Anspielungen auf PJ-Texte zunehmend als Ausdruck nicht von dj Lesefrüchten, sondern als Ausdruck einer literarischen Beziehung zwischen DJ auf PJ gelten."[12]

Others see the Book of Isaiah as a unity. Deriving many of his ideas from Hans Wildberger, John D. W. Watts considers the Book of Isaiah a carefully organized, unified work; in his view, the entire Book of Isaiah is the work of a single final redactor, completed not much later than 435 B.C. PI, DI, and TI are relegated to the category of preexisting documents. In his view, these are of interest only to literary criticism; his own interests lie elsewhere.[13] Using a purely synchronic approach, his concern is with the message of the final redactor, who—in his view—formed the entire book into a coherent whole. In this view, the Book of Isaiah is—as its superscript says—a "vision" (Isa 1:1) which Watts divides into "twelve generations" from the time of Uzziah to that of the first hearers of the book in the generation following Nehemiah and Ezra. The clear division between chapters 1–39 and 40–66, in Watts's view, is the division between what he terms the "the former times: judgment, curse" and "the latter times: salvation, blessing."[14] Dominique Janthial argues in *L'oracle de Nathan et l'unité du livre d'Isaïe* that the play on the word "house" as found in the oracle of Nathan "pouvait constituer un fil rouge courant d'un bout du livre à l'autre et permettant de guider le lecteur dans l'enchevêtrement des oracles."[15]

---

[12] Ibid., 40.

[13] John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33* (WBC 24; Waco: Word Books, 1985) and *Isaiah 34-66* (WBC 25; Waco: Word Books, 1987). For his division between chaps. 1–39 and 40–66, see ibid., li.

[14] Ibid., li.

Scholars are by no means of one mind concerning the legitimacy of treating DI as a *Fortschreibung* of PI, or the possibility of reading the book as a whole, let alone the approach of Watts.[16] Ulrich Berges takes a more moderate approach, combining diachronic and synchronic methods in order to propose a literary history of Isaiah. He does not suggest that the book can be read as a monolithic unity but rather suggests that substantial portions were added (e.g., Isaiah 33 and 36–39) to what were originally separate works in order to create a measure of cohesion.[17] Berges is in the process of producing a multivolume commentary on Isaiah in collaboration with Willem A. M. Beuken, the latest addition being *Jesaja 40–48* by Berges (2008).[18]

B. The Question of the Canonicity of LXX Isaiah

The first question in discussing biblical canonicity concerns the definition of the term "canon." According to many scholars, the definition involves only a list of books, not the specific textual form of those books. "Both in ancient Judaism and in Christianity it is the book of Jeremiah, for example, that is canonical, not the textual form—a LXX vs. MT—of the book."[19] Bruce Metzger makes the same point:

---

[15] Dominique Janthial, *L'oracle de Nathan et l'unité du livre d'Isaïe* (BZAW 343; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004) 307.

[16] Höffken, *Jesaja,* 28–40.

[17] Ulrich Berges, *Das Buch Jesaja: Komposition und Endgestalt* (Herders biblische Studien 16; New York: Herder, 1998).

[18] See also Willem A. M. Beuken and Ulrich Berges, *Jesaja 1–12* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2003) and Beuken and Berges, *Jesaja 13–27* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2007).

[19] See E. Ulrich, "Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament," in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003) 57-80, here 58-59.

> Eusebius and Jerome, well aware of such variation in the witnesses, discussed which form of text was to be preferred. It is noteworthy, however, that neither Father suggested that one form was canonical and the other was not. Furthermore, the perception that the canon was basically closed did not lead to a slavish fixing of the text of the canonical books. Thus, the category of 'canonical' appears to have been broad enough to include all variant readings (as well as variant renderings in early versions). . . . In short, it appears that the question of canonicity pertains to the document *qua* document, and not to one particular form or version of that document.[20]

Not all scholars, however, are of the same mind. J. Cook, for example, implicitly considers the text version of the book to be a canonical question as well. "Dogmatic statements about the extent and effect of Jewish and Christian canons seem to be relatively uncomplicated. . . . However, when the subject matter, the texts, are considered then it becomes evident that the issue is infinitely more complicated."[21] Thus, if canonicity is only a matter of a list of books, the question is simple and of little interest for Isaiah studies. Among Jews and Christians, Isaiah is included in every major list of canonical books or, to use the more concise German term, *Bücherkanon*. If, however, questions of content, that is the textual form of each book (*Textkanon*) is added to the *Bücherkanon* question, then the subject of canonicity becomes of great interest in Isaiah studies.

C. The Question of *Textkanon*

J. Blenkinsopp, another scholar who differs with Ulrich and Metzger, holds that the issue of canonicity has never been merely about a *Bücherkanon*. He notes that "the existence of biblical *testimonia* and combinations of texts from different books, such as we find at the beginning of Mark's gospel (Mark 1:2 combining Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3) or in the Matthean fulfillment saying (e.g., Matt 21:5), illustrate the fact that in the earliest period the individual text, not the book, was the canonical unit, and for many that is still the case."[22] Thus, for scholars like Blenkinsopp, the contents and form of each book in the canonical list also pose legitimate questions in the area of canonicity.

---

[20] Bruce Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987) 269-70.

[21] Johann Cook, "Textual Diversity and Canonical Uniformity," in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. Auwers and de Jonge) 135-52, here 135.

Any clear discussion of canonicity must include the admission that one cannot separate canonicity from specific communities at specific times in history. No test based purely on reason can determine, based on the internal evidence of a text, whether it is "canonical." "The idea that canon stands for a theologically self-consistent, coherent, and unified literary entity, free of internal contradictions and contrarieties . . . is contradicted by the abundant evidence of internal contradictions and conflicting ideologies or theologies in the Hebrew Bible."[23] Thus, the question must be dealt with, first of all, from a historical and sociological perspective.

"Wer Kanon sagt, hat bereits Kirche gesagt. . . . Der Kanon hat eine soziologische Dimension und ist wesentlich ein Rezeptionsphänomen." Böhler elaborates: "Wer 'Kanon' sagt, hat 'rezipierende Kirche' gesagt, hat 'Literatur in einem nicht bloß mehr historischen, sondern situationsübergreifenden literarischen Zusammenhang' gesagt, hat 'normative Literatur' gesagt."[24]

---

[22] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Panel Review of *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament,* by Rolf Rendtorff," *HBT* 28 (2006) 5-10, here 7.

[23] Ibid., 6.

[24] Dieter Böhler, "Der Kanon als hermeneutischen Vorgabe: Über aktuelle Methodendiskussionen in der Bibelwissenschaft," *TP* 77 (2002) 161-78, here 167. To Böhler's observation here, I propose one

The canonical status of MT Isaiah within Judaism seems simple to assess at first glance. It has been explicitly canonical for Jewish believers throughout the world since ca. A.D. 250-300.[25] Yet even here complexities arise: strictly speaking, there is no such thing as a single Masoretic text. In reality, all that exists is a family of Masoretic texts, available to scholars as differing editions of different medieval manuscripts. "All the editions of the Hebrew Bible, which actually are editions of 𝔐, go back to different medieval manuscripts of that tradition, or combinations of such manuscripts."[26] What I call MT Isaiah in this dissertation, for example, is more precisely *BHS*[27] Isaiah, that is, the form of Isaiah presented in a diplomatic edition of one of the earliest extant Masoretic texts, the Leningrad Codex B 19^{A} (hereafter: L). To complicate matters further, what was accepted as canonical in A.D. 250-300 was not precisely the MT but rather the proto-Masoretic text (M), that is, without the later vocalization, punctuation, and accent marks. To be sure, the differences among witnesses of the MT seldom amount to matters of great substance; the point, nevertheless, holds: when we speak of "the MT" we are speaking of something that exists only as an idea.

Is MT Isaiah canonical for Christians? Despite modern western biblical scholarship's clear preference for the MT, the fact is that the MT has clearly not been the

---

modification: in order to be inclusive of Judaism in this discussion of the canonicity of various text-forms of Isaiah, one should substitute "faith community" for "church."

[25] For many scholars, the Jamnian/Yavnean hypothesis was laid to rest by J. P. Lewis in 1964 ("What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" *JBR* 32 [1964] 125-32).

[26] Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 3.

[27] *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (5th ed.; ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

Textkanon of the OT for all Christians at all times. "Die Frage, welche *Sprache* und *Sprachgestalt* als kanonisch bzw. inspiriert anzusehen ist . . . [war] bereits von Augustinus und Hieronymus verschieden beantwortet worden."[28] Indeed, while a generalization about the complex multicultural reality of the early Church is just that, it was the LXX that was "grob gesagt, die Bibel des Urchristentums. Durch ihre Schriften und durch sie als 'Schrift' wurde ihm die Botschaft des Alten Bundes als 'praeparatio Evangelii' vermittelt."[29]

The LXX did not serve all Christian communities in the early Church as their *Textkanon* (one need only think of Jewish Christians in Palestine), nor was the proto-Masoretic text (M) monolithically seen as uniquely canonical within Judaism of the first two and a half centuries A.D. and earlier. For example, in the time of Justin, his *Dialogue with Trypho* suggests that

> [t]he Septuagint text, albeit limited to those particular books recognized by the Jews, apparently still represented the basis of dialogue on both sides of the Jewish-Christian debate. We find no evidence in Justin that his Jewish opponents were referring to any completely new recension of the Greek text such as that of Aquila, which presumably was introduced in Palestine as a Greek 'Targum' for translating the Hebrew scripture reading and only gradually asserted itself in the Diaspora as well.[30]

This suggests, at a minimum, that the Septuagint had an authority that was not seriously questioned at least among certain groups within Judaism. "Until approximately the mid-second century there was apparently a kind of basic Jewish-Christian consensus concerning the LXX as the basis of scholarly argumentation."[31] Matters had changed radically by the time of the fifth- or sixth-century *Dialogus Christiani et Judaei,* in which, from the Christian perspective,

---

[28] Max Seckler, "Über die Problematik des biblischen Kanons und die Bedeutung seiner Wiederentdeckung," *TQ* 180 (2000) 30-53, here 38.

[29] Ibid., 41. Again, the problem becomes far more complicated when the Peshitta, Targums, and other early versions are taken into account.

[30] Martin Hengel, "The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians," in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* (ed. James D. G. Dunn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 39-83, here 49.

> . . . Aquila is made into the party bearing primary responsibility for having falsified scripture; that is, both the original Hebrew text and the translation of the Seventy-two, who inspired by the Holy Spirit, allegedly rendered the original text without error. This shows that, at this late date, Aquila's translation had displaced the LXX in the synagogue. . . . It also shows clearly how the Christian version of the translation hypothesis had developed further. In the interim, the LXX had long become an exclusively Christian writing, something not yet the case for Justin though he did campaign vehemently for it.[32]

The Western Church's allegiance to the LXX, however, was to change. Two major events mark the history of Western Christianity's transition from the adoption (by and large) of the LXX as *Textkanon* to its adoption of the MT as the new *Textkanon*. The first such event is Jerome's establishment of the quest for the *Hebraica veritas* as an ideal by translating into Latin the *books* of the Hebrew canon directly from the proto-Masoretic (hereafter M) scrolls available to him. The second was the Reformers' imitation of Jerome's precedent by translating the MT into modern vernaculars. Unlike Jerome, they also adopted the MT's *Bücherkanon.*

Two additional events addressed the status of the MT for Catholics. One was the Council of Trent's affirmation of the canonical status of the Old Vulgate (the Vulgate of Jerome, minus 3 and 4 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh).[33] This removed any doubt that the *Bücherkanon* of the OT for the Catholic Church was that of the LXX;[34] it also seemed to implicitly ratify Jerome's quest for the *Hebraica veritas.* That Trent permitted Jerome's quest to be continued by Catholic scholars was finally clarified in Pius XII's 1943 encyclical letter on biblical studies, *Divino afflante Spiritu.*[35] A treatment of the full encyclical is not appropriate here, but its clarification of the teaching of Trent was of great importance. In *Divino afflante Spiritu* 20, Pius XII pointed out that the same council presented as a desideratum the proposal that the Pope "should have corrected, as far as possible, first a Latin, and then a Greek, and Hebrew edition, which eventually would be published for the benefit of the Holy Church of God." Pius XII called upon Catholic scholars to fulfill this desideratum. In par. 21, Pius XII taught that Trent was affirming that the Vulgate was "free from any error whatsoever in matters of faith and morals" and "may be quoted safely and without fear of error in disputations, in lectures and in preaching; and so its authenticity is not specified primarily as critical, but rather as juridical." In par. 23, he clarifies that translations from the original languages into the "vulgar tongue" were not forbidden by Trent.

---

[31] Ibid*.,* 6-7.
[32] Ibid., 54.
[33] Ibid., 68.

Thus, in effect, Pius XII, removed any stigma from the Reformers' decision, in principle, to translate directly from the MT into modern languages, encouraging Catholic scholars to do likewise. Pius XII in the encyclical went to considerable effort to stress that this teaching (i.e., that modern translations from the original languages were to be encouraged) was a clarification, not a change, of Trent's teaching. Trent had made positive assertions about the canonicity of the Vulgate while remaining silent on other texts such as the MT, the LXX, modern translations, etc.

---

[34] The Roman Catholic Church, more precisely, recognizes one *form* of the LXX *Bücherkanon*. Two other forms of the *Bücherkanon* are recognized among various Orthodox Churches as outlined in the *SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (ed. P. Alexander et al.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999) 170-71.

[35] Pius XII. *Divino afflante Spiritu* ("On the Promotion of Biblical Studies"), English translation provided by the Vatican (Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943).

Along with Pius XII's clarifications, however, many questions arise. The ratification of the *Bücherkanon* of the Vulgate and the assertion of that text's freedom from error in faith and morals leaves open various questions concerning *Textkanon.* Clearly Jerome's translation (the Vg), translations from the Vg, as well as modern translations of the MT have enjoyed preeminence in the West as evidenced by their use in worship since the time of Jerome. But what is the *Textkanon* status of the LXX for Roman Catholics?

Seckler points out further complexities that come from four false assumptions—assumptions that were far more plausible until recent years when the implications of the Dead Sea Scrolls, discovered beginning in 1947, have become more apparent. One of those major implications is the level of complexity in any attempt to reconstruct an *Urtext* for any book of the Bible.[36]

> Die Option für die Biblia Hebraica, der auch Pius XII. schließlich weit entgegenkam, hatte in dem Horizonten des archaisierenden Authentizitätsdenkens eine vierfache Annahme zur Voraussetzung: (1.) die Annahme, daß der Buch-, Text- und Sprachkanon der LXX/Vulgata im Vergleich zum authentischen Urtext der hebräischen Bibel verderbt, verfälscht und dekadent sei. (Übersetzungsprobleme; Hellenisierungsproblematik; dogmatische Sinnverschiebungen); (2.) die Annahme, daß ein Rückgang hinter die

---

[36] In "The Original Shape of the Biblical Text" (in *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989* [ed. J. A. Emerton et al.; VTSup 43; Leiden: Brill, 1991] 343-59, here 349), E. Tov notes the distinction between the MT as but one form of the biblical text and "the original text of the Bible, if there ever was one." Tov sees his goal in text criticism in terms of recovering proto-MT (M), *not* the *Urtext* (see ibid., 357).

> Verderbnisse der Kirchengeschichte und des Hellenenismus in die reinen Ursprünge führe; (3.) die Annahme, daß der originäre Offenbarungs- bzw. Inspirationsvorgang im Diktat des Urtextes liege; (4.) die Annahme, daß dieser Urtext existiert und in der hebräischen Bibel vorliegt. Alle diese Annahmen erweisen sich zunehmend als falsch bzw. fiktiv. . . . Die Annahme der Existenz eines inspririerten hebräischen Original- und Urtextes ist ein Phantom (teils weil es ihn nie so gab, teils weil er nicht mehr erreichbar ist), der masoretische Buch- und Textkanon ist nur einer unter anderen, er kann den seit der Reformation auf ihn gesetzten Echtheitskriterien nicht standhalten, weder chronologisch noch inhaltlich.[37]

In the absence of an Isaiah *Urtext,* there are no simple answers to the complexities of its *Textkanon*. Ultimately, questions of canonicity are matters of faith and will depend on its definition of "canon" and "inspiration." In this connection, Johan Lust offers the following observations, which suggest that the canonicity of LXX Isaiah should not be dismissed a priori:

> There is sufficient evidence in favour of a less narrow pre-Masoretic Canon in as far as the text of the respective biblical books is concerned. The Septuagint, supported by the Qumranic data, pleads in favour of this assumption. The selection of the manuscripts, used for translation, proves that they were recognized as authoritative, even when they differed from those later accepted as canonical in MT. Theories about the inspiration of the translators support the view that divergences from the Hebrew, due to conscious interventions of the translators, can also be accepted as authoritative.[38]

D. Research on DI

The written, as opposed to oral, nature of DI has achieved universal consensus in the field. The same cannot be said about the segment's authorship. For example opinions differ on whether there was a single author or a group, such as a "school."[39] For many, especially for those who have put aside the Servant Song hypothesis of Bernhard

---

[37] Seckler, "Problematik," 40-41.

[38] Johan Lust, "Septuagint and Canon," in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. Auwers and de Jonge) 39-55 here 55.

[39] Höffken, *Jesaja*, 101.

Duhm,[40] the idea of a single author is plausible. A current debate is whether the author was more a poet or a prophet.[41]

In addition, many questions remain concerning the structure and unity of DI.[42] At present, there is a trend among some scholars, beginning with W. A. M. Beuken and H. Leene, to attempt to understand DI as a unity by regarding it as a drama.[43] Klaus Baltzer goes so far as to analyze DI as, in effect, a libretto intended for actual performance. For him, DI is nothing less than a six-act play intended for theatrical performance during Passover/the Feast of Unleavened Bread.[44]

Other debates include how the “Servant Songs” (42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; and 52:13–53:12) and the “Polemics against Idol-Makers” (40:19-20; 41:7; 44:9-20; 45:16-20b; 46:5-8) function within DI.[45]

E. Research on the Servant Songs

While many scholars still accept Duhm’s hypothesis concerning the four “Servant Songs,” others have modified the number and/or delimitations of each as proposed by him. Indeed, some have bid *Farewell to the Servant Songs*, to cite the title of a monograph by Tryggve Mettinger.[46] Francis Landy sees the division in scholarship on this question—perhaps a bit too neatly—as forming two camps: "German scholarship" and "anglophone scholarship."

---

[40] Bernhard Duhm (*Das Buch Jesaia* [2nd ed.; HKAT 3/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902] 277) proposes that the Servant Songs are by an author different from that of the rest of DI.

[41] Höffken, *Jesaja,* 101.

[42] Ibid., 102.

[43] Ibid., 103.

[44] Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

[45] Höffken, *Jesaja,* 102.

[46] Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *A Farewell to the Servant Songs: A Critical Examination of an Exegetical Axiom* (trans. Frederick H. Cryer; Scripta minora 1982-1983: 3; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1983).

> German and anglophone scholarship sharply divide over the so-called servant songs, as they do over everything else. German scholarship tends to isolate the servant songs from the rest of Deutero-Isaiah, and see them as a separate collection, to ascribe them to the circle of Trito-Isaiah, to see in them the influences of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and to determine text-critically the growth of the text, rather as a dendrologist determines the age of a tree. In 49.1-6, R. P. Merendino, for example, traces the transformation of a poem originally about Cyrus to one about the servant and then about Israel. In English scholarship, in contrast, we encounter increasing skepticism about the very existence of the servant songs, a refusal to isolate them from the Deutero-Isaianic context and the Isaianic tradition as a whole.[47]

For most scholars, however, German-speaking and anglophone alike, the identity of the Servant remains controversial. Blenkinsopp noted in 2000, "Since Christopher R. North surveyed the range of opinion on the identity of the Servant in 1948 (2nd ed., 1956), no significant new options have emerged. While there was then and still is a strong critical preference for an individual rather than a collective interpretation, none of the fifteen individuals named as candidates by one commentator or another and listed by North has survived scrutiny."[48] At least two monographs published since Blenkinsopp's above assessment have contributed to the question of the identity of the Servant. Antony

---

[47] Francis Landy, "The Construction of the Subject and the Symbolic Order: A Reading of the Last Three Suffering Servant Songs," in *Among the Prophets: Language, Image and Structure in the Prophetic Writings* (ed. Philip R. Davies and David J. A. Clines; JSOTSup 144; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 60-71, here 61.

[48] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55*: *A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2000) 355.

Tharekadavil's proposal in his 2007 monograph,[49] in which he posits that the Servant is the "Yahweh alone" party among the deportees in Babylon, is essentially a refinement/variation of a proposal made as early as 1792 by H. E. G. Paulus (one of North's options listed as the "Pious Minority within Israel").[50] A new option that does not seem to fall easily under any of the categories of North's survey was also published after Blenkinsopp's assessment above, namely, that of Frederick Hägglund, who holds that the Servant represents "people in exile who in Isa 40:1–52:12 had been expected to return, and the 'we' are the people in the land who encounter those who return."[51]

Odil Hannes Steck, who accepts Duhm's hypothesis, sidesteps the question of the identity of the Servant. In a pair of articles in *ZAW,* he first notes a similarity in the structure of the commissioning scene in 1 Kgs 22:19-22 and the structure of the commissioning of the Servant in the first three Servant Songs. Both structures comprise three parts: the commission itself, reference to the means by which the divine end is to be accomplished, and the guarantee of success.[52] In the second article, Steck also sees the same triadic commission structure echoed in each of the three parts of the Fourth Servant Song.[53]

---

[49] Antony Tharekadavil, *Servant of Yahweh in Second Isaiah: Isaianic Servant Passages in Their Literary and Historical Context* (European University Studies XXIII: 848; Berlin: Peter Lang, 2007).

[50] Christopher R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study* (2nd ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1963) 35.[51] Frederick Hägglund, *Isaiah 53 in the Light of Homecoming after Exile* (FAT 2. 31; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

[52] Odil Hannes Steck, "Aspekte des Gottesknecht in Deuterojesajas 'Ebed-Jahwe-Liedern'," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 372-90.

Höffken sees research on the Servant Songs—among those who accept Duhm's hypothesis—shifting from a continuation of attempts to identify the Servant as either an individual or group of either the past or the future, to a growing trend towards studying the group of four Servant Songs in view of the rest of DI.[54] This has led some to conclude that "the Servant" does not refer to the same group or individual in all of the Servant Songs.[55] A variation on this approach is that of Rainer Albertz, who sees the Servant as various aspects of the complex reality of Israel with its various roles in God's plan.[56]

F. Research on Isaiah 53

Of the Servant Songs, the Fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13–53:12, hereafter Isaiah 53) has received the most attention among researchers.[57] The field has largely rejected any notion of a simplistic connection between Isaiah 53 and ancient Near East mythic rituals, although substitute king rituals were known in Mesopotamia from the Isin period (early second millennium B.C.) until Alexander the Great. To be sure, connections between these practices and Isaiah 53 have been made (I. Engell, for example, found the source of imagery in the poem in the *akitu* festival or Tammuz liturgies).[58] Beginning with J. Scharbert in 1958, however, the field has largely discountenanced the idea that Isaiah 53 represents an actual substitute king ritual.[59] Nevertheless, a few scholars consider a relationship between Isaiah 53 and its ancient Near Eastern context, perhaps an indirect one, worth exploring. Although Janowski suggests that "the complexity of Isa 53 is only heightened by other relevant concepts (such as Mesopotamian substitute king rituals . . .),"[60] he does not, to my knowledge, explore the relationship further. J. Walton makes the case that the striking correlations between Assyrian text imagery concerning substitute king rituals and the imagery in Isaiah 53 seem to solve some of the vexing problems of the latter. By also noting the differences between Isaiah 53 and the proposed Assyrian *Prätexte,* he attempts to show that Isaiah 53 is neither history, nor prophecy about a future individual, but rather a glimpse of a new ideal of kingship for Israel.[61]

---

[53] Odil Hannes Steck, "Aspekte des Gottesknecht in Jes 52,13 – 53,12," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 36-58.

[54] Höffken, *Jesaja*, 102.

[55] See, e.g., Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55,* 299-300.

[56] Rainer Albertz, *Die Exilszeit: 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzylopädie 7; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001) 303.

[57] A recent contribution on the Fourth Servant Song, reflecting the field's surge of interest in intertextuality, is Marta García Fernández's study of the relationship of the passage to Genesis 2-3: "Is 52,13-53,12: ¿una nueva creación?" *Scriptorium victoriense* 54 (2007) 5-34. On the basis of a detailed study of vocabulary, she argues that Isaiah 53 can be seen in terms of a New Creation.

---

[58] See John H. Walton, "The Imagery of the Substitute King Ritual in Isaiah's Fourth Servant Song," *JBL* 122 (2003) 734-43, here 734.

[59] Ibid., 735.

[60] Bernd Janowski, "He Bore Our Sins: Isaiah 53 and the Drama of Taking Another's Place," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Source* (ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; trans. Daniel P. Bailey; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996) 48-74, here 52 n. 62.

[61] Walton, "Imagery," 734.

II. The State of Questions Directly Related to This Dissertation

A. The Masoretic Texts

The so-called "Masoretic Text," is actually a group of closely related MSS more precisely referred to as "Masoretic Texts." The term is normally used to designate "that textual tradition which was given its final form by Aaron Ben Asher of the Tiberian group of the Masoretes."[62] Thus, what is normally called "the MT" can even more precisely be called "the Tiberian Masoretic Texts."

Recent scholarship is divided over questions concerning the vocalization found in the MT. Although P. Kahle argued that the Tiberian vocalization system represents an artificial reconstruction, analysis of texts at Qumran and research by J. Barr and F. M. Cross suggest that this system of vocalization represents a Tiberian pronunciation of the eighth and ninth centuries and thus, while dialectical, it is not artificial.[63] This system is also referred to as North-Palestinian. The other systems of vocalization were Palestinian (or South-Palestinian), Babylonian, and Tiberian-Palestinian.[64]

"M" refers to the consonantal base of the MT deriving from the Second Temple period. Since the *BHS* vocalization represents only one, rather late system, less weight will be given to the vocalization found therein than to the consonantal base (M).

B. The LXX

As mentioned above, "the LXX" is an ambiguous term. It is often used in conjunction with an OT book simply to mean the original translation of that book into

---

[62] Tov, *Textual Criticism,* 22.
[63] Ibid., 48-49.
[64] Ibid., 43-44.

Greek. In these cases, the more accurate designation is “Old Greek” (“OG” or “G”), although “LXX” is widely used in this sense even in scholarly writing. In this dissertation “LXX Isaiah” will always be used to mean “OG Isaiah.”

The originally separate translation of the Pentateuch was the original LXX. To the original LXX were added Greek translations of the other books of the *Tanakh* and other sacred writings (the “deutero-canonical” books) that, prior to the discoveries at Qumran, were universally held to have been composed in Greek.[65] It is this larger collection that is now referred to as the LXX. According to Emanuel Tov, the LXX can also refer to collections that include *recensions* of OG translations.[66] In this dissertation “the LXX” refers to the collection of the OG Pentateuch, the OG translations of the other books of the *Tanakh*, and the “deuterocanonical” books.

Although the majority of scholars holds that a single translation was made of each book of the OG, a minority sees the various books of the OG as the result of multiple attempts at translation—most likely growing out of liturgical practice in the Diaspora that only gradually becoming standardized.[67] The consensus is that Isaiah was translated into Greek in 170-150 B.C. because LXX Isaiah contains allusions to historical situations and events of those years.[68] The Greek version of Isaiah (presumably a separate undertaking from other books of the OT) is also held to have been produced in Egypt, most likely in Alexandria—or perhaps in Leontopolis by an Oniad individual or group who had fled to Egypt. While Ekblad connects the Servant with the self-understanding of the Jewish community of Alexandria, M. Hengel associates the Servant rather with the last "legitimate" high priest, Onias III. [69] It appears that the translator of Isaiah reconceptualized the original of DI with the entire Book of Isaiah in mind, and translated freely with thematic emphases not found in the Hebrew.[70] In his 2008 monograph, Ronald L. Troxel argues that LXX Isaiah is the work of a single translator in Alexandria who "was concerned to convey the sense of Isaiah to his readers, even if that sense was derived from within a larger notion of literary context than is permitted a modern translator."[71] His book downplays the role of "contemporization" (e.g., the Servant of Isaiah 53 as Onias III noted above) and explores the likely influence of the Alexandrian Museum (world-famous for its library), which was an unparalleled center of learning in its time and whose scholars made pioneering contributions in the fields of translation, textual criticism, and philology.

---

[65] Questions of the *Urgeschichte* of the LXX canon—how it was formed, its status in Palestinian Judaism before Christ, etc.—are no simple matters. According to Martin Hengel (*The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* [trans. Mark E. Biddle; London/New York: T & T Clark International, 2002] 3), “for the textual history of canonical Scripture, the ‘Alexandrian Canon,’ may be assumed to be a reliable basis: originating in pre-Christian Judaism —although differing in size in the Christian manuscript tradition—and accepted by primitive Christianity as ‘Holy Scripture.’ ” The three great codices of the LXX of the fourth and fifth centuries, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus, all “exhibit such significant differences that one cannot yet speak of a truly fixed canon even in this period” (ibid., 57). I would argue that the LXX canon has never been resolved except by decisions of the various churches, as evidenced by the variety of OT canons in the Roman and Eastern Churches.

[66] Tov, *Textual Criticism,* 135.

[67] Ibid., 136.

---

[68] Ibid., 137. See also I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Mededelingen en Verhandelingen No. 9 van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootshap "Ex Oriente Lux"; Leiden: Brill, 1948) 70-94, for a detailed discussion of these historical allusions.

[69] Höffken, *Jesaja,* 16. Arie van der Kooij (*Die Alten Textzeugen des Jesajasbuches* [OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981] 330-31) proposes that the author of LXX Isaiah 53 was Onias IV, working at Leontopolis.

[70] Ibid., 16-17. "Die Übersetzung ist nicht ein Vers-für-Vers-Unternehmen. Sie hat vielmehr weitere Buchzusammenhänge im Blick. . . . Die Übersetzung setzt also eine eminente Kenntnis des Gesamtbuches voraus – anders kann sie nicht funktionieren. . . . Es zeigt sich, grob gesprochen, dass der Übersetzer nicht nur bei Jes 53 den Text neu konzipiert und in bewusster Textgestaltung eigene Akzente gesetzt hat, die dem Original großteils abgehen."

[71] Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 291.

The numerous textual witnesses and important early translations of LXX Isaiah fall into four groups.[72] Of particular interest are the uncial MSS, which fall under two of these groups. The first group includes the Codex Alexandrinus (A), which is closely related to the Codex Marchalianus (Q) and, less consistently, to the Codex Sinaiticus (S). This group is called A-Q. To this tradition also belongs the commentary on Isaiah of Cyril of Alexandria. Although the Old Latin translation of this passage (Isaiah 53) is no longer directly extant, most Old Latin citations from this passage by the Church Fathers also fall under this tradition. So does the Sahidic Translation (Sa), an incomplete Coptic version of Isaiah, which, fortunately, includes all of Isaiah 53.

Over against this group are the uncial MSS stemming from one of the columns contained in Origen's *Hexapla* and *Tetrapla*, namely, the LXX column (as distinguished from the columns containing the recensions of Aquila and Symmachus, respectively). The Eusebius-Pamphilius Edition of Origen's LXX was also a source for these uncials. To this tradition belong the Codex Vaticanus (B) and the Codex Venetus (V), which are very close to each other. When these two are in agreement, they will be referred to as *O*. A Syriac translation of the passage found in the Codex Syrohexaplaris Ambrosianus (Syh) also belongs to the *O* tradition.

A third group includes the recension of Lucian, *L*. The commentaries of Chrysostom (Chr) and Theodoret (Tht) belong to this group. I. L. Seeligmann describes *L* as exhibiting "the character of epexegetical alterations and additions . . . constitut[ing], indeed valuable documentary evidence concerning the ancient interpretations of the Septuagint" among more general "tendencies towards adaptation to the Massoretic text, stylistic improvements in, [and] more or less subjective and individual interpretations of, the Greek text."[73]

---

[72] The following is my synopsis of the introduction in Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Isaias,* vol. 14 *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985) 7-121.

Other witnesses include dozens of Greek miniscule MSS. Some of these fall variously under the above categories. Others, however, comprise the fourth group, a tradition distinct from A-Q, *O,* and *L*. This group, consisting only of miniscules, is referred to as the Catena Group, *C*, so named because its representatives are found in the Catenae on the Prophets, e.g., MSS 87-91-490, which preserve the *Catena in XVI prophetas.* The readings of this group represent a hybrid version of the text as found in the previously mentioned groups.

The LXX texts of the Isaiah Servant Songs I use in this dissertation are based on the critical edition of Isaiah by Joseph Ziegler.[74] In the instances where my text differs from his, my divergent choices are clearly footnoted. Most of the notes in Ziegler's textual apparatus refer to variant readings found either in "the Three" (οἱ γ′), that is, the three recensions made respectively by Aquila (hereafter α′) dated ca. A.D. 125, Theodotion (hereafter θ′) dated to the late second century A.D., and Symmachus (hereafter σ′) dated to the end of the second or beginning of the third century A.D., or witnesses dependent on them.[75] The Three, in fact, are of little interest for the project of discovering the most authentic readings of the LXX, since their purpose was largely to

---

[73] Seeligmann, *Septuagint,* 20.

[74] Ziegler, *Isaias,* 320-23. Ziegler's critical text is based primarily on the five uncial MSS, A,B,Q,S, and V, as well as dozens of minuscule MSS.

[75] For dating "the Three," see Tov, *Textual Criticism,* 145-46.

“correct” the LXX in order to make it harmonize with Hebrew texts current at the time of each. Some of their readings, on the other hand, are of great interest for discovering variants and interpretations of the Hebrew texts of the early centuries of our era. The other notes in Ziegler’s critical apparatus, especially those on A-Q and *O*, are another matter. These readings, by and large, are not intended to harmonize the LXX with the MT, but rather represent alternate readings of the “original” LXX. They are not, of course, all of equal weight.

C. Isaiah Texts at Qumran

No fewer than twenty-one scrolls or fragments of the Book of Isaiah were found at Qumran.[76] These texts are designated collectively as QIsa and categorized by means of a preceding number corresponding to the cave in which they were found. A following letter in superscript further differentiates the scrolls found in those caves containing more than one Isaiah MS. Thus, the twenty-one Isaian scrolls and fragments found at Qumran are designated[77]: 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, 4QIsa^a, 4QIsa^b, 4QIsa^c, 4QIsa^d, 4QIsa^e, 4QIsa^{f,} 4QIsa^g, 4QIsa^h, 4QIsa^i, 4QIsa^j, 4QIsa^k, 4QIsa^l, 4QIsa^m, 4QIsa^n, 4QIsa^o, 4QpapIsa^p, 4QIsa^q, 4QIsa^r, and 5QIsa.

As is evident from the above designations, the Isaiah MSS came from three caves (that is, Caves 1, 4 and 5). Cave 5 yielded only a tiny fragment with parts of two verses that have not been conclusively identified.[78] Cave 1 yielded the only complete scroll (1QIsa^{a})—the Great Isaiah Scroll—and also a well-preserved but incomplete scroll (1QIsa^{b}). The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^{a}) has dominated Isaiah research vis-à-vis Qumran, and the development of digitized computer enhancement has been used to make more accurate readings of that scroll within the past decade.[79] The majority of the Qumran Isaiah texts were found in Cave 4, which yielded eighteen of the twenty-one. These include one incomplete scroll covering "substantial parts including both the beginning and the end of the book (4QIsa^{b}), while another one was preserved relatively well (4QIsa^{c})."[80] 4QpapIsa^{p} is the only Qumran Isaiah fragment written on papyrus.[81]

---

[76] Emanuel Tov, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah* (ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; 2 vols.; VTSup 70; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997) 2. 491-511, here 492-93. Outside of Qumran, an additional Isaiah fragment, which was found at Wadi Murabba‘at and published in 1961, is often counted under the broader category of “findings in the Judean Desert.”

[77] Ibid., 492-93.

All four Servant Songs in their entirety, of course, are found in the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^{a}). The First Servant Song (42:1-9) is also found in part in 4QIsa^{b} (42:2-7, 9) and 4QIsa^{h} (42:4-11). The Second Servant Song (49:1-13) is also found in its entirety in both 1QIsa^{b} and 4QIsa^{d}. The Third Servant Song (50:4-11) is found in part in 1QIsa^{b} (50:7-11). The Fourth Servant Song (52:13–53:12) is also found in part in four of the twenty-one Isaiah Qumran scrolls: twelve of the poem's fifteen verses (53:1-12) are found in 1QIsa^b, nine verses in 4QIsa^c (52:13-15; 53:1-3, 6-8), four in 4QIsa^d (53:8-12) and two in 4QIsa^b (53:11-12).[82]

---

[78] For the contents of 5QIsa as well as the other Qumran Isaiah MSS, see Eugene Ulrich, "An Index to the Contents of the Isaiah Manuscripts from the Judean Desert," in ibid. 2. 477-80, here 478-80.

[79] See *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^{a}): A New Edition* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron; STDJ 32; Boston: Brill, 1999).

[80] Tov, "Isaiah at Qumran," 2. 493.

[81] Ibid.

In general, textual evidence from Qumran suggests that two distinct scribal traditions, reflecting differences in orthography and morphology, coexisted in the period of Second Temple Judaism. The Qumran texts can be divided into two groups according to these traditions. One group of texts follows a scribal tradition virtually identical to that of the MT—but without pointing or accentuation—and can therefore be called "in the proto-Masoretic tradition." The second group, consisting of texts using a tradition quite different in orthography and morphology, is referred to as "Qumran Scribal Practice."[83]

The term "Qumran Scribal Practice" can be taken in two ways. On the one hand, the term can be taken to imply acceptance, in whole or in part, of the well-known Qumran-Essene hypothesis. This hypothesis ascribes the origin of at least some of the Dead Sea Scrolls to a sectarian community, which had scribes among its members, living at Qumran. E. Tov subscribes in part to this hypothesis (explicitly stating that some of the scrolls found in the caves near Qumran were produced at the site itself),[84] but he seems to avoid describing the sect as Essene. He explains the origin of the phrase "Qumran Scribal Practice" thus: "The notion that these texts are intimately connected with the Qumran covenanters derives from the fact that virtually *all* the Qumran sectarian writings are written in this practice."[85] Since he accepts the broad outline of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis, his only reservation in using the now common term "Qumran Scribal Practice" is that it might be taken to imply that all of the texts exemplifying this practice were produced at Qumran, whereas in his view some of them may have been produced elsewhere. Nothing hinders us from imagining that the "Qumran Scribal Practice" may well have been used in many parts of ancient Israel during the Second Temple Period. Whereas Tov admits the possibility that only some of the scrolls found at Qumran were produced there, to posit that *any* of the scrolls were produced at the Khirbet Qumran site must be seriously questioned, according to an increasing number of scholars.[86]

---

[82] Eugene Ulrich, "An Index to the Contents of the Isaiah Manuscripts from the Judean Desert," in *Scroll of Isaiah* (ed. Broyles and Evans) 2. 477-80, here 480.

[83] Tov, "Isaiah at Qumran," 2. 505. In his later work, *Textual Criticism*, Tov divides all the Qumran scrolls into five categories: texts written in the Qumran practice, proto-Masoretic texts, pre-Samaritan (or harmonizing) texts, texts close to the presumed Hebrew source of OG, and nonaligned texts. Tov places 1QIsa^a in his last category and 1QIsa^b in his second category.

[84] Tov, "Isaiah at Qumran," 2. 492.

On the other hand, "Qumran Scribal Practice" can be used as a term that refers to Qumran merely because it is the only site where scrolls attesting this practice have been *found* (without intending to imply any position on where they were produced). Taken in this second way, the term is perfectly acceptable. It implies nothing about the geographical extent of this scribal practice; nor does it imply anything about where these particular scrolls exemplifying the Qumran Scribal Practice were *produced*, much less the identity of their writers.[87] It is only in this second sense that I use the term.

---

[85] Ibid., 2. 508.

[86] See, for example, Paulson Pulikottil, *Transmission of the Biblical Texts in Qumran* (JSPSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 163-64. Yizhar Hirschfeld (*Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004]) gives perhaps the most convincing alternative hypothesis date, based on the most recent archaeology. He argues that the Khirbet Qumran site, far from being isolated, was indeed at a commercial crossroads of an economically vibrant region, that the residents at the site were wealthy, had luxurious tastes, and— based on more recent excavations of burial sites—included men, women, and children. He proposes that the numerous *miqva'ot*, which were considered unusual at the time of the original excavation, are no more numerous at Qumran than at several other sites known to be non-sectarian, which were excavated after Qumran. None of this, strictly speaking, disproves the Qumran-Essene hypothesis, but the evidence does at least call aspects of it into question. Furthermore, the work shows how much of the traditional hypothesis is founded on speculation. Hirschfeld goes further than merely calling the hypothesis into question, concluding that the site was the Judean equivalent of a *villa rustica*: part vacation home, part agro-industrial concern.

The majority of the Qumran Isaian texts belong to the first group, that is, they are similar in scribal style to the MT tradition (although, of course, without vocalization, punctuation, and accentuation). The similarity between this first group—loosely referred to as the proto-Masoretic group—and the medieval MT MSS of Isaiah is striking. There are numerous differences, to be sure, but the proto-MT group found at Qumran and the medieval MT tradition differ mostly in minutiae. For example, a comparison of the Isaiah text of the most familiar MT MS, the Leningrad Codex (L), and the most complete proto-Masoretic Isaiah MS at Qumran, 1QIsa^b, yields differences between them in orthography (107), grammatical forms (24), the addition of the conjunctive waw (16), difference in number (14), lack of the conjunctive waw (13), and different words (11), but fewer than ten differences with regard to each of the following: missing articles, missing letters, difference in pronouns, difference in prepositions, missing words, additional words, and word order.[88] Few of these differences involve any major difference in meaning. For a text of the length of Isaiah, such closeness is remarkable. In short, B. J. Roberts and D. Barthélemy's early assessments of 1QIsa^b still appear accurate, that is, its text is "closely aligned to the MT."[89] Such closeness is also evident in the other proto-MT Isaian texts from Qumran. As Tov states: "The close relationship between the medieval representative of MT, L, and 1QIsa^b is matched by almost all texts of Isaiah from cave 4."[90]

---

[87] It is not difficult to imagine plausible explanations for how scrolls produced elsewhere might have ended up in the caves of Qumran. See Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context,* 45.

[88] Tov, "Isaiah at Qumran," 2. 506.

[89] Ibid.

The second textual group, the representatives of the "Qumran scribal practice," is attested by only two of the Isaiah MSS found at Qumran: 1QIsa^a and 4QIsa^c.[91] The two scrolls written in this style immediately stand out in contrast to the proto-Masoretic MSS, given that their scribes wrote the "tetragrammaton and other divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters."[92] The two Isaian texts from this tradition also differ greatly from the MT group in orthography, namely, in their abundant use of plene spellings. The plene spellings in the "Qumran Scribal Practice," however, lack rigid uniformity, suggesting that the practice allowed for some amount of variation. The spellings in 1QIsa^a and 4QIsa^c are in fact far from internally consistent, let alone in comparison with each other.[93] Besides such orthographical differences, morphological differences also appear.

---

[90] Ibid. Although Lange (*Handschriften*, 278) confirms the relative agreement (in comparison with other biblical books) of MT Isaiah with the Qumran Isaiah MSS in general, he cautions against unnuanced statements ("überpointierten Aussagen") that seem to gloss over the differences. Interestingly, Lange (ibid.) considers 1QIsa^b as one of the less Proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran, surely an opinion influenced by the lack of weight he gives to differences in orthography vis-à-vis Tov.

[91] Tov, "Isaiah at Qumran," 2. 507.

[92] In *Textual Criticism,* 2. 493, Tov gives a more complex five-category division of Qumran texts and places 1QIsa^a in a category different from the "Qumran Scribal Practice" (see p. 26, n. 82). It is difficult to know if Tov meant to reverse his opinion. Presumably, his comments in "Isaiah at Qumran," concerning the characteristics of "Qumran Scribal practice" (the paleo-Hebrew script used exclusively in writing the tetragrammaton, the abundance of plene spellings and the idiosyncratic morphology) still hold true for 1QIsa^a.

[93] Tov, "Isaiah at Qumran," 2. 509.

An example of a morphological difference between Qumran scribal practice texts and the MT type texts is the use of the peculiar suffixes כה- and מה-.[94] Other differences include scribal marks, marginal symbols, and extra spaces between words to indicate divisions.[95]

4QIsa^{c} and especially 1QIsa^{a} differ from the MT, however, in still other ways than in their scribal practice. "1QIsa^{a} contains altogether some 250 supralinear additions of words or letters as well as 148 crossings out, erasures and dotted words or letters on its 1573 well-preserved lines, that is, an average of one intervention in every four lines of text."[96] Because of the great number of such interventions in 1QIsa^{a}, "the notion that the scroll's variations are due to scribal mistakes prevailed and dominated all the discussions of the scroll."[97] Pulikottil, however, argues that "as long as it cannot be proved that one [manuscript] . . . is intended to be an exact copy of [another] . . . and as long as the deviation does not cause disruption of the logical flow of thought, syntactical problems or lexical difficulties, there are no sure grounds to designate [such variations] as error."[98] The possibility remains that at least some of these variations are, rather, interpretive in character.

---

[94] Ibid.

[95] Pulikottil, *Transmission*, 17.

[96] Ibid., 16.

[97] Emanuel Tov, "The Textual Base of the Corrections in the Biblical Texts Found at Qumran," in D. Dimant et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 299-314, here 303.

[98] Pulikottil, *Transmission,* 20.

D. Qumran Isaiah and LXX Isaiah vis-à-vis M Isaiah

Most scholarly work gives at least implicit preeminence to M (the consonantal text underlying the MT). For example, QIsa or LXX Isaiah readings that differ from M are considered "variants" of M, seldom the reverse. Although well into the twentieth century many scholars were inclined to see variants in the LXX as "more original" than readings in the MT, such an assessment of LXX Isaiah's value in this regard has been losing ground in the past 30 years. "Die Argumentation für einen der LXX zugrunde liegenden angeblich besseren oder anderen hebräischen Text hat deutlich an Boden verloren."[99] Opinions, however, vary. Scholars such as Tov continue to hold that the LXX (and other ancient translations) are highly important.[100]

Some scholars are inclined to see the LXX versions and Qumran texts of biblical books as representative of differing traditions which coexisted in the diversity of Second Temple Judaism. In their view, to consider one form of the text superior in some way to the others would be to impose an anachronistic approach to the biblical texts. According to Pulikottil, the canonization and standardization of the Hebrew Bible, as well as the uniformity of Jewish ideology grounded in Pharisaism, which reduced the role of the scribe to that of a mere copyist, belongs to an era well after the production of 1QIsa^{a}.[101] The scribes who wrote 1QIsa^{a}

> . . . did not subscribe to the idea that the biblical era had been terminated, nor did they accept the concomitant notion that 'biblical' literature and literary standards

---

[99] Höffken, *Jesaja,* 15.

[100] Tov, *Textual Criticism* ,122.

[101] Pulikottil, *Transmission,* 23. For a discussion on dating the beginning of this "era well after the

> had been superseded or replaced by new conceptions. . . . [They thought of] biblical literature as living matter, and participated in the ongoing process of its production.[102]

Pulikottil, Zevit, Talmon and Berges are in good company with the likes of Tov—scholars who recognize the role of authority and tradition within Judaism in designating or recognizing a particular *form* of Isaiah as authoritative, the text that later became known as proto-Masoretic Isaiah (hereafter M Isaiah). In effect, Tov and others see all of the textual variants found in Qumran Isaiah texts and LXX Isaiah as part of a complex literary formation history of Isaiah (that is, pertaining to literary criticism), not simply part of its transmission (that is, pertaining to textual criticism). In other words, it was only some time after the period when the Qumran Isaiah texts were written and LXX Isaiah was translated that a particular form of Isaiah (what in hindsight we call "proto-Masoretic," more accurately "pre-M") underwent a final redaction (in effect the proto-Masoretic *Urtext*), which was recognized by Jewish religious authorities and the

---

production of 1QIsa^{a}", see Z. Zevit "Canonization of the Hebrew Bible," in *Canonization and Decanonization: Papers Presented to the International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR), Held at Leiden 9-10 January 1997* (ed. A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn; *Numen* Book Series 82; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 133-60, here 139. According to Zevit and others, canonization began as an implicit assumption that only became explicit with the growth of the rabbinic tradition. "Accordingly, the Mishna [by Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi] and the Tosefta [an expansion of Rabbi Judah's *mishna* including *mishnayot* of other scholars of his generation] comprise the first canon of the Jewish people." By "first canon" I take Zevit to imply, not that there have been subsequent canons for the Jewish people, but that prior to the Mishna and Tosefta the Jewish people did not have an agreed-upon canon based on a universally accepted authority or authoritative texts. The situation changed when the biblical books commented on in the Mishna and Tosefta were accepted by the generations following Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi, ca. 250-300 as closed and canonical for Jews (ibid., 152-53).

[102] S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible: A New Outlook," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross, Jr. and S. Talmon; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,

community as a whole. Until this point scribes and translators functioned as redactors as well.[103]

Once this possibility is admitted, many of the variations in 1QIsa^{a} are easily explained as redactions: harmonizations with the proximate context, as well as with the broader context of the entire scroll or even with other biblical books. Other differences, especially those involving the use of differing roots may be the result of different *Vorlagen*. One example is in 52:14 where 1QIsa^{a} has משׁחתי while the MT reads מִשְׁחַת. Which is more original? Barthélemy translates the Qumran text as “I anointed” and sees it as an original messianic variant.[104] Evidently, this reading was eventually rejected in favor of מִשְׁחַת (a problematic *hapax legomenon* usually translated “disfigurement of face”) in the move towards standardization. Another interesting textual issue raised by the Qumran findings, pertinent to Isaiah 53, occurs in connection with 53:11 where the MT reads מֵעֲמַל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה, whereas two of the texts in the proto-Masoretic tradition (1QIsa^{b} and 4QIsa^{d}) and one of the Qumran practice texts (1QIsa^{a})

1975) 321-400, here 379. For a similar view see Ulrich Berges, “Light from 1QIsa^{a} on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah,” in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranata; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 193-204, here 194.

[103] Arie van der Kooij, “Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: Its Aim and Method,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94,2; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 729-39, here 730. Van der Kooij disagrees, however, on some points with Tov’s approach, objecting that although “large differences” resulting from the work of scribes and translators who saw their role as more than mere copyist or literal translator “may be similar to—though not necessarily identical with—large scale redactional elaborations which are characteristic of the literary history of a book . . . [there is] no compelling reason for the idea that particular ‘sizeable differences’ should be seen as reflecting the literary history of a book” (ibid., 730-31).

[104] D. Barthélemy, “Le Grand Rouleau d’Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte,” *RB* 57 (1950) 530-49, here 547.

adds אור. This evidence—especially when coupled with the LXX 53:11 reading (δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς)—attests to a textual fluidity one would expect in a work still in process of redaction. The fact that LXX Isaiah reads δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς implies a commonality in outlook between the writers of 1QIsa^b, 4QIsa^d, and 1QIsa^a and the translator of LXX Isaiah—a commonality that could be explained in any number of ways and one which, on Tov's approach, was decided against in the final redaction, M Isaiah.

Pulikottil lists the fourteen readings from 4QIsa^c which agree with the fragmentary1QIsa^a over against the MT.[105] Does this suggest that 1QIsa^a and 4QIsa^c were based on a different *Vorlage* than that of the MT? It is, of course, impossible to rule out such a hypothesis. The difficulty (impossibility?) in determining whether, in any given instance, a difference between two texts stems from a deliberate decision of one of the producers of the texts or from difference in *Vorlagen* is captured by Troxel, whose remarks apply equally well to scribes and translators:

> Scholars tend to favor one of two stances: given the wealth of variants revealed by the DSS, some tend to detect a Hebrew variant behind most divergences from the MT, while others, fascinated by signs that the translator wove contextual interpretation into his translation, tend to attribute divergences to the translator's exegesis.[106]

III. Assumptions, Aims, and Method of This Study

As the above survey of the state of research shows, many unresolved issues remain regarding the Servant Songs of Isaiah and many other topics related to this study. As mentioned earlier, this dissertation sets aside many of these questions and investigates an aspect of the texts that is largely unexplored, their portrayal of God. But is it possible to simply set these questions aside? Clearly, in order to proceed with this project, certain assumptions must be made. Regarding the legitimate questions of the validity of the category “servant songs,” their authorship and placement in the text, the relationship between PI, DI, and TI, and the famous question of the identity of the Servant (that is, the identity/identities intended by the author/redactor in the case of the MT, or the translator in the case of the LXX), I am assuming that even without adopting a position on any of these matters valid assertions still can be made about the portrayal of God within the texts to be studied. As for the relationships between PI, DI, and TI, I am assuming with Höffken that the LXX Isaiah translator had great familiarity with the whole of the Book Isaiah (see p. 21, n. 70).

---

[105] Pulikottil, *Transmission,* 218.

[106] Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah,* 74.

As for text-critical questions, I am assuming the position of Tov and others described above, who hold that scribes and translators before the beginning of Christianity saw sacred texts and their roles in transmitting them quite differently from later scribes and translators. As a result, texts copied and translated before the early centuries A.D. were marked by a fluidity and diversity, whereas afterwards standardization and strict adherence to texts deemed inspired was the norm. Standardization of the texts of the *Tenakh* occurred in Judaism at some point in the early centuries A.D. This text, which is referred to as M, was a consonantal text, the vocalization of which was at first transmitted orally. The MT probably reflects the consonantal text M more reliably than it does the vocalization tradition with which M was first read.

I am also assuming that the LXX Servant Songs are translations of texts closely resembling M Servant Songs. This is merely an assumption: I see no way of proving in most instances that a discrepancy between the meaning of M and the meaning of LXX could not result from a difference in *Vorlagen.* I will often note that important possibility in the course of my dissertation.

As noted above, the primary aim of this study is to describe how God is portrayed in each of eight texts, namely, both the M and LXX texts of each of the four Servant Songs, to compare these portrayals and to note patterns that emerge. Quite secondary are my attempts to explain the possible origins of any discrepancies and to speculate as to which might involve intentional changes based on theological motivation on the part of the Greek translator. Differences need not have originated with the LXX translator or his *Vorlage(n).* Theoretically it is possible that in any given instance the LXX text represents the older tradition and that a given discrepancy arises from an error or intentional alteration by a scribe or redactor within the M or pre-M text tradition. In point of fact, however, I have found no instances in passages pertaining directly to the portrayal of God where this seems to me likely to be the case.

As for method, although I occasionally address issues of the history of the formation of the texts in question, my approach is mostly synchronic. At every step I am primarily interested in the final redaction of M Servant Songs and LXX Servant Songs in their canonical placement within DI and in the portrayal of God expressed or implicit in each. Since important nuances in the portrayal of God can be greatly affected by the slightest difference in even a single word, I have sought to be appropriately thorough in addressing questions of textual criticism and translation. In addition, since differences in nuance may possibly at times be gleaned from the identity of the implied speaker(s) and implied addressee(s), I also discuss these issues in some detail. A complete exegesis of all eight texts is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Instead exegetical discussions are limited to those verses that contribute most directly to the portrayal of God. I have chosen to investigate the portrayal of God that emerges from a careful reading of the whole of any given text of the four songs before engaging in intertextual comparisons. Only after careful analysis of all the differences in the portrayal of God in the corresponding M and LXX texts do I then seek to identify patterns. Whether these patterns constitute *Tendenzen* on the part of the LXX translator is finally taken up in the last chapter.

Chapter Two: The First Servant Song

In this chapter, I begin with a discussion of the First Servant Song's delimitation. Next I will offer my own English translation of the MT pericope, with explanations of my translational choices for some of the more difficult cases and with evaluations of the major variants noted in the corresponding textual apparatus of *BHS*. Next I will analyze the identity of the implied speakers and audiences for the sections of this pericope. After these preliminary steps, I will analyze the portrayal of Yhwh in those verses in which the implied speaker is Yhwh or in which the implied speaker directly quotes Yhwh. Finally, I will examine the portrayal of Yhwh in those verses where the implied speaker, an unnamed spokesman—presumably the prophet—speaks in his own words.

I then will take up the LXX text of the First Servant Song. I will provide my own translation with text critical notes, an analysis of the implied speakers and audiences, and the portrayal of κύριος in the song. Thereafter, I will present my translation of the MT and LXX text of the First Servant Song side by side and compare and contrast their portrayals of God. Finally, a conclusion will summarize the similarities and differences between the two texts.

I. Delimitation

The literary history of the opening unit in Isaiah 42 is far from certain. Goldingay and Payne state, "There are a number of theories regarding the history of the material's development: that vv. 5-7 or 6-7 are a later addition to original material from Second

Isaiah; that vv. 5-9 are a supplement to vv. 1-4; that vv. 1-4 are the later addition to 41.21-29 + 42.5-9; or that vv. 1-4 and 5-7 are a later addition to 41.21-29 + 42.8-9."[1] Note that one common element among all these hypotheses is that Isa 42:1-4 is consistently considered a distinct unit.

That a new unit begins at 42:1 is clear. Although 42:1 is a continuation of the divin discourse found in chapter 41, the subject changes from the futility of idols to the presentation of an unnamed servant (but identified as Jacob/Israel in LXX Isa 42:1) and his task.

The evidence that the unit ends at 42:4 is less clear. North uses a somewhat complex argument to show why he considers 42:4 the end of the first Servant Song. He begins by arguing against what he considers the most likely alternative (42:1-7). North accepts Duhm's assumption that the Servant Songs were inserted into the text of DI by an author different from that of the main text. For the sake of argument he supposes that 42:1-7 may have been inserted into a text in which 42:8-9 immediately followed 41:29. Indeed, it is plausible that 42:8-9 originally followed 41:29: in 42:8-9 Yhwh asserts his ability to do precisely what he asserts the idols cannot do in 41:26-29, that is, foretell events. Nevertheless, North ultimately rejects this supposition (that 42:8-9 originally followed 41:29) because "[41:29] has the appearance of being the end of an oracle [and] [v]erses 8-9 are an equally good continuation of [42:7], which, if nothing followed, would end abruptly."[2] For these reasons, North holds that there is no separating vv. 8-9 from v. 7.

---

[1] John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40–55* (2 vols.; ICC; London: T & T Clark, 2006) 1. 211.

Does this mean that the Servant Song actually extends from 42:1 to 42:9? Not according to North. In the next step of his argument, he states, "Those who [group verses 8-9] with ver. 7 are in the difficulty that if they admit vv. 8-9 as a continuation they are dealing with a typical Deutero-Isaianic oracle, with references to 'former' and 'new' things, which elsewhere in the prophecy have no immediate connexion with the Servant." He concludes that "it is therefore best to treat vv. 5-9 as a unity."[3]

All of this can be summarized in the following argument. For North, there is no separating vv. 8-9 from 5-7. But vv. 5-9 cannot be part of the First Servant Song because these verses are written by the author of DI, who was different from the author of the servant songs. Therefore the First Servant Song ends with 42:4.

North's argument is based on the premise that the Servant Songs were not written by the same author as the rest of DI. Since this, however, is an assumption about which there is little consensus among scholars, the possibility of the First Servant Song comprising 42:1-9 remains. Other scholars propose stronger arguments than that of North for separating 42:5-9 from 42:1-4. In 42.5 we encounter a "messenger formula."[4] An even clearer indicator that a new section begins here is that the addressee is now the one commissioned.[5] This evidence, in addition to the fact that major divisions are found in the textual tradition between vv. 4 and 5 as well as between vv. 9 and 10 (e.g., the *petuḥot* are found between v. 4 and v. 5 and between v 9 and v. 10 in the MT, and the remainder of the line of the parchment is left blank after v. 4 and after v. 9 in 1QIsa^{a})[6] strongly suggests a separation of some kind between 42:1-4 and 5-9.[7]

---

[2] Christopher North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963) 132.

[3] Ibid. A different approach is taken by Eugene Robert Ekblad (*Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* [Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999] 58), who suggests, on account of the change from the second person singular to plural, that v. 9 belongs with the following pericope. His view does not take into account the major division markers found in the textual tradition between vv. 9 and 10 and the poetic structure of the text (see Marjo C.A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, *The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40–55* [OTS 41; Leiden: Brill, 1998] 120). By "division markers in the textual tradition" I mean the *petuḥot* and *setumot* or spaces left open in Hebrew MSS; the various sigla in Greek MSS including the *petuḥot* and *setumot* borrowed from Hebrew, lines projecting into the left margin and usually headed by a capital letter found in S, B, A, and Q; and spaces left open or "rosettes" (diamond-shaped clusters) found in Syriac MSS. For more details, see Korpel and de Moor, *Structure*, 2-6.

Yet the question remains: Are the two sections independent pericopes or subsections of a single pericope, that is—for example, "two units of poetry on the theme of human agency that are intimately linked to each other?"[8] The following reasons lend support to the latter alternative.

Goldingay and Payne note that although the two sections "would be capable of standing alone . . . their individual significance (including who is addressed and who is referred to) becomes markedly more difficult to determine if they are treated as independent units."[9]

---

[4] This is the first time in DI that a prophecy is introduced with a messenger formula (cf. oracles in other parts of the *Tanakh*, e.g., Isa 36:4, and 14; 1 Kgs 22:27). As Goldingay and Payne point out (*Isaiah 40–55*, 1. 223), this is often but not necessarily the beginning of a new unit. For atypical examples of such messenger formulae occurring within a unit rather than beginning one, see Isa 36:16 and 44:2.

[5] Ibid.. As will become evident, shifts in the addressees, while evidence of a new section, need not indicate a new unit.

[6] Korpel and de Moor, *Structure,* 154.

[7] Korpel and de Moor (ibid., 153) give additional reasons for the delimitation of 42:1-4 as a unit. The "canticle" has the "threefold responsion" of משׁפט, a responsion of גוי with אי, a twofold responsion of יצא and "concantenations" of רצץ and כהה. (I take "concantenations" here to mean more than mere repetition of words or ideas, but rather repetitions involving a more complex interplay of linked terms.) Moreover, verses 2-4 can only be understood in light of v. 1.

[8] Walter Brueggemann, *Isaiah 40–66* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998) 41.

Jim W. Adams argues from a parallel situation found in the Second Servant Song. The Second Servant Song (49:1-13) has a similar structure to that of the first, delimited by him as 42:1-9. Both songs begin with "a discussion about the servant (42:1-4 and 49:1-6) followed by additional comments given by Yahweh introduced by similar speech formulas (42:5-9; 49:7-13)."[10]

Baltzer argues that "the twofold division of the text may be connected with the requirements of the genre: vv. 1-4 comprise the presentation and calling of the servant . . . . Verses 5-7 bring the actual installation, with the direct address to the Servant."[11]

With admirable nuance, Korpel and de Moor make the case for considering 42:1-9 as a unit on its own. They note the numerous examples of "distant parallelism" between elements in vv. 1-4 and elements in vv. 5-9: תמך ("grasp/support") in v. 1a and הזק ("seize") in v. 6a, נתן רוח ("give spirit") in v.1b and נתן נשמה/רוח ("give breath/spirit") in v. 5b, גוי ("people/Gentile") in both v. 2b and v. 6b, and יצא hiphil ("cause to go forth") in both v. 1b and 7b. This, as well as other evidence, leads them to conclude that “if one wants to maintain the supposition of various redactional layers one has to pay due attention to the fact that the regular structure we found presupposes utmost care for the composition as a whole on the part of the final redactor. Failure to recognize this will result in failure to do justice to his literary artistry and his theological intentions.”[12]

---

[9] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 1. 21.

[10] Jim W. Adams, *The Performative Nature and Function of Isaiah 40–55* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies [formerly JSOTSup] 448; New York: T & T Clark, 2006) 109. In fact, John L. McKenzie (*Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB 20; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968] 40) and others see a similarity in structure for the first *three* Servant Songs and what he calls their "responses." Isa 42:5-9 is "a response to the Servant Song; responses can also be identified after the second and third Song. The ideas are repeated and simplified." In a similar vein, Ulrich Berges (*Jesaja 40–48* [HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2008] 213) refers to "das erste Gottesknechtslied (V 1-4), zusammen mit der Ergänzung (V 5.6-9)."

[11] Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (translated by Margaret Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 124-25.

For all of these reasons, I have chosen to delimit the First Servant Song as extending from 42:1 to 42:9. The clear shift between v. 4 and v. 5 surely points to a measure of complexity in the literary history of the pericope, but the evident correlations between the sections (as noted by Korpel and de Moor) and the near impossibility of interpreting vv. 5-9 without reference to vv. 1-4 (as noted by Goldingay and Payne) point to a single pericope with regard to the final form in which the text has come down to us.

II. The Portrayal of God in MT Isa 42:1-9

A. Text-critical Notes and Translation

הֵ֣ן [a] עַבְדִּי֙ אֶתְמָךְ־בּ֔וֹ[b]

---

[12] Korpel and de Moor, *Structure*, 156.

[a] 1QIsa[a] has the more common word, הנה. The same discrepancy is found between the MT and 1QIsa[a] texts of 41:24 and 29. I retain the *BHS* reading as the more difficult one. The LXX does not have the equivalent ἰδού and instead reads Ιακωβ. It is easier to see why a Greek translator of a Hebrew *Vorlage* would substitute a name in place of the particle than why a scribe copying a Hebrew text would substitute the particle for the name. The more original reading, therefore, most likely did not have the name identifying the servant. The discrepancy between the MT and LXX rendering of the verse was noted by “the Three,” i.e., Symmachus (hereafter σ′), Aquila (hereafter α′), and Theodotian (hereafter θ′), all of whom delete Ιακωβ and insert ἰδού in their recensions, as does the sixth century (LXX) codex Marchalianus.

[b] 1QIsa[a] apparently has the cohortative אתמוכה “let me hold [him] fast.” The reading, however, has no witnesses among Masoretic texts. (See Chapter One for a discussion of the so-called “Masoretic Text.”) The LXX here has the plus Ισραηλ, not likely to be original for the same reason given with regard to Ιακωβ in note a.

בְּחִירִ֖י רָצְתָ֣ה נַפְשִׁ֑י
נָתַ֤תִּי רוּחִי֙ עָלָ֔יו[c]
מִשְׁפָּ֖ט[d] לַגּוֹיִ֥ם יוֹצִֽיא׃

[1]Behold my servant: I will hold him fast.
In my chosen one my soul has been pleased.
I have put my spirit upon him;
justice for the nations will he bring forth.

[2]לֹ֥א יִצְעַ֖ק וְלֹ֣א יִשָּׂ֑א[e]
וְלֹֽא־יַשְׁמִ֥יעַ[f] בַּח֖וּץ קוֹלֽוֹ׃

[2] He will not cry out, nor will he raise—
nor make heard in the streets—his voice.

[3]קָנֶ֤ה רָצוּץ֙ לֹ֣א יִשְׁבּ֔וֹר

---

[c] Baltzer (*Deutero-Isaiah,* 127) observes: "It is striking that the formulation we find in the present text, 'to put spirit on someone' (נתן על) is found only in Num 11:25 and 29, where it has to do with the 'spirit' of Moses, which is transferred to the seventy elders by Yahweh himself. It is then interpreted as the spirit of prophecy, which Moses actually hopes will be given to the whole people (v. 29)."

[d] 1QIsa^a has ומשפטו, 1QIsa^b ומשפטי. Since these are easier readings, they are less likely to be origina

[e] The LXX has ἀνήσει, third person future indicative active of ἀνίημι (here, probably "[e]The LXX has ἀνήσει, third person future indicative active of ἀνίημι (here, probably "send up"; ἀνίημι is the verb the LXX uses elsewhere to render נשׂא). The Vg, which reads *neque accipiet personam* ("nor will he have repect to person") most likely presupposes an ellipse of the noun פנים (cf. Deut 10:17 לֹא־יִשָּׂא פָנִים = "does not show partiality"). If the Vg presumes an ellipse (and not an additional word פנים), then neither the LXX nor the Vg presupposes a variant in its respective Hebrew *Vorlage*. On the other hand, a possible variant can be inferred from Jerome (*Commentariorum in Isaiam, PL* 24, 421.507), who translates σʹ as *decipietur* ("he will be deceived"): this reading implies that σʹ's *Vorlage* read ישׁא. This variant has been adopted by the Hebrew University Bible. Finally, Arnold B. Ehrlich (*Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches* [4 vols.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912] 4. 152) proposes the emendation ישׁאג ("he will shout"): "ג ist wegen der Aehnlichkeit mit dem folgenden Buchstaben [ו] irrtümlich weggefallen." Ehrlich's proposal may find support in Syr, which reads ܢܢܒ ("clamoring"). The variants and proposed emendations point to the unusual but euphonic word order of the MT.

[f] Isac Leo Seeligmann (*The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* [Mededelingen en Verhandelingen No. 9 van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootshap "Ex Oriente Lux"; Leiden: Brill, 1948] 56) notes that the passive voice of the LXX version implies a different vocalization: יִשָּׁמַע. The Vg also has the verb in the passive voice (*audietur*="he will be heard"), but Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein ("Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah," *Textus* 4 [1964] 176-210, here 195) argues that Jerome's rendering presupposes the hiphil.

וּפִשְׁתָּ֥ה כֵהָ֖ה לֹ֣א יְכַבֶּ֑נָּה[g]
לֶאֱמֶ֖ת יוֹצִ֥יא מִשְׁפָּֽט׃

[3] A crushed reed he will not break
and a smoldering flaxen wick he will not extinguish.
According to truth,[h] he will bring forth justice.

[4] לֹ֤א[i] יִכְהֶה֙ וְלֹ֣א[i] יָר֔וּץ
עַד־יָשִׂ֥ים בָּאָ֖רֶץ מִשְׁפָּ֑ט
וּלְתוֹרָת֖וֹ אִיִּ֥ים יְיַחֵֽילוּ׃ פ

[4] He will not grow dim nor will he be crushed
until he establishes justice on the earth;
and his teaching the distant islands and shores will await[j].

[5] כֹּֽה־אָמַ֞ר הָאֵ֣ל ׀ יְהוָֹ֗ה[k]
בּוֹרֵ֤א הַשָּׁמַ֙יִם֙ וְנ֣וֹטֵיהֶ֔ם[l]
רֹקַ֥ע הָאָ֖רֶץ וְצֶאֱצָאֶ֑יהָ
נֹתֵ֤ן נְשָׁמָה֙ לָעָ֣ם עָלֶ֔יהָ
וְר֖וּחַ לַהֹלְכִ֥ים בָּֽהּ׃

[5] Thus says the God, Yhwh,
creator of the skies and stretching them out,
hammering out the earth and its issue,

---

[g] 1QIsa^a has the same verb without the third person feminine singular suffix with the energic נ: יכבה ("he will not extinguish").

[h] Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55*, 1. 220) point out that לֶאֱמֶת occurs only here in the MT. It is not likely to be equivalent to בֶּאֱמֶת ("in truth/truly"). BDB gives "according to truth" as its definition of לֶאֱמֶת. McKenzie (*Second Isaiah*, 36) suggests "faithfully." Claus Westermann (*Isaiah 40–66* [trans. David M. G. Stalker; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969] 96) proposes that the meaning is that . . . "'he is to bring forth justice in truth' (strictly 'to be truth', i.e., that it becomes the truth, is made to prevail)."

[i] 1QIsa^a has ולוא.

[j] BDB gives the alternative definition "hope for," which is reflected in the LXX's ἐλπιοῦσιν ("they will hope [for]").

[k] 1QIsa^a has האל האלהים.

[l] Joüon (§136 e N) considers ונֹוטֵיהֶם a plural of majesty. GKC (§93ss) views the form as singular, with the י representing the final ה of the root נטה.

giver of breath to the people upon it
and of spirit to those who move on it:

[6]אֲנִ֨י יְהוָ֛ה קְרָאתִ֥יךָֽ בְצֶ֖דֶק
וְאַחְזֵ֣ק[m] בְּיָדֶ֑ךָ וְאֶצָּרְךָ֗[n]
וְאֶתֶּנְךָ֛ לִבְרִ֥ית עָ֖ם
לְא֥וֹר גּוֹיִֽם׃

"I, Yhwh, have called you (singular) in righteousness[o]
and will take you by your hand and will watch over[p] you;
and I will make[q] you into a covenant of humanity[r],
a light of nations.

[7]לִפְקֹ֖חַ עֵינַ֣יִם עִוְר֑וֹת
לְהוֹצִ֤יא מִמַּסְגֵּר֙ אַסִּ֔יר
מִבֵּ֥ית כֶּ֖לֶא יֹ֥שְׁבֵי חֹֽשֶׁךְ׃

[7] to open eyes that are blind,
to bring out of the dungeon the prisoner,
out of the prison house those sitting in darkness.

[8]אֲנִ֥י יְהוָ֖ה ה֣וּא שְׁמִ֑י
וּכְבוֹדִי֙ לְאַחֵ֣ר לֹֽא־אֶתֵּ֔ן
וּתְהִלָּתִ֖י לַפְּסִילִֽים׃

---

[m] The Syr, *Tg. Isa.*, and Vg all presuppose the "inverted future" (wayyiqtol) vocalization. See Joüon §47; Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 124.

[n] The Syr and Vg presuppose the wayyiqtol vocalization.

[o] *TNK* "In My grace"; *NAB* "for the victory of justice." K. Koch ("צדק *ṣdq* to be communaly faithful, beneficial," in *TLOT* 2. 1046-47) considers the substantives צֶדֶק and צְדָקָה synonymous.

[p] *TNK*: "created"; *NJB* and *CJB*, Baltzer (*Deutero-Isaiah*, 124): "formed," evidently taking the root to be צוּר.

[q] Westermann (*Isaiah,* 100) points out that the expression "give as a *b^{e}rit*" occurs nowhere else in the MT." Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–5* , 1. 227) note that "*nātan* . . . parallels English 'render' in meaning both 'give' and 'make into,' and the second is more appropriate here."

[r] North (*Servant*, 132-33) notes that, according to some, the rendering "covenant people" is grammatically possible; he argues, however, that לִבְרִית עָם should be translated as a genitive of object parallel to "a light of nations." Further, North observes, the rainbow of Gen 9:8-17 (see especially Gen 9:13, "I set my bow in the clouds to serve as a sign of the covenant between me and the earth," *NAB*) is not a "proper parallel, though in the light of it we cannot exclude the possibility. . . 'covenant bond of humanity.'"

[8] I am Yhwh; this is my name,
and my glory to another I will not give,
nor my praise to idols.

[9]הָֽרִאשֹׁנ֖וֹת הִנֵּה־בָ֑אוּ
וַחֲדָשׁוֹת֙ אֲנִ֣י מַגִּ֔יד
בְּטֶ֥רֶם תִּצְמַ֖חְנָה אַשְׁמִ֥יעַ אֶתְכֶֽם׃

[9] The former things, behold they have come.
And new things, I am telling
before they spring forth I announce to you (pl.)."

B. Implied Speakers and Addressees

When written prophecy is proclaimed, there is an actual speaker and an actual audience, but there can be implied speakers and audiences as well. Identifying the implied speakers and addressees of our pericope depends in large measure on how the pericope's relation to its context and the nature of DI is construed. If DI is essentially a loosely organized anthology of units of various genres, then to seek answers to questions raised by the poem by reference to its current context would be of little value and quite likely misleading. Even if the rest of DI is carefully organized, if the servant songs (or even just the First Servant Song) were inserted with little or no concern for the context (as Duhm proposes), to identify the implied speakers and addressees from the preceding passages would be to go beyond the intention of the author(s) of the poem and the redactor(s) who gave the work its current form.

As stated in Chapter One, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to conduct a full investigation into the problem of the relationship of the Servant Songs to the rest of DI. Instead, when investigating the Songs' portrayal of God, I will simply assume that the present context does inform the text, whether or not the original authors and later redactors intended it to do so.[13]

That the implied speaker is Yhwh in 42:1-4 would be clear even to those who did not know the preceding context but were familiar with the images evoked by the unit's content. For those who know the preceding context this would be even clearer because there is no indication of a change of speaker at 42:1 from the preceding verses where Yhwh is said to be the speaker (see 41:13, 14, 17, and 21). The implied speaker, however, changes in 42:5. There, Yhwh suddenly is spoken of in the third person. In 42:6-9, this new speaker continues, but is quoting the direct discourse of Yhwh. Who is the implied speaker in vv. 5-9? Since he is clearly delivering an oracle, the implied speaker is presumably a prophet.

The direct discourse of Yhwh in 42:6-9 is to an implied individual or group addressed in the second person singular. Is there another implied audience as well in 42:6-9 (or for that matter in 42:1-4)? The preceding trial scene might suggest that God is addressing a heavenly court. On closer inspection, however, this is unlikely: in 41:28 the heavenly court is empty:[14] וְאֵרֶא וְאֵין אִישׁ ("I look and there is no one").[15]

---

[13] See Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001) 323 and 325. As numerous commentators have shown, DI can be read, albeit not without difficulty, as an organic whole. Through the use of catchwords, repetition of themes, ideas, phrases, and distinctive vocabulary the text itself strongly suggests some degree of inner cohesion. The context therefore naturally serves to provide answers to questions raised in the minds of the readers and hearers. In other words, whatever may have been the literary history of the poem and whatever its various fragments may have meant before being incorporated into the final redaction, DI (and some would argue the whole Book of Isaiah) as we have received it can be read to some degree as an organic unity. To read each pericope in rigid isolation seems artificial and only useful at best as a preliminary exercise.

[14] Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 124.

[15] Jan L. Koole, *Isaiah,* Part 3 (trans. Anthony P. Runia; 3 vols.; Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 1997-98) 1. 214. Koole observes that although in the previous chapter the

Therefore, I agree with Blenkinsopp's analysis: vv. 1-4 are simply addressed to the congregation, members of exilic or postexilic Israel. In vv. 5-9 the implied addressee is the Servant; the passage, however, is also meant to "invit[e] the readers or hearers to imagine being present at an actual ceremony of installation in office."[16] Verse 9 changes from the singular addressee of vv. 6-7 to a plural addressee. While some commentators have argued, based on this shift, that v. 9 or vv. 8-9 are not part of the preceding pericope, I take the second person plural suffix to be addressed simply to the readers or hearers who "are invited to imagine being present" at the Servant's installation, as Blenkinsopp proposes.

Blenkinsopp's proposal only works, of course, if the primary implied addressee (the Servant) and Israel are not one and the same. Israel cannot very well be the audience at its own installation. As will become clear in the section on the LXX, however, if the Servant *is* taken to be "Israel," the pericope would require that *this* "Israel" ("the Servant") still be somehow distinguished from the implied audience of vv. 1-5, the entire people of Israel (hereafter, "Jacob/Israel").

---

nations have been addressed, ". . . in 41:21-29 the address has gradually shifted and finally, for the nations and their gods, the 3.p. form is used. It is therefore likely that Israel is being addressed."

[16] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2000) 211-12. Obviously, vv. 1-4 cannot be addressed to the Servant: the use of the third person singular to refer to the Servant in 42:1b precludes the possibility that עַבְדִּי in 42:1a is being used as a vocative.

C. What Yhwh Says and Implies About Himself

42:1 Yhwh is a God who Reveals.

The poem's first word, הֵן raises the question of the poem's *Sitz im Leben*. Since Baltzer sees Isaiah 40–55 as a liturgical drama,[17] he holds that "'[s]ee' should be understood in a literal sense: the presentation of the Servant of God. There is something to be seen!"[18]

There are many biblical texts where Yhwh "condescends" to speak with humans by means of a voice or a vision. Thus, in Isa 42:1, Yhwh is in some sense present to both the Servant and the addressees when he introduces the Servant to them. Yet there is nothing in that context to suggest that the Servant or the addressees are "in heaven." Rather, Yhwh, in some sense, has "descended" to speak to them, presumably through the prophet. Whatever the unit's *Sitz-im-Leben,* at a minimum, one can say that through this one word, הֵן, Yhwh is portrayed as a God who reveals. Moreover, in this case, the object of his revelation to Israel is not so much a fact as "a person" (whether an individual or a group).

42:1 Yhwh Acts through Human Agency: עַבְדִּי.

As mentioned in Chapter One, the identity of the Servant is a topic beyond the scope of this dissertation. Nevertheless, some analysis of the general characteristics of those whom Yhwh designates as עַבְדִּי in the *Tanakh* overall, in the Book of Isaiah, and in DI, respectively, will prove helpful in our analysis of how Yhwh is portrayed in this poem.

---

[17] Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah,* 7.
[18] Ibid., 394.

In the *Tanakh* overall, Yhwh speaks of no fewer than ten different persons or groups as עַבְדִּי. By far the most frequent referent is David. Outside the Book of Isaiah, Yhwh so addresses or refers to Moses and Jacob/Israel, each four times. Yhwh also addresses other persons by this title in the *Tanakh*: Abraham (Gen 26:24), Job (Job 1:8; 2:3; 42:8), the prophet Isaiah (Isa 20:3), and Zerubbabel (Hag 2:23). The three oracles in MT Jeremiah, in which Yhwh refers to Nebuchadrezzar/ Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon as "my servant" (Jer 25:9; 27:6; 43:10), are *sui generis* in that the referent is a mortal enemy of Judah.[19] The tenth referent (Zech 3:8) is unique in that Yhwh identifies the intended figure not by name, but rather as צֶמַח, "a branch," that is, a future king of David's line.

With three important exceptions, all of the above individuals are powerful or wealthy—or become so after Yhwh's call—and are intimates of Yhwh to whom he assigns an important role in carrying out his plan. The three exceptions, Job, Nebuchadnezzar, and at times Jacob/Israel, stand out in their lacking one or the other of the characteristics listed above. Job differs in that, although he is a Yhwh-worshiper who is described in Job 1:1 as תָּם וְיָשָׁר (variously translated as "perfect/blameless/without sin/wholehearted and upright"), he is also a Gentile who plays no role in the history of Israel, much less that of the world. Nebuchadnezzar differs in that, although powerful, wealthy, and assigned an important role in carrying out Yhwh's plan in imposing punishment on Judah, he is not even a Yhwh-worshiper, much less his faithful intimate.

---

[19] In LXX Jeremiah, Yhwh never refers to Nebuchadnezzar as "my servant."

Thus, he is more an unwitting tool than a (self-aware) servant. Accordingly, Yhwh's references to him as עַבְדִּי are laden with irony that carries a powerful rhetorical effect. Finally, Jacob/Israel, when referred to by Yhwh as עַבְדִּי, differs in that, in every case, the designation refers to a group rather than an individual, that is, to the nation of Israel rather than to the patriarch.[20] While Jacob/Israel is in some cases referred to as an agent of Yhwh's plan (for example, in all but one case in Deutero-Isaiah, namely 45:4), in other cases the nation is portrayed as an unfaithful and disobedient people—hardly a people intimate with Yhwh. In the latter cases, Jacob/Israel's role in Yhwh's plan in history is left open to question. In Isa 45:4, Israel is referred to as עַבְדִּי, here more as a beneficiary than as an agent effecting Yhwh's plan. The references in Jer 30:10; Ezek 37:25; and Jer 46:27-28 are to Israel/Jacob as both beneficiary and object of chastisement.

In the MT of Deutero-Isaiah, Yhwh's use of עַבְדִּי displays several distinctive features. Whereas in PI, Yhwh uses עַבְדִּי, only twice—in the one case referring to David (Isa 37:35) and in the other to the prophet Isaiah (20:3)[21]—in DI, the term suddenly occurs nine times. Of the nine occurrences of the term עַבְדִּי in DI, five refer explicitly to Jacob/Israel.[22] When Yhwh identifies the servant in DI, it is always as Jacob/Israel. The remaining four instances[23] portray Yhwh using the term without such identification,[24] making the referent notoriously difficult to determine. The designation

---

[20] In Ezek 37:25, "Jacob" is perhaps meant in both senses.

[21] This is Yhwh's only reference to Isaiah as עַבְדִּי in the MT.

[22] Isa 41:8; 41:9; 44:2; 45:4; 49:3.

[23] Isa 42:1; 42:19; 52:13; 53:11.

[24] The use of the term "my servant" without further identification in the MT is a defining characteristic of the Servant Songs.

עַבְדִּי does not occur at all after 53:11. In short, DI can be distinguished from the rest of Isaiah by these two features: DI contains the only instances of Yhwh's referring to Jacob/Israel as "my servant" in the Book of Isaiah, just as it is only in DI that Yhwh speaks of someone as "my servant" without further identification.

Intertextually, then, much is implied about Yhwh's otherwise unidentified Servant in Isa 42:1. Given Yhwh's normal use of the term outside of DI, the Servant, whether an individual or a collective, is usually an intimate of Yhwh. Like the other Servants, with the exception of Job, the poem's Servant presumably has a role in God's plan of history.

What then can be concluded about Yhwh from his use of the term עַבְדִּי in 42:1-9? Yhwh acts in history through human beings to whom he gives important missions. Yhwh in a sense makes himself "dependent" on the cooperation of the servant for his plan to be accomplished. Moreover, by means of his plan, Yhwh not only acts on Israel's behalf, but also on that of "the nations."

42:1 Yhwh's Predeliction: רָצְתָה נַפְשִׁי

Goldingay and Payne state:

> The king's servant is by definition one whom the king supports. The latter phrase [42:1aβ] is contained within the former [42:1aα], so that expressing it brings out what is implicit. Similarly the new verb [to be pleased with] re-expresses the content of the familiar word 'chosen.' . . . The point of the line is merely—but significantly—to resume what we already know before building on it with something genuinely novel in v. 1b.[25]

These observations, however, seem to gloss over two important details of what Yhwh tells us about himself in Isa 42:1. First, human kings do not necessarily uphold their servants, but here Yhwh promises to do so. Second, kings, human and divine, may choose a servant for any number of reasons, but here Yhwh portrays himself in very human terms as choosing this servant out of affection for or delight in him: בְּחִירִ֖י רָצְתָ֣ה נַפְשִׁי.[26]

---

[25] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 1. 212.

42:1 Yhwh Empowers His Servant with His רוּחַ.

Christians accustomed to thinking of "the Spirit" as a divine Person are likely to miss the anthropomorphic quality of Yhwh's words as they would have been read and heard by the text's first audience. Both נֶפֶשׁ and רוּחַ can be very human, indeed creaturely, terms. Essentially רוּחַ here means "breath." "Where the *nephesh* feels and senses, the *ruah* acts."[27] Yet the Servant does not merely have Yhwh's רוּחַ in the way all living beings do; Yhwh has "put his רוּחַ upon" the Servant, a phrase identical to the wording used in Num 11:25, 29 and similar to terminology for the commissioning of charismatic leaders, as saviors and judges, in Israel's early period (Judges 6; 1 Samuel 16).[28] In v. 1a and 1bα then, Yhwh portrays himself relating to his servant righteously, with affection, empowering him to act beyond the abilities of other human beings.

42:1 Yhwh Wills Justice (מִשְׁפָּט) for the Nations, Yhwh's Task for the Servant.

Beginning with this phrase (42:1) and continuing through v. 4, Yhwh implicitly asserts his unique divinity by foretelling future events, something that idols cannot do (41:26-29). Yhwh makes this claim explicitly at the end of the First Servant Song in v. 9.

---

[26] Koole (*Isaiah,* 1.216) notes that "נַפְשִׁי suggests the intimacy of God's favor."

[27] John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006) 214. This is not to deny that רוּחַ ultimately has its origin in and belongs to Yhwh. "Each person has God's *ruah*. . . .The *ruah* returns to God because it is his" (ibid).

[28] Westermann, *Isaiah,* 93-94.

In v. 1bβ, we are told that the Servant's task involves מִשְׁפָּט and "nations." Baltzer notes a reminiscence here of the language used in accounts of the commissioning of early OT judges to whom Yhwh gives his spirit, usually in order "to go out" or "to lead out" (**יצא**), a technical term for going to war.[29] Witness the striking similarity of vocabulary—at least in the roots if not in the stems used—in the commissioning of Othniel and that of the Servant:

וַתְּהִי *עָלָיו* *רוּחַ־יְהוָה* וַיִּשְׁפֹּט אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל **וַיֵּצֵא** לַמִּלְחָמָה Judg 3:10
The spirit of Yhwh was *upon him*, and he judged Israel and **he went out** to war.

It is quite possible that the prophet uses the following rhetorical strategy to draw attention to how different this Servant of Yhwh will be. Beginning with language evocative of the commissioning of early OT judges, the prophet intends, through v. 1, to lead readers and hearers to think that, as in the time of the judges, Yhwh will raise up a Servant to rectify Israel's plight by bringing forth judgment against the nations.[30] Then, as the following verses unfold, the Servant Song contradicts all of the expectations raised by his doing so. When the readers and hearers discover in the following verses that this Servant is not to bring forth judgment *against* the nations, they must ask the question: “What then is the מִשְׁפָּט that the Servant will cause to go forth?”

---

[29] Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah,* 127. Baltzer's primary point here is actually quite different. Using a series of arguments, Baltzer (ibid.) builds a case for seeing the Servant as Moses or a *new* Moses. He notes, "In the *Hiphil* it is then much the most frequent term for the bringing out of Egypt. . . . [I]t is Moses, after he has received his installation at the burning bush (Exodus 3), who is charged: 'You shall bring out (**וְהוֹצֵא**) from Egypt my people, the Israelites' (v. 10). Against this background, the text might be paraphrased: in this installation (the *new*) Moses is given the gift of the spirit, not in order to bring out a more or less peaceful body of volunteers, but so as to bring forth 'a decree of justice.'" The verb **יצא** is congruent with his arguments. The verb alone, however, seems weak grounds for connecting this passage with the call of Moses. **יצא** seems to me too common a root of itself to evoke the exodus—even in its hiphil form.

[30] Although there are many examples where the preposition לְ denotes "for" as in "judgment for," there are at least two instances in the OT where the preposition לְ is used in connection with מִשְׁפָּט to mean "judgment against": Deut 19:6 (in which וְלוֹ אֵין מִשְׁפַּט־מָוֶת has the sense of "there is no death sentence *against* him") and Hos 5:1 (where לָכֶם הַמִּשְׁפָּט can only mean "the judgment is against you").

Goldingay and Payne argue that since all instances of מִשְׁפָּט with reference to Gentiles in DI are in the “trial speeches,” מִשְׁפָּט should be interpreted in the narrow judicial sense of “a decision.” In DI, the occurrences of מִשְׁפָּט in relation to Gentiles “all turn upon justice . . . and result in the Gentiles’ gods’ claim to divinity being declared to be nothing: Yahweh alone is God.”[31] Certainly such an interpretation is valid, given the placement of the First Servant Song immediately after a court scene (41:21-29) in which the efficacy and indeed the very existence of the gods of the nations is at issue. And the importance of all nations coming to worship the one true God as a theme throughout the Book of Isaiah can hardly be overemphasized. But is מִשְׁפָּט here open to a broader interpretation as well?

In my view, one reasonable way to determine the meaning of יוֹצִיא מִשְׁפָּט in Isa 42:1 and 3 is to consult the clear meaning of the phrase in a parallel occurrence in the OT. Aside from its occurrence in Isa 42:1 and 3, מִשְׁפָּט as the object of the verb יצא (hiphil) occurs only one other time in the MT, namely, in Ps 37:6:

וְהוֹצִ֣יא כָא֣וֹר צִדְקֶ֑ךָ
וּ֝מִשְׁפָּטֶ֗ךָ כַּֽצָּהֳרָֽיִם׃

“And he will cause your righteousness to go forth as a light

---

[31] Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55*, 1. 214-15) are in agreement with Begrich, Sidney Smith, Lindblom, and Muilenburg, who also understand the word in the judicial sense.

> and your judgment as the noon."

Here מִשְׁפָּט is used in synonymous parallelism with צֶדֶק ("rightness/righteousness").

In fact, BDB gives "justice" as one of the definitions of מִשְׁפָּט. Furthermore, all four occurrences of מִשְׁפָּט in DI (40:14; 42:1, 3, and 4) can be meaningfully translated as "justice," as many English translations indeed do: *NRSV*, *RSV*, *NKJV*, *NASB*, and others.[32] Finally, the rest of the pericope, which speaks of the Servant giving sight to the blind and releasing captives (42:7), suggests a translation of מִשְׁפָּט with an equivalent broader than "decision."

Interpreting מִשְׁפָּט in this broader sense of "justice" instead of "a decision" would not contradict Goldingay and Payne's position. "Justice" would certainly include vindication of Yhwh's claim to be God alone. But in OT thought, true worship of Yhwh alone would also include practicing justice in the broader sense (see Isa 5:8-23).

McKenzie, along with other scholars, however, goes even further in interpreting מִשְׁפָּט in Isa 42:1 and 3 to mean something close to "the true religion" or "the revelation of Yhwh."

> "Judgment" is a word too broad for translation by a single English word. . . . Judgment also means a law, or the right way of doing things; it is related to "instruction" (vs. 4), by which we have translated *torah*. . . . [מִשְׁפָּט and תוֹרָה] together convey the idea of revelation, the revelation which in Israel's history is initiated in the patriarchal period and takes form in the covenant of Sinai. The Servant is the mediator of the revelation of Yahweh, and this is his mission.[33]

---

[32] With a few possible exceptions, the 21 occurrences of מִשְׁפָּט in Isaiah mean "judgment" in the sense of "*right* judgment," "vindication," or "justice."

[33] McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 37. (מִשְׁפָּט and תוֹרָה occur in close proximity in Isa 42:4.) For views similar to that of McKenzie, see Westermann and North.

To read “the revelation of Yhwh” into מִשְׁפָּט here seems to go a bit beyond the text. Perhaps nearer the mark are the three following definitions—Childs: “the restoration of God’s order in the world”; [34] Blenkinsopp: “a social order based on justice that originates in the will and character of the deity”;[35] and Liedke “an action that restores the disturbed order of a (legal) community. . . . [This should] be understood not only as a one-time act but also as a continuous activity, as a constant preservation of the *šālôm.*”[36]

Yhwh’s assigned task for the Servant reveals his concern for the nations. In earlier biblical writings, “the nations” are often portrayed as evil, albeit sometimes used as instruments in the hands of Yhwh to punish Israel.[37] DI’s portrayal of Yhwh’s concern for the nations as more than tools to discipline Israel builds on that of PI (see e.g., Isa 2:2-4). Prior to PI the reference to Yhwh’s instruction or law as the object of the nations’ desire (42:4) would be difficult to imagine. In short, by v. 4 it is clear to the reader and hearer that Yhwh’s מִשְׁפָּט is not directed against the nations; rather, it is something associated with instruction or law for these nations, and the object of their hope.

42:2-4 Yhwh Will Allow His Nonviolent, Merciful Servant to Suffer Violence.

McKenzie gives a plausible interpretation of v. 2: with the Servant there will be no “loud proclamations of public authority.” He will not “impose his words on his listeners. Nor (vs. 3) will he use violence or coercion."[38] The chosen and favored Servant upon whom Yhwh has put his spirit, far from "going out" (יצא) with an army against Israel's enemies, will rather bring forth (יוציא) a welcome teaching and resultant justice to the nations in a new way, without violence, indeed without so much as raising his voice.

---

[34] Childs, *Isaiah,* 325.

[35] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55,* 210.

[36] G. Liedke, “שׁפט *špṭ* to judge,” *TLOT* 3. 1392-99, here 1393-94.

[37] The most obvious example is the fall of the Northern Kingdom to Assyria and the fall of Judah to the Babylonians, which the Deuteronomistic History sees as God’s punishment of the people of Israel for failing to keep the law.

Goldingay and Payne suggest another interpretation in light of their careful word studies. They observe that יִצְעַק "is a verb for a cry of pain and grief (see, e.g., 19.20; 33.7; 46.7; 65.14). . . . A similar pattern of usage applies to the byform [זעק] . . . (Isa 14.31; 15.4, 5.8; 26.17; 30.19; 65.19)."[39] In addition they note that, while the raising of one's voice בַּחוּץ ("outside/in the streets/in public") can refer to someone's teaching (Prov 1:20) or announcing news of triumph (2 Sam 1:20), בַּח֖וּץ in Isaiah more commonly occurs in contexts of desolation and punishment: cf. 5:25; 10:6; 15:3; 24:11; 51:20, 23. Similar uses of בַּחוּץ are also prominent in Lam 1:20; 2:19, 21; 4:1, 5, 8, 14.[40]

At first glance, Goldingay and Payne's lexical data on both יִצְעַ֖ק and בַּח֖וּץ seem to obfuscate rather than clarify the meaning of the verse. Why would Yhwh state in v. 2 that his Servant will not cry out in pain or grief in a public context of desolation and punishment? To the degree that the four Servant Songs are interrelated, the meaning of this phrase becomes clearer from the perspective of the Fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13–

---

[38] McKenzie, *Second Isaiah,* 37.

[39] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 1. 217.

[40] Ibid., 216. Karl Elliger (*Deuterojesaja* [BKAT 11; Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978] 1.209) gives further evidence that צעק means "'aufschreien in Not' oder 'schreien um Hilfe oder im Befreiung aus Not'" here.

53:12). The statement that the Servant will not cry out in a context of punishment and desolation (42:2) can be seen as foreshadowing the Servant's remarkable silence in the face of his public humiliation and undeserved suffering (53:7).[41]

In the First Servant Song, an intimation of opposition to the Servant can be seen in Yhwh's promise to "hold him fast" (v.1). That the Servant will not use force or violence is evident from the mercy that he is to show to "the crushed reed" and "the smoldering flax wick" in v. 3.[42] The mercy he shows to others will not, however, be shown to him. To the degree that the four servant songs are interrelated, the prediction that the Servant will "grow dim" and "be crushed" (v. 4) can be seen in light of the Fourth Servant Song as foreshadowing his oppression, suffering, and death, all of which he will endure without complaint. And yet, Yhwh promises that his Servant will be successful in his mission.

---

[41] Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55,*1. 216) suggest that v. 2 is "a litotes or understatement for effect." Thus, in v. 2 Yhwh means that the servant, far from clamoring for justice, will be a model of patience.

[42] Isa 36:6 and 2 Kgs 18:21 (parallel texts) refer to Egypt as a "crushed reed," i.e. apparently strong but in fact weak (and therefore unreliable as an ally). In Isa 43:17 the drowning of Pharaoh and his army is compared to the quenching of a wick. If Egypt is taken to be the archetypal enemy, perhaps the sense is that the Servant of Yhwh will not establish justice by using force against his enemies. The fact that Isaiah uses both metaphors in reference to Egypt, however, may be beside the point. The crushed reed and the smoldering wick may have been proverbial metaphors for the vulnerable. The latter metaphor is related to the lament motif of the snuffing of a light. In 2 Sam 14:7b, the wise woman of Tekoa, in mouthing the words Joab has instructed her to say to David, is clearly using a metaphor for someone in danger of being killed: " Thus, they would quench the last ember remaining to me, and leave my husband without name or remnant upon the earth." That the smoldering or extinguished light may have been metaphors for suffering in general in the ANE is evidenced by Sumerian lament (*ANET*, 385) which reads: "(Now) dark and smoky, may my brazier glow; (now) extinguished, may my torch be lighted." Indeed, Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55,*1. 216) see also 42:3 as an example of litotes indicating that the servant will not only refrain from using force but will be a model of mercy.

42:4 Yhwh Will Bring Justice to the Nations through His Servant.

The parallelism of v. 4aβ ("until he establishes justice on the earth") and this colon, 4b, points to a close relationship between מִשְׁפָּט and תּוֹרָתוֹ. The latter can mean either "his instruction" or "his law." Both English words are related to each other and to מִשְׁפָּט in that "instruction" here refers to teaching proper human conduct in the moral or cultic spheres, often regulated by law, and ordered to justice. In short, מִשְׁפָּט will result not from punishment but from the Servant's תּוֹרָה.[43]

Yhwh's final assertion about the Servant goes so far as to say that the distant islands and shores await the Servant's teachings, thus removing any possibility that the Servant's מִשְׁפָּט is something the nations should fear. The phrase could also be translated to mean that the Servant's teachings will be a source of hope.[44]

42:6 Yhwh Calls His Servant "in Righteousness."

There are at least three parallels between this verse (42:6) and 42:1. In 42:1 Yhwh promises to hold his Servant fast, an idea echoed here by his promise to "take [him] by the hand"[45] and to "watch over" him. Second, in v. 42:1 Yhwh asserts that the Servant's mission will involve מִשְׁפָּט. In 42:6a, the same idea is referred to by the term בְּצֶדֶק: that מִשְׁפָּט can be synonymous with צֶדֶק has been seen above given the synonymous parallelism of the two words in Ps 37:6. According to BDB, the prefix ב can have causal force; hence "I have called you in righteousness" could mean "I have called you because of/for the sake of righteousness."[46] Third, the universality of the Servant's mission is expressed in 42:1 by לגּוֹיִ֖ם, "for nations/Gentiles." Here in 42:6b Yhwh calls his Servant to become "a covenant for humanity, a light for nations."

---

[43] Cf. Isa 2:1-3. In Isa 42:4, if the Servant is, for example, Moses or Israel/Jacob, "his teaching" could refer to the Law of Moses.

[44] In fact, according to BDB, יחל piel can mean "hope for." *HALOT* cites Ps 119:49 in giving "to cause to hope" as a possible definition for יחל piel.

[45] In Isa 42:6, there may be a connotation that the Servant whom Yhwh will support is a royal figure: Blenkinsopp (*Isaiah 40–55*, 211) notes that "grasping of the ruler's hand by the deity is part of official court language in the ancient Near East (cf. Isa 45.1, with explicit reference to Cyrus)."

42:6 Yhwh Will Make His Servant into a Covenant of Humanity, a Light of Nations.

וְאֶתֶּנְךָ (lit*.,* "I will give you"—or with the wayiqtol vocalization—"I gave you") occurs rarely in the *Tanakh* (1 Kgs 14:7; 16:2; Isa 42:6; 49:8; Ezek 5:14; 16:27; 28:18). Although the form can mean "I will deliver you up" (Ezek 16:27), it normally functions with a double object and means "I will render you" in the sense of "I will appoint/make or turn you (into)." In both verses from Isaiah and in the two Ezekiel verses with this meaning (5:14 and 28:18), the second object is preceded by the prefix ל.

Into what will Yhwh make the servant? There are several interpretations of the phrase לִבְרִית עַם, none completely satisfying. A number of commentators have found the phrase obscure enough in meaning as to warrant suggesting that בְּרִית must mean something other than "covenant."[47] The main problem with these proposals, as North observes, is that in the OT בְּרִית occurs some 287 times with the meaning "covenant, and there is nothing to signal that this occurrence should be interpreted differently."[48]

---

[46] *NAB*: "I have called you for the victory of justice."

[47] Mark Smith, "*Běrît ʻam/ běrît ʻôlām*: A New Proposal for the Crux of Isa 42:6," *JBL* 100 (1981) 241.

[48] Christopher R. North, *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to*

Even עַם poses problems for interpretation. Although most English translations supply the definite article (for example, see the *RSV* above), it is clearly absent in the MT.[49] McKenzie rightly points out that the phrase literally means "covenant of a people."[50] The next issue is whether "people" is to be taken as the subject (rendering the phrase something like "a covenant people") or as an object (rendering the phrase something like "a covenant for a people"). That it is used in parallelism with גּוֹיִם לאוֹר ("a light for nations") argues strongly in favor of the latter understanding. Baltzer notes, "[I]f one assumes that 'light to (of) the nations' is an objective genitive, in the sense of 'in order to bring light to the nations,' the corresponding interpretation of 'covenant to (of) the people' would be ' the one who brings the covenant to the people.'"[51]

The phrase "covenant of a people" is thus open to many interpretations. There are at least two distinct arguments from v. 6 and its immediate context for interpreting עַם in v. 6 in the broader sense of "humanity." Although עַם tends to mean Israel, this is by no means always the case.[52] In the present example, the preceding verse leads the reader to

---

Chapters XL-LV (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964) 112. The sheer number of occurrences of ברית makes a meaning altogether different from "covenant" untenable; North, however (following H. Torczyner), suggests that the term may convey a *double entendre* in that the Akkadian word for "vision" is *birûtu*. Adopting this meaning for the word creates a perfect parallel: "a vision of people(s), a light of nations." In both constructions the second terms would be understood as genitives of object. (North assumes that the author of the verse lived in Babylon and had some knowledge—as would his audience—of Akkadian.)

[49] Rare exceptions include the *NET*: "a covenant mediator for people," *TNK:* "A covenant people," and *Young's Literal Translation*: "a covenant of a people."

[51] Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah,* 131-32.

[52] Delbert R. Hillers ("*Běrît ʻām*: Emancipation of the People." *JBL* 97 [1978] 175-82, here 181) shows that, in at least three other passages of the OT, "עָם is used in parallelism with גּוֹיִם and clearly refers

understand עַם in the sense of "humankind," as Westermann and others observe: "Since, . . . as all editors agree, in v. 5 the same word '*am* designates the human race, it should be presumed to have the same, or at least a similar, comprehensive sense in v. 6 as well (so also Marti, Kittel, Köhler, Volz and Muilenburg)."[53]

Another reason to take עַם in v. 6 in the broader sense of "humanity" has nothing to do with the meaning of any term in v. 5, but rather with the kind of parallelism used within v. 5 where the final phrase, נֹתֵ֤ן נְשָׁמָה֙ לָעָ֣ם עָלֶ֔יהָ וְר֖וּחַ לַהֹלְכִ֥ים בָּֽהּ ("giver of breath to people on it and breath to those who move on it") is a clear example of synonymous parallelism. The following verse (v. 6) provides no reason to read its parallelism differently, that is, as antithetical. Therefore, to read the עַם and גוֹיִם of v. 6 as synonymous is preferable. Nonetheless, some commentators do take the parallelism in v. 6 as antithetical.[54] Lohfink presents an argument for this interpretation. He holds that the use of להוציא, "to bring out", "to lead out" in v. 7 suggests exodus typology. In a context of such exodus typology, בְּרִית עַם would suggest a covenant with Israel.[55] This point is made clearer, for Lohfink, in looking ahead to Isa 49:1-9. Within this passage, the words of Isa 42:6b are repeated: the last two words of Isa 42:6b recur in 49:6b (גוֹיִם לְאוֹר "as a light of [the] nations") while the first four words of 42:6b recur in 49:8: עָם

---

to foreign people." He cites Ps 18:44 (cf. 2 Sam 22:44); Isa 25:3 (both of which use plural verbs with the singular *'ām*); and Isa 13:4.

[53] Westermann, *Isaiah,* 100.

[54] For example, Georg Fohrer (*Das Buch Jesaja* [3 vols.; ZBK; Zurich: Zwingli, 1967] 3. 51): "Die Aufgabe des Propheten wird zweifach umschrieben: Bund des Volkes und Licht der Heiden. Die erste Aussage bezieht sich auf Israel, mit dem in Zweiten Jesaja, ein neuer Anfang gesetzt wird."

[55] Norbert Lohfink, "Covenant and Torah in the Pilgrimage of the Nations (The Book of Isaiah and Psalm 25)," in *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms* (ed. Norbert Lohfink and Erich Zenger; trans. Everett R. Kalin; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000) 37-83.

וְאֶצָּרְךָ֒ וְאֶתֶּנְךָ֛ לִבְרִ֥ית (“I will keep you and will appoint you as a covenant of a people [*or:* of humanity]”). In Isa 49:1-9, the exodus typology is unmistakable. Again, in the context of exodus typology, לִבְרִית עַם would mean “a covenant of a people,” i.e., “a covenant for Israel.”[56]

I find two weaknesses in Lohfink’s argument**.** First, even if it is frequently used in reference to the exodus tradition, the verb להוציא, in Isa 42:7, is too common a word in the MT to evoke the exodus automatically. Second, the image of prisoners in a dungeon is not a clear reference to the predicament of Israel in Egypt. Lohfink seems to acknowledge these weaknesses by then resorting to the context of Isaiah 49 to bolster his interpretation of the phrase in Isaiah 42. These weaknesses in Lohfink’s argument suggest that “as a covenant of humanity” remains the preferable translation of עַם לִבְרִית in the context of Isa 42:6b.[57]

The unusual turn of phrase, “making my Servant into a covenant of humanity,” reminds us that Deutero-Isaiah is poetry, which by nature stretches ordinary usages of language. Unusual though it may be, the phrase is not totally incomprehensible, at least to some commentators. For McKenzie, “the Servant is called a covenant; the force of the figure means that the Servant mediates between Yahweh and the peoples, that the Servant becomes a bond of union,”[58] while Grimm and Dittert interpret “Bund für das Volk” as a sort of title given the Servant.[59] Perhaps the phrase could also be interpreted in the following way. If two stone tablets could be called "the covenant" (as in "Ark of the Covenant," see, e.g., Deut 10:8), how much more might the Servant, whether a righteous individual or group, be so designated? The stone tablets conveyed the covenant by bearing the inscribed commandments; Yhwh's Servant will be the covenant by living the will of God inscribed on the heart.[60]

---

[56] Ibid., 48-49. Whether עַם refers to Israel or to humankind, Lohfink suggests that the overall meaning of 42:6b is not greatly affected. “In any case Israel’s covenant is associated here with the turning of the nations to the God of Israel. . . .”(ibid., 50).

[57] McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 40.

[58] Ibid.

Yhwh Will Restore Humanity through his Servant (42:7).

While in vv. 2-3, Yhwh described primarily what the Servant would *not* do in bringing forth מִשְׁפָּט, now Yhwh describes the Servant's מִשְׁפָּט in positive terms. According to Leidke's definition above (see p. 58, n. 36), מִשְׁפָּט can describe activity that restores a disturbed order, bringing and preserving שָׁלוֹם. Blindness and bondage are themselves disturbances within the order proper to the human person. They also serve as apt metaphors for many of the disorders of human experience. Blindness can allude to lack of education, willful ignorance, poor judgment, among other things. Bondage can refer to political oppression, debilitating illness, abject poverty, etc. Thus, the Servant's bringing forth מִשְׁפָּט is described in terms of restoring the gifts human beings "ordinarily" enjoy, i.e., what human life consists of when things are "made right."

---

[59] Werner Grimm and Kurt Dittert, *Deuterojesaja: Deutung—Wirkung—Gegenwart* (Calwer Bibelkommentare; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1990) 331.

[60] Cf. Jer 31:33: "But this is the *covenant* which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD. I will place my law within them, and *write it upon their hearts*" (*NAB,* emphasis added).

Yhwh Alone is God Because He Alone Foretells and Causes Events (42:8-9).

The content of the oracle addressed to the Servant occurs in vv. 6-7. The words of Yhwh before and after this message to the Servant are his self-identification (the words אֲנִי יְהוָה in vv. 6 and 8-9 "frame" the oracle). In ancient thought, the name is "something real, a piece of the very nature of the personality whom it designates, expressing the person's qualities and powers."[61]

The rest of vv. 8-9 has two purposes. It tells why Yhwh's word, unlike any supposed word of an idol, can be trusted. It also situates the Song within the larger context of DI by referring to the trial speech immediately preceding the First Servant Song (41:21-29). At issue in the former unit is whether the idols were able to predict events:[62]

> 41:22 יַגִּ֙ישׁוּ֙ וְיַגִּ֣ידוּ לָ֔נוּ אֵ֖ת אֲשֶׁ֣ר תִּקְרֶ֑ינָה
> הָרִאשֹׁנ֣וֹת ׀ מָ֣ה הֵ֗נָּה
> הַגִּ֙ידוּ֙ וְנָשִׂ֣ימָה לִבֵּ֔נוּ וְנֵדְעָ֖ה אַחֲרִיתָ֑ן
> א֥וֹ הַבָּא֖וֹת הַשְׁמִיעֻֽנוּ׃

> Let them come near and foretell to us what it is that shall happen!
>   What are the things of long ago?
> Tell us, that we may reflect on them and know their outcome;
>   or declare to us the things to come!

These last two verses of the First Servant Song (42:8-9) essentially reiterate the verdict that Yhwh pronounced after the trial in 41:29: הֵ֣ן כֻּלָּ֔ם אָ֥וֶן אֶ֖פֶס מַעֲשֵׂיהֶ֑ם ר֥וּחַ וָתֹ֖הוּ נִסְכֵּיהֶֽם׃ ("Behold, all of them are false; their works are worthless, their molten images are wind and emptiness" *NAB*).

---

[61] BDAG, s.v. ὄνομα.

[62] According to Gottfried Quell ("θεός," *TDNT* 3. 79-89, here 89), "if a being wishes to be God, he must do that which is worthy of God. . . . The proofs of God in Dt. Is. are all based on this premise."

D. What the Prophet Says and Implies about Yhwh

Yhwh as Creator, Craftsman, Giver of Life (42:5-6)

The messenger formula found throughout OT prophecy is often simply “Thus says Yhwh” (or variations thereof), although sometimes titles are added to or substituted for the divine name. The combination of הָאֵל יְהוָה here “can only be an emphatic way of stating that . . . the species אֵל is exhausted in Yahweh.”[63] Particularly in Isaiah, however, the simple formula using the divine name and/or titles is often expanded with participial phrases, as in the present verse. What is unusual in this instance is that the participial phrases do not reflect Yhwh’s relation to Israel in history, as is normally the case, but rather Yhwh’s relationship to the whole world in his role as creator. This string of participial phrases relating Yhwh to the whole world is paralleled elsewhere in Isaiah only in 45:18 (“For thus says the LORD, The creator of the heavens, who is God, The designer and maker of the earth who established it, Not creating it to be a waste, but designing it to be lived in: I am the LORD, and there is no other,” *NAB*)[64]

Yhwh is creator (בּוֹרֵא). The verb ברא is used about fifty times in the OT and takes only God as its subject.[65] “‘Bara’ concerns bringing heaven and earth into existence by focusing on operation through organization and assignment of roles and functions. . . . [In the ANE] the greatest exercise of the power of the gods was not demonstrated in the manufacture of matter, but in the fixing of destinies."[66]

---

[63] Ibid.

[64] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 1. 224.

[65] Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought*, 183.

Following the same order as in the first Genesis account of creation, Yhwh here is portrayed as creating the sky before the earth (see Gen 1:6-10). Next, Yhwh is depicted—quite anthropomorphically—as stretching out the sky as if it were a tent and then hammering out the earth and the things growing out of the earth, like a smith pounding out objects from metal or a sculptor pounding away with hammer and chisel. The portrayal of God as creator of heaven and earth, and as giver of breath and life to all the peoples on the earth emphasizes the universal implications of the Servant's mission in the oracle that follows (42:6-9).

E. A Summary of the Portrayal of Yhwh in MT 42:1-9.

Yhwh is portrayed in MT Isa 42:1-9 as a lord or master who entrusts his beloved servant with a mission to the nations. He will endow his servant with his spirit and support, and he foretells the servant's success in establishing justice, at least in part through his teaching or giving of law. God will somehow be in a covenant relationship with humanity through this servant, who will be its light.

In addition to these aspects, the portrayal of Yhwh that emerges from the First Servant Song in the MT contains several paradoxes. On the one hand, Yhwh is the one God, who alone foretells events from first to last. On the other hand, far from dwelling in majestic indifference to human folly, he is implicitly portrayed as fiercely jealous of his glory and resentful of praise given to carved idols. Similarly, while Yhwh is creator of heaven and earth and all that comes out of the earth, giving life to all living creatures, at the same time the prophet also portrays him as a tent-dweller spreading out the sky as a tent and as a common artisan laboriously hammering away to form the earth and its creatures.

---

[66] Ibid.

Yhwh promises מִשְׁפָּט for the nations, that is, a rectification of grave disorders, represented by blindness and bondage. Yet Yhwh also foretells—without explanation or any indication that something is amiss—that his Servant will be crushed, without complaining, in a context of punishment.

In short, Yhwh in MT Isa 42:1-9 is clearly the one omniscient God of all creation, merciful to people of every nation and having great love for his Servant; yet he is portrayed with very human traits, some of which could be construed at best as paradoxes, and at worst, as limitations.

III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isa 42:1-9

A. Text-critical Notes and Translation

[1] Ιακωβ[a] ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ[b]·
Ισραηλ[c] ὁ ἐκλεκτός[d] μου, προσεδέξατο[e] αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου·
ἔδωκα[f] τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν,
κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει[g]

[1] Jacob is my παῖς;[h] I will uphold him;
Israel, my chosen one, my soul has accepted him.
I have put my spirit upon him;
judgment to the nations he will bring forth.

---

[a] The reference to Jacob and Israel is not found in the MT. Matthew 12:18-21 cites Isa 42:1-4, but it is impossible to determine whether the author is using a translation that deviates from the LXX, quoting from memory, or improvising his own translation from the Hebrew (see Seeligmann, *Septuagint,* 24-25, n. 22). As in the MT, references to Jacob and Israel are not found in Matt 12:18. The MT begins instead with הֵן; correspondingly, Matt 12:18 opens with the Greek equivalent ἰδού. One 14th-century MS from the Alexandrian Group (106) begins with καὶ ἰδού.

[b] Matt 12:18 has ὃν ᾑρέτισα ("whom I chose") instead of ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ ("I will uphold him.").

[c] Matt 12:18 and the corresponding MT verse have no reference to Israel. See note a.

[d] In the Bohairic Coptic translation, there is no equivalent for ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου. Instead of ἐκλεκτός μου, Matt 12:18 has ἀγαπητός μου in this position.

[e] Matt 12:18 has εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν "with whom [my soul] is well pleased."

[f] The perfect tense δέδωκα is found in one MS of the Catena Group (87). The future θήσω ("I will place/put") occurs in Matt 12:18.

[g] Matt 12:18 has ἀπαγγελεῖ ("he will proclaim/ announce").

[h] Baltzer (*Deutero-Isaiah*, 125) notes: "It is remarkable that here and in 41:9 the LXX should render עבד by παῖς (Aquila and Symmachus have ὁ δοῦλός μου). The different semantic fields of עבד and παῖς should be noted in this connection. This plays a part in the reception in the NT; cf. Matt 12:18-21."

Tyndale's New Testament (1534) translates Matt 12:18a "Beholde my chylde"; similarly, The Bishops' Bible (1568) reads: "Beholde my childe."

The closest equivalent to ὁ παῖς μου in English that may be familiar to Americans would be the Southern usage of "my boy" to refer to one's son or to refer, in a way now considered offensive, to one's employee/servant. In an idealized version of societal relations in American Southern culture, the term could conceivably have been used with the best of intentions, including the desire to support, protect, and/or educate. That the term is now considered offensive when used of an adult servant/employee, and incendiary when used of one of African-American heritage, indicates that the term would now be heard derogatorily, as a declaration of inferior status. In short, since there is no good English equivalent for παῖς, I have chosen to preserve this ambiguity by leaving the term untranslated rather than to settle on a connotation that the LXX Isaiah translator—perhaps quite deliberately considering the alternative (see α′ and σ′)—left indeterminate..

[2] οὐ κϵκράξϵται[i] οὐδὲ ἀνήσϵι[j],
οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσϵται ἔξω ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ[k].

[2] He will not cry out, nor will he raise [his voice]
nor will his voice be heard outside.

[3] κάλαμον τϵθλασμένον[l] οὐ συντρίψϵι[m]
καὶ λίνον[n] καπνιζόμϵνον[o] οὐ σβέσϵι,
[p]ἀλλὰ ϵἰς ἀλήθϵιαν ἐξοίσϵι κρίσιν[p].

[3] A bruised reed he will not break
and a smoking flaxen wick he will not extinguish,
but he will bring forth judgment in truth.

[4] ἀναλάμψϵι[q] καὶ οὐ θραυσθήσϵται[r],

---

[i] κραυγάσϵι, from the related verb κραυγάζω (used of dogs: “to bay,” ravens: “to croak,” but also of human beings: “to cry aloud, scream”), is found in some MSS from the Catena group (cf. Matt 12:19aβ). Matt 12:19aα reads οὐκ ἐρίσϵι (“he will not contend”), and its equivalent is found in the Bohairic Coptic translation.

[j] οὐ βοήσϵι (“he will not call/shout/cry out”) is found in a 12th-century codex (538) from the *codices mixti* group; another codex from the same group, dated to the 14th century, has οὐχ ἐρίσϵι (“he will not contend”). Ziegler proposes in his apparatus that this word choice was influenced by Matthew’s use of the same word in the previous phrase of the same verse (see note i). In this segment of the verse, Matthew himself has οὐδὲ κραυγάσϵι (see note i). The Syrohexaplaric translation reads ܢܳܒܚ, the active participle of ܢܒܚ (“to clamor”). All of these readings point to a difficulty in the text in which ἀνήσϵι, which is transitive, lacks an object.

[k] Instead of οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσϵται ἔξω ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ, Matt 12:19b reads οὐδὲ ἀκούσϵι τις ἐν ταῖς πλατϵίαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ (“nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets,” *NAB*).

[l] Some witnesses render the following perfect passive participles, all of which modify κάλαμον (“reed”): συντϵθλασμένον (“crushed”), occurring in A′ V 311′- 456 and *C*; τϵθραυσμένος (“shattered”), occurring in 93*, 410, and 958, and συντϵτριμμένον (“broken/shattered/crushed”) occurring in Matt 12:20. In a different vein, τὴν κάλαμον τὴν Ιουδαιων ἀσθένϵιαν “the reed, the weakness of Jews,” is the reading in *cI*. 377 substitutes τῶν for the second τήν (“the reed, a weakness of the Jews”).

[m] Matt 12:20 reads οὐ κατϵάξϵι (“he will not break”).

[n] λίβανον (here, “frankincense”) is the reading in 534, most likely a case of parablepsis.

[o] Matt 12:20, as well as the citations by Justin and Cyril of Alexandria, reads τυφόμϵνον (“smoldering”).

[p—p] Matt12:20 is missing this line as well as the first line of v. 4, probably due to homoioteleuton. Note that both vv. 3c and 4b end with κρίσιν, just as the corresponding lines in the MT end with מִשְׁפָּט. If Matt 12:20’s minus is an error and is due to homoioteleuton, it could have occurred in either a Hebrew or a Greek text tradition.

[q] The three manuscripts belonging to a subgroup of the Catena tradition render the verb in the present tense, ἀναλάμπϵι (“he blazes”). Theodoret of Cyrus’s commentary on Isaiah has ἀναβλέψϵι (“he will look up”).

[r] οὐ θλασθήσϵται (“he will not be crushed”) is found in 91, one of the main witnesses of the Catena

ἕως ἂν θῇ[s] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν·
καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι[t] αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

[4] He shall blaze up and not be broken down
until he establishes judgment on the earth;
and nations will hope in his name.

[5] οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς[u]
ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ πήξας αὐτόν,
ὁ στερεώσας τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ
καὶ διδοὺς πνοὴν τῷ λαῷ τῷ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς
καὶ πνεῦμα τοῖς πατοῦσιν αὐτήν·

[5] Thus says κύριος,[v] the God,[w]
the creator of the sky and the one who fixed it in its place,
the establisher of the earth and the things that are in it,
and the giver of breath to people upon it
and spirit to all who tread on it:

[6] ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς
ἐκάλεσά σε ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ
καὶ κρατήσω[x] τῆς χειρός σου
καὶ ἐνισχύσω[y] σε,

---

group. οὐ σβεσθήσεται (“he will not be extinguished”) is the original reading in S, probably as an assimilation to v. 3b καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσει (“a smoking flaxen wick he will not extinguish”).

[s] Matt 12:20 uses a different verb ἐκβάλῃ (“he will bring forth”) and has a longer reading with the additional words [“additional words” hereafter: “a plus”]: εἰς νῖκος (“to victory”). 534 contains the same plus, possibly influenced by Matthew.

[t] Here, *contra* Joseph Ziegler (*Isaias* [*Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, vol. 14; 3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983]), I have rendered the reading found in the Greek codices and the versions as well as Matthew, all of which witness to ὀνόματι. Ziegler reads καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ, one of two possible translations of the MT’s וּלְתוֹרָתוֹ (“and [to/for] his law/instruction”). It is no doubt on account of Matthew’s agreement with the LXX for this particular reading that Seeligmann (*Septuagint,* 24) states that in Matthew “only at the finish suddenly corresponds to the Septuagint.”

[u] The Sahidic Coptic translation has this plus: ᾿Ισραήλ.

[v] κύριος (“Lord”) is the LXX’s common translation of Yhwh and takes on the quality of a name. I have attempted to convey this quality by leaving it untranslated. See v. 8.

[w] The use of the definite article conveys the sense that this is not “a god” but “*the* god” or, simply, “God.”

[x] 534 and the Syropalestinian Syriac translation render ἐκράτησα (“grasped”).

[y] 534 and the Syropalestinian translation render ἐνίσχυσα (“strengthened”).

καὶ ἔδωκά σε[z] εἰς διαθήκην γένους,[aa]
εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν,

[6] “I am κύριος, the God.
I called you (sg.) in righteousness
and will grasp you by your hand
and will strengthen you;
and I give you as a covenant of a race,
as a light of nations.

[7] ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλῶν,
ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐκ δεσμῶν δεδεμένους
καὶ ἐξ οἴκου φυλακῆς καθημένους ἐν σκότει.[bb]

[7] To open eyes of blind persons,
to lead people who are bound up out of their bonds,
and from the prison house those who sit in darkness.

[8] ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός,[cc] τοῦτό μού ἐστι τὸ ὄνομα·
τὴν δόξαν μου ἑτέρῳ οὐ δώσω
οὐδὲ τὰς ἀρετάς μου τοῖς γλυπτοῖς

[8] I am κύριος, the God; this is my name.
My glory I will not give to another,
nor my virtues to carved things.

[9] τὰ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἰδοὺ ἥκασιν,
καὶ καινὰ ἃ ἐγὼ ἀναγγελῶ,[dd]
καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ἀνατεῖλαι[ee] ἐδηλώθη ὑμῖν.[ff]

[9]The things that were from the beginning, behold they have come

---

[z] S has a plus: εἰς δικαιώσυνην (also meaning “in righteousness”).
[aa] S, C', Bo, and Syropalestinian Syriac translation have a plus: μου (“my”).
[bb] The commentary on Isaiah by Cyril of Alexandria has a plus: βάθει (“deep”).
[cc] There is no corresponding phrase to the LXX’s ὁ θεός in the MT.
[dd] Some MSS in the Sinaiticus tradition have ποιῶ (“I do/make”).
[ee] This reading follows the “best witnesses of the Alexandrinian group,” according to Ziegler (*Isaias,* 99); the other witnesses read πρὸ τοῦ ἀναγγεῖλαι (here, “before announcing”).
[ff] Codex Marchalianus (Q) renders ἡνῖν.

> and new things which I announce
> even before they arise are made clear to you (pl.)."

B. Implied Speakers and Addressees

LXX Isaiah 42:1-9, like other Greek translations of OT prophecy, was intended to be proclaimed to Greek-speaking Jews of the Diaspora who were contemporaries of the translator. The implied speaker in 42:1-4 is κύριος. The speaker's identity is clear both from the preceding context as well as the content of our pericope, just as is the case in MT Isa 42:1-4. In LXX Isa 42:5, there is a change in speaker from Yhwh to the prophet, who then relays God's message in vv. 6-9. This is also the case in the MT.

The implied audience of κύριος in 42:6-9 is Jacob/Israel. Is there another implied audience as well? Here the context of the LXX differs from that of the MT. In the "trial scene" preceding our pericope, God has summoned idols and their worshipers from among the nations in a challenge to foretell events. But none dares to come forth.

> [41:28] ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἰδοὺ οὐδείς,
> καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἀναγγέλλων ·
> καὶ ἐὰν ἐρωτήσω αὐτούς Πόθεν ἐστέ; οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῶσίν μοι.
>
> For from among the nations, behold: no one!
> And of their idols there was none to declare.
> And if I should ask them, "Where are you from?" by no means would they answer me.

After the silence of the nations and their idols, the following verse (41:29) conveys the verdict of ὁ κύριος: εἰσὶν γὰρ οἱ ποιοῦντες ὑμᾶς, καὶ μάτην οἱ πλανῶντες ὑμᾶς ("For they are your makers, and vain are they that cause you to go astray").

Unlike the MT, LXX 41:29 includes second person plural pronouns. To whom is κύριος addressing his verdict here? Ekblad argues convincingly that the you (pl.) in the first clause is addressed to the idols, while the second clause is addressed to all among the nations and the children of Israel who are led astray by idols and those who worship them.[67]

Thus, unlike MT Isa 42:1-4, in LXX Isa 42:1-4, κύριος presumably continues to address the same implied audience, that is, those Jews and Gentiles who have been led astray by the makers of idols. While in vv. 5-9 κύριος addresses the Servant Jacob/Israel directly, the readers and listeners are also invited to imagine that the addressees of LXX Isa 42:1-4 (those from among the nations who have been led astray) are now present for Jacob/Israel's installation as Servant. As in the MT, LXX 42:8-9 echoes the verdict of 41:29 in which κύριος proclaims his uniqueness. The (grammatical) number of the addressee(s) changes from the singular to plural in LXX 42:9. I take this change as an indication that the message of κύριος specifically to Jacob/Israel (LXX 42:6-7) has concluded. Verses 8-9 are no longer addressed only to Jacob/Israel but also to Jews and Gentiles who have been led astray. It is implicitly an appeal on the part of κύριος to idolaters to repent and turn to him.

C. What κύριος Says and Implies about Himself

κύριος Will Support His Chosen παῖς, Jacob/Israel (42:1a).

On the one hand, the choice of the word παῖς in the LXX Servant Songs is unremarkable. In Isaiah, seventeen of the twenty-three occurrences of עֶבֶד used in a religious sense, are rendered by παῖς in the LXX.[68] There are only eleven verses in the entire LXX in which the Lord addresses or refers to someone called ὁ παῖς μου. Only three of these occur outside of DI. One refers to Caleb,[69] another to Moses,[70] and the third to Isaiah.[71] In these three passages, there is no reason to suppose that the LXX Isaiah translator's *Vorlage* was different from the MT: ὁ παῖς μου is a common, if ambiguous, translation of עַבְדִּי ("my servant") in the MT.[72]

---

[67] Ekblad, *Servant Poems,* 41-55.

The remaining eight occurrences of ὁ παῖς μου are all in LXX DI. In these occurrences, it is less clear that ὁ παῖς μου is best translated "my servant." Here the better translation could well be "my child" or "my son." In LXX DI, ὁ παῖς μου always refers to either Jacob/Israel—or, in the "Servant Songs," to an unspecified person or group. Nowhere in the OT (MT or LXX) does God refer to Caleb, Moses, or Isaiah as his son or child. God *does* refer to his people Jacob/Israel with terms that can only mean

---

[68] Walther Zimmerli, "παῖς θεοῦ: The LXX Translations," *TDNT* 5. 673-77, here 675.

[69] Num 14:24: ὁ δὲ παῖς μου Χαλεβ, ὅτι ἐγενήθη πνεῦμα ἕτερον ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπηκολούθησέν μοι, εἰσάξω αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν εἰς ἣν εἰσῆλθεν ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ κληρονομήσει αὐτήν ("But my servant Caleb, because there was another spirit in him, and he followed me, I will bring him into the land into which he entered, and his seed shall inherit it").

[70] Josh 1:7: ἴσχυε οὖν καὶ ἀνδρίζου φυλάσσεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν καθότι ἐνετείλατό σοι Μωυσῆς ὁ παῖς μου· καὶ οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖς ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν εἰς δεξιὰ οὐδὲ εἰς ἀριστερὰ ἵνα συνῇς ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ἐὰν πράσσῃς ("Be strong, therefore, and act like a man, to observe and do as Moses my servant commanded you; and you shall not turn therefrom to the right nor to the left, that you may be wise in whatever you do"). Moses is referred to as ὁ παῖς κυρίου in Josh 1:13; 11:12; 12:16; 13:8; 18:7; 22:2; and 22:5. He is referred to as ὁ παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ in 1 Chr 6:34 and 2 Chr 2:49.

[71] Isa 20:3: καὶ εἶπεν κύριος, ὃν τρόπον πεπόρευται Ησαιας ὁ παῖς μου γυμνὸς καὶ ἀνυπόδετος τρία ἔτη, ἔσται σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν ("And the Lord said, 'As my servant Isaiah has walked naked and barefoot three years, there shall be signs and wonders for the Egyptians and Ethiopians'").

[72] All three persons so designated (Caleb, Moses, and Isaiah) were especially faithful to the Lord. They were not noted for wealth or power when Yhwh gave them their roles.

"my son" or "my child" (see LXX Exod 4:22,[73] and, implicitly LXX Isa 1:2[74]). One of the most consoling images of God in the preexilic prophets occurs in Hos 11:1: כִּי נַעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל וָאֹהֲבֵהוּ וּמִמִּצְרַיִם קָרָאתִי לִבְנִי׃ ("For Israel was a boy and I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son").[75]

As for the LXX Servant Songs, in which ὁ παῖς μου refers to an unspecified person or group, there are no other examples in the LXX to use as a guide for the translation. Perhaps the strongest case for translating παῖς in DI as "son/child" is the way it was interpreted in Hellenistic Judaism. According to Jeremias, "one may say that Hell[enistic] Judaism inclines to construe the παῖς θεοῦ of Dt. Is. as 'child of God,' and prefers the collective interpretation."[76]

---

[73] σὺ δὲ ἐρεῖς τῷ Φαραω, τάδε λέγει Κύριος Υἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου Ισραηλ · ("You shall say to the Pharaoh, thus says the Lord: 'Israel is my first-born son.'" This matches the MT's בְּנִי בְכֹרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל ("Israel is my first-born son").

[74] ἄκουε, οὐρανέ, καὶ ἐνωτίζου, γῆ, ὅτι Κύριος ἐλάλησεν Υἱοὺς ἐγέννησα καὶ ὕψωσα, αὐτοὶ δέ με ἠθέτησαν ("Hear, O heaven, and hearken, O earth: for the Lord has sspoken: 'Sons I have begotten and brought them up, but they have rejected me'").

[75] Hos 11:1 νήπιος Ισραηλ καὶ ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα σὐτὸν καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ ("Israel [was] a child and I loved him and out of Egypt I called his children"). It is true that the case for intertextuality between LXX Isa Isa 42:1 and LXX Hos 11:1 is weaker than the intertextuality between MT Isa 42:1 and MT Hos 11:1 because the latter does not necessarily imply that Yhwh considers Israel *his* son. The LXX translator of Isaiah, however, may not have even known the LXX's rather free translation of this verse of Hosea. The various books of what is commonly referred to as the LXX were translated by different translators at different times, and while there is evidence that later translators did try to follow precedents set by the translators of the Pentateuch (see discussion below on the use of κύριος) there is no reason to believe that consistency was attempted or even possible in the translations of the non-Pentateuchal books. The translator of Isaiah, who obviously was capable of making his own translation of Hos 11:1, may well have regarded παῖς as a perfectly legitimate translation of נַעַר in Hos 11:1.

[76] J. Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ in Later Judaism in the Period after the LXX," in *TDNT* 5. 677-700, here 684. He bases his argument for the meaning of "child" largely on passages from the Book of Wisdom, which, in his view, give a collective interpretation of Isaiah 53. He asserts (ibid.) that "this collective understanding of the servant of God in Is. 53 was completely unknown to Palestinian Judaism

A further support for the possibility that ὁ παῖς μου might be best translated "my Son" in Isaiah 53 is offered by Dafni who asserts that παῖς in relation to a divinity (μου in Isa 42:1 refers to God) does involve the notion of sonship. For example, παῖς Διός was the title for the powerful half-god Hercules, who was fathered by Zeus.[77] Dafni's assertion is supported by BDAG.[78] Whether, however, such an implication (with its roots in pagan usage) was in some nonphysical sense envisaged by the translator is impossible to say.[79]

Whether κύριος in LXX Isa 42:1 is speaking of his relationship to Jacob/Israel in terms of a master and a servant, or rather of a father and son remains an open question. In my view, if the translator opted for παῖς over δοῦλος as an exegetical choice (and not

---

during the first Christian millennium (it occurs for the first time in Rashi, d. 1105)." The possibility that "child/son" is the intended meaning may also find support in the evidence that in one or more of the LXX Servant Songs the παῖς was construed among some as the messianic king promised in Nathan's oracle, 2 Samuel 7 (see, for example, ibid. 686-89, where Jeremias cites evidence that LXX was also interpreted messianically in pre-Christian Judaism; and Seeligmann, *Septuagint*, 119). Psalm 2:7, which itself acquired messianic connotations, refers to the messianic king as "my son" (κύριος εἶπεν πρός με· υἱός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε). Likewise, Yhwh promises David in 2 Sam 7:1-17—a text which was also read messianically—"Your seed (see 2 Sam 7:12c: καὶ ἀναστήσω **τὸ σπέρμα σου** μετὰ σέ, ὃς ἔσται ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας [And I shall raise up *your seed* after you, who will be from your loins]) . . . shall be a son to me" (see 2 Sam 7:14a: ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα καὶ **αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν** ["I shall be to him as a father and he will be to me as a son"]).

[77] Evangelia G. Dafni, "Die sogenannten *'Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder in der Septuaginta," *XII. Congress of the IOSC* (SBLSCS 54; ed. M. K. Peters; Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 193.

[78] See BDAG, s.v. παῖς, παιδός ὁ or ἡ (Hom. et al.) *child.* 3bγ.

[79] Nor does Dafni ("Septuaginta," 193) offer "son" as the only possible interpretation. She also presents an argument for translating παῖς as "servant." "Wenn ein Knecht im Griechischen mit παῖς angeredet wird, dann gilt dies also Zeichen dafür, dass sein Herr so liebevoll für ihn sorgt, wie er für seinen eigenen Sohn sorgen würde" (ibid.,193). While Dafni may be perfectly correct, it is worth considering that to translate παῖς into German or English is to translate that word into languages which simply have no exact equivalent to παῖς (servants and sons do not form a single category covered by a single word in English or German). This raises questions pertaining to the philosophy of translation well beyond the scope of this dissertation. Suffice it to say that the felt need here to distinguish παῖς as "child/son" from παῖς as an affectionate term for "servant," may be a modern German- or English-speaker's preoccupation that may have been quite foreign to the mentality of the head of a Greek-speaking household of ancient times.

merely out of convention), it was probably not primarily to introduce the possible connotation of sonship but rather to be consistent with the important παιδεία theme in Third and Fourth Servant Songs.[80]

Whether he is addressing his son or his servant, κύριος is portrayed in LXX Isa 42:1 as promising loyal protection of Jacob/Israel, whom he has elected for a mission by his own sovereign choice. His "soul" has "accepted him" (42:1): in more idiomatic English, κύριος has accepted Jacob/Israel wholeheartedly.

42:1b κύριος Has Given His Spirit to Jacob/Israel to Bring Justice to the Peoples

Although the LXX translation corresponds word for word to the MT, ἐκφέρω has none of the possible military implications of יצא hiphil. Moreover, according to Friedrich Büchsel in *TDOT* 3. 941-42, although κρίσις is used most frequently in the LXX to translate מִשְׁפָּט, the Greek term carries slightly different implications. It is, e.g., used in synonymous parallelism to ἔλεος in Ps 100 (101):1 and in Ps 32 (33):5.[81] Thus, κρίσις in LXX Isa 42:1b carries with it the sense both of mercy and of "judgment," the latter in the sense of "vindicating the oppressed."

---

[80] In my view, the translator, by introducing this complex of terms intended to allude to Isa 50:4-5: Κύριος δίδωσίν μοι γλῶσσαν **παιδείας** τοῦ γνῶναι ἐν καιρῷ ἡνίκα δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον, ἔθηκέν μοι πρωΐ, προσέθηκέν μοι ὠτίον ἀκούειν· καὶ ἡ **παιδεία** κυρίου ἀνοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδε ἀντιλέγω ("The Lord gives me a tongue of *instruction*, to know the moment when it is necessary to speak a word. He appointed me early, he has provided me with an ear to hear; and the *instruction* of the Lord opens my ears, and I do not disobey, nor contradict") and Isa 46:3: ἀκούσατέ μου, οἶκος τοῦ Ιακωβ καὶ πᾶν τὸ κατάλοιπον τοῦ Ισραηλ, οἱ αἰρόμενοι ἐκ κοιλίας καὶ παιδευόμενοι ἐκ παιδίου ("Hear me, o house of Jacob, and all the remnant of Israel, who are born from my womb, and instructed [by me] from infancy").

[81] In both instances, ἔλεος is used to translate חֶסֶד, which according to *HALOT* denotes "loyalty and faithfulness."

42:2-3 κύριος, Who Will Crush War, Promises That Jacob/Israel Will Establish Justice Quietly and Gently.

In both the MT and the LXX, Egypt is twice referred to as a “crushed reed” (Isa 36:6 and 2 Kgs 18:21). Likewise in both MT and LXX Isa 43:17, the drowning of Pharaoh and his army is compared to the quenching of a wick. Given that LXX Isaiah is held to have been translated in Egypt, the possibility that the parallel images of “the reed” and “the wick” in 42:3 may well be taken to refer to Egypt here adds contemporary political relevance to what is being asserted. Indeed, just ten verses later, LXX Isa 42:13 asserts that κύριος will shout and stir up zeal against his enemies. But who are his enemies? The enemy does not appear to be Egypt or any of the other nations historically at odds with Israel. Chief among the enemies is war itself. Thus the translator of LXX Isa Isa 42:13 seems to emphasize the nonviolence of Jacob/Israel by portraying κύριος as an enemy of war in the proximate context of our pericope: [42:13] κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ἐξελεύσεται καὶ συντρίψει πόλεμον, ἐπεγερεῖ ζῆλον καὶ βοήσεται ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ μετὰ ἰσχύος (“The Lord God of power will go forth and crush war; he will stir up zeal and shout against his foes with strength”).

This is remarkably different from the same verse in the MT: יְהוָה֙ כַּגִּבּ֣וֹר יֵצֵ֔א כְּאִ֥ישׁ מִלְחָמ֖וֹת יָעִ֣יר קִנְאָ֑ה יָרִ֙יעַ֙ אַף־יַצְרִ֔יחַ עַל־אֹיְבָ֖יו יִתְגַּבָּֽר׃ (“The LORD goes forth like a warrior, Like a fighter He whips up His rage. He yells, He roars aloud, He charges upon His enemies” [*TNK*]).

In the MT, there is no correlation between the Yhwh’s predictions concerning his Servant’s peaceful manner of bringing forth justice (42:3) and the warlike actions of

Yhwh himself just ten verses later (42:13). That the Greek translator was cognizant of this discrepancy between MT Isa 42:3 and 13 and wished to harmonize the texts concerning κύριος (42:13) and Jacob/Israel (42:3) is suggested not only by the surprising difference in meaning between LXX and MT 42:13 but also by the use of a distinctive catchword, i.e., συντρίψει common to both verses.[82] The word is used in both verses, thereby drawing attention to their connection to each other.

Thus, through intertextual connections, the gentle and quiet manner of Jacob/Israel points to "new things" (42:9) indeed. Among the "new things" κύριος foretells*,* justice no longer entails the destruction of Israel's enemies as in the "old" exodus from Egypt; in the time of the "new things," war itself will be crushed. This idea is congruent with the memorable images of international peace found in PI such as the portrayal of "God's holy mountain" in Isa 2:1-4 and Isaiah 11 (especially "the peaceable kingdom" of 11:1-9).

42:4a κύριος Foretells the Success of Jacob/Israel's Mission.

This verse in the LXX uses the positive expression ἀναλάμψει ("he will blaze up") in contrast to the MT's negative statement לֹא יִכְהֶה ("he will not grow dim"). While a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is always a possible explanation for any difference between the MT and LXX, Ekblad suggests that here the translator chose ἀναλάμψει for exegetical reasons, namely, in order to allude to Isa 9:1 with its references to darkness and light: ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει, ἴδετε φῶς μέγα· οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς λάμψει ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς (emphasis added) (“You people who walk in darkness: See! A great light! You who live in region and shadow of death: a light shines upon you!”). Whether the translator had such a connection in mind or not, the correspondence between LXX Isa 42:4 and LXX Isa 9:1 is striking.

---

[82] Forms of συντρίβω are uncommon in LXX DI, occurring only in two other verses (45:2 and 46:1). The element of a common "catchword" connecting LXX Isa 42:3 and 13 is thus not likely attributable to the LXX *Vorlage.* There is no other word common to both MT Isa 42:3 and 13.

LXX Isa 42:4a is less definite than MT Isa 42:4a concerning the fate of the παῖς. As has been noted, unlike MT Isa 42:4a, the LXX rendition has no reference to his growing dim. Furthermore, the LXX phrase “broken down,” strictly speaking, is not necessarily a prediction of a future event. The use of ἕως with ἄν and the aorist subjunctive merely “denote[s] that the commencement of an event is dependent on circumstances.”[83] Thus, the verse asserts nothing more than if the παῖς is “broken down,” it will not be before judgment is established upon the earth. That assertion is not the same as a prediction that the παῖς *will* be broken down.

42:4 κύριος Foretells That the Nations Will Hope in “His Name.”

[4b] καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν (and nations will hope in his name).

How is it that LXX Isa 42:4 reads “his name” instead of the MT’s “his teaching/law (*torah*)”? J. Ziegler and J. Koenig hold that the LXX reading is a Christian innovation dependent upon Matt 12:21.[84] Koenig, however, suggests that the innovation was not arbitrary but rather in line with hermeneutical practice of Second Temple Judaism. His most convincing evidence is 1QIsa^{a} 26:8 which reads:

---

[83] BDAG, s.v. ἕως.

[84] Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATAbh XII 3; Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934) 141; Jean Koenig, *L’Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982) 233.

> אף אורח משפטיך יהוה קוינו
> לשמך ולתורתך תאות־נפש׃
>
> Yes, the way of your judgments, Yhwh, we await.
> Your name and your law are the soul's desire.[85]

Koenig suggests that this parallelism between לשמך ולתורתך ("your name and your law") "invite à admettre la possibilité d'une tradition exégetique qui autorisait la substitution de la Loi au Nom . . . et inversement."[86]

A very different explanation is offered by R. R. Ottley, who observes that "ὀνόματι is possibly corrupted from νόμῳ."[87] Thus, one possibility that he suggests is an error in transmission after the verse was translated from Hebrew into Greek. The similarity between ὄνομα and νόμος is clear enough. But how does one account for τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ being taken as τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ? It is indeed hard to account for this as an instance of parablepsis. The more plausible explanation lies in oral transmission. If one pronounces the two readings rapidly, it becomes clear how easily the two could be confused. Therefore, I take the difference between the MT and the LXX to be most easily explained as an error in transmission, with the copyist mistaking what the reader dictated (or even possibly what he himself read aloud). It seems possible that this reading became standard in all LXX MSS made after the writing of the Gospel of Matthew gives the wording of the citation of the verse in Matt 12:21.

---

[85] Cf. MT Isa 26:8: אַף אֹ֧רַח מִשְׁפָּטֶ֛יךָ יְהוָ֖ה קִוִּינ֑וּךָ לְשִׁמְךָ֥ וּֽלְזִכְרְךָ֖ תַּֽאֲוַת־נָֽפֶשׁ׃ ("Yes, the way of your judgments, Yhwh, we await; your name and remembrance of you are the soul's desire.")

[86] Koenig, *L'Herméneutique,* 233.

[87] Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (2 vols.; Cambridge: University Press, 1904) 2. 307.

The difference between the MT and LXX in this verse is no small matter. How is this different meaning of the verse to be understood? In this context, the literal meaning of LXX Isa 42:4 is that the name in which the nations will hope is "Jacob/Israel." This would be an unusual and perhaps even theologically problematic statement. Clearly, "the name" which is ordinarily the object of hope in the OT (in the LXX no less than the MT) is the name of κύριος, not Jacob/Israel. "The belief in the efficacy of the name is extremely old; its origin goes back to the most ancient times and the most primitive forms of intellectual and religious life."[88]

Perhaps the problem lies in reading an ancient text through modern lenses. Personal pronouns in the OT (in both MT and LXX renditions) are often used with a flexibility that does not bear the close scrutiny of the modern reader. As just one example, in LXX Psalm 90:1-2 (MT Psalm 91), the third person singular verbs have as their subject the person "abiding in the help of the Most High"; in the second verse, the "one abiding in the help of the Most High" refers to the Lord both in the second person and then suddenly in the third person.

> [1] ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ ὑψίστου
>   ἐν σκέπῃ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ αὐλισθήσεται.
> [2] ἐρεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ, ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἶ καὶ καταφυγή μου,
>   ὁ θεός μου, ἐλπιῶ ἐπ’ αὐτόν

---

[88] BDAG, s.v. ὀνομα.

> He who abides in the help of the Most High,
> will be lodged in the shade of the God of heaven.
> He shall say to the Lord, "*You* are my helper and my refuge:
> my God; I will hope in *him*" (emphasis added).

Such examples could be easily multiplied. Therefore, it is quite possible that the idea of nations hoping in the name "Jacob/Israel" would never have occurred to the original readers and hearers of LXX Isa 42:4b. They would have immediately recognized that "his name" in which "the nations will hope" refers to the Lord's name.

Another solution is that the translator *did* mean that the name of Jacob/Israel is to be the hope of the nations. In this case, the translator probably intended to imply a kind of identification between the name of Jacob/Israel and the name of κύριος. Although this identification is not common in the OT, there is at least one parallel worthy of consideration, i.e., Jer 14:9b: וְאַתָּ֧ה בְקִרְבֵּ֣נוּ יְהוָ֗ה וְשִׁמְךָ֛ עָלֵ֥ינוּ נִקְרָ֖א אַל־תַּנִּחֵֽנוּ׃ ("Yet You are in our midst, O LORD, And Your name is attached to us—Do not forsake us!" *TNK*).

In contrast to MT Isa 42:4, the LXX version of the same verse leaves unspecified the way in which Jacob/Israel will establish justice; that is, unlike the MT, the LXX makes no reference to the nations' hoping in Jacob/Israel's "teaching" or "law." Thus, if "bringing forth justice" involves the nations' receiving teaching, presumably requiring some changes in their way of life or even adoption of new laws, this requirement is not even hinted at in the LXX rendition of this verse.

42:6 κύριος Calls Jacob/Israel and Promises Support and Strength

In 42:5 and 6, the LXX Servant Song first makes reference to God in the third person. Following the example of the LXX Pentateuch, the rest of the LXX translators, including the translator of Isaiah, render “Yhwh” κύριος (“Lord”) instead of a transliteration or translation of “Yhwh.” While κύριος could be evidence of a Hebrew *Vorlage* (אָדוֹן or אֲדֹנָי) which differed from the MT, it is far more likely the translator’s circumlocution for the sacred name of God. Here, without the definite article, “Lord” has more the nature of a name than a title. (In fact, the sacred writer portrays God as asserting that κύριος ὁ θεός is his *name* in v. 8).[89]

Of course, the substitution of κύριος (with or without the definite article) for the divine name in proclaiming the sacred text reflected great reverence for the name of God. The fact that the LXX translators of the Pentateuch and all subsequent LXX translators went further and avoided even writing the name of God (or its transcription or translation) may have been an additional precaution against violating Exod 20:7 and Deut 5:11 and subjecting the divine name to profanation, especially as the sacred texts would now become accessible to non-Jews through their translations.[90]

Apologetics may have also played a role in the written substitution of κύριος instead of a transcription or translation of Yhwh among the LXX translators. Jewish translators working in the highly sophisticated multicultural milieu of Alexandria surely wished to present their religion in the most favorable light possible. The Hebrew name of their God, יהוה, or any translation or transcription thereof, would be unintelligible to anyone who was not familiar with the history of Israel. Furthermore, the name could be too easily dismissed as yet another of many names of the myriad deities worshiped in the various religions represented among the residents of Alexandria. By contrast, κύριος would have been accessible conceptually to someone without any knowledge of Israel's history. In other words, κύριος is a term any Greek speaker could understand; it is a divine appellation that would be meaningful to the non-Jewish portion of a society that boasted of its learning and philosophy. Used in the absolute ("Lord" or "the Lord"), in contradistinction to a qualified usage, e.g., "the lord of the sea," κύριος is a name that could not be easily dismissed in that it conveys that the one so designated has unique dominion over all creation. Thus, while something is lost, something else is gained in the change from יהוה to κύριος in Hellenistic Judaism.[91]

---

[89] For a much fuller treatment of the history and implications of the LXX’s use of the term, see Gottfried Quell, “κύριος: The Old Testament Name for God,” in *TDOT* 3. 1058-81, here 1080. κύριος indicates “the one who has lawful power of disposal.” Used in an absolute sense (as explained below) κύριος suggests “God’s legitimate, unrestricted and invisible power of disposal over all things.”

[90] The LXX seems to give a greater importance to a “name-of-God” theology than does the MT. In MT Exod 34:14b, e.g., we read כִּ֚י יְהוָה֙ קַנָּ֣א שְׁמ֔וֹ אֵ֥ל קַנָּ֖א הֽוּא׃ (“For Yhwh’s name is ‘Jealous,’ a jealous God is he”); whereas in the LXX of the same verse, we find ὁ γὰρ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ζηλωτὸν ὄνομα θεὸς ζηλωτής ἐστιν (“For ‘the Lord God’ is a jealous *name*, he is a jealous God” [emphasis added]).

42:6 κύριος Gives Jacob/Israel as Both a Covenant to Israel and as a Light to Gentiles.

The LXX renders εἰς διαθήκην γένους ("as a covenant of a race") for the MT's לִבְרִית עָם ("as a covenant for humanity"). The word γένος has a wide range of possible meanings. According to Ekblad, "in the . . .LXX when γένος is not better translated "kind," it almost always refers to . . . Israel." If we continue to assume (as we have) that the second person singular in vv. 6-7 refers to the παῖς, i.e., Jacob/Israel, v. 6 is puzzling assertion. In what sense could Jacob/Israel be appointed a covenant of Israel? The only possible solution is to take the παῖς Jacob/Israel as a subset of Israel or as "ideal" Israel (whether a group or an individual). Hence, in the LXX version, v. 6 presents a surprising twist—and important moment—for readers and hearers of the LXX version of the First Servant Song, who have hitherto been given no indication that Israel/Jacob in this pericope means anything other than the entire nation. Beginning with this verse, these readers and hearers now must ask: Who is this "Jacob/Israel" whom κύριος designates as ὁ παῖς μου in this Song? The answer, at this point, is by no means obvious.

---

[91] Quell states ("κύριος"3. 1062): "If it implied a weakening for the link with history, it did not break this link. If it softened its numinous dynamic for Israel, at the decisive point it surrendered the national character of the Canon and thereby interpreted its deepest meaning. The God to whom the Canon bears witness is called "Lord" because He is shown to be the exclusive holder of power over the cosmos and all men, the Creator of the world and the Master of life and death. The term "Lord" is thus a summation of the beliefs of the OT. It is the wholly successful attempt to state what God is, what the Holy One means in practice for men, namely, the intervention of a personal will, with approximately the pregnancy and binding force which constitute the distinctive mark of the name Yahweh."

42:7 κύριος, through Jacob/Israel, Will Restore Sight and Freedom to the Blind and the Bound.

Here the LXX conveys the same meaning as the MT. The previous verse has already indicated that the παῖς "Jacob/Israel" is not coterminous with the nation of Israel. This distinction is reinforced in this verse. The blind, whose eyes Jacob/Israel is to open, include at least some of Jacob/Israel who "have eyes but do not see" (Isa 6:10).

42:8 κύριος Asserts His Utter Uniqueness.

Beliefs in the ancient world about the importance and power of names have been discussed above. Once again here, as expected, the translator does not transliterate or translate the Hebrew name of God: κύριος ὁ θεός evidently serves as a worthy substitute.

In v. 8bβ, the LXX attempts to clarify the ambiguous reading of the MT: לֹֽא־אֶתֵּ֑ן וּתְהִלָּתִ֖י לַפְּסִילִֽים (“I will not give my praise to idols”). Clearly, in the MT’s reading, there is no question of God offering praise to idols. Rather, the clause most likely means: “The praise that I (should) receive I will not share with idols.” The LXX translator subtly guides the reader/hearer away from this portrayal of a God jealous of the praise that is his due. In the LXX, it is God’s ἀρεταί (“excellent qualities, powers”), that he does not share with idols.[92] Although the LXX phrase could be taken in the same sense as the Hebrew (see note 92) , the interpretation that emerges if the far more common meaning of ἀρεταί is presupposed is the following: κύριος is not so much jealous of praise due to him being given to another, as he is intent on pointing out the absurdity of doing so.

As in the MT, LXX Isa 42:8-9 reiterates in essence the verdict of 41:29. κύριος, the unique foreteller of events, condemns those who lead others into idolatry as “vain” (μάτην). In both the MT and LXX, Isa 42:8-9 is the end of the oracle of which 42:5 is the introduction, forming an *inclusio.* As we have just seen, Isa 42:9 portrays God as omniscient and the foreteller of events: he alone is Lord of history. As the next section will show, Isa 42:5 portrays κύριος as the Lord of heaven and earth and all that is in them and the Lord of all life. Both verses form an *inclusio* emphasizing God's uniqueness.

---

[92] There is, of course a close correlation between excellence and praise. According to BDAG (s.v. ἀρετή) “[i]n accordance w. a usage that treats ἀ. and δόξα as correlatives (ἀ.=excellence that results in approbation and therefore δόξα=renown), which finds expression outside the OT (Is 42:8, 12) in the juxtaposition of the two terms (Herodian; Pausanias, Arcadia 52, 6 ins on a statue in honor of Philopoemen at Tegea; Dionys. Hal.; Diod. Sic. 2, 45, 2 of a woman, self-styled ‘Daughter of Ares’, reputed for her valor. . .), the LXX transl. הוֹד majesty, high rank (Hab 3:3; Zech 6:13; cp. Il. 9, 498 ἀ. w. τιμή and βίη, 23, 578 w. βίη) and also תְּהִלָּה praise sg. (Is; cp. Od. 14, 402 ἀ. w. ἐϋκλείη ‘good repute’) with ἀ pl. . . . .” In my view the translator chose this somewhat ambiguous term (ἀρεταί) knowing that “Gr-Rom. publics would in the main be conditioned to hear a stress on performance, which of course would elicit praise (cp. Plut., Mor. 535d).”

D. What the Prophet Says about κύριος.

42:5 κύριος Is the Only God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth and the Giver of Life.

As previously noted, the prophet portrays κύριος in LXX 42:5 in his relationship not only to Israel but also to all creation. He is *the* God, who both created and fixed the sky, and established the earth and everything emanating from the earth. He is, *a fortiori*, the creator of living things, including—of course—all humankind. As giver of breath and spirit, he is implicitly master of both life and death. Unlike the MT, the LXX here eschews anthropomorphic imagery.

E. A Summary of the Portrayal of κύριος in LXX Isa 42:1-9.

In LXX Isa 42:1-9, God addresses those led astray by idolaters, both Jews and Gentiles. He declares that his name is κύριος. He is *the* God, the sole creator of the heavens and the earth and all that is in them. He is the Lord of life. He alone can foretell future events. In asserting that he bestows none of these—or any other divine attributes—upon idols, he implicitly calls his audience to turn (back) to him. He identifies "Jacob/Israel"—who is somehow distinct from the nation of Israel—as his beloved son or servant. Through "Jacob/Israel," to whom he guarantees success, κύριος will establish justice for the nations and restore sight and freedom. The nations hope in the name of κύριος (or possibly in the name of "Jacob/Israel" who, in some sense, bears the name of κύριος). He gives “Jacob/Israel” as a covenant and a light to the nations.

IV. Comparison of the Portrayals of God in the MT and LXX Texts of Isa 42:1-9

MT	LXX
[1] Behold my Servant: I will hold him fast. In my chosen one my soul has been pleased. I have put my spirit upon him; justice for the nations will he bring forth.	[1]Jacob is my παῖς; I will uphold him; Israel, my chosen one, my soul has accepted him. I have put my spirit upon him; judgment to the nations he will bring forth
[2] He will not cry out, nor will he raise nor make his voice heard in the street.	[2] He will not cry out, nor will he raise [his voice] nor will his voice be heard outside.
[3]A crushed reed he will not break and a smoldering flaxen wick he will not extinguish. According to truth he will bring forth judgment.	[3] A bruised reed he will not break and a smoking flaxen wick he will not extinguish, but he will bring forth judgment in truth.
[4] He will not grow dim nor will he be crushed until he establishes justice on the earth; and his teaching the distant islands and shores will await.	[4] He shall blaze up and not be broken down until he establishes judgment on the earth; and nations will hope in his name.
[5] Thus says the God, Yhwh, creator of the skies and stretching them out, hammering out the earth and its issue giver of breath to the people upon it, and of spirit to those who move on it:	[5]Thus says the God, the creator of the sky and the one who fixed it in its place, the establisher of the earth and the things that are in it and the giver of breath to people upon it and spirit to all who tread on it:
[6]“I, Yhwh, have called you (singular) in righteousness and will take you by your hand; I will watch over you, and will make you into a covenant of humanity, a light of nations,	[6] “I, κύριος God, called you (singular) in righteousness and will grasp you by your hand and will strengthen you; and I give you as a covenant of a race, as a light of nations,
[7] to open eyes that are blind, to bring out of the dungeon the prisoner, out of the prisonhouse those sitting in darkness.	[7] to open eyes of blind persons, to lead people who are bound up out of their bonds, and from the prisonhouse those who sit in darkness.
[8] I am Yhwh; this is my name, and my glory to another I will not give, nor my praise to idols	[8] I am κύριος the God; this is my name. My glory I will not give to another, nor my virtues to carved things
[9] The former things, behold they have come. And new things, I am telling before they spring forth announce to you (pl).”	[9] The things that were from the beginning, behold they have come; and new things which I announce even they arise are made clear to you (pl).”

Similarities

Both texts portray God as utterly unique. He alone is the creator of heaven and earth and all they contain. He alone is able to foretell events. God's glory is unique and not shared by idols. In both texts as well, God is portrayed revealing an event of universal significance. He has chosen a beloved agent and put his spirit upon him. God foretells that this agent will not fail to bring forth justice gently and quietly to the nations, giving sight to the blind and freedom to those in bondage. In both texts, the agent will be appointed as a light to nations by God, who points to the fulfillment of past prophecies as proof of his word.

Differences

In the MT, God identifies himself using the sacred Hebrew name, Yhwh. In the LXX, God does not use his Hebrew name but identifies himself as κύριος ("Lord"). The MT, unlike the LXX, portrays God's act of creation in anthropomorphic terms. Whereas the MT depicts God as one who does not share his praise with idols, the LXX portrays God in more rational terms, namely, as one who does not share divine attributes that merit praise.

In the LXX, God is portrayed as speaking of his beloved agent, using a term that could be used for a son or a protégé, and further identifies him as "Jacob/Israel." In the LXX version of the oracle (specifically 42:6), however, κύριος suggests that here "Jacob/Israel" is not coterminous with the nation of Israel. The "Jacob/Israel" whom he has designated as ὁ παῖς μου will be appointed as a covenant to the nation of Israel. It would seem, therefore, that the two entities cannot be identical. In the MT, by contrast, God speaks of the agent as his Servant and does not identify him by name. In the MT, God will appoint the Servant as a covenant to nations, not as a covenant for Israel. While the MT portrays God as establishing justice for the nations at least in part through *torah* ("instruction" or possibly "the Law"), the LXX makes no mention of his doing this. Instead, in the LXX, the nations will hope in "his" name, an ambiguous statement probably referring to the name of κύριος rather than that of Jacob/Israel.

Finally, in the MT, God foretells that his Servant will be "crushed" and hints at his silently enduring some sort of punishment. In the LXX, God says nothing definite about his beloved agent's demise. In LXX 42:4, which refers to "Jacob/Israel's" being "broken down," κύριος does not foretell the demise of his παῖς as a definite future event; he merely asserts, rather, that the demise of his παῖς will *not* happen without his mission succeeding.

V. Summary

A comparison of the MT and LXX of the First Servant Song of Isaiah suggests that the LXX version portrays God in a way that would be more congenial to the sophisticated milieu of Alexandria than does the MT. Anthropomorphisms are absent from the LXX. Instead of God's Hebrew name, the more universally intelligible appellation κύριος is substituted. While in both the LXX and the MT, God foretells justice, liberation, and light for the nations, the MT also speaks of the Servant's demise, which raises questions about God's faithfulness to him. In the LXX, the Servant's demise is scarcely hinted at. Any notion that God’s justice to the nations could involve punishment, especially in the form of violence or war, is precluded in the LXX not only by God’s foretelling that Jacob/Israel will accomplish his mission with quiet gentleness (something also implied in the MT), but also by the portrayal of war itself as the principle enemy of κύριος in LXX Isa 42:13 (which is quite different from the MT). If the bringing forth of God’s justice involves the nations being instructed or needing to adopt a new Law as the MT reader/hearer might surmise, the LXX version of the First Servant Song makes no mention of it. Furthermore, unlike MT Isa 42:1-9, the implied audience of the entire LXX version of the pericope includes Jews and Gentiles alike—in vv. 1-5 and 8-9 as the directly implied audience, in vv. 6-7 as the indirectly implied audience.

κύριος is implicitly portrayed in the LXX as more rational and less emotional than in the MT: in the LXX he comes across as not so much jealous of praises due to him being offered to idols as he is intent on enlightening all who have been led astray among the nations—Jews *and Gentiles*—about the absurdity of idolatry, that is, trusting in powerless beings who cannot even foretell events, much less can claim to have created the heavens and the earth and all they contain.

Chapter Three: The Second Servant Song

This chapter begins with the question of whether what has traditionally been called the "Second Servant Song"—regardless of the various delimitations proposed for it—is rightly designated as a "servant song" at all. After arguing for the legitimacy of this designation, I will proceed with the question of its delimitation. Next, I provide my own translation of the Masoretic text of the Second Servant Song with a discussion of text-critical issues and an analysis of the implied speakers and audiences. A discussion of the portrayal of Yhwh in the song follows.

I next take up the LXX text of the Second Servant Song: my own translation with text-critical notes, an analysis of the implied speakers and audiences, and the portrayal of κύριος in the song. Thereafter, I present my translation of the Masoretic and LXX texts side by side and compare and contrast their portrayals of God.

I. Preliminary Questions

A. Can 49:1-6 (Or Any Pericope Including 49:3) Be Considered a "Servant Song"?

Before discussing the delimitation of "the Second Servant Song," a preliminary question must be addressed. The distinguishing feature of the servant songs is their reference to a servant of Yhwh who is not clearly (i.e., unambiguously) identified as Jacob/Israel.[1] In view of this distinguishing feature, it would seem that the words "You are my Servant, Israel" in v. 3 would disqualify 49:1-6 (Duhm's limitation of the Second Servant Song)—or any delimitation that includes v. 3—as a "servant song" altogether.

---

[1] See Richard J. Clifford, "Second Isaiah," *ABD* 3. 490-501, here 499.

For Duhm, the problem was only apparent. For him "Israel" in v. 3 is a gloss. This opinion is far from certain.[2] Thus, the problem remains.

The question is more complicated, however, than the mention of "Israel" in v. 3, taken out of context, might suggest. Its complexity becomes evident in vv. 5-6: how can the Servant "Israel" have a mission to the people, Jacob/Israel, if the two entities are identical? Given this problem, a possible solution is that "Israel" in v. 3 is a predicative rather than a vocative and, further, a designation rather than a description.[3] "[If] v. 3 is not a *description* of Israel as the servant but rather a *designation* of the servant as Israel . . . the apparent clash with vv. 5-6 disappears."[4] In other words, the solution could be that "Israel" here is the name that Yhwh assigns to an individual or group not identical to Jacob/Israel.

Although a full discussion concerning the identity of the Servant is outside the scope of this dissertation, a comment about the plausibility of Yhwh's giving the name "Israel" to a person or group that somehow differs from the whole of Jacob/Israel does seem in order at this point. Accordingly, I present here one of several possibilities offered by exegetes, not to resolve the problem of the Servant's identity but simply to show that the idea of Yhwh's designating as "Israel" a person or group other than Jacob/Israel is plausible. Clifford writes, "The proper answer to how servant Israel can have a mission to Israel is to recall that servants in Israel were understood dialectally [*sic*], in relation to the people to whom they were sent; people and servant were profoundly orientated to each other. . . . The servant is what all Israel is called to become."[5] Since other exegetes as well have offered interpretations of v. 3 in which Yhwh gives the name "Israel" to a person or a group other than Jacob/Israel, it becomes clear that "Israel" in v. 3 is not in fact unambiguously identical with "Jacob/Israel."

---

[2] See Norbert Lohfink, " 'Israel' in Jes 49,3," in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten: Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler* (ed. Josef Schreiner; 2 vols.; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1972) 2. 217-30 for a thorough discussion of the originality of "Israel" in this verse.

[3] See Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; London: Westminster John Knox, 2001) 384.

[4] H. G. M. Williamson, "The Conception of Israel in Transition," in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives* (Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study; ed. R. E. Clements; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 141-61, here 146.

In conclusion, I maintain that Isa 49:1-6—or any delimitation of the pericope that includes v. 3—qualifies as a "servant song." As stated above, the distinguishing feature of the servant songs in DI is a reference to a Servant of God who is not unambiguously identified as Jacob/Israel. Since the reference to "Israel" in v. 3 has this distinguishing feature (i.e., it does not *unambiguously* identify the Servant of the pericope beginning with 49:1 as Jacob/Israel), the passage therefore can be rightly called a servant song.

B. Delimitation of the Second Servant Song

Is Isa 49:1-6 a Distinct Unit?

The passage first identified by Duhm as the Second Servant Song, Isa 49:1-6, is clearly a distinct unit. The implied speaker is the Servant, whereas both the preceding and following passages (48:17-21, 22; 49:7, 8-12) are oracles of Yhwh spoken by the prophet.[6] The implied audience of Isa 49:1-6 is the whole world, whereas in the previous oracle the implied audience is Jacob/Israel. The addressee of the following oracle (49:7) is either Jacob/Israel or the Servant, but in any event not the whole world. The unit

---

[5] Richard J. Clifford, *Fair Spoken and Persuading: An Interpretation of Second Isaiah* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984) 152-53.

[6] Those who hold that the Servant and the prophet are one and the same obviously will not recognize a change in speaker at this point.

49:1-6 is even demarcated by an inclusio: v. 1 addresses islands and nations far away, while v. 6 refers to “the end of the earth.”

What is debated, however, is whether Isa 49:1-6 constitutes the entire Second Servant Song or only its first section.[7] Most commentators hold one of two positions: the Servant Song clearly ends with v. 6 or it continues through v. 13. In what follows I analyze both positions.[8]

Does the Servant Song End with v. 6?

Whereas the implied audience in vv. 1-6 is the whole world, v. 7 begins an oracle of Yhwh addressed to “one despised,” an ambiguous term but certainly not a reference to the whole world. Furthermore, unless the Servant is to be identified with the prophet, the implied speaker is also different. But as noted in Chapter Two, a change in the implied audience, and perhaps the speaker as well, is not necessarily indicative of a new pericope.

---

[7] A similar problem occurs in the delimitation of the First and Third Servant Songs. In the case of the first three Servant Songs, at issue is whether or not to expand the delimitations proposed in 1892 by Bernhard Duhm (*Das Buch Jesaia* [2nd ed.; HKAT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902] 277) by including additional verses.

[8] Some scholars in effect take a middle ground, preserving Duhm’s delimitations while regarding the sections following the first three songs (i.e., 42:5-9; 49:7-13; and 50:9-10) as “responses” (John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* [AB 20; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967] 40), or “eine Erweiterung” (Ulrich Berges, *Jesaja 40–48* [HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2008] 213), or even as additional Servant Songs (Hugo Gressmann, *Der Messias* [FRLANT 43; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929] 299-301)—or additional “poèmes” (Pierre Grelot, *Les poèmes du Serviteur: De la lecture critique à l’herméneutique* [LD 103; Paris: Cerf, 1981] 30-31). In the case of the Second Servant Song, Christopher North (*The Suffering Servant: An Historical and Critical Study* [2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948] 130) distinguishes 49:8-13 from 49:1-6 by calling the latter a “Servant Song” and the former an “Israel Song,” which has been transformed thanks to v. 8bα (ibid. 129) into a “Song about the Servant.” These solutions highlight the complexity of the question, given that the material following the “Servant Songs” as delimited by Duhm is both continuous with and distinct from Duhm’s “songs.”

In addition, there are some commentators who hold that the Second Servant Song ends at v. 12 and that v. 13 is one of some eight hymns of praise punctuating DI (e.g., Tryvge N. D. Mettinger, *A Farewell to the Servant Songs: A Critical Examination of an Exegetical Axiom* [Scripta minora 1982-83.3; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1983] 25). Others, e.g., Eugene Robert Ekblad, Jr. (*Isaiah’s Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* [Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999] 85-88) and Andrew Wilson (*The Nations in Deutero-Isaiah* [Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 1; Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1986] 277) delimit the unit as 49:1-9a. It is impossible to discuss every argument advanced by scholars on the matter. Suffice it to say that 49:1-13 consists of distinct sections. The pertinent question is whether they are sufficiently unified around the character of the Servant to be considered a unit on their own.

Duhm proposes that the verses following v. 6 have “nothing to do with vv. 1-6,” but are closely related to “48:12-16, 20f.”[9] This claim supports his hypothesis that the servant songs are interpolations by a different hand. However, it is far from clear that vv. 7-9 are more “closely related to chap. 48:12-16, 20f.” than to 49:1-6.[10] Whereas vv. 48:12-16 and 20-21 are *unambiguously* addressed to Jacob/Israel, the same cannot be said of 49:7-9. Indeed, in Isa 49:8 Yhwh designates the addressee as בְּרִית עַם (“a covenant of humanity”), a title occurring only one other time in the OT, namely, as a designation of the Servant in the First Servant Song (Isa 42:6), see Chapter Two. Furthermore, mention in 49:9a of the release of prisoners (as opposed to slaves) and restoration of sight seems to be direct references to the Servant’s mission as formulated in the First Servant Song (see 42:7). If the Servant of the First Servant Song cannot unambiguously be identified with Jacob/Israel, neither can the addressee of Isa 49:8.

Duhm is correct, of course in noting that 48:12-16, 20-21; and 49:8-12 have to do with the homeward journey of Jacob/Israel. Nevertheless, to assert that these segments have “nothing to do with 1-6” is unconvincing. Verses 5a and 6a seem to indicate that part of the Servant’s task is precisely to bring back and restore Jacob/Israel, thus establishing a clear link between vv. 1-6 and vv. 8-12.[11]

---

[9] Duhm, *Jesaia,* 371.

[10] McKenzie, *Second Isaiah,* 108.

[11] This is the understanding of most commentators. One notable exception is Christopher North (*Second Isaiah: Introduction,* Translation and Commentary to Chapters LX–LV [London: Oxford University Press, 1964] 191**),** who proposes that instead of expanding the Servant’s mission, Yhwh in v. 6 redirects it to the Gentiles alone.

Beyond Duhm's unsustainable claim that the material immediately after v. 6 has "nothing to do with 1-6," are there other arguments for considering v. 6 the end of the Second Servant Song? The presence of a *Botenformel* ("Thus says the Lord") in both vv. 7 and 8 is odd and has been cited as grounds for distinguishing these verses from vv. 1-6. Grimm and Dittert, for example, propose that v. 7 and vv. 8-12 are each separate oracles and should be treated as distinct pericopes.[12] On the other hand, even if v. 7 and vv. 8-12 were originally separate oracles (that have been preserved in whole or in part), the more important question is whether they function, nonetheless, as a continuation of vv. 1-6 in their current form and position in the text.

Does the Servant Song Extend to v. 13?

In my view, the redactor did indeed use what may have been originally separate elements in vv. 7-13 to develop an expansion of vv. 1-6. As already noted, v. 8 includes a citation from the First Servant Song (42:6) ("I give you as a covenant of humanity"). This feature seems intended to lead the reader/listener to construe all of vv. 7-9a as addressed to the Servant and therefore as a continuation of the Second Servant Song. And if vv. 7-9a are part of the present Second Servant Song, then vv. 9b-13 are as well. Even if vv. 9b-12 were probably once part of an "Israel-Song,"[13] and v. 13 a hymn of praise, nevertheless, in their present position these verses are closely related to what precedes. As noted above regarding the content of vv. 8-12, the Servant still has as his task the restoration of Israel. Furthermore, without 49:9a, the pronoun “they” in v. 9b has no referent. There are likewise numerous connections between vv. 1-6 and 7-13;[14] for example, “covenant of people” in v. 8 corresponds to “a light to the nations” in v. 6. (The two titles occur juxtaposed in the First Servant Song; see 42:6.) Further connections abound in both vocabulary and syntax, thus enabling Wilson to identify a chiasm encompassing vv. 1-13.[15]

---

[12] Werner Grimm and Kurt Dittert, *Deutero-Jesaja: Deutung—Wirkung—Gegenwart* (Calwer Bibelkommentare; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1990) 326. Whether v. 7 constitutes an oracle on its own is disputed. North (*Suffering Servant,* 130) proposes that v. 7 is a fragment of an oracle that has been incorporated into vv. 7-13. Claus Westermann (*Isaiah 40-66* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969] 212-13) radically emends vv. 7-13 by omitting v. 8aα and b, and relocating v. 7b to after v. 12. Emending the text in this instance, however, seems to reduce the role of the final redactor to that of a glossator who has somehow adulterated the "original," "authentic" text.

[13] North, *Suffering Servant,* 130.

Further arguments for including vv. 7-13 as part of the Second Servant Song can be made in terms of the macrostructures in DI. For example, while Korpel and de Moor see all of Isaiah 49 as a single *canto,* they concede that “one might defend that the chapter should be divided into two cantos. *The first one would cover . . . vv. 1-13* [emphasis added] and would deal with the servant of the LORD and his initial doubt (v. 4a). The second canto would cover . . . vv. 14-26 which deal with Zion’s doubt about the possibility of restoration.”[16] Using a different approach, S. L. Stassen sees Isa 49:1-13 as a second prologue of Isaiah 40–55. (For him, Isa 40:1-11 functions as DI’s [initial] prologue.) He further identifies a chiastic relationship between the two prologues. Whereas the first prologue uses Zion-Jerusalem imagery to introduce the Jacob-Israel portion of DI (chaps. 40–48), the second prologue uses Jacob-Israel imagery to introduce the Zion-Jerusalem section of DI (chaps. 49–55).[17]

---

[14] See Wilson, *Nations,* 271.

[15] See ibid., 276-82. Wilson also notes a parallel chiasm in the second half of the chapter, 49:14-26.

[16] Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, *The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40-55* (OTS 41; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 444-45.

In conclusion, although Isa 49:1-6 is a distinct unit, there are plausible reasons for seeing vv. 7-13 as an addition to the text, grafted onto vv. 1-6—purposefully and artfully, if not seamlessly. To neglect these verses would be to miss important material the redactor seems to have intended to apply to the Servant figure. In my view, therefore, the extant Second Servant Song extends from v. 1 through v. 13.

II. The Portrayal of God in MT Isa 49:1-13

A. Text-critical Notes and Translation

1 שִׁמְע֤וּ אִיִּים֙ אֵלַ֔י[a]
וְהַקְשִׁ֥יבוּ לְאֻמִּ֖ים מֵרָח֑וֹק
יְהוָה֙ מִבֶּ֣טֶן קְרָאָ֔נִי
מִמְּעֵ֥י אִמִּ֖י הִזְכִּ֥יר שְׁמִֽי׃

Listen, O isles, to me,
and give heed, O peoples far away!
Yhwh has called me from the womb;
from the inward parts of my mother
[b]he has pronounced my name.[b]

---

[17] S. L. Stassen, "Jesaja 40:1-11 en 49:1-13 als belangrike struktuurmerkers in de komposisie van Jesaja 40–55," *NGTT* 32 (1991) 178-86, here 186.

[a] 4QIsa^d places אֵלַ֔י ("to me") directly after שִׁמְע֤וּ. An equivalent to the phrase "to me" is altogether lacking in several LXX MSS, and the Vg. Likewise, according to S. P. Brock (*The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshiṭta Version: Isaiah* [Leiden: Brill, 1987] 89), the most reliable Syriac textual tradition also lacks "to me," reading instead: ܫܬܘܩܘ ܓܙܪ̈ܬܐ ܘܨܘܬܘ ܐܡ̈ܘܬܐ ("Be still, O islands; give ear, O peoples"); one variant in the Syriac apparatus (11 l 4), however, corresponds closely to the MT.

[b] הִזְכִּ֥יר שְׁמִֽי literally means "he caused remembrance (made mention) of my name." Jan L Koole (*Isaiah,* Part 3 [trans. Anthony P. Runia; 3 vols.; Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 1997] 2. 8), North (*Second Isaiah,* 186), and others note the similarity of the Hebrew phrase הִזְכִּ֥יר שְׁמִֽי to *šuma zakāru* in Akkadian. *Zakāru* is defined as "aussprechen, nennen, reden, schwören" and is attested with gods as subject and human beings as object ("Menschen von Göttern: . . . *šumū zakāru*" (*AHw,* 3. 1503); cf. the Cyrus cylinder, an inscription found on a clay barrel first published

[2] וַיָּ֤שֶׂם פִּי֙ כְּחֶ֣רֶב חַדָּ֔ה
בְּצֵ֥ל יָד֖וֹ [c] הֶחְבִּיאָ֑נִי
וַיְשִׂימֵ֙נִי֙ לְחֵ֣ץ בָּר֔וּר
בְּאַשְׁפָּת֖וֹ הִסְתִּירָֽנִי׃

And he has made my mouth as a sharp sword;
in the shadow of his hand he hid me;
he made me a polished arrow;
in his quiver he concealed me.

[3] וַיֹּ֥אמֶר לִ֖י עַבְדִּי־אָ֑תָּה
יִשְׂרָאֵ֕ל [d] אֲשֶׁר־בְּךָ֖ אֶתְפָּאָֽר׃

And he said to me, "You (sg.) are my Servant,
Israel, in whom I will boast."

[4] וַאֲנִ֤י אָמַ֙רְתִּי֙ לְרִ֣יק יָגַ֔עְתִּ
לְתֹ֥הוּ וְהֶ֖בֶל כֹּחִ֣י כִלֵּ֑יתִי
אָכֵן֙ מִשְׁפָּטִ֣י אֶת־יְהוָ֔ה
וּפְעֻלָּתִ֖י אֶת־אֱלֹהָֽי׃

As for me,[e] I said, "For emptiness have I toiled,
for chaos and vapor have I spent my strength.
Yet assuredly, my justice is with Yhwh
and my recompense with my God."

---

by H. W. Rawlinson and quoted here from *ANET,* 315: "Marduk [who does care for] . . . on account of (the fact that) sanctuaries of all their settlements were in ruins and the inhabitants of Sumer and Akkad had become like (living) dead, turned back his countenance) [his] an(ger) [abated] and he had mercy (upon them). He scanned and looked through all the countries, searching for a righteous ruler willing to lead him [i.e., Marduk] (in the annual procession). (Then) **he pronounced the name** of Cyrus (*Ku-ra-aš*), king of Anshan, declared him (lit. **pronounced [his] name**) to be(come) the ruler of all the world." (Emphasis added.) "He has pronounced my name" evidently conveys the concept of a calling or commissioning.

[c] 1QIsa^{a} reads ידיו, "his hands."

[d] "Israel" is lacking in Kennicott 96 and 4QIsa^{d}. If it is original, we are faced with the well-known problem: How can Israel have mission to Israel (see v. 5)? Lohfink ("'Israel' in Jes 49,3" 217-29) argues against considering "Israel" a gloss. In contrast, Joseph Blenkinsopp ("The Servant and the Servant in Isaiah," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*[ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; 2 vols.;VTSup 70; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997] 1. 165) see "Israel" in v. 3 as "representing . . . a very early stage of the traditional Jewish interpretation of the עַבְדִּי passages." I retain the *BHS* reading as the *lectio difficilior.*

[e] My translation attempts to convey the emphasis in the Hebrew on the first person singular resulting from the presence of the opening pronoun.

[5]וְעַתָּ֣ה ׀ אָמַ֣ר יְהוָ֗ה
יֹצְרִ֤י מִבֶּ֙טֶן֙ לְעֶ֣בֶד ל֔וֹ
לְשׁוֹבֵ֤ב יַעֲקֹב֙ אֵלָ֔יו
וְיִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל ל֣וֹ [f] יֵאָסֵ֑ף
וְאֶכָּבֵד֙ בְּעֵינֵ֣י יְהוָ֔ה
וֵאלֹהַ֖י הָיָ֥ה עֻזִּֽי [g]

And now Yhwh says
—the one who formed me from the womb to be his Servant,
to bring Jacob back to him,
and that Israel might be gathered to him
([h]and I will be honored in the eyes of Yhwh
for my God has become my strength[h])—

[6]וַיֹּ֗אמֶר [j] נָקֵל֩ מִֽהְיוֹתְךָ֨ לִ֜י עֶ֗בֶד
לְהָקִים֙ אֶת־שִׁבְטֵ֣י יַעֲקֹ֔ב
וּנְצִירֵ֥י [k] וְיִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל לְהָשִׁ֑יב

---

[f] The ketib לא (“not”), supported by 4QIsa^{d}, could be translated in context as “and that Israel not be swept away/annihilated” (lit. “not be gathered up,” see Vg); cf. Isa 42:1; 16:10; Jer 48:3. I have chosen the qere לוֹ (“to him”) because of external evidence: it is supported by both 1QIsa^{a} and the LXX as well as several MT MSS.

[g] 1QIsa^{a} reads עזרי (“my help”).

[h—h] *BHS* suggests that this phrase originally stood at the end of v. 4 where it would continue the train of thought seamlessly. The interplay, however, between וְאֶכָּבֵד in v. 5 with its root כבד (“to be heavy”) and נָקֵל (“it is a light thing”) in v. 6 is more obvious in the current MT arrangement. If the phrase has been moved, perhaps it was shifted to its current location precisely to feature this wordplay.

[j] North (*Second Isaiah*, 186); *BHS*; and others suggest that the MT’s וַיֹּאמֶר (“he said”), which is grammatically unnecessary, may have been added by a scribe for the sake of clarity.

[k] R. N. Whybray (*Isaiah 40–66* [NCB; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975] 139) emends the text to נִצְרֵי (“offshoots, descendants”), but there seems to be no compelling reason to do so. The ketib וּנְצִירֵי, a *hapax legomenon* supported by 1QIsa^{a} , is evidently a masculine plural construct adjective meaning “preserved” (used here as a substantive). The qere is ונצורי, vocalized as וּנְצוּרֵי, the qal passive participle of נצר (“preserved/ kept/ protected”). There is no substantial difference in meaning between the two readings.

וּנְתַתִּ֙יךָ֙ לְא֣וֹר גּוֹיִ֔ם
לִֽהְי֥וֹת יְשׁוּעָתִ֖י עַד־קְצֵ֥ה הָאָֽרֶץ׃ ס

he said, "It is easy[l], on account of your being my Servant,
to raise up the tribes of Jacob
and to bring back the survivors of Israel—
therefore[m] I will make you into a light of nations
[n]to be my salvation[n] to the ends of the earth!"

[7]כֹּ֣ה אָֽמַר־יְהוָ֡ה
גֹּאֵ֨ל יִשְׂרָאֵ֜ל קְדוֹשׁ֗וֹ
לִבְזֹה[o]־נֶ֜פֶשׁ לִמְתָ֤עֵֽב[p] גּוֹי֙

---

[l] GKC §67t analyzes נָקֵל as the niphal participle and translates the phrase "it is a light thing" (cf. 2 Kgs 20:10).

[m] On the above translation of the waw as "therefore," see Bruce K. Waltke and M. P. O'Connor, *Introduction to Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004) 532. "32.2.2c In a simple (con)sequential situation, the independent clause represented by qtl also constitutes the logical basis or cause for the situation expressed by relative wqtl."

[n—n] As Koole (*Isaiah III,* 2. 24) notes, the Vg (*ut sis salus mea,* "that you might be my salvation") and the LXX (τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν, "in order for you to be salvation") both understand the Hebrew to mean that Yhwh's Servant, Israel, is to be "salvation." On the other hand, many modern English versions make no such direct identification between the Servant and salvation but rather translate the phrase along the lines of the *TNK*, "that My salvation may reach the ends of the earth."

[o] Both 1QIsa^a and 4QIsa^d have the qal masculine singular passive participle construct of בזה ("despised") in their reading לבזוי־נפש (lit., "to a despised of person", i.e., "to a person despised" or "to one despised by a person"). The MT and Qumran texts have essentially the same meaning (see the following note for the meaning of the MT); I retain the MT as the more difficult construction. Joseph Blenkinsopp (*Isaiah 40-55:* A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [AB 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2000] 303), evidently following the BHS apparatus, notes a Cairo Geniza fragment whose reading supposedly contains an active participle ("one despising") corresponding to the LXX. But Dominique Barthélemy (*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* [2 vols.; OBO 50; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986] 2. 359) argues that the Cairo Geniza Babylonian fragment ("il s'agit du ms Oxford Bodl Heb d 64, fol. 1b") actually reads לבֿזה (= לִבְזֵה), the Aramaic equivalent of the Qumran readings, i.e., the passive participle.

[p] Here the MT reading is לִמְתָעֵב which is the piel masculine singular participle construct of תעב ("abhorring"). All the versions, however, read the participle as a passive.

לְעֶ֣בֶד מֹשְׁלִ֔ים
מְלָכִים֙ יִרְא֣וּ וָקָ֔מוּ
שָׂרִ֖ים וְיִֽשְׁתַּחֲוּ֑וּ
לְמַ֤עַן יְהוָה֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר נֶאֱמָ֔ן
קְדֹ֥שׁ יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל וַֽיִּבְחָרֶֽךָּ׃

Thus says Yhwh,
  the redeemer of Israel, its Holy One,
  to one despised,[q] to one abhorred by a nation,
  to the servant of rulers,
"Kings shall see and shall arise;
  princes, and they shall prostrate themselves,
  because of Yhwh, who is faithful,
  the Holy One of Israel, who has chosen you (sg.)."

[8]כֹּה ׀ אָמַ֣ר יְהוָ֗ה
בְּעֵ֤ת רָצוֹן֙ עֲנִיתִ֔יךָ
וּבְי֥וֹם יְשׁוּעָ֖ה עֲזַרְתִּ֑יךָ
וְאֶצָּרְךָ֗ [r] וְאֶתֶּנְךָ֙ לִבְרִ֣ית עָ֔ם

---

[q] According to GKC §75n, לִבְזֹה־נֶ֫פֶשׁ is an infinitive construct ("to the despising of person"); see Koole, *Isaiah III*, 2. 26; North, *Second Isaiah*, 190; and John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40–55* [2 vols.; ICC; London: T &T Clark, 2006] 2. 169). "Person" here could be taken either as the subject or the object. Following the interpretations of Vg, the Targum, and Syr, I take it as the object ("[the act of] despising a person") rather than the subject ("a person's despising"). As Goldingay and Payne (ibid.) and North (*Second Isaiah*, 190) observe, the expression seems to be an *abstracto pro concreto* (see GKC §83c).

[r] LXX, Syr, Vg, and Arabic all have various verbs in the past tense, thus suggesting that the (unpointed) Hebrew verb was understood as a wayyiqtol. However, the root of the verb is unclear. B and the Targum seem to based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* reading יצר ("to form") while A seems to be based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* reading עזר ("to help"). The MT and Vg witness to נצר ("to preserve"). In the absence of a consensus about an alternative, I retain the MT.

לְהָקִ֣ים אֶ֔רֶץ
לְהַנְחִ֖יל נְחָל֥וֹת שֹׁמֵמֽוֹת׃

Thus says Yhwh:
“In a time of favor I have answered you (sg.),
on a day of salvation I have helped you (sg.);
I will watch over you and make[s] you into a covenant of humanity,
[t]to restore possession of a land,[t]
to apportion desolate heritages;

[9]לֵאמֹ֤ר לַאֲסוּרִים֙ צֵ֔אוּ
לַאֲשֶׁ֥ר בַּחֹ֖שֶׁךְ הִגָּל֑וּ
עַל־דְּרָכִ֣ים [u] יִרְע֔וּ
וּבְכָל־שְׁפָיִ֖ים מַרְעִיתָֽם׃

to say to prisoners, ‘Come out,’
to those who are in darkness, ‘Reveal yourselves.’[v]
They shall pasture along the ways,
on all the bare heights shall be their pasture.

[10]לֹ֤א יִרְעָבוּ֙ וְלֹ֣א יִצְמָ֔אוּ
וְלֹא־יַכֵּ֥ם שָׁרָ֖ב וָשָׁ֑מֶשׁ

---

[s] Here, those translations that render the MT’s וְאֶצָּרְךָ֙ וְאֶתֶּנְךָ in the past tense (e.g., *NRSV*) seem to assume a wayyiqtol vocalization. I see no compelling reason for this emendation.

[t—t] Antoon Schoors (*I Am God your Saviour: A Form-Critical Study of the Main Genres in Is. XL-LV* [VTSup 24; Leiden, Brill, 1973] 101-2, n. 3) writes, “הקים ארץ means ‘to put in possession of a land” owing to the meaning of קום, ‘to be established, confirmed (of a purchase),’ in Gen xxiii 17, 20; Lev xxv 30, xxvii19. . . .” Wilson (*Nations*, 264, 277-78) argues that in relation to בְּרִית עָם the term אֶרֶץ requires a universalistic interpretation, “earth/world.” Although DI seems to intend “earth” rather than “land” in its every other use of the word, here the reference to נְחָלוֹת (“inheritances”) strongly suggests that it is the land of Israel that is to be established again. Although נְחָלוֹת in the sense of “inalienable property, especially land” occurs nowhere else in the Bible in the plural form, I agree with Koole (*Isaiah III*, 2. 39) that a universalist interpretation “can only offer contrived explanations of this word.”

[u] 1QIsa^a here reads הרים (“mountains”).

[v] In the qal, hiphil, and hophal גלה can mean “go into exile.” There is possibly an element of wordplay in the use of גלה niphal here which is lost in my translation. The wordplay in 49:9aβ might be rendered along the lines of: “[to say] to those in darkness ‘Exile yourselves [from the *darkness*].’”

כִּֽי־מְרַחֲמָ֣ם יְנַהֲגֵ֔ם
וְעַל־מַבּ֥וּעֵי מַ֖יִם יְנַהֲלֵֽם׃

They shall not hunger or thirst,
neither scorching wind nor sun shall strike them down,
for their Compassionate One will lead them,
and by springs of water will guide them.

[11]וְשַׂמְתִּ֥י כָל־הָרַ֖י לַדָּ֑רֶךְ
וּמְסִלֹּתַ֖י יְרֻמֽוּן׃

And I will make all my mountains a road,
and my highways will be raised up.

[12]הִנֵּה־אֵ֕לֶּה מֵרָח֖וֹק יָבֹ֑אוּ
וְהִנֵּה־אֵ֙לֶּה֙ מִצָּפ֣וֹן וּמִיָּ֔ם
וְאֵ֖לֶּה מֵאֶ֥רֶץ סִינִֽים׃

Behold, these shall come from afar,
and behold, these from the north and from the sea,
and these from the region of Aswan.[w]”

[13]רָנּ֨וּ שָׁמַ֜יִם וְגִ֣ילִי אָ֗רֶץ
וּפִצְח֥וּ [x] הָרִ֖ים רִנָּ֑ה
כִּֽי־נִחַ֤ם יְהוָה֙ עַמּ֔וֹ
וַעֲנִיָּ֖ו יְרַחֵֽם׃ ס

Shout, O heavens, and rejoice, O earth!
Break into shouting, O mountains!
For Yhwh has comforted his people
and will have compassion on his afflicted.

---

[w] Cf. סְוֵנֵה in Ezek 29:10 and 30:6, which is usually transliterated “Syene.” Some English translations (e.g., *NAB* and *NRSV*) take סִינִים in Isa 49:12 to refer to the same place; others (e.g., the JPS *Tanakh* [1985]) make a distinction and transliterate the term in 49:12 as “Sinim.” According to Barthélemy

[x] Here I follow the imperative of the qere, 1QIsa^a, and many MT MSS against the jussive of the ketib יִפְצְחוּ.

B. Implied Speakers and Addressees

My analysis of the portrayal of Yhwh in the MT Second Servant Song (Isa 49:1-13) first considers what Yhwh says and implies about himself and then what the other speakers say and imply about him. A brief analysis of the pericope's implied speakers and audiences is therefore a necessary preliminary step.

The implied audience of vv. 1-6 clearly consists of "isles" and "peoples far away" (v. 1a), that is, the whole world. "[The section] begins with an appeal to the world and ends with a promise to the world."[18]

The verses' implied speaker, however, is not immediately clear. Verse 1b refers to Yhwh in the third person, thus suggesting that he is not the speaker. An autobiographical narrative ensues that cites someone's beginnings "from the womb" (v. 1). It is not, however, until v. 3 that the speaker seems to reveal his identity when he directly quotes Yhwh: "And [Yhwh] said to me, 'You are my servant, Israel, in whom I will receive glory.'"

This revelation on the one hand provides an answer to the question of the speaker's identity: the speaker is Yhwh's Servant Israel. But that identification also poses a problem, as discussed above. Is the speaker "Israel" identical to Jacob/Israel?

If so, how can this pericope qualify as a servant song?[19] The answer to the question seems clear enough. Verse 6 strongly suggests that "Israel" cannot be simply identical to Jacob/Israel in its entirety in light of what Yhwh, as quoted by the Servant, says there: "[Yhwh] said, 'It is easy, on account of your being my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel.'" To assume that the Servant referred to in v. 6 is identical to Jacob/Israel would lead to two improbabilities. First, Yhwh would be portrayed as assigning Jacob/Israel a mission to Jacob/Israel. Second, in the same sentence Yhwh would be addressing Jacob/Israel in the second person while also referring to Jacob/Israel in the third person. Thus, for the purposes of this analysis, I assume that "my servant, Israel" in v. 3 is not identical to Jacob/Israel. In short, my analysis assumes that in vv. 1-6 the speaker is a person or group other than Jacob/Israel whom Yhwh nonetheless calls "my servant, Israel."[20]

---

[18] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 2. 155.

[19] For the purposes of this dissertation, a "servant song" is a passage in DI that is spoken to, by, or about a person (individual or collective) whom Yhwh identifies as "my Servant" and who is not unambiguously identifiable with Jacob/Israel.

Two points of refinement should be noted within vv. 1-6. Although the implied speaker is the Servant and the implied audience is the whole world, in v. 4 the Servant is reporting to the world his complaint to an unidentified addressee (in all likelihood Yhwh), while in v. 3 and vv. 5-6 the Servant informs the world of two direct quotes that Yhwh has addressed to the Servant himself.

The opening of v. 7 marks the start of a new section. Verse 7 begins (as does v. 8) with a *Botenformel* ("Thus says Yhwh"), indicating that here the implied speaker is a prophet. The oracle is delivered to "to one who is despised (לִבְזֹה־נֶפֶשׁ)." If v. 7 is read as a separate oracle, the addressee could be Jacob/Israel.[21] Several factors, however, suggest that this is not the intention of the author/redactor. Words based on the root בזה occur only two other times in DI (in fact, in all of Isaiah), i.e., twice in 53:3 within the Fourth Servant Song, where they form an inclusio.[22] There, בזה niphal participle ("despised") describes the otherwise unidentified Servant of Yhwh. Furthermore, all of 49:7 can be seen as "a careful paraphrase of . . . the . . . 'fourth' servant song. It follows the same pattern of the servant's humiliation and abuse, his ultimate recognition by kings and rulers, and his final vindication by God."[23]

---

[20] My analysis of the portrayal of Yhwh in the Second Servant Song makes no further assumptions about whether the Servant here is an individual or a group, much less assumptions about his/its identity. Nor does it assume that the servant spoken of in one servant song is necessarily the same as the servant(s) spoken of in any other song. Many commentators, in fact, propose that the identity of the Servant varies from song to song (see, e.g., Childs, *Isaiah*, 384 and Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55*, 299-302).

In addition to the allusions in 49:7 to the Fourth Servant Song, vv. 8-12 provide further evidence that the addressee is not Jacob/Israel. Although exegetes who read the oracle as addressed to Jacob/Israel understand Yhwh as the subject of the infinitives "to restore" and "to apportion" in v. 8, this interpretation runs into problems given the next infinitival phrase, where Yhwh is not likely the subject of the words "to say to prisoners . . . and to those who are in darkness" given that the mission to prisoners and those in darkness was delegated to the Servant in the First Servant Song (42:7). Baltzer observes, "From v. 8 onward it is clear that the Servant has tasks to perform on behalf of

---

[21] Grimm and Dittert (*Deutero-Jesaja,* 326-30) take this position, acknowledging it to be "gegen die Mehrzahl der Exegeten."

[22] [53:3] נִבְזֶה֙ וַחֲדַ֣ל אִישִׁ֔ים אִ֥ישׁ מַכְאֹב֖וֹת וִיד֣וּעַ חֹ֑לִי
וּכְמַסְתֵּ֤ר פָּנִים֙ מִמֶּ֔נּוּ נִבְזֶ֖ה וְלֹ֥א חֲשַׁבְנֻֽהוּ׃

("He was held in contempt and forsaken by people, a man of pain and experienced in suffering,
as one from whom people hide their faces, held in contempt, and we held him of no account.")

[23] Childs, *Isaiah,* 386.

[Jacob/Israel]."[24] Further, in vv. 8-12 Jacob/Israel is always referred to in the third person. Thus, if the second person singular masculine pronoun's referent remains ambiguous in v. 7, the ambiguity is resolved in vv. 8-12. Nothing in the text suggests that the second person masculine singular pronoun refers to a different person in v. 7 than it does in vv. 8-12. Rather, in both cases the second person masculine singular pronoun refers to the Servant.

The segment's final verse (v. 13) extends the theme of universalism to all of creation, animate and inanimate, thus forming an inclusio with v. 1. If the isles are to listen in v.1, the mountains, indeed the heavens and the earth, are to shout and rejoice in v. 13. Again the implied audience is the whole world. Presumably the prophet remains the implied speaker.

C. What Yhwh Says or Implies about Himself

49:3 "You are my servant, Israel."

The above statement is a declaration formula, "a one-way formula in nominal form, which affirms the inferior's relationship to the superior. The master orally declares the underling's fellowship to him. The formula, though not a two-fold one (hence it does not explicitly state the reciprocal relationship: 'you are my vassal, I am your lord'), nevertheless implies the vassal-lord fellowship."[25] In the ANE, kings were known as

---

[24] Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 312.

[25] Paul Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East* (AnBib 88; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982) 195.

"servants" of their gods.[26] As previously noted in Chapter Two, however, there are many examples in the OT of Yhwh's referring to personages other than kings as "my servant."

49:3 ". . . in [my Servant] I will boast (אֶתְפָּאָר)."

In the ANE, human events were understood as the outcomes of decisions taken by the council of the gods. "The rise and fall of empires reflected decisions in a divine assembly. . . . One decision leads to the rise of Akkad to hegemony over the city state, another to its fall, again to the rise of Babylon and its fall."[27] While the hierarchy of the gods is not always clear in other ANE religions, in the OT Yhwh is never less than "king of all the gods" (Pss 95:3; 96:4; 97:7-9). Elsewhere in the OT, Yhwh is portrayed as a king seated on a throne consulting with a heavenly council. If in earlier stages of the formation of the OT materials Yhwh's courtiers were also gods themselves, monotheism has reduced their status to כָל־צְבָ֤א הַשָּׁמַיִם "all the host of heaven" (see, e.g., 1 Kgs 22:19-23, which describes the heavenly court scene deciding the outcome of the battle of Ramoth-Gilead). In Isaiah 6, the heavenly entourage consists of ministering seraphs. Indeed, Baltzer sees the opening of DI (Isaiah 40) as a heavenly court scene that begins with an implicit decision about a historical event which involves the return from exile.[28] Yet in Isa 40:13 Yhwh consults no one. Isaiah 41:21 serves as a sort of *coup de grâce* for OT court scenes involving a pantheon. Here the gods are summoned not to a council but for a trial scene. The verdict is quickly reached: "Why, you are nothing and your work is naught! To choose you is an abomination" (*NAB*). Thus in 49:3 Yhwh's self-assurance in predicting the outcome of the Servant's mission shows Yhwh, not a council of gods, as the unique director of the course of human history.

---

[26] See, for example, "Ugaritic Myths, Epics, and Legends: The Legend of King Keret," in *ANET,* 142-49, here 144.

[27] Paul Hanson, "Jewish Apocalyptic against Its Near Eastern Environment," *RB* 78 (1971) 38-39.

[28] Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah,* 47-61.

Yhwh is portrayed in 49:3 as one who will boast in his Servant. אֶתְפָּאָר is the first person common hithpael of פאר which can mean "to boast" (see Isa 10:15 where it is used in synonymous parallelism with the hithpael of גדל, "to brag").[29] Thus, Yhwh foretells, in very human terms, that the Servant will be a source of pride to him.

49:6a "It is easy, on account of your being my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the survivors of Israel."

Here Yhwh is responding to the Servant's complaint in 49:4, "For emptiness have I toiled, for chaos and vapor have I spent my strength." His response is far from the tender empathy associated with motherly images for Yhwh elsewhere in Isaiah (see, e.g., Isa 49:15; 66:11, 13). As Blenkinsopp observes, "Strange, indeed, it must seem by normal standards, this responding to the complaint of inadequacy and failure by adding a further and heavier burden of responsibility."[30] Here Yhwh is portrayed as a tough superior, who seems not particularly moved by the Servant's dejection. Yet there is consolation in Yhwh's word, albeit implicitly. Rather than giving up on the Servant, Yhwh assures him, in marked contrast to what his present failure would seem to suggest, that success is assured precisely because he is Yhwh's Servant. In short, although Yhwh appears here as a tough taskmaster, he is also an unlimited source of strength, who guarantees success to those who remain faithful to his call.

---

[29] D. Vetter, "פאר *p'r* pi to glorify," *TLOT*, 963-64, here 963.

[30] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55,* 301.

49:6b “I will render you a light of nations to be my salvation (יְשׁוּעָתִי) to the ends of the earth!”

Just as in the First Servant Song, Yhwh is portrayed here as the giver of light to those in darkness and deliverance to those in bondage through the human agency of his Servant.[31] The theologically loaded term יְשׁוּעָה (“help/deliverance/salvation”) is open to many interpretations. Here I take the term to have a connotation of justice. That the term *can* connote justice is evident from the fact that it is most frequently paired with צְדָקָה in synonymous parallelism in the OT.[32] The term is also frequently paired with מִשְׁפָּט.[33] That the term *does* connote justice/judgment in 49:6 is suggested by an examination of the various allusions in the Second Servant Song to the First Servant Song (some in the form of verbatim citations):

[49:8] “I will watch over you and make you into a covenant for humanity.” // [42:6] “I will watch over you, and make you into a covenant for humanity.”

[49:6] “I will render you a light of nations.” // [42:6] “I will . . . render you . . . a light of nations.”

---

[31] Does this salvation involve the nations or only Israel dispersed throughout the world? Harry Orlinsky (*Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah: The So-Called “Servant of the Lord” and “Suffering Servant” in Second Isaiah* [VTSup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1977] 98-117) and Clifford (*Fair Spoken,* 153) interpret “light for nations” as a metaphor for Israel whose salvation the nations will witness, without partaking of it themselves. For a similar interpretation see Schoors, *I Am God,* 302.

[32] G. Gerleman, “ישׁע *yšʿ* to help,” *TLOT* 2. 584-87.

[33] Ibid. See also John E. Hartley, “ישׁע,” *TWOT*, 414-16.

[49:9] ". . . to say to prisoners, 'Come out,' to those who are in darkness, 'Reveal yourselves.'"// [42:7] ". . . to open blind eyes, to bring the prisoner out of the dungeon, those sitting in darkness out of the prison house."

The parallel between 49:6 and 42:4 seems to be part of this series, as well:

[49:6] "[He is] to be my salvation to the ends of the earth." // [42:4] "He . . . [will establish] justice on the earth."

In short, Yhwh portrays himself as a deliverer, who purposes to render, through his Servant, justice, enlightenment, and freedom to the ends of the earth.

49:7 "Kings shall see and shall arise; princes, and they shall prostrate themselves because of Yhwh, who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel, who has chosen you."

The implication of this announcement is that Gentile kings and princes will worship Yhwh. The universal worship of Yhwh is prophesied in Isa 45:22 and 23. What will kings see that will evoke such a response? There are two possibilities that are not mutually exclusive. The first possible motivation may be Israel's return from exile.

> Since the return from the diaspora is an event on the stage of the world, foreign kings will be witnesses of it and therefore they will prostrate themselves. . . . [T]heir homage is brought about by Yahwe's [sic] salvific act to Israel. . . . That their homage is brought about by Yahwe's salvific act to Israel, is underlined in the verse [49:7]: Yahwe remained faithful (*ne'ēmān*) to the election (*wayyibḥārekā*).[34]

According to this view, Yhwh's purpose in delivering his people from exile is not only their own welfare but also the revelation of his power and faithfulness to the nations. In the OT, "faithfulness" (as well as cognate words based on אמן niphal) usually pertains to human persons and even things (e.g., “a firm place,” Isa 22:23; “a sure house,” 1 Sam 25:28; 2 Sam 7:16). In the OT, the Hebrew word for “faithful” (נֶאֱמָן) is predicated of Yhwh only here and in Deut 7:9. Yhwh is faithful to his election of Israel and his promise to restore Israel from its Babylonian captivity (Isa 41:8-9; 44:2; 45:4).[35]

---

[34] Schoors, *I Am God,* 103.

The second possible motivation for Gentile kings and princes to worship Yhwh, as spoken of in 49:7, is suggested by the already noted connections between this verse of the Second Servant Song and the Fourth Servant Song. Against that background, the kings’ response as cited in 49:7 would refer to the exaltation of the Servant (52:13-15).

In 49:7 Yhwh calls himself “the Holy One of Israel,” an epithet with many layers of meaning. The thirty-eight occurrences of קָדֹשׁ (the adjectival form of קדשׁ) in Isaiah account for roughly one-third of its uses in the OT.[36] Twenty-six occurrences of the form in Isaiah constitute part of the divine title קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל “the Holy One of Israel,” an epithet that occurs only seven times elsewhere in the OT: once in 2 Kings (2 Kgs 19:22), once each in three psalms (Pss 71:22; 78:41; 89:19), and twice in Jeremiah (Jer 50:29; 51:5). In its oldest meaning, the root קדשׁ had the sense of “imbued with mana”[37] and could be associated with objects (sacred pillars, amulets, etc.) and processes (religious rites and customs). The description of a god as “holy” was particularly common in Canaanite religion.[38] Yhwh is described as “holy,” notably in Isa 6:3 and several psalms (e.g., Ps 99:3, 5, 9). The phrase “the Holy One of Israel” occurs in an eschatological hymn of praise in Isa 12:6 (cf. Ps 71:22). Yhwh’s holiness also has implications for Israel’s conduct (see, e.g., Lev 19:2) and as such is used by the prophets both as a basis for accusations against the people and as a foundation for hope of salvation.[39]

---

[35] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55,* 305.

[36] H.-P. Müller, “קדשׁ *qdš* holy,” *TLOT* 3. 1103-18, here 1106-7. The form occurs twenty times in Exodus, fifteen times in Psalms, and seven times each in Leviticus and Numbers. The form is otherwise rare (with only one or two occurrences) or absent altogether elsewhere in the OT.

[37] Ibid., 1107.

At the end of the verse, Yhwh reminds the Servant that he is “chosen” (cf. 42:1). Yhwh chooses whomsoever he wills to be his Servant. The initiative comes from Yhwh and is often met with resistance or complaint (v. 4).

49:8a Thus says Yhwh: “In a time of favor I have answered you, on a day of salvation I have helped you.”

In this oracle of salvation (49:8a), Yhwh is most likely using the *perfectum propheticum* (GKC §106n): Yhwh’s promise of salvation and help should be considered “as good as done.” That Yhwh’s salvation has not yet occurred is clear in v. 8b, where the sense is that the Servant will experience success in his mission “to restore possession of a land, to apportion desolate heritages” in the future.

Although some exegetes, including Westermann[40] and Koole,[41] make a distinction between “a time of favor” and “a day of salvation,” I see the two phrases here as parallel synonymous expressions typical of Hebrew poetry. Yhwh chooses when he will intervene. Although in English “I have answered” and “I have helped” suggest a distinction between word and action, the Hebrew verb ענה "rarely connotes verbal response when Yhwh is the subject."[42] The Servant has voiced his complaint; Yhwh will most assuredly respond by helping (answering) him at the appointed time.

---

[38] Ibid., 1110.
[39] Ibid., 1107-12.
[40] Westermann, *Isaiah,* 215.
[41] Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 37.

49:8b "I will watch over you and make you into a covenant for humanity, to restore possession of a land, to apportion desolate heritages."

The Servant thinks that he has expended his strength to no avail (49:4). The reassurance that Yhwh will watch over the servant (49:8bα) suggests that the latter has encountered not only indifference but also opposition to his mission.

Verse 8bβ is similar to v. 6 in that in both verses Yhwh responds to the Servant's complaint of apparent failure and fatigue by conferring a worldwide mission upon him. As noted above, 49:8bβ is a verbatim citation from the First Servant Song (42:6). On the one hand, Yhwh's appointing the Servant as "a covenant for humanity" here seems out of place in the context of the rest of the Second Servant Song, which concerns the Servant's mission to Jacob/Israel. This awkwardness may point to the activity of a redactor, who inserted the citation precisely to connect this material more explicitly to the First Servant Song. On the other hand, Yhwh's appointing the Servant as covenant for humanity in the present context may simply point to a mysterious connection, to which I alluded to above, between the Servant's restoration of Israel and his mission to the nations.

Taken as a whole, 49:8b portrays Yhwh as a protector of the Servant. As the establisher of בְּרִית עַם ("a covenant for humanity"), Yhwh can be nothing less than

---

[42] C. J. Labuschagne, "ענה *'nh* I to answer," *TLOT* 2. 929.

Lord of the universe to whom all kings and peoples are as vassals. Yhwh promises restoration of the Land, thus highlighting his faithfulness to Israel, which goes back to his covenant with Abraham. Yhwh will restore and reapportion the land through the human agency of the Servant, much as he acted through Joshua in the original apportioning of the land.

49:9a ". . . to say to prisoners, 'Come out,' to those who are in darkness, 'Reveal yourselves.'"

Since physical imprisonment or confinement to dark places was not the ordinary plight of Israelites in Babylon,[43] the above words more likely allude to forms of metaphorical bondage such as foreign domination and the darkness of profound religious uncertainty. In context, therefore, the words suggest Israel's freedom to return to its homeland and the vision of new hope offered by the unexpected turn of events. The similar images in 42:7 are also at least in part metaphorical; however, while in the first Servant Song freedom and sight are promised universally to those bound and in darkness, here they are promised more specifically to Jacob/Israel.

49:9b-12 "They shall pasture along the ways, on all the bare heights shall be their pasture. They shall not hunger or thirst, neither scorching wind nor sun shall strike them down, for their Compassionate One will lead them, and by springs of water will guide them. And I will make all my mountains a road, and my highways will be raised up. Behold, these shall come from afar, and behold, these from the north and from the sea, and these from the region of Aswan."

What the Servant's role is to be in Israel's homeward journey is not clear. To say that Yhwh himself will lead his people does not exclude that his Servant may be his instrument in doing so. Thus, e.g., while Yhwh is said to have led the Israelites to the

---

[43] Amy Dockser Marcus, *The View from Nebo: How Archaeology is Rewriting the Bible and Reshaping the Middle* East (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2000) 172-73.

Promised Land בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן "through Moses and Aaron" (Ps 77:21), the description of the first exodus in Ps 78:52-53 portrays Yhwh as the Shepherd, not even mentioning the role of Moses and Aaron. Even the promised signs and wonders involving the transformation of nature (*Naturwandlung*) designed to ease Israel's journey could be worked through the Servant acting as a new Moses. At issue here is the portrayal of Yhwh. Whatever the role of the Servant in the actual journey back to the homeland, Yhwh here portrays himself as a shepherd, not only providing for all the needs of his flock and protecting it from all harm but also working extraordinary *Naturwandlungen* on behalf of his people. The motif of Yhwh as the compassionate shepherd echoes Isa 40:11. The *Naturwandlung* motif and, more specifically, the making of a road through the wilderness recall Isa 40:3-4 and 43:19. The motif of Yhwh himself shepherding his people back not only from Babylon but also from all the other nations to which they have been dispersed occurs elsewhere in DI (see 43:5) and in other exilic prophets (e.g., Jer 31:10; Ezek 34:11-16).

D. What Others Say or Imply about Yhwh

49:1b "Yhwh has called me from the womb; from the inward parts of my mother he has pronounced my name."

Parallels in Neo-Assyrian literature refer to kings who were "summoned prenatally to kingship."[44] Isaiah 49:1b also bears similarity to the OT topos of the prophetic commission (see, e.g., Jer 1:5). Whether the Servant is a prophetic figure, a royal personage, or both,[45] Yhwh is portrayed here as purposeful in planning the course of human history, raising up his Servant to play a specific role.

---

[44] See above p.105, n. b and Steven W. Holloway, *Aššur is King! Aššur is King!: Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 10; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 181-82. Blenkinsopp (*Isaiah 40–55,* 300) notes that a calling-from-the-womb scene similar to that of 49:1b is "applied metaphorically to the pre-history of Israel (44:1-2)."

49:2 “And he has made my mouth as a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand he hid me; he made me a polished arrow; in his quiver he concealed me.”

The reference to the Servant’s mouth as a “sword” involves wordplay in Hebrew: פִּי כְּחֶרֶב (“my mouth as a sword”) sounds very much like פִּי־חֶרֶב (“an edge of a sword” [literally, “a mouth of a sword”]). The connection between the mouth/speech and the sword is also found in Ps 64:4; Prov 5:4; and is taken up in the NT (Heb 4:12; Rev 1:16; 19:15).

These words of the Servant are about himself but also contribute to the Song’s picture of Yhwh. Yhwh is often portrayed as a warrior (e.g., Exod 14:14, 25; 15:3; Habakkuk 3). Here Yhwh is armed not with ordinary weapons of violence but with his Servant as ammunition and his Servant’s words as a weapon. Clearly, Yhwh is armed for something other than ordinary battle. That Yhwh has hidden his prized weapon and ammunition suggests a strategy of stealth and surprise (see 49:7). It seems likely that a connection is intended here with 42:13-16 in which Yhwh is portrayed as suddenly exploding into cosmic battle against all his enemies. His explosive action includes transforming nature (for good and for ill), this resulting in enlightenment for the blind and creation of paths facilitating the people’s journeys. The enlightenment of the blind, as noted above, figures prominently in both the First and Second Servant Songs, while the transformation of nature to facilitate Israel's homeward journey is characteristic of the Second Servant Song.

---

[45] See Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 155 for a discussion of both the prophetic and kingly aspects of the Servant’s call described in 49:1-4.

49:4, 5bβ "As for me, I said, 'For emptiness have I toiled, for chaos and vapor have I spent my strength. Yet assuredly, my justice is with Yhwh and my recompense with my God. And I will be honored in the eyes of Yhwh for my God has become my strength.'"

Here I have moved v. 5bβ back to its likely original placement (see p. 116, n. h). In this continuation of the Servant's address to the world (vv. 1-6), the Servant tells of his complaint along with his declaration of trust in Yhwh, two elements of the psalm of individual thanksgiving (cf. Psalms 30 and 116). Implicitly, Yhwh is thereby portrayed as one who responds to the prayers of those who trust in the midst of suffering. That Yhwh does respond to such prayer is confirmed by the oracles of v. 7 and vv. 8-12.

The complaint expresses the Servant's dejection and frustration.[46] Conversely, the Servant's prayer of trust underscores Yhwh's justice and his reward to those who remain faithful despite their suffering. The Servant will be content to be honored in the eyes of Yhwh (note the anthropomorphism), even if not in the eyes of his fellow human beings.[47] The Servant is confident that Yhwh is just and rewards his servants' faithfulness to their missions regardless of human results. Although the Servant has spent his own strength (v. 4), his real strength is to be found in Yhwh (v.5).

---

[46] The frustration of the Servant bears a resemblance to the experience that the prophet Isaiah is told will be his at his call (Isa 6:9).

[47] The difference between Yhwh's perception and that of humanity is expressed in Isa 55:8-9: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways my ways, says the LORD. As high as the heavens are above the earth, so high are my ways above your ways and my thoughts above your thoughts" (*NAB*).

49:5abα “And now Yhwh says—the one who formed me from the womb to be his Servant, to bring Jacob back to him, and that Israel might be gathered to him . . .”

The outward sign of Jacob’s return to God, Israel’s being gathered to Yhwh, will be the return to the land. DI, however, does not portray Yhwh as somehow still having his “name” (in the sense of presence) located in the ruins of the Temple of Jerusalem while awaiting Israel’s homeward journey (cf. 1 Kgs 8:47-49). Yhwh, whose abode is in heaven (40:22), will come (40:10) and lead his scattered people himself as a shepherd leads his flock (40:3-5, 9-11; 52:12). The picture is of Yhwh’s coming to his scattered people wherever they are and leading them as he himself makes his own return (שׁוב) to Zion (52:8). But first Jacob/Israel must be brought back (לְשׁוֹבֵב) spiritually to Yhwh if they are to follow him. Hence, the Servant must lead Jacob/Israel out of its blindness and deafness (42:19) and away from sin (43:24) that they might then follow the Shepherd, the Compassionate One (49:10).

49:7a “Thus says Yhwh, the Redeemer of Israel, its Holy One, to one despised, to one abhorred by a nation, to the servant of rulers . . .”

The prophet portrays Yhwh as גֹּאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, “the kinsman of Israel.” גֹּאֵל, in this context, connotes a kinsman who has done the kinsman’s part by ransoming from bondage (cf. Lev 25:47-49). Thus, the designation “Redeemer of Israel” implies that there is a familial bond between Yhwh and Israel. In 43:3, Yhwh says that he gives Egypt, Cush, and Seba as ransom for his chosen people. McKenzie is surely correct in his assessment: “The line does not mean that Yahweh readily sacrifices any people to preserve Israel; Second Isaiah is more subtle than that. It means that whatever price is necessary to redeem Israel, Yahweh is prepared to pay; the sum is a human figure applied to Yahweh."[48] Still, the metaphor does raise a philosophical question. How can Yhwh, the omnipotent God of all creation and history, be beholden to anyone and obliged to do anything in order to bring his people back?

Although there have been intimations of opposition to the Servant before this point in the servant songs (see especially 49:4), here in 49:7aβ for the first time the intensity of opposition to and contempt for the Servant is made clear. Once again the reader/audience is reminded that Yhwh's evaluation of the Servant is different from that of the Servant's fellow human beings.

49:13 Shout, O heavens, and rejoice, O earth! Break into shouting, O mountains! For Yhwh has comforted his people and will have compassion on his afflicted.

The prophet here portrays Yhwh as the God who receives praise in a liturgy in which all creation participates. The divine attributes that are given as motivation for nature's exuberant rejoicing are not so much Yhwh's power and majesty as rather his compassion for the afflicted and his giving comfort to his people.

E. A Summary of the Portrayal of Yhwh in the Second Servant Song

In the MT Second Servant Song, the Servant and the prophet portray Yhwh in puzzling ways at times. Yhwh is depicted as a warrior who forms his Servant as a weapon and his Servant's word as ammunition, which are kept concealed in Yhwh's hand and quiver respectively as if for a surprise attack. In a different image, Yhwh is portrayed as Israel's "kinsman" (גֹּאֵל) who pays a ransom for his people's freedom and repossession of their land. In the oracle(s) (see vv. 7-12), Yhwh's self-portrayal is also puzzling. After the Servant complains to his Lord about his futile efforts resulting in utter exhaustion, Yhwh at first appears curiously unsympathetic, responding to the Servant's complaint by doubling his workload, albeit while assuring him of success.

---

[48] McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 51.

At the same time, the Second Servant Song is rich in less puzzling imagery describing Yhwh. Yhwh forms his Servant from the womb, protects him, and is his source of strength. Yhwh promises the nations that his Servant will enlighten them and be Yhwh's covenant and salvation for them. As the Holy One of Israel, Yhwh has shaped Israel's experience through his wondrous deeds and ethical demands. As the Compassionate One, Yhwh will shepherd his people in their return to Zion from the four corners of the earth, giving them pasture and protection from the heat and easing their journey by means of *Naturwandlungen*. The sovereign Lord of History will cause kings and princes to fall down in adoration as he faithfully effects the return of his people scattered in exile among the nations and exalts the formerly abhorred and despised Servant. Yhwh is the comforter of Israel whose compassion for the afflicted elicits jubilant praise in a liturgy in which all creation participates.

III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isa 49:1-13

A. Text-critical Notes and Translation

1 ’Ακούσατέ μου,[a] νῆσοι,
καὶ προσέχετε,[b] ἔθνη·
διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ στήσεται, λέγει κύριος,
ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου [c] ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομά μου.

Listen to me, O isles,
and give heed, O peoples!
“After much time it shall stand,” says κύριος.
From my mother’s womb he called my name.

2 καὶ ἔθηκε τὸ στόμα μου ὡσεὶ μάχαιραν ὀξεῖαν
καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔκρυψέ με,
ἔθηκέ με ὡς βέλος ἐκλεκτὸν [d]
καὶ ἐν τῇ φαρέτρᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐσκέπασέ [e] με.

And he made my mouth as a sharp sword
and under the shelter of his hand he hid me.
He made me as a chosen arrow
and in his quiver he sheltered me.

3 καὶ εἶπέ μοι Δοῦλός μου εἶ σύ,[f] Ισραηλ,
καὶ ἐν σοὶ δοξασθήσομαι

And he said to me, “It is you (sg.) who are my Servant Israel
and in you (sg.) I will be glorified.”

---

[a] This first occurrence of μου (“to me”)n the verse is missing in the MSS of the catena group that includes 87, 91, 309 and 490 (*C*) and in Theodoret of Cyrus’s Commentary on Isaiah.

[b] The miniscule MS 88 has an additional μου (“to me”) after προσέχετε (“give heed”).

[c] One of the catena subgroups, consisting of MSS 377, 564, and 565, renders this verse without the pronoun μου at this point.

[d] ἐκλεκτόν (“chosen”) likely reflects ברור. in the translator’s *Vorlage,* the same word that occurs here in the MT. According to BDB, although originally meaning “polished/purified,” the passive participle of ברר evidently acquired the meaning of “chosen” in late biblical Hebrew (see 1 Chr 7:40; 9:22; 16:4; Neh 5:18).

[e] Instead of ἐσκέπασεν (“he sheltered”), many MSS read ἔκρυψεν (“he hid”).

[f] The grammatically unnecessary pronoun σύ (“you”) renders the second person singular addressee emphatic. The pronoun is lacking in MSS 109 and 736.

[4] καὶ ἐγω [g] εἶπα Κενῶς ἐκοπίασα
καὶ εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐθέν [h] ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύν μου·
διὰ τοῦτο ἡ κρίσις μου παρὰ κυρίῳ,
καὶ ὁ πόνος μου ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ μου.

As for me I said, "For emptiness I toiled,
and for vanity and nothingness I have spent my strength.
Therefore my justice is in the presence of κύριος
and my toil before my God."

[5] καὶ νῦν οὕτως λέγει κύριος
ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας δοῦλον ἑαυτῷ
τοῦ συναγαγεῖν τὸν Ιακωβ καὶ Ισραηλ πρὸς αὐτόν·
συναχθήσομαι καὶ δοξασθήσομαι ἐναντίον κυρίου,
καὶ ὁ θεός μου ἔσται μου ἰσχύς.

And now thus says κύριος,
who created me from the womb as his own servant,
to gather Jacob and Israel to him—
(I will be gathered and glorified before κύριος,
and my God will be my strength)

[6] καὶ εἶπέ μοι[i] Μέγα σοί ἐστι τοῦ κληθῆναί σε παῖδά μου
τοῦ στῆσαι τὰς φυλὰς Ιακωβ καὶ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ισραηλ ἐπιστρέψαι·
ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε [j] εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν
τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

—and he said to me—: "It is a great thing for you (sg.) to be called my παῖς
to establish the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the dispersed of Israel.
Behold I have made you (sg.) a light of peoples,
for you (sg.) to be salvation to the end of the earth."

[7] Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε, ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ
Ἁγιάσατε τὸν φαυλίζοντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ

---

[g] The emphasizing pronoun ἐγώ (see n. f), is lacking in Codex Venetus (V).

[h] Instead of οὐθέν, many MSS read the equivalent οὐδέν.

[i] Several MSS and catenae lack μοι ("to me"). The 11th-cent. Munich catena lacks the entire phrase καὶ εἶπέν μοι ("and he said to me"), probably taking it as an unnecessary repetition of v. 5a.

[j] Codex Sinaiticus (S), several MSS of the Hexapla group, the Lucianic recensional group, and the catenae, as well as the patristic commentaries have a plus here: εἰς διαθήκην γένους ("[into] a covenant of a race"). The phrase may have been omitted due to homoiarcton. Nevertheless, I agree with Ziegler that the phrase in question was probably not original but was rather inserted secondarily to harmonize the verse with 42:6.

τὸν βδελυσσόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν δούλων [k] τῶν ἀρχόντων·
βασιλεῖς ὄψονται αὐτὸν καὶ ἀναστήσονται ἄρχοντες
καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῷ ἕνεκεν κυρίου
ὅτι πιστός ἐστιν ὁ ἅγιος Ισραηλ, και ἐξελεξάμην [l] σε.

Thus says κύριος, your deliverer, the God of Israel.
“Hallow (pl.)[m] the one who holds his life in contempt,
who is abhorred by the nations, by the servants of princes.
Kings will see him, and princes shall arise
and shall prostrate themselves before him for the sake of κύριος;
for faithful is the Holy One of Israel, and I have chosen you (sg.).”

[8] οὕτως λέγει κύριος Καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐπήκουσά σου
καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας ἐβοήθησά σοι
καὶ ἔδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην ἐθνῶν
τοῦ καταστῆσαι τὴν γῆν
καὶ κληρονομῆσαι κληρονομίαν ἐρήμου,

Thus says κύριος: “In a time of favor I have heard you,
and in a day of salvation I have helped you;
and I have given you as a covenant of nations
to establish the land
and to inherit an abandoned inheritance.

[9] λέγοντα τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς ’Εξέλθατε,
καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ σκότει ἀνακαλυφθῆναι.
καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν βοσκηθήσονται
καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς τρίβοις ἡ νομὴ αὐτῶν ·

Telling those in bondage ‘Come out!’
and those in darkness to be uncovered.
In all their ways they shall be provided food,
and in all the paths shall be their pasture.

---

[k] Ziegler here adopts τὸν δοῦλον (“the servant/slave”), based on the reading of MSS 410, 90, 130, 311, the original reading of 86, and the presumed *Vorlage* of Jerome’s Latin translation of the LXX passage: “Sic dicit Dominus qui eruit te Deus Israel. Sanctificate eum qui despicit animam suam qui abominationi est gentium, qui servus est principum” (*Commentarius in Isaiam* [*PL,* 24]). Ziegler’s reading τὸν δοῦλον accords with the MT but is at variance with all of the LXX codices, most of the miniscules, all of the Greek Fathers’ commentaries, and both the Syriac and Coptic translations of the LXX. By way of exception, I have chosen not to follow Ziegler in this instance but rather to adopt the above reading (τῶν δούλων) found in the vast majority of witnesses.

[l] Instead of ἐξελεξάμην (“I have chosen”) many MSS read ἐξελεξάτο (“he has chosen”). This is an easier reading in its context and therefore probably not original.

[m] ἁγιάσατε can mean either “sanctify/consecrate” or “revere.” Although “hallow” is somewhat archaic, it captures the ambiguity of the Greek.

[10] οὐ πεινάσουσιν οὐδὲ διψήσουσιν,
    οὐδὲ πατάξει αὐτοὺς καύσων οὐδὲ ὁ ἥλιος,
  ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐλεῶν αὐτοὺς παρακαλέσει
    καὶ διὰ πηγῶν ὑδάτων ἄξει αὐτούς·

They will not hunger or thirst
    nor will burning heat or the sun strike them down,
but rather he, their Mercifully Faithful One, will comfort them
    and through springs of water will lead them.

[11] καὶ θήσω πᾶν ὄρος εἰς ὁδὸν
    καὶ πᾶσαν τρίβον εἰς βόσκημα αὐτοῖς.

And I will make every mountain a road,
    and every path into pasture for them.

[12] ἰδοὺ οὗτοι πόρρωθεν ἔρχονται,
    οὗτοι [n]ἀπὸ βορρᾶ[n]
    καὶ οὗτοι ἀπὸ θαλάσσης,
    ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκ γῆς Περσῶν.

Behold these come from afar,
    these from the north,
    and these from the sea,
    and others from the land of the Persians.

[13] εὐφραίνεσθε, οὐρανοί, καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθω ἡ γῆ,
    ῥηξάτωσαν τὰ ὄρη εὐφροσύνην,[o]
  ὅτι ἠλέησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ
    καὶ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ παρεκάλεσεν.

Rejoice, O heavens; and let the earth be glad:
    let the mountains break forth with joy;
for God has merciful covenantal love[p] for his people,
    and the lowly ones of his people he comforts.

[n—n] V reads ἀπὸ γῆς βορρᾶ ("from the land of the north") in which γῆς is probably a gloss borrowed from LXX Jer 3:18 or possibly a harmonization with ἐκ γῆς Περσῶν ("from the land of the Persians") at the end of the verse.

[o] Many MSS, including the original reading in S, have an additional phrase here: καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ δικαιοσύνην ("and the hills righteousness"). This is most likely a gloss borrowed from LXX Ps 71:3.

[p] See Rudolf Bultmann "ἔλεος," in *TDNT,* 2. 477-87. I discuss the meaning of the term in my exegesis below.

B. Implied Speakers and Addressees

Determining the implied speaker of LXX Isa 49:1a is no simple matter. Leaving aside that question for the moment, I begin with what is clear: the implied speaker in the following verses 49:1b-6 is the παῖς "Israel" (see v. 3), who gives an autobiographical report. Also as in the MT, the opening verse (MT 1a = LXX 1aα) is a summons for the isles and nations to heed. Unlike the MT, however, the LXX does not move directly from the summons to the autobiographical report of the παῖς. Inserted between the summons and the autobiographical report, the LXX relays a brief, enigmatic message that seems to convey a direct quote of κύριος (LXX 1aβ): "After much time it/he shall stand."[49] Thus two questions arise concerning LXX Isa 49:1a. The first question is: Who is the implied speaker here who relays the message of κύριος? The likely candidates are the παῖς or the prophet. The second question is: Does the direct quote of κύριος begin with "After much time it/he will stand" or rather with the command to heed (v. 1aα)? In other words, is the command "Listen to me, O isles, and give heed, O peoples!" to be taken as the implied speaker's own command or as the beginning of the message of κύριος itself? I take the command as a direct quote of κύριος because in the six other LXX DI passages (46:3, 12; 51:1, 4, 7; and 55:2) beginning ἀκούσατέ μου ("hear me") the speaker is κύριος.

---

[49] The discrepancy between the MT and LXX here need not be attributed to a different *Vorlage* or to freedom on the part of the translator. Thus, according to J. Ziegler (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* [ATA 12.3; Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934] 76), the Tetragrammaton יהוה ("Yhwh") in the *Vorlage* of v. 1 was probably construed as יהיה ("it/he will be[come]"). I. L. Seeligmann (*The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* [Mededelingen en Verhandelingen No. 9 van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"; Leiden: Brill, 1948] 66) cites two additional cases where the translator evidently misread the tetragrammaton and translated it as a finite verb: 4:5 and 28:21. In all three cases, the translator mistakenly translated the tetragrammaton as ἔσται ("he/it will be") instead of κύριος or ὁ θεός. Why then in LXX Isa 49:1a did the translator also include the divine name κύριος? The translator may have been unable to determine whether the third letter of the word in question was a *yod* or a *waw* and so decided to "cover his bases" by translating the Hebrew word both as στήσεται and κύριος (cf. 8:18, where the tetragrammaton is translated as ὁ θεός καὶ ἔσται). The translator seems to have added a verb λέγει ("says"), which has no equivalent in MT 49:1.

In the rest of the pericope (vv. 1b-13), the implied speakers and audiences are the same as those identified in my section on the MT of 49:1-13. In vv. 1b-6 the implied speaker remains the Servant and the implied audience the whole world. As with the MT, the Servant's report includes his dialogue with God, which is reported as direct speech.

In v. 7, the *Botenformel* indicates that the implied speaker is the prophet. The prophet addresses someone for whom κύριος is a deliverer. In the context of LXX DI, κύριος is frequently referred to as the deliverer of Jacob/Israel (e.g., 44:6; 47:4; 48:17; 48:20) but never as the deliverer of his Servant (παῖς).[50] Therefore, the oracle is most likely addressed to Jacob/Israel.[51] The content of the oracle (v. 7) begins with the command to "hallow . . . the one abhorred by the nations." This can hardly mean that Jacob/Israel is to hallow itself; rather it is the Servant who is to be hallowed first by Jacob/Israel and then by kings.[52]

---

[50] By "Servant (παῖς)" I mean one whom κύριος refers to as his παῖς or δοῦλος (within LXX DI) without clearly meaning Jacob/Israel.

[51] See Grelot, *Poèmes,* 93: "[L]'interprétation de tout le passage . . . invite en effet à distinguer le peuple pris dans son ensemble (cf. le suffixe de la 2^e personne du singulier au début du verset) et le personnage dont il va être question maintenant à la 3^e personne. Ce personnage doit être 'sanctifié' en vue de sa glorification finale par les rois et les gouvernants (v. 7c)."

[52] See Ekblad, *Servant Poems,* 87.

In vv. 8-12 another *Botenformel* indicates that the speaker is the prophet. The oracle is most likely addressed to the Servant because the addressee is given missions to "those in bondage" and "those in darkness," missions assigned to the παῖς in the First Servant Song (see 42:7). Furthermore, in this verse Jacob/Israel is a recipient, not an agent, of deliverance. Isa 49:13 is addressed to all creation as a sort of inclusio with 49:1.

C. What κύριος Says or Implies about Himself

49:1aβ "After much time it shall stand," says κύριος.

The most likely meaning of this enigmatic oracle (v.1aβ) becomes more apparent after a brief look at the structure of vv. 1-7, which comprises a four-part chiasm based on the repetition of certain words.[53]

A [1] ᾿Ακούσατέ μου, νῆσοι, καὶ προσέχετε, **ἔθνη** · διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ ***στήσεται***, λέγει κύριος, ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομά μου [2]καὶ **ἔθηκε** τὸ στόμα μου ὡσεὶ μάχαιραν ὀξεῖαν καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔκρυψέ με, **ἔθηκέ** με ὡς βέλος **ἐκλεκτὸν** καὶ ἐν τῇ φαρέτρᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐσκέπασέ με.

B [3] καὶ εἶπέ μοι **Δοῦλός** μου εἶ σύ, Ισραηλ, καὶ ἐν σοὶ **δοξασθήσομαι** [4] καὶ ἐγω εἶπα Κενῶς ἐκοπίασα καὶ εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς ἔδωκα τὴν **ἰσχύν μου** · διὰ τοῦτο ἡ κρίσις μου παρὰ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ πόνος μου **ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ μου**.

B′ [5] καὶ νῦν οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας **δοῦλον** ἑαυτῷ τοῦ συναγαγεῖν τὸν Ιακωβ καὶ Ισραηλ πρὸς αὐτόν · συναχθήσομαι καὶ **δοξασθήσομαι ἐναντίον** κυρίου, καὶ **ὁ θεός μου** ἔσται μου **ἰσχύς**.

A′ [6] καὶ εἶπέ μοι Μέγα σοί ἐστι τοῦ κληθῆναί σε παῖδά μου τοῦ ***στῆσαι*** τὰς φυλὰς Ιακωβ καὶ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ισραηλ ἐπιστρέψαι· ἰδοὺ **τέθεικά** σε εἰς φῶς **ἐθνῶν** τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. [7] Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ ῾Αγιάσατε τὸν φαυλίζοντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τὸν βδελυσσόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν **ἐθνῶν** τῶν δούλων τῶν ἀρχόντων · βασιλεῖς ὄψονται αὐτὸν καὶ ἀναστήσονται ἄρχοντες καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῷ ἕνεκεν κυρίου ὅτι πιστός ἐστιν ὁ ἅγιος Ισραηλ, και **ἐξελεξάμην** σε.

---

[53] This chiastic structure is lacking in MT Isa 49:1-7. Some of the unexpected Greek equivalents that the translator chose as translations of Hebrew terms seem to have been selected precisely with this chiasm in mind. I am indebted to Ekblad (*Servant Poems,* 86) for his careful analysis of the recurrent vocabulary in the chiasm, although I differ substantially with him regarding the chiasm's divisions.

Forms of the verb ἵστημι are prominent in both A and A′, suggesting, at least as a starting point, that v. 7 may give us a clue as to the meaning of στήσεται in v. 1. The establishment of Jacob/Israel (v. 7) is at the heart of the Servant's mission. In their main thrust, vv. 1-7 include the idea that despite its initial failure the Servant's mission will succeed. Thus, v. 1aβ can be understood as affirming that eventually Jacob will be "established." Indeed, v. 1a works well in relation to the whole of vv. 1-7 as a quasi-title involving a double entendre; "he (it) will stand" means that Jacob/Israel will be firmly established, while "it will stand" suggests that the word of κύριος will come to pass. That both will happen only "after much time"—at least in the way hoped for— would have been painfully obvious to the Jews in Egypt, for whom LXX Isaiah was translated centuries after the decree of Cyrus.

In short, κύριος portrays himself in v. 1a as Lord of the whole world and Lord of History, who not only foretells future events but also implicitly calls the whole world to believe what he foretells. The time range of this message ("after a long time") is characteristic of exilic and postexilic prophecy, which no longer sees God as one who reacts quickly to human action (or nonaction), but who does have "a detailed plan for the history of all the nations which he was working out in a more or less predetermined manner."[54]

---

[54] John Barton, "Post-Exilic Prophecy," in *ABD,* 5. 489-95, here 491.

49:3 And he said to me, "It is you who are my servant Israel and in you I will be glorified."

As discussed in the section on MT 49:1-13, "my Servant Israel" in 49:3 can hardly be simply identical to Jacob/Israel, primarily because in both the MT and LXX, v. 6 indicates that the Servant Israel has a mission to Jacob/Israel. Therefore, in designating the Servant with the name formerly associated only with the patriarch Jacob/Israel or his descendants en masse, κύριος asserts his lordship in yet another way that is distinct from his previous summoning all peoples to attention and his prediction of future events. The assigning of a name displays superiority. For example, Adam has the authority to name the animals (Gen 2:l9), and a mother (Gen 4:1, 25) or a father (Gen 4:26) have the authority to name their children. The changing of an existent name—usually the prerogative of God—is shared by Moses when he changes the name of Hoshea son of Nun to Joshua (Num 13:16). The authority to confer the name "Israel" on his Servant, however, is unique to κύριος.

Why does κύριος call the Servant δοῦλος instead of παῖς (cf. 42:1; 49:6)? While Grelot takes his doing so as a sign that the two terms are interchangeable,[55] I think it more likely that the use of δοῦλος emphasizes the paradox that κύριος will be glorified in one who is lowly (see especially 49:7). Conversely, when κύριος uses the term παῖς in v. 6, he emphasizes the dignity of the παῖς in response to his dejection (v. 4).

---

[55] Grelot, *Poèmes*, 90. For in-depth discussions of the use of δοῦλος and παῖς in the LXX Pentateuch, see Arie van der Kooij, "Servant or Slave? The Various Equivalents of Hebrew *'Ebed* in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana 2007* (ed. M. K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: SBL, 2008) 225-38; and Benjamin Wright, "Δοῦλος and Παῖς as Translations of עבד: Lexical Equivalences and Conceptual Transformations," in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Cambridge, 1995* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 263-77.

In this verse κύριος stands in a lord-vassal (or perhaps more specifically a king-minister) relationship to "Israel." Once again, κύριος is also portrayed as the Lord of History in his ability to foretell that he will be glorified in his Servant.

49:6 And he said to me: "It is a great thing for you to be called my παῖς to establish the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the dispersed of Israel. Behold I have made you a light of peoples (φῶς ἐθνῶν), for you to be salvation (σωτηρίαν) to the end of the earth."

The above words of κύριος are a remarkable departure from MT Isa 49:6a ("It is easy, on account of your being my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the survivors of Israel"). It is hard to conceive of a plausible explanation for the LXX's reading, whose meaning is nearly the opposite of that of the MT; furthermore, there is "no textual evidence outside of the LXX to support this variant."[56] Most likely, the LXX translator found the reply unworthy of God and, "scandalized by the prophet's words[,] . . . directly reverse[d] the line's meaning."[57] In LXX Isa 49:6, κύριος speaks as a supportive father figure, who emphasizes the dignity of the role he has given his παῖς and acknowledges the immensity of his first task vis-à-vis Jacob/Israel—to say nothing of his additional mission to the world. He even shares with his παῖς the titles of “light” and “salvation” which elsewhere refer to κύριος himself.[58]

---

[56] Ekblad, *Servant Poems,* 108.

[57] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 166.

49:7 “Hallow the one who holds his life in contempt, who is abhorred by the nations (ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν), by the servants of princes. Kings (βασιλεῖς) will see (ὄψονται) him and princes shall arise and shall prostrate themselves before him for the sake of κύριος; for faithful is the Holy One of Israel, and I have chosen you (sg.).”

κύριος calls for Jacob/Israel to revere his παῖς. No such command occurs in the MT. A likely explanation for this striking difference is that the *Vorlage* in each case read קדשו, which in the MT tradition was vocalized קְדֹשׁוֹ (“its [Israel’s] Holy One”), the last in a series of appositions referring to Yhwh, while the LXX Isaiah translator evidently took the term in his unpointed *Vorlage* to mean קַדְּשׁוּ (“hallow” [2nd person imperative]). The oracle also foretells that princes will prostrate themselves before him for his (κύριος) sake. Three key words of 49:7 (ἐθνῶν, βασιλεῖς, and ὄψονται) connect this verse with 52:15, a pivotal verse in the Fourth Servant Song, which describes a similar reversal of the Servant’s fortune. That κύριος commands Jacob/Israel to hallow his παῖς and specifies that kings and princes will prostrate themselves before the παῖς show the support of κύριος for his παῖς despite present failure. The Servant had already portrayed himself in v. 4 as a failure in his mission. Here we are given an even grimmer picture of his fate as one despised by nations. This raises the question, how will κύριος bring about such a reversal of fortune in the face of this human resistance and hatred?

---

[59] Cf. LXX Ps 26:1, κύριος φωτισμός μου καὶ σωτήρ μου (“Κύριος is my light and my savior”) and Ps 117:21, ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ὅτι ἐπήκουσάς μου καὶ ἐγένου μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν (“I will thank you for you heard me and became my salvation”).

However the reversal may occur, the vindication of the παῖς will show the faithfulness of κύριος to Jacob/Israel whom he has chosen (Isa 14:1; 41:8, 9; 43:10; 44:1,2).[59]

49:8-9a "In a time of favor I have heard you and in a day of salvation I have helped you; and I have rendered you as a covenant of nations to establish the land and to inherit an abandoned inheritance, telling those in bondage 'Come out!' and those in darkness to be uncovered."

κύριος answers prayer at the time when in his infinite wisdom he sees fit. The παῖς will establish the land and inherit a desolate inheritance (presumably the reference is to the abandoned land of Israel) in order to be a covenant to peoples. In the process, the Servant will liberate those in bondage and darkness. κύριος here speaks as Sovereign over all peoples, who will be in a covenant relationship with him as his vassals through his Servant.[60] He is also Liberator of those in bondage and darkness through the agency of his Servant.

49:9b-12 "In all their ways they shall be provided food (βοσκηθήσονται), and in all the paths shall be their pasture. They will not hunger or thirst nor will burning heat or the sun strike them down, but rather he, their Mercifully Faithful One, will comfort them and through springs of water lead them. And I will make every mountain a road, and every path into pasture for them. Behold these come from afar, these from the north, and these from the sea, and others from the land of the Persians."

MT 49:9b-12, as a prophetic text written from the point of view of being in exile in Babylon, depicts the exiles coming from other regions, namely, the north, west, and *south*. On the other hand, the LXX translator had Egypt as his reference point and so depicts the "other" exiles arriving from the non-Egyptian parts of the Diaspora, i.e., coming from the north, west and *east*. κύριος is the Provider and Protector of his people who works *Naturwandlung* to ease their homeward journey. The references to pasture (βόσκω, whence βοσκηθήσονται, related to the Latin *pasco, pascere*) evoke the image of κύριος as herdsman or shepherd with its obvious connections to the exodus from Egypt (see, e.g., LXX Ps 76:21 [MT Ps 77:20]).

---

[59] See Ekblad, *Servant Poems,* 122.

[60] See Chapter Two of this dissertation for a discussion of the phrase "covenant for humanity."

D. What Others Say or Imply about κύριος

49:1b-2 From my mother's womb he called my name. And he made my mouth as a sharp sword and under the shelter (σκέπην) of his hand he hid me. He made me as a chosen arrow and in his quiver he sheltered (ἐσκέπασέν) me.

κύριος is here portrayed as an archer and swordsman who, in his divine plan, fashions his Servant's mouth (that is, his power of speech) to be "his sword" and forms his Servant to be "the chosen arrow in his quiver." As in the MT, the purpose of κύριος in carrying such metaphorical weaponry is likely related to his actions as a warrior described in 42:13-16.[61] In this verse (LXX Isa 49:2), the translator uses two cognate words related to σκέπω ("shelter") in making explicit the intention of κύριος to protect his Servant. In the corresponding MT verse, Yhwh's intention of protecting the Servant is at best implicit.

49:4 As for me I said, "For emptiness I toiled, and for vanity and nothingness I have spent my strength. Therefore my justice is in the presence of κύριος and my work (πόνος) before my God."

The Servant has thus far received no reward from his labors and for that reason ('therefore") depends on κύριος for "justice" (here, in the sense of a just reward). The meanings of the word πόνος include "labor," "the fruit of labor," and "the suffering attendant upon hard labor." In the context, the last meaning is the most apt one. The translator's word choice may have been made to create an intertextual relationship with the same noun in the Fourth Servant Song (see Isa 53:4 and 11), the only other occurrences of πόνος in LXX DI. κύριος is depicted as a just master who will not leave unrequited the toil of the Servant, despite its difficulty and apparent fruitlessness. κύριος could also be seen as in some sense lifting up the Servant, who speaks of his justice—i.e., his just reward—"in [his] presence."

---

[61] Cyril of Alexandria (*PG* 70, 1037-40) presents a different view born of the *sensus plenior*. For him the quiver in which the arrow is hidden is God's foreknowledge and the purpose of the arrow is the destruction of Satan. "Yet he wounds in another way, for benefit and salvation. Thus it says in the Song of Songs, 'I am wounded with love' (Song 2:5)."

49:5 κύριος . . . created me from the womb as his own servant, to gather Jacob and Israel to him (πρὸς αὐτόν). I will be gathered (συναχθήσομαι) and glorified before κύριος, and my God will be my strength.

κύριος here is portrayed as not only the speaker's lord/king/master but also as his Creator. He has created the Servant with a mission in mind, namely, in order to gather Jacob/Israel to him. κύριος will also gather[62] and glorify the Servant before himself and will be his strength.

49:7aβ κύριος, your deliverer, the God of Israel

Unlike the corresponding verse in the MT, in which Yhwh is said to be the "Redeemer/Ransomer" of Israel, the LXX has the prophet refer to κύριος as Israel's "Deliverer." It is clear that the translator knew words based on λυτρόω ("to ransom")—

---

[62] Seeligmann (*Septuagint,* 116) takes the verb συναχθήσομαι in v. 5 as a clear indication that in LXX Isaiah 49 the Servant is "the people." "Here Israel is made to declare—cf. 44.23—that she will be glorified when gathered together once more from among the peoples." While it is not my intention to take a position on the identity of the Servant, I see two problems with his proposal. First, it should be noted that συναχθήσομαι has a whole range of meanings, including "I will be invited/received as a guest," and "I will be advanced" which open up other interpretative possibilities, especially in light of the Fourth Servant Song. Second, Seeligmann does not address the famous problem of how Israel, in v. 6, can have a task vis-à-vis Jacob/Israel.

including λυτρούμενος ("one who redeems")—as renderings for words based on the Hebrew root גאל, since he used such words to translate גאל in reference to God words a total of ten times in LXX Isaiah (35:9; 41:14; 43:1, 14; 44:22, 23, 24; 52:3; 62:12). Thus, there is no obvious reason why he chose words based on the less precise equivalent ῥύομαι in Isa 44:6; 47:4; 48:20; 49:26; 51:10; 52:9; 54:5, 8; and 59:20, as well as in the present verse.

Although the translator's reasons for rendering גאל as he does here may well have been purely stylistic, the impact of his translational choice on the portrayal of κύριος in the Second Servant Song is significant. That a god would be a deliverer, in the sense of rescuer, is a universal concept of a powerful deity. Thus the portrayal of κύριος as ὁ ῥυσάμενος would pose little difficulty to a Alexandrian Jewish audience conscious of its minority standing in a sophisticated cosmopolitan center of learning. κύριος as a "redeemer" is another matter. In what sense is a deity who needs to pay a ransom all-powerful? There is, of course, emotional appeal in a story of a deity who takes on the role of a kinsman and, at some cost to himself, effects the release of a people whom he addresses as ὁ παῖς μου. But in the sophisticated milieu of Alexandria did the translator cringe somewhat at such an idea? In a city famous for the study of philosophy did the notion of the God of Israel paying ransom, i.e., as a λύτρον ("redeemer"), come across as a bit too "folksy," a bit too mythological—especially when the translation "deliverer" seemed to do justice to the *Vorlage*'s term?[63]

---

[63] This assumes the *Vorlage* here was identical to the MT, something we cannot know for sure. According to F. Büchsel, "λύτρον," in *TDNT*, 4. 340-349, here 340 n. 8, "λύτρον plays no part in Gk.

This suggestion of course raises the question of why the translator does not eliminate the idea of God as Redeemer from Isaiah completely. This question will be taken up in Chapter 6 which is concerned with the Servant Songs' portrayal of God vis-à-vis his portrayal in the whole of DI.

49:13 Rejoice, O heavens; and let the earth be glad: let the mountains break forth with joy; for God has merciful covenant love (ἠλέησεν) for his people, and the lowly ones of his people he comforts (παρεκάλεσσεν).

If we assume that the *Vorlage* was identical to the MT, the translator evidently was judicious in his translations of the verbs of which κύριος is the subject: in the MT, Yhwh comforts (נחם piel) his people and has pity (רחם, piel) on the lowly ones of his people. Here the translator renders נחם, piel not as as παρεκάλεσεν as one might expect but rather as ἠλέησεν.[64] In general, the LXX speaks of the ἔλεος of κύριος not as an emotion but rather as "his faithful and merciful help . . . the חסד which God has promised, so that, although one cannot claim it, one may certainly expect it. In other words the thought of חֶסֶד and the thought of covenant belong together."[65] κύριος has a covenant, and hence ἔλεος, not only vis-à-vis the poor of his people, but also his people as

---

philosophical usage. Philo in Sacr. AC, 121 says: πᾶς σοφὸς λύτρον φαύλου and v. Arnim, III, p. 162, 4f. claims that this is Stoic. It certainly corresponds to statements in which the Stoics extol the sage, but it may be that Philo is simply imitating such statements. Epict[etus] does not use λύτρον."

[64] According to Rudolf Bultmann ("ἔλεος," in *TDNT,* 2. 477-87, here 479), although words related to ἐλεέω often translate words related to חסד in the LXX, it is not unusual to find the former also translating רחם piel, as in this verse. Although Stoicism saw ἔλεος as "a sickness of the soul," other schools of Greek philosophy found ἔλεος "fitting for the noble. . . . [T]he deity can also be the subject of ἔλεος (ἐλεεῖν); thus God's ἔλεος is displayed in regeneration. . . ." (ibid., 477-78).

[65] Ibid., 480.

a whole. Thus, according to this verse, the reason creation should praise κυριός is that he acts out of faithfulness to his promises.

In addition, if we assume that the *Vorlage* was identical to the MT, the translator renders the piel of רחם ("to have compassion") with a somewhat free equivalent, a form of παρακαλέω ("to comfort/console"). Thus, κύριος is also to be praised for his "consolation" of the lowly ones of Israel. LXX Isaiah 40–55, sometimes referred to as "The Book of Consolation," begins (40:1) with the double command παρακαλεῖτε παρακαλεῖτε τὸν λαόν μου λέγει ὁ θεός ("'Console, console my people,' says God"). At the end of 49:1-13, the "second prologue" of DI (see p. 113), it is only fitting that the final word should correspond to the first word of the first prologue. κύριος here is portrayed not only as one who commands that consolation be given, but also as a Consoler himself (cf. 40:10-11; 41:27; 51:3, 12). To console is an action whereas to have pity is a passion, an emotion. Is the translator avoiding the philosophical problem of a God who has emotions?

E. Summary of the Portrayal of God in the LXX Second Servant Song

Much is revealed and implied in the LXX Second Servant Song about κύριος through his own words and those of others, especially regarding his relationship to the world, to Jacob/Israel, and to his παῖς, whom he calls "Israel." κύριος is Lord of the whole world, for which he wills salvation and enlightenment. As Lord of history, he addresses the whole world and implicitly calls upon all to believe what he foretells. The relationship of κύριος to the world is that of a sovereign with kings and nations as his vassals; κύριος acts through the agency of his παῖς who is in some mysterious sense διαθήκην ἐθνῶν ("a covenant of nations").

κύριος, the Deliverer, foretells the restoration of Jacob/Israel, which he will effect in part through the agency of his παῖς. κύριος is Liberator of those in bondage, Enlightener of those in darkness; likewise through the agency of his παῖς, κύριος will shepherd his people, who are dispersed to the four corners of the world, providing for and protecting them in their journey back to their homeland, and working *Naturwandlungen* to facilitate their journey. κύριος is deserving of praise from all creation for his faithful love toward Jacob/Israel and as Consoler of the lowly of his people.

κύριος is like an archer and swordsman, who—as Creator of the Servant—fashions him in order to use him with stealth as his weapon. κύριος is related to his παῖς as his master and more specifically as a king to his minister, whom he names "Israel," and by whom he will be glorified. κύριος answers the prayer of his παῖς according to his own timing. κύριος speaks as a compassionate father to his παῖς and asserts his all-encompassing role that extends not only to the dispersed of Jacob/Israel but also to the nations as their Light and Salvation (titles often applied to himself). κύριος is Protector of his παῖς. As a just master, κύριος inspires confidence and maintains a level of intimacy with his παῖς, whom he will reward justly. κύριος will "gather" his παῖς and be his strength.

Finally, readers and hearers are left to wonder why κύριος as Sovereign Lord of the world and Lord of History allows his παῖς to be an object of scorn and hatred before he brings about the astonishing reversal of fortune that he promises for his παῖς.

IV. Comparison of the Portrayal of God in the MT and LXX Texts of Isa 49:1-13

MT Isa 49:1-13	**LXX Isa 49:1-13**
[1]Listen, O isles, to me, and give heed, O peoples far away! Yhwh has called me from the womb; from the inward parts of my mother he has pronounced my name.	[1]Listen to me, O isles, and give heed, O peoples! “After much time it shall stand,” says κύριος. From my mother’s womb he called my name.
[2]And he has made my mouth; as a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand he hid me; he made me a polished arrow; in his quiver he concealed me.	[2]And he made my mouth as a sharp sword and under the shelter of his hand he hid me. He made me as a chosen arrow and in his quiver he sheltered me.
[3]And he said to me, “You (sg.) are my Servant, Israel, in whom I will boast.”	[3]And he said to me, “It is you (sg.) who are my Servant Israel and in you (sg.) I will be glorified.”
[4]As for me, I said, “For emptiness have I toiled for chaos and vapor have I spent my strength. Yet assuredly, my justice is with Yhwh and my recompense with my God.”	[4]As for me I said, “For emptiness I toiled, and for vanity and nothingness I have spent my strength. Therefore my justice is in the presence of κύριος and my toil before my God.”
[5]And now Yhwh says— the one who formed me from the womb to be his Servant, to bring Jacob back to him, and that Israel might be gathered to him (and I will be honored in the eyes of Yhwh	[5]And now thus says κύριος who created me from the womb as his own servant, to gather Jacob and Israel to him—(I will be gathered and glorified before κύριος,

for my God has become my strength)—	and my God will be my strength)
[6]he said,	[6]–and he said to me—:
“It is easy, on account of your (sg) being my Servant,	“It is a great thing for you (sg) to be called my παῖς
to raise up the tribes of Jacob	to establish the tribes of Jacob
and to bring back the survivors of Israel	and to bring back the dispersed of Israel.
—therefore I will make you (sg.)	Behold I have made you (sg.)
into a light of nations	a light of peoples,
to be my salvation	for you (sg.) to be salvation
to the ends of the earth!”	to the end of the earth.”
[7]Thus says Yhwh,	[7]Thus says κύριος,
the redeemer of Israel,	your (sg.) deliverer, the God of Israel:
its Holy One,	“Hallow (pl.) the one
to one despised,	who holds his life in contempt,
to one abhorred by a nation	who is abhorred by the nations,
to the servant of rulers,	by the servants of princes.
“Kings shall see and shall arise;	Kings will see him,
princes,	and princes shall arise
and they shall prostrate themselves	and will prostrate themselves before him
because of Yhwh,	for the sake of κύριος;
who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel,	for faithful is the Holy One of Israel,
who has chosen you (sg.).”	and I have chosen you (sg.).”
[8]Thus says Yhwh:	[8]Thus says κύριος:
“In a time of favor I have answered you (sg.),	“In a time of favor I have heard you (sg.),
on a day of salvation	and in a day of salvation
I have helped you (sg.);	I have helped you (sg.);
I will watch over you (sg.)	
and make you (sg.)	and I have given you (sg.)
into a covenant of humanity,	as a covenant of nations
to restore possession of a land,	to establish the land
to apportion desolate heritages;	and to inherit an abandoned inheritance.
[9]to say to prisoners, ‘Come out,’	[9]Telling those in bondage ‘Come out!’
to those who are in darkness,	and those in darkness
‘Reveal yourselves.’	to be uncovered.
They will pasture along the ways,	In all their ways they will be provided food,
on all the bare heights	and in all the paths
will be their pasture.	will be their pasture.

[10]They will not hunger or thirst neither scorching wind nor sun shall strike them down, for their Compassionate One will lead them, and by springs of water will guide them.	[10]They will not hunger or thirst nor will burning heat or the sun strike them down, but rather he, their Mercifully Faithful One, will comfort them and through springs of water will lead them.
[11]And I will make all my mountains a road, and my highways will be raised up.	[11]And I will make every mountain a road and every path into pasture for them.
[12]Behold, these shall come from afar, and behold, these from the north and from the sea, and these from the region of Aswan.”	[12]Behold, these come from afar, these from the north, and these from the sea, and others from the land of the Persians.”
[13]Shout, O heavens, and rejoice, O earth! Break into shouting, O mountains! For Yhwh has comforted his people and will have compassion on his afflicted	[13]Rejoice, O heavens; and let the earth be glad: let the mountains break forth with joy; for God has merciful covenantal love for his people, and the lowly ones of his people he comforts.

The MT and LXX texts of Isa 49:1-13 are in substantial agreement in their portrayal of God as he relates to the Servant, to Jacob/Israel, to the nations, and indeed to all creation. In both, the Servant/παῖς depicts God as the one who formed him and called him (that is, commissioned him) from the womb (49:1,5). For the Servant, God is a Warrior, who as Archer and Swordsman makes the Servant like an arrow for his quiver and his Servant’s word as a sword in his right hand (49:2). Despite his hardships, the Servant expresses supreme trust in God by portraying him as the Just One who will provide recompense (49:4) and by referring to God as “my Strength” (49:5).

God implicitly depicts himself as lord/master in referring to "my Servant"; more precisely, his relationship to his Servant is that of a King to his minister; by naming his Servant "Israel," God asserts his supreme authority, and in foretelling his own glorification through his Servant, God speaks as Lord of History (49:3). God is portrayed as the protector of the Servant/παῖς ("I will watch over you," MT 49:8 and "He sheltered me," LXX 49:2). God portrays himself as a helper (49:8) who answers the prayer of his Servant, who—even though he is abhorred by nations—remains unswerving in his trust. God answers the Servant's prayer, doing so, however, when in his infinite wisdom he sees fit (49:8a).

In relationship to Jacob/Israel, God, in both the MT and LXX, refers to himself as "the Holy One of Israel" (49:7), who as Lord of History foretells the restoration of Jacob/Israel to its inheritance, which he will effect, at least in part, through the agency of his Servant/παῖς (49:6a). As Shepherd of Israel**,** God will care for his people, giving them pasture, slaking their thirst, protecting them from heat, and working *Naturwandlungen* to ease their return journey to Zion from the four corners of the earth (49:10-12).

By addressing the whole world, the opening of the song in both the MT and LXX implies that God wills to reveal his plan to all the nations (49:1). God appoints the παῖς in some mysterious sense as "covenant of nations" (49:8b). Implicitly, God does this as Supreme Sovereign over all kings and nations, who become his vassals through his Servant/covenant. God is Savior of the nations: God wills that his Servant be light of the nations and salvation to the ends of the earth (49:6b). In foretelling that kings and princes will prostrate themselves, God implicitly asserts once again that he is Lord of History (49:7).

In the final verse of the segment, the Prophet, in both MT and LXX, portrays God as Lord of Heaven and Earth and as deserving of praise from all creation (49:13). Creation's praise gives witness to God's goodness to Jacob/Israel and to his care for his afflicted ones.

In both texts, readers/hearers are left to wonder why God as Sovereign Lord of the world and Lord of history allows his παῖς to be an object of scorn and hatred and how he will bring about the astonishing reversal of fortune he promises for his παῖς (49:7).

Despite their substantial agreement, the MT and LXX texts of Isa 49:1-13 do differ in various emphases and nuances in their respective portrayals of God. In the MT, the Lord of History speaks in a way congruent with the oracles typical of preexilic prophecy, with the implied audience being invited to read the signs of the times as a means of discerning imminent events. In the LXX, especially in 49:1β, the Lord of History speaks more in line with the oracles of postexilic prophecy, that is, with the long sweep of history bordering on the eschatological in view. Although in both texts God implicitly wills to make his plans known to the nations, in the MT God is not portrayed as directing an oracle towards them. By contrast, through the quasi-oracle of 49:1β, the LXX portrays God as addressing the nations with a message expressly directed to the whole world and implicitly calling for their belief in his word.

Various differences also point to a portrait of a more rational, congenial God in LXX Isa 49:1-13 than in the corresponding MT text, especially in the portrayal of his relationship to his παῖς. The most striking of these differences is found in LXX v. 6 where God's initial response to the Servant's complaint ("It is a great thing for you [sg.] to be called my παῖς . . .") makes far more sense than the MT's puzzling answer by Yhwh, which reads almost as a *non sequitur* ("It is easy, on account of your [sg.] being my Servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to bring back the survivors of Israel . . ."). More subtle differences in the LXX text also seem to portray God as more sensitive towards his Servant, whose relationship with him is one of greater reciprocity. In v. 2, the LXX portrays God as "sheltering" his Servant in his quiver. In the MT, God is portrayed rather as "concealing" the Servant, an action which is not as obviously intended for the Servant's good. In v. 5 the Servant sees himself as God's "*own* Servant," a nuance missing in the MT. In LXX 49:6, God refers to him as παῖς μου, with its possible connotation of sonship, lacking in MT 49:6. While in both texts the Servant portrays God as the Just One who will compensate him, the LXX—unlike the MT—uses expressions that suggest greater intimacy in that the just compensation for the παῖς will be given "in the presence of" (παρά, ἐναντίον) God (49:4b).

The Alexandrian audience, for which DI was most likely translated, was surely attuned to Greek philosophy, a thought world quite different from the one surrounding the exiles in Babylon for whom DI wrote. Several differences between the MT and LXX texts of the Second Servant Song point to a LXX depiction of God adjusted to such a philosophy-influenced Alexandrian mindset. As discussed above, the MT image of God as "Redeemer," which implies kinship and involves payment of ransom, may have posed philosophical questions concerning the omnipotence of the one God for such an audience.

In the LXX text of this pericope the problem is absent because God is portrayed instead as a "Deliverer," an image which would have been considered unproblematic in the Alexandrian milieu**.** As for anthropomorphisms, although God is portrayed in both texts (49:2) as having a right hand, the LXX avoids another anthropomorphism in 49:5 where it substitutes "before κύριος" for MT's "in the eyes of Yhwh." With regard to anthropopathisms, the LXX seems to deemphasize the role of emotion in God's actions. While in MT 49:3 Yhwh will "boast" in his Servant, in the corresponding LXX verse κύριος "will be glorified" in him. In LXX Isa 49:10, if Bultmann's analysis of the use of the concept of ἐλεέω applies to this pericope (see p. 159), as I think it does, the reference here to God as ὁ ἐλεῶν cannot simply be translated as "the Merciful One": the LXX usage of the verb ἐλεέω with God as the subject connotes acting with mercy, but a mercy not so much motivated by an emotion (such as pity) as by faithfulness to promises made within a covenantal context. In short, the LXX's ὁ ἐλεῶν is less motivated by emotion than is the מְרַחֲמָם ("their Compassionate One") spoken of in the corresponding verse in the MT. Finally, in LXX 49:13bβ, God is portrayed as providing "comfort" —rather than the MT's "having compassion on" (יְרַחֵם)— "the afflicted" (MT)/ "the lowly ones of his people (LXX)." Here, once again, the LXX text downplays, vis-à-vis the MT, the role of emotion in God's actions.

It would be an exaggeration to say that the MT and LXX texts of the Second Servant Song present radically different images of God. But the differences between them are real and seem to fall into patterns. The question remains whether these patterns are also present in the two texts' portrayal of God in the other Servant Songs and, if so, whether they reflect a theological *Tendenz* (or *Tendenzen*).

Chapter Four: The Third Servant Song

In this chapter, I begin with a discussion of the Third Servant Song's delimitation. Next, I provide my own translation of the MT of the Third Servant Song with a discussion of text-critical issues. There follows an analysis of the implied speakers and audiences, this section concluding with a discussion of the song's portrayal of Yhwh.

I then will take up the LXX text of the Third Servant Song. I provide my own translation with text-critical notes, together with an analysis of the implied speakers and audiences, and the portrayal of κύριος in the song. Thereafter, I present my translation of the Masoretic and Septuagint texts of the Third Servant Song side by side and compare and contrast their portrayals of God. A conclusion summarizes the comparison.

I. Delimitation

There is near universal agreement among commentators that a new pericope begins at Isaiah 50:4.[1] This view is supported by the various indications of a break between Isa 50:3 and 4 in many important Hebrew, Greek and Syriac MSS. For example, among Hebrew MSS, the MT MSS have a *setuma* after 50:3; 1QIsa^a leaves the rest of the line after 50:3 blank.[2] These division markers in the MSS accord with the content of the text. The implied speaker in 50:1-3 is the Prophet, who delivers an oracle of Yhwh. Whether the speaker changes in v. 4 is a matter of debate,[3] but clearly whoever is speaking no longer quotes Yhwh directly (i.e., in the first person), but rather refers to him in the third person. More importantly, the topic shifts from Israel's sin to the autobiographical narrative of a righteous sufferer.

---

[1] The views of several commentators who do not see v. 4 as the beginning of a new pericope are summarized by Jan L. Koole (*Isaiah III* [trans. Anthony P. Runia; 3 vols.; Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 1998)] 2. 102-3). In addition, see Richard J. Clifford (*Fair Spoken and Persuading: An Interpretation of Second Isaiah* [Theological Inquiries; New York: Paulist, 1984] 156-64) who holds that 50:1–51:8 is a single poem. Similarly, Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor (*The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40-55* [OTS 41; Leiden: Brill, 1998] 488-89) label 50:1–51:8 as a single "canto." Nevertheless, Clifford (*Fair Spoken,* 157 and 163) sees 50:4 as the beginning of a new stanza, while Korpel and de Moor (*Structure,* 488) regard the verse as the beginning of a new "sub-canto."

[2] These division markers are pointed out by Korpel and de Moor (*Structure*, 447). See ibid., 5-6

There is less agreement on where the pericope ends. Many commentators hold one of two main positions: some hold that the pericope ends with v. 9, others that it ends with v.11. Other scholars, however, follow Duhm[4] in taking a *via media.* These scholars refer to vv. 10-11 as, for example, "a response" [5] or "a commentary-like addition"[6] to the preceding Servant Song (cf. the similar "responses" to the first two servant songs in 42:5-9 and 49:7-12, respectively). Grelot takes the same approach, identifying vv. 10-11 as the seventh of some ten short "Servant poems" in Isaiah 40–55. For Grelot, this seventh poem goes with the sixth poem (50:1-9) to form the Third Series of Poems.[7]

In what follows, I assume that the Third Servant Song begins with v. 4 and explore arguments for the above proposals regarding its end. Those who argue that the

---

for a description of the various division markers used in LXX MSS and ibid., 6-9 for a description of various division markers found in the major Syriac MSS.

[3] Brevard S. Childs (*Isaiah* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001] 394) writes: "Although the term *servant* is not used in vv. 4-9, the larger context, before and after, removes any possible doubt that the speaker is the servant." Of particular significance is the reference to "his (Yhwh's) Servant" in v.10. Given that the implied speaker in vv. 1-3 is the Prophet and in vv. 4-9 the Servant, does it not follow that there is a change in the implied speaker in v. 4? Not necessarily. Several scholars argue that the Servant and the Prophet (i.e., Deutero-Isaiah) are one and the same (see, e.g., R. N. Whybray, *The Second Isaiah* [OTG; Sheffield: JSOT, 1983] 74-78).

[4] Bernhard Duhm (*Das Buch Jesaia* [2nd ed.; HKAT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1902] 341) delimits the pericope as follows: "50,4-11: das dritte Ebed-Jahwe-Lied v. 4-9 mit dem Zusatz v. 10f."

[5] John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* (AB 20; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968) 116.

[6] Childs, *Isaiah,* 395.

[7] Pierre Grelot, *Les poèmes du Serviteur: de la lecture critique à l'herméneutique* (LD 103; Paris: Cerf, 1981) 30 and 47.

pericope ends with v. 9 find some support in the MS evidence, i.e., the short space after v. 9 in 1QIsa[a] and in some MT MSS.[8] Furthermore, there is a somewhat complex change in the implied speaker(s) in vv. 10-11. The crucial point is that the speaker in v. 10 cannot be the Servant since he is referred to in the third person.[9] Moreover, those who see the pericope ending with v. 9 have form criticism on their side. Verses 4-9 can be seen as a "the confession of confidence spoken by as mediator of the word."[10] Verses 10-11 do not pertain to this form. Finally, vv. 4, 5, 7, and 9 each begin with אֲדֹנָי יְהוִֹה ("my Lord Yhwh"), a phrase surprisingly infrequent in DI (its only other occurrences being in 40:10, 48:16, and 49:22). This unifying phrase is absent in vv. 10-11.[11]

Those who argue that the pericope ends rather with v.11 are supported by division markers in MT MSS, Qumran MSS, as well as LXX and Syriac MSS. The MT tradition follows 50:11 with a *petuḥa*. 1QIsa[ab] leave the rest of the line following v. 11 blank. LXX codices S, B, A, and Q, as well as several Syriac MSS, have their respective division markers after v. 11. Significantly, other division markers found in some MSS at an earlier point, that is, *within* 50:4-11 (e.g., the short space after v. 9 in 1QIsa^{a} mentioned above) are minor compared to the markers that appear at the *end* of the section.[12]

---

[8] Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron, ed., *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa[a]): A New Edition* (STDJ 32; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 84; Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 102. As noted in Chapter One, the designation "the Masoretic Text" is a bit of a misnomer. In reality, "the MT" is a tradition attested by multiple MSS similar enough to be considered closely related but with differences of varying import.

[9] Who is the speaker? It is presumably not Yhwh, since he is referred to in the third person in v. 10 as well. In v. 11, however, the speaker is Yhwh. In v. 11, the clause מִיָּדִי הָיְתָה־זֹּאת (literally: "this happened from my hand") surely is uttered by the divine voice. See the following section analyzing the implied speakers and audiences.

[10] Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969) 228.

[11] For a different view, see Korpel and de Moor, *Structure,* 488. They see a parallelism between אֱלֹהִים and אֲדֹנָי. For them, the fourfold יהוה in vv. 4, 5, 7, and 9 (vocalized inconsistently) is answered at the end of v. 10 in which יְהוָה is followed by בֵּאלֹהָיו. For Korpel and de Moor (*Structure,* 488), the relationship between יְהוָה followed by בֵּאלֹהָיו in v.10 vis-à-vis the four occurrences of יהוה אדני in vv. 4-9 constitutes an "inclusion/responsion."

For those who consider v. 11 the end of the Third Servant Song, the change in speaker after 50:9 is not determinative. As mentioned in previous chapters, if we use the nearly universally agreed upon delimitation of the Fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13–53:12) to derive principles for the delimitation of the other servant songs, a change in implied speakers is not sufficient grounds for demarcating the beginning of a new pericope. As for content, vv. 10-11 are not only in some ways continuous with vv. 4-9 but even crucial in one respect for understanding the latter. Continuity with what precedes is seen in the exhortation to listen to the Servant in vv 10-11.[13] While v. 10 is "a commentary on the security of those who fear Yahweh and obey his Servant; ver. 11 is a commentary on the fate of those who are recalcitrant."[14] Such continuity is reinforced by the terminological parallelism between "the tongue" of the Servant in 50:4 and "the voice" of the Servant in v. 10. "The voice of the Servant is the 'word' spoken by his 'tongue' to the 'weary', v. 4."[15] That the readers/hearers only learn in v. 10 that the autobiographical narrative of vv. 4-9 was spoken by the Servant makes vv. 10-11 not only continuous with but also crucial for understanding vv. 4-9.

In conclusion, there are good arguments for ending the pericope with v. 9 but also good arguments for ending it with v. 11. I support, therefore, Duhm's *via media*:

---

[12] Ibid., 448-49.

[13] Grelot, *Poèmes,* 30.

[14] Christopher R. North, *The Second Isaiah:* Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL–LV (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964) 206.

[15] Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 126

although vv. 10-11 are distinct from vv. 4-9 in certain respects, they are nevertheless continuous with, and even crucial for that segment, in others. We thus have a like state of affairs as with the first two servant songs. Since I have included the “additional verses” in my delimitations of those first two servant songs, I shall include vv. 10-11 in my treatment of the Third Servant Song as well.

II. Portrayal of God in MT 50:4-11

A. Text-Critical Notes and Translation

4 אֲדֹנָ֣י יְהֹוִ֗ה נָ֤תַן לִי֙ לְשׁ֣וֹן לִמּוּדִ֔ים
לָדַ֥עַת לָע֛וּת [a] אֶת־יָעֵ֖ף [b] דָּבָ֑ר [c]

---

[a] לָע֛וּת is a *hapax*. John Goldingay and David Payne (*Isaiah 40–55* [2 vols.; ICC; London: T & T Clark, 2006] 2. 209) note a parallel *hapax* (i.e., similar in spelling and arguably with the same meaning, “to help”), i.e., עוּשׁ in Joel 4:11. They also note that repointing עות as piel, meaning “bend/twist/subvert” (e.g., Job 8:3; Amos 8:5), here would result in a reading requiring “a *tour de force* of interpretation.” LXX^{A} reads: ἐν καιρῷ . . . εἰπεῖν (“to speak at a fitting time”). By way of explanation, BDB, s.v. **עוּת,** notes that H. Oort (*Theologisch Tijdschrift* [no issue number; 1891] 469) suggests that the LXX *Vorlage* read לדעת לעתו דבר, “to know a word in its time.” Duhm (*Jesaja,* 379), however, objects that the word order in that case should be לדעת דבר לעתו. Several emendations for the MT term have been proposed. For example, *BHS* proposes לִרְעוֹת “to teach, edify,” while Klaus Baltzer (*Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55* [tr. Margaret Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001], Duhm (*Jesaja*, 379), and others emend the MT to לַעֲנֹת “to answer.” I retain the MT reading as the *lectio difficilior* and discuss its interpretation below in note i.

[b] The Cairo Geniza fragment Eb 10 has the infinitive יֶעוֹף, “to grow weary.” There are no other witnesses to this reading.

[c] Some commentators ignore the *atnaḥ* and take דָּבָר as the beginning of the next sentence (e.g., McKenzie [*Second Isaiah,* 115] “with a word he wakens in the morning”). Grelot (*Poèmes,* 48) proposes: “une parole éveille chaque matin.” That the MT’s *atnaḥ* (indicating that דָּבָר is the close of 50:4a rather than the beginning of 50:4b) is correct, however, is supported by the *waw* before the following verb in 1QIsa^{a} (see Paulson Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^{a}* [JSPSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001] 83). Despite their differences, both the LXX and Vg also translate דָּבָר as the end of verse 4a: κύριος δίδωσίν μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας τοῦ γνῶναι ἡνίκα δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον (“The Lord gives me a tongue of instruction, to know when it is fit to

יָעִיר [d] לִי֙ אֹ֔זֶן יָעִיר [e] ובֹּקֶר בַּבֹּ֗קֶר [f]
לִשְׁמֹ֖עַ כַּלִּמּוּדִֽים׃

[g]My Lord[g] Yhwh has given me [h]a disciple's tongue[h]

---

speak *a word*") and *Dominus dedit mihi linguam eruditam ut sciam sustentare eum qui lassus est verbo* ("the Lord gives me a well-trained tongue than I might know how to sustain the weary *with a word*").

[d]The vertical stroke (*paseq*) in the MT after יָעִיר indicates the Masoretes' uncertainty about the word. Although *BHS* proposes that the word be deleted, it is attested in 1QIsa^{a} (there preceded by a *waw*—see previous note) and was undoubtedly in the *Vorlage* of the Vg's *erigit mane mane erigit mihi aurem* ("he rouses [my ear] in the morning, in the morning he rouses my ear").

[e]1QIsa^{a} reads ועיר, no doubt a use of the epexegetical *waw* (see Pulikottil, *Transmission*, 96 and Bruce K. Waltke and M. P. O'Connor, *Introduction to Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004] §39.2.4).

[f] Dominique Barthélemy (*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* [2 vols.; OBO 50/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986] 2. 371) notes that the repetition of בַּבֹּקֶר ("in the morning") is missing in one MT MS (Kennicott), the LXX, and both the Old Latin and the Ge'ez (Ethiopic) versions. The repetition of בַּבֹּקֶר, however, is supported by all the other MT MSS and by 1QIsa^{a}. The expression בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר occurs as well in Isa 28:19 and Exod 16:21, where it also means "morning by morning"/"every morning." Furthermore, α′ gives ἐγείρει ἐν πρωΐᾳ ἐν πρωΐᾳ ἐξεγείρει μοι ὠτίον ("He rouses [my ear] in the morning, in the morning he rouses my ear"). Cf. Vg in previous note. Barthélemy (ibid.) proposes, as an explanation of the lack of repetition of πρωΐ ("in the morning") in the LXX, that the prefix in the LXX's προσέθηκέν is a corruption of πρωΐ.

[g—g] Almost all English versions, perhaps under the influence of the LXX's κύριος ("Lord") or ὁ κύριος ("the Lord") and the Vg's *Dominus* ("Lord" or "the Lord"), translate אֲדֹנָי as "the Lord" despite the Hebrew term's first person singular common possessive pronoun suffix. (*TNK*, a notable exception, often—but inconsistently— translates אדֹנָי as "my Lord.") Here, I include the personal suffix, considering it significant because it personalizes the relationship between Yhwh and his Servant. Baltzer (*Deutero-Isaiah,* 338) suggests including the possessive pronoun, although in the end he uses the traditional translation. For a detailed summary of arguments both for translating the Hebrew with the possessive pronoun ("my Lord") and with the definite article ("the Lord"), see Hans-Jürgen Hermission, *Deuterojesaja* (BKAT 11_{13}; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2008) 114-15. Hermission (ibid., 115) concludes that "[e]ine sichere Entscheidung für den *ursprünglich* [emphasis original] intendierten Sinn der Wendung ist nicht möglich." See also GKC §§87g, 135q.

[h—h] Literally,"a tongue of disciples/pupils/ones under instruction." Alternatively, the term לִמּוּדִים could be taken "as an intensive rather than numerical plural, an abstract noun, as in Sir 51.28 (see GK 124df)," according to Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40-55,* 2. 208), thus "a tongue of learning." Goldingay and Payne (ibid.) also note that the translations of the term in the LXX (all major witnesses except A):παιδείας ("training"), the Syr: ܝܘܠܦܢܐ ("learning"), and the LXX^{A}: σοφίας ("wisdom"), all translate לִמּוּדִים as an abstract noun. But such translations miss a possibly important link with the only other occurrences of forms of למד in Isaiah (i.e., 8:16 and 54:13) where the meaning is clearly "disciple(s)."

to know how to help[i] the weary[j] [k]with a word.[k]
Morning after morning he rouses, he rouses my ear
to give heed like a disciple.

5 אֲדֹנָ֤י יְהוִה֙ פָּֽתַח־לִ֣י אֹ֔זֶן
וְאָנֹכִ֖י לֹ֣א מָרִ֑יתִי
אָח֖וֹר לֹ֥א נְסוּגֹֽתִי׃

My Lord Yhwh has [l]opened my ear,[l]
[m]because for my part,[m] I have not rebelled,
I have not turned back.

6 גֵּוִי֙ נָתַ֣תִּי לְמַכִּ֔ים
וּלְחָיַ֖י לְמֹֽרְטִ֑ים [n]

---

[i] Although BDB, s.v. עות, considers its definition, i.e., "to help," "very dubious," it goes on to mention cognates in Arabic (*ʿa̱ta* IV "aid, succor") and Aramaic (עות = "help"). The BDB translation corresponds to the Vg, which translates the verb as *sustenare* ("to sustain") and α′, who renders ὑποστηρίσαι ("to support"). *TNK*, following the LXX^A, takes עות as a denominative from עת ("time"). For a summary of the numerous proposed emendations, see Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah,* 2. 209).

[j] Forms of יעפ occur in four consecutive verses of Isaiah 40 (vv. 28, 29, 30, and 31).

[k—k] Literally, "a word." I translate "with a word" based on GKC §118m 5. ". . . [T]he accusative is used very variously (as an *accus. adverbialis* in the narrower sense), in order to describe more precisely the *manner* [emphasis original] in which an action or state takes place. In English such accusatives are mostly rendered by *in*, *with*, *as*, *in the form or manner of* . . . , *according to*, *in relation to*, *with regard to* [emphasis original]." The Vg also in effect interprets דָּבָר adverbially with its use of the ablative *verbo* ("with a word").

[l—l] As Werner Grimm and Kurt Dittert (*Jesaja 40-55: Deutung—Wirkung—Gegenwart* [Calwer Bibelkommentare; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1990] 361) note, "Das 'Öffnen des Ohrs' ist im Babylonischen eine Metapher . . . ." See AHw, s.v. *petû(m)*, II 858-61, esp. 859 and s.v. *uznu(m)*, 1447-48, here 1448. "To open the ear" has the sense of "jdm. aufmerksam machen, aufklären" (ibid., 859).

[m—m] The conjunction *waw* can have many meanings, including "since" or "because"; see Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax,* §39.2.3b, #6-7. My reasons for the above translation are given in the exegesis below. In addition, my translation takes as emphatic the grammatically superfluous first person independent pronoun, אָנֹכִי. The only other occurrences in Isaiah of forms of מרה ("rebel," see 1:20; 3:8; 63:10) all refer to Israel's or Judah's rebellion against Yhwh. The Servant, speaking in the first person, emphasizes that *his* response to Yhwh is the opposite.

[n] לְמֹרְטִים is based on the root מָרַט ("to make smooth," "to make bare"). The term is intelligible

פָּנַי֙ לֹ֣א הִסְתַּ֔רְתִּי [o] מִכְּלִמּ֖וֹת וָרֹֽק׃

My back I gave to those who beat me,
and my cheeks [p]to those who plucked my beard[p];
my face I did not hide from shaming[q] and spitting.

7 וַאדֹנָ֤י יְהוִה֙ יַעֲזָר־לִ֔י
עַל־כֵּ֖ן לֹ֣א נִכְלָ֑מְתִּי
עַל־כֵּ֞ן שַׂ֤מְתִּי פָנַי֙ כַּֽחַלָּמִ֔ישׁ
וָאֵדַ֖ע כִּי־לֹ֥א אֵבֽוֹשׁ׃

Since my Lord Yhwh is my helper[r]
—therefore I was not ashamed;
therefore I set my face like flint
since I knew that I would not be put to shame.

8 קָרוֹב֙ מַצְדִּיקִ֔י
מִֽי־יָרִ֥יב אִתִּ֖י נַ֣עַמְדָה יָּ֑חַד [s]
מִֽי־בַ֣עַל מִשְׁפָּטִ֔י יִגַּ֖שׁ אֵלָֽי׃

---

in the light of Ezra 9:3, where the word clearly refers to “plucking of the beard” and Neh 13:25 (“I took them to task and cursed them; I had some of them beaten and their hair pulled out; and I adjured them by God: ‘You shall not marry your daughters to their sons nor take any of their daughters for your sons or for yourselves’”). The passage from Nehemiah suggests that the action in question was a means of public shaming. See Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 211.

[o] 1QIsa^a has הסירותי (“I turned away”).

[p—p] Literally, “to ones making bare.” See note n.

[q] I take מִכְּלִמּוֹת as an intensifying (i.e., “shaming”) rather than a numerical plural (i.e., “insults”).

[r] I try to capture the ambiguity of the Hebrew, which conveys only an incomplete action and could mean, e.g., “was helping me,” “helps me,” or “will help me.”[s] 1QIsa^a reads יחדיו. Pulikottil (*Transmission,* 171) notes that the second half of 1QIsa^a has several other examples of יחדיו instead of the MT’s יחד (e.g., 42:14; 43:26; and 44:11). Shemaryahu Talmon (“The Qumran יחד: A Biblical Noun,” in *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* [ed. S. Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1989] 53-60, here 59-60) shows that, although the term in its suffixed forms in Qumran usually seems to be adverbial, it is often used as a synonym for עדה, קהל, and ברית in its unsuffixed form and even sometimes in its suffixed forms.

[s] 1QIsa^a reads יחדיו. Pulikottil (*Transmission,* 171) notes that the second half of 1QIsa^a has several other examples of יחדיו instead of the MT’s יחד (e.g., 42:14; 43:26; and 44:11). Shemaryahu

The One who will vindicate me[t] is at hand.
  Who will arraign me? Let us have a legal proceeding![u]
  Who is my adversary?[v] Let him initiate a case against me.[w]

9 הֵ֣ן אֲדֹנָ֤י יְהוִה֙ יַעֲזָר־לִ֔י
מִי־ה֖וּא יַרְשִׁיעֵ֑נִי
הֵ֤ן כֻּלָּם֙ כַּבֶּ֣גֶד יִבְל֔וּ
עָ֖שׁ יֹאכְלֵֽם׃

Behold, my Lord Yhwh is my helper.
  Who will declare me guilty?
Behold, all of them will wear out like a garment;
  the moth will eat them up.

10 מִ֤י בָכֶם֙ יְרֵ֣א[x] יְהוָ֔ה
שֹׁמֵ֖עַ בְּק֣וֹל עַבְדּ֑וֹ
אֲשֶׁ֣ר׀ הָלַ֣ךְ חֲשֵׁכִ֗ים וְאֵ֥ין נֹ֙גַהּ֙ ל֔וֹ
יִבְטַח֙ בְּשֵׁ֣ם יְהוָ֔ה
וְיִשָּׁעֵ֖ן בֵּאלֹהָֽיו׃

Talmon (“The Qumran יחד: A Biblical Noun,” in *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* [ed. S. Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1989] 53-60, here 59-60) shows that, although the term in its suffixed forms in Qumran usually seems to be adverbial, it is often used as a synonym for עדה, קהל, and ברית in its unsuffixed form and even sometimes in its suffixed forms.

[t] Yhwh is present here as the Servant’s defending witness. מַצְדִּיקִי is a quasi-technical term belonging to the judicial sphere in Hebrew. Trial language is found throughout DI; see, e.g., Isa 41:1–42:4; 43:8-13; 45:20-24; 48:15-16 (cf. Roy F. Melugin, “Form Criticism, Rhetorical Criticism, and Beyond in Isaiah,” in *“As Those Who Are Taught”: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* [ed. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull; SBLSS 27; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006] 263-78, here 266).

[u] Literally, “let us stand together,” here in the sense of “let us take our stand against each other.” For similar uses of נגשׁ qal in DI see 41:1, 21-22; 45:20-21.

[v] *HALOT* defines בַּעַל מִשְׁפָּטִי as “my adversary.” Its parallel expression in MHeb, בעל דִּין, is even closer to the Akkadian congnate *bēl dīni* (“Prozeßgegner”), according to *AHw,* I, 119.

[w] Literally, “Let him approach me.” According to *HALOT,* s.v. נגשׁ, this term in a legal context has a technical meaning referring to “the parties in dispute turn[ing] towards each other.”

[x] 1QIsa^a has the plural form of the adjective יראי (“fearing”).

Who among you fears Yhwh
listening to the voice of his Servant?
Let him who[y] walks in darkness[z] with no light
trust in the name of Yhwh
and rely upon his God.

[11] הֵ֧ן כֻּלְּכֶ֛ם קֹ֥דְחֵי אֵ֖שׁ
מְאַזְּרֵ֣י [aa] זִיקֹ֑ות
לְכ֣וּ ׀ בְּא֣וּר אֶשְׁכֶ֗ם
וּבְזִיקוֹת֙ בִּֽעַרְתֶּ֔ם
מִיָּדִי֙ הָֽיְתָה־זֹּ֣את לָכֶ֔ם
לְמַעֲצֵבָ֖ה תִּשְׁכָּבֽוּן׃ פ

Behold all of you are kindlers of fire,
[bb]setting brands ablaze.[16][bb]

---

[y] The remainder of the verse could refer to the Servant; see Abraham ben Meir Ibn Ezra (*The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah* [ed. and trans. M. Friedländer; 4 vols.; Society of Hebrew Literature; London: N. Trübner, 1873] 1. 230), who argues that the meaning in connection with v. 11 is "there is none among you that feareth the Lord. . . . This is the right explanation, and it is confirmed by the words which follow." As Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40-55,* 2. 216) note, however, that on this interpretation ". . . v. 11 would be an unparalleled negative statement to the prophet's own community." Furthermore, both the LXX and 1QIsa^{a} signal a change in subject: the LXX changes from third person singular to second person plural, while 1QIsa^{a} shifts from third person singular to third person plural. Therefore, I take v. 10b to refer to anyone in the community who fears Yhwh and listens to the Servant.

[z] הָלַ֣ךְ חֲשֵׁכִ֗ים literally means "he has walked *in* darkness." Koole (*Isaiah III*, 2. 126) points to Lam 3:2 as a parallel usage.

[aa] This reading is supported by 1QIsa^{ab} and the Vg's *accincti* ("girded").

[bb—bb] Barthélemy (*Critique textuelle,* 2. 372-73) disagrees with the translations based on the notion of the addressees' girding (i.e., arming/supplying/surrounding) *themselves* with fiery arrows/firebrands because the reflexive sense of אזר ("gird") is peculiar to the hithpael stem, whereas מְאַזְּרֵי is in the piel. Melding similar solutions independently arrived at by the medieval commentator Yefet ben Eli and the late 17th-/early 18th-century Dutch Protestant theologian and Hebraist Campegius Vitringa, Barthélemy takes "girding" as transitive and זִיקוֹת to mean "sparks" (here, as those obtained by striking a flintstone). What is pictured, in Barthélemy's view, is surrounding sparks with combustible material in order to create a fire. I find his solution problematic with regard to his translation of זִיקוֹת. The term occurs only here in the Bible, and although it is sometimes translated as "sparks," according to *HALOT,* "flaming arrows" would be the more likely meaning in light of DSS usage, MHb, and the Akk. cognate *zīqtu*, "Brandpfeil" (*AHw*). This meaning also accords with the most likely meaning of the parallel term זִיקִים in Prov 26:18. We are left with the problem of what "girding flaming arrows" means. I propose that the expression means something like "surrounding the arrows, one by one, with fire," hence, "setting brands ablaze" (cf. *RSV* and *NRSV*).

Walk into the flame of your fire;
  walk[cc] into the flaming arrows that are now burning!
From my hand this has befallen you:
  in [dd]a place of torment[dd] [ee]shall you lie down.[ee]

B. Implied Speakers and Addressees

Since he speaks of his body (tongue, ear, back, cheeks, face) and he is given a word to rouse the weary, that is, the exiles in Babylon (see 40:28-31), the natural reading would seem to be that an individual is speaking in vv. 4-9. The implied speaker refers to himself as one whom Yhwh trains to hear and speak "as a disciple." The implied speaker of the autobiographical section of the Second Servant Song (49:1-6) is the Servant. The Third Servant Song is also autobiographical and occurs in close proximity to the Second Servant Song; therefore, it is natural for the reader/hearer to assume that the implied speaker of the Third Servant Song (50:4-9) is also the Servant.[16] Like the Servant in include humiliation and physical suffering, throughout which he expresses trust in Yhwh. The readers'/hearers' natural assumption that the implied speaker in vv. 4-9 is the Servant seems to be further confirmed in v. 10, which admonishes those who fear Yhwh to listen to the voice of the Servant.

[cc] I repeat "walk" because I take the *waw* in וּבְזִיקוֹת as explicative.

[dd—dd] Both *HALOT* and BDB give "a place of pain" as their definition of the *hapax* מַעֲצֵבָה. *TWOT* also cites "torment" as a possible definition. The definition, "a place of pain," is supported by the rabbinical tradition as found in *Midrash Rabbah* (L. Rabinowitz, trans., *Ruth, Ecclesiastes;* vol. 8 of *Midrash Rabbah* [ed. H. Freedman and M. Simon; 10 vols.; New York: Soncino, 1983] 83), as explained in the exegetical section below. Although it is difficult to know exactly what is envisioned, the punishment seems to threaten more than to "lie down in sorrow" (cf. LXX 50:11).

[ee—ee] BDB, s.v. שָׁכַב, takes the verb to mean here "lie down in death."

[16] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah,* 2. 205. "The 'I' form of the prophet's testimony in 50:4-9 corresponds to that of 49:1-6 and vv. 10-11 in due couse treat vv. 4-9 as words of Yhwh's servant like 49:1-6."

In addition, Baltzer sees the identity of the implied speaker indicated by the threefold reference to "The Lord/ My Lord Yhwh": "So that there can be no doubt at all as to who has appeared here, the first saying begins: 'the *Lord,* Yahweh.' 'The *Servant* of Yhwh' is the correspondence [to the *Lord,* Yhwh] even if this is not expressly said."[17]

The readers/hearers would likely assume, however, that the implied speaker in v. 10 can no longer be the Servant because this verse refers to the Servant in the third person. Nor can the speaker be Yhwh who is also referred to in the third person.[18] The remaining possibility is that the implied speaker here is the Prophet—unless one wishes to posit a new implied speaker. This is possible but unnecessarily complicated for our purposes.[19] The words of the Prophet are presumably those given to him by Yhwh. In v. 11 the words are also those of Yhwh, but now in the first person: in this context, who else could say, "From my hand this has befallen you"? Since nothing in the text suggests a theophany, the implied speaker remains the Prophet, who delivers Yhwh's words.

---

[17] Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah,* 338.

[18] See Grimm and Dittert, *Deuterojesaja*, 359. For an alternative opinion on the latter point, see Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 216 who note that "[r]eferences to Yhwh in the third person are common enough on Yhwh's own lips." On this view, in vv. 10-11 the implied speaker would be Yhwh. For the same view, see Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 122.

[19] Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 205) imply that the Prophet and the Servant are one and the same, a position held by many commentators. In this case, it would seem the speaker must be someone other than the Prophet/Servant or Yhwh.

In the entire Third Servant Song the implied audience seems to include the opponents of the Servant. Whether these are Babylonians, opponents among Jacob/Israel, or both is unclear.

C. What Yhwh Says or Implies about himself

50:10 Yhwh Expects Those Who Fear Him to Listen to the Voice of His Servant (שֹׁמֵעַ בְּקוֹל עַבְדּוֹ).

Yhwh has already introduced his Servant and his unique mission to the world in the first two servant songs. Thus far, Yhwh has tolerated indifference and opposition against his Servant. Now he permits the Servant to undergo physical abuse. Here Yhwh, presumably through the voice of the prophet, presents the implied audience, both supporters and opponents of the Servant, with a moment of choice. Those who have opposed the Servant are called to conversion. “Listening to the voice” of the Servant in this context implies more than merely paying attention, or even giving a sympathetic hearing. Nothing less than obedience to an authority figure is implied (cf. Gen 22:18; Deut 21:18; Exod 4:1; Josh 22:22).[20] The pairing of obeying the Servant with fear of Yhwh implies that the Servant has the highest possible level of authority. “Fearing the Lord and hearkening to the voice of the Servant go hand in hand.”[21] To oppose the Servant is to have no fear of Yhwh.

---

[20] Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 126.

[21] Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972) 3. 303. See also John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40–66* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998) 329.

50:10 Yhwh Expects the One Who Walks in Darkness (אֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ חֲשֵׁכִים) to Trust in Him.

Yhwh's Servant is the example par excellence of trusting Yhwh (e.g., 50:7-9) while "walk[ing] in darkness" (cf. Ps 23:4a). The phrase הָלַךְ חֲשֵׁכִים is reminiscent of Isa 9:1 הָעָם הַהֹלְכִים בַּחֹשֶׁךְ ("the people who have walked in darkness"), but mainly by way of contrast. Whereas the people of Isa 9:1 "have seen a great light," the one who walks in darkness in Isa 50:10 "has no light" (וְאֵין נֹגַהּ לוֹ). Trusting in Yhwh in such circumstances is the essence of the kind of faith expressed in psalms of trust, a genre with which the Servant's words in vv. 4-9 have much in common, as mentioned in the section on delimitation. Isaiah 50:3 suggests that the darkness that the exiles in Babylon are experiencing is a result of Yhwh's anger. Nevertheless, Yhwh directs those who fear him to follow the example of the Servant by trusting in Yhwh despite the darkness.[22]

50:11 Yhwh Curses the Fire-builders: "Walk into the flaming arrows that are now burning! From my hand this has befallen you: in a place of torment (לְמַעֲצֵבָה) shall you lie down."

מַעֲצֵבָה is nearly universally translated as "a place of torment." Although the Hebrew term is a *hapax*, the idea behind it has biblical analogues. Baltzer notes that Deut

---

[22] Although some see more theological significance in the text's phrase, "the name of Yhwh" here (see, e.g., Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 125-26), the synonymous parallelism between "trust in the name of Yhwh" and "rely upon his God" suggests that "the name of Yhwh" is here simply a synonym for "Yhwh" (see A. S. van der Woude, שֵׁם*, TLOT,* 3. 1348-76, here 1362).

32:22 refers to "fire that burns to the depths of the underworld."[23] Further, Isa 30:33 refers to a fiery place of punishment (cf. also 66:24).[24]

The identity of the group destined to lie down in "a place of torment" as a punishment "from the hand of Yhwh" is not altogether clear. Unquestionably, a contrast is drawn between the God-fearers who obey the Servant and those who do not. But in what sense does this second group "kindle fires and set brands ablaze?" Numerous interpretations have been proposed. Some interpretations see a reference to offenses against Yhwh. For example, E. J. Young[25] sees "kindling fire" as avoiding the darkness involved in following Yhwh and living a life of self-reliance and creature comforts (see Job 18:5-6). This solution is plausible as far as it goes, but it does not address the image of "setting brands ablaze." Others see the imagery of v. 11a as referring to an affront to Yhwh through various forms of pagan worship (see, e.g., L. G. Rignell,[26] J. D. Smart[27]). This solution is supported by the apparent paronomasia in the following verse: those who kindle fires will go "into a place of torment" (לְמַעֲצֵבָה). Although the term מַעֲצֵבָֽה is thought to derive from עֹצֶב ("sorrow"), the same root word עֹצֶב has an unrelated second meaning, namely, "idol" (see Isa 48:5). In view of this meaning, Rignell proceeds to translate לְמַעֲצֵבָה in v. 11cα "on the place of the idols." Whether or not this is the intended meaning, astute readers/listeners would surely have at least noticed the possibility of a double entendre. Rignell's and Smart's solution, like that of Young's, is plausible, but it does not explain the reference to "flaming arrows."

---

[23] Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah,* 342.

[24] By the time of Jesus, the fiery place of torment for the dead deserving punishment was identified with Gehenna or Ge-hinnom, a shortened form of Ge-ben-Hinnom (גֵיא בֶן־הִנֹּם). Jeremiah 7:31-32 identifies the latter as a site where Judahites immolated children against Yhwh's command, a site that would become a horrifying burial place for the wicked.

[25] Young, *Isaiah,* 3. 304-5.

[26] L. G. Rignell, *A Study of Isaiah Ch. 40-55* (LUÅ 52; Lund: Gleerup, 1956) 71.

[27] James D. Smart, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40–66* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965) 174.

Other interpretations explain "kindling fire" and/or "setting arrows ablaze" as the general behavior of the godless not only against Yhwh but also against their neighbors. Thus, with regard to the image of "kindling," Prov 26:21 refers to the contentious man as "kindling strife" (לְחַרְחַר־רִיב). Westermann, for his part, sees the images of fire and flaming arrows more generally as

> These are metaphors to describe the action of the transressors against the righteous. Ps 57.5 (4) is similar, ‚among those who spit flames, whose teeth are spears and arrows.' In those Psalms whose subject is the action of the godless, the punishment measures up to the action (57.6 [5] 'they dug a pit and have fallen into it'). Similarly here, 'walk into the glow of your fire and into the brands which you set alight'. That is to say, they are to perish by means of the weapons they had used against the righteous.[28]

Some of the earliest interpreters of Isa 50:11 also understood "kindling fires" and "setting arrows ablaze" as transgressions against the righteous in general. For example, the Cairo Damascus Document cites Isa 50:11a nearly verbatim in describing the followers of Belial who will attack Israel in the end time:

כלם קדחי אש ומבערי זיקות (CD 5:13)[29].

In later rabbinic material of uncertain dating, fire-kindlers and arrow-lighters are those who wrong their neighbors in various ways: in *Midrash Rabbah Ecclesiastes,* the commentary on Eccl 3:9 (“What advantage has the worker from his toil?” *NAB*) pictures God citing Isa 50:11 to the wicked who are

---

[28] Westermann, *Isaiah,* 235.

[29] "All of them are kindlers of fire and burners of firebrands."

> . . . condemned to Gehinnom; and they grumble at the Holy One, blessed be He, saying, ‘Behold, we looked for the salvation of the Holy One, blessed be He, and this is what happens to us!’ The Holy One, blessed be He, replies to them, ‘In the world in which you spent your lives were you not quarrelsome, slander-mongers, and evil-doers; did you not indulge in strife and violence? That is what is written, *Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that gird yourselves with firebrands; therefore begone in the flame of your fire, and among the brands that ye have kindled* (Isa. L, 11).[30]

In conclusion, those who “kindle fires” and “set arrows ablaze” are clearly distinguished from those who fear Yhwh and listen to his Servant. The image of kindling fire may refer to dependence on one’s own resources instead of reliance on and obedience to Yhwh. The reference to both kindling fire and setting arrows ablaze seems to imply offenses in general against the righteous. As a final note, the cryptic nature of verse 11a suggests an intentional polyvalence. There is nothing to prevent the readers/hearers who “have ears to hear” from perceiving additional meanings, e.g., possible allusions to sacrificial fires associated with idolatry, especially in view of the double entendre with לְמַעֲצֵבָה.

---

[30] Rabinowitz, trans., *Ruth, Ecclesiastes,* 83.

D. What the Servant Says or Implies about Yhwh

50:4 Morning after morning [Yhwh] rouses, he rouses my ear to give heed like a disciple (כַּלְמוּדִים).

The self-identification of the Servant with disciples (לְמוּדִים)[31] implicitly identifies Yhwh as his teacher. The image of Yhwh's every morning "rousing the ear" of his disciple calls to mind something akin to formal education. Manfred Weippert suggests that the image evokes ANE elementary religious educational practices similar to those still practiced in Arab cultures and among Orthodox Jews—and not unlike the Catholic catechetical approach of yesteryear. In order to understand the scenario described in Isa 50:4, according to Weippert "muß man die orientalische Unterrichtmethode kennen, die uns bereits aus der Spätantike bekannt ist, die man aber auch heute noch in arabischen und orthodox-jüdischen Elementarschulen erleben kann: Der Stoff wird vom Lehrer vor-, vom Schüler nachgesprochen."[32]

---

[31] On the translation of a Hebrew form containing a plural noun כלְמוּדִים with an English phrase with a singular noun "like a disciple" see p. 161, n. h—h. For purposes of conjecture about the identity of the Servant of the Third Servant Song of DI, the connection between לְמוּדִים ("disciples") in Isa 50:4 (twice) and לְמֻדָי ("my disciples") in 8:16 takes us only so far. To be sure, words based on למד are far from common in the Book of Isaiah, the only other occurrence being 54:13. The correlation between the terms in 50:4 and 8:16 is intriguing. Of course, since Isaiah was an eighth century prophet and DI is dated around 540 B.C., there is no possibility that the author of DI was personally instructed by Isaiah. Still, is the Servant in Isa 50:4 hinting that he is one of Isaiah's disciples in a broader sense? Such a scenario has an appeal: the Servant could be Isaiah's "disciple" who finally reveals what Isaiah has written and sealed in the scroll (see 8:16), viz., that the exile, a punishment for Judah's transgressions, has been "a time of deep darkness and distress (8:22), which, however, will be followed by a time of great light (9:12)" (see Clifford, *Fair Spoken,* 162). Some commentators, e.g., Grimm and Dittert (*Deuterojesaja,* 360) and Clifford ("Second Isaiah," *ABD,* 3. 490-501, here 493), do adopt such a position. In my view, however, the texts 8:16 and 50:4 do not suffice as proof that the author of Isaiah 40-55 was somehow a disciple of Isaiah of Jerusalem. Indeed, the rather remarkable point made in Isa 50: 4 is not that the Servant's teacher is Isaiah, but Yhwh himself.

[32] Manfred Weippert, "Die 'Konfessionen' Deuterojesajas," in *Schöpfung und Befreiung: für Claus Westermann zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. Rainer Albertz, Friedmann W. Golka, Jürgen Kegler; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1989) 104-15, here 111-12. Georg Fohrer (*Das Buch Jesaja* [3 vols.; ZBAT; Zurich:

Here Yhwh succeeds in tutoring his Servant, whereas previously he has failed with Jacob/Israel. Jacob/Israel has been called to task for not heeding (30:9); the Servant of chap. 50 heeds “like a disciple.”[33]

50:4 My Lord Yhwh has given me a disciple’s tongue to know how to help the weary with a word.

The purpose of Yhwh’s teaching is to give the Servant “the tongue of a disciple,” that is, the ability to speak authoritatively from his knowledge of the Teacher’s doctrine. This knowledge enables the Servant to speak in a way that helps “the weary” (אֶת־יָעֵף). Words based on the same root יעפ occur only five other times in Isaiah, all within DI. Four of these other occurrences are clustered within 40:28-30, where they refer to Jacob/Israel. Westermann observes: “‘Weary’ or ‘prostrate’ is undoubtedly to be given the meaning it has in 40.28ff., where it is three times repeated. There, too, ‘the weary’ has a word spoken to him, and there the one who is ‘weary ‘is Israel. The same will apply here.”[34] Clearly the exiles of Jacob/Israel are among the weary whom the Servant addresses.

50:5 My Lord Yhwh has opened my ear.

Here in v. 5, Yhwh is portrayed not as a schoolmaster but as a divine being. In the Babylonian milieu, “to open the ear” was said of a deity who enlightens the wise man. The motif of a god “opening the ear” of someone has already been mentioned (see p. 178, n. l). A clear example occurs in the Akkadian *Erra Epic,* known to us through an

---

Zwingli, 1964] 3. 137) paints a similar picture: “[Der Knecht] in der Schule des Meisters belehrt und geübt wird.”

[33] Clifford, *Fair Spoken,* 162.

[34] Westermann, *Isaiah,* 228.

approximately 750-line text, which is written on five tablets dating to the eighth century B. C. The final tablet describes an era of peace and prosperity in which Erra (also known as Nergal, Girra, and Dibbarra), a Mesopotamian god of war and of plague, promises that "[i]n the sanctum of the learned, where they shall constantly invoke my name, I will grant them understanding. . . ."[35] The Akkadian for "I will grant them understanding" is the idiom *uzunnunu apetti*, lit., "their *ear* I will open."[36] Akkadian *petû* is the cognate of Hebrew *ptḥ*. Note that the reference is to "ear" and not "ears," exactly as in the Isaiah passage (cf. Isa 48:8). Understanding is granted to those who constantly invoke the god's name.

Why does the Servant affirm that he has not rebelled after asserting that Yhwh has opened his ear (v. 5)? Why does the Servant encounter the abuse he describes (vv. 6-7)? A possible solution is that the Servant, after Yhwh's having opened his ear, must now deliver a message that is unwelcome. But this solution has no obvious support from the text itself. The only message the Servant refers to is "a word to the weary" (v. 4), which would not provoke opposition for any obvious reason.

A more probable solution to the first question, why the Servant affirms that he has not rebelled after asserting that Yhwh has opened his ear, is not found within the text of the Third Servant Song but rather in its context. Isa 50:5 surely alludes to a verse two chapters before where not only the striking Akkadian metaphor "to open the ear" but also the idea of rebelling both occur, i.e., Isa 48:8: "You have never heard, you have never known, from of old your ear has not been opened. For I knew that you would deal very treacherously, and that from birth you were called a rebel" (*NRSV*). Thus, Yhwh opens the ear of the Servant in the Third Servant Song because he has not rebelled, whereas he did not open the ear of Israel in chap. 48 because of its rebelliousness. Docility is not the Servant's virtuous response after Yhwh opens his ear. Rather, Yhwh has opened the ear because Servant has not rebelled.

---

[35] Benjamin R. Foster, trans., *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993) 911.

[36] Luigi Cagni, *L'Epopea di Erra* (Studi Semitici 34; Rome: Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente, 1969) 128-29.

As for the second question, the abuse the Servant encounters may be an intensification of the lack of receptivity about which he has already complained to Yhwh (49:4). The text of the Third Servant Song offers another explanation in vv. 8-9. The Servant has evidently been confronted with false accusations and challenges his accusers to take up the matter in court. From these, the Servant is confident, he will be exonerated by Yhwh himself (v. 8). These two explanations of the physical abuse of the Servant are not mutually exclusive.

If my solution is correct, the Servant's ear has been opened because he was not rebellious despite the abuse Yhwh allowed him to suffer. In short, opposition to the Servant is not the result of a supposed message the Servant delivers because Yhwh has opened his ear. Rather, Yhwh has opened the Servant's ear because of his faithfulness in the face of opposition.

50:6-8 Yhwh Allows His Servant to Suffer Humiliation, Physical Affliction, and False Accusations at the Hands of His Enemies.

Fohrer points out the progression in the Servant's suffering from his lack of success among the deportees expressed in the Second Servant Song to more serious, even

violent, opposition described in some detail in the Third Servant Song. "Hatte der Knechtsprophet in 49, 1-6 über die Erfolglosigkeit seines Wirkens infolge des Widerstrebens der Deportieren geklagt, so zeigt das vorliegende Wort [Isa 50:4-9], daß der Widerstand gegen ihn noch viel weiter ging und bedrohliche Ausmaße annahm, ohne ihn jedoch von seinem Weg abbringen zu können."[37] Rather than complaining more bitterly to Yhwh, however, the Servant does not complain at all here. Instead, he undergoes suffering without resistance, willingly, even "offering his back" to the floggers and his cheeks to the beard-pluckers. The Servant has reached a new level of trust in Yhwh.

50:8 Yhwh Is His Servant's Vindicator.

As mentioned above, part of the suffering the Servant endures includes being subjected to false accusations. The Servant portrays Yhwh as his vindicator, who is at hand, ready to defend him in a court of law.

50:9 Yhwh is the Servant's עזר ("Helper/Hero/Warrior").

Hebrew words based on the root *'zr* often present a problem to the translator. The first meaning is "help." In view of the Ugaritic root *ǵzr* ("youth," "warrior"), however, Hebrew forms based on *'zr* may instead take on a second meaning, namely, "to be strong," or a meaning that blends the two related meanings. "The philological possibility involves the fusion in Hebr. of some consonants that are still distinct in Ug.: an exact demarcation between 'helper/help' and 'hero, warrior/might' continues to be difficult because of the proximity of meaning . . . which would also explain the ultimate displacement of any root *ʻzr* II by *ʻzr* I."[38]

---

[37] Fohrer, *Jesaja,* 3. 137.

Yhwh has fulfilled his promise to be the Servant's helper/source of strength (e.g., 49:8). Yhwh's help has not spared the Servant his suffering, but it has given him the strength to endure it with patience and even willingness.

III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isa 50:4-11

A.Text-critical Notes and Translation

4 κύριος [a] δίδωσίν μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας [b]
τοῦ γνῶναι ἐν καιρῷ [c] ἡνίκα δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον,

---

[38] U. Bergmann, "עזר," in *TLOT*, 2. 872.

[a] According to Joseph Ziegler (*Isaias* [Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum; Vol. XIV; 3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983] 310-11) many MSS and early Church Fathers (B, O' [B^{c}]-Q^{mg} ; L'; 403'; Syp; Eus; Tht), repeat κύριος here as well as in vv. 5, 7, and 9. For more details, see Wolf Wilhelm Grafen Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religiongeschichte* (4 vols.; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1929) 1. 522. Presumably, the first iteration translates אֲדֹנָי, the second יְהוִה.

[b] A reads σοφίας ("of wisdom").

[c] Ziegler (*Isaias,* 310) omits ἐν καιρῶ, "in season" since the phrase occurs only in the Alexandrian miniscules Mss. 26-86 and the Catena MSS 564 and 565. I retain it, however, since I think it is likely to be original. A later scribe probably removed the phrase, deeming it superfluous. If it is not original, we would have the improbable situation of needing to attribute to pure *chance* that a scribe added a phrase that just happens to correspond closely to the MT's לָע֥וּת. (See Blenkinsopp [*Isaiah 40–55,* 318] who proposes that a scribe "misread *lāʻēt* for *lāʻût.*")

ἔθηκέν μοι πρωΐ,[d] πρωΐ [e] ἔθηκέν μοι ὠτίον ἀκούειν·

κύριος gives me a well-trained tongue[f]
that I may know the time when it is necessary to speak a word,
giving me[g] in the morning, in the morning giving me an ear to hear.

καὶ ἡ παιδεία κυρίου ἀνοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα,
ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω.

And [h]the discipline of κύριος[h] opens my ear,
and as for me, I do not distrust or contradict.

6 τὸν νῶτόν μου δέδωκα εἰς μάστιγας,
τὰς δὲ σιαγόνας μου εἰς ῥαπίσματα,[i]
τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα
ἀπὸ αἰσχύνης ἐμπτυσμάτων·

I have given my back to scourges

---

[d] Following the first iteration of πρωΐ, the Sahidic (or, less precisely, Coptic) translation's *Vorlage* presumably read ὡς ὁ παιδεύων ("as one who disciplines"), likely a mistranslation of כלמודים or a translation of a variant such as כמלמודים.

[e] I emend the text here following Barthélemy (*Critique textuelle,* 2. 371), who proposes that the prefix in the LXX's προσέθηκεν is a corruption of πρωΐ.

[f] Literally "a tongue of instruction/learning/discipline/correction/chastisement." Eugene Robert Ekblad, Jr. (*Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* [Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999] 136) proposes the translation, "a chastening tongue."

[g] Here I use a participle in order to capture the indeterminate qualities of the aorist. τίθημι + dative can mean "to give (to) someone" in the sense of "to award someone" or "to assign someone" (see LSJ, s.v. τίθημι).

[h—h] Ekblad (*Servant Poems,* 139) proposes "the chastening of the Lord."

[i] I agree with Ziegler (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* [ATAbh XII 3; Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934] 127) that the difference between the MT ("those who pluck my beard") and the LXX here is probably attributable to the translator's unfamiliarity with the word מרט ("to make smooth," "to make bare") or with its specific meaning in this context.

and my cheeks to blows,
and my face I did not turn away
from the shame of spittings.

[7] καὶ κύριος βοηθός μου ἐγενήθη,
διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐνετράπην,
ἀλλὰ ἔθηκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν
καὶ ἔγνων ὅτι οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ.

And κύριος became my helper;
therefore I was not ashamed,
but rather I have set my face like solid rock
and I realized that I would surely not be disgraced.

[8] ὅτι ἐγγίζει ὁ δικαιώσας με
τίς ὁ κρινόμενός μοι;
ἀντιστήτω μοι ἅμα·
καὶ τίς ὁ κρινόμενός μοι;
ἐγγισάτω μοι.

He who justified me draws near.
Who is the one who contends with me?
Let him confront me at once.
Yes, who is the one who contends with me?
Let him draw near me.

[9] ἰδοὺ κύριος βοηθεῖ μοι·
τίς κακώσει με;
ἰδοὺ πάντες ὑμεῖς ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεσθε, [j]
καὶ ὡς σὴς καταφάγεται ὑμᾶς.

Behold, κύριος helps me;
who will harm me?
Behold, all of you will become old like a garment,
and, as it were, a moth will devour you.

---

[j] As Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 215) note, παλαιωθήσεσθε is “arguably . . . [simply] an undertranslation of *bālāh.*”

10 [k]Τίς ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον; [k]
ἀκουσάτω [l] τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ·
οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐν σκότει οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς φῶς,
πεποίθατε ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου
καὶ ἀντιστηρίσασθε ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ.

Who among you fears κύριος?
Let him hear the voice of his παῖς.
Those who walk in darkness—they have no light;
trust in the name of κύριος,
and lean upon God.

11 ἰδοὺ πάντες ὑμεῖς πῦρ καίετε
καὶ κατισχύετε φλόγα·
πορεύεσθε [m] τῷ φωτὶ [m] τοῦ πυρὸς ὑμῶν
καὶ τῇ φλογί ᾗ ἐξεκαύσατε·
δι᾽ ἐμὲ ἐγένετο ταῦτα ὑμῖν,
ἐν λύπῃ κοιμηθήσεσθε.

Behold all of you kindle fire
and make a flame stronger.
Walk by the light of your fire
and by the flame that you have kindled.
Because of me, these things happen to you,
in sorrow you shall lie down.

[k—k] This question is inexplicably missing in catenae MSS 87, 91, 309 and 490.

[l] Evidently, the LXX *Vorlage* read ישׁמע instead of שׁמע.

[m—m] Here the LXX matches both the Syr (ܒܢܘܗܪܐ) and the Vg (“*in lumine*”), both meaning “in the light.” The *Vorlage* for all three versions (the LXX, the Syr, and the Vg) was, no doubt באור. It is likely that the translator for each would have seized on a more familiar word, אוֹר (“light”), in an unpointed text. The MT, however, here probably preserves the original, less common vocalization, בְּאֽוּר “into the flame.”

B. What κύριος Says or Implies about Himself

50:10 κύριος Admonishes the Implied Audience to Listen to the παῖς.

In the Third Servant Song, the παῖς tells of his persecution through public humiliation and physical abuse. κύριος, presumably through the voice of the Prophet, admonishes the implied audience. Those who fear κύριος are to listen to the voice of his παῖς even though, as the rest of v. 10 implies, doing so will involve walking in absolute darkness. They will have no light, but must instead have absolute trust in κύριος.

50:11 κυριός Will Allow Those Who Do Not Listen to Suffer the Consequence of their Choice.

To those who do not follow his admonition, κύριος says, "all of you kindle (καίετε) fire." It is clear from the rest of v. 11 that lighting a fire signifies acting in a way opposed to fearing κύριος and to listening to his παῖς. The phrase, "walk by the light of your fire" (v. 11b) suggests that "lighting a fire" is most likely equivalent to rejecting κύριος and his παῖς, in an attempt to live by one's own lights rather than in the darkness that accompanies obedience to the παῖς. Thus we have ". . . an ironic contrast between these enlightened ones, the *illuminati* [v. 11], and those who remain faithful to the prophetic word, even though in the dark [v. 10]."[39]

For alert readers/listeners, an allusion to LXX Isa 44:15-16 adds an additional, and by no means contradictory, meaning to the significance of lighting a fire in 50:11. As Ekblad observes, Isa 50:11 and 44:15-16 are the only places in LXX Isaiah where humans are the subject of "to light" (καίω).[40] Isaiah 44:15 refers to people "burning"

---

[39] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55,* 322.

[40] Ekblad, *Servant Poems,* 161.

(καύσαντες) the wood from the trees planted by κύριος (v. 14) in order to warm themselves and to cook; the remaining wood is used to make idols to worship as their gods. Consequently, "all of you kindle fire" (50:11), heard in the context of 44:15-16, would trigger the image of idolaters, who—although they are caricatured in such polemical passages against idolatry in DI—are accurately portrayed insofar as they worship created things rather than the Creator. For the rebels, the consequence of not trusting in κύριος and not listening to his παῖς is that they are condemned to live by their own lights. κύριος is prepared to let those in the audience do this, even though he warns them that they will lie down in sorrow.

50:11b Their Lying Down in Sorrow will Come through κύριος.

That a portion of Jacob/Israel would end up "l[ying] down in sorrow" is not a sign of weakness or failure on the part of κύριος, their God. Rather, that they should suffer the consequence of walking by their own lights is part of his plan: everything, in one way or another, δι' ἐμὲ ἐγένετο ("happens because of me").

C. What the παῖς Says or Implies about κύριος

κύριος as a Pedagogue

50:4 κύριος Gives the παῖς an Ear to Hear and a γλῶσσαν παιδείας ("a Well-trained Tongue").

γλῶσσαν παιδείας could mean "a chastened tongue" or "a chastening tongue." Both renderings are intelligible. The two meanings in any event are not mutually exclusive. Opposition to the Servant (v. 6) may well be a result of chastising speech on the part of the παῖς, for example, against those who afflict the weary. But the emphasis in

vv. 4-5 seems to be more on the learning of the παῖς, more specifically learning when to speak and when to be silent. Thus, the more likely understanding is that the παῖς is being given a trained, chastened, disciplined tongue. Moreover, vv. 4-5 describe κύριος as one who gives[41] his παῖς —the intended etymological link with παιδεία surely influenced the translator's choice of παῖς over δοῦλος—an "ear to hear" morning by morning.[42]

50:5 κύριος as Pedagogue Uses Suffering in His Pupil's Instruction.

Furthermore, it is ἡ παιδεία κυρίου ("training/instruction of κύριος" [see v. 5]) that opens the ear of the παῖς "to hear."[43] That the παῖς has not disobeyed or contradicted the training suggests that the παιδεία entails something from which a person might recoil. The connection between παιδεία and suffering is taken for granted in the OT. In the OT, just as a good father disciplines his children, so God acts towards those he loves.[44] Through the comparison of the suffering of those faithful to κύριος with a divine παιδεία (the usual LXX translation of מוּסָר), God is portrayed as neither cruel nor arbitrary but rather as loving towards and desiring the good for a παῖς. "In every passage in the prophets where *yasar* has been clearly discernible, . . . its basic meaning . . . relate[s] to the idea of a lesson to be learned or taught."[45]

---

[41] The LXX Isaiah translator may have freely translated יָעִיר ("rouse") with ἔθηκεν (here, "gave"—see p. 197, n. g) in order to allude to the second Servant Song where forms of τίθημι figure prominently in 49:2 and 6. In any case, the very free translation cannot be attributed to any unfamiliarity with the Hebrew word on the part of the LXX Isaiah translator. Ekblad (*Servant Poems,* 138) shows that the LXX Isaiah translator knew the meaning of עור (note especially how he accurately translates forms in the hiphil in Isa 41:2, 25; and 45:13).

[42] In the context of Isaiah, the phrase "an ear to hear" is surely meant to contrast the Servant's gift of understanding with the lack of understanding on the part of the people to whom Isaiah is sent and instructed to say according to Isa 6:9 in both the MT and LXX: שָׁמ֙וֹעַ֙ וְאַל־תָּבִ֔ינוּ וּרְא֥וּ רָא֖וֹ וְאַל־תֵּדָֽעוּ שִׁמְע֤וּ ("Listen intently but you will not discern; look intently and you will not perceive") and ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε ("You shall hear a report and not understand at all, look intently and not see at all").

[43] As Ekblad (*Servant Poems*, 139) notes, the LXX Isaiah translator seems to have taken some liberty in rendering the final כַּלִּמּוּדִים ("like disciples/well-trained") in MT Isa 50:4 as the opening of LXX Isa 50:5 καὶ ἡ παιδεία κυρίου ("and the training of the Lord"). Note that the translation has no equivalent for the prefix כַּ.

Although the word παιδεία itself is found only once in LXX Proto-Isaiah (PI) in 26:16[46], the concept is nonetheless given great weight in PI by the opening "vision" of the Book of Isaiah, the description of a father's endless "disciplining" of his children to no avail (1:2-6), a metaphor for the devastation of Israel. In LXX DI, the word παιδεία itself occurs with some frequency: three times within four chapters (in 50:4, 5; and 53:5). The παῖς willingly submits (v. 6) to humiliation and physical affliction precisely because it is part of ἥ παιδεία κυρίου. The παῖς in effect says, “Through his training, which includes humiliation and suffering, κύριος opens my ears (ἀνοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα) that is, he enlightens me.”[47] This is congruent with Judaic thought—and evidently, Hellenistic Judaism as well, if not more so (see p. 184, note 44)—which took as a given that suffering is part and parcel of the instruction that leads to wisdom and glory; see, e.g., LXX Prov 15:33 φόβος θεοῦ παιδεία καὶ σοφία, καὶ ἀρχὴ δόξης ἀποκριθήσεται αὐτῇ (“Fear of God is παιδεία and wisdom; and the highest glory will be bought forth from it” [cf. *NETS*]). We have already seen that the association of παιδεία with wisdom is implicit in the Third Servant song’s reference to the opening of the ears of the παῖς. The association of παιδεία with glory—and further development of its association with wisdom—becomes a theme in the Fourth Servant Song.

---

[44] That God disciplines his people as a good father disciplines his son is clear, e.g., in both MT and LXX Deut 8:5. In addition Jim Alvin Sanders (*Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism* [Colgate Rochester Divinity School Bulletin 28; Rochester: Colgate Divinity School, 1955] 112) cites Prov 3:11-12:
מוּסַר יְהוָה בְּנִי אַל־תִּמְאָס וְאַל־תָּקֹץ בְּתוֹכַחְתּוֹ כִּי אֶת אֲשֶׁר יֶאֱהַב יְהוָה יוֹכִיחַ וּכְאָב אֶת־בֵּן יִרְצֶה
("The chastening of Yhwh, my son, do not reject and do not loathe his rebuke; for whom Yhwh loves, he rebukes, as a father the son whom he favors.") The LXX's rendition of these verses suggests that Hellenized Jews considered the infliction of suffering on one's charges part of a proper training at least as much if not more than their Hebrew-speaking counterparts:
υἱέ, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος· ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται ("My son, do not despise the chastening of κύριος nor grow weary under his reproof; for κύριος chastens his beloved, and scourges every son he receives").

[45] Sanders, *Suffering*, 19.

[46] κύριε, ἐν θλίψει ἐμνήσθην σου, ἐν θλίψει μικρᾷ ἡ παιδεία σου ἡμῖν ("Lord, in affliction I remembered you; by little affliction your discipline for us").

50:7 κύριος Helps the παῖς.

The παῖς is able to show remarkable forbearance and equanimity in the face of humiliation and physical affliction because κύριος has become his helper. The strength and help of the Lord promised in the Second Servant Song (see 49:5, 8) is now evidenced by the willingness of the παῖς to endure not only failure (see 49:4) but also persecution (50:6).

---

[47] Thus, Jerome (*Commentarium in Esaiam XIV, prol.-l, 4/7* in *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera*: Pars I Opera exegetica, 2A Commentariorum in Esaiam Libri XII-XVIIII in Easaia parvula ad adbreviatio [ed. Marcus Adriaen; CC, Series Latina 73a; Turnhout: Brepols, 1963] 553) translates LXX Isa 50:5 “et disciplina Domini aperit aures meas” (“and the discipline of the Lord opens my ears”) and comments, “. . . linguam acceperit disciplinae, ut sciret quando deberet loqui, quando reticere” (“. . . he accepted the tongue of discipline, that he might know when he should speak, when to be silent”).

50:8 κύριος Draws Near, Ready to Vindicate His παῖς.

One of the ways the παῖς is persecuted evidently includes false accusations or the threat of them. The παῖς portrays κύριος as present and ready to vindicate him. So confident is the παῖς that κύριος will prove his innocence that he challenges his opponents to go to court and concludes with a taunt: “Behold, all of you will become old like a garment, and, as it were, a moth will devour you” (LXX 50:9b).

D. A Summary of the LXX Third Servant Song’s Portrayal of κύριος

In the Third Servant Song, κύριος is portrayed in relationship to the παῖς, to those who fear him, and to those who do not. In his relationship to the παῖς, κύριος is seen as allowing him to suffer not out of spite or capriciousness, but as part of the divine pedagogy. κύριος, the pedagogue, is intent upon forming his pupil into a disciple who truly hears with understanding and who is trained in eloquence and, when necessary, prudent silence. In relation to those who fear him, κύριος is also a teacher with a simple lesson: listen to the Servant and, because the darkness will be total, trust in κύριος. To those who do not fear him, the lesson of κύριος is stern. Those who do not listen to the Servant condemn themselves to walking by their own lights and coming to a bad end.

IV. Comparison of the Portrayal of God in the MT and LXX Texts of Isa 50:4-11

[4]My Lord Yhwh has given me	κύριος gives me
a disciple’s tongue	a well-trained tongue
to know how to help the weary	that I may know the time
with a word.	when it is necessary to speak a word,
Morning after morning he rouses,	giving me in the morning, in the morning
he rouses my ear	giving me an ear
to give heed like a disciple.	to hear. [5]And the discipline
[5]My Lord Yhwh has opened my ear,	of κύριος opens my ear,

because for my part, I have not rebelled, I have not turned back.	and as for me, I do not distrust or contradict.
[6]My back I gave to those who beat me, and my cheeks to those who plucked my beard; my face I did not hide from shaming and spitting	[6]I have given my back to scourges and my cheeks to blows, and my face I did not turn away from the shame of spittings.
[7]Since my Lord Yhwh is my helper —therefore I was not ashamed; therefore I set my face like flint since I knew that I would not be put to shame.	[7]And κύριος became my helper; therefore I was not ashamed, but I have set my face like solid rock and I realized that I would surely not be disgraced.
[8]The One who will vindicate me is at hand	[8]He who justified me draws near.
Who will arraign me? Let us have a legal proceeding! Who is my adversary? Let him initiate a case against me.	Who is the one who contends with me? Let him confront me at once. Yes, who is the one who contends with me? Let him draw near me.
[9]Behold, my Lord Yhwh is my helper. Who will declare me guilty?	[9]Behold, κύριος helps me; Who will harm me?
Behold, all of them will wear out like a garment; the moth will eat them up.	Behold, all of you will become old like a garment, and, as it were, a moth will devour you.
[10]Who among you fears Yhwh listening to the voice of his Servant?	[10]Who among you fears κύριος? Let him hear the voice of his παῖς.
Let him who walks in darkness with no light trust in the name of Yhwh and rely upon his God.	Those who walk in darkness —they have no light; trust in the name of κύριος, and lean upon God.
[11]Behold all of you are kindlers of fire, setting brands ablaze.	[11]Behold all of you kindle fire and make a flame stronger.
Walk into the flame of your fire; walk into the flaming arrows that are now burning!	Walk by the light of your fire and by the flame that you have kindled.

[13]From my hand this has befallen you: in a place of torment shall you lie down.	Because of me, these things happen to you, in sorrow you shall lie down.

A. Similarities

In both texts, God (presumably through the prophet) admonishes those who fear him to listen to the voice of the Servant. Both texts imply that doing so will entail walking in darkness; but those who do so will not be alone. God can be trusted and relied upon. In both texts, God gives a warning to those who do not heed his admonition.

In both texts, the Servant portrays God as his teacher. God is also the Servant's helper in the face of humiliation and physical abuse. Finally the Servant portrays God as his vindicator who stands near and is ready to prove the Servant's innocence in the face of false accusations.

B. Differences

In the warning God gives to those who do not obey the voice of the Servant the two texts differ considerably. Yhwh expresses anger, in effect cursing the rebels and telling them to walk into their fire and flames in MT 50:11b. In the end he will punish them by sending them to their death in a place of torment (MT 50:11c). By contrast, in LXX 50:11b, κύριος continues his warning with irony by telling the rebels to walk by their own lights. If they do, they will lose their way and, because of κύριος (that is, only because nothing happens except because of him), lie down in sorrow. This could be interpreted literally as "to fall asleep in grief" or, more likely, in the figurative sense, "to die in sorrow." In dealing with the rebels, κύριος in LXX 50:11 is portrayed as more measured than is Yhwh in MT 50:11: there is neither anger expressed nor threat of torment. Those who refuse to follow the Servant's instructions, which are meant ultimately for the people's weal and not woe, and instead prefer to follow their own lights will be doomed to unhappiness or even an unhappy death.

Yhwh has "opened the ear" of his Servant because he has proved trustworthy, he has not rebelled in the face of humiliation and physical pain (MT 50:5-7). Yhwh treats his Servant as a disciple, giving instruction daily in the manner of religious instruction in the ANE (MT 50:4b). Because Yhwh has taught him how to heed as a disciple, the Servant is able to speak like a disciple of Yhwh, who desires to help the weary through the word of his Servant (MT 50:4a).

In the LXX, κύριος is implicitly portrayed more like a pedagogue—a schoolmaster— who trains, educates, and chastises his pupil (παῖς), using pedagogical methods which include pain and suffering. Even as those who torment the παῖς are rebelling against God and his παῖς, they are unwitting instruments of κύριος in his disciplining and forming his παῖς. Their abuse is somehow used by κύριος to "open the ears" of his παῖς. Because of his "opened ears," the παῖς knows how to speak with a well-trained tongue, knowing especially when to speak and when to remain silent.

To the degree that MT Isa 50:4-9 and LXX Isa 50:4-9 connect the suffering of the servant with the "opening of the ear(s)" differently, they also approach theodicy differently. Analysis of this difference is helped by recognizing that both the MT and

LXX Isa 50:4-7 use the rhetorical device hysteron-proteron.[48] In this device, the reported order of events is the opposite of that in which they occur.

In the MT Third Servant Song, the key to its theodicy is to recognize that the Servant's unjust public humiliation and physical abuse is a test. With the help that comes from Yhwh (v. 7), the Servant is able to endure unjust suffering (v. 6), and he passes Yhwh's test by not rebelling (v. 5b). Yhwh, having found the Servant trustworthy—unlike Jacob/Israel, then takes him on as a disciple and "opens his ear" (v. 5a). Yhwh first teaches the Servant to hear like a disciple (v. 4b). Finally, Yhwh teaches his Servant how to speak, like a disciple, a word to the weary (v. 4a).

That God would need to conduct a test to discover anything (in this case, test his παῖς to discover his trustworthiness) is hard to reconcile philosophically with an omniscient God who knows all future events.[49] Of course, testing human beings can be different from testing unchanging material objects in that the testing of the former can have as its purpose strengthening them precisely in the area being tested. Thus, a second interpretation of the MT's theodicy of the Third Servant Song might involve testing in a way that is far from irrational. On this interpretation Yhwh could be seen as testing his Servant precisely in order to strengthen him (and perhaps secondarily to make that strength known to the παῖς and to others—but certainly not to the all-knowing God).

Nevertheless, I propose that the LXX translator saw the possibility of his philosophically astute Alexandrian readers/hearers assuming the former of these two interpretations of v. 5b. In order to avoid this possibility, the translator deftly modifies the theodicy of the LXX text: the pain and suffering of the παῖς is not a test in the sense of the means by which κύριος might learn more about his παῖς, but rather precisely the opposite: the παιδεία (instruction/education/discipline/chastisement) of κύριος is a tool whereby the Servant learns. κύριος allows pain and suffering only in order that the παῖς might learn and gain wisdom.

---

[48] I am indebted to Goldingay and (*Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 208) who point out this rhetorical device in v. 4. In my view the device extends much further.

[49] Georg Bertram, "παιδεύω," *TDNT*, 5. 608.

The LXX's starting point in the inverted sequence of the hysteron-proteron passage, just as in the MT, is the help that comes from God (v. 7). But in the LXX the help of κύριος enables the Servant to trust that his suffering has to be undergone voluntarily (vv. 5b-6): in fact, the suffering is itself part of the παιδεία that "opens his ear" (v. 5a). Because of his "opened ear" the παῖς is able to speak with a well-trained tongue and to remain silent at the proper time. In short, his pain and suffering result ultimately in eloquence and knowing when to speak and when to be silent.

Though the use of suffering in education is increasingly alien in most modern Western approaches to education, the two were closely connected in both the OT and Hellenistic worlds. Thus, the LXX text of the Third Servant Song implicitly attempts to replace an explanation for God's allowing the just Servant to suffer that was deemed "irrational" (i.e., God learning through conducting a test) with one that a Hellenistic audience would find far more congenial.

V. Summary

Because the LXX text and the MT of Third Servant Song are substantially similar, there is little reason to suspect substantial differences in the *Vorlagen.* Although some differences may be attributable to differences in pointing (see, e.g., p. 199, n. m—m) or lack of familiarity with a given Hebrew term (see p. 197, note i) there are certain translational choices (assuming that the LXX *Vorlage* was the same as M) that may be explained as exegetical *Tendenzen* affecting the portrayal of God. The question remains: on the assumption that the LXX *Vorlage* was substantially identical to M, do the LXX Isaiah translator's avoidance of anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms and his tendency to portray God in other ways that are more congruent with a Greek philosophical outlook constitute *Tendenzen*?

Anthropomorphisms /Anthropopathisms

The translator of LXX Isa 50:11 surely was reading a *Vorlage* identical to that of MT 50:11 but translated מִיָּדִי ("from my hand") as δι’ ἐμέ ("through/because of me"). This may be an example of a *Tendenz* of the LXX Isaiah translator to avoid anthropomorphisms, although the translator may have simply construed מִיָּדִי as an idiom so common that there was little risk of it being taken as an anthropomorphism. His goal may have been merely to translate into idiomatic Greek.

Yhwh's words, "Walk into the flame of your fire," in MT 50:11 portray an angry God unlike LXX 50:11 where κύριος instead says, "Walk by the light of your fire." The meaning is ironic; κύριος obviously wants the implied audience to do the opposite of what he says. Although irony is a very human mode of expression, surely here it does not express wrath. Rather, it is part of God's reasoning with the rebels, as if to say: "Let us suppose you *do* walk by your own lights. This will be the result . . . ." This, too, seems to be an example of the translator's avoidance of portraying an emotional God.

A God for a Greek Milieu

The LXX translator of the Third Servant Song avoids portraying God as testing his Servant, a concept that—taking testing to be a way for God to gain knowledge—could be construed as "irrational" to a Greek philosophical mindset. Instead, the LXX text of the Third Suffering Servant Song portrays God as a pedagogue who uses pain and suffering as a means of training his pupil. Whatever modern audiences may think of such an approach to pedagogy, an ANE reader/audience would have found it eminently reasonable that a loving father would subject his son to pain in order to rear him well. There is nothing metaphysically impossible in the notion that God would do the same to one he addresses as ὁ παῖς μου.

Chapter Five: The Fourth Servant Song

In this chapter, following the same pattern used in the previous chapters, I begin with a discussion of the Fourth Servant Song's delimitation. Next, I offer my own English translation of the MT pericope, with explanations of my translational choices for some of the more difficult cases and with evaluations of the major variants noted in the textual apparatus of *BHS*. Then I identify the implied speakers and audiences for the various sections of the pericope. After these preliminary steps, I analyze the portrayal of Yhwh in those verses in which the implied speaker is Yhwh or in which the implied speaker directly quotes Yhwh. Finally, I examine the portrayal of Yhwh in those verses spoken anonymously in the first person plural and not quoting Yhwh. The identity of the group referred to simply as "we" in these verses is debated among exegetes. Presumably a single person speaks in its name.

I then take up the LXX text of the Fourth Servant Song: I provide my own translation with text-critical notes together with an analysis of the implied speakers and audiences, and of the portrayal of κύριος in the song. Next, I present my translation of the MT and LXX texts of the Fourth Servant Song side by side and compare and contrast their portrayals of God. Finally, a conclusion will summarize the similarities and differences between the two texts.

I. Delimitation of the Pericope

Most exegetes agree upon the delimitation of the passage traditionally labeled "the Fourth Servant Song" (including those who disagree with this traditional designation, following Duhm). The reasons are outlined succinctly by Blenkinsopp: "The address of a servant of Yahveh [*sic*]in 49:1-6 and the present passage, in which the Servant does not speak but is spoken about, both rather abruptly follow exhortations to depart from the place of exile (48:20-22; 52:11-12). The contextual isolation of 52:13–53:12 is also emphasized by the apostrophe to Zion that precedes and follows it (52:1-2, 7-10; 54:1-17)."[1]

Isaiah 52:11-12 constitutes a clear exodus allusion. Blenkinsopp, along with most commentators, sees this passage as addressed to the exiles in Babylon, who, having been freed by Cyrus, are encouraged to make their new exodus back to Jerusalem.[2] To Blenkinsopp, the subsequent reference to the Servant of Yhwh in 52:13 appears abrupt.

There are at least two ways of reading 52:13. If it is read as addressed to the exiles (just as are the preceding verses), the Servant would presumably be someone (or some group) *other* than the exiles, since it seems unlikely that the exiles are both being addressed (e.g., 52:12) and also being referred to as "my Servant" (52:13–53:12) in the third person singular. Thus, on this way of reading the verse, at a minimum 52:13 introduces a new topic, the Servant, which is continued through the following fourteen verses. A second way of reading 52:13 is to see the Servant as the exiles (or a subgroup within the community) who were being addressed in the previous verse. Given this reading, the exiles, who are the addressees through 52:12, suddenly are spoken of in the third person singular in 52:13, thus implying a new unspecified audience. In any event, 52:13 involves either a change in topic or a change in addressee. Even clearer is the change of mood—in the grammatical sense—at 52:13 from the imperative to the indicative, as well as in the emotional sense from the sustained joy of 52:7-12 to a stunning sobriety that dominates in 52:14–53:10. As for the end of the pericope, this clearly cannot extend beyond 53:12 because the mood shifts back to the imperative at 54:1 and the series of "apostrophes to Zion" which begin with 52:1-2 and 52:7-10 resumes.[3]

---

[1] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55* (AB 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2002) 349. For similar views, see John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40–55* (ICC; 2 vols.; London: T & T Clark, 2006) 2. 275 and Georg Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja* (3 vols.; ZBK; Zurich: Zwingli, 1964) 3. 160, among others.

[2] For a different view, which sees the addressees as the new Israel who will go forth in battle from Jerusalem, see Hans M. Barstad, *A Way in the Wilderness* (JSS Monograph 12; Manchester: University of Manchester, 1989) 102-5.

Is Isa 52:13–53:12 an Integral Unit?

Is Isaiah 53 one unit or two?[4] The chapter and verse divisions in all modern versions of Isaiah suggest that 53:1 is the beginning of a new pericope. Indeed, some scholars argue that 52:13-15 and 53:1-12 are two distinct pericopes. For example, J. Coppens, H. Orlinsky, and R. N. Whybray consider 52:13-15 a "distinct salvation pronouncement."[5]

Little clarification of the matter is to be gained from examining the MT MSS:

---

[3] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55,* 339.

[4] As mentioned above, "Isaiah 53" refers to Isa 52:13–53:12.

[5] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55*, 351. See also Jan L. Koole, *Isaiah,* part 3, vol. 2, *Isaiah 49–55* (trans. Anthony P. Runia; Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), "Orlinsky and Whybray identify the Servant with Israel in 52:13-15 and with the prophet himself in chap. 53. The arguments for . . . [this] view are not very convincing" (p. 259).

> The Hebrew manuscript tradition shows some variation, but it broadly reflects the same two possibilities, of treating 52.13–53.12, as one unit or as two. Thus some MT MSS provide a setuma before 52.13, again before 53.1, and then before 54:1. 1QIs[a] similarly begins new lines at 52.13 and 53.1, though it also begins and indents a new line at v. 9, slightly indents the line for v. 10aβ (v. 10aα had extended to the end of the preceding line), has slight spaces before vv. 6b and 12, then begins a new line at 54.1. Other MT MSS treat 52.13-53.12 as one whole, lacking the setuma at 53.1, while 1QIs[b] likewise has a space division before 52.13 and none before 53.1. On the other hand, no MT MSS have a petucha at both 52.13 and 53.12, and none has a petucha at 53.1.[6]

Nevertheless, there are good reasons for considering 52:13-53:12 (Isaiah 53) a unified whole.

> A strong argument for the unity of 52:13ff, and chap. 53 is the connection of 52:14aB.b with 53:2. The quasi-chiastic correlations between 52:15b and 53:1 are remarkable: לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ ['they have not heard'] is matched by לִשְׁמֻעָתֵנוּ ['what we have heard'] respectively; הִתְבּוֹנָנוּ ['will understand/contemplate'] (52:15) is probably matched by הֶאֱמִין ['would/has/can believe'] in 53:1 (43:10, cf. 28:9, 19); in the same way רָאוּ ['they have seen'] in 52:15 corresponds to נִגְלָתָה ['has been revealed'] in 53:1 (cf. 40:5; 47:3). Perhaps a more obvious argument against the separation of 52:13-15 from what follows is the close connection of these verses with 53:11-12. In both stanzas God talks about 'my Servant' in his relationship with the 'many' and all emphasis lies on the elevation which he is granted after his humiliation.[7]

C. Westermann also notes the chiastic features in Isaiah 53 and the connection between 52:15 and the following verses, but highlights somewhat different items as well. Specifically, he observes that 53:2-5 (the poem's detailed description of the Servant's suffering) corresponds to 52:14 ("Just as many were desolate over you [masc. sing.]—so marred beyond anyone was his appearance, his form beyond [that of] human beings. . ."), while 53:10b-11a (a description of Yhwh's exaltation of the Servant) corresponds to 52:15 (". . . so shall he sprinkle many nations. Concerning him, kings will shut their mouths; for they will see what has not been told them; they will understand what they had never heard"). Westermann writes that "what ends vv. 13ff., 'that which they have not heard' (v. 15c) becomes the introduction to the report. Thus introduced the report proper begins in v. 2."[8]

---

[6] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 275.

[7] Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 259.

Goldingay and Payne note further chiastic features and other connections between 52:13-15 and the following verses: "The third-person verbs beginning in 53.2 are deprived of an antecedent identifying their subject if chapter 53 is separated from what precedes. The further reference to the servant's 'look' and 'appearance' (53.2, cf. 52.14) specifically links 52.13-15 and 53.1-12."[9]

For the above reasons, Isaiah 53 is, in my view, clearly an integral unit. The intricate use of inclusions is evidence that the poem is not only a unity but also highly structured and carefully balanced.

II. The Portrayal of God in MT Isaiah 53

A. Text-critical Notes and Translation

[52:13]הִנֵּ֥ה יַשְׂכִּ֖יל עַבְדִּ֑י
יָר֧וּם [a] וְנִשָּׂ֛א וְגָבַ֖הּ מְאֹֽד׃

---

[8] Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969) 256.

[9] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 2. 275.

[a] One of the three—most likely the first—of the semantically similar verbs in the second clause above lacks a counterpart in the LXX. One possibility is that the *Vorlage* of the LXX may have been different from that of the MT. If so, which of the two *Vorlagen* would have been more original? If one follows the rule *lectio brevior praeferanda est*, the supposed *Vorlage* of the LXX would be more original and the MT an expansion. P. Kyle McCarter, Jr. (*Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* [GBS; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986] 90) describes the MT of Isaiah in general as "expansionistic." On the other hand, the supposed *Vorlage* of the LXX may be less original, having been shortened through

See, my Servant will be wise,[b]
he will be exalted, and lifted up, and be very high.

14 כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמְמוּ עָלֶיךָ [c] רַבִּים
כֵּן־מִשְׁחַת [d] מֵאִישׁ מַרְאֵהוּ
וְתֹאֲרוֹ מִבְּנֵי אָדָם

---

homoiarcton, given that וְגָבַהּ and וְנִשָּׂא have the same opening letter and easily confused second letters. Still another possibility is that there may have been only one *Vorlage* for this verse: the Greek translator may have found its three approximate synonyms unacceptably redundant.

[b] English does not have a good single-term equivalent for יַשְׂכִּיל which bears a whole range of meanings from “to be wise,” to “to act wisely,” “to teach,” “to prosper,” and “to cause to prosper.” The connection among these meanings is shown by M. Sæbø in “שׂכל *śkl* hi. to have insight,” *TLOT* 3. 1269-72. Although the *NAB*, *RSV*, and *NRSV*, etc., are correct in translating the term “[he] shall prosper,” I have chosen to render “he will be wise” because this is closer to the LXX and Vg and because it highlights important structural features of the passage, as explained below. H. L. Ginsburg (“The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant,” *VT* 3 [1953] 400-404) suggests that Dan 12:3ab, with its wisdom reference, is a commentary on Isa 52:13a and 53:11c. R. Bergey (“The Rhetorical Role of Reiteration in the Suffering Servant Poem [Isa 52:13-53:12],” *JETS* 40 [1997] 177-88 and Michael Barré (“Textual and Rhetorical-Critical Observations on the Last Servant Song [Isaiah 52:13-53:12],” *CBQ* 62 [2000] 8) note that translating the word יַשְׂכִּיל with an English equivalent having a sapiential meaning serves to highlight the parallelism between יַשְׂכִּיל and both הִתְבּוֹנָנוּ (52:15d) and בְּדַעְתּוֹ (53:11c). Isa 52:13 would then form an *inclusio* with 52:15d, thus demarcating the prologue; in addition, 52:13 would also form an *inclusio* with 53:11c, thus demarcating the entire poem. Such a translation of יַשְׂכִּיל is further supported by the LXX which translates it, as well as the two previously mentioned verbs in 52:15d (הִתְבּוֹנָנוּ) and 53:11c (בְּדַעְתּוֹ), with forms of συνίημι. Likewise, the Vg renders the three Hebrew terms by words with sapiential meanings: 52:13 *intelleget*; 52:15d *contemplati sunt*; and 53:11c *in scientia sua.*

Aquila (hereafter α′) has ἐπιστημονισθήσεται, “he will be caused to understand”; but α′ often uses passives for verbs that look transitive but are actually intransitive (Harald Hegermann, *Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta* [Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1954] 28-29).

[c] Syriac and two Hebrew MSS have a third person singular suffix. The otherwise universally attested second person singular suffix is to be preferred, however, as the *lectio difficilior.* A sudden switch from third person to second person or vice versa is not an uncommon feature of prophetic and poetic language (GKC §144p).

[d] 1QIsa^a has משחתי, the י of which can be interpreted as a *hireq compaginis*. The 1QIsa^a reading is possibly more original: a later scribe may have perceived this as a mistake or removed it to avoid ambiguity. Also, one MS vocalizes the verb as the hophal masculine singular participle of שחת (used twice elsewhere in the OT: in Prov 25:26 to describe a spring as “ruined” and in Mal 1:14 as a substantive, meaning “a blemished, unfit offering”).

(15a)כֵּ֣ן יַזֶּה֙ גּוֹיִ֣ם רַבִּ֔ים

Just as many were desolate over you (masc. sing.)—
so marred[e] beyond anyone was his appearance,
his form beyond [that of] human beings—
[15a]so will he sprinkle[f] many nations.

---

[e] The above translation is traditional, but not without problems. Those who argue for "anointed" instead of "marred," e.g., Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 291) ask why the masculine singular construct nominal form מִשְׁחַ֥ת (literally, "disfigurement of face," according to BDB) is used instead of the far more conventional hiphil active participle, מַֽשְׁחִית ("spoiling") or hophal participle, מָשְׁחֵת ("polluted, damaged, blemished") if something like "marred" is the intended meaning. They also point out that every other occurrence of מִשְׁחַת in the *Tanakh* is related to anointing. The construct form used before the prepositional form מֵ (as in מֵאִ֖ישׁ) is not uncommon in "elevated (prophetic or poetic) style" (GKC §130a). In short, they propose translating מִשְׁחַת as the construct form of מִשְׁחָה ("an anointing") and translate the phrase ". . . so his appearance is anointed beyond that of any other human being." In a similar vein, 1QIsa[a] renders משחתי, which, following D. Barthélemy ("Le grand rouleau d'Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte," *RB* 57 [1950] 530-49, here 546-47), could be translated as ". . . so I anointed his appearance . . ." as opposed to taking the hireq as a *hireq compaginis* (see n. d).

Barthélemy's as well as Goldingay and Payne's proposals are not without problems. Although *HALOT* gives "anointing" as its first definition, BDB defines the noun מִשְׁחָה only as "ointment" or "consecrated portion." Furthermore, in this verse, the only possible object of anointing is מַרְאֵהוּ ("his appearance, his visage, his countenance"). Nowhere else in the OT is someone's appearance, visage, or countenance "anointed." (It may be replied, on the other hand, that nowhere else is a person's appearance said to be "ruined/disfigured" either.)

Perhaps the strongest argument against the rendering "anointing" is that the versions evidently read the word as related to שׁחת rather than משׁח. The unusual MT vocalization can be dealt with without changing the consonantal text: as mentioned in the previous footnote, some, including the editors of *BHS*, propose simply revocalizing it as a hophal participle (cf. Mal 1:14 מָשְׁחָת).

Finally, however, it remains possible, as Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55*, 2. 292) suggest, following W. H. Brownlee and J. Koenig, that the word is intentionally ambiguous. Such ambiguity would not be incongruent with the rest of the poem, in which the Servant's suffering ("ruin/disfigurement") leads to the taking away of sin, a priestly ("anointed") role in the *Tanakh.*

[f] The literal meaning of יַזֶּה is "he shall sprinkle." It is well attested in MSS, including Qumran Isaiah texts, and this translation is supported by the Vg, *iste asperget*, and the recensions of both α′ and Theodotion (hereafter θ′): ῥαντίσει. Furthermore, the Syr has the semantically related verb, ܡܕܟܐ (““to purify"). The reading goes back at least to 100 B.C. as attested by 1QIsa[a] (for the dating, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* [2nd rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992] 106). The reading is said to be problematic (Blenkinsopp, Barré, et al.), because the object of the verb in Hebrew is supposedly always elsewhere a liquid (water, blood, oil), and the liquid is sprinkled "on" (על) something or someone. One OT exception, Lev 4:6b, however, shows that this "standard" usage was not the only possibility: וְהִזָּ֨ה מִן־הַדָּ֜ם שֶׁ֣בַע פְּעָמִ֗ים לִפְנֵ֣י יְהוָ֔ה אֶת־פְּנֵ֖י פָּרֹ֥כֶת הַקֹּֽדֶשׁ ("And he shall sprinkle the surface of the sanctuary curtain with blood seven times before the Lord"). Note that here the direct object indicated by the direct object marker, אֶת, is פְּנֵ֖י פָּרֹ֥כֶת הַקֹּֽדֶשׁ ("the surface of the sanctuary curtain") and the liquid being sprinkled ("the blood") is preceded by מִן ("with").

עָלָ֛יו יִקְפְּצ֥וּ מְלָכִ֖ים פִּיהֶ֑ם
כִּ֠י אֲשֶׁ֨ר לֹֽא־סֻפַּ֤ר לָהֶם֙ רָא֔וּ
וַאֲשֶׁ֥ר לֹֽא־שָׁמְע֖וּ הִתְבּוֹנָֽנוּ׃

Concerning him, kings will shut their mouths;
for they will see what has not been told them;
they will understand what they had never heard.

53:1 מִ֥י הֶאֱמִ֖ין לִשְׁמֻעָתֵ֑נוּ
וּזְר֥וֹעַ יְהוָ֖ה עַל[g]־מִ֥י נִגְלָֽתָה׃

Who has believed what we have heard?
The arm of Yhwh—to[h] whom has it been revealed?

Must the direct object of sprinkling be a thing, as in the example of Lev 4:6? There is no evidence that the direct object could not also be a person or persons. The hiphil of נזה is used in the context of consecrating persons (Exod 29:21 and Lev 8:30) and purifying persons (Lev 14:7; Num 8:7; 19:18, 19).

In short, since there is no reason to doubt that "many nations" can be the direct object, or to think that the liquid used needs to be specified, there is no need to seek another meaning beyond the widely attested OT gesture of sprinkling.

Support for this reading is also offered on different grounds by Johannes Lindblom (*The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah: A New Attempt to Solve an Old Problem* [LUÅ N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 47, Nr. 5; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951] 41). He argues from the fact that פ״ן and פ״י (= I-nun and I-yod) verbs are often closely cognate, that נזה and יזה are also closely cognate. These verbs are preserved in two names in the OT: יזיאל Ket. יזואל (Jeziel) in 1 Chr 12:3 and יזיה (Izziah) in Ezra 10:25, meaning "he who is besprinkled by God" and "he whom Yhwh has purified," respectively. The stems evidently were transitive with personal objects. Martin Noth, in a letter to Lindblom concerning this passage, opines that the Masoretes certainly had "sprinkle/besprinkle" in mind, although he questions whether this was the original consonantal text (see Lindblom, *Servant*, 41, n. 60).

The common alternative, "he shall startle" (so the RSV, NRSV, and NAB), reads the MT as a causative form of an otherwise unattested verb נזה, cognate with the Arabic *nzw* ("to leap"). Such a meaning is suggested nowhere else in the OT by the Hiphil of נזה. Although this rendering would correlate loosely with the LXX's θαυμάσονται in meaning, the LXX has "many nations" rather than "he" as the subject.

[g] 1QIsa^b has אל, which is probably to be rejected in favor of the otherwise universally attested and more ambiguous reading cited above.

[h] Other possible translations include "concerning whom," "against whom," "because of whom," etc. α′, θ′, and Symmachus (hereafter σ′) translate עַל־מִי as ἐπί τινα ("on [or upon] whom"). In support of the above translation, Christopher R. North (*The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study* [2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963] 229) notes that עַל can have the same meaning as אֶל, but with a more forceful nuance (see, e.g., 1 Sam 1:10; 1 Kgs 22:43). Read in connection with Isa 52:10:

חָשַׂ֤ף יְהוָה֙ אֶת־זְר֣וֹעַ קָדְשׁ֔וֹ לְעֵינֵ֖י כָּל־הַגּוֹיִ֑ם וְרָאוּ֙ כָּל־אַפְסֵי־אָ֔רֶץ אֵ֖ת יְשׁוּעַ֥ת אֱלֹהֵֽינוּ׃

("Yhwh has bared his holy arm to the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth will see the victory of our God"), the above meaning seems clear.

[2] וַיַּ֨עַל כַּיּוֹנֵ֜ק [i] לְפָנָ֗יו [j]
וְכַשֹּׁ֙רֶשׁ֙ מֵאֶ֣רֶץ צִיָּ֔ה
לֹא־תֹ֥אַר ל֖וֹ
וְלֹ֣א הָדָ֑ר וְנִרְאֵ֥הוּ
וְלֹֽא־מַרְאֶ֖ה וְנֶחְמְדֵֽהוּ׃

[2] He grew like a shoot before him,
like a root out of arid ground.
He had no form,
no splendor that we could see,
no appearance that we should desire him.

[3] נִבְזֶה֙ [k] וַחֲדַ֣ל אִישִׁ֔ים
אִ֥ישׁ מַכְאֹב֖וֹת וִיד֣וּעַ חֹ֑לִי
וּכְמַסְתֵּ֤ר פָּנִים֙ מִמֶּ֔נּוּ
נִבְזֶ֖ה [l] וְלֹ֥א חֲשַׁבְנֻֽהוּ׃

---

[i] According to Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 299), elsewhere in the *Tanakh* the feminine equivalent of יוֹנֵק is far more common; presumably, the author uses the masculine to apply it more explicitly to the Servant (masculine). The ordinary meaning is “young boy.” Thus, the LXX (παιδίον), α′ (τιθιζόμενον), θ ′ (θλάζον), and Syr (ܝܠܘܕܐ) all translate with words referring to a child. Whether “suckling child” is actually intended, however, is thrown into question by the verb יַעַל (“to grow”), which, according to Goldingay and Payne, is used elsewhere of plants but never of human beings. The Vg’s *virgultum* and *Tg. Isa.*’s כְלַבלַבִין (“like sprouts/blooms”) also support the above translation. If the reference is to “a plant,” the etymology suggests a “sucker,” i.e., a shoot from a plant’s root rather than from its stem (cf. Isa 11:1). Perhaps the poet had a double entendre in mind.

[j] *BHS* proposes לְפָנֵינוּ “before us,” without offering textual evidence for this reading. Barré (“Last Servant Song,” 12) claims that 1QIsa^{a} reads לפננו, which looks quite plausible to me from the photograph of 53:2 (see *The Great Isaiah Scroll* [*1QIsa^{a}*]*: A New Edition* [ed. Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron; STDJ 32; Boston: Brill, 1999] 88). The transcription given by the editors, however, after having checked the reading against enhanced computer negatives, is לפניו. Whatever the reading of 1QIsa^{a}, I retain the MT reading as the *lectio difficilior.*

[k] Barré (“Last Servant Song,” 13) suggests that the following *waw* originally was the ending on the preceding form נבזהו “we held him in no esteem,” both here and in the repetition of the verb later in the verse.

[l] 1QIsa^{a} has ונבוזהו, i.e., the qal *wayyiqtol*, first person common plural, with a third person masculine suffix. The *BHS* reading, however, is supported by the weight of the MT MSS, the LXX, and the Vg.

[3] He was held in contempt and forsaken by people,
a man of pain and experienced[m] in suffering,[n]
as one from whom people hide their faces,[o]
held in contempt, and we held him of no account.

[4] אָכֵ֤ן חֳלָיֵ֙נוּ֙ ה֣וּא נָשָׂ֔א
וּמַכְאֹבֵ֖ינוּ[p] בָלָ֑ם
וַאֲנַ֣חְנוּ חֲשַׁבְנֻ֔הוּ נָג֛וּעַ
מֻכֵּ֥ה אֱלֹהִ֖ים וּמְעֻנֶּֽה׃

[4] Yet as our sufferings that he carried,
our pains that he bore.
We accounted him hurt,
smitten by God, and afflicted.

[5] וְהוּא֙ מְחֹלָ֣ל מִפְּשָׁעֵ֔נוּ
מְדֻכָּ֖א מֵעֲוֺנֹתֵ֑ינוּ
מוּסַ֤ר שְׁלוֹמֵ֙נוּ֙ עָלָ֔יו
וּבַחֲבֻרָת֖וֹ נִרְפָּא־לָֽנוּ׃

[5] But he was pierced because of our transgression,
crushed because of our iniquities.
The chastisement of our peace was upon him,
and by his scourging[q] we were healed.

[6] כֻּלָּ֙נוּ֙ כַּצֹּ֣אן תָּעִ֔ינוּ
אִ֥ישׁ לְדַרְכּ֖וֹ פָּנִ֑ינוּ

---

[m] The active participle would be an easier reading, but the passive participle of the MT can be translated as "experienced" (see, e.g., Deut 1:13).

[n] Although חֳלִי is often translated "sickness," the word can have the broader meaning of "suffering," as is evident in Prov 23:35; Qoh 6:2; 2 Kgs 8:29; 1 Sam 22:8; Cant 2:5; and passim.

[o] According to John L. McKenzie (*Second Isaiah:* Introduction, Translation, and Notes [AB 20; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968] 131), "[I]n ancient belief it was dangerous to look at one who was an obvious object of divine anger."

[p] Some MSS, and the presumed *Vorlagen* of the Syr, and the Vg repeat the third person singular masculine independent pronoun הוּא as in v. 4a. As the *lectio brevior,* the MT is likely the more original.

[q] חֲבֻרָתוֹ is a singular noun, literally, "his stripe/wound." Here it is possibly used as a collective, meaning "his stripes" or, more idiomatically, "his scourging."

וַֽיהוָה֙ הִפְגִּ֣יעַ בּ֔וֹ אֵ֖ת עֲוֺ֥ן כֻּלָּֽנוּ׃

[6] All of us like sheep went astray,
each turned to his own way;
and Yhwh visited upon him the iniquity (and its consequences[r]) of us all.

[7] נִגַּ֨שׂ וְה֣וּא נַעֲנֶה֮
וְלֹ֣א יִפְתַּח־פִּיו֒
כַּשֶּׂה֙ לַטֶּ֣בַח יוּבָ֔ל
וּכְרָחֵ֕ל לִפְנֵ֥י גֹזְזֶ֖יהָ נֶאֱלָ֑מָה
וְלֹ֥א יִפְתַּ֖ח פִּֽיו׃

[7] He was hard pressed, yet[s] he was submissive,
and he did not open his mouth;
like a sheep that is led to slaughter,
like a ewe that is silent before her shearers,
he did not open his mouth.

[8] מֵעֹ֤צֶר וּמִמִּשְׁפָּט֙ לֻקָּ֔ח
וְאֶת־דּוֹר֖וֹ מִ֣י יְשׂוֹחֵ֑חַ
כִּ֤י נִגְזַר֙ מֵאֶ֣רֶץ חַיִּ֔ים
מִפֶּ֥שַׁע עַמִּ֖י[t] נֶ֥גַע לָֽמוֹ[u]

[8] After detention and after[v] judgment he was taken away;

---

[r] English does not have a good single-term equivalent for עָוֺן, which connotes not only "iniquity" but also various of its consequences, i.e., "guilt" and "punishment."

[s] Some translations (e.g., *KJV, NRSV, NJB, RSV* etc.) render "and he was afflicted." Barré ("Last Servant Song," 16) and others comment that "if the verbs were correlative one would not expect *hû'* before the second verb." Thus the meaning of וְה֣וּא נַעֲנֶה is more likely "yet he was submissive."

[t] 1QIsa^{a} has עמו, "his people." The final consonant of the word in 1QIsa^{b} and 4QIsa^{d} is difficult to discern; it could be a *waw* or a *yod.* The MT, "my people," is to be preferred as the *lectio difficilior.*

[u] According to Joüon §103 f, this is a rare poetic pausal form of לוֹ.

[v] There are, of course, other possible translations of *min.* The above is based on context. See Barré, "Last Servant Song," 17.

as for his generation[w] who would be concerned?
For he was cut off from the land of the living.
Because of the transgression of my people, he was afflicted.

[9] וַיִּתֵּ֤ן אֶת־רְשָׁעִים֙ קִבְר֔וֹ
וְאֶת־עָשִׁ֖יר[x] בְּמֹתָ֑יו[y]
עַ֚ל לֹא־חָמָ֣ס עָשָׂ֔ה
וְלֹ֥א מִרְמָ֖ה בְּפִֽיו׃

[9] He was given[z] his grave among the wicked,
and with a rich man, for his death,[aa]

---

[w] The meaning of וְאֵ֥ת־דּ֖וֹרוֹ is far from clear. One alternative to the above translation is "his dwelling" (ibid.; cf. Isa 38:12). Another alternative is proposed by Mitchell Joseph Dahood ("Isaiah 53:8-12 and Masoretic Misconstructions," *Bib* 63 [1982] 566). He states that "the separative force of ’*et* is gradually being recognized (cf. Gen 49:25; 6:13; 2 Chron 24:23 and Isa 7:17)" and proposes the translation ". . . and of his generation who gave him a thought?" McKenzie (*Second Isaiah*, 130) suggests emending the text from דּ֖וֹרוֹ to דְּבָר֖וֹ ("his case"). Although this is an easier reading, it is not supported by the MSS or the versions.

[x] McKenzie (*Second Isaiah*, 130), among others, proposes emending the text from עָשִׁ֖יר to עֹשֵׂי רַע ("evil-doers"). This emendation is not supported by any of the MSS or versions.

[y] 1QIsa^a has במותו, or "in his death" (or "his high place" [!]; see below) with the full spelling characteristic of 1QIsa^a. This reading is supported by no other witness; the above reading is more difficult and therefore likely to be more original.

[z] According to Barré ("Last Servant Song," 21) this is a verb with an impersonal subject "literally 'one gave'= 'and it was given.'" Cf. Ezek 21:16aα וַיִּתֵּ֥ן אֹתָ֖הּ לְמָרְטָ֑ה ("It has been given to be polished," *TNK*).

[aa] Literally: "in his deaths." Although NT refers to "the second death" (e.g., Rev 20:6), exilic Judaism, so far as I am aware, had no concept of a person undergoing more than one death.

There are several possible solutions. First the reading could make sense taken at face value if the servant is a collective figure, e.g., Israel, although the combination of the collective singular ("his") with the plural ("deaths") is somewhat awkward.

Second, this could be an abstract plural (GKC §124a) or a plural of amplification (GKC §124e) which would be translated simply by the singular as we find in the LXX ἀντὶ τοῦ θάνατου ("for his death") and the Vg *pro morte sua* ("for his death"). (The *Tg. Isa.* gives בְמוֹתָא, "in the death.")

Third, the above text could be corrupt. The *Vorlagen* of the LXX and the Vg may have had בְּמֹתוֹ, "in his death," but it would be hard to account for a later scribe's adding a *yod*. A possible explanation follows: 1QIsa^a has במותו, or "in his death" (or "his high place" [!]; see below) with the characteristic full spelling. It is possible that the first *waw* of this reading was misconstrued as a *yod* (a common graphic confusion) and then transposed with the *taw*.

[bb] חָפֵץ can mean "took delight," but this meaning is not consistent with the context of DI (see discussion below in section C).

he will see offspring and length of days.
The will of Yhwh will be effective by his hand.

[10] וַיהוָ֞ה חָפֵ֤ץ דַּכְּאוֹ֙ הֶֽחֱלִ֔י
אִם־תָּשִׂ֤ים אָשָׁם֙ נַפְשׁ֔וֹ
יִרְאֶ֥ה זֶ֖רַע יַאֲרִ֣יךְ יָמִ֑ים
וְחֵ֥פֶץ יְהוָ֖ה בְּיָד֥וֹ יִצְלָֽח׃

[10] But Yhwh willed[bb] to crush him severely.
If he[cc] should offer an *'asham*,[dd]
he will see offspring and length of days.
The will of Yhwh will be effective by his hand.

[11] מֵעֲמַ֤ל נַפְשׁוֹ֙ יִרְאֶ֣ה [ee] יִשְׂבָּ֔ע

[cc] תָּשִׂים is either: (1) second person singular, i.e. "if you put/make/appoint" or (2) third person singular feminine with referent נַפְשׁוֹ, i.e., "if his soul puts/makes/appoints/ offers." The first possibility is unlikely because the referent would either be Yhwh or the Servant, who are both referred to in the third person in the same verse. Finally, the referent could be the audience addressed in the singular or an individual within the audience. But who besides Yhwh or the Servant could designate or make the Servant's life a sin offering? This leaves us with the second possibility: the subject is third person singular feminine, that is נַפְשׁוֹ "his soul." The verb, תָּשִׂים is in the qal, so there is no question of a reflexive meaning. Given that תָּשִׂים is a transitive verb with נַפְשׁוֹ as its subject, its only possible object, by process of elimination, is "an *'āshām.*" As will be argued below, נַפְשׁוֹ here has nothing to do with "soul" in the modern sense, but utilizes language typical of Leviticus and refers to an individual. Thus, here it is best translated simply as "he."

[dd] I have chosen to leave אָשָׁם untranslated because it has a quasi-technical meaning in Leviticus and Numbers in which it normally refers to the sacrifice of either a ram, or a lamb (plus grain and oil) if the guilty party cannot afford the former (see Lev 7:1-7; 14:21; 19:21; and Num 5:7-8). Most English translations render "sin-offering," which does not necessarily convey the idea of animal sacrifice.

[ee] The LXX, 1QIsa^{ab}, and 4QIsa^{d} all have an additional word, "light," evidently as object of "see." The MT is to be preferred as the *lectio brevior.* Although the LXX and 1QIsa^{a} read the word "light" as the object of the verb "see," it is not attested in the other MSS or the versions. Since "see" is a transitive verb in Hebrew as well as in English, the reading in the LXX and 1QIsa^{a} is easier, and therefore likely to be a scribal emendation. (Conversely it would be difficult to explain why a scribe would leave "light" out.) Emanuel Tov (*The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* [Jerusalem Biblical Studies; Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981] 156) suggests that the Qumran texts and the *Vorlage* of the LXX may reflect a gnostic tendency. Likewise, Francis James Morrow ("The Text of Isaiah at Qumran"[Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1973] 143) points out the importance of light to the sect(s) associated with the Qumran scrolls, who in some instances called themselves בְּנֵי אוֹר, "Sons/Children of Light." In my view, "seeing light"—even in a metaphorical sense—is an idea so common (see, e.g., Isa 9:2) as hardly to necessitate such elaborate surmises.

בְּדַעְתּ֗וֹ יַצְדִּ֥יק צַדִּ֛יק עַבְדִּ֖י לָֽרַבִּ֑ים
וַעֲוֺנֹתָ֖ם ה֥וּא יִסְבֹּֽל׃

[11]Because of his travail he shall see, he shall be satisfied.[ff]
  By his knowledge[gg] my servant, the just one, will justify the many,[hh]
    and their wrongdoing and its consequences he shall bear.

12 לָכֵ֞ן אֲחַלֶּק־ל֣וֹ בָרַבִּ֗ים

[ff] The *RSV* has "He shall see the fruit of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." This is a possible translation, although it does not account for the מִן of מֵעֲמַ֤ל. Perhaps the form could be taken as a partitive: "He shall see some of the fruit of his soul's travail. . . ." The *NRSV* and *NAB* both have "light" as the object of "see" (see preceding note). The *NAB* is free in its translation of יִשְׂבָּ֔ע as "in fullness of days."

[gg] Some translations (e.g., *NRSV*) take בְּדַעְתּ֗וֹ as the end of the first sentence of the verse. However, reading בְּדַעְתּ֗וֹ as the first word of the second sentence, as above, is more consistent with the MT and 1QIsa^{a}. The latter prefixes בְּדַעְתּ֗וֹ with a *waw*, thereby unmistakably construing it as the first word of the second sentence.

[hh] The *lamed* as a prefix normally functions as a preposition, although in some cases it serves an object marker (GKC §117n). The Vg evidently construes the *lamed* in לָרַבִּים as one of those instances (*multos* ["the many"]), as do the LXX, α′, θ′, and σ′. All the major English translations take "the many" as the object of the verb יַצְדִּיק.

If the *lamed* is taken as a preposition, two possible translations emerge:

1. My Servant will vindicate the just [one] to/for the many.
2. The just one will vindicate my Servant to/for the many.

Sentence 1 could mean (a) "My Servant will act as a just judge for the many." Or if "the just one" is taken to be Yhwh, it would mean (b) "My Servant will vindicate Yhwh to the many." (The latter seems contrived since the speaker *is* Yhwh and he would be referring to himself in the third person.) Sentence 2 could mean, "Yhwh will vindicate my Servant to the many." (This seems contrived for the same reason. It would be a likely possibility if the final *yod* were emended to final *waw*—a case of a common graphic confusion—thus reading "Yhwh will vindicate his Servant to the many." In this case the speaker would remain the same as in the previous verses.) 1a and 2 (with the emendation) seem to have equal claims as possible translations.

Two further possibilities remain: "My Servant will vindicate the just one (himself) to the many." Or "The just one (i.e., the Servant) will vindicate my Servant [himself] to the many." These two renderings amount to the same thing. This is essentially the solution offered by Goldingay and Payne (*Isaiah 40–55*, 2. 325-27) who take the verb as a hiphil internal causative. In my view, however, it seems contrived to have the same person referred to as "my Servant" as the subject and "the just one" as the object—or vice versa.

Thus, the traditional translation given above seems the most probable because it follows the versions in reading "the many" as the object. The somewhat unusual use of the ל here might be explained as follows: the subject and object of the clause in question are difficult to ascertain. Perhaps since poetry generally eschews אֶת as an object marker (indeed, with the notable exception of 53:6b, the word always means "with" in this poem), there was a stylistic reason to use the ל instead.

וְאֶת־עֲצוּמִים֙ יְחַלֵּ֣ק שָׁלָ֔ל
תַּ֗חַת אֲשֶׁ֨ר הֶעֱרָ֤ה לַמָּ֙וֶת֙ נַפְשׁ֔וֹ
אֶת־פֹּשְׁעִ֖ים נִמְנָ֑ה
וְהוּא חֵטְא [ii]-רַבִּ֣ים נָשָׂאוְ
וְלַפֹּשְׁעִ֖ים יַפְגִּֽיעַ׃ ס

[12] Assuredly, I will give him a share in the many[jj],
    and with the multitudes[kk] [ll]he will divide spoil,[ll]
[mm]inasmuch as[mm] he exposed himself [nn] to death
    and was numbered among rebels,
    whereas the sin of many he carried
    and for those rebelling he will intercede.

[ii] 1QIsa[ab] have חטאי ("sins"). The plural is also attested in the LXX, ἁμαρτίας. Nevertheless, I retain the MT sg. reading of חֵטְא as the *lectio difficilior.*

[jj] Although many modern versions take בָרַבִּים to mean "with the great ones," the Vg ([*dispertiam*] *ei plurimos*) and the LXX ([κληρονομήσει] πολλούς), as well as θʹ and σʹ ([μεριῶ αὐτῷ] ἐν πολλοῖς), favor the above translation. The use of "the many" instead of "the great" is also consistent with my translation of רַבִּים in 52:14, 15; and 53:11. The word רַבִּים is governed by ב because it is the object of a verb connoting authority (see GKC §119k.)

[kk] The pair רַבִּים and עֲצוּמִים in the sense of "many" and "mighty," occur together with some frequency in the Deuteronomistic History and in each case describes the nations to be dispossessed by Israel (Deut 4:38; 7:1; 9:1; 11:23; Josh 23:9). Even in that combination, the connotation of "mighty" seems to be "mighty on account of quantity" and only secondarily—as a result—"mighty" in a military sense. In the two other uses of the word in Isaiah, i.e., 8:7 and 60:22, the connotation is clearly "mighty on account of quantity." To translate וְאֶת־עֲצוּמִים "and with the mighty" is, in my view, misleading because in contemporary usage "the mighty" implies "powerful people" or "ones who are mighty," i.e., "mighty" in a political, military or even possibly a spiritual sense.

[ll —ll] For an analogous example of יְחַלֵּק שָׁלָל meaning "he will divide spoil," see Gen 49:27.

[mm—mm] According to *HALOT*, תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר here means "inasmuch as" (cf. Num 25:13 and Deut 21:14).

[nn] Literally, "he made himself naked."

B. Implied Speakers and Addressees

It is clear for various reasons that Yhwh is the implied speaker in Isa 52:13-15 and 53:11-12. Although there is no explicit indication that Yhwh speaks in 52:13, this can be presumed because its term עַבְדִּי is clearly used by Yhwh as the speaker in 41:8 and 9; 42:1 and 19; 44:2; 45:4; and 49:3. Granted then that Yhwh is the speaker in 52:13, there is no indication of a change of speakers in 52:14-15.[10]

At the end of the poem, if 53:12 is spoken by Yhwh, so is 53:11, as is evident from the recurrence of the term עַבְדִּי there. There is no reason to posit a change of speakers in 53:12, as the content makes clear. Thus, I attribute 53:11-12 as a whole to Yhwh as the speaker.

The remaining verses, 53:1-10, are usually construed as spoken by a group or an individual speaking in the name of a group because of the numerous occurrences of first person plural verbs. I favor the latter interpretation for two reasons. First, as Blenkinsopp suggests, the segment has the air of a eulogy with a personal, empathic quality that is easier to imagine coming from an individual than from a group.[11] Second, this interpretation permits the sudden appearance of a first person singular suffix in v. 8 (עַמִּי, "my people") to be construed simply as a way of adding personal emphasis to the speaker’s identification with “the people” rather than as an awkward interruption by another speaker.

---

[10] Although it is possible that Yhwh is the speaker in 53:8 because of the first person singular suffix of עַמִּי, this would be an awkward interjection in a narrative in which the speaker refers to himself in the first person plural. Therefore, it seems more likely that 53:1-11 is spoken by an individual in the name of a group. In this one instance, the individual uses the singular instead of the first person plural. Moreover, it is quite possible that the correct reading is עמו, as attested in 1QIsa^a. The confusion of *yod* and *waw* is common, as has been previously noted.

[11] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55,* 351.

I have chosen to discuss what Yhwh says or implies about himself under a different heading from that under which I discuss what the “we” say about Yhwh. On a purely literary level, the poem has the elements of a drama, at least insofar as various speakers are speaking different lines. Verses 52:13-15 and 53:11-12 constitute a prologue and epilogue, respectively. Although in my view Blenkinsopp’s claim about the speaker and the circumstances of 53:1-10 goes beyond what the text itself warrants, his basic observation, that the middle section is presented not as a divine oracle but rather as an interpretation of the Servant’s suffering, is valid and insightful.[12]

C. What Yhwh Says and Implies about Himself

52:13 Yhwh Points Out (הִנֵּה) His Astonishing Promise of His Servant’s Exaltation.

Although the term הִנֵּה in 52:13 echoes 42:1, the situation in 52:13 is different: the Servant has already been introduced. Here הִנֵּה refers not to a person but to a statement. In other words, Yhwh is not pointing to the Servant but rather alerting the addressees to the significance of the statement he is about to make concerning him. “The ‘*Aufmerksamkeitserreger*’ הנ(ה) now no longer applies, as it did in 42:1, to the personal presence of the Servant but refers to the immediately following ישׂכיל."[13] Yhwh reveals the future exaltation of his Servant.[14] That he does so at the beginning of the poem suggests that the exaltation of his Servant is the lens through which the poem is to be read.

---

[12] According to Blenkinsopp (*Isaiah 40–55,* 350), “[w]hat the body of the poem [53:1-10] gives us is an *interpretation* by a convert to the Servant’s person and teaching, offered either in his own name or that of the group to which he belongs.”

In Chapter Two, I discussed the use of עַבְדִּי as it pertains to the Servant Songs in general. The following verse (52:14), however, begins to reveal two aspects of Yhwh's use of the term עַבְדִּי which are peculiar to the Fourth Servant Song. Although Yhwh in other passages in the *Tanakh* allows his other "servants" to suffer while accomplishing his plan, in this poem Yhwh—in an unprecedented, even unique way—not only permits but seems to "use" the Servant's submissive and silent suffering as the very means whereby his plan is accomplished. Furthermore, the plan that this Servant is to accomplish is not merely on the level of history, nor is it primarily for the temporal benefit of Israel (for example, bringing about a new political situation for the people). In contrast to the role of those others referred to as עַבְדִּי in the *Tanakh*, if there are political or temporal implications to the Servant's mission, they are not specified.

In 52:13, the reader/hearer is left to wonder whether Yhwh is merely foretelling the Servant's exaltation or promising to bring it about. The verb וְנִשָּׂא has an ambiguity that leaves open the possibility that the Servant's exaltation will be somehow "his own" doing.

---

[13] Koole, *Isaiah III,* 2. 264. See also Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 288.

[14] Throughout the entire poem, the main clauses of the verses in which Yhwh speaks have verbs in the *yiqtol.* Theoretically, these verbs could be translated by other tenses, but the future tense seems most plausible and is found in all the major English translations.

> The three verbs give ascending and cumulative definition to the result of the servant's acting with insight: he will arise (ingressive, suggesting the beginning of a process), exalt himself (niphal, suggesting his personal involvement), and thus finally be high (stative)—indeed, very high. While the LXX renders the three verbs by two passives (Aq, Th, Sym by three passives), the Hebrew verbs may as easily suggest the servant's achievement. He is acting, not being acted on.[15]

This argument, however, is dependent upon the interpretation of the niphal of נִשׂא as reflexive. Since, however, this verb form can also be interpreted passively, as do the LXX (ὑψωθήσεται) and the Vg (*exaltabitur*), the question must be considered open.

52:14-15 Yhwh Will Reveal an Unheard-of Plan to Kings and Nations to Purge Many Nations of Their Sins though his Servant, Granting Them Sight and Understanding.

Yhwh is presumably still the speaker. Again he speaks of the Servant. He further describes the exaltation of the Servant, but not before describing the extreme humiliation that will precede this. The reason for the Servant's marred appearance and the negative reaction of "many" is not given. "So will he sprinkle many nations" refers in my view to the Servant's quasi-cultic role, which is later developed in the MT form of the poem (see especially 53:10b). The kings' shutting their mouths may well be "a sign of awe and honor."[16]

---

[15] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 289.

[16] Edward J. Young (*Isaiah 53: A Devotional and Expository Study* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953] 21) notes a parallel with Job 29:9-10. In v. 9, Job speaks to Yhwh, recalling the respect he used to command in his community: שָׂ֭רִים עָצְר֣וּ בְמִלִּ֑ים וְ֝כַ֗ף יָשִׂ֥ימוּ לְפִיהֶֽם ("The chief men refrained from speaking and covered their mouths with their hands" *NAB*).

Although he says nothing explicitly about himself here, Yhwh implicitly asserts that his plan with regard to the Servant will not conform to human expectations. In fact, Yhwh's plan involves something of which kings and nations have never heard, things that have never been reported to them. Again implicitly Yhwh reveals that through his servant he will purge[17] many nations of sins and give kings and nations sight and understanding. That Yhwh reveals his glory to kings and nations—especially through his mighty deeds on behalf of Israel—is found elsewhere in the *Tanakh* (e.g., Deut 28:1; Ps 72:17) but the explicit promise to the nations of the gifts of sight and understanding (gifts not traditionally associated with the גּוֹיִם) and the implicit promise of the purgation of their sin is promised only in Second Isaiah. Interestingly, sight and understanding are also two of the rewards promised the Servant (see 53:11 for an exact parallel to "sight" and 52:13 for a close parallel to "understanding").

53:11a Yhwh's Recompense to His Servant

Yhwh speaks again in the closing section of the poem. Isa 53:11 speaks of Yhwh's rewarding the Servant's suffering with sight and satisfaction. The parallelism of "he shall see" (53:11a), Yhwh's first word in this concluding section, with "my Servant will be wise” (52:13), the initial statement of Yhwh in the opening section, is one of the many chiastic elements in the poem.

---

[17] An example of the connection between "sprinkling" and "purging" is seen in Ps 51:9:

.תְּחַטְּאֵ֣נִי בְאֵז֣וֹב וְאֶטְהָ֑ר תְּ֝כַבְּסֵ֗נִי וּמִשֶּׁ֥לֶג אַלְבִּֽין׃

"Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean; wash me and I shall be whiter than snow."

Although the Hebrew does not use the verb נזה here, the LXX and Vg do use verbs meaning "sprinkle"; the Vg renders *asparges* [*sic*] *me* (*Biblica Sacra iuxta Vulgatem Versionem, editionem quartam emendatam* [ed. Roger Gryson; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994]). The LXX has ῥαντιεῖς με. Hyssop, a plant used in sprinkling rites, appears as an ablative of instrumentality in the Vg, *hysopo*, and as a dative of instrumentality in the LXX, ὑσσώπῳ. Another example occurs in Ezek 36:25: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you" (*NRSV*).

The verb “see” is normally used with an explicit object. It can, however, also be used in instances where the object is implicit. What, then, will the Servant see? The יִרְאֶה of 53:11 echoes 52:15’s רָאוּ, the third person masculine plural *qatal* of the same verb. The object of רָאוּ is אֲשֶׁר לֹא־סֻפַּר לָהֶם, this suggesting something altogether unexpected. The text does not specify that the object of sight is the same for “kings” (52:15) and for the Servant. It is safe to infer, however, from the immediately following verb יִשְׂבָּע (“he will be satisfied”), that his seeing will constitute part of a more-than-sufficient compensation for the Servant’s suffering.

53:11b Yhwh’s Plan Calls for the Justification of Many through the Servant.

Yhwh’s plan entails the justification of “the many.” The exact meaning of “the many” is not clear from the text of the Fourth Servant Song and remains a disputed question. If the Servant is Jacob/Israel, “the many” seemingly would have to include some or all Gentiles. If the Servant is an individual or a subset of Jacob/Israel, Gentiles are not necessarily included. All that we can say with certainly is that “the many” would have to include others besides the Servant. To say more is to enter into a discussion beyond the scope of this dissertation. What can be asserted about the portrayal of Yhwh if we set aside the questions of the identity of “the many” along with the question of the identities of the Servant and the “we’?

To analyze what Yhwh says in 53:11b, it is necessary to note the context which includes several assertions made by the "we" (A fuller discussion of what the "we" say and imply about Yhwh is provided in section D below.) The "we" assert that the Servant's sufferings are the consequence of their sins (Isa 53:5a and 8bβ) according to Yhwh's design (v. 6c). Orlinsky's assertion that Isaiah 53 says nothing more than this would be sustainable were it not for further assertions made by both the "we" and Yhwh.[18]

In Isa 53:5b, the "we" go further in stating that the Servant's sufferings are not only the consequence of their sin but also that his sufferings result in "our peace" שְׁלוֹמֵ֙נוּ֙ and that "by his scourging we were healed" (וּבַחֲבֻרָת֖וֹ נִרְפָּא־לָֽנוּ). Whybray has shown that this need not imply anything more than that Israel's recovery from the catastrophe of exile was at the expense of the suffering of a righteous individual.[19] (The same could be said of a righteous group.)

In Isa 53:11b, however, Yhwh clearly seems to be saying something more. The Servant is linked not only to the healing and peace of the "we" but to the justification of "the many." What links the Servant to the justification of "the many" in Yhwh's plan is

---

[18] According to Harry Orlinsky, the link between the suffering of the Servant and the justification of "the many" need not be read as a full-blown theology of vicarious atonement. Orlinsky (*Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah: The So-Called "Servant of the Lord" and "Suffering Servant" in Second Isaiah* [VTSup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1977] 56) asserts that "all our text says is that the individual person, whoever he was, suffered on account of Israel's transgressions," and "no inkling of vicarious suffering obtains in Isaiah 53. . ." (ibid., 59).

[19] R.N. Whybray (*The Second Isaiah* [OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983] 78) rejects the traditional interpretation of the Servant's role as that of vicarious suffering: "[His] suffering, as in the case of other prophets, was the consequence of the nation's sin, for it was the nation's plight which had made his prophetic activity necessary. At the same time it could be said that his sufferings led to their restoration to 'wholeness' or their 'healing'—that is to their release from exile: for had he not persevered in his dangerous word at the risk of suffering and death, the divine word which, like a sharp sword in Yahweh's hand, brought about the fall of Babylon would not have been pronounced."

"his knowledge" (דַּעתּוֹ). While this term belongs to the several sapiential references in the Fourth Servant Songs, to limit its meaning to intellectual knowledge is, in my view, to miss the term's fuller meaning in Hebrew especially as used in this context. דַּעַת is related to וִידוּעַ (the passive participle of the same root ידע) found in 53:3, where it means "experienced." In v. 3 this word is used in the phrase describing the Servant as "experienced in suffering." Seen in this light, בְּדַעְתּוֹ means not only "in his *intellectual* knowledge" but also knowledge in the full Hebrew sense of the word, that is, the experiential knowledge of suffering as described in 52:12 and 53:3-10: disfigurement, disgrace, imprisonment, humiliation, injustice, calumny, scourging, and death.

Furthermore, although the poem gives no unambiguous indication that the Servant desires or offers to suffer or die in the place of others, the final two words of the poem וְלַפֹּשְׁעִ֖ים יַפְגִּֽיעַ ("and for those rebelling he will intercede") and the *'āshām* reference in 53:10 suggest, at a minimum, that the Servant's "knowledge" includes a congruity between his intentions and those of Yhwh. While justification of "the many" (v. 11) is not explained, it would seem that it entails more than the peace and healing which, as noted above, could be merely a reference to the return of the exiles to Israel. The justification of "the many" implies that through the Servant, Yhwh somehow puts "the many" into right relationship with himself, an action that transcends temporal benefits.

53:12a Yhwh Gives to the Servant "the Many" with Whom the Servant Divides Spoils.

The image of 53:12a seems to have overtones of a military victory that are unexpected in light of what precedes. Various commentators offer solutions for this apparent *non sequitur*. Thus, North points out that שָׁלָל does not always carry military connotations. For example, Isa 9:2 has the connotation of the fruits of a harvest festival (cf. Prov 31:11).[20] Westermann regards the language of dividing spoils as "general terms taken from tradition. The one who had been deprived of all the good things of life is now to receive them in abundance."[21]

Yet there are other solutions to the problem of this apparent *non sequitur*. McKenzie takes the language to be metaphoric, though neither agricultural nor generic. It refers rather to the victory of some sort of hero: "The Servant is certainly not a military hero, whatever he is. But he is one who will restore Israel as an enduring reality."[22]

Baltzer sees the military imagery as allusive and laden with paradox. Making an intriguing if impossible-to-prove connection between 53:12 and Isa 2:1-5, he suggests that the "many" in the former text are the nations streaming to Zion.[23] Rather than coming to wage war, however, "they shall beat their swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks" (2:4aβ *NAB*), and the "spoils" in which they will share are *Torah* and the word of Yhwh (Isa 2:3).

---

[20] North, *Suffering Servant*, 127. It should be noted that 9:2 and perhaps the passage in question are exceptions. The other uses of the term in Isaiah (Isa 8:1, 3, 4, 10:6, and 33:23) all have military connotations.

[21] Westermann, *Isaiah,* 268.

[22] McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 136.

[23] Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 426.

> Many peoples shall come and say: "Come, let us climb the LORD's mountain, to the house of the God of Jacob, that he may instruct us in his ways, and we may walk in his paths." For from Zion shall go forth instruction, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem (*NAB*).

Whether the allusion Baltzer identifies here was a conscious one on the part of the poet, or whether any paradox was even intended in either of the above passages, is impossible to say. A shared distinctive word or phrase in the two verses would make the case for the proposed allusion more compelling. Likewise, a sharper delineation of the alleged "paradox" would make the author's intention more obvious. Baltzer's reading is nevertheless apt. Just as the stream of nations of Isaiah 2 is a great Un-invasion, and Zion is "despoiled" only of her greatest treasure, *Torah* and the Word of God, so the Servant of Isaiah 53 is the great Un-warrior who conquers nations through his free and silent submission to injustice and violence, and who despoils "the many" and their kings only of their blindness and sins.

Yhwh's allotment of "the many" as the Servant's portion is the granting him of some sort of dominion or authority over them. Yet it is not a dominion that exploits "the many" but one in which "the many" will share in the Servant's "spoils" of sight and understanding (52:15), *shalom* and healing (53:5).

The language of military victory in 53:12, in my view, is already foreshadowed in 53:1b: "The arm of the Lord—to whom has it been revealed?" Of the thirty-three references to "the arm of the Lord" in the *Tanakh*, at least twenty-three appear quite explicitly in the context of Yhwh's victorious battle over an enemy.[24] Most of the OT's other references to the "arm of Yhwh" can also be seen as involving some sort of salvation or protection from enemies. "The arm of Yhwh" is used within DI itself in 51:9 with a clear reference to the divine victory over the forces of chaos:

> Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the LORD!
>   Awake, as in days of old, the generations of long ago!
> Was it not you who cut Rahab in pieces, who pierced the dragon? (*NAB*)

Perhaps most relevant of all these instances is the use of the image in 52:12, the verse leading into our poem, which prepares the reader/hearer to expect an account of a victory in what follows:

> Yhwh will bare his holy arm to the eyes of all the nations,
>   and all the ends of the earth shall see the victory of our God (*NAB*).

53:12 Yhwh Allows His Servant to be Counted among Rebels, for Whom He Intercedes.

To be counted among rebels is one of the humiliations the Servant endures, but he not only accepts it: in an expression of solidarity, he also intercedes for them. As mentioned above, the Servant's intercession for rebels suggests that his cooperation with Yhwh is not blind. As an intimate of Yhwh, he knows that his mission is for those who rebel against Yhwh. The Servant's intercession also suggests that the justification of the many is linked not simply to an unknowing, silent suffering and death but to a suffering and death made consciously purposeful through the Servant's prayer.

---

[24] Exod 6:6; 15:6; Deut 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 9:29; 11:2; 26:8; 33:27; 2 Kgs 17:36; Pss 77:15; 79:11; 89:11; 89:21; 136:12; Isa 30:30; 48:14; 59:16; 62:8; 63:5; Jer 21:5; Ezek 20:33.

D. What the "We" Say and Imply about Yhwh

Up to this point, I have discussed the portrayal of Yhwh through his own words. Now I turn to portrayal of Yhwh as conveyed by the central part of the poem (53:1-10) in the words of others. The reference to the arm of Yhwh in the third person singular (53:1) and the use of first person plural (53:2) make clear that the speaker is no longer Yhwh (as in 52:13-15). Who is this new speaker? Isa 53:8 provides an important clue. Here the reference to "my people" by the speaker suggests that he is an individual speaking on behalf of a group. It is highly implausible that "my people" refers to any group other than Israel. The speaker begins with questions. Such questions using the *qatal* are often rhetorical and express astonishment.[25] Thus, the force of the first question might be conveyed by a rendering like: "Who would have believed what we have heard?" with an implied answer of "No one."[26]

The second question serves as a transition to the speaker's narration of the life of the Servant. Read in the proximate context of chap. 52, the answer to this second question, "The arm of Yhwh—to whom has it been revealed?" has been already given. Isa 52:10 ("Yhwh has bared his holy arm to the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth will see the victory of our God") not only answers the question but serves as a kind of foreshadowing *précis* of the entire Fourth Servant Song, which begins two verses later.

---

[25] See GKC §106p.

[26] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55,* 2. 297.

53:4 Yhwh Upholds His Servant's Innocence.

Isaiah 53:4 marks the moment of illumination for the bystanders. Contrary to their previous assessment, the Servant, they now realize, is not the guilty one. This illumination involves a radical departure from a simplistic connection of suffering with personal guilt.

Yet even if the simplistic explanation is wrong, it at least has the advantage of preserving both Yhwh's omnipotence and righteousness. This new insight—that the Servant is innocent—opens up, as does the Book of Job, the most difficult questions of theodicy.

53:5-6 Yhwh Links the Transgressions of his People to the Suffering of the Servant.

A preliminary solution to the problem of the suffering of the innocent Servant is offered by the reality of human freedom. The text implies that at least some of the Servant's suffering is at the hands of fellow human beings. In other words, the Servant is bearing the "suffering" of the group in the sense that at least some of them have inflicted that suffering upon him. Such an explanation, however, is partial at best.

The inescapable conclusion appears to be that in some sense Yhwh is behind the innocent Servant's experience of sufferings that are deserved by "the many." In the Christian tradition this is explained as vicarious suffering in atonement for sin. Such an explanation does not by any means resolve every problem of theodicy, but it clearly resolves one preliminary problem: it preserves Yhwh's omnipotence. The Servant's suffering is not caused by another god or force over whom Yhwh has no power. Rather, the Servant's suffering is somehow part of Yhwh's own plan.

On the other hand, it is less clear whether Yhwh's righteousness is also preserved in this understanding. Vicarious suffering for atonement exonerates Yhwh from causing the suffering of his Servant for merely cruel or capricious reasons. His intention is purposeful, for a good beyond the group's wildest expectations: Yhwh takes away the burden of the consequences of the group's wrongdoing. But is the means just?

53:10a Yhwh Wills to Crush his Servant.

The question of Yhwh's righteousness in the case of the Servant of Isaiah 53 comes to a head in 53:10a. This verse presents theological problems that have been dealt with in a variety of ways. Just how starkly the problem poses itself depends in part on the understanding of the verb חָפֵץ. The importance of interpreting חָפֵץ correctly is underscored by its reappearance in the nominal form later in the verse, forming a sort of *inclusio*: v. 10a opens with וַיהוָה חָפֵץ, while 10d begins with וְחֵפֶץ יְהוָה. If חָפֵץ is taken to mean "took pleasure in, delighted in," the verse can only pose a severe test of faith. However, חָפֵץ can also mean "to will, to have as one's purpose." This latter meaning is suggested by the context of DI.

DI's emphasis on monotheism and the sovereignty of Yhwh over all of creation and history is conveyed, among other passages, in Isa 44: 24b-28.

> [24] I am the LORD, who made all things, who alone stretched out the heavens; when I spread out the earth, who was with me? [25] It is I who bring to naught the omens of liars, who make fools of diviners; I turn wise men back and make their knowledge foolish. [26] It is I who confirm the words of my servants, I carry out the plan announced by my messengers; I say to Jerusalem: Be inhabited; to the cities of Judah: Be rebuilt; I will raise up their ruins. [27] It is I who said to the deep: Be dry; I will dry up your wellsprings. [28] I say of Cyrus: My shepherd, who fulfills my every

> wish (חֶפְצִי). He shall say of Jerusalem, “Let her be rebuilt,” and of the temple, “Let its foundations be laid” (*NAB*).

While חֶפְצִי in 44:28 still could be translated as “my pleasure,” for the modern reader this rendering would suggest that Yhwh is an arbitrary autocrat rather than a just ruler. Such a portrayal of Yhwh would contradict the verses in the above passage, which show his concern for truth (44:25) and keeping his word (44:26). Thus, the translation more consistent with chap. 44, and DI in general, is “purpose” or “will.” Accordingly, the meaning of 53:10a is not that God “delighted” to crush his servant but rather that (even) the crushing of the Servant was according to God’s purpose or will.

Even on this understanding of חָפֵץ, however, the verse still poses problems for the modern reader, as it evidently already did for the translators of the LXX and the Targum, who took the verb דָּכָּא as an Aramaism meaning “to clean/ purge” (related to the Hebrew זכה, piel). Thus in these versions 10a takes on a radically different meaning. It is nothing less than the beginning of Yhwh’s rehabilitation of the Servant through the “cleansing” of his wounds. These readings certainly present a more congenial image of Yhwh, but they sidestep the ordinary meaning of דָּכָּא, (a verb which has already appeared in 53:5) and the connection between 53:10 and the previous nine verses, especially vv. 5-6, which imply that the suffering of the Servant was according to the will and purpose of Yhwh.[27]

---

[27] “The line thus expresses in a sharper way the point that has recurred through [*sic*] vv. 1-9: Yhwh was behind the servant’s suffering.” Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 2. 318-19.

Modern commentators propose similar translations and/or emendations of the MT. An example is Westermann, whose translation reads: "Yet Yahweh took pleasure in him [who was crushed]."[28] Westermann arrives at his translation by reading "with Elliger *dakkā'ō* [דַּכָּאוֹ 'his battered/crushed one'] instead of *dakk*^{e}*'ō* [דַּכְּאוֹ 'to batter/crush him']."[29]

Clifford calls Yhwh's purpose inscrutable.[30] This is true, but the text goes further: the following parts of the verse (10b and c) are a partial attempt at getting past the inscrutability of the divine will. "It seems that it was the vocabulary of sacrifice that provided the prophetic author with the means for expressing this discovery about the significance of the Servant's suffering."[31]

53:10b and c: If the Servant "Offers an '*āshām,*" Yhwh Will Reward the Servant with Posterity and Long Life and the Will of Yhwh Will Be Effective through Him.

The ambiguity of this verse was pointed out in the notes on it in Section IIA. The translation I have proposed does not explicitly refer to the Servant's offering his life, as the majority of modern English translations suggest, but merely to his offering an '*āshām.* Whether the '*āshām* to be offered is in point of fact the Servant's life is left to the reader/listener to ponder.

---

[28] Westermann, *Isaiah*, 205. I have substituted Hebrew script instead of Westermann's transliteration

[29] Ibid.

[30] "In 42:21, the same expression is found, 'It pleased YHWH for his own justice's sake, that he [the servant] should glorify the Teaching and exalt it.' The expression emphasizes the inscrutable purpose of God" (Richard J. Clifford, *Fair Spoken and Persuading: An Interpretation of Second Isaiah* [New York: Paulist Press, 1984] 174).

[31] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55,* 351.

What then do v. 10b and c convey about Yhwh? Obviously, Yhwh is again portrayed as rewarding the Servant. Orlinsky and Whybray take the promises of long life and posterity, two of the greatest blessings offered to individuals in the *Tanakh*, as proof that the Servant does not die. However, metaphorical meanings for "posterity" and "long life" are also possible. Indeed, most commentators who take the Servant to be an individual take "posterity" to mean "disciples" and "long life" to refer to some sort of afterlife.

Yhwh will reward the Servant, but v. 10 suggests that the reward is dependent on the action of the Servant. To understand this condition, it is necessary understand why the Servant, the subject, is referred to as נַפְשׁוֹ ("his soul"): אִם־תָּשִׂ֤ים אָשָׁם֙ נַפְשׁ֔וֹ. The most likely explanation is that נֶפֶשׁ is a typical term for "an individual" or "a person" in Leviticus, especially in conditional formulations stating legislative principles (see, for example, Lev 5:1, 2, and 4).[32] Thus, the poet uses the term נַפְשׁוֹ, a conditional formulation, and the term אָשָׁם to evoke Leviticus.[33] The reader is left to apply this juridical-sounding maxim to the case of the Servant. Thus, the author's attempt to grapple with the mystery involves a sort of loose evocation of the levitical laws concerning reparation:

---

[32] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40–55*, 2. 320.

[33] An example with the use of נֶפֶשׁ in a conditional formulation and the offering of an אָשָׁם with a consequent reward is found in Lev 5:21-26:

> [5:21] If someone (נֶפֶשׁ) commits a sin of dishonesty against the LORD by denying his neighbor a deposit or a pledge for a stolen article, or by otherwise retaining his neighbor's goods unjustly, [22] or if, having found a lost article, he denies the fact and swears falsely about it with any of the sinful oaths that men make in such cases, [23] he shall therefore, since he has incurred guilt by his sin, restore the thing that was stolen or unjustly retained by him or the deposit left with him or the lost article he found [24] or whatever else he swore falsely about; on the day of his guilt offering he shall make full restitution of the thing itself, and in addition, give the owner one fifth of its value. [25] As his guilt offering he shall bring to the LORD an unblemished ram of the flock of the established value. When he has presented this as his guilt offering (לְאָשָׁם) to the priest, [26] the latter shall make atonement for him before the LORD, and he will be forgiven whatever guilt he may have incurred (*NAB*).

> The idea behind this type of reparation sacrifice is that, given the right dispositions, the transgressions and the guilt of the sacrificial adepts die with the death of the ʾ*asham* animal. The analogy with the Servant is clear, but like all analogies it walks with a limp, for the Servant is not an animal, and his death cannot simply be on a par with the death of a lamb or a goat. Here the panegyrist speaks in riddles and mysteries.[34]

If the text implies an analogy between the Servant and a sacrificial animal, the more important analogy, in my view, is implied between the Servant and those whom Blenkinsopp refers to as "the sacrificial adepts"—a phrase I take to mean "those who are adept at making sacrificial offerings in a way pleasing to Yhwh." In short, the poet speaks with a metaphor of animal sacrifice not so much to equate the death of the Servant with that of a ram or lamb as to introduce the major factor that distinguishes sacrifice from other instances of suffering or death—that is, the intention and the "right dispositions," of the one *making* the offering.

Up until v. 10, the Servant, who suffers silently, has only been seen from the outside. Thus v. 10 is a pivotal moment in the poem because it shifts to the internal disposition of the Servant. The servant's suffering is a given. The question is whether he will merely endure it silently or offer it willingly. That he does offer it willingly is suggested by the mention of his making intercession for "the rebels" (see 53:12). Thus v. 10b presents Yhwh's rewarding of the Servant as conditional lest Yhwh be seen as a god primarily interested in suffering and blood rather than in the disposition of the one who makes the offering.

---

[34] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55*, 354-55.

E. Summary of the Portrayal of Yhwh

Yhwh is portrayed in MT Isa 52:13–53:12 as a God who reveals an unexpected future event to both Israel and the nations. He will use the human agency of "his Servant" to accomplish his purpose in a new way. Yhwh's purpose in this case is not primarily historical or political, nor is it confined to Israel. Through the innocent Servant's suffering and death, Yhwh will purge "the many" of their sins and give sight and understanding to kings and nations. Yhwh also reveals in no uncertain terms that suffering is not necessarily to be taken as proof of personal guilt. Yhwh's Servant is crushed not for cruel or capricious reasons but as part of the divine plan. Yhwh is not so much interested in the Servant's suffering as in the Servant's willingness to offer up his suffering. Yhwh will compensate his suffering Servant with extreme exaltation, dominion over many, and sight and wisdom. The Servant will be satisfied.

It is interesting to note that the more problematic assertions about Yhwh, including his will to crush the servant (53:10), are not made by Yhwh but by the "we." Also in the five verses in which Yhwh does speak (52:13-15 and 53:11-12), he reveals nothing directly about himself, except in the very last. In 53:12, the only sentence in the poem where Yhwh speaks of himself as the subject, he simply reveals how and why he will reward the servant. In all Yhwh's other statements, the Servant is the subject. Even in Yhwh's statements about the Servant, however, he implicitly reveals much about himself which is new and indeed astonishing. He reveals his paradoxical victory and foretells that it will be revealed to all nations. However, the how and why of Yhwh's victory through his Servant's suffering is largely left cloaked in mystery.

III. The Portrayal of God in LXX Isaiah 53

A. Text-critical Notes and Translation

[52:13] ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς [a] μου
καὶ ὑψωθήσεται [b] καὶ δοξασθήσεται [c] σφόδρα.

See, my παῖς will understand,
and he will be exalted and glorified exceedingly.

[14] ὃν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοί,
οὕτως ἀδοξήσει ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἶδός σου
καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων,

Just as[d] many will be amazed at you (masc. sing.)
—so inglorious will be your appearance before people
and your glory before the people—

[15] οὕτως θαυμάσονται [e] ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ
καὶ συνέξουσι βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν·

---

[a] α′ and σ′ both have δοῦλος. While this might be seen as part of a larger agenda to preclude any Christianizing tendency to interpret παῖς μου as "my child/son," the more immediate explanation is probably simpler. Aquila "is simply following his own strictly practiced translation technique of always rendering Heb. roots by the same Gk. roots," while Symmachus is following Aquila (Joachim Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ in later Judaism in the Period after the LXX," *TDNT* 5. 677-700, here 683). For a discussion of Aquila's purpose in revising the LXX in view of the "ever-widening breach between Old and New Israel," see Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968; reprint, Ann Arbor: Eisenbrauns, 1978) 76-83, here 76.

[b] See note a on p. 198 for possible explanations for the presence of two verbs in the second clause of this verse in the LXX instead of the three found in the MT.

[c] The term δοξασθήσεται is a unique match in the LXX for וְגָבַהּ (although LXX Job 40:10 renders וָגֹבַהּ with δόξαν). LXX translators seem to have had a tendency to use δόξα and related forms in their translations even when the MT might suggest other translational possibilities. "For the prominence of δόξα in 𝔊 (against 𝔐) see Exod 15:1-18; Isa 11:3; 30:27; 33:17; 40:6; 52:14; 53:2" (Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 127).

[d] Literally, "in the way/manner." I take ὃν τρόπον as an accusative of respect. (See Maximilian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek* [4th ed.; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000] 23.) It is correlative with οὕτως in v. 15: "Just as . . . so . . . ."

[e] The recensions α′ and θ′ have ῥαντίσει ("he will sprinkle, he will purify"); σ′ has ἀποβάλλει "he throws off." Thus α′ and θ′ conform (and σ′ is loosely related semantically) to the Hebrew text of their time, preserved in the MT: יַזֶּה ("he will sprinkle," usually in a cultic context).

ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται,
καὶ οἳ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι, συνήσουσι.

15 so will many nations will be astonished at him
and kings will keep their mouths shut:
for they to whom it was not reported concerning him will see;
and they who have not heard will understand.

53:1 κύριε,[f] τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;
καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;

κύριε, who has believed what we have heard,
and the arm of κύριος—to whom has it been revealed?

2 ἀνηγγείλαμεν [g] ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ
ὡς παιδίον [h] ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ, οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα·
καὶ εἴδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος·

We reported before him:
"Like a little child, like a root in a thirsty land, he has no form or glory.
We saw him and he had neither form nor beauty."

3 ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον
ἐκλεῖπον παρὰ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,[i]

---

[f] The vocative of κύριος is universally attested in the LXX MSS and could have its origin in a different Hebrew *Vorlage.* Otherwise, following the principle of *lectio brevior praeferenda est,* it is to be considered the translator's gloss. In either case, it is impossible to say how much of what follows in v. 15 (and beyond?) is to be taken as addressed to κυριος. An awkwardness already occurs in the second question where "the arm of κύριος" constitutes a reference to κύριος in the third person, despite his supposedly being the addressee.

[g] ἀνηγγείλαμεν appears in all of the Greek codices, in the versions, and in the patristic tradition. Nevertheless, Ziegler (*Isaias*, 99) argues that it is not original. ". . . die häufig gerade in Is. bezeugte Verwechslung von ἀναγγέλλειν und ἀνατέλλειν wird auch hier vorliegen: 42:9 lesen die besten Zeugen der alexandrinischen Gruppe ἀνατεῖλαι gegen ἀναγγεῖλαι der übrigen; 45:8 lesen alle ἀνατειλάτω 2°[=*bis*] gegen ἀναγγεῖλατω, das nur B liest; 43:19 lesen alle richtig ἀνατελεῖ gegen ἀναγγελεῖ, das von 93 (Abschrift einer Unziale) und 456 bezeugt wird; 47:13 ist in 490 ἀνατειλάτωσαν aus ἀναγγειλάτωσαν verschrieben [i supply Greek breathing marks and accents where missing in the original]." Although Ziegler's argument is impressive, it is far from obvious how the posited confusion of τ and γγ could occur. In 53:2 ἀνέτειλε makes for an easier reading ("he/it sprang up") which is closer to, but still an inexact match for, the MT's עָלָה ("it sprang up" [said of plants]). The lack of a *single* witness for Ziegler's reading for this particular verse (ibid., 99 "die Überlieferung einheitlich ανηγγειλαμεν liest") leads me to regard ἀνηγγείλαμεν as the authentic reading.

[h] B and the Catenae have ὡς παιδίον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ("like a little child before him"), presumably an emendation made to reflect the word order of the MT. αὐτοῦ could refer either to the παῖς or to κύριος. Although πεδίον, "a plain," is the original reading in S, it is otherwise unattested.

[i] Ziegler, following seemingly minor witnesses against weightier ones, has τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. He seems to be basing himself on the *lectio brevior* principle, despite the weight of the textual witnesses

ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὢν καὶ εἰδὼς φέρειν μαλακίαν,
ὅτι ἀπέστραπται [j] τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, ἠτιμάσθη καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη.

[3] Indeed his appearance was despised,
and he was forsaken beyond all human beings,
a man of suffering, and acquainted with the experience of sickness,
for his face was turned away:
he was dishonored, and of no account.

[4] οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται,
καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ
καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει.

[4] He bears our sins and he suffers for us;
yet we accounted him to be in trouble,
and in suffering, and in affliction.

[5] αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν
καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν·
παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ' αὐτόν,
τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν.

[5] He was wounded on account of our lawless deeds
and was bruised because of our sins.
The discipline of our peace was upon him;
by his bruises we were healed.

[6] πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν,
ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη·
καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν.

[6] All of us like sheep have gone astray;
each in his own way has gone astray;
and κύριος handed him over for our sins.

[7] καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα [k]

---

reading πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων or τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. It seems likely that the reading τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, following the MT, was original and later rejected by a scribe as a Hebraism. Since it is easier to explain how a translator into Greek would omit a Hebraism than introduce one, in this case I prefer the longer reading.

[j] Variants in the minor witnesses include ἀπέστρψεν, ἀπέστρεπται, and ἔστρεπται with only one attestation of each.

[k] Several miniscules and Patristic sources have αὐτοῦ following στόμα.

ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη
καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος
οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

[7]And in the mistreatment he does not open his mouth.
He was led as a sheep to the slaughter.
As a lamb before its shearer is silent,
so he does not open his mouth.

[8]ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει[l] ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη·
τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται;
ὅτι [m] αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ [m] ,
ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον.

[8]In humiliation he was deprived of a [fair] verdict.
Who will declare his generation?
For his life is taken from the earth.
Because of the lawless deeds of my people he was led to death.

[9]καὶ δώσω[n] τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ
ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν,
οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.

[9]And I will give the wicked[o] in exchange for[p] his burial,

---

[l] Many MSS have αὐτοῦ, which is probably an expansion.

[m—m] This is a free translation of נִגְזַר מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים (“he was cut off from the land of the living”). The LXX translator presumably modified the meaning to harmonize this verse with the idea of exaltation in 52:13.

[n] The MT has וַיִּתֵּן (literally, “and he will give”), i.e. a verb of the same meaning as the LXX’s δώσω, but in the third person singular masculine. Does this suggest that the LXX with its rendering in the first person singular had a different *Vorlage*? Not necessarily. The LXX’s first person (δώσω) instead of the MT’s third person (וַיִּתֵּן) may reflect “contextual exegetical editing, harmonizing with the first person τοῦ λαοῦ μου in 53:8b” (Eugene Robert Ekblad, Jr., *Isaiah’s Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* [Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999] 237).

[o] The LXX reads the Hebrew ואת as an object marker rather than a preposition.

[p] The LXX’s *Vorlage* evidently had a ב before קִבְרוֹ to harmonize with the ב in בְּמֹתָיו. The translator evidently took it as a *beth pretii* (see BDB, s.v. I ב III 3).

and the rich in exchange for his death;
for he did no lawless deed,
nor was deceit found in his mouth.

[10]καὶ κύριος βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς·
ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας
ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον·

[10]And κύριος wills to purge him of his suffering.
If you (plural) should make a sin offering,[q]

---

[q] The phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας is here used with a substantive meaning "sin offering." The use of the phrase in this quasi-technical sense is clear when it occurs with the definite article, as in, e.g., LXX Lev 14:13: καὶ σφάξουσιν τὸν ἀμνὸν ἐν τόπῳ οὗ σφάζουσιν τὰ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ τὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ· ἔστιν γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. ὥσπερ τὸ τῆς πλημμελείας, ἔστιν τῷ ἱερεῖ· ἅγια ἁγίων ἐστίν ("And they shall slaughter the lamb in a place where they slaughter the whole-burnt offerings and the sin offerings—in a holy place: for it is the sin offering. Just as the guilt offering, it belongs to the priest; it is most holy"). BDB asserts that אָשָׁם (the term used in MT Isa 53:10) "seems to have been confined to offences against God or man that could be estimated and so covered by compensation. The ordinary trespass offering was a ram, together with restitution and a penalty of a fifth of its value." Special rules obtained for lepers, Nazirites, cases in which the wronged party was deceased, etc. The blood of the ram (or other animal in exceptional cases) was not applied to the horns of the altar. According to BDB, חַטָּאת can also refer to a sin offering, but while it could be offered by individuals for other kinds of sin than those for which an אָשָׁם is prescribed, it was also included among the offerings to be made during the feast of weeks (Lev 23:19); the dedication of an altar (Ezek 43:19,21,22,25); to cleanse the sanctuary (Ezek 45:17,19); as a Passover ritual (Ezek 45:22, 23); as part of the priest's cleansing after serving in the sanctuary (Ezek 44: 27), etc. Note that in LXX Lev 14:13 τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας consistently matches הַחַטָּאת (although the order in MT 13a הַחַטָּאת וְאֶת־הָעֹלָה is clearly reversed in the LXX). τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας in 13b is again, no doubt, intended to match the חַטָּאת in כַּחַטָּאת. The περὶ ἁμαρτίας of LXX Isa 53:10b, however, matches not חַטָּאת, but אָשָׁם. In the thirty-eight occurences of forms of אָשָׁם used in the sense of "guilt-offering" found in the *Tanakh* (Lev 5:6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25; 6:10; 7:1,2, 5, **7**, 37; 14:12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 24, 25, 28; 19:21, 22; Num 5:7 [twice] , 8 [twice]; 6:12; 18:9; 1 Sam 6:3,4, 17; 2 Kgs 2:17; Ezek 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; 46:20), the LXX uses πλημμελείας or a related form as its match twenty-six times. However, Lev 5:7 and 7:7 match περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας with אָשָׁם; 2 Kgs 2:17 and Ezek 42:13 use τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων περὶ ἁμαρτίας while Ezek 40:39; 44:29; and 46:20 use ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας. This suggests that LXX translators did not consistently preserve the distinction between חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם. Since אָשָׁם occurs in Isaiah only one other time, i.e., in 24:6 with a different meaning, and the LXX translator of Isaiah uses the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας only in Isa 53:10, it is impossible to know whether he knew the distinction in Hebrew between חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם and whether he chose περὶ ἁμαρτίας for exegetical reasons. Is it possible that the translator *did* know the difference and chose περὶ ἁμαρτίας over πλημμελείας because he was loath to leave open the possibility of comparing the death of the παῖς to the sacrificial death of a ram – especially in light of 53:7 which compares the silence of the Son/Servant to the silence of a sheep or lamb?

your soul will see a long-lived posterity.

10bβ καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν
11 ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ,
δεῖξαι[r] αὐτῷ φῶς [s]
καὶ πλάσαι [t] τῇ συνέσει [u]

δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον εὖ δουλεύοντα [v] πολλοῖς,
καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει.[w]

10d And κύριος wills to take away
11 from the travail of his soul,

---

[r] Evidently the translator construed the unpointed text as יַרְאֶה ("he will show") instead of the MT's vocalization, יִרְאֶה ("he will see").

[s] As mentioned above in the notes on the corresponding verse of the MT, according to Tov (*Septuagint,* 156), this reading probably reflects a different *Vorlage*¸ one related to the Isaiah texts found at Qumran. 1QIsa^{ab} and 4QIsa^{d} have אור (see Morrow, *Isaiah at Qumran,* 180). I. L. Seeligmann (*The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* [Mededelingen en Verhandelingen No. 9 van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootshap "Ex Oriente Lux"; Leiden: Brill, 1948] 119) is of the opinion that LXX v.11 is typical of a larger pattern involving the translator's "rendering of biblical images into the Hellenistic sphere of thought."

[t] καὶ πλάσαι ("and to form") in the LXX appears to be intended to correspond to יִשְׂבָּע ("he will be satisfied") in the MT. Ekblad (*Servant Poems*, 252) offers the following elaborate explanation: "Πλάσσω matches the Qal of יָצַר ('to form, to fashion') in all but three of its fifteen occurrences in Isaiah. One possible explanation is that the LXX translator, seeing יִשְׂבָּע בְּדַעְתּוֹ יַצְדִּיק, skipped over יִשְׂבָּע to the first three consonants of יַצְדִּיק, reading the third consonant ד as ר before rejoining the original line בְּדַעְתּוֹ."

[u] Although forms of σύνεσις are not infrequently used elsewhere in the LXX to match words etymologically related to דַּעַת, here it "clearly reflects contextual exegesis, fulfilling Isaiah . . . 52:12 . . . : 'My servant will understand'" (Ekblad, *Servant Poems*, 254).

[v] "Here the LXX read the MT's עַבְדִּי as a participle of the verb עבד. . . .The LXX translator may well have avoided rendering the MT's first singular suffix (of 'my servant') to avoid the MT's more difficult reading of the Lord as speaker in 53:11" (Ekblad, *Servant Poems,* 255-56).

[w] This is the only time that the LXX uses a form of ἀναφέρω for the MT's סבל. It may be an allusion to the concept of bearing the sins of others found in LXX Num 14:33 ("And your sons shall be dwelling in the wilderness forty years, and they shall bear [ἀνοίσουσιν/ἀναφέρω] your fornication, until your carcasses are consumed in the wilderness.") Another possibility is that the unusual rendering was chosen for exegetical reasons. According to LSJ, ἀναφέρω can denote not only bearing a burden but also taking the initiative in transferring this onto oneself. Furthermore, according to ibid. 260, ἀναφέρω is most often used in Isaiah to mean "offer" in a sacrificial context; indeed, it is the technical term used in the LXX Pentateuch for the priestly offering of sacrifice. Finally, BAGD, s.v. ἀναφέρω,gives as a further possible meaning "take away."

to show him light
and to form [him] with understanding,
to justify the just one who serves many well;
and he will bear their sins.

[12]διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς
καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα
ἀνθ’ ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη·
καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν
καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

[12]Therefore, he will inherit many,
and he will divide the spoils of the mighty,
because his soul was handed over unto death,
and he was counted among the lawless;
and he bore the sins of many
and was handed over because of their sins.

B. Implied Speakers and Addressees

That LXX Isa 52:13-15 is spoken by κύριος is clear for reasons similar to those given for the MT of these verses. Although there is no explicit indication that κύριος speaks in 52:13, this can be presumed because its term, παῖς μου, is used several other times in DI when κύριος is implicitly the speaker, and explicitly in 45:1-4. Granted then that κύριος is the speaker in 52:13, there is no indication of a change of speakers in 52:14-15.

That 53:9 is also spoken by κύριος is clear from the context. The verb δώσω there could hardly be spoken by a human being. The implied audience is no longer κύριος but an unidentified audience (Israel? nations and kings?).

Although the remaining lines, 53:1-8 and 10-12, could be spoken by a variety of speakers, the simplest interpretation is to construe them all as spoken by a single unidentified narrator who addresses κύριος (at least for the first few verses) and refers to his unidentified group (hereafter designated as the "we") in the first person plural (vv. 1-6) and to himself in the first person singular (v. 8). Conjectures about the identity of the group range from a group of disciples to many nations and kings.[35] Also unidentified is the "you" (plural) in v. 10. Since v. 10 speaks of their making a sin offering to κύριος, this "you" presumably is limited to Israel and perhaps Gentile God-fearers.

C. What κύριος Says or Implies about himself

52:13a ἰδοὺ συνήσει ("Behold, he will understand.")

The word ἰδού is an interjection obviously related to ἰδοῦ, the aorist middle imperative of ὁράω. By means of this interjection, κύριος is commanding the people to *see* that his παῖς will *understand*. Both seeing and understanding are important, not only in the poem but also in the Book of Isaiah as a whole. Analysis of all the occurrences of the extremely common verb ὁράω in Isaiah is beyond the scope of this section, but three points are worth noting. Words related to "seeing" comprise no fewer than three of the first eight words which open the Book of Isaiah: ὅρασις ἣν εἶδεν Ησαιας υἱὸς Αμως ἣν εἶδεν. . . (LXX Isa 1:1). Second, four forms of ὁράω occur in chap. 6, the call narrative of Isaiah. Third, many of the occurrences of the verb appear in the context of the recurring theme of Jacob/Israel's inability or unwillingness to see (e.g., Isa 6:9,10; 29:10; 30:10; and 42:20).

---

[35] Christopher R. North (*The Second Isaiah:* Introduction, Translation, and Commentary to Chapters XL–LV [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964] 235-36) first suggests three possibilities as referents of the "we": "(i) the 'many nations' of lii. 15; (ii) the Israelites; (iii) the Prophet speaking for his fellow countrymen." He later concludes that "the interpretation of the Servant's sufferings must be the Prophet's, moved by the Holy Spirit. As such it is, in the universal setting of the passage, as appropriately voiced by Gentiles as by Jews." On the other hand, Blenkinsopp (*Isaiah 40–55,* 351) proposes that "the eulogist is an individual, almost certainly a disciple, . . . and one who speaks on behalf of those who 'revere Yahveh [*sic*] and obey the voice of his Servant' (50:10)." Koole (*Isaiah III,* 275) and North (*Second Isaiah*, 235) both note that the identification of the "we" with "nations and kings" (52:15) is usually favored by those who identify the Servant with Israel. As noted previously, a fuller exploration of this topic is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

The translator's use of the second verb of the poem, συνήσει, is easier to summarize. By way of this judicious translational choice, the translator highlights a connection with a recurrent theme in the book. Notably, "in five out of eight occurrences of this verb [συνίημι] in Isaiah [LXX] the people are described as not understanding."[36] The complaint of κύριος about his people's lack of understanding (along with their lack of sight) is announced as a theme of the book in the call of Isaiah in 6: 9-10 (LXX):

> καὶ εἶπεν· πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὸν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ· ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε· ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.
>
> And he said, "Go and say to this people, 'You will indeed hear, but you will not understand at all; and you will indeed see, but you shall not perceive.' For the heart of this people has become dull, and their ears are hard of hearing, and they have closed their eyes so that they may not see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and turn back and I heal them."

Paradoxically, in the account of the call of Isaiah, κύριος says that Israel will hear without understanding (ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε), while in the Fourth Servant Song, kings and nations will understand even without hearing (καὶ οἳ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν συνήσουσιν). Both verbs "understand" and "see" are repeated in strategic locations in the LXX version of the call of Isaiah and Isaiah 53 to great effect. While the centrality of the theme of seeing and understanding is implicit in both pericopes in the MT, it is less clear there because different verbs are used in reference to seeing and understanding. By confining himself to forms of just one verb for each activity, the translator of the LXX more effectively underscores these activities' importance in both the poem and the call narrative of Isaiah.

---

[36] Ekblad, *Servant Poems*, 179.

52:13b ὁ παῖς μου ("my παῖς")

I have already alluded to the importance of παιδεία as a central theme in Chapter Two in the section on the LXX First Servant Song (where the term παῖς makes its first appearance in the LXX Servant Songs) and in Chapter Four in the section on LXX Third Servant Song (where the term παιδεία is first introduced in the LXX Servant Songs). In the Fourth Servant Song, the centrality of the theme παιδεία as understood in wisdom literature becomes more evident. In light of its rich intertextual connections, the term παιδεία found later in Isa 53:5 conveys much more than does "chastisement," the common English equivalent for מוּסָר in most modern translations of MT Isa 53:5.[37] In Isaiah 53, the word παιδεία, especially in the light of the use of ὁ παῖς μου suggests rather a broader notion of *Erziehung*[38] ("education," or "upbringing") whose goal is both ὅρασις and σύνεσις (52:13). The presence in the poem’s first eight verses of three forms related to παῖς, eight words connected with ὁράω, and three forms cognate with συνίημι suggests that the translator wished to emphasize this theme of the instruction by κύριος of his παῖς leading to sight and understanding. That the παιδεία of the παῖς will be accomplished in part by the infliction of physical suffering poses problems, to say the least, for most modern readers but would have been taken for granted by most ANE and Hellenistic audiences.

---

[37] Of forty-one occurrences of מוּסָר in the *Tanakh*, thirty-three are translated by παιδεία or a closely related form in the LXX. Of the remaining eight, four are in verses that do not appear in the LXX or whose meaning differs radically from the meaning of the *Tanakh* text. מוּסָר, like παιδεία, can also have a broader sense of "discipline" or "instruction" but that connotation is less obvious in the Hebrew of this passage—hence the near unanimity of English translations in rendering "chastisement"—because in MT Isaiah 53 the subject of the poem is introduced as עַבְדִּי.

[38] Evangelia G. Dafni, "Die sogenannten *'Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder in der Septuaginta," in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (ed. M. K. Peters; SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 187-200, here 193. Of the 110 appearances of various forms of παιδεία in the LXX, the vast majority are found in Wisdom literature and the Psalms. Among the prophetic and apocalyptic writers, the word appears seven times in Jeremiah, four times in Isaiah, twice in Zephaniah, and once each in Amos, Habakkuk, Baruch, Ezekiel, and Daniel. Its single appearance in the Pentateuch is in Deut 11:2; it also appears in 2 Esdras, twice in 2 Maccabees, and three times in 4

53:12c κύριος Will Exalt and Glorify (ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται) His παῖς.

In addition to σύνεσις, κύριος promises ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα: the παῖς will be exalted and exceedingly glorified. The use of the passive form makes clear that this happening will be effected by κύριος. “Either of these verbs when having human beings and not God as their object, contains an element of deliverance from humiliation and misery.”[39] Examples of this can be seen in Isa 44:23; 49:5.[40]

The LXX’s δοξασθήσεται in v. 13 is an unusual translational choice for the MT’s נִשָּׂא or זָּבַהּ. A similar match is attested only one other time in the LXX, i.e., in 2 Esdr 8:36.[41] The choice of ὑψωθήσεται is unremarkable in itself; but here, paired with the unusual choice of δοξασθήσεται, it suggests an intertextual connection with Isa 4:2: τῇ δὲ

Maccabees. For a thorough overview of the use of the term in the Greek world, in the LXX, and in Hellenistic Judaism, see Georg Bertram, “παιδεύω,” *TDNT* 5. 596-625, especially 603-12.

[39] Seeligmann, *Septuagint,* 116.

[40] Ibid.

[41] As Ekblad (*Servant Poems,* 181) notes, in 2 Esdr 8:36, δοξάζω matches the piel of נשׂא in MT Ezra 8:36. Note, however, that the form of נשׂא in Isa 52:13 (וְנִשָּׂא) is not piel but rather niphal. LXX Job 40:10 renders וְגָבַהּ with δόξαν.

ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐπιλάμψει ὁ θεὸς ἐν βουλῇ μετὰ δόξης ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ **ὑψῶσαι** καὶ **δοξάσαι** τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ισραηλ (“and on that day God will shine in counsel with glory on the earth to exalt and glorify the remnant of Israel”). The two verbs are also used in reference to κύριος in Isa 5:16 and 33:10. That this verbal combination is used only of κύριος, Jacob/Israel, and the παῖς in Isaiah suggests a special connection among them (including the possibility that Jacob/Israel and the παῖς are identical).

In summary, κύριος says nothing directly about himself in 52:13, and yet much can be inferred. κύριος reveals something (implicit in the opening particle ἰδού) to Jacob/Israel, the presumed audience of Isaiah. In his use of the term παῖς, he portrays himself metaphorically as the head of a household who considers the so-designated individual or group (that is, the subject of the poem) as part of his “household,” for whom he is responsible. He asserts that his παῖς will “understand.” Finally, κύριος promises that he will “exalt and glorify,” his παῖς, that is, deliver him from humiliation and misery—and raise him to a level that is otherwise associated with Jacob/Israel and κύριος.

52:14 κύριος Will Astonish Nations and Kings and Give Them Sight and Understanding through the Reversal of Fortune of His παῖς.

In this verse, the themes of seeing and understanding are further developed and the idea of humiliation (“de-glorification”) is introduced as a counterpoint to the glorification spoken of in 52:13. The translator uses the unusual term ἀδοξήσει[42] to correspond to δοξασθήσεται in 52:13; furthermore, in the next verse (v. 15) the translator matches another form of συνίημι to a different but semantically related Hebrew word (הִתְבּוֹנָנוּ) in the corresponding Hebrew verse in order to echo its parallel in v.13. In doing so, the translator develops a chiasm already in the first three verses of the poem that shows the "integrity of the LXX as a distinct interpretation."[43]

---

[42] This is its only occurrence in the LXX.

> A See (ἰδού) my παῖς will understand (συνήσει) and he will be exalted and
> glorified exceedingly.
> B Just as many (πολλοί) will be amazed at you (ἐπὶ σέ)
> C so inglorious will be your appearance (literally, so will your appearance be
> "deglorified") (ἀδοξήσει) before people (ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων)
> C′ and your glory (δόξα) before the people (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων)
> B′ so will many (πολλά) nations be astonished at him (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ)
> and kings will keep their mouths shut.
> A′ For they to whom it was not reported concerning him, will see (ὄψονται)
> and they who have not heard, will understand (συνήσουσιν).[44]

At the heart of the chiasm (C, C′) stands the παῖς in his humiliation ("deglorification") while the beginning and end segments (A, A′) present the promised results of his humiliation: the servant's glorification and the enlightenment of the many, respectively. B and B′ refer to the reaction of the "many," "many nations," and "kings."

Again, κύριος reveals nothing directly about himself but does imply that he will bring about the sight and understanding of the kings and nations, not through speech and hearing but through the Servant's astonishing reversal of fortune from a state of humiliation to a state of glory. Through the unfolding of the Servant's career, κύριος emerges as one who reveals himself not only by words but also by action, and who does so not only before Israel but also before the nations. Moreover, he reveals himself as one who works in ways transcending the expectations of humanity, by not leaving the “de-glorified” παῖς without rich compensation.

---

[43] Ekblad, *Servant Poems*, 177.
[44] Ibid.

53:9 κύριος Will Give “the Many” as a Reward to the παῖς in Exchange for His “Death and Burial.”

The great difference in meaning between this verse in the LXX and the corresponding verse in the MT is not necessarily evidence of different *Vorlagen*, as explained in the notes on v. 9 in Section IIIA. The verse is already ambiguous in the MT. The LXX translator’s seeming attempt to clarify its meaning results in a more profound ambiguity.

This verse in the LXX can be interpreted in at least two very different ways. For Ekblad and others, κύριος promises that the wicked and the rich will die and be buried instead of the Servant because of his innocence in word and deed. This would be consistent with the LXX’s “theology of retribution” and “avoidance of a theology that attributes the servant’s suffering to God.” [45]

Ekblad’s reading, in my view, however, is unconvincing theologically and semantically. In the LXX, DI’s theology does not avoid attributing the suffering of the παῖς to God. Indeed, all the suffering of the παῖς in LXX 53:2-5, except that caused by human rejection, appears to come from the hand of God. The issue is then not whether God is inflicting the suffering but rather on whose account he does so. Furthermore, in Isa 53:6b κύριος is said to have given the παις up on account of the sins of the “we” (καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν), an assertion reiterated (with κύριος as the implicit agent) in v. 12 (διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη). Nor is it obvious, on purely semantic grounds, that “to give the wicked for his [Servant’s] death” means “to cause the wicked to die instead of his Servant.” A verb other than δίδωμι would be needed to convey that meaning more clearly.

---

[45] Ibid., 237-38.

It is much more likely, in my view, that the poem portrays κύριος as giving the wicked *to the* παῖς – as part of the reward of his travail.[46] This correlates to the Servant’s inheriting many (v. 12) as a reward *from* κύριος . That the “many” of v. 12 are “the wicked” of v. 9 (or at least a subset of them) is suggested by v. 6a, a confession of universal guilt (πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν, ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη).[47] Thus, the text suggests that the gift of “the wicked” (and “the rich”) to the Servant from κύριος is equivalent to the Servant’s inheritance of the “many” for whom he intercedes. A correlation between giving and receiving is further suggested by the fact that both are connected to the “de-glorification” of the παῖς: that is, the giving of the wicked and the rich is “in exchange for,” or “at the price of” (ἀντί) his death and burial; the receiving of many is “because of” (διά) the Servant’s taking upon himself the sins of many and interceding for them (v. 12). Finally, Ekblad’s view presumes that the παῖς does not die in LXX Isaiah 53, a view that is tenable but not obvious, as I shall argue in Section D.

---

[46] What this reward means concretely depends partly on whether the παῖς is Israel/Jacob (or a subset thereof) or an individual, a question beyond the scope of this dissertation.

[47] The “many” are called “the wicked” because, although the Servant’s παιδεία brings them peace (53:5b) and his bruises bring them healing, the LXX—unlike the MT—does not refer to the justification of the many, as will be noted in connection with 53:10.

D. What the "We" Say and Imply about κύριος .

53:1 God is Addressed as κύριε.

I have already discussed the significance of the term κύριος in Chapter Two in the section on LXX First Servant Song where the term first appears in the LXX Servant Songs. Here in 53:1 we encounter the only instance of the vocative form of the term in the LXX Servant Songs. As discussed in n. f on p. 229, the presence of the vocative of κύριος ("Lord") could be evidence of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or, as is more likely, may simply be a translator's gloss. With this one word, a report such as we have in the MT becomes a prayer.

53:1 κύριος Has Revealed a Never-before-heard-of Event to Nations and Kings.

The addressee is κύριος; the identity of the speakers (or their spokesperson)—the "we"—is less clear. The question is complex and, as stated in Chapter One, cannot be treated within the scope of this dissertation. Moreover, it is not critically important to the central question of the dissertation: how is God portrayed?

How much of what follows the opening vocative κύριε in the above verse is addressed to κύριος, given that already in 53:1b he is spoken of in the third person? Such a sudden shift to speaking of the addressee in the third person need not signal the end of the prayer. It could be taken as a sign of respect, but the explanation is probably far simpler. κύριε is in all likelihood the addition of the LXX translator of Isaiah, who simply left the following references to κύριος in his *Vorlage* in the third person unchanged, thus creating a few awkward readings such as that in v. 1b. Basing myself on this assumption, I will take the whole of vv. 1-8 as addressed to κύριος and constituting a sort of penitential prayer.[48] The opening questions in 53:1 are rhetorical. The first ("Who has believed what we have heard?") refers to the amazement and astonishment expressed in 52:14 and 15. The second question ("To whom has the arm of κύριος been revealed?") is also rhetorical and functions as a bridge into the following account of the Servant's life.

The concept of "the arm of κύριος" is even more common in the LXX than in the MT because the translators tended to use βραχίων to translate not only זְרוֹעַ but also יָד. While the expressions "hand of κύριος" and "arm of κύριος" are in virtually every case equivalent in meaning (that is, a metaphor for the power of κύριος, especially against his enemies), the intertextuality between certain passages is more apparent in the LXX because of its greater consistency in the use of βραχίων. For example, while 53:1b may be an allusion to 26:11 in the MT, it is far more evidently so in the LXX.[49] As in the MT, there are also strong intertextual links between LXX 53:1 and 40:10-11; 51:5; and especially 52:10.

---

[48] Could the presentation of 53:1-8 as a prayer also serve to highlight that what follows the address κύριϵ is not a divine oracle but rather the community's struggling efforts to understand the suffering of the innocent παῖς?

[49] Compare Isa 26:11 in the LXX: **κύριϵ** ὑψηλός σου ὁ **βραχίων,** καὶ οὐκ **ᾔδϵισαν**, γνόντϵς δὲ αἰσχυνθήσονται· ζῆλος λήμψϵται λαὸν **ἀπαίδϵυτον,** καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπϵναντίους ἔδϵται. ("κύριϵ, your arm is lifted, yet they did not know it; but when they realize it they will be ashamed: jealousy will seize an undisciplined nation, and now fire shall consume the adversaries") to the same verse in the MT:

יְהוָה רָמָה יָדְךָ בַּל־יֶחֱזָיוּן יֶחֱזוּ וְיֵבֹשׁוּ קִנְאַת־עָם אַף־אֵשׁ צָרֶיךָ תֹאכְלֵם׃

("Yhwh! Your hand was lifted, but they did not see. Let them see, and they will be ashamed, as zeal for your people, even fire, consumes your enemies.")

In the LXX, Isa 53:1 and 26:11 share the invocation of God and the use of the same term βραχίων. Moreover, the use of ᾔδϵισαν and especially ἀπαίδϵυτον in 26:11 further suggests intertextuality with 52:13. In the MT, 53:1 lacks the invocation of God; the phrase, וּזְרוֹעַ יְהוָה, is only semantically related to יָדְךָ in 26:11; and there is nothing equivalent to the LXX παῖς/παιδϵία wordplay.

As has already been observed in the previous section on the MT, LXX Isa 51:5 and 52:10 as well as 52:15 also supply the reader or listener with the answer to the second question: “The arm of κύριος—to whom has it been revealed?” The implicit answer must include the Gentiles, “nations and kings.”

53:4 κύριος Heals and Brings Peace to the “We” through the Suffering of His παῖς.

The report of the ostracism of the sick and suffering παῖς in vv. 2-3 turns from judgment against him to an acknowledgement of him, beginning in v. 4 where the “we” realize that it was not his sin but their own that engendered his predicament. The idea that the suffering of the innocent is brought on by the wicked is a commonplace of human experience; but the concept that such suffering could also be somehow morally *beneficial* to the wicked themselves would have been bewildering to the ancients, no less than to most modern readers. Westermann argues that it is precisely the novelty of such a notion that provokes the astonishment of nations and kings (52:15) and unbelief (53:1).

> The new thing of which they had never dreamt and which shattered an almost primeval iron law was that the cause of the blows was now viewed in a different light. This comes in v. 4a: *our* sicknesses—he bore them.[50]

The problem of the suffering of the innocent, in particular on account of the wicked, has been treated in Chapter Two.[51] Much of what is said there with reference to the *Tanakh* holds true of the LXX. Nevertheless, in LXX Isaiah 53 in general, and particularly in this passage, different nuances are introduced through the translator's emphasis on the παιδεία metaphor.

---

[50] Westermann, *Isaiah,* 263.

[51] The emphasis in MT Isaiah 53 is on the Servant’s vicarious suffering as a sin offering for the many. According to J. J. Stamm (*Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel* [ATANT 10; Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1946] 73) “Der Knecht stand in seinem stellvertretenden Leiden unter dem Wohlgefallen Gottes: ‘Aber Jahwe fand Gefallen an seinem Zerschlangenen, /Hielte den, der sein Leben zum Schuldopfer gab.’ (53:10).”

In LXX Isaiah 53, just as the translator emphasizes ὁράω, συνίημι, and δόξα in the opening chiasm of Isaiah 53 by means of deliberately selected Greek equivalents for Hebrew words, here too the translator creates a degree of emphasis on the concept of παιδεία by a careful choice of Greek words to match their Hebrew counterparts. As mentioned above, his use of παιδεία in 53:5 is highlighted by his previous use of παῖς in 52:13 and παιδίον in 53:2. The LXX's account of the life of the παῖς—a sort of "from-birth-to-death" narrative—begins in 53:1 and describes his status as παιδίον (53:2), a legitimate but less obvious match for יוֹנֵק, given the context of the verse in the MT. The "biography" continues by describing his life of suffering and sickness. The "we," with their theological beliefs, take for granted that his suffering is a sign of the παῖς's disfavor before God. In other words, the "we" rejected him precisely because they took his inhuman appearance, sickness, and suffering as proof of his sinfulness. The turning point in the prayer of the "we" comes when—somehow[52]—they realize that it is not for *his* sins but rather for *their* sins that he suffers. In an altogether astonishing, unheard of way (cf. 52:15), the woe of the παῖς is for their weal. This realization is expressed in the extraordinary phrase: his παιδεία brings them peace (53:5).[53]

---

[52] Westermann (*Isaiah,* 263) comments: "What led the led the speakers in 53.1-11 to make the discovery they did? There is as little answer to it as to the question of the Servant's identity."

[53] The word μώλωπι ("bruises, wounds") evokes corporal punishment as part of παιδεία. The two are hardly interchangeable terms, but in the milieu of the LXX the pairing of corporal punishment and παιδεία was not infrequent. Although corporal punishment as a means of instruction has become abhorrent to most elements of modern Western culture, its connection to instruction in wisdom is taken for granted in

κύριος is thus portrayed as dealing with humanity in ways far more complex than the more simplistic models of sin and punishment held by many Jews of the time.[54] Isa 53:4-5 makes it clear, once and for all, that not all suffering is a punishment for personal guilt. This is an insight that is especially developed in Job—albeit from a different angle—and much of the LXX's wisdom literature. As the following section will observe, suffering in the wisdom tradition is often seen as a kind of "education."

Although the "we" have misconstrued the situation, the OT is by no means so limited in its view of suffering as to reduce all instances to punishment for guilt. The prophetic writings, no less than the rest of the OT, readily accept that suffering could be inflicted not only on one's enemies, but also medicinally on one's charges out of concern for them. As discussed in Chapter Four, the metaphor of παιδεία (the usual LXX translation of מוּסָר) is thus intended to portray κύριος as neither cruel nor arbitrary in allowing a παῖς to suffer.

But v. 6 describes a more complex situation. While the innocent suffering of the παῖς *is* for his own enlightenment (see Isa 53:11), in v. 5 his suffering is described as the παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ("the discipline of our peace"),[55] that is the παιδεία of peace for

---

the OT. The idea is more prevalent in the LXX than in the *Tanakh* because of its larger canon comprising additional wisdom books that frequently refer to παιδεία. That the connection was as common to the mentality of the LXX as it is shocking to most Western modern readers can be seen in Sir 22:6: μουσικὰ ἐν πένθει ἄκαιρος διήγησις μάστιγες δὲ καὶ παιδεία ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ σοφίας ("Like music in time of mourning is inopportune talk, but a thrashing and discipline are at all times wisdom").

[54] Of course, many people of different religious persuasions have such beliefs even today.

[55] This phrase is used nowhere else in the LXX. The exact meaning of the phrase is as enigmatic as the mystery it seeks to explain. Jim Alvin Sanders (*Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism* [Colgate Rochester Divinity School Bulletin 28; Rochester: Colgate Divinity School, 1955] 16) offers a detailed argument for translating the corresponding Hebrew phrase in MT Isa 53:6 as "the discipline intended (or necessary) for our peace."

the "we." Given, however, its conjunction with the previous terms παῖς and παιδίον, the reader or listener is directed away from seeing the παιδεία of the innocent παῖς on behalf of the many as merely bewildering.[56] In part, the mystery can be seen as an example of instruction through observation of the suffering of another.[57] Whatever the intended meaning of κύριος allowing his innocent παῖς to suffer for the guilty, the poem's use of παῖς, παιδεία, and παιδίον places the suffering παῖς within the biblical tradition of the use of suffering by κύριος to form those whom he loves.

In summary, Judaism—and evidently Hellenistic Judaism all the more so—took as a given that suffering is part and parcel of the instruction that leads to wisdom and glory as discussed in Chapter Four. Thus, in its use of the language of παιδεία the LXX, going beyond MT Isaiah 53, provides another entry point into, if not a satisfying explanation of, the mystery of innocent suffering offered on behalf of others.

53:6 κύριος Gives His παῖς over into the Hands of His Enemies on account of the Universal Guilt of the "We."

The insight of vv. 4-5 is reiterated in v. 6, now with the use of the metaphors of sheep and straying from the way.[58] Two precisions are added to the previous insight of the "we." First, v. 6a states the universality of the guilt: all the "we," without exception, have turned from the way. Second, this verse also makes explicit the role, hitherto implicit, of κύριος in the suffering of the παῖς. κύριος is portrayed as "giving up," "surrendering," "handing over" his παῖς.

---

[56] Perhaps the "we" are being taught the lesson of repentance. "God teaches repentance through calamity" (ibid*.,* 101).

[57] Sanders (*Suffering,* 45) lists four other OT examples of instruction learned through the observation of others' suffering: Jer 2:30; Ezek 5:15; Deut 11:2; Prov 24:32.

[58] "Going astray" is a favorite metaphor in wisdom literature and the psalms for sinning. The translator of LXX Isaiah highlights the semantic equivalence of sinning and going astray in his free translation of Isa 46:8: זִכְרוּ־זֹאת וְהִתְאֹשָׁשׁוּ הָשִׁיבוּ פוֹשְׁעִים עַל־לֵב ("Remember this, and stand firm You sinners, return in your heart") as μνήσθητε ταῦτα καὶ στενάξατε, μετανοήσατε, οἱ πεπλανημένοι, ἐπιστρέψατε τῇ καρδίᾳ ("Remember these things, and groan; repent, you that have gone astray, return in your heart"). Could the status of all as straying sheep in LXX 53:6 also be an allusion to LXX Isa 13:14 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων, ὥστε ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποστραφῆναι καὶ ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ διῶξαι

παραδίδωμι with κύριος as subject, is most commonly used in the LXX to denote the handing over of a people (or occasionally a person) to the power of an enemy.[59] The suffering of the παῖς at the hands of human beings is not due to other gods or happenstance (lest there be any doubt), but is in accord with the purpose of κύριος. The mysterious reason for κύριος handing over his παῖς is simply noted, without further explanation: the sins of the "we." To whom and with what result he does so is only partially hinted at in the following verses.

53:8-9 Does κύριος Permit the παῖς to Die?

Although κύριος is implicitly behind the inhuman appearance of the παῖς, sickness, and suffering in vv. 2-6 and explicitly involved in handing him over in v. 6, the

---

("And those who are left will be like a fleeing fawn and like a stray sheep, and there will be no one to gather them, so that one will turn back to one's people and flee to one's own land")?

[59] Ceslas Spicq, "παραδίδωμι," in *Notes de lexicographie, néo-testamentaire: Supplément* (OBO 22/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982) 504-15, here 510-12. The verb is also used in a judicial sense (ibid., 514). It is interesting to note that this verb is used in the NT as "un terme technique de la Passion de Jésus." In this case, the term is used in the passive in a juridical sense (he was handed over to the authorities), here by means of a betrayal. "En effet, la παράδοσις fut aussi une trahison (προδοσία)" ibid., 513. Is there a connection between the NT association of παραδιδωμι with Jesus' Passion and κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτόν in LXX Isa 53:6? Spicq makes an interesting case: "Par ailleurs, *paradidonai* se dit aussi d'hommes qui se donnent eux-mêmes et se sacrificent pour Dieu ou leur prochain, tels Shadraq, Méshak et Abed-Négo qui ont 'livré leur corps plutôt que de servir et d'adorer tout autre dieu que leur Dieu' (Dan 3:28). Or le Serviteur de Iahvé avait été prédit livré à la mort pour le rachat des péchés (Is. LIII, 6, 12). Cette acceptation religieuse est inséparable de *paradidonai* dans la mort de Jésus; ***Dieu l'a livré*** (Rom. IV, 25; VIII, 32) ou lui-même s'est livré (Gal. II, 20) s'offrant en sacrifice d'agréable odeur (Eph. v 2, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν)" ibid., 513-14 (emphasis added).

Friedrich Büchsel ("παραδιδωμι," *TDNT*, 2. 169) states, "The formula παραδοῦναι εἰς χειράς τινος . . . is not found in pure Gk, though it is common in the LXX: Jer. 33:24f. etc. and occurs in Joseph. Ant. 2.20."

suffering spoken of in vv. 7 and 8 is not directly caused by κύριος but rather occurs at the hands of wicked human beings. κύριος is portrayed as permitting but not directly causing his παῖς being led to death (cf. Job 1-2).

As discussed above, Whybray, Orlinsky, and others argue that MT Isaiah 53 does not imply that the Servant dies. David Sapp argues that LXX Isaiah 53, to an even greater extent, leaves open the possibility that the παῖς does not die. "The LXX has shifted its attention from the coercive, judgmental actions of the Servant's oppressors (Hebrew) to the justice they have denied him. And since justice has been denied the Servant, he is in need of vindication by the Lord."[60]

Sapp translates v. 8, αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, as "his life is taken up from the earth" and goes on to argue that κύριος steps in when the παῖς is at the point of death and prevents the death from occurring. His argument, in my view, has two weaknesses. First, Sapp offers no alternative explanation as to what the Servant's life being "taken up from the earth" could mean. Sapp does not suggest that the LXX implies that the παῖς will be taken up into heaven like Enoch (Gen 5:24) and Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11) but simply that he will be rescued from death and that others will die in his place. Second, while he argues convincingly that 12c παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ could be interpreted as meaning that the παῖς was merely led to the point of death, he does not adequately address the verse's cumulative effect in the context of the two important previous references to death and burial in the poem (53:8-9).

---

[60] D. A. Sapp, "The LXX, 1QIsa^a, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins* (ed. William H. Bellinger and William Reuben Farmer; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998) 170-92, here 177. His above assertion may be true, but reading the text as objectively as possible involves, in my view, putting aside one's own expectations of just deserts for the παῖς and letting the text speak for itself.

On the other hand, some measure of ambiguity must be admitted in both the MT's and LXX's references to the death and burial of the Servant/παῖς. This is due to three reasons. First, in Hebrew poetry—and especially in the psalms of lament, which seem to have at least influenced Isaiah 53—images involving death and burial can refer to extreme distress of various kinds.[61] Second, the poem, in both the LXX and the MT, speaks of the Servant/παῖς as somehow surviving his ordeal and being amply rewarded. At the time of the poem's original composition, Jewish belief in resurrection was at best in a nascent stage.[62] Third, the servant is never explicitly identified, and so long as the possibility remains that the Servant is a metaphor for a group such as the faithful remnant of Israel, or a group of disciples, the image of death and burial hardly needs to be interpreted literally. That the image of death and resurrection could serve aptly as a metaphor for Israel in exile and its remarkable liberation from exile is seen in Ezekiel 37.[63] The following verse intensifies the ambiguity: Does the παῖς die?

---

[61] For example, Psalm 88 is considered "an individual lament of a person near death" (John Kselman and Michael Barré, "Psalms," Chapter 34 in *NJBC,* p. 541). The speaker complains to God, נֶחְשַׁבְתִּי עִם־י֣וֹרְדֵי ב֑וֹר ("I am reckoned with those who go down to the pit") in 88:5a and later, שַׁ֭תַּנִי בְּב֣וֹר תַּחְתִּיּ֑וֹת ("you plunged me into the bottom of the pit" *NAB*) in 88:7a.

[62] On the other hand, by the time of the poem's translation into Greek the idea was probably no longer new. See Jon D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006) 197.

[63] Christoph Barth (*Die Errettung vom Tode: Leben un Tod un den Klage- und Dankliedern des Alten Testaments* [ed. Bernd Janowski; 2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1997] 142) connects Ezekiel 37 with Isaiah 53: "In Ez 37 ist die leibliche Auferstehung als Bild gebraucht. Vom verdienten T[od] zum L[eben] kommt Israel durch das Leiden des unschuldigen Gottesknechts (Jes 53)."

53:10a and 11a κύριος Will Cleanse the παῖς of His Wound; κύριος Will Take away from the Travail of His Soul.

Verse 10a and 10c form a synonymous parallelism. Sapp interprets 10a literally as a divine intervention just before the παῖς dies: "[T]he Lord wants to save the Servant from his unjust suffering, not add to it by allowing him to die for some special cause."[64] Nevertheless, the meaning of the phrase καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς (literally, "to cleanse/purge him of the blow/wound/plague/ suffering") in 53:10 is far from obvious. In fact, little more can be ascertained than that κύριος wills to intervene on the behalf of the παῖς. If it were clear that the παῖς is an individual and not a group, and if it could be demonstrated that the idea of an intervention by κύριος after death would have been meaningless to the translator, Sapp's case would be more compelling. Since neither premise can be assumed, we must be content with the ambiguity concerning the death of the παῖς.

From a theological standpoint, whether κύριος restores the servant right at the point of death or after death is of consequence primarily for the question of whether the unfolding drama reflected in the text can be compared to a completed sacrifice.

53:10b "If You (plural) Should Make a Sin Offering, Your Soul Will See a Long-lived Posterity."

Inserted between the parallel statements of 10a and 10c is the above conditional sentence which seems curiously out of place. Apparently addressed to Israel (and possibly God-fearers), v. 10b amounts to a call to conversion with the promise of reward, all in traditional OT terms. The call includes the making of a sin-offering, while the reward promised by κύριος for this is long-lived posterity.

---

[64] Sapp, "The LXX," 180.

In an attempt to make this conditional sentence fit the context, M. Hengel suggests that the sin offering in question may consist of the many confessing their guilt and acknowledging the action of κύριος through the Servant.[65] Whether this was the LXX translator's intention is impossible to say. While Hengel's proposal may be theologically defensible, in my view it goes beyond what the text says. The text itself is simply a promise; the context suggests no more than a connection of some sort between the conversion of the wicked and the suffering of the παῖς.

53:11 κύριος Desires to Show the παῖς Light, and to Form [Him] with Understanding.

In his discussion of LXX Isa 26:9b,[66] Seeligmann asserts that Isaiah's identification of "justice and law with light" as an "ancient oriental and especially Israelite notion."[67] Other examples in the writings of the prophets can be found. Note, for instance, the strictly agricultural metaphors of the Hebrew text of Hos 10:12b:

נִ֥ירוּ לָכֶ֖ם נִ֑יר וְעֵת֙ לִדְר֣וֹשׁ אֶת־יְהוָ֔ה עַד־יָב֕וֹא וְיֹרֶ֥ה צֶ֖דֶק לָכֶֽם׃

("Break up for yourselves a new field, for it is time to seek the Lord, till he come and rain down justice upon you," *NAB*). Perhaps influenced by pre-gnostic ideas, the LXX of Hos

---

[65] See M. Hengel, "Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit," in B. Janowski and P. Schulmacher, eds., *Der Leidende Gottesknecht: Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (FAT 14; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 49-92, here 79.

[66] Isa 26:9b: διότι φῶς τὰ προστάγματά σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, δικαιοσύνην μάθετε, οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, "For your commandments are a light on the earth: learn righteousness, you who dwell on the earth."

[67] Seeligmann, *Septuagint*, 108.

10:12b introduces the idea, for example, of "the light of knowledge" in its free translation: φωτίσατε ἑαυτοῖς φῶς γνώσεως, ἐκζητήσατε τὸν κύριον ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῖν ("Light for yourselves the light of knowledge; seek κύριος till the fruits of righteousness come upon you"). Concerning this translation, Seeligmann notes that, "here, δικαιοσύνη signifies the result of the search after God, and the kindling of a φῶς γνώσεως."[68] Thus, the light of "knowledge of God" is the fruit of practicing righteousness.[69] The LXX version of Isa 53:11 offers a similar concept: the reward for the righteousness of the παῖς is light. "Φως is used here in the signification for the light of true knowledge, σύνενσις not acquired by man through his own efforts, but granted him by God. We may say that the famous passage in Ps 35 (36).10, ὅτι παρὰ σοὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς ἐν τῷ φωτί σου ὀψόμεθα φῶς ["For with you is the fountain of life: in your light we shall see light"] contains what may be regarded as a combination of both these conceptions."[70]

"To form him with understanding" is the second element of the synonymous parallelism of v. 11a. "This is the only place in the Pentateuch and Isaiah where the Lord is described as forming anyone with understanding. Yet this very clearly evokes the

---

[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid.

Lord's forming of Israel as his servant (Isa 44:21,24)."[71] This final sapiential reference rounds out the theme of παιδεία in the LXX poem.

53:11 κύριος Vindicates His παῖς, the Just One, Who Serves Many Well.

The LXX of Isaiah 53, unlike the MT, makes no reference to the justification of the many. δικαιόω with the παῖς as the object here is used in the forensic sense of "vindicate" or "acquit." Although the vast discrepancy in meaning between the MT and LXX could well have resulted from different *Vorlagen,* it is also quite possible that the LXX's *Vorlage* was the same as the MT. There the meaning of the Hebrew is highly ambiguous (see p. 229, n. hh), and the LXX translator may have been loath even to consider the possibility that the verse meant that "the many" (whom the reader/hearer of the Fourth Servant Song might well assume to be as universally sinful as the "we") being declared innocent by κύριος on theological grounds. Declaring a party to be innocent, the ordinary meaning of צדק (hiphil), if the party is known to be guilty is strongly condemned in the OT. (See for example, Isa 5:22-23: "Woe to the champions at drinking wine, the valiant at mixing strong drink! To those who acquit the guilty for bribes, and deprive the just man of his rights" [*NAB*].)

Although the vindication of the παῖς according to the LXX is far less remarkable than "justification of the many" (יַצְדִּ֥יק צַדִּ֦יק עַבְדִּ֖י לרַבִּים) promised in the corresponding MT verse, it is remarkable enough in the context of Isaiah, especially after the declaration of universal guilt in v. 6.

---

[71] Ekblad, *Servant Poems,* 253.

> In Isaiah no one is righteous (59:4) except for the Lord (41:10; 45:21) and a future righteous king (32:1). The servant here in 53:11 is one exception. The reader of Isaiah is invited to consider to what extent the servant can be identified with their righteous king in Isaiah 32:1 or with the Lord's righteous right hand (41;10; cf. 53:1). In both the LXX and the MT those who serve the Lord (54:17) and even all people (60:21) shall be righteous before the Lord. While in the LXX of Isaiah the servant does not make people righteous in 53:11, the LXX has its own unique way of understanding the servant as achieving this righteousness.[72]

Finally, the παῖς is seen not only as a servant of κύριος but also as a servant of "the many." The outline of his life and suffering is the same as in the MT, and the LXX translator is not denying the obedient service of the παῖς to κύριος. Nevertheless, by portraying the παῖς as serving the many he introduces a new thought, which offers a profound insight: the παῖς serves κύριος precisely by serving "the many."

53:12 To Compensate the παῖς for Being Misjudged and Handed Over, κύριος Gives Him Many Persons and the Spoils of the Mighty as His Inheritance.

Much of what was said in Section II with reference to this verse in the MT is equally true of the corresponding verse in the LXX version, notably the reference to "the spoils," an image normally associated with warfare. In the LXX, the παῖς does not divide the spoils *with* the great (a common but, in my view, erroneous translation of the MT),[73] but rather the spoils *of* the great. Through this minor alteration, the translator suggests that the theme of the reversal of fortune for the παῖς is accompanied by a reversal of fortune for the great, namely, their being despoiled.

---

[72] Ibid., 255.

[73] Instead of "Therefore I will give him his portion among the great, and he shall divide the spoils with *the mighty*" (*NAB*, emphasis added), the correct translation, in my view for reasons explained above, is: "Assuredly, I will give him a share in the many, and with the multitudes he shall divide spoil."

E. Summary of the Portrayal of God in the LXX Fourth Servant Song

In the LXX version of Isaiah 53, κύριος is portrayed as a fatherly teacher who spares no effort in his endeavor to give his people, and indeed nations and kings, true vision and understanding. Through an astonishing, never-before-heard-of event, the κύριος subjects an individual or group whom he addresses as a member of his own household, whether his son or a sonlike servant, to humiliation, disease, suffering, disfigurement, physical abuse, false judgment, and death—or at least near-death. This ordeal is presented in terms of a divine discipline or παιδεία, with the purpose of forming this παῖς in wisdom, understanding, and light. In addition, κύριος rewards him with "many" and with the spoils of the mighty. These rewards of the παιδεία of the παῖς are not limited to him, however. Through his painful experience, nations and kings are also brought to understanding and vision; the "we" are both healed and given peace. Many who have strayed are encouraged to return to κύριος with the promise of reward. The Servant is vindicated, thereby demonstrating that suffering is not necessarily proof of divine disfavor. Indeed, the exaltation accompanying his vindication makes clear that the suffering of the παῖς was neither the final word nor futile, but rather a sign of his intimate connection to κύριος in the divine plan for the good of the many.

IV. Comparison of the Portrayal of God in MT Isaiah 53 and LXX Isaiah 53

A. Introduction

This section will first present my translation of MT Isaiah 53 and LXX Isaiah 53 side-by-side, so as to facilitate comparing and contrasting the two texts. After analyzing the two text forms' similarities and differences in their portrayal of God, I shall draw some final conclusions.

English Translations of MT and LXX Isaiah 52:13–53:12

MT	**LXX**
[13] See, my Servant will be wise, he will be exalted, and lifted up, and be very high.	[13] See, my παῖς will understand, and he will be exalted, and glorified exceedingly.
[14] Just as many were desolate over you (masc. sing.)—so marred beyond anyone was his appearance, his form beyond [that of] human beings— [15] so will he sprinkle many nations.	[14] Just as many shall be amazed at you (masc. sing.)—so inglorious will be your appearance before people and your glory before the people—
Concerning him, kings will shut their mouths; for they will see what has not been told them; they will understand what they had never heard.	[15] so many nations will be astonished at him and kings will keep their mouth shut: for they to whom it was not reported concerning him will see; and they who have not heard will understand.

IV. Comparison of the MT and LXX

[1] Who has believed what we have heard? The arm of Yhwh—to whom has it been revealed?	[1] κύριε, who has believed what we have heard, and the arm of κύριος —to whom has it been revealed?
[2] He grew like a shoot before him, like a root out of arid ground. He had no form, no splendor that we could see, no appearance that we should desire him.	[2] We reported before him: “Like a little child, like a root in a thirsty land, he has no form or glory. We saw him and he had neither form nor beauty.
[3] He was held in contempt and forsaken by people, a man of pain and experienced in suffering, as one from whom people hide their faces, held in contempt, and we held him of no account.	[3] Indeed his appearance was despised, and he was forsaken beyond all human beings, a man of suffering, and acquainted with the experience of sickness, for his face was turned away: he was dishonored, and of no account.
[4] Yet it was our sufferings that he carried, our pains that he bore. We accounted him hurt, smitten by God, and afflicted.	[4] He bears our sins and suffers for us; yet we accounted him to be in trouble, and in suffering, and in affliction.
[5] But he was pierced because of our transgression, crushed because of our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his scourging we were healed.	[5] He was wounded on account of our lawless deeds, and was bruised because of our sins. The discipline of our peace was upon him; by his bruises we were healed.
[6] All of us like sheep went astray, each turned to his own way; and Yhwh visited upon him the iniquity (and its consequences) of us all.	[6] All of us like sheep have gone astray; each in his own way has gone astray; and κύριος handed him over for our sins
[7] He was hard pressed, yet he was submissive, and he did not open his mouth; like a sheep that is led to slaughter, like a ewe that is silent before her shearers, he did not open his mouth.	[7] And in the mistreatment, he does not open his mouth. He was led as a sheep to the slaughter. As a lamb before its shearer is silent, so he does not open his mouth.

[8] After detention and after judgment he was taken away; as for his generation who would be concerned? For he was cut off from the land of the living. Because of the transgression of my people, he was afflicted.	[8] In humiliation, he was deprived of a [fair] verdict. Who will declare his generation? For his life is taken from the earth. Because of the lawless deeds of my people, he was led to death.
[9]He was given his grave among the wicked, and with a rich man, for his death, although no violence had he done, and no falsehood was in his mouth.	[9] And I will give the wicked in exchange for his burial and the rich in exchange for his death; for he did no lawless deed nor was deceit found in his mouth.
[10]But Yhwh willed to crush him severely. If he should offer an *'āshām* he will see offspring and length of days. The will of Yhwh will be effective by his hand.	[10]And κύριος wills to purge him of his suffering. If you (plural) should make a sin offering, your soul shall see a long-lived posterity.
[11]Because of his travail he shall see, he shall be satisfied. By his knowledge my servant, the just one, will justify the many, and their wrongdoing (and its consequences) he shall bear	And κύριος wills to take away [11]from the travail of his soul, to show him light, and to form [him] with understanding; to justify the just one who serves many well; and he shall take their sin upon himself.
[12]Assuredly, I will give him a share in the many, and with the multitudes he shall divide spoil, inasmuch as he exposed himself to death and was numbered among rebels, whereas the sin of many he carried and for those rebelling he will intercede.	[12] Therefore, he will inherit many, and he will divide the spoils of the mighty, because his soul was handed over to death, and he was counted among the lawless; and he bore the sins of many, and was handed over because of their sins.

A. Similarities

God as One Who Reveals to the Nations, Giving Sight and Understanding to Them and to the Suffering One

At the heart of both texts is the promise of a revelation. God is portrayed as beginning an astonishing revelation in the drama of the Suffering One. God reveals to the "we," in a moment of insight, that their estimation of the Suffering One has been totally wrong: he is innocent and his suffering was on their behalf. That God will give kings and nations such understanding and sight is portrayed as a future event, as is the exaltation of the Suffering One. In neither text is the precise content of this understanding and sight made explicit. It is simply referred to as astonishing, amazing, never-before-heard-of, and is centered on the reversal of fortune for the Suffering One.

Congruent with the universalism found elsewhere in Isaiah, Isaiah 53 portrays God as One who reveals not only to Israel but also to the nations. The revelation promised to the nations goes beyond merely showing them the sovereignty and glory of Israel's God. This revelation promises understanding and sight, gifts that the Book of Isaiah frequently chides Israel itself for lacking.[74] These gifts are also among those promised to the Suffering One.

Neither text elucidates the precise connection between God's reversal of the Suffering One's fortune and his gift of understanding and sight. How he will give nations and kings these gifts is not explained. Presumably, in the process, the "we" will come to know of the Suffering One's reversal of fortune.

---

[74] See Isa 6:10. Ekblad (*Servant Poems,*179) notes that of the eight occurrences of forms of συνήμι in LXX Isaiah (1:3; 6:9, 10; 7:9; 43:10; 52:13, 15; 59:15), five refer to Israel's failure to understand (1:3; 6:9, 10; 7:9; 59:15).

In Both Texts God Brings about a Reversal of Perception in the "We."

God is spoken of in MT Isa 53:4 as actually smiting the Suffering One; in the LXX God's role in his suffering is merely implicit. Despite this subtle difference, both texts have as their pivotal point the moment of illumination, when the "we" who observe his suffering come to realize that their assumption about God's purpose in causing or allowing the Suffering One's travail was completely mistaken. Up to that point, the "we," in line with the conventional wisdom of the time, have seen the Suffering One as receiving his just deserts. Suddenly in v. 5, everything is turned around. The "we," who presumed themselves innocent because they were free from suffering, come to realize that they are the guilty. On the other hand, the Suffering One, who was to be shunned because of his presumed guilt, is innocent.

This turnabout involves no small insight. How God brings about such a total reversal of perception (prior to the Suffering One's promised exaltation) is one of the great mysteries of the poem.

Both Texts Suggest God's Plan Involves an Exchange.

This radical change in perception in v. 5 is revolutionary: the woe of the Suffering One is for the weal of the many. The MT does not portray God himself commenting upon this paradox. Rather, it is the "we" who suggest that God somehow accepts the woes of the Suffering One as the price of peace, healing, and reconciliation of the many. If the *beth* in MT Isa 53:5bβ וּבַחֲבֻרָת֖וֹ נִרְפָּא־לָֽנוּ is read as a *beth pretii,* as various authors do, the meaning is "and because of (in exchange for) his scourging we were healed." The LXX is less cautious. Here it is not the "we" who express their belief about the Servant, but God himself speaking in v. 9, who promises to give “the rich and the wicked” to the Suffering One at the price of his death and burial.

God Leaves Much Cloaked in Mystery.

In both texts, the reader is left with many questions. Besides the most notorious question, namely, the identity of the Suffering One, there is the question of how the “we” come to realize that it is for their transgressions that he suffered and died, when his exaltation is to take place, and how it is to be revealed. The identity of the “we” is likewise unspecified. Most perplexing of all is how and why God uses the woe of the Suffering One to bring about the weal of many.

B. Differences

Is God Pleased “to Crush” or “to Purge” the Suffering One?

There are likewise several differences between MT Isaiah 53 and LXX Isaiah 53 in their portrayals of God. Perhaps the most immediately striking such difference is the greater support God gives the Servant/παῖς in LXX Isaiah 53 as compared to MT Isaiah 53. In LXX Isa 53:10, after handing the Suffering One over, God, as it were, quickly steps in to bring relief to that figure. This element is lacking in the MT. To be sure, MT Isaiah 53 portrays God as just: he does not allow the Suffering One’s affliction to continue past death (literal or metaphorical), and he promises more than ample compensation to the Suffering One for his afflictions. But there are no explicit indications that the motivation behind this reward is support for the Servant/παῖς. In brief, MT Isaiah has no equivalent to LXX Isa 53:10a,c “And κύριος wills to purge him of his suffering . . . and κύριος wills to take away from the travail of his soul." Quite the contrary. MT Isa 53:10 baldly states, "Yhwh willed to crush him severely."

A View of God More Congenial to Hellenistic Philosophy

Besides the example in 53:10 discussed above, other examples of differences between the two text forms can be seen in 52:15, 53:4, and 6, where LXX Isaiah 53 seems to be more suited to an audience that comes from a different cultural background and has a different theological approach than that of Palestinian Judaism. (It is not my intention to date the Fourth Servant Song or to take a position on whether it was written in Babylon or Palestine. Even if the text originated in Babylon during the exile, its orientation, in my view, is Palestinian with these allusions to Temple worship, which in mainstream Judaism of the Exile and Second Temple Period could only take place in Jerusalem.) Whether these reflect differences in *Vorlage,* translational error, or deliberate changes on the part of the LXX translator—or even *Tendenzen*—is impossible to determine.

In 52:15 the LXX omits the reference to the Servant's sprinkling of many nations, substituting instead a parallel to the reference to the kings' shutting (or keeping shut) their mouths: "many nations will be astonished at him." The action of "sprinkling" in MT Isa 52:15 is most likely a reference to a cultic action which may have resonated more with Jews in Palestine than with Jews of the Diaspora who were less connected to Temple ritual.

In 53:4 the readers of the LXX—no less than those of the MT—would have construed the Suffering One's afflictions (at least those not inflicted by fellow human beings) as, at a minimum, involving God. But while the MT asserts that the "we" saw God's role in the Servant's suffering as a matter of fact ("we accounted him hurt, smitten by God and afflicted"), the LXX translation here does not even mention God ("we accounted him to be in trouble, and in suffering, and in affliction"). In this instance, the LXX seems to leave more room for the idea of God's merely allowing the suffering of the παῖς instead of directly causing this. In the same line, MT Isa 53:6 asserts God's direct involvement by stating "Yhwh visited upon him the iniquity (and its consequences) of us all." The LXX, by contrast, merely states, "κύριος handed him over for our sins." This could be taken to imply that it was not the direct will of κύριος but rather his permissive will that his παῖς should suffer.

The LXX no less than the MT affirms that the Suffering One is afflicted because of the sins of others and that his suffering benefits the "we" and "the many." The LXX describes this change in their status as "an exchange" for his death and burial (see LXX Isa 53:9). Here the LXX does not go so far as MT Isa 53:10 in juxtaposing the suffering of the Servant with the idea of sacrifice.

Moreover, while the LXX seems to see that the suffering of the παῖς as beneficial to the "we" and "the many," it avoids stating—as does MT Isa 53:11—that "the just one will justify many," a statement that could be taken to imply that "the just one will declare the guilty innocent." LXX Isa 53:11 rather avers that κύριος "justifies (vindicates) the just one (the παῖς)," a statement that not only avoids the possibility of giving scandal but contributes to the LXX's more congenial portrayal of God as both compassionate and just.

God as Lord of History vs. God as Divine Pedagogue

God’s relationship to the Suffering One is also portrayed differently in the MT and the LXX as a result of the distinct titles God uses to address that figure. By addressing in MT 52:13 as עַבְדִּי, Yhwh puts the Suffering One in the company of those in the OT with history-changing missions—mostly kings, or powerful leaders (or, in some instances, the people of Israel) who were true to him.[75] Because the designation עַבְדִּי is connected with great historical figures, the MT Isaiah 53 reads more like one more (albeit unique) historical saving event by Yhwh operating through a human agent. By contrast, κύριος addresses the subject in LXX 52:13 with the seemingly more familial or intimate term, ὁ παῖς μου. This manner of address does not have such a long history associated with it as does the MT designation. Furthermore, the “we” seem to be on more intimate terms with God by virtue of the inserted Κύριε in LXX Isa 53:1: what is a report in the MT (53:1-9) is a prayer acknowledging error and guilt in the LXX.

God’s way of relating to the Suffering One in each version is consistent with the title whereby he addresses him there. In the MT, the Servant acts as “Minister” or “Agent” to accomplish God’s plan for history.[76] Yhwh’s plan is effected by the hand of the Servant who exposes *himself* to death and intercedes for the many. The fulfillment of

---

[75] See Chapter Two.

[76] Yhwh, of course, is the principal agent. “The point of the Isaianic text is that God himself took the initiative in accepting the servant’s life as the means of Israel’s forgiveness. In the first divine speech (53:13), the ‘success’ of the servant is promised because of what God had done. This promise was hidden, never before told (v. 15) but Israel finally understood it as a revelation from ‘the arm of the LORD.’ The role of the servant resulted in Israel’s forgiveness because of God’s acceptance of the servant’s obedient suffering” (Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001] 418).

God's plan is dependent upon the Servant's offering a guilt offering. The ambiguity of the Hebrew even allows the reader to wonder whether Yhwh will exalt the Servant or whether the servant will exalt himself.

By contrast, in LXX Isaiah the Suffering One is passive. God alone is the agent who hands him over to death and who forms him in wisdom. The Suffering One is not said to intercede for or to justify the many, as is the case in MT Isa 53:11; rather it is God who justifies the Suffering One (LXX Isa 53:11).

A Total Transformation?

This raises the question: does the LXX essentially convert Isaiah 53 from a poem about the justification of the unjust into a lesson about the pedagogy of suffering? While both the MT and LXX versions speak of reconciliation with God, vicarious suffering, and the suffering of the Servant bearing the fruit of understanding, they have different emphases. In light of MT 52:15, כֵּן יַזֶּה גּוֹיִם רַבִּים ("For he shall sprinkle many nations"), the enigmatic MT 53:10 אִם־תָּשִׂים אָשָׁם נַפְשׁוֹ ("If he [his soul] presents *'āshām* . . .") and MT 53:10 יַצְדִּיק צַדִּיק עַבְדִּי לָֽרַבִּים ("My Servant, the Just One, will justify the many"), the Hebrew version of the poem can be said to have atonement with overtly cultic overtones as its theme. Yhwh is seen as the Lord of history who accomplishes his plan through the faithfulness of his Servant. But whereas Yhwh's plan to justify the unjust through the Servant is at the heart of the entire poem in the MT, such a plan is much less clearly articulated in the LXX. If the unjust are reconciled with God, the LXX implies that it will be because of their repentance, expressed through a sin offering. Although the context suggests that the sin offering and the suffering of the servant are somehow related, the LXX text does not spell out the connection between them.

LXX Isaiah 53, for its part, can be said to have as its theme instruction with emphatic wisdom overtones. In LXX Isa 53:11, κύριος promises "to show [the παῖς] light and to form him with understanding (δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει)." The ideas of "light" and "formation in understanding" are absent from or at most only implicit in the MT. Furthermore, LXX emphasizes the concept of παιδεία by its less-than-obvious translational choices of παῖς in 52:13 and παιδίον in 53:2. Thus, the overall impression is that in LXX Isaiah 53 κύριος is a fatherly teacher.

Nevertheless, to affirm that the poem has been totally transformed in the LXX version would in my view be an overstatement. A more accurate statement might be that there is a decided shift in emphasis. The idea of suffering as educative is not absent in the MT itself. In fact, it is present at the center of the poem (Isa 53:5) in the pregnant assertion that "the discipline of our peace was upon him." Thus, it would seem more accurate to say that the LXX translator, to the degree that differences are attributable to his intentional modifications, seems to have seen the inherent potential of the above phrase and endeavored to develop its implications. Wisdom vocabulary is present in MT Isa 52:13 and both 52:15d and 53:11c, and it is emphasized by its placement that forms an *inclusio* both for the prologue and for the entire poem. The LXX translator, however, seems to make the poem's wisdom character far more obvious by translational choices that create word repetition as opposed to mere echoing of ideas. Conversely, although the salvific purpose of the Suffering One's afflictions are more pronounced in MT Isaiah 53, the idea of the Suffering One's afflictions being for the weal of many is by no means relegated to the background in the LXX Isaiah 53. While the benefit of the suffering of the παῖς for the many is not expressed in cultic terms, it is nevertheless emphasized by sheer repetition, as evidenced in LXX Isa 53:5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12.

Thus, while a total transformation may be an overstatement, the considerable differences between MT Isa 53 and LXX Isa 53, to the extent they represent exegetical choices on the part of the translator of LXX Isaiah (and the final redactor of M Isaiah), suggest that the formation of both texts entailed an awareness of the theological outlooks of their intended readership/audiences.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

I. Introduction

In this chapter I will begin with a review of some of the salient findings of my comparison of the portrayals of God in the Masoretic and LXX texts of the Servant Songs of Isaiah. In that review I will present both similarities and differences between the two text forms but with a special focus on the differences. This comparison, the primary purpose of my dissertation, rests on my delimitation of the Servant Songs, on text-critical and translational choices, on my exegesis of particular passages (within the limits imposed by my bracketing of certain questions as explained in Chapter One), and finally on a close comparative reading of the texts.

The origins and possible intended effects that I posit for some of these differences rest on much more speculative grounds. For the various reasons cited in the first chapter (most importantly the unavailability of the *Vorlagen* used by either the translator/redactor of LXX or the scribe/redactor of M)[1] my suggestions in this regard are necessarily hypothetical at best and should be seen as secondary to the dissertation's main objective of comparing the two text forms' portrayals of God. The differences are the substance of my research; my suggestions concerning how they came to be and possible purposes that they may have served are nothing more than educated guesses.

This chapter will conclude with questions raised by my research that may merit further investigation. Given that Duhm's hypothesis of the Servant Songs' independence from the rest of DI no longer enjoys broad consensus, one question deserving special attention is whether the portrayal of God in the Servant Songs is consistent with the Deity's portrayal in the rest of DI. Would a comparison of the portrayal of God in the entire Hebrew and Greek texts of DI yield results similar to this dissertation's more narrowly focused comparison? Clearly, a thorough investigation of this topic is beyond the scope of my dissertation, but I will offer a few preliminary observations regarding it (see below).

---

[1] By "M" I mean the proto-Masoretic text (of course, without vowel and accent marks) that was approved by rabbinical Judaism in the early centuries A.D. and that served as the basis for the MT.

II. Salient Similarities and Differences in the Portrayal of God in the Masoretic and Septuagint Texts of the Servant Songs

A. Areas of Similarities and Differences

Names and Titles of God

In several instances within the Servant Songs, the titles referring to God in the MT correspond exactly to those in the LXX. Thus, e.g., הָאֵל parallels ὁ θεός in 42:5 (literally, "the God"); in 49:4 and 6, both the MT's אֱלֹהָי and the LXX's τοῦ θεοῦ μου can be translated into English as "my God"; similarly, in 49:7 the typically Isaian phrase "the holy one of Israel," is conveyed in the MT by קְדֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל and ὁ ἅγιος Ισραηλ in the LXX. Nevertheless, there are important differences in the way the MT and LXX Servant Songs refer to God. In twelve instances God is referred to as יְהוָה ("Yhwh") in the MT but as κύριος ("Lord"—always without the definite article) in the LXX (42:5, 6, 8; 49:1, 5[*bis*], 7[*bis*], 8; 53:1, 6, 10).[2] On the one hand, this fact is unremarkable: the use of κύριος for יהוה was a translational convention following the precedent set by the translators of the Torah into Greek (the original Septuagint). On the other hand, the way God is referred to in the two text forms affects his portrayal. The Hebrew proper name of God is laden with meaning to those (and only those) familiar with the OT, evoking a long history of the relationship between God and the Jewish people, to whom he reveals himself and whom he chooses as his own. Readers immersed in the LXX translations of any or all biblical literature may have come to read κύριος more as a name than as a title[3] and may have invested κύριος with the same connotations evoked by the name Yhwh. These connotations, however, would escape the uninitiated; κύριος of itself conveys nothing about a particular people or history. Used in an unqualified sense[4] the title does, however, evoke the divine cosmic dominion in a way that יהוה only gradually came to do. Thus, the term κύριος may well have helped in bringing non-Jews to an appreciation of the God of Israel: the one so called could not be dismissed as just another national deity. In addition, by avoiding transliterating the name Yhwh into Greek, the Hebrew proper name of God was afforded more protection against profanation by those Jews or non-Jews whose only access to the Hebrew scriptures was through the LXX. But something is lost in going from the proper name, Yhwh, to what was at least originally a title, i.e., κύριος.

---

[2] Isa 49:13 has יהוה in the MT and ὁ θεός in the LXX. I can see no basis for deciding which of the two represents the "more original" reading.

---

[3] Greek-speaking Jews likely came to hear κύριος much as Christians hear “Christ,” that is, as a name rather than a title, as evidenced by the fact that Christians rarely, if ever, use the definite article with, much less translate, the term “Christ” into modern languages.

[4] “Lord” used in a qualified sense (e.g., “lord of the sea”) was a common ANE and Hellenistic designation for a god.

In Isa 50:7 and 9, God is referred to as אֲדֹנָי יְהֹוִה and in Isa 50:4 as אדֹנָי יְהֹוִה in the MT (“My Lord Yhwh”), but simply as κύριος (“Lord”) in the corresponding verses in the LXX, thus intensifying the difference in the portrayal of the Deity in these instances. At the risk of oversimplification, I offer the following comment regarding the impact that the various designations have on the portrayal of God in the two text forms: κύριος emphasizes God’s relationship to the cosmos and all humanity; יְהוַה highlights God’s relationship with the Jewish people, while אֲדֹנָי יְהֹוִה\יְהֹוִה underscores God’s personal relationship to his Servant in the context of Yhwh’s relationship with Israel.

God the Sole Creator of the Universe

Both the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Servant Songs portray God as the sole creator of heaven and earth and all that is in them. MT Isa 42:5, using anthropomorphic imagery, describes God’s forming the sky and then putting it in place as if pitching an immense tent. Thereafter, Yhwh’s creation of the earth and all that comes out of it is described with vocabulary that evokes a smith’s hammering away in the practice of his craft. In contrast, LXX 42:5 conveys the same basic meaning without these anthropomorphic images. This is but one example of the LXX Servant Songs’ lack of anthropomorphisms in verses where they occur in the MT. That is not to say the LXX texts lack them altogether: for example, in the LXX no less than in the MT, God is portrayed as having an arm in 53:1, while in 49:2 he is spoken of as having a hand and carrying a sword and wearing a quiver of arrows. Again, in both the MT and LXX Second Servant Song he is portrayed as a shepherd (49:10).

God Alone Can Foretell History

In the ANE view, history unfolded according to divine decisions. Isaiah insists that these divine decisions are not made by a council of gods, much less by gods of other nations. Both the LXX and MT Servant Songs portray God as proving that he is peerless precisely because he alone foretells and causes the events of history (42:9). LXX 49:1, however, conveys an aspect of God's role in history that is not explicitly formulated in the MT Servant Songs, namely, God's overarching plan extending into the distant future rather than merely reacting to impending situations and determining short-term outcomes.

God, the Holy One of Israel

Both the MT and LXX texts of the Servant Songs refer to the unique love God has for Israel. Both the MT and LXX Second Servant Song use exodus motifs to describe God's promise of gathering his people from exile and leading them to Zion as a shepherd leads his flock (49:9-12). In the MT Second Servant Song, however, God will restore his people out of "compassion" (49:13), whereas in the LXX Second Servant Song he is motivated by "mercy." The distinction is subtle but important. Mercy (ἔλεος) need not be accompanied by any particular emotion. In fact, Bultmann has shown that in biblical thought the mercy of God is associated primarily with faithfulness to his covenant. In contrast, "having compassion" (רחם) does involve emotion and is often—but not necessarily—accompanied by some particular action. Verse 49:13 is but one instance among several in the Servant Songs in which the MT portrays God anthropopathically while the LXX does not.

Both the MT and LXX Second Servant Song portray God as the rescuer of his people but with different terms. In MT Isa 49:7 God is referred to as גֹאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל ("the kinsman who redeems/avenges/provides progeny for Israel"), whereas in LXX Isa 49:7 God is referred to simply as ὁ ῥυσάμενος ("the deliverer"). This is another example of the MT's use of an anthropomorphism where the corresponding LXX verse uses a term not likely to be read/heard as an anthropomorphism at all. (A God who calls himself a "kinsman" of human beings is decidedly more anthropomorphic than a God who calls himself a "deliverer.")

God and the Servant/παῖς

In the MT and LXX Servant Songs, God is portrayed in much the same way in his dealings with the Servant. Thus, he is portrayed as forming and calling the Servant from the womb. God is the protector, helper, and strength of the Servant and answers his prayer, albeit in his own time. God's justice is affirmed: he will reward the Servant for his suffering with understanding and glory. And yet, God's mode of addressing the Servant differs in the MT and the LXX, a difference that affects God's portrayal. In the MT, God refers to the Servant as עַבְדִי ("my servant/slave") whereas in the LXX God refers to the Servant as ὁ παῖς ("my child/servant/slave") and in one case (49:3) as δοῦλός μου ("my servant/slave"). This one exception notwithstanding, God in the LXX could be construed as "father" of the παῖς, a possibility not suggested by the designation עַבְדִי in the MT Servant Songs. It seems unlikely that the LXX Isaiah's translator was reading a different Hebrew designation for the Servant in his *Vorlage*. But if the *Vorlage* had the same reading as the MT, why then did he choose, in all but one instance, the ambiguous translation παῖς instead of the "literal" δοῦλος? As we have noted, the above choice on the part of the LXX Isaiah translator seems consistent with his emphasis on the suffering of the παῖς as a matter of παιδεία, an interpretation that is also found in the MT Fourth Servant Song, where the suffering of the Servant in the MT is depicted in one instance as מוּסַר ("chastisement") in Isa 53:5. Elsewhere, however, the MT Servant Songs offer other understandings of why God permits or even wills his Servant to suffer. In the MT Third Servant Song, as I argue in Chapter Four, the suffering of the Servant can be construed as a test. In the MT Fourth Servant Song, the reader/hearer seems invited to see the Servant's death in a sacrificial light. The LXX Servant Songs, in contrast, are more consistent in emphasizing the suffering of the παῖς as a form of παιδεία. Marked differences in the LXX Servant Songs at crucial points (e.g., 50:5 and 53:10) steer the reader/hearer away from understandings of the suffering of the παῖς as a test or sacrifice and towards an understanding more typical of OT wisdom literature, namely, παιδεία. Among the rewards of the παῖς resulting from his παιδεία mentioned in the LXX Fourth Servant Song (see 53:11) are "light" and "understanding."

Furthermore, the phrase ὁ παῖς μου, with its potential for being construed as "my child" or in this context "my son," is perhaps more consistent with the gentler ways God is depicted in his treatment of the παῖς in the LXX, most notably in 53:10 but also in other verses such as 53:4. The παῖς suffers, but less clearly as the direct will of κύριος. MT 53:4 refers to the Servant as "smitten by Yhwh," whereas the same verse in the LXX speaks of the παῖς as "in trouble, in suffering and in affliction" but without reference to the role of κύριος. In LXX 53:6 God is portrayed as handing the Servant over, while in MT 53:6 God is portrayed as "visiting" upon the Servant the transgressions of the many. The distinction between God's permitting the suffering of his παῖς rather than inflicting that suffering may be subtle, but it does seem to soften the theodicy problem somewhat. The biggest difference in the portrayal of God's actions towards his Servant/παῖς, however, is in MT 53:10 where Yhwh is said to will to "crush him with affliction," while in LXX 53:10 the reversal of fortune for the παῖς has already begun: far from being portrayed as "crush[ing]" him, κύριος is here said to be pleased "to cleanse him of his wound." These two vastly differing statements depend on whether דכא is read as an Aramaicism דכא/דכי meaning "cleanse"/"purge" or as a Hebrew word meaning "crush," as discussed in Chapter Five.

Although it is obvious that Yhwh eventually takes away the Servant's suffering in the MT Fourth Servant Song, LXX 53:10 clearly states that κύριος *wills* "to take away from the travail of his soul." Through his exaltation of the Servant, Yhwh implicitly vindicates the Servant in the MT Fourth Servant Song, but his doing so is stated explicitly in LXX 53:11.

God and the Nations

In both the MT and LXX Servant Songs, God's plan includes revealing himself to the nations and, through his Servant/παῖς, bringing about justice, liberation, and salvation. God appoints his Servant/παῖς as a light of nations and as a covenant of humanity. In both forms of the text, God plans an astonishing reversal of fortune in the life of the Servant that will bring nations and kings to recognize the one true God and his Servant/παῖς (49:7). A small but noteworthy difference between the MT and LXX Servant Song's portrayal of God in this connection is that in LXX 49:1 God addresses the nations in a quasi-oracle and implicitly calls upon them to believe his word, whereas God nowhere addresses the nations in the MT Servant Songs.

God and Those Who Acknowledge the Servant/παῖς

In the Fourth Servant Song, both the MT and the LXX imply that God reveals, in a moment of insight for those who held the Servant/παῖς in contempt, that their perception of the Servant/παῖς has been totally wrong. Not only is he innocent, but *they* are the guilty ones for whom he is suffering. They come to see his chastisement as the means by which they are healed and given peace (53:5).

There are differences, however, in how God is portrayed as making the suffering of the Servant/παῖς benefit the many. In LXX 53:9, κύριος is portrayed as "giv[ing] the wicked" (to the παῖς ?) "in exchange for his death." The same idea is reflected in the NT concept of Christ's purchasing sinners by his death (see, e.g., 1 Cor 6:20). There is nothing resembling such an exchange or a purchase suggested by MT 53:9, although in another verse, MT 53:5, if one reads the *beth* in וּבַחֲבֻרָת֖וֹ נִרְפָּא־לָֽנוּ as a *beth pretii,* as various authors do, the meaning is "and because of (in exchange for) his scourging we were healed." On the other hand, the idea of God's will being fulfilled if the Servant offers an אָשָׁם (a “sin offering,” usually of a ram) in MT 53:10 is altogether absent from the LXX Fourth Servant Song.

B. Patterns within the Differences

The differences between the MT and LXX texts outlined above fall into patterns. The MT Servant Songs have more anthropomorphisms than do the LXX Servant Songs. As for anthropopathisms, if the God portrayed in the LXX Servant Songs has emotions, these are not obvious in comparison to those of the God of the MT Servant Songs. The theodicy problem is dealt with in various ways in the MT Servant Songs: the Servant is being tested; his suffering and death is analogous to a sin offering; the Servant is undergoing chastisement. In the LXX, by contrast, other than the one reference to the death of the παῖς being “in exchange for” sinners, the suffering of the παῖς is uniformly explained as a παιδεία that results not only in wisdom, understanding, enlightenment, exaltation, and exceeding glory for the παῖς, but also in revelation, peace, and healing for the many.

Thus, the MT and LXX Servant Songs clearly evidence distinctive characteristics in their respective portrayals of God. It is noteworthy that the characteristics of the LXX Servant Songs would seem appropriate for an audience consisting of Greeks and Hellenized Jews. For the benefit of Greeks interested in learning more about the God of Israel and for Hellenized Jews, the difference between the God of Israel and the pagan gods is more sharply delineated in the LXX Servant Songs than in the MT; κύριος is portrayed, albeit inconsistently, quite differently from the highly anthropomorphic and anthropopathic gods of the Alexandrian milieu and more consistently in line with the god of Greek philosophy (e.g., Aristotle's uncaused cause). Moreover, the suffering of the παῖς is not the result of a mythological plot involving anything like capriciousness or jealousy among feuding gods but is rather analogous to the chastisement, including corporal punishment, any good ANE or Hellenistic father would be expected to inflict on a child for its own welfare and that of society. The omniscient and all-good κύριος of the LXX Servant Songs, who neither needs to test his Servant to see if he is trustworthy nor wills to crush him or have the Servant offer a sin offering to him, is in many ways easier to reconcile with the best in Greek philosophy (which educated Alexandrian Jews would have known) than would be the God portrayed in the MT Servant Songs.

C. Do These Patterns Reflect *Tendenzen* in the LXX Isaiah Translator's Work?

I do not think these above characteristics of the LXX Servant Songs, strictly speaking, can be called *Tendenzen* on the part of the LXX Isaiah translator for various reasons. *Tendenzen,* understood as patterns of conscious choices by a redactor to change his *Vorlage* for given purposes, can be identified only if there is reasonable certainty about how the translator's *Vorlage* read and reasonable certainty that the changes to this were intentional.

Qumran studies have shown that biblical texts were in a state of considerable fluidity before the first centuries A.D. This fluidity makes it difficult to affirm that in any instance of an MT/LXX Isaiah discrepancy that the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah was identical to the particular textual tradition that was later enshrined in the MT. In other words, almost any given difference between the MT and LXX texts could be the result of a difference between the textual tradition underlying the MT (M) and the LXX translator's *Vorlage* for Isaiah. Moreover, even if we suppose for the sake of argument that the *Vorlage* used by the LXX Isaiah translator was identical to M Isaiah, many of the differences in LXX Servant Songs could be explained quite plausibly as unintentional (or perhaps unconscious): differing vocalizations of the consonantal text, difficulty in deciphering letters, ambiguity in the meaning of Hebrew words, among other factors. Furthermore, at least one characteristic of the MT Servant Songs compared to the LXX Servant Songs mentioned above seems too inconsistent to qualify as a *Tendenz*: why would a translator/redactor with an aversion to anthropomorphisms allow so many to remain? Finally, the Servant Songs represent only a small sample of the Book of Isaiah. Identification of real *Tendenzen* would require a comparison of a much larger sample of material—ideally the whole Book of Isaiah.

III. Areas for Further Research

Instead of a large-scale comparison of the portrayal of God in MT Isaiah and LXX Isaiah, perhaps a more modest project focused only on MT DI (i.e., leaving aside LXX DI at first) would suffice to begin to answer certain questions raised in the dissertation. A preliminary comparison *within* the MT between the portrayal of God in the Servant Songs on the one hand and remainder of DI on the other might provide evidence either supporting or undermining the position that the Servant Songs and the rest of DI came from the same pen, *pace* Duhm. Even a cursory investigation shows that there are images of God in other parts of MT DI that have little to do with the images of God in MT Servant Songs, notably that of God as a birthing mother in 42:14. Furthermore, whereas the God of MT Servant Songs is a God of consolation for his people, in other passages in MT DI God is harsh in his critique of Israel's past and present faults (e.g., 42:18-25; 43:23-28). But are there enough of such divergent images of God to suggest different authorship? Could not these differences merely be due to the Servant Songs' distinctive function(s) within DI?

A similar intra-LXX comparison of the portrayal of God elsewhere in DI vis-à-vis his portrayal in the Servant Songs would yield answers to the question of *Tendenzen*. A cursory comparison of LXX Servant Songs and their LXX DI context reveals inconsistencies in images of God. Thus, for example, in contrast to the God beyond passion of the LXX Servant Songs, LXX Isa 42:25 presents God as having brought about war against Israel in his fury.

A more complex comparison involving both the MT and LXX texts of the Servant Songs vis-à-vis the MT and LXX texts of the rest of DI would further answer the question of whether some of the differences between the MT and LXX Servant Songs might qualify as *Tendenzen.* Again, a cursory survey reveals that the same inconsistencies between the MT Servant Songs and MT DI in God's attitude and plan for the nations occur also in the corresponding LXX verses. For example, while both the MT and LXX Servant Songs portray God as planning to reveal himself and extend salvation to the nations, other verses in both MT DI and LXX DI call this portrayal into question.

Thus, the salvation of Jacob/Israel is to be brought about by God's destruction of Babylon, which is described in vengeful terms in both MT and LXX Isaiah 47. Again, there is some ambiguity concerning the question of which nations among the oppressors of Israel God is referring to in 49:26, but in both MT and LXX salvation for them seems far from God's intentions. Moreover, although God's banquet described in chap. 55 seems intended for all the nations, on the other hand God promises Lady Zion in MT and LXX Isa 49:23 that the nations will come "to lick the dust of your feet."

Such inconsistencies might reflect various layers in the literary history of DI. An interesting question to examine would be the extent to which other such inconsistencies suggest diachronic layers within MT.

Of course, another kind of comparative research, the comparison between larger portions of MT with LXX Isaiah, is also suggested by the results of this dissertation. In comparing MT DI with LXX DI, for example, how are the seeming differences in theological perspectives among the probable literary strata of MT DI mentioned above handled by the LXX translator? Is there evidence that one or more such perspectives were favored by the latter?

IV. Summary

The portrayals of God in the MT and LXX Servant Songs each have characteristics that, whether intentionally, fortuitously, or both, seem to suit their intended audience. More precisely stated, several aspects the LXX Servant Songs portray God in ways that would be more acceptable to the Alexandrian milieu than would their

MT counterparts. While it is tempting to view these aspects of the LXX Servant Songs as evidence of *Tendenzen* on the part of the translator, our lack of knowledge about the *Vorlage* from which he worked and the limitation of the sample (i.e., the extent of the Servant Songs in comparison to the whole of DI) make it impossible to do so with assurance.

The dissertation raises many questions concerning a variety of issues which may be worthy of investigation. The comparison of the portrayal of God (or for that matter a comparison of many other questions) between any two biblical texts is potentially of interest, but certain types of comparison are worthy of special mention here. Most directly related to the topic of this dissertation are questions of the consistency of the portrayal of God *within* larger sections of MT Isaiah (or within larger sections of LXX Isaiah) as well as the comparison of his portrayals in larger sections of LXX Isaiah vis-à-vis the corresponding sections of MT Isaiah. Less directly related to my topic but equally interesting would be similar research in comparing the portrayals of God in MT texts of other books vis-à-vis LXX forms of the corresponding texts. Substituting or even adding the DSS to the mix opens up even more possibilities. Such comparisons involving MT, LXX and DSS texts seem especially worthy of study, given the growing consensus that the literary formation of various biblical texts continued to some degree at least until the second century B.C.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Brock, S. P., ed. *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshiṭta Version: Isaiah.* Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Cagni, Luigi, ed. and trans. *L'Epopea di Erra.* Studi Semitici 34. Rome: Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente, 1969.

Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th ed.. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

Foster, Benjamin R. ed. and trans. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature.* Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe Henry, ed. *The Book of Isaiah.* The Hebrew University Bible. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1995.

Gryson, Roger, ed. *Biblica Sacra Iuxta Vulgatem Versionem, editionem quartam emendatam*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Kraus, Wolfgang and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.

Parry, Donald W. and Elisha Qimron, eds. *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^{a}): A New Edition.* STDJ 32. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Pius XII. *Divino afflante Spiritu* ("On the Promotion of Biblical Studies"). English translation provided by the Vatican. Washington, D.C. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943.

Rabinowitz, L., trans. *Ruth, Ecclesiastes.* Vol. 8 of *Midrash Rabbah,* edited by H. Freedman and M. Simon. 10 vols. New York: Soncino, 1983.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

Stenning, J. F., ed. *The Targum of Isaiah.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Isaias.* Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum. Vol. XIV. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Selected Reference Works

Alexander, P., J. Kutsko, J. Ernest, S. A. Decker-Lucke, D. L. Peterson, eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.

Denzinger, H. and A. Schönmetzer, eds. *Enchiridion symbolorum: Definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*. 22nd ed. Rome: Herder, 1963.

Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.* Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000.

Sokolov, Michael. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period.* Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash, and Targum 2. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990.

Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael P. O'Connor. *Introduction to Hebrew Syntax.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Zerwick, Maximilian. *Biblical Greek.* 4th ed. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000.

Commentaries

Baltzer, Klaus. *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

Berges, Ulrich. *Das Buch Jesaja: Komposition und Endgestalt.* Herders biblische Studien 16. Freiburg: Herder, 1998.

__________. *Jesaja 40–48.* HTKAT. Freiburg: Herder, 2008.

Beuken, Willem A. M. and Ulrich Berges. *Jesaja 1 –12.* HTKAT. Freiburg: Herder, 2003.

________. *Jesaja 13–27.* HTKAT. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 40–55*: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. AB 19A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 40–66.* Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah.* OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Clifford, Richard J. *Fair Spoken and Persuading: An Interpretation of Second Isaiah.* New York: Paulist Press, 1984.

Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. 2nd ed. HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.

Elliger, Karl. *Deuterojesaja.* BKAT 11. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.

Fohrer, Georg. *Das Buch Jesaja.* 3 vols. ZBK. Zurich: Zwingli, 1964.

Goldingay, John and David Payne. *Isaiah 40–55.* 2 vols. ICC. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

Grimm, Werner and Kurt Dittert. *Deuterojesaja: Deutung—Wirkung—Gegenwart.* Calwer Bibelkommentare. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1990.

Hermission, Hans-Jürgen. *Deuterojesaja.* BKAT 11_{13}. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2008.

Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir. *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah.* Edited and translated by M. Friedländer. 4 vols. Society of Hebrew Literature. London: N. Trübner, 1873.

Jerome. *Commentarium in Esaiam*. In *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Pars I Opera exegetica, 2A*. Edited by Marcus Adriaen. CC (Series Latina) 73a. Turnhout: Brepols, 1963.

Koole, Jan L. *Isaiah,* Part 3. Translated by Anthony P. Runia. 3 vols. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters, 1997-98.

McKenzie, John L. *Second Isaiah:* Introduction, Translation, and Notes. AB 20. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968.

North, Christopher R. *The Second Isaiah:* Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL–LV. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40*-66. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Smart, James D. *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40–66.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

Thompson, Michael. *Isaiah: Chapters 40-66.* Epworth Commentaries. Peterborough, England: Epworth Press, 2001.

Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1-33.* WBC 24. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985.

________. *Isaiah 34-66.* WBC 25. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.

Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40–66.* OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

__________. *Das Buch Jesaja Kapitel 40–66.* ATD 19. Göttingen:Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Whybray, R. N. *Isaiah 40-66.* NCB. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.

Young, Edward J. *The Book of Isaiah*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

Monographs, Collected Essays, and Articles

Adams, Jim W. *The Performative Nature and Function of Isaiah 40-55.* Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies (formerly JSOTSup) 448. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.

Albertz, Rainer. *Die Exilszeit: 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Biblische Enzyklopädie 7. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001.

Barré, Michael. “Textual and Rhetorical-Critical Observations on the Last Servant Song (Isaiah 52:13-53:12).” *CBQ* 62 (2000) 522-34.

Barstad, Hans M. *A Way in the Wilderness.* JSS Monograph 12. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1989.

Barth, Christoph. *Die Errettung vom Tode: Leben und Tod in den Klage- und Dankliedern des Alten Testaments.* Edited by Bernd Janowski. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1996.

Barthélemy. Dominique. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament.* 2 vols. OBO 50. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

________. “Le grand rouleau d’Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte.” *RB* 57 (1950) 530-49.

Barton, John. “Post-Exilic Prophecy.” In *ABD,* 5. 489-95.

Baudissin, Wolf Wilhelm Grafen. *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religiongeschichte.* 4 vols. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1929.

Berges, Ulrich. “Light from 1QIsa^{a} on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah.” In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo,* edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 193-204. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Bergey, R. “The Rhetorical Role of Reiteration in the Suffering Servant Poem (Isa 52:13-53:12).” *JETS* 40 (1997) 177-88.

Bergmann, U. “עזר *‘zr* to help.” In *TLOT*, 2. 872-74.

Bertram, Georg. “παιδεύω.” In *TDNT* 5. 596-625.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. “Panel Review of *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament,* by Rolf Rendtorff.” *HBT* 28 (2006) 5-10.

________. “The Servant and the Servants in Isaiah.” In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah,* edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 2 vols. 1. 155-75. VTSup 70. Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997.

Böhler, Dieter. “Der Kanon als hermeneutischen Vorgabe: Über aktuelle Methodendiskussionen in der Bibelwissenschaft.” *TP* 77 (2002) 161-78.

Büchsel, Friedrich. “λύτρον.” In *TDNT,* 4. 340-49.

_________. “παραδιδωμι.” In *TDNT,* 2. 169.

Bultmann, Rudolf “ἔλεος.” In *TDNT,* 2. 477-87.

Clifford, Richard J. “Second Isaiah.” In *ABD,* 3. 490-501.

Cook, Johann. “Textual Diversity and Canonical Uniformity.” In *The Biblical Canons,* edited by J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, 135-52. BETL 163. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

Dafni, Evangelia G. “Die sogenannten *‘Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder in der Septuaginta.” In *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, edited by M. K. Peters, 187-200. SBLSCS 54. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Dahood, Mitchell Joseph. “Isaiah 53:8-12 and Massoretic Misconstructions.” *Bib* 63 (1982) 566-70.

De Sousa, Rodrigo F. *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1–12.* Library of Hebrew Bible/OldTestament Studies 516. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.

Ehrlich, Arnold B. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches.* 4 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912.

Ekblad, Eugene Robert. *Isaiah’s Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study.* Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

García Fernández, Marta. “Is 52, 13-53,12: ¿una nueva creación?” *SV* 54 (2007) 5-34.

Ginsburg, H. L. “The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant.” *VT* 3 (1953) 400-404.

Gressmann, Hugo. *Der Messias*. FRLANT 43. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929.

Gerleman, G. “ישׁע *yš‘* to help.” In *TLOT* 2. 584-87.

Grelot, Pierre. *Les poèmes du Serviteur: De la lecture critique à l’herméneutique.* LD 103. Paris: Cerf, 1981.

Hägglund, Frederick. *Isaiah 53 in the Light of Homecoming after Exile.* FAT 2. 31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Hartley, John E. “ישׁע.” *TWOT*, 2. 414-16.

Hanson, Paul. “Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment.” *RB* 78 (1971): 38-39.

Hegermann, Harald. *Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1954.

Hengel, Martin. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon.* Translated by Mark E. Biddle. London/New York: T & T Clark International, 2002.

_________. "The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians." In *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135*, edited by James D. G. Dunn, 39-83. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

_________. "Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit." In *Der Leidende Gottesknecht: Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte*, edited by Bernd. Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, 49-92. FAT 14. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Hillers, Delbert R. "*Bĕrît ʿām*: Emancipation of the People." *JBL* 97 (1978) 175- 82.

Hirschfeld, Yizhar. *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.

Höffken, Peter. *Jesaja: Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004.

Holloway, Steven W. *Aššur is King! Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire.* Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 10. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Janowski, Bernd. "He Bore Our Sins: Isaiah 53 and the Drama of Taking Another's Place." In *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher; translated by Daniel P. Bailey, 48-74. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Janthial, Dominique. *L'oracle de Nathan et l'unité du livre d'Isaïe.* BZAW 343. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Joachimsen, Kristin. "Steck's Five Stories of the Servant in Isaiah lii 13–liii 12 and Beyond." *VT* 57 (2007) 208-28.

Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study.* 1968. Reprint, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1989.

Jeremias, Joachim. "παῖς θεοῦ in later Judaism in the Period after the LXX." In *TDNT* 5. 677-700.

Kalluveettil, Paul. *Declaration and Covenant: A Comprehensive Review of Covenant Formulae from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East.* AnBib 88. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.

Kedar-Kopfstein, Benjamin. “Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome’s Isaiah.” *Textus* 4 (1964) 176-210.

Koch, K. “צדק *ṣdq* to be communally faithful, beneficial.” In *TLOT,* 2. 1046-47.

Koenig, Jean. *L’Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe.* VTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Kooij, Arie van der. *Die Alten Textzeugen des Jesajasbuches.* OBO 35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

________. “Servant or Slave? The Various Equivalents of Hebrew *‘Ebed* in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch.” In *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Ljubljana 2007,* edited by M. K. H. Peters, 225-38. SBLSCS 55. Atlanta: SBL, 2008.

________.“Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: Its Aim and Method.” In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov,* edited by Shalom M. Paul et al., 729-39. VTSup 94.2. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

________. “The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew.” In *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by the Editors of* Biblia Hebraica Quinta, edited by Yohanan A. P. Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weis, 143-52. VTSup 110. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.

Korpel, Marjo C. A. and Johannes C. de Moor. *The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry: Isaiah 40-55.* OTS 41. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Kselman¸ John and Michael Barré. “Psalms.” In *NJBC,* 523-52.

Landy, Francis. “The Construction of the Subject and the Symbolic Order: A Reading of the Last Three Suffering Servant Songs.” In *Among the Prophets: Language, Image and Structure in the Prophetic Writings,* edited by Philip R. Davies and David J.A. Clines, 60-71. JSOTSup 144. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1993.

Lange, Armin. *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Vol. 1 in *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Lapointe, Eugène. "Le Serviteur de Yahvé du Deutero-Isaïe: Essai d'identification." *Science et Esprit* 62 (2010) 61-89.

Labuschagne, C. J. "ענה ʻ*nh* I to answer." In *TLOT,* 2. 926-30.

Liedke, G. "שׁפט *špṭ* to judge." In *TLOT,* 3. 1392-99.

Levenson, Jon D. *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Lewis, J. P. "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" *JBR* 32 (1964) 125-32.

Lindblom, Johannes. *The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah: A New Attempt to Solve an Old Problem*. LUÅ N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 47, Nr 5. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951.

Lohfink, Norbert. "'Israel' in Jes 49,3." In *Wort, Lied und Gottespruche: Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten: Festschrift für Joseph Zielgler,* edited by Josef Schreiner, 217-29. FB 2. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1972.

_________. "Covenant and Torah in the Pilgrimage of the Nations (The Book of Isaiah and Psalm 25)." In *The God of Israel and the Nations: Studies in Isaiah and the Psalms,* edited by Norbert Lohfink and Erich Zenger and translated by Everett R. Kalin, 37-83. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.

Lust, Johan. "Septuagint and Canon." In *The Biblical Canons,* edited by J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, 39-55. BETL 183. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

McCarter, P. Kyle. *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible.* GBS. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Marcus, Amy Dockser. *The View from Nebo: How Archaeology is Rewriting the Bible and Reshaping the Middle East.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 2000.

Melugin, Roy F. "Form Criticism, Rhetorical Criticism, and Beyond in Isaiah." In *"As Those Who Are Taught": The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, 263-78. SBLSS 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *A Farewell to the Servant Songs: A Critical Examination of an Exegetical Axiom.* Translated by Frederick H. Cryer. Scripta minora 1982-1983: 3. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1983.

Metzger, Bruce. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Morrow, Francis James. "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran." Ph.D. Dissertation. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1973.

Müller, H.-P. "קדשׁ *qdš* holy." In *TLOT,* 3. 1103-18.

North, Christopher R. *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Orlinsky, Harry. *Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah: The So-Called "Servant of the Lord" and "Suffering Servant" in Second Isaiah.* VTSup 14. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Ottley, Richard R. *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus).* 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1906-1909.

Pulikottil, Paulson. *Transmission of the Biblical Texts in Qumran.* JSPSup 34. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Quell, Gottfried. "κύριος: The Old Testament Name for God." In *TDOT,* 3. 1058-81.

________. "θϵός." In *TDNT,* 3. 79-89.

Sæbø , M. "שׂכל *śkl* hi. to have insight." In *TLOT,* 3. 1269-72.

Sanders, Jim Alvin. *Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism.* Colgate Rochester Divinity School Bulletin 28. Rochester: Colgate Rochester Divinity School, 1955.

Sapp, D. A. "The LXX, 1QIsa^{a}, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53 and the Christian Doctrine of Atonement." In *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins,* edited by William H. Bellinger and William Reuben Farmer, 170-92. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998.

Schoors, Antoon. *I Am God Your Saviour: A Form-Critical Study of the Main Genres in Is. XL–LV.* SVT 24. Leiden, Brill, 1973.

Seckler, Max. “Über die Problematik des biblischen Kanons und die Bedeutung seiner Wiederentdeckung.” *TQ* 180 (2000) 30-53.

Seeligmann, I. L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems.* Mededelingen en Verhandelingen No. 9 van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootshap “Ex Oriente Lux.” Leiden: Brill, 1948.

Smith, Mark. “*Bĕrît ‘am/ bĕrît ‘ôlām*: A New Proposal for the Crux of Isa 42:6.” *JBL* 100 (1981) 241.

Spicq, Ceslas. “παραδίδωμι.” In *Notes de lexicographie, néo-testamentaire: Supplément,* edited by Ceslas Spicq, 504-15. OBO 22/3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

Stamm, Johann Jakob. *Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel.* ATANT 10. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1946.

Stassen, S. L. “Jesaja 40:1-11 en 49:1-13 als belangrike struktuurmerkers in de komposisie van Jesaja 40–55.” *NGTT* 32 (1991) 178-86.

Steck, Odil Hannes. “Aspekte des Gottesknecht in Deuterojesajas ‘Ebed-Jahwe-Liedern’.” *ZAW* 96 (1984): 372-90.

_______. “Aspekte des Gottesknecht in Jes 52,13–53,12.” *ZAW* 97 (1985) 36-58.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. “The Textual Study of the Bible: A New Outlook.” In *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, edited by F. M. Cross, Jr. and S. Talmon, 321-400. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

________. “The Qumran יחד: A Biblical Noun.” In *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies,* edited by S. Talmon, 53-60. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989.

Tharekadavil, Antony. *Servant of Yahweh in Second Isaiah.* European University Studies 23:848. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible.* 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

________. "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources." In *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, edited by Adrian Schenker, 121-44. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 52. Atlanta: SBL, 2003.

_________. "The Original Shape of the Biblical Text." In *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989*, edited by J. A. Emerton, 343-59. VTSup 43. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

________. "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran." In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah,* edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. 2 vols. 2. 491-511. VTSup 70. Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997.

________. "The Textual Base of the Corrections in the Biblical Texts Found at Qumran." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, edited by D. Dimant et al., 299-314. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

________. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research.* Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.

Troxel, Ronald L. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah.* JSJSup 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Ulrich, Eugene. "An Index to the Contents of the Isaiah Manuscripts from the Judean Desert." In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah,* edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; 2 vols. 2. 477-80. VTSup 70. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

_________. "Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament." In *The Biblical Canons,* edited by J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, 57-80. BETL 163. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.

Vetter, D. "פאר *p'r* pi. to glorify." In *TLOT*, 2. 963-64.

Walsh, Jerome T. *Style and Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.

Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.

________. "The Imagery of the Substitute King Ritual in Isaiah's Fourth Servant Song." *JBL* 122 (2003) 734-43.

Weippert, Manfred. “Die ‘Konfessionen’ Deuterojesajas.” In *Schöpfung und Befreiung: für Claus Westermann zum 80. Geburtstag,* edited by Rainer Albertz, Friedmann W. Golka, and Jürgen Kegler, 104-15. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1989.

Whybray, R. N. *Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet: An Interpretation of Isaiah 53.* JSOTSup 4. Sheffield: JSOT, 1978.

_________. *The Second Isaiah.* OTG. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.

Williamson, H. G. M. “The Conception of Israel in Transition.” In *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives.* Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study, edited by R. E. Clements, 141-61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Wilson, Andrew. *The Nations in Deutero-Isaiah.* Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 1. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1986.

Woude, A. S. van der. “שֵׁם *šēm* name.” In *TLOT,* 3. 1348-76.

Wright, Benjamin. “Δοῦλος and Παῖς as Translations of עבד: Lexical Equivalences and Conceptual Transformations.” In *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Cambridge, 1995,* edited by Bernard A. Taylor, 263-77. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Young, Edward J. *Isaiah 53: A Devotional and Expository Study.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.

Zevit, Z. “Canonization of the Hebrew Bible.” In *Canonization and Decanonization: Papers Presented to the International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR), Held at Leiden 9-10 January 1997,* edited by A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn, 133-60. Studies in the History of Religions 82. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias.* ATAbh XII 3. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.

Zimmerli, Walther. “παῖς θεοῦ: The LXX Translations.” In *TDNT,* 5. 673-77.