

## New Ways in Textual Criticism

### Isa 42,1-4 as a Paradigm Case

Holger GZELLA  
*Leiden University*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

A serious study of the ancient versions of the Bible, their style and their own theological ideas, is likely to question various well-established methods of traditional textual criticism, leading to surprising, perhaps even irritating results. The versions may indeed improve one's understanding of some finer points of Hebrew syntax<sup>1</sup>, but they may equally well mirror a very peculiar understanding of the meaning of the original text by the translator<sup>2</sup>. In my recent commentary on Daniel 8<sup>3</sup> I have tried to draw attention to several disputed points in which especially the Greek and Latin translations cannot simply be adduced as reliable witnesses to a supposedly original Hebrew text. Yet the visions in the Book of Daniel are often difficult to understand due to their linguistic subtleties and their puzzling imagery. The following observations attempt to throw some light on the textual history of Isa 42,1-4 by applying similar interpretative principles to a shorter and, in a certain sense, more accessible passage. They are, however, not limited to the exclusive aim of reconstructing the "original" Hebrew text<sup>4</sup>, although this goal will continuously have to be borne in mind. At the same time they try to assess the individual "profile" of the major ancient versions, i.e., the Septuagint, the Peshitta, the Targum and the Vulgate. Therefore a major question will always consist in trying to understand the interpretation of the text by the translators and

\* Für Klaus Beyer zum 75. Geburtstag, mit Respekt und Dankbarkeit.

1. H. GZELLA, *Hebräische Verbformen mit modaler Bedeutung im Spiegel der alten Bibelübersetzungen*, in R.G. LEHMANN (ed.), *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, 5, Waltrop, 2004, 67-101.

2. See my book *Lebenszeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Eschatologie und Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalter* (BBB, 134), Berlin, 2002.

3. H. GZELLA, *Cosmic Battle and Political Conflict: Studies in Verbal Syntax and Contextual Interpretation of Daniel 8* (Biblica et Orientalia, 47), Rome, 2003, pp. 26-62.

4. Due to the fact that the Biblical books have been composed in multiple layers, this is not a straightforward task (and its theological significance, for that matters, is far from clear): Which stage of the tradition should be aimed at? Are there any objective criteria?

the translation technique applied as well as the exegetical methods in the background. For this reason, the passage will be treated as a whole in the individual versions (rather than verse by verse). The aim is not in the first place to isolate differences relevant for an approximation to the hypothetical Hebrew original and its change in textual history, but to take the respective textual units in the versions compared to precisely *one* final form of the text<sup>5</sup>, i.e., MT, into consideration as an end in itself. Certainly the textual history of the versions will at times have to be discussed as well.

Such a comparative study does not only seem useful for the reconstruction of a minute piece of the history of exegesis, but it can also yield important results for a reconstruction of the original text, since it sharpens the eye for a clearer distinction between faithful translation of the Hebrew text and consciously applied interpretation, especially since there are many methodological convergences among the ancient versions, even if their actual interpretations often differ widely. In the light of a knowledge of these techniques by means of abstraction a presumable *Vorlage* may thus be individuated more objectively.

Since B. Duhm Isa 42,1-4 has been called the “First Servant Song”, and there are good reasons to treat this passage as a unit of its own. First of all, the deictic marker ⌌ introduces a new scene, after the judgment scene in heaven (41,21-29) has been concluded. Moreover, with vv. 10ff there follows a hymn on YHWH as the lord of the universe. All in all, vv. 1-9 describe the vocation and installation of the Servant by YHWH. But one can propose a further cesura between v. 4 and v. 5, following the Masoretic tradition (which sets a *petucha* after v. 4)<sup>6</sup>, since with v. 5 a new divine speech begins, which is not immediate anymore, but mediated by someone else. The Servant is now being addressed directly, as the second person suffixes show. This seems to be enough formal evidence in order to distinguish between a “vocational call” (*Berufungswort*) in Isa 42,1-4 and an “installation report” (*Einsetzungsbericht*) in vv. 5-9. Such a division also corresponds to the understanding of the passage in antiquity, as the division of the text in the ‘A’ Scroll from Qumran shows. Consequently, it appears sensible to take Isa 42,1-4 together as the textual unit to be analyzed within its textual tradition.

The importance which the Servant Songs had on later literature, as is amply illustrated by the wealth of their quotations in the New Testament and the attention devoted to them in Rabbinic exegesis (as well as in the

5. For a justification of this approach cf. J. LUST, *Exegesis and Theology in the LXX of Ezekiel: The Longer ‘Pluses’ and Ezek 43:1-9*, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Jerusalem 1986*, Atlanta, 1987, 201-232, pp. 201f.

6. See in general J.M. OESCH, *Petucha und Setuma: Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testaments* (OBO, 27), Freiburg (Schweiz) – Göttingen, 1979.

writings of the Church Fathers), also justifies such a study of this unit. Although the New Testament usage of the First Servant Song will occasionally be considered, a thorough investigation into its own complex textual<sup>7</sup> and theological history is beyond the scope of this study.

## II. THE HEBREW TEXT

The Hebrew textual tradition of Deuteroisaiiah as a whole is exceptionally good, as has already been realized long ago<sup>8</sup>. The general reliability of the Masoretic text is emphasized by the comparatively small number of obvious corruptions as well as by its support through the great Isaiah Scroll from the Judean Desert (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) and some minor Qumran fragments. The passage in question, Isa 42,1-4, is no exception to this general principle. Therefore variants in the ancient versions have to be treated with particular caution; especially since they often result from a conscious interpretation of the Hebrew text rather than a plain and literal translation, they cannot serve *sic et simpliciter* as a basis for textual emendations. But prior to a discussion of the complex relationship between the Hebrew text and the ancient versions, it appears sensible to verify the reliability of MT through a comparison with the Qumran texts of Isaiah, particularly with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

### 1. The Masoretic Text

The division of the text as presented by the scribe of the *Codex Leningradensis* indicates that Isa 42,1-4 has been understood as a unit (see the Introduction, above, for literary reasons why this is indeed a plausible view), since a whole line is left blank after 42,4 (for the similar division in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> see below). The text according to this manuscript reads:

<sup>1</sup>הֵן עַבְדִּי אֶתְמַךְ-בּוּ בְּחִירִי רְצִתָּה נַפְשִׁי  
 נְתַתִּי רוּחִי עָלָיו מִשְׁפָּט לְגוֹיִם יוֹצִיא:  
<sup>2</sup>לֹא יִצְעַק וְלֹא יִשָּׂא וְלֹא-יִשְׁמִיעַ בְּחוּץ קוּלוֹ:  
<sup>3</sup>קָנָה רְצוּץ לֹא יִשְׁבוֹר וּפְשָׁתָה כְּהֵה לֹא יִכְבֹּנָה  
 לְאַמַּת יוֹצִיא מִשְׁפָּט:  
<sup>4</sup>לֹא יִכְהֶה וְלֹא יִרוּץ עַד-יָשִׁים בְּאֶרֶץ מִשְׁפָּט  
 וּלְתוֹרָתוֹ אֵיִם יִיחִילוּ:

<sup>1</sup>Behold my servant, I shall uphold him, my chosen one – my soul delights.  
 I have given my spirit upon him, he will bring forth judgment to the nations.

7. For bibliographical references see M.J.J. MENKEN, *The Quotation from Isaiah 42,1-4 in Matthew 12,18-21: Its Textual Form*, in *ETL* 75 (1999) 32-52, pp. 34f with notes.

8. See C.C. TORREY, *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation*, Edinburgh, 1928, pp. 206f.

<sup>2</sup>He will not cry nor will his lift up (sc. his voice) nor will he voice be heard outside.

<sup>3</sup>A bruised reed he will not crush and a (dimly) burning wick he will not extinguish,

in truth he will bring forth judgment.

<sup>4</sup>He will not grow faint nor be crushed until he establishes a judgment on earth;

and the islands will expect his law.

As the following observations will show, MT is in many parts confirmed by other direct witnesses of the Hebrew textual tradition. Since the text, as it stands, is fairly clear, there are not many opportunities for conjectures which receive no support from the versions. The quite popular attempt to revocalize ירוץ in v. 4 into ירוץ will be dealt with below. Some interpreters (Giesebrecht, Cheyne)<sup>9</sup> have proposed to correct לְאֲמֹת into לְאֲמוֹת, “to the peoples”, which is unlikely, since 1) this rare word does not occur in Deuteroisaiah, 2) it would not contribute anything to a better understanding of the text<sup>10</sup> and 3) it has no external support. So far the conjectures; the real variants within the Hebrew tradition will be discussed below. From the same discussion it will emerge that MT could with some probability be corrected in two instances, namely by reading (with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and all the ancient versions) יִכְבֶּה instead of יִכְבְּה in v. 3 and (with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>b</sup>) וְלֹא instead of לֹא in v. 4.

## 2. Other Traditions of the Hebrew Text

The evidence presented by other direct witnesses to the Hebrew text, namely Qumran and a medieval fragment with Babylonian pointing, in the case of this passage generally supports MT. Due to the great popularity of the Book of Isaiah at Qumran, where it is, besides its treatment in several commentaries<sup>11</sup>, attested in at least 21 manuscripts (some argue for 22, but such a number is conjectural)<sup>12</sup> – three of them containing at least parts Isa 42,1-4<sup>13</sup> – and thus only superseded by the Psalter (at least 36 manuscripts) and Deuteronomy (at least 26 manuscripts), there is a fair amount of early Hebrew witnesses. Substantial variants are predominantly presented by the ‘A’ Scroll from the Judean Desert, and in case of

9. Cf. K. ELLIGER, *Deuterocesaja*, Vol. 1 (BK, 11/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978, p. 198.

10. So rightly C.R. NORTH, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study*, Oxford, 1948, p. 117; ELLIGER, *Deuterocesaja* (n. 9), p. 198, who characterizes this conjecture as “überflüssig”.

11. G.J. BROOKE, *Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Literature*, in C.G. BROYLES – C.A. EVANS (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, Vol. 2 (VT.S, 70/2), Leiden, 1997, 609-632.

12. A descriptive introduction to the various Isaiah fragments is provided by P.W. FLINT, *The Isaiah Scrolls from the Judean Desert*, in BROYLES – EVANS (eds.), *Writing* (n. 11), 481-489.

13. See the survey by E. ULRICH, *An Index to the Contents of the Isaiah Manuscripts from the Judean Desert*, in BROYLES – EVANS (eds.), *Writing* (n. 11), 477-480.

these variants one can distinguish between linguistic revisions (presumably modernizations) and true variant readings. An overall examination, however, leads to the conclusion that there was only one edition of the Book of Isaiah at Qumran. This edition exhibits no consistent patterns or rearrangements. There is a remarkable number of proto-Masoretic texts at Qumran, but even those written according to spelling practice common at Qumran (i.e., 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>) could possibly have been copied from a proto-Masoretic original and hence ultimately reflect the same textual form. Thus the known texts do not differ among themselves with respect to their recensions<sup>14</sup>. The evidence of the Qumran material deserves particular attention, not only because of its antiquity and the fact that it is in Hebrew, but also because it shows considerably less influence of exegesis than the other versions, especially the Septuagint and the Targum. Hence the Qumran fragments are much more promising for a reconstruction of the original Hebrew text than other witnesses.

(a) Isaiah Scroll 'A' from the Dead Sea (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)

The 'A' Scroll or 'Great Isaiah Scroll' from the Judean Desert occupies an important place in the history of the Hebrew text of Isaiah, since it not only antedates MT by about a millennium (on palaeographic grounds it is generally dated to ca. 150-125 BC, which is roughly confirmed by a radiocarbon analysis), but its state of preservation – apart from some very small lacunae esp. in cols. I-IX, the 66 chapters of the Book of Isaiah are complete – and its overall textual quality make it a witness of great authority which allows some reliable conclusions concerning what was once at least one of the text types of the Book of Isaiah. It is generally rather close to MT<sup>15</sup>, and the fact that it agrees with MT in the case of Isa 42,1-4 against the interpretative additions especially of Septuagint and Targum (see below) makes it highly probable that at least the gist of the Hebrew text of this very passage presented by MT is in any case very old and may well have been the *Vorlage* – or quite similar to it – of the ancient versions. The view that the scribe of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, like the one of the *Codex Leningradensis*, has understood Isa 42,1-4 as a literary unity is supported by the fact that he devoted a paragraph on its own to these four verses, beginning a new line with v. 1 as well as with v. 5 and leaving the end of 41,29 and 42,4 blank (*petucha*)<sup>16</sup>, which can be clearly seen from photographs of the manuscript<sup>17</sup>. In general, non-orthographic (the Qumran text usually has *scriptio plena*) differences between 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and MT can often be attributed either to a form of linguistic reworking or indeed to

14. E. Tov, *The Text of Isaiah at Qumran*, in BROYLES – EVANS (eds.), *Writing* (n. 11), 491-511, esp. p. 511.

15. FLINT, *Isaiah* (n. 12), p. 483.

16. Cf. OESCH, *Petucha* (n. 6), pp. 200-248. Oesch shows that in 80% the division of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> into sense units corresponds to the medieval manuscripts of MT.

17. These are easily accessible in the usual facsimile editions.

actualizing exegesis, which does of course not exclude that within the total of the Book there are indeed certain cases in which the reading of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is clearly preferable to MT. The text, as it stands – including the line division – is as follows (since an explanation of the individual differences will be provided below, there is no translation included)<sup>18</sup>:

הנה עבדי אתמוכה בו בחירי רצתה נפשי נתתי רוחי עליו ומשפטו  
 לגואים יוציא<sup>2</sup> לוא יזעק ולוא ישא ולוא ישמיע בחוצ קולו<sup>3</sup> קנה רצוצ  
 לוא ישבור ופשתה כהה לוא יכבה לאמת יוציא משפט<sup>4</sup> ולוא יכהה ולוא  
 ירצ עד ישים בארצ משפט ולתורתיו איים ינחילו

Especially linguistic differences without a further bearing on the sense have been individuated and elucidated in great detail by E.Y. Kutscher<sup>19</sup>, who tried to show that the rapid and wide-ranging spread of Aramaic as a spoken language in Palestine and the consequent reduction of Hebrew to a literary language applied by learned circles has clearly left its mark on the linguistic garb of the Scroll. While the actual extent of the dominance of Aramaic as a spoken language in Palestine during the time of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is certainly open to debate, the material compiled and arranged by Kutscher provides a sound basis for assessing the value of certain grammatical and stylistic differences in Isaiah. Arie van der Kooij<sup>20</sup>, on the other hand, has shown how the prophecies of the Book of Isaiah have been adapted to the contemporary setting of the Scroll. Traces of the first type of variants can clearly be found in Isa 42,1-4 (evidence for a “messianic” reading is scarce, see below), but as they correspond to some major tendencies of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and its linguistic as well as theological setting as a whole and are generally not corroborated by other external evidence (such as support from the versions), they can for the most part safely be assumed to be variants confined to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> or its textual type, if they have in fact been present in other individual texts apart from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> as well. This shall be briefly indicated by means of a discussion of the actual variants, except the orthographic ones, which shall receive no further treatment.

Three textual differences between MT and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> are already present in v. 1. First, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads הנה instead of MT’s הן. This change occurs over 20 times in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (while a change the other way round occurs only once) and is almost certainly due to the attempt to distinguish clearly between the Hebrew conjunction הן, which can either mean “if” or function as a deictic particle, and the Aramaic conjunction הן, which can only mean “if” and corresponds to אם in Hebrew; an analogous change can be

18. The Hebrew text of the Scroll is available in D.W. PARRY – E. QIMRON, *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>): A New Edition* (STDJ, 32), Leiden, 1998 (facsimile of the manuscript with transcription).

19. E.Y. KUTSCHER, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)* (STDJ, 6), Leiden, 1974.

20. A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuchs: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO, 35), Freiburg (Schweiz) – Göttingen, 1981.

observed in the Samaritan Pentateuch<sup>21</sup>. Furthermore, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has the “cohortative” or “lengthened imperfect” אַתְּמִיכָה instead of the plain *yiqtol* form אַתְּמִיךְ, as in MT. A long form instead of a short form in MT is especially typical of the second half of the Qumran Scroll. This change is either due to an assimilation to the contemporary literary language, as “lengthened imperfects” are also documented by Late Biblical Hebrew books, such as Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, or it is, on the contrary, an archaizing feature, since these “cohortative” forms are absent from Mishnaic Hebrew. (In the latter case also the use of such verbal forms in Late Biblical Hebrew would be feature of archaizing style)<sup>22</sup>. In any case it is clear that the longer form is a feature which is amply attested in other Qumranic writings as well and hence may be due to conscious change<sup>23</sup>, though the result is presumably purely stylistical, as the “cohortative” can hardly be distinguished from the simple imperfect (at least not on contextual grounds), while the singular occurs above all in hymnic writings. Hence it is quite likely that this textual difference reflects and assimilation to the style of other hymnic pieces of Qumran literature and is thus proper to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

More interesting from a point of view of theological exegesis is the reading וּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ (the reading וּמִשְׁפָּטִי, as in the Targum, presented by some commentaries<sup>24</sup>, results from an incorrect transcription of the Qumran manuscript<sup>25</sup>) instead of MT’s מִשְׁפָּט. The first וּ makes the flowing of the text smoother by adding a final nuance, the sense being “so that he may deliver his justice to the nations”, but is unlikely to have been original, since MT’s lack of the conjunction is confirmed by Septuagint, Peshitta and Vulgate, while the reading וּמִשְׁפָּט has rather poor external support (the *ketib* of five manuscripts, Mt 12,18 and the Bohairic version<sup>26</sup>); the conjunction may be a dittography due to the final *waw* of the preceding

21. KUTSCHER, *Language* (n. 19), pp. 214f. For other instances of typologically similar renderings in to the Samaritan Pentateuch, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 566f; M. MANSOOR, *Some Linguistic Aspects of the Qumran Texts*, in *JSS* 3 (1958) 46-49.

22. KUTSCHER, *Language* (n. 19), pp. 40 and 326-328.

23. Cf. M.G. ABEGG, Jr., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in P.W. FLINT – J.C. VANDERKAM (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol. 1, Leiden, 1998, 325-358, pp. 336f, who detects a lengthening in 35% of the singular and 65% of the plural forms.

24. See J. STEINMANN, *Le Livre de la consolation d’Israël et les Prophètes du retour de l’exil* (Lectio Divina, 28), Paris, 1960, *ad loc.* M.H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, *Die Jesaja-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum*, in *Bib* 35 (1954) 51-71, p. 60, lists some other scholars who have the same wrong reading of the Qumran text (Driver, Burrows, Lindblom).

25. Although *waw* and *yod* are, as often and especially in the Qumran writings, quite similar, a look on the corresponding photograph in the usual facsimile editions and a comparison with other instances of these letters (the *yod* directly followed by a *waw* in the preceding word) shows that the reading must be וּמִשְׁפָּטִי. For the vertical stroke of the *waw* is usually a bit longer than the one of the *yod*, while the top of the latter is nearly always significantly wider.

26. ELLIGER, *Deuterocesaja* (n. 9), p. 198, *ad loc.*

עליו. The reading ומשפטו, i.e., the conjunction *and* the suffix, on the other hand, is only attested by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. It has been proposed that the emphasis on “his justice” which the Servant carries out, caused by the possessive suffix, reflects a messianic interpretation of this passage<sup>27</sup>. While it is true that the third person singular suffix does not receive support from the ancient versions (only the Targum has a first person singular suffix, see below) and that a messianic interpretation of this passage is at least theoretically feasible (it is made explicit by a part of the manuscript tradition of the Targum, see below, and messianic interpretations have already been detected in other readings of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> by J.V. Chamberlain<sup>28</sup>), it is hard to see how “his justice” instead of “justice” can be adduced as evidence for a messianic reading of this very text, for it is not clear what should be particularly “messianic” about משפטו, especially since 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has, at least in Deuteroisaiah, generally more suffixes than MT. On the contrary, one could also suppose that the reading משפטו was original and its suppression in MT, or the textual tradition reflected by MT, secondary. Such a change could have taken place in order to avoid a personification of divine attributes (“his power”, “his glory”)<sup>29</sup> and would thus be in accordance with other elements in Jewish exegesis emphasizing God’s transcendence (see below for examples from the Targum). But clarity in this question seems almost impossible to achieve.

Rather a straightforward linguistic modernization, on the other hand, appears to be in the background of the reading יזעק instead of MT’s יצעק in v. 2, since the synonymous verb זעק is more common in the Second Temple Hebrew than צעק, as appears from the vocabulary of Chr, Neh and Esth<sup>30</sup>. The *ketib* of four manuscripts exhibits the same change<sup>31</sup>.

In v. 3, MT has the *piel* form with a third person feminine singular suffix יִכְבְּנָה, “quench it”, while 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads יִכְבָּה, i.e., a form without suffix. If vocalized as a *qal*, “to quench, to go out” (cf. 1 Sam 3,3; Prov 31,18), the verb would then logically refer to פשתה כהה, with a problem of congruency between the feminine subject and the masculine verb. This appears to have been the interpretation of bYeb 93b<sup>32</sup>, which corrects the form to the grammatically required feminine תִּכְבָּה. In order to avoid this difficulty, it would be easier to vocalize the form as a *piel* (יִכְבְּנָה) and understand it like MT, just without the suffix: “he will not quench” (a vo-

27. P. PULIKOTTIL, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>* (JSPS, 34), Sheffield, 2001, p. 149.

28. J.V. CHAMBERLAIN, *The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll*, in VT 5 (1955) 66-372.

29. So for example K. BALTZER, *Deutero-Jesaja* (KAT, 10/2), Gütersloh, 1999, p. 24: “Möglicherweise liegt z.B. in der Zurückdrängung von Suffixen im MT die Tendenz, ein personales Verständnis von Begriffen [...] zu vermeiden”.

30. Cf. also KUTSCHER, *Language* (n. 19), pp. 34 and 233.

31. ELLIGER, *Deuterofjesaja* (n. 9), p. 198, *ad loc.*

32. Noted in the apparatus in the edition by M.H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Isaiah*, Jerusalem, 1995, *ad loc.*

calization as a *pual*, יִכְבֶּה, “he will not be quenched”, would be theoretically possible, but this stem is not attested with כִּבֶּה). This corresponds to the evidence furnished by Septuagint, Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate and hence may be the preferable reading.

Whereas v. 4 begins asyndetically in MT, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has a conjunction before and reads וְלוֹא. The Qumran text thus provides a closer connection with the preceding v. 3, which also contains the same image. Since omitting the conjunction is the *lectio facilior*, because it harmonizes v. 4 with the rest of the generally asyndetic passage, and since it is also attested by another Qumran witness (4QIsa<sup>b</sup>, see below), it may be preferable to MT. But even if this is the correct reading, it has been corrupted at quite an early stage, since the mainstream of the tradition, i.e., most manuscripts of the LXX, Aquila, Theodotion, Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgate, confirms MT. In v. 4, the Qumran text also has the plural וְלוֹתוֹרַתָּי, “his laws”, instead of MT’s singular לְתוֹרָתוֹ, “his Torah”. A similar change from singular to plural does happen in Biblical texts from Qumran<sup>33</sup>, and in this particular place it *may* be considered a kind of harmonization with the immediately following plural אֵימִים. With parallel nouns, such cases are especially frequent<sup>34</sup>, but also merely mechanical and therefore superfluous harmonizations are attested<sup>35</sup>. This *may* be one of them, as it is hard to see how a plural form, which is not attested by the versions, could in this very place seem preferable to the singular, all the more because the singular has a technical meaning “Torah” (which makes it extremely puzzling why the plural has been introduced). Since this is not the only instance of such a change, but rather another example of a general tendency to be observed in the Scroll, and the plural תּוֹרָתִי is – albeit rarely – attested in the Bible (this makes an eventual harmonization with אֵימִים all the easier)<sup>36</sup>, the plural reading cannot be considered the *lectio difficilior*. It will be seen below that 4QIsa<sup>b</sup> also has the singular לְתוֹרָתוֹ, just like MT and the versions. This is further evidence that the singular is preferable, considering both internal and external criticism.

A final difference is the verb used at the end of v. 4: While MT has יִתְחִילוּ, “they [sc. the islands] will wait” (*piel* from יָחַל), 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has יִנְחִילוּ, “they will give as an inheritance” (*hiphil* from נָחַל). Since there are two plural nouns, תּוֹרַתָּי and אֵימִים, it is not clear which one serves as the subject. One may at the first glance think that MT’s singular תּוֹרָתוֹ was changed into the plural because it was imagined the subject of the plural form יִנְחִילוּ, i.e., “his laws will give the islands as an inheritance”. This could be an allusion to Deut 32,8 (בְּהִנְחִיל עָלֵינוּ גּוֹיִם), but the precise sense is still unclear – why is not God the subject, but “his laws”? In addition,

33. See KUTSCHER, *Language* (n. 19), pp. 394-400.

34. KUTSCHER, *Language* (n. 19), pp. 396f, furnishes several examples.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 397.

36. The meaning is apparently “many individual laws”, cf. Gen 26,5; Ex 16,28; 18,16,20; Lev 26,46.

such an interpretation does not solve the problem why, if the grammatical number of one word had to be changed, the scribe would not have adjusted the verb to the singular, thus keeping the usual singular *תורתו*, rather than changing the noun to the fairly strange plural *תורתיו*. An easier explanation is that, as in MT, *איים* serves as the subject, but again this seems hard to square with the *hiphil* verbal form, clearly indicated by the *yod* – what does “the islands will give his laws as an inheritance” mean? Unless one wants to assume an otherwise unattested meaning of *נחל* *hiphil* synonymous to the usual *qal* meaning “to inherit”, this passage remains obscure. However, since the *qal*, too, can have both meanings, “to inherit” and “to give as an inheritance” (rare, but cf. Num 34,17f; Jos 19,49), this may not be completely impossible. In this case, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> would have a stronger “missionary” meaning – the islands, *pars pro toto* for regions far away<sup>37</sup>, will not only “await” God’s law(s), they will “inherit” them.

#### (b) Other Qumran Fragments

The passage Isa 42,1-4 is, although missing from 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, in part also attested by two fragments from Qumran Cave 4, namely 4QIsa<sup>b</sup> (4Q56)<sup>38</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>h</sup> (4Q62)<sup>39</sup>. The former, dating from about the third quarter of the first century BC (since it exhibits palaeographic features which are characteristic of both the late Hasmonaean and the Herodian scripts)<sup>40</sup>, contains some parts of vv. 2-4. The latter, written in Hasmonaean script and hence presumably dating from ca. the first half of the first century BC<sup>41</sup>, contains the second half of v. 4. Both confirm the consonantal text of MT and the division of vv. 1-4 as a unit of its own (there appears to be some free space at the end of v. 4 in 4QIsa<sup>h</sup>) for the most part, with the exception that 4QIsa<sup>b</sup> reads *ולא* at the beginning of v. 4, against the mainstream of the tradition (MT, most manuscripts of the LXX, Aquila, Theodotion, Targum, Peshitta, Vulgate), which has just *לא*. In this respect, 4QIsa<sup>b</sup> corresponds to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and some manuscripts of the Septuagint. Since the spelling of the word in the fragment from Cave 4 is defective (like the preceding *לא* at the end of v. 3 and thus corresponding to the “mixed” orthography of this text), while it is *plene* in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (*ולוא*), it seems to be the case that 4QIsa<sup>b</sup> is not an exact mirror of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, if an orthographic variant can bear the burden of proof for this, although it confirms – at least in this case – the otherwise only rarely attested reading of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. Hence, the reading *ולא* at the beginning of v. 4 may be preferable to MT’s *לא*, but does not necessarily have to be. 4QIsa<sup>h</sup>, on the

37. Cf. ELLIGER, *Deuterocesaja* (n. 9), p. 55 n. 5.

38. E. ULRICH et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, X: The Prophets* (DJD, XV), Oxford, 1997, p. 37 (frgs. 28-30).

39. *Ibid.*, p. 118 (frgs. 1-2).

40. FLINT, *Isaiah* (n. 12), pp. 484f.

41. FLINT, *ibid.*, p. 486.

other hand, confirms with the reading לתרתו MT's לתורתו in v. 4, against the plural לתורתיו in IQIsa<sup>a</sup>, just that it spells לתרתו defectively<sup>42</sup>, while MT spells it *plene*.

(c) MS 240 of the Jewish Theological Seminary

A variant vocalization of ירוץ in v. 4 is provided by an Isaiah fragment with Babylonian pointing from fr. MS 240, EMC 73 of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, written in about the 12<sup>th</sup> century and containing parts of Isaiah in Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic. The writing is of the older Yemenite type, and a vocalization has been added by two different hands<sup>43</sup>. For instead of ירוץ, as in MT, the first hand of this fragment reads a form that, in the Tiberian pointing, would be ירוץ (it has been proposed to correct MT accordingly)<sup>44</sup>, while otherwise it fully confirms the consonantal text and vocalization of MT. The second hand has, as noted by Diez-Macho in the apparatus, a pointing analogous to MT's ירוץ, i.e., with a long /ā/ in the first syllable. The pointing ירוץ would be a *niphal* form of רצץ, “he will be crushed”, just like the passive θραυσθήσεται in the Septuagint. The fact that one would normally expect ירוץ, i.e., with /ō/ in the second syllable instead of /ū/, as in Ez 29,7 (/ō/ and /ū/ are distinct in Babylonian pointing, so the reading of the manuscript is unambiguous), is presumably of little significance, since *yiqtol* forms of geminate verbs do exhibit alternative vocalizations at times (even in the *qal*)<sup>45</sup>. The passive vocalization is certainly the easier reading, and a correction is less problematic, because it does not affect the consonantal text, but it may well be possible that רצץ or a by-form of רוץ – as geminate verbs are often alternative realizations of hollow roots – could have an intransitive meaning in the *qal* as well<sup>46</sup>, hence MT's ירוץ could be the correct reading (in this case, one would imagine an assonance with רצוץ in v. 3<sup>47</sup>).

### III. THE GREEK VERSIONS

Among the Greek versions of the text, the Septuagint deserves particular attention because of its proximity to the Hebrew text, which may even antedate IQIsa<sup>a</sup> by a few years, while the remnants of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion seem to exhibit a greater literalness of translation. Within the network of the other ancient translations and interpreta-

42. This text only makes sparing use of vowel letters.

43. The text has been edited by A. DIEZ-MACHO, *A New Fragment of Isaiah with Babylonian Pointing*, in *Textus* 1 (1960) 132-143.

44. Cf. BALTZER, *Deutero-Jesaja* (n. 29), p. 170.

45. W. GESENIUS – E. KAUTZSCH, *Hebräische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 28<sup>th</sup> 1909 (repr. Hildesheim, 1985), §67q. Cf. B.A. LEVINE, *Numbers 21–36* (AB, 4a), New York, 2000, p. 169.

46. See ELLIGER, *Deuterocesaja* (n. 9), pp. 198f, with reference to the commentaries by Levy and North.

47. BALTZER, *Deutero-Jesaja* (n. 29), p. 177 n. 250, considers this as a possibility.

tions, the Septuagint allows an almost uniquely clear insight into the exegetical and interpretative techniques common during the intertestamental period. In fact, the Septuagint rendering of this passage appears to be the version which develops most clearly its own elaboration of the text, which, as will be seen, even rearranges the underlying structure. This fact requires a slightly more profound examination of the complex relationship between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text. The value of all the Greek versions for the reconstruction of the Hebrew text is, however, conditioned by the fact that they are specimens of the translation of Hebrew poetry into a non-Semitic language and therefore face the respective translator with even more serious linguistic difficulties which the author of the Targum or the Peshitta simply did not have.

### 1. *The Septuagint*

The text of this passage as presented by the Septuagint is in several ways markedly different not only from the Masoretic Text, but also from other important witnesses of the Hebrew original, such as the Peshitta or the Vulgate, while there are at the same time only few problems of major importance within the tradition of the Greek text itself. It is an important document showing the reception and interpretation of the Book of Isaiah at about the mid-second century BC. The text followed here is, apart from the last part of v. 4 (see below for a discussion of this specific problem), the one printed by Ziegler in his Göttingen edition<sup>48</sup>:

<sup>1</sup>Ἰακωβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ  
 Ἰσραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἢ ψυχὴ μου  
 ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτὸν  
 κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει

<sup>2</sup>οὐ κεκράζεται οὐδὲ ἀνήσει  
 οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ

<sup>3</sup>κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει  
 καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσει  
 ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει κρίσιν

<sup>4</sup>ἀναλάμψει καὶ οὐ θραυσθήσεται  
 ἕως ἂν θῆ ἔπι τῆς γῆς κρίσιν  
 καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν

<sup>1</sup>Jacob my boy, I will support him;  
 Israel my chosen one, my soul has accepted him.  
 I have put my spirit upon him,  
 he shall bring forth judgment to the nations.

<sup>2</sup>He will not cry nor let go up [sc. his voice],  
 nor will his voice be heard outside.

<sup>3</sup>A bruised reed will he not break  
 and a smoking flax will he not extinguish,

48. J. ZIEGLER, *Isaias*, Göttingen, 1954, pp. 276f.

but he shall bring forth a judgment for truth.

<sup>4</sup>He will shine and not be shattered,  
until he will have established judgment on earth,  
and gentiles will hope for his name.

The fact that there is a rather stable tradition of the Greek text, considerable differences in comparison with the Masoretic Text, a strong support of the latter through other ancient translations, and a growing awareness in modern scholarship of a particular stylistic and theological profile of several books of the Septuagint seems to demand an initial enquiry into the reliability of the Septuagint of Isaiah as a witness for the reconstruction of the Hebrew original. It is only against such a general background that further specific observations can be correctly made.

As expected, many variants in the internal tradition of the Septuagint and its daughter versions result with all probability from a harmonization of this text with the Isaiah quotation in Mt 12,18-21, especially in the Bohairic translation, which adds what in Greek would be a *καί* before *κρίσιν* in v. 1, and reads *οὐκ ἐρίσει* instead of *οὐ κεκράζεται* in v. 2. The reading *ἐρίσει* instead of *ἀνήσει* in manuscript 534 of the Septuagint is likely to derive from Mt 12,19 as well, no less than the addition *εἰς νῖκος* in v. 4 of the same manuscript, which presumably originates in Mt 12,20 (where it stands for the *נִיחָן* of Isa 42,3). In reading *λίβανον* for *λίνον* in v. 3, manuscript 534 departs from the Gospel text as well, but this is clearly a corruption probably motivated by liturgical use. For *ἀνήσει* in v. 2 manuscript 308 has *βοήσει*; the antiquity of this variant may be confirmed by Tertullian's *neque contendit neque clamavit*. Other minor variants can easily be explained as internal harmonizations, esp. with respect to vv. 3 and 4. Instead of *θραυσθήσεται* in v. 4, the *lectio difficilior* and at the same time the one with better external attestation (that is, B\*), manuscript 91 reads *θλασθήσεται*. This is most probably due to the influence of *τεθλασμένον* in v. 3 (for which several manuscripts, namely A', V, 311'-456, C', 449', 534 and some Fathers have *συντεθλασμένον*, a noteworthy external attestation, but apparently a harmonization with *συντρίψει* later in the same verse and maybe also *συντετριμμένον* in Mt 12,20; manuscript 46 has in fact *συντετριμμένον*, which may be due to an influence of Mt 12,20 rather than being an assimilation to *συντρίψει*), while S\* has *σβεσθήσεται*, which has presumably been derived from *σβέσει* in v. 3.

#### (a) The Septuagint of Isaiah as a Version and its Relationship to MT

Already earlier scholarship was, with the notable exception of A. Scholtz<sup>49</sup>, strongly in favour of a close similarity between the *Vorlage* of

49. A. SCHOLTZ, *Die Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Isaias*, Würzburg, 1880. Scholtz tries to explain the differences between MT and LXX in light of the hypothesis of LXX-Isa being a literal translation of a *Vorlage* distinct from MT.

the Septuagint version of Isaiah and MT and thus had to attribute the noteworthy divergences to other factors. R.R. Ottley, for example, noted that the *Vorlage* was “very closely resembling M.T.”<sup>50</sup>, although his argument is circular: He did not want to accept a *Vorlage* differing strongly from the text type that was to become MT later on, because the latter’s antiquity goes back at least to the 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD, as it becomes apparent through the very literal translation of Aquila, who must have had a text before him which was extremely similar to what is now MT. This is, however, no valid evidence for excluding the theoretical possibility of yet another form of the Hebrew text which circulated considerably earlier, namely at the time of the composition of LXX-Isa (presumably around 140 BC), but disappeared shortly afterwards, so that it did not leave traces in other textual witnesses. A similar line was taken by J. Fischer<sup>51</sup>, who also emphasized that the divergences resulted from conscious alterations through the translator (such as leaving out or summing up phrases) as well as through gaps in the *Vorlagentext*<sup>52</sup>, misreadings, free renderings and only partially conscious changes of consonants in order to adapt the text to a certain interpretation; furthermore, one has to account for instances of corruptions within the manuscript tradition of the Greek text<sup>53</sup>.

In any case, these approaches both rest on the *petitio principii* of a similarity between the *Vorlage* of LXX-Isa and MT, which has to be verified against the background of a closer study of the translation technique of this book and the Qumran texts still unknown to scholars at that time. A new generation in determining the relationship between these texts was inaugurated by J. Ziegler<sup>54</sup>, who attempted to examine the style of the book in the Greek version in own right and came to the conclusion that paraphrases and glosses – nowadays one might call them “intertextual references” – are characteristic features of the translator’s style (although Ziegler himself would not exclude variants and glosses in the *Vorlage*)<sup>55</sup>. Since many major divergences between the MT of Isa and its LXX version do in fact consist in an alternative wording and additional explanations, which are in part also present in the rendering of certain expressions quite close to MT, it may seem not wholly implausible to attribute them to the translator himself. This hypothesis can be corroborated by the observation that the content of these additions fairly often derives from other places of the same book (which, according to Ziegler, the translator

50. R.R. OTTLEY, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*, Cambridge, 1906, Vol. 1, p. 18.

51. J. FISCHER, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?: Eine textkritische Studie* (BZAW, 56), Gießen, 1930, p. 8 (this is mainly an attempt to argue against the famous, though unsatisfactory hypothesis of F. Wutz that the Septuagint originated as a transcription).

52. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 10: “um einen bestimmten Sinn zu gewinnen”.

54. J. ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATAbH, 12/3), Münster, 1934.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

knew by heart), i.e., there is not altogether too much external textual substance in the plusses<sup>56</sup>. This had already been stressed by A. Zillesen, who for the same reason strongly doubted the value of LXX-Isa for reconstructing MT. (It is interesting to note that Zillesen advanced his argument mainly in order to counter the attempt of some scholars to provide a tentative “amelioration” of MT in the light of metrical observations, itself obviously being a rather slippery path, for which LXX-renderings, supposed to confirm a reconstructed “original” text, served as additional evidence)<sup>57</sup>. Another very strong counterargument to the attempt to explain differences between Isa LXX and Isa MT by means of a different *Vorlage* was developed by I.L. Seeligmann<sup>58</sup>, who took up Ziegler’s idea of a creative translator, but pushed it considerably further by pointing out various instances not only of a paraphrase of the text, but also of an actualizing and adapting interpretation in the light of the translator’s contemporary history and theology<sup>59</sup>, especially with regard to the “updating” of prophecies. This has proved to be a most fruitful approach in recent scholarship on the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint as well<sup>60</sup>. Many conclusions can still be accepted as valid, and in fact much recent work devoted to this field tries to tackle the underlying theological concepts<sup>61</sup> or is concerned with a Hellenistic cultural background of the book which is greatly at variance with the Hebrew milieu from which the original text once has emerged<sup>62</sup>. Therefore it has to be borne in mind that Isaiah in the LXX is actually intended to be an interpretation of MT, which makes it rather difficult to use it as a means in order to reconstruct the original Hebrew text.

Also the very numerous Isaiah texts found at Qumran, which probably belong to a proto-Masoretic textual form (see above), further support the view that the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of Isaiah, too, resembled MT closely<sup>63</sup>. For the Septuagint of Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, presumably almost contemporary texts with the Septuagint perhaps antedating 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> by a few years, although they both individually deviate from MT in many instances, share only an extremely small number of common readings against MT, and even then they cannot be shown to reflect an identical

56. *Ibid.*, pp. 135-175.

57. A. ZILLESSEN, *Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja* (c. 40-66), in ZAW 22 (1902) 238-263.

58. I.L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL, 9), Leiden, 1948.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

60. For a brief survey see A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Isaiah in the Septuagint*, in BROYLES – EVANS (eds.), *Writing* (n. 11), 513-529, esp. pp. 515-517.

61. For a select bibliography cf. E.R. EKBLAD, *Isaiah’s Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 23), Leuven, 1999, p. 21 n. 20.

62. So S.E. PORTER – B.W.R. PEARSON, *Isaiah Through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah*, in BROYLES – EVANS (eds.), *Writing* (n. 11), 531-546.

63. TOV, *Text* (n. 14), p. 511.

Hebrew text other than MT<sup>64</sup>. Therefore agreement in individual cases most probably results from common interpretative practice<sup>65</sup>.

(b) Explanations and Comments in Isa 42,1-4 LXX

Like some other versions, such as two manuscripts of the Targum (see below), the Septuagint of this passage seems to have been puzzled by the enigmatic reference to the “Servant” in v. 1. Thus it clarifies his identity as the people of Israel by means of the double addition “Jacob” in the first stichos – replacing the deictic particle  $\eta\eta$  (which destroys the inclusion present in MT due to the second deictic particle in v. 9) – and “Israel” in the second one. On the other hand, the absence of this additional information in MT, Qumran fragments, Peshitta and Vulgate makes it likely that these two words were not part of the original Hebrew text. On the other hand, they are unlikely to constitute an otherwise completely unattested secondary corruption of the original Septuagint reading. For then one would have to assume something like a palaeographically very unlikely corruption of an original  $\text{I}\Delta\text{OY}$  (=  $\eta\eta$ , as in Mt 12,18 and Theodotion; the reading of manuscript 88 may be a secondary correction in the light of this evidence) into  $\text{I}\text{A}\text{K}\Omega\text{B}$  and a corresponding expansion of the second stichos. So the transmitted text of the LXX of this passage presumably reflects a conscious interpretation that goes back at least to the original Septuagint itself. This hypothesis may derive further support from the fact that these additions are missing in the subgroup *oII* of the Hexaplaric recension.

This point of view also gain support from the fact that the identification of the Servant either with Israel or with the Messiah was a major issue in the Jewish exegetical tradition at least from the intertestamental period up to the middle ages<sup>66</sup>. The interpretation of the figure of the Servant as the people of Israel appears to have been the mainstream, and it has also been accepted by the majority of medieval Jewish commentators, with the notable exception of Qimchi and Abarbanel<sup>67</sup>. If the Septuagint emerged at least partly from a scholastic background, or was designed to be used in teaching<sup>68</sup>, so that it could serve for linguistic and exegetical purposes, it is no wonder that this passage of LXX-Isa takes up one of the apparently most popular interpretative problems posed by the biblical text.

64. See A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah: Some General Comments*, in G.J. BROOKE – B. LINDARS (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (SBLSCS, 33), Atlanta, 1992, 195-213.

65. Cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Isaiah* (n. 60), pp. 517f.

66. Cf. H. HAAG, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterocesaja*, Darmstadt, 1985, *passim*.

67. Cf. O. KAISER, *Der königliche Knecht*, Göttingen, 1962, *passim*; I. ENGNELL, *The 'Ebed-Yahwe' Songs and the Suffering Messiah in 'Deutero-Isaiah'*, in *BJRL* 31 (1948) 54-93.

68. As has recently been pointed out by A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *The Origin and Purpose of Bible Translations in Ancient Judaism: Some Comments*, in *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1 (1999) 204-214.

The interpretation favoured by the Septuagint is especially interesting when considered in connection with the alleged "messianic" tendency of many books of this version. Maybe the popularity of the "collective" identification was so strong that it could override this tendency at least in Isa 42, 1, although it has to be borne in mind that even individual books of the Septuagint are hardly consistent in their own theological accentuation (the question of anthropomorphisms, carefully avoided in some places, left unaltered in others, is another example). Besides the external evidence of the other versions and the wide attestation of such an identification of the Servant in exegetical tradition, there is yet another point of view from which one could argue that the two names "Jacob" and "Israel" are secondary additions: The anonymity of the Suffering Servant is, according to the insights of comparative religion and anthropology, a vital feature of scapegoat rituals<sup>69</sup>. Thus the nameless Servant might point to a more original stage of the text, although it is not clear when this archaic conception had been abandoned in favour of a decisive identification; at least in theory this could have taken place already in the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint<sup>70</sup>. Even though it is widely recognized by now that several books of the Septuagint, particularly the Psalter, Isaiah and the Pentateuch, are generally likely to introduce their own interpretations into the text (see above), this procedure is not restricted to the Septuagint, but interpretative corrections and additions are also known from the Masoretic tradition. In such a case the *Vorlage* would be a witness for a different tradition of the Hebrew text, since the textual tradition of MT is corroborated by Peshitta, Vulgate and the other Greek translations. It has to be borne in mind, however, that the lack of these names is the *lectio difficilior*, since adding them is easier to explain than lack them out.

Thus it cannot be said with certainty when and where the identification of the Servant with the people of Israel originated, but it seems fairly plausible that it results from a synthesis of the two concepts of the "Servant Israel" (as in Isa 41, 10.13; 44, 2.21f; 45, 4) and the "Servant of God" (such as 42, 18-23; 43, 8-13; 50, 4-9; 53). These were originally distinct in the Book of Isaiah, but occur side by side in the immediate as well as in the wider context of the passage in question. Both are associated with the election by YHWH and his support and therefore furnish a model for the people of Israel. Hence a subjective reading of the text itself might ignore this distinction and bring both ideas together, i.e., the later exegetical traditions originate in this case from "internally" establishing a relationship between the two "servants" without adducing new material. It is in any case very noteworthy that the additions "Jacob" and "Israel" in the LXX, although they apparently take up an ancient and widespread exegetical tradition, are not inserted into the text as explana-

69. Cf. R. GIRARD, *La violence et le sacré*, Paris, 1972.

70. See R. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (NT.S., 18), Leiden, 1967, pp. 111f.

tory glosses, but in an effective and stylistically sophisticated fashion. For one would normally expect a gloss in the strict sense to *follow* the word it refers to, but here both plusses stand first, thus forcefully expressing the topic of the whole passage. Furthermore the *double* addition of the information furnishing the interpretative identification corresponds to the *parallelismus membrorum*, i.e., it leaves the syntactic and semantic parallelism of the first and the second stichos completely intact. Moreover, the wording appears to have been influenced by prophetic diction. So the Septuagint here presents not only a learned comment, but it also tries to incorporate the interpretation into the text it refers to in a literary ambitious manner. Within the wider context, the explicit identification of the Servant results in an even more forceful contrast with the “idols” of the preceding section.

The description of the Servant as *παῖς μου* instead of עַבְדִּי goes into the same direction. For *παῖς* is semantically more open, meaning “servant” as well as “young person” (just like the English “boy” / “girl”), and thus may have had some influence on the use of this passage in Mt 12<sup>71</sup>, especially since *παῖς θεοῦ* was interpreted as “son of God” among Greek-speaking Jews<sup>72</sup>. On the other hand, *παῖς* in Deuteroisaiiah often clearly refers to Jacob / Israel<sup>73</sup>, so this translation matches the exegetical plus explaining the identification of the Servant<sup>74</sup>, though it can hardly be said with certainty in which direction an eventual causal relationship went (did the use of *παῖς* determine the addition “Jacob” and “Israel”, if this is indeed proper to the Septuagint and not to its *Vorlage*, or the other way round?), if there ever existed any.

Isa 42,2 is translated quite literally by the Septuagint, even to the extent that the elliptical expression אֲשֶׁר אֶלֶּךְ is not expanded, but rendered οὐδὲ ἀνήσει, “nor let [sc. it] go / loose”, which is hardly good Greek and may result from a preceding use of ἀνίημι for אֲשֶׁר<sup>75</sup>. Yet the *hiphil* עָשָׂה is expressed by the passive form ἀκουσθήσεται, which would be the *niphal* עָשָׂה in Hebrew. The reason for this may be either a *Vorlage* without the *yod*, be it because it in fact read the *niphal* or because it was written defectively, or indeed a stylistic one, since שמע in the *hiphil* would be difficult to render in Greek anyway. This latter possibility is more plausible, since the construction with a causative שמע is often changed in the Greek<sup>76</sup>. So, too, λίνον καπνιζόμενον (“a smoking flax”) in v. 3 is not exactly equivalent to וַיִּשְׂתַּחֲוֶה כְּהָהָה (“a [dimly] burning

71. BALTZER, *Deutero-Jesaja* (n. 29), p. 171 n. 222.

72. Cf. Wis 2,13.16.18.

73. Cf. 41,8f; 42,19; 43,10; 44,1f.21; and esp. 45,4. This reference is less prominent in Isa 1–39.

74. EKBLAD, *Isaiah* (n. 61), p. 63, sees in the use of the verb ἀντιλαμβάνω an intertextual reference to Isa 9,6f, linking Israel with the royal, Davidic child. This is at least theoretically possible, especially since other key-words, too, recur in both passages.

75. Isa 1,14; 2,9; cf. also 46,4. The more normal translation, both in Isaiah and elsewhere, would be αἶρω.

76. MENKEN, *Quotation* (n. 7), p. 41.

wick”), although it is semantically very close. The image of the wick is interpreted by the subgroup *cI* of the *catenae* by means of the addition τὴν (τῶν) Ἰουδαίων ἀσθενείαν, but this is clearly a later Christian interpretation, although it may be somehow related to the Jewish tradition of explaining the wick as the “poor”, which is reflected in the Targum (see below). Moreover, it is noteworthy that συντριβῶ in the Septuagint of Isaiah is generally used for God’s judgment, even where there are different Hebrew words in the background<sup>77</sup>. So the uniformity in vocabulary may recall other similar passages, although the use of this Greek verb for רַבֿ appears to be the most widespread one. The conjunction ἀλλά may – but does not have to – go back to a *waw* in the *Vorlage* which is now lost, but this *waw* has not left any trace either in MT or in the Qumran fragments or in the other versions. Perhaps it is easier to explain the presence of the ἀλλά, in any case a strong adversative particle, as a conscious effort by the LXX translator to make the contrast with what follows more explicit.

The positive formulation in v. 4, ἀναλάμψει (“he will shine”, for MT’s הִקְדִּיחַ אֵלַי, “he will not grow faint”; this has undergone various forms of corruption in the textual history of the Greek: the subgroup *cI* of the *catenae* reads the present ἀναλάμπει, while the manuscripts 88, 407 and Justin read ἀναλήφει, 239<sup>r</sup> has ἀνακάμψει, 239 ἀνακαλύψει, some other minor manuscripts put a καί before), has no parallel in the other versions and may have been introduced by the Septuagint in order to give more emphasis to the figure of the Servant. The translation of אִיְלָדִים, “islands”, with ἔθνη in v. 4 (and 41,5; otherwise it is translated literally with νῆσοι), however, is a piece of contextual exegesis. For this rendering certainly betrays an influence of the frequent parallelism “islands” / “nations” with the meaning “foreign regions” in Isaiah<sup>78</sup> and therefore constitutes a straightforward clarification of a rather idiosyncratic image. The formulation ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν may be indebted to Isa 11,10; it recurs in 51,5. At the same time, it establishes, together with the double ἐπί and the double κρίσις, an *inclusio* with τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in v. 1<sup>79</sup>. Maybe also the translation ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ (instead of “his law”, as in MT) was meant to strengthen this *inclusio* by recalling ἐπ’ αὐτόν in v. 1, if it is not just a corruption from an original literal νόμῳ αὐτοῦ<sup>80</sup>, which has no support whatsoever in the manuscript tradition (the word אֱמֻנָה in the Peshitta is no evidence for this, see below)<sup>81</sup>. In the light of Isa 26,8; 63,16.19, it may be a paraphrase<sup>82</sup>, or indeed an instance of theological

77. Cf. Isa 1,28; 8,15; 10,33; 14,5.12; 21,9; 42,13.

78. ELLIGER, *Deuterocesaja* (n. 9), p. 55 n. 5.

79. EKBLAD, *Isaiah* (n. 61), p. 59.

80. This has already been assumed by ZILLESSEN, *Bemerkungen* (n. 57), p. 256, and is also mentioned by OTTLEY, *Book* (n. 50), Vol. 2, p. 307.

81. Ziegler in his edition prints indeed νόμῳ αὐτοῦ and remarks laconically: *scripsi*. But this may be too confident. Rahlfs in his edition, on the other hand, sticks to ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

82. OTTLEY, *Book* (n. 50), Vol. 2, p. 307.

exegesis which introduces a tradition *not* proper to the Book of Isaiah as such<sup>83</sup>, as it has been suggested that there was a Jewish tradition associating the “name” of God with his “Torah”<sup>84</sup>. Therefore the reading of the Septuagint could theoretically be a conscious application of this exegetical tradition, especially since a substitution of God’s “name” for νόμος does occur in the textual tradition of the Septuagint<sup>85</sup>.

Yet despite the translator’s apparent ambition to develop a concentric structure, he was, interestingly, literal enough to preserve the original difference between τοῖς ἔθνεσιν *with* the article in v.1 and ἔθνη *without* the article in v. 4<sup>86</sup>. This betrays a very subtle and refined translation technique. All early recensions of the Septuagint and the early Latin versions agree in translating the last clause like this, while the other early Greek versions literally follow MT. However, this does not necessarily point to a lost variant in the Hebrew tradition<sup>87</sup>, for there is no compelling reason why assimilation to MT should have taken place before Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.

## 2. *The Other Greek Versions*

Due to the fragmentary nature of the remains of Aquila’s, Symmachus’, and Theodotion’s translations of Isa 42,1-4 and their indirect transmission<sup>88</sup>, a clear profile of their versions of this passage can hardly be individuated. Therefore the treatment of these witnesses shall be predominantly cursory and descriptive. The quotation of these verses in Justin, Tryph. 123 and 135 (both quotations are at variance among themselves), does not seem to be of independent value, but draws on the Septuagint as well as on Mt 12,18-21. In v. 1, Theodotion shares the Septuagint’s translation παῖς μου for יְהוָה (according to the Syro-Hexapla), while Aquila and Symmachus have δοῦλος, but he nonetheless seems to use a more technical term for ὡς ἡ ψαλμὸς and translates it with ὃν ἠὲ δόκησεν ἢ ψυχῇ μου (εὐδοκέω is also to be found in Mt)<sup>89</sup>. Additionally, the same

83. L. PRUS, *Jüdische Tradition in der LXX*, Leiden, 1948 (repr. Hildesheim, 1987), *passim*, shows that this is often the case with the Septuagint, which anticipates traditions explicitly known only from later Rabbinic exegesis.

84. J. KOENIG, *L’Herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe* (VT.S, 33), Leiden, 1970, pp. 232-237. Koenig’s approach and method are often highly problematic, however, cf. A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Accident or Method?: On ‘Analogical’ Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in IQ1<sup>a</sup>*, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 43 (1986) 366-376.

85. There are variant readings to Ex 16,4; 2 Chr 6,16; Ps 59 (58),12; 119 (118), 165; 130 (129), 5; Isa 42,24.

86. This point is missed by Ekblad.

87. So GUNDRY, *Use* (n. 70), p. 115 (the idea itself goes back to E. Hatch).

88. The fragments have been collected by F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta*, Oxford, 1875 (repr. Hildesheim, 1964).

89. H.B. SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, 1902, p. 395, points to a general resemblance of the quotation in Mt to Theodotion, but the use of

translator smoothens the syntax of the phrase by inserting a relative pronoun (as does Mt). This seems to be an original solution to the problem of the terse Hebrew phrase, since Septuagint, Targum and Vulgate, insert a resumptive pronoun when faced with the same difficulty. The exegetical identification of the Servant is missing, while it is present in later quotations of the Biblical passage<sup>90</sup>.

In v. 2, Symmachus seems to understand the Hebrew וְלֹא יִשָּׂא, maybe because of the elliptical formulation, as וְלֹא יִשָּׂא and translates οὐδὲ ἐξαπατηθήσεται, at least according to Jerome: *Vel iuxta Symmachum, non decipietur [...]; omnes insidias diaboli intellegens*<sup>91</sup>. Still, this translation is rather strange, since יִשָּׂא in the – rarely attested – *niphal* means “to have vain hopes”, while in the *hiphil* it means “to deceive”. A straight passive sense “to be deceived” is not really attested for the Hebrew. Furthermore, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion apparently agree in translating כְּהָה in v. 3 rather freely, but aptly, with ἀμαυρόν, “dark”, cf. Jerome: *Linum fumigans, sive ut ceteri transtulerunt, obscurum atque tenebrosum*<sup>92</sup>. Aquila and Symmachus share the Septuagint’s λίνον, while Theodotion has στυπτόον. For the first part of v. 4, Aquila and Theodotion seem to agree in wrongly רָוַץ deriving from the root רוץ, “to run”, while they translate לֹא יִכְהָה, contrary to the LXX, literally, as Jerome reports: *Pro quo Aq. et Theod. interpretati sunt: Non obscurabit, non curret, donec ponat in terra iudicium*. The translation of the rest of v. 4 is more literal in the other Greek versions than it is in the Septuagint, for Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion have, according to Origen’s note, all νῆσοι for אֲיִים and νόμος for תּוֹרָה<sup>93</sup>. In total, the evidence from the remaining Greek versions indicates that the Hebrew text in the background was either MT or a text very close to it.

#### IV. THE PESHITTA

An analysis of the Peshitta of Isa 42,1-4 appears to be less revealing for the methodology of ancient translation technique, which can be seen at work much more clearly in the Septuagint and the Targum, than for the discussion about a common Aramaic ancestor text to Septuagint, Peshitta and Targum. This discussion casts some doubt on the reliability of the Peshitta as a witness to the original Hebrew text of Isaiah, although it is evidently very close to MT. Therefore the examination of the Syriac ren-

εὐδοκέω with preceding relative pronoun is the only really strong similarity, as OTTLEY, *Book* (n. 50), Vol. 2, p. 306, correctly remarks. This is not particularly significant, since εὐδοκέω with the accusative is frequent in Biblical as well as extra-Biblical Greek.

90. Cf. the quotations in Justin, *Dial.* 123.135, which sometimes agree with LXX (they have the identification of the Servant in v. 1a) and sometimes vary between LXX and the quotation in Mt 12,18ff.

91. FIELD, *Origenis* (n. 88), p. 515.

92. *Ibid.*

93. *Ibid.*, p. 516.

dering of this passage shall take place explicitly against the background of the question of its origin.

### 1. *Problems in Assessing the Text-Critical Value of the Peshitta of Isaiah*

An attempt to assess clearly the value of the Peshitta of Isaiah as an independent textual witness is significantly obscured by the fact that there are numerous cases where the Syriac translation agrees with the Septuagint and the Targum against MT. This has given rise to the hypothesis, originally advanced by P. Kahle and A. Baumstark and defended by A. Vööbus and B.J. Roberts<sup>94</sup>, that all three translations are based on a common Aramaic ancestor, more precisely: a Palestinian Targum. If this were true, the relationship between the Syriac and the Hebrew text would be merely indirect, and the textual evidence of the Peshitta would have little more bearing than, for example, the daughter versions of the Septuagint. But a re-examination<sup>95</sup> of the evidence strongly seems to suggest that many of the most persuasive variants either can be explained against the background of the internal textual history of the Peshitta (including later harmonizations with the Septuagint)<sup>96</sup>, while others hint at analogous exegetical techniques<sup>97</sup>. Hence there is no valid evidence for a common ancestor of Peshitta, LXX and Targum, while it is still highly probable that, in individual cases, the Syriac translator consulted the Septuagint – as did Jerome. P.B. Dirksen concluded<sup>98</sup> “that the Hebrew text which is reflected in the Peshitta is practically identical with MT, or at least very close to it”. If the observation is true that the respective *Vorlage* was a proto-Masoretic text<sup>99</sup> and that it has been composed and published at a rather early date – on the basis of historical allusions van der Kooij argues for 162<sup>100</sup> – it is indeed, at least in theory, a serious witness for the development and even the reconstruction of the Hebrew text at least at its

94. For the exact references see C.E. MORRISON, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL, 11), Leiden, 2001, pp. 1-3.

95. P.B. DIRKSEN, *The Old Testament Peshitta*, in M.J. MULDER – H. SYSLING (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Philadelphia, 1988, 255-297.

96. Cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), pp. 259-270. L. DELEKAT, *Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta*, in *Bib* 38 (1957) 185-199, 321-335, pp. 191f, draws attention to the possibility that the translators themselves have consulted LXX and Targum, a view that has already been proposed by H. WEISZ, *Die Peschitta zu Deuterocesaja und ihr Verhältnis zu MT., LXX. u. Trg.*, Diss. Halle, 1893 (p. 20 for Isa 42,1-4).

97. See E.R. ROWLANDS, *The Targum and the Peshitta Version of the Book of Isaiah*, in *VT* 9 (1959) 178-191.

98. DIRKSEN, *Old* (n. 95), pp. 258f.

99. So VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 298.

100. *Ibid.*, p. 295. M.P. WEITZMAN, *Lexical Clues to the Composition of the Old Testament Peshitta*, in M.J. GELLER et al. (eds.), *Studia Aramaica: New Sources and New Approaches* (JSSSup, 4), Oxford, 1995, 217-262, p. 245, argues for a date at about the time of the Bar-Kokhba revolt.

own time of composition (i.e., the textual form between Qumran and the *Leningradensis*), a value which is, unfortunately, diminished by the comparatively late appearance of the Syriac text in the manuscripts. The application of common exegetical methods, however, does seem to permit at the same time the individuation of a certain specific profile which also becomes manifest in the translation of Isa 42,1-4.

## 2. *The Profile of the Peshitta of Isa 42,1-4*

An analysis of the Peshitta of Isa 42,1-4 indicates that at least this passage corresponds very closely to MT, whereas both LXX (as has been shown) and Targum (as will be indicated in the next chapter) do not, but provide their own interpretations and fit them into the text. As there are very significant differences between the translation of the Septuagint and the Targum – the LXX version being much less close to MT –, at least the passage of Isa 42,1-4 in the Syrian can in theory be adduced to support MT, which must have been extremely close to its *Vorlage*. The precise milieu of the Peshitta of Isaiah is extremely hard to grasp, and the question whether this translation originated from a Jewish or Christian background is still an open one<sup>101</sup>. The methodical framework of the translator is easier to individuate. For even though Septuagint, Peshitta and Targum share a common exegetical background, it is hard to believe, on the basis of this passage, that they derive from a common (Aramaic) ancestor. If they all derive from a text more or less resembling MT, which is extremely plausible in the case of the Targum and the Peshitta<sup>102</sup> and quite plausible for the Septuagint, they have applied their interpretative techniques in a markedly different fashion. The text of the Peshitta version according to the critical edition by Sebastian Brock<sup>103</sup> reads:

<sup>1</sup> ܟܠ ܠܒܢܝ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ  
 ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ ܫܘܪܝܢܐ  
<sup>2</sup> ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ  
<sup>3</sup> ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ  
 ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ ܠܐ ܝܫܘܥ

101. A Christian background has sometimes been proposed due to the translation “our Lifegiver / Redeemer” in Isa 25,6-8, but it is not at all clear why this should only refer to Christ and not to God. Other renderings, too, are quite susceptible to Christian interpretation, but no such passage has yet been accepted beyond doubt. Cf. A. GELSTON, *Was the Peshitta of Isaiah of Christian Origin?*, in BROYLES – EVANS (eds.), *Writing* (n. 11), 563-582.

102. The fact that the Old Testament Peshitta was directly translated from MT and not from the LXX (as many other Christian versions, such as the Armenian translation), may bear on its origin, cf. GELSTON, *Peshitta* (n. 101), p. 581.

103. S.P. BROCK, *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version 3.1: Isaias*, Leiden, 1987.

4 ܠܗ ܢܘܨܝܢ ܗܘܐ ܢܘܨܝܢ  
 ܘܢܘܨܝܢ ܘܢܘܨܝܢ ܘܢܘܨܝܢ  
 ܘܢܘܨܝܢ ܘܢܘܨܝܢ ܘܢܘܨܝܢ

<sup>1</sup>Behold my servant – I have sustained. And as to my chosen one: My soul is pleased.

I have given my spirit upon him, he has brought judgment to the nations.

<sup>2</sup>He will not cry and not shout and will not make his voice heard outside.

<sup>3</sup>He will not break the crushed reed  
and not quench the flickering lamp.

Indeed he will reveal a judgment.

<sup>4</sup>He does not become dim and does not flicker,  
until he will have established a judgment on earth,  
and the islands will expect faithfully his law.

The internal tradition of the Syriac text does not present too many major problems. Some manuscripts (6h3, 9a1, 12a1, 12d2) omit the final *yudh* in ܘܢܘܨܝܢ in v. 1, but this is clearly an inferior reading, as the possessive suffix is supported MT as well as all the other witnesses and is also required by the parallelism with ܘܢܘܨܝܢ in the first stichos. A more serious question concerns the reading of ܘܢܘܨܝܢ in v. 3 – some manuscripts (7a1, 1111) have ܘܢܘܨܝܢ, i.e., a passive form (it could be theoretically *ethpeel* or *ethpael*, as both have the passive meaning “to be broken”). This is strong evidence, since 7a1 (Ms B 21 Inferiore of the Ambrosiana in Milan) is the best Syriac manuscript for the whole Old Testament including Apocrypha<sup>104</sup>, and a ܢ could have easily dropped out due to haplography or due to harmonization with MT and the other versions, which read an active verb here. In this case, it may be best not to decide the question whether the correspondence with MT and the other textual witnesses is secondary or original and just indicate the problem with the reading ܘܢܘܨܝܢ as does Brock in his text. For ܘܢܘܨܝܢ in the same verse, 9a1<sup>fam</sup> reads the imperfect ܘܢܘܨܝܢ which matches MT, LXX, Targum, and Vulgate and therefore may be considered a harmonization with the mainstream of the textual tradition, although M.P. Weitzman has clearly demonstrated that 9a1<sup>fam</sup> also contains ancient readings<sup>105</sup>. Brock, in any case, prints the *lectio difficilior*, i.e., the perfect ܘܢܘܨܝܢ.

#### (a) A Fairly Literal Translation

A comparison of the Peshitta text of this passage with MT and the other ancient versions emphasizes that the Peshitta generally agrees with MT against Septuagint and Targum, since their explanatory additions in

104. It has therefore been chosen by the Peshitta Institute, Leiden, as the base text for the critical edition.

105. M.P. WEITZMAN, *The Originality of Unique Readings in Peshitta MS 9a1*, in P.B. DIRKSEN – M.J. MULDER (eds.), *The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History* (MPIL, 4), Leiden, 1988, 225-258.

v. 1 (the interpretation of the Servant as the People of Israel in LXX, see above) and v. 3 (the interpretation of the reed and the lamp as the poor in the Targum, see below) are absent. Furthermore, the Peshitta even imitates the terse style of the Hebrew of v. 1, where it translates the expression  $\text{בְּחִירֵי נַפְשֵׁי רִצְתָהּ נִפְשֵׁי}$  literally with  $\text{ܨܚܘܢܝܗܘܢ ܨܚܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$  (see above for the variant without the final *yudh*), i.e., without inserting a  $\text{ܐ}$  before and a resumptive pronoun afterwards, which would be much closer to normal Syriac prose style – exactly this has been done in the Aramaic Targum (see below). Instead, the Peshitta seems to sacrifice clarity to literalness in this point. But still it has a more harmonic text since it omits the indirect object  $\text{ܒܘ}$  after  $\text{ܐܘܢܩܘܡܗܘܢ}$  in the same verse by simply reading  $\text{ܨܚܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$ . Since the reading of MT is confirmed by (methodically) so diverse translations as Septuagint ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$ ), Targum (a pronominal suffix for the direct object:  $\text{ܐܘܩܪܒܝܗܘܢ}$ ) and Vulgate (*eum*), the text of MT is presumably original. So either the Peshitta had an otherwise completely unattested *Vorlage* without the  $\text{ܒܘ}$  or it has consciously dropped the  $\text{ܒܘ}$  in order to have a more balanced verse. This is grammatically possible, since  $\text{ܨܚܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$  functions both as a transitive and an intransitive verb<sup>106</sup>. On the other hand, the Peshitta prefers an easier reading in v. 3, having  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$  (“in truth”) for  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$  (presumably “as truth”)<sup>107</sup>, as if the preposition were  $\text{ܒ}$ , just like the Vulgate (*in*), while Septuagint ( $\epsilon\lambda\zeta$ ) and Targum ( $\text{ܒ}$ ) agree with MT.

The literalness of the Peshitta translation is also illuminated by its translation of v. 4, especially the phrase  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$ . It thus exactly reproduces the figurative language of the Hebrew (two verbs from the semantic field of the similes in v. 3 – although there the Peshitta has “flickering lamp” instead of “smouldering wick”, as in MT, and so presents a more striking image –, which are now applied to the Servant) and even arrives at a certain consistency (the double  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$  in v. 3 and v. 4 is both times translated with the *palpel* of  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$ ), whereas Targum and Vulgate “naturalize” the image by using verbs with square with the Servant as subject (“to become tired”, “to become dreary”) and not with the reed or the wick respectively. The Septuagint, for that matter, advances an even stronger interpretation of this verse (see above). From these facts it emerges that at least in this case the Peshitta seems to be directly dependent on the Hebrew text, presumably in a form rather close to MT, while a cross-influence of the Septuagint, which occurs at times in Isaiah in the Peshitta, cannot be detected here. The reading  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$ , i.e., a Greek loan-word, for  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$  in v. 4 is no proof in favour of such a view, since a) the reading  $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in the Septuagint is only hypothetical (Ziegler postulates it as original by assuming a corruption due to a scribal error, but there is no direct evidence for this, see above) and b)  $\text{ܘܢܘܨܘܢܝܗܘܢ}$  is a normal word in Syriac which does by no means point to any influence of the

106. Cf. J. PAYNE SMITH (= Mrs. MARGOLIOUTH), *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford, 1903, s.v. (pp. 380f).

107. BALTZER, *Deutero-Jesaja* (n. 29), p. 175.

Septuagint<sup>108</sup>. Hence the thesis of a common ancestor to Septuagint, Targum and Peshitta is, at least from the point of view of Isa 42,1-4, rather doubtful, as Septuagint and Targum render this passage fairly freely, while the Peshitta sticks closely to what appears to have been its *Vorlage*, a text rather similar to MT. Only a striking similarity between the Peshitta version of Isa 42,2 and Mt 12,19 could theoretically point to a common Aramaic background and shall therefore be treated separately.

(b) Isa 42,2 and Mt 12,19 – A Common Aramaic Tradition in the Background?

The comparison of Isa 42,2 with Mt 12,19 is puzzling. For instead of the presumably elliptical expression  $\text{אָרְבָּתָא וְלֵא} \text{אָרְבָּתָא}$  in MT, the Peshitta, together with the other ancient Syriac versions S and C, translates  $\text{ܐܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ}$ . The rest of this verse is rendered literally. In Syriac, the *aphel* of  $\text{ܐܘܨܘܢܐ}$  means “to shout”, hence the Syriac rendering is not a slavish imitation of the Hebrew text, but still literal. Now Mt 12,19 has οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κρυσγάσει, which *may* be based on an original interpretation which perhaps circulated orally (like other similarities to Septuagint and Targum, this does not prove the existence of a *written* ancestor) in an Aramaic-speaking milieu which interpreted the Hebrew text in a way somehow similar to the Peshitta (where it idiomatically renders the Hebrew). Subsequently, such a reading could have been reanalyzed in the light of the very familiar Hebrew root  $\text{רִיב}$ , “to quarrel”.

This remains a possibility, but its value is significantly weakened by the observation that a root  $\text{ܐܘܨܘܢܐ}$  “to shout”, is only attested in Syriac, not in Palestinian Aramaic, which would have been the language in which such an interpretation of the Hebrew circulated, if it indeed ever existed. Although the idiom of the Peshitta may perhaps share some common features with a Palestinian dialect<sup>109</sup>, this is serious counter-evidence and may suggest that the rendering in Mt does not depend on the Peshitta of this verse<sup>110</sup>. Perhaps another possible explanation is that the expression

108. See J. LUND, *Grecisms in the Peshitta Psalms*, in P.B. DIRKSEN – A. VAN DER KOOIJ (eds.), *The Peshitta as a Translation. Papers Read at the II Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden 19-21 August 1993* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute, 8), Leiden, 1995, 85-102.

109. B.J. ROBERTS, *The Old Testament Text and Versions*, Cardiff, 1951, p. 218.

110. The argument advanced by GUNDRY, *Use* (n. 70), pp. 113f, accepted by W.D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (ICC), Edinburgh, 1991, Vol. 2, *ad loc.* (ἐρίζειν = “to quarrel with words”, i.e., it derives directly from  $\text{ܐܘܨܘܢܐ}$ ), seems faulty: From the point of view of semantics, these are two different things. Moreover, at least the various books of the Septuagint translate  $\text{ܐܘܨܘܢܐ}$  almost always with lexemes which essentially mean “to shout”, and never with ἐρίζειν (cf. T. MURAOKA, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint: Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance*, Grand Rapids, 1998, p. 126), while ἐρίζειν reflects  $\text{גָּרָה}$  (2 Kgs 14,10) and  $\text{מָרָה}$  (1 Sam 12,14s). So the idiom of Biblical Greek maintains the semantic difference between these two verbs.

οὐκ ἔρῖσει has been motivated by the context, esp. Mt 12,15 – Jesus departs when becoming aware of the Pharisees' plan to kill him<sup>111</sup>.

## V. THE TARGUM

Although the value of the Targum for an approximation to the presumable original text of Isa 42,1-4 is fairly limited, because it is an actualizing interpretation rather than a faithful translation<sup>112</sup>, a brief investigation is nonetheless worthwhile. Such an analysis illustrates the history of interpretation of the passage and sheds some light on the exegetical methods and translation technique used by the author of the Targum. Some observations made here regarding the theology of the Isaiah Targum appear to have been neglected by scholarly literature. Since other versions, especially the Septuagint, share a good deal of these methods, a study of the Aramaic version can indeed contribute to a deeper appreciation also of those translations which have a more immediate bearing on the history of the Hebrew text. The reason is an awareness of the methodological canon and the exegetical questions raised in early Jewish biblical scholarship constitutes a serviceable tool for distinguishing between what is likely to be a translator's interpretation and the reading of his *Vorlage*. Such a common background in method and interpretation of the Targum and the other ancient versions seems all the more likely once one accepts an early date of composition, like AD 132, forcefully argued for by Arie van der Kooij<sup>113</sup>, at least for the original exegetical framework (a theory first advanced by Bruce Chilton in 1982 enriches this view by the hypothesis of a second exegetical framework of the Isaiah Targum in the fourth century<sup>114</sup>, but this does not rule out that the interpretation of Isa 42,1-4 belongs to the earlier substratum). The rendering of the Targum is as follows:

אהא עבדי אקרבניה בחירי דאתרעי ביה מימרי  
 אתין רוח קודשי עלוהי דיני לעממין יגלי  
 ללא יצוח ולא יכלי ולא ירים בברא קליה  
 לענותניא דכקני רעיע לא יתבר וחשיכיא דכבוצין עמי לא יטפי  
 לקושטיה יפיק דינא

111. Cf. also J. BEATON, *Messiah and Justice: A Key to Matthew's Use of Isaiah 42,1-4*, in *JSNT* 75 (1999) 5-23, here p. 8.

112. Cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 161.

113. See VAN DER KOOIJ, *ibid.*, pp. 171, 195-197: Since the Targum appears to allude to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 (esp. in the case of its rendering of Isa 32,14), this is a clear *terminus post quem*, while its presumable ignorance of the Bar Kosiba revolt suggests a date before AD 135. An independent linguistic analysis of the Aramaic also argues for a date earlier than AD 135 (p. 187). For alternative views cf. pp. 182ff (KOCH: AD 70; CHURGIN: time of Rabbi Aqiba; LE DÉAUT: 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> c. AD; LEVEY: ca. AD 900).

114. Cf. now the summary by B. CHILTON, *Two in One: Renderings of the Book of Isaiah in Targum Jonathan*, in BROYLES – EVANS (eds.), *Writing* (n. 11), 547-562.

ללא יהלי ולא ילאי עד דיתקין בארעא דינא  
ולאורייתיה גוון יכתרון

<sup>1</sup>Behold my servant, I will bring him near, my chosen one in whom my decision is pleased.

I will put my holy spirit upon him, he will reveal my judgment to the peoples.

<sup>2</sup>He will not call out nor shout nor lift up his voice outside.

<sup>3</sup>He will not break the humble ones who are like a crushed reed, and he will not quench the poor ones who are like a dimly burning wick.

He will bring forth judgment in his truth.

<sup>4</sup>He will not become tired nor weary, until he will have established judgment on earth

and the islands will be waiting for his law.

The text followed here is the one of the manuscript **2211** of the British Museum. Although it does not always present the best text throughout and there is still room for discussion regarding its overall value as a textual witness, it has been adopted mainly because both critical editions, the one of John Stenning<sup>115</sup> no less than the one of Alexander Sperber<sup>116</sup>, use it as their textual basis. Although Stenning corrects BM **2211** in several places, this manuscript has not yet been replaced by another standard text. The general profile of this particular Aramaic version shall be established by means of an analysis of certain characteristic features of technique and interpretation.

### 1. *Harmonizations*

The translation technique as such of this passage in the Targum has left its traces in several harmonizations which lead to a stylistically more consistent and unified text. Particularly noteworthy is the rendering of the *qatal* נתתי in MT with the Aramaic imperfect אמתין in v. 1, since this is a departure from the fairly usual Targumic practice of translating a Hebrew *qatal* with an Aramaic perfect and a Hebrew *yiqtol* with an Aramaic imperfect. While especially a Hebrew *yiqtol* form is frequently rendered in a fashion not corresponding to this norm<sup>117</sup>, the usage of an Aramaic imperfect for a Hebrew *qatal* form is much less common and calls for explanation. Presumably it can be most easily understood as an instance of harmonization, because *yiqtol* is the dominant verbal form in the Hebrew text. Since the translator may well have been reluctant to see a difference in the *qatal* נתתי as opposed to the other *yiqtol* forms and thus understood all the verbal forms alike as future-time references<sup>118</sup>, such a harmonizing translation is feasible. Alternatively, his translation can perhaps grammatically also be justified by the assumption that he understood the *qatal*

115. J.F. STENNING, *The Targum of Isaiah*, Oxford, 1949.

116. A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, Vol. 3: *The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*, Leiden, 1962.

117. Cf. D.M. GOLOMB, *A Grammar of Targum Neofiti* (HSM, 34), Chico, 1985, p. 121.

118. See the copious material presented by S. BOMBECK, *Das althebräische Verbal-system aus aramäischer Sicht: Masoretischer Text, Targume und Peschitta*, Frankfurt/Main, 1997, for a documentation of the ample use of the Aramaic imperfect for future-time.

form as performative, i.e., the donation with the spirit took place at the moment of the very presentation of the servant<sup>119</sup>. However, performative utterances tend to favour a participle in later Aramaic. Perhaps the translator thought of a prophetic perfect which did not exist in Aramaic (Dan 7,27 is a different case, since the perfect there rather seems to refer back to the vision in 7,14)<sup>120</sup>? Interestingly, the future tense  $\theta\eta\sigma\omega$  in Mt 12,18 presents exactly the same change, but this may witness to an analogous interpretation of this passage around the first century AD rather than a direct dependence of any kind.

This explanation is confirmed by the fact that the Targumic translation of this passage exhibits other instances of a clear harmonization in comparison with MT, which may suggest that the more unified outlook of the Aramaic text is likely to result from a particular translation technique rather than a different *Vorlage* – this is most obvious in the case of  $\text{נְתַחֵן} / \text{נְתַחֵן}$ , since there is no reason at all for postulating an original Hebrew text reading a *yiqtol* form, and MT is indeed confirmed by LXX and Vulgate, which both read past tense forms ( $\xi\delta\omega\kappa\alpha$ <sup>121</sup> and *dedi*). Hence it also appears reasonable to attribute other examples of stylistic unification to the translator. Such examples consist the addition of a possessive suffix to  $\text{דִּינִי}$  (MT:  $\text{מִלְשַׁפְּטִי}$ ), apparently due to the fact that in the Hebrew *all* the preceding nouns have a first person possessive suffix as well. The same applies to the addition of a third person masculine possessive suffix to  $\text{לְקוֹשְׁטִיא}$  in v. 3 (“his truth”), as opposed to the mere  $\text{אֱמֶת}$  in MT, which might be considered as a harmonization with  $\text{קְלִיָּה}$  in v. 2 and  $\text{אוֹרֵייתִיה}$  in v. 4 – at least if the text is sound. The variant reading  $\text{לְקוֹשְׁטִיא}$  (“the truth” instead of “his truth”) in the Second Rabbinic Bible, the Antwerp Polyglot and the Bodleian MS 2617 would then have to be seen as a harmonization with MT, although it has been accepted by Stenning<sup>122</sup>. Throughout the Isaiah Targum, especially the pronominal suffixes have been harmonized<sup>123</sup>, so that evidence of this kind is of little positive value with respect to a presumable reading of the Hebrew text in the background.

Moreover, the elliptical expression  $\text{רְצָתָהּ בְּנַפְשִׁי}$  (one would expect a further specification like “in him”) in v. 1 is rendered syntactically smoother

119. Cf. B.K. WALTKE – M. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake, 1990, §30.5.1d. Such a performative use of the *qatal* is also attested by its cognate forms in other Semitic languages, for example various Aramaic dialects, Phoenician and Arabic; a reliable statement on Targumic Aramaic is at present difficult, because its verbal syntax has not been investigated thoroughly (and independently from the Hebrew) up to now.

120. See H. GZELLA, *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen* (VOK, 48), Wiesbaden, 2004, 237-242.

121. The Greek aorist serves as the normal way of translating a Hebrew *qatal* in the Septuagint, cf. J. BARR, *Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts*, in C.E. COX (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Jerusalem 1986*, Atlanta, 1987, 381-403, pp. 384ff.

122. See his note in the apparatus *ad loc.*: “Read  $\text{לְקוֹשְׁטִיא}$  O'R<sup>L</sup>”.

123. Cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 177: “Das Suffix im Targ stellt wohl eine Harmonisierung mit dem Kontext dar”.

by translating it with a relative clause, *מימרי דאתרעי ביה*, which fits much easier into the rest of the sentence. In v. 2 there is some further reworking, since instead of a sequence of two verbs of shouting followed by one causative verb (“let his voice be heard”, *hiphil*), as in MT, the Aramaic text has three verbs of shouting – the last of which, “he lifts up his voice”, presumably corresponds to the second in MT (ישא with an implied direct object “his voice”, i.e., an elliptical expression for an originally transitive construction<sup>124</sup>), while the two preceding verbs (צווח and כלא II<sup>125</sup>) are intransitive and semantically synonymous. So instead of an intransitive verb, an elliptical form of a transitive construction and a causative construction with direct object, as in MT, the Targum has two intransitive verbs followed by a transitive verb with its direct object specified. Hence, the Aramaic text presents less stylistic variation and a greater uniformity.

Interestingly, this harmonizing tendency is *not* at work in the translation of the two very similar phrases *לְאַמַּת לְגוֹיִם יוֹצִיא מְשַׁפֵּט* in v. 1 and *לְאַמַּת לְגוֹיִם יוֹצִיא מְשַׁפֵּט* in v. 3. While the Targum renders *יצא מְשַׁפֵּט* in v. 3 quite literally with *לקושטיה יפיק דינא*, it introduces the idea of “revealing” God’s judgment to the nations in v. 1 (*גילי דיני לעממין*). The phrase *יפיק דינא* in v. 3 indicates that the translator apparently had no problem with imitating the rather strange and idiomatic expression “to bring forth judgment”, which in turn gives rise to the question why the same phrase in two almost subsequent verses is translated with two different verbs. This marked variation may, however, be motivated by the translator’s fondness of the idea of a revelation of God’s kingdom, which he introduces into the text quite a number of times (24,23; 31,4; 40,9; 52,7 and elsewhere)<sup>126</sup>. Maybe this idea of revelation is also in the background of the translation *אקרבניה*, “I will bring him near”, instead of MT’s *אֶתְמַדְּבּוֹ*, “I uphold him”. Therefore he may have used the double occurrence of *יצא* in order to allude to one of his theological key-concepts while translating the other, parallel instance literally, thus following his tendency to transport everything already contained in the Hebrew text, but enriching it with additional explanations and interpretations. Such an opportunity could well have overridden the otherwise prevailing tendency apparent in the attempt to achieve a harmonic target text.

## 2. *Divine Transcendence and the Question of Messianism*

With respect to the theological outlook of this passage in the Targum, there is an interesting internal variant of the Aramaic textual tradition in

124. If one does not want to take *קולו* at the end of the verse as a postponed object with another verb intervening (cf. Num 14,1) or indeed a double-duty direct object of both preceding verbs, which is, however, unlikely, since the parallelism with *יצעק* would argue in favour of a verb without a direct object (so, too, NORTH, *Suffering* [n. 10], p. 117).

125. See G. DALMAN, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, Göttingen, <sup>3</sup>1938 (repr. Hildesheim, 1997), s.v. Cf. Am 1,2; Jo 4,16 for the specific meaning “roar” (NORTH, *Suffering* [n. 10], p. 117).

126. Cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 174.

v. 1: Instead of **הא עבדי**, some textual witnesses insert a reference to the Messiah, reading **הא עבדי משיהא**. The rather wide attestation of this variant indicates that it bears some weight, for it is found in many of the early printed editions, i.e., the First Rabbinic Bible (1515-1517), the Second Rabbinic Bible (1524-1525) and the Antwerp Polyglot (1569-1573). That this variant is *not* one of the secondary changes of these editions, which often tend to accommodate the Aramaic text with the Hebrew one<sup>127</sup>, is confirmed by the fact that it also has a basis in the manuscript tradition, that is, in the Jews' College Manuscript and, most notably, the *Codex Reuchlinianus*. But although the latter is the oldest surviving manuscript, it is certainly not the most reliable one, as it contains a number of expansive additions and reflects a comparatively late text type<sup>128</sup>.

Furthermore the observation that an analogous, specific identification of the Servant can be found in the Septuagint as well (though *materialiter* a different one, namely as the People of Israel, see above for details), strongly suggests that in principle the identification of the enigmatic Servant was a firmly established exegetical practice and that Septuagint and Targum in this point shared, in principle, a common methodological background, but achieved different individual results, because they drew their answers to the question of the Servant's identity from different parts of the context. Moreover, the addition **משיהא** is consistent with other messianic interpretations in the Targum: A reference to the Messiah is added in 52,13, cf. also 28,5; such an identification presumably gave rise to the messianic variant reading in 42,1<sup>129</sup>. Hence it is very unlikely that either the addition found in the Septuagint or the one in the Targum reflects a different *Vorlage*, even if one accepts it as the original reading of the Isaiah-Targum and corrects the standard text provided by Stenning and Sperber (which is not unproblematic, as the *Codex Reuchlinianus* is undoubtedly not a first-rate manuscript). Of course this does not argue against the otherwise strongly attested messianic outlook of this Targum.

The rendering of the second half of this stichos as **בחירי דאתרעי ביה מימרי**, however, is a clear instance of theologically motivated translation. The rendering of **נפשי**, "my soul", as in MT, with **מימרי**, "my decision" (a key-word in contexts of election and punishment in the Isaiah-Targum) is indebted to exegesis rather than to an alternative Hebrew reading, for it avoids the obvious anthropomorphism of crediting God with a **נפש**. Such an avoidance of anthropomorphisms is amply attested in Targumic translation technique<sup>130</sup>, although, just as in the Septuagint, it is never consistently applied. Nonetheless, the use of **מימרי** could have appeared very

127. See B.D. CHILTON, *The Isaiah Targum* (The Aramaic Bible, 11), Edinburgh, 1987, p. XXXI (basing himself for the most part on Sperber's observations).

128. *Ibid.*, p. xxx.

129. See R.A. AYTOUN, *The Servant of the Lord in the Targum*, in *JTS* 23 (1921-22) 172-180 (esp. 174f); P. SEIDELIN, *Der Ebed Jahwe und die Messiasgestalt im Jesaja-targum*, in *ZNW* 35 (1936) 194-231.

130. M.L. KLEIN, *The Translation of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Targums* (VT.S. 32), Leiden, 1981, pp. 162-177.

convenient in the light of an interpretation of נפש as “will, intention”, but the connotations of מימרי, even if it is intended not as the avoidance of an anthropomorphism, but as a literal translation, still add a different nuance to the text. Particularly in the Isaiah-Targum this lexeme often furnished the translator with a possibility to introduce one of his theological key-terms instead of a Hebrew word which he simply did not wish to copy literally<sup>131</sup>. Another attempt to emphasize divine transcendence might be the plus ריח קודש in v. 1, where MT only reads ריחי. Again, מימרי for נפש as a clear example of an interpretative translation technique makes it plausible that the same theological conception has also influenced the rendering of ריחי with ריח קודש. Thus it is not necessary to postulate a different *Vorlage*, but the Targumic reading matches the interpretative principles applied elsewhere in this as well.

### 3. “Armenfrömmigkeit” and Interpretation of Images

Another very striking feature of this Targumic translation consists in its interpretation of the images. This is especially apparent in v. 3, which has, due to its rather enigmatic character, undergone certain explanatory additions in other versions (most prominently in the Greek ones) as well. In the Targum, both images, the “crushed reed” and the “burning wick”, have been deciphered by means of two parallel relative clauses reducing the similes to explicit comparisons with the “humble” and the “poor”, as the preposition כ indicates. In terms of method, this is not wholly unlike the explicit identification of the Servant in v. 1 with the People of Israel, as it has become part of the text itself in the Septuagint. Within the Targum of Isaiah as such, poetic images and metaphors are generally either directly interpreted, or their nature as a mere comparison is emphasized, like in this place, by means of a כ<sup>132</sup>. Thus the explanation adapts itself to the style of the original text by maintaining the *parallelismus membrorum*, but at the same time it shifts the actual focus of the expression from a rather open and ambiguous image to a precise statement concerning the mercy the Servant will have with the עוֹתֵינִיא and the חֲשִׁיא. These two entities are now the direct objects of the two verbs לֹא יִתְבַּר and לֹא יִטְפִי, while the original metaphors now function as mere appositions. So the Targum presents a less metaphorical and more straightforward view of the Servant’s working, while at the same time incorporating the original imagery (yet subordinating it to a more “naturalistic” reading). Such an approach is consistent with the usual practice to leave figu-

131. So, too, B.D. CHILTON, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSSOTS, 23), Sheffield, 1982, p. 137 n. 2: “The programmatic avoidance of anthropomorphism was especially occasioned by v. 1a, where ‘my soul’ in the MT was replaced by the meturgeman with ‘my memra’”.

132. For examples for the frequent interpretation of images and metaphors cf. J. RIBERA FLORIT, *El Targum de Isaías: La versión aramea del profeta Isaías* (Biblioteca Midrásica, 6), Valencia, 1988, pp. 29-32.

rative language in the text, but to furnish it with additional explanations<sup>133</sup>.

The actual interpretation the translator presents for this double image is extremely interesting, for the prominence of the poor apparently reflects a certain interpretative and exegetical tendency in Early Judaism which can clearly be observed elsewhere, too: In the LXX Psalter, for example, there are, with respect to MT, numerous additions – many of them very similar to the ones in this Targumic passage – and slight alterations in favour of the poor and the needy. These renderings unambiguously hint at a strong emphasis on “Armenfrömmigkeit” in certain exegetical schools, namely a reading of Biblical texts which explicitly takes into account the needs of the humble and the lowly (the underlying idea includes material poverty, but is not restricted to it)<sup>134</sup>. The assumption of an early date for the Targum to the Prophets and Judaea as its provenance<sup>135</sup> makes such a comparison even more pertinent. Since a great similarity in method (that is, an exegetical addition) as well as in content can be detected here, it appears extremely probable to conclude that in this case, too, the Isaiah Targum applies a widespread interpretative technique. This certainly argues against the value of these additions as witnesses to a Hebrew text different from MT, and at the same time it individuates a characteristic feature of the theology of the Isaiah Targum which has been completely ignored so far by modern studies (such as the monograph by Chilton). Furthermore, the Targum also “naturalizes” the figurative language of the Hebrew text in v. 4 in stating that the Servant will not become “tired” (לֹא הִלָּא and לֹא אָהָה are largely synonymous), while MT by means of a chiasmus maintains the image of the burning wick and the crushed reed of the preceding verse. Hence it reads לֹא יִכָּהֶה, “he will not become dim”, and וְלֹא יִרְוץ, “he will not break”. This Targumic rendering, in turn, is analogous to the translation of the Vulgate (see below). This fashion of interpreting the poetic images might have something to do with a possible educational origin of the Targumim, with the liturgical use being secondary<sup>136</sup>, but clarity is hard to achieve here. In general, van der Kooij’s conclusion, i.e., that the *Vorlage* of the Targum to Isaiah is generally identical with MT<sup>137</sup>, is confirmed by an attempt which seeks to explain the interpretational differences between both texts.

133. See VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 176: “Bei Vergleichen verfährt der Übersetzer so, dass er sie einerseits übernimmt, andererseits aber auch seine Deutung hinzufügt”.

134. See H. GZELLA, *Die Wiege des griechischen David: Die Diskussion um den Ursprung des Septuaginta-Psalter in der neueren Forschung*, in E. ZENGER (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (HBS, 32), Freiburg u.a., 2001, 19–47, pp. 34–42, with many examples.

135. Cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 187.

136. At least this is the point of W.F. SMELIK, *The Targum of Judges*, Leiden, 1995.

137. So VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 175.

## VI. THE LATIN VERSIONS

For the textual tradition of Isa 42,1-4 in Latin, there is ample documentation thanks to the Vulgate by Jerome (whose understanding of the Hebrew text can be further illuminated by his commentary, which often does not only provide the corresponding lemma, but also a paraphrase) and quotations in the Latin Fathers. These quotations have been collected in the corresponding *Vetus Latina* volume dedicated to Isaiah.

1. *The Vulgate*

The value of the Vulgate for textual criticism is conditioned by the fact that Jerome made ample use of the Greek versions for his translation, although in general he preferred to follow the Hebrew text<sup>138</sup>. A detailed comparison of the Latin and the Hebrew text is, however, especially fruitful in the light of the hypothesis advanced by Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein<sup>139</sup>, who tried to challenge the *communis opinio* by arguing that Jerome's Hebrew *Vorlage* represented a different textual tradition than MT<sup>140</sup>. At least the passage under examination provides little evidence for such a view, as it appears to be a fairly literal translation matching the general character of the Vulgate of Isaiah<sup>141</sup>, but there are a few interesting points to raise. The text reads as follows:

<sup>1</sup>ecce servus meus suscipiam eum electus meus conplacuit sibi in illo anima mea

dedi spiritum meum super eum iudicium gentibus proferet

<sup>2</sup>non clamabit neque accipiet personam nec audietur foris vox eius

<sup>3</sup>calamum quassatum non conteret et linum fumigans non extinguet in veritate educet iudicium

<sup>4</sup>non erit tristis neque turbulentus donec ponat in terra iudicium et legem eius insulae expectabunt

<sup>1</sup>Behold my servant, I shall uphold him, my chosen one – my soul delights in him.

I have given my spirit upon him, he will bring forth judgment to the nations.

<sup>2</sup>He will not cry nor will he regard a person nor will he voice be heard outside.

<sup>3</sup>The shaken reed he will not crush and the burning wick he will not extinguish,

in truth he will bring out judgment.

138. See B. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, *Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah*, in *Textus* 4 (1964) 176-210, p. 176.

139. B. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, *The Vulgate as a Translation: Some Semantic and Syntactical Aspects of Jerome's Version of the Hebrew Bible*, Diss. Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1968.

140. He has been severely criticized by VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), who concluded (p. 319) that the Hebrew text on the basis of which Jerome wrote his translation of Isaiah corresponds to MT.

141. See VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 300.

<sup>4</sup>He will not be dreary nor disturbed until he establishes a judgment on earth;  
and the islands will expect his law.

The internal variants of the textual tradition of the Vulgate for this passage are only minute. In fact, variation is restricted to the reading *profert* (present tense) instead of *proferet* (future tense) in v. 1, which is documented by the textual witnesses C, Σ, A, S, and T; this may be a *lectio faciliior*, since it is the less common grammatical form (while a corruption from *proferet* to *profert* can be easily explained on grounds of pronunciation). The different word-order *vox eius foris* in v. 2 in c instead of *foris vox eius*, in turn, is hardly significant for interpretation.

As to the divergences from MT: The addition *in illo* in v. 1 appears to be an insertion in order to make the sentence smoother (a similar path has been taken by the Targum) and might have been inspired by the pronoun αὐτόν in the LXX translation, which furnishes the direct object of a transitive verb, whereas the Vulgate inserts an indirect object. All these renderings appear to be attempts to make the terse style of the Hebrew phrase more readable. On the basis of *nec audietur* in v. 2 it has been proposed that the hiph. form יִשְׁמַע was written defectively as יִשְׁמַע in Jerome's *Vorlage*, consequently understood as either a *niphal* or a *qal* (with impersonal subject)<sup>142</sup> and therefore translated with a passive form<sup>143</sup>. But the passive rendering may well go back to the LXX version (οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται)<sup>144</sup>, which Jerome used to consult frequently. The translation *neque accipiet personam* in v. 2, however, confirms MT's לֹא יִשָּׂא פְּנֵי. Yet it is not, as it seems to be at a first glance, an indication of Jerome's failure to understand the elliptical Hebrew expression (the required direct object קוֹל is only implied, and the different solutions of the versions to this problem make it clear that it is unlikely to assume that an original פְּנֵים has dropped out), but an instance of contextual exegesis. For the paraphrase in Jerome's commentary on Isaiah (*levabit in altum vocem suam*, IV,507) sufficiently demonstrates that he understood this phrase, while the wording *neque accipiet personam* recalls his translation of Deut 10,17, where לֹא יִשָּׂא פְּנֵים (in the sense of being impartial) is rendered with *personam non accipit*<sup>145</sup>. Presumably Jerome translated Isa 42,2 in this very manner, too, because he insisted on a forensic sense of מִשְׁפָּט. This translation remains unique within the Latin tradition, since the *Vetus Latina* quotations correspond for the most part to the Hebrew text, while some of them take up the reading ἀνήσει of the Septuagint.

Apart from that, the only remaining major deviation from MT seems to be found in the beginning of v. 4, where the Vulgate reads *non erit tristis*

142. For this phenomenon see C. RABIN, *Ancient Versions and Indefinite Subject*, in *Textus* 2 (1962) 60-76.

143. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, *Vulgate* (n. 139), p. 195.

144. So VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen* (n. 20), p. 311.

145. Cf. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, *Vulgate* (n. 139), p. 195 n. 33.

*neque turbulentus*, i.e., it interprets the image and explains it by means of two *adjectives*. Yet the Hebrew text has the *verbs* “become dim” instead of “be dreary” and “break” instead of “be disturbed” and thus keeps up the figurative language by taking over the simile of the burning wick and the crushed reed from the preceding verse. The fact that the Targum deciphers the image likewise, but understands the meaning “to be tired” instead of “to be dreary” (see above), may suggest that the method applied is analogous (did Jerome learn about this from his Jewish masters in Scripture?), while the actual outcome is different. Strikingly, the Vulgate also mirrors the stylistic variation in its rendering of **טַרְשָׁן מִשָּׁפַי**, which has already been observed in the case of the Targum. In one instance the Vulgate uses the verb *proferre* (v. 1), in the other one, however, it has the verb *educere* (v. 3), yet apparently without the theological nuances present in the Targumic translation (see above). These brief observations appear to corroborate the widespread classification of the Vulgate of Isaiah as a faithful translation of a *Vorlage* which is at least very close to MT. Nonetheless, traces of stylistic improvements and exegesis (particularly in v. 2 and at the beginning of v. 4) can be determined.

## 2. Quotations in the Early Latin Fathers

The *Vetus Latina* fragments of this passage do not seem to conserve variants of major importance, but follow, as one would expect, the Septuagint<sup>146</sup>. The early Latin versions thereby do in any case reflect the textual variation esp. of v. 3 in the LXX (see above) in that the variation between *fractam*, *confractam*, *contusam* and *quassatam* corresponds to the oscillation of the Greek manuscript tradition between **τεθλασμένον**, **συντεθλασμένον**, **συντετριμμένον** and **τεθραυσμένον**. This evidence allows to conclude that some of these variants are in fact quite old. Especially Augustine is often a faithful witness to the Septuagint tradition and therefore advances the “collective” interpretation of the Servant as the People of Israel by reading *Jacob puer meus* and *Israel electus meus* in v. 1, *cessabit* for **נָשָׂא** (reflecting **ἀνήσει** in the LXX) and *audietur* for **שָׁמַעַי** (LXX: **ἀκουσθήσεται**, the similarity of Jerome’s *audietur* suggests that the rendering in the Vulgate ultimately derives from the LXX as well, see above) in v. 2 as well as *refulgebit* in v. 4, which reflects the Septuagint interpretation **ἀναλάμψει** (“he will shine up”) for MT’s **לֹא יִכְהָה** (“he will not become dim”), and *gentes* (= **ἔθνη** LXX) instead of MT’s **אִיִּים** (“islands”) in the same verse.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the textual history of Isa 42,1-4 has attempted to show that the proto-Masoretic text of Isaiah was with all probability established

146. See R. GRAYSON, *Esaias II* (Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel, 12/2), Freiburg, 1993, pp. 967-976.

as the standard text before the other witnesses existed, since neither the Septuagint nor the Qumran fragments seem to hint at a *Vorlage* recensionally different from MT. The great variation in the translation of individual passages in Septuagint, Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate can thus be best attributed to a great extent to the application of certain exegetical techniques, which share a common methodological background, such as the explanation of similes, but which do, however, not necessarily lead to identical results. From this point of view, the Septuagint and the Targum seem to be the most “creative” versions, while the Peshitta and the Vulgate are more literal, though even they betray traces of a consciously applied interpretative translation technique. For this reason, the Hebrew fragments of Isaiah found at Qumran deserve particular attention for the reconstruction of the original Hebrew text. Together with other pieces of evidence they suggest that a case can be made for correcting MT in two instances, i.e., יִכְבֹּדָה instead of יִכְבֹּדָה in v. 3 (according to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and all the ancient versions) and לֹא instead of לֹא in v. 4 (with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>b</sup>). The evidence of the quotations in the *Vetus Latina* shows, for that matter, that some textual variants in the history of the Septuagint text, which presumably derive from attempts to adjust v. 3 to v. 4, are quite old, while others go back to external harmonizations with the quotation of Isa 42,1-4 in Mt 12,18-21.

Talen en Culturen van het Midden-Oosten  
 Hebreeuws-Aramees  
 Postbus 9515  
 2300 RA Leiden  
 The Netherlands

Holger GZELLA

ABSTRACT. — This study undertakes a meticulous comparison of Isa 42,1-4 in its Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin versions. It tries to demonstrate by means of the analysis of a single passage that the ancient versions can only be adduced as witnesses to the original Hebrew text against the background of their own stylistic and exegetical preferences. A comparison of these respective preferences leads to the conclusion that the versions share a common stock of interpretative methods differently applied to the source text. Hence they are to a different extent influenced by some of the major theological ideas of their time, such as messianism, divine transcendence, or the hitherto unnoticed sympathy for the poor and needy.