

THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH

A critical and exegetical study
of
the Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of Divinity
Rhodes University

In Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Jan Hendrik Leonard Dijkman
November 1960

Preface.

For more than two thousand years the question of the identity of the Servant of Yahweh in Is. 40 - 55, and especially in the so-called " Servant Songs ", has exercised the minds of students of the Old Testament. The first answer which we may trace with any certainty is that of the translator of this particular section in the Septuagint, who adds the words " Jacob " and " Israel " to the text. This is closely followed in the New Testament by the answer which Philip gave to the Ethiopian eunuch's query, " Of whom speaketh the prophet this ? of himself, or of some other ? " (Acts 8:34f.). These two answers are typical of the two possible extremes in solving the problem. The first sees the Servant as a collective entity, the people Israel, while the second sees him as an individual figure, namely, Jesus Christ.

The second answer explains why the interpretation of the Servant figure has been such a live issue throughout the entire history of Christendom. In it Christians have seen a prophecy of Jesus Christ - and more particularly in the suffering of the Servant, a prophecy of the facts which form the basis of the Christian Salvation, the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Until the close of the eighteenth century, the generally accepted interpretation of the figure of the Suffering Servant among Christians was to identify him completely with Christ. With the development of the scientific study of the Old Testament during the last two centuries, every generation has raised the question afresh and sought to answer it. There is hardly an Old Testament scholar who has not laboured over it, and many have published their attempts at a solution.

Hence the literature on the subject is enormous.

In the present study no attempt has been made to give an exhaustive survey of all the interpretations of the Servant figure, but the text of the Servant Songs has been examined before an interpretation of the Servant figure was attempted. It is to be hoped that the final interpretation here given will reflect the thought of the prophet rather than that of the interpreter.

At the outset my indebtedness to Professor C.R. North's book, "The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah", must be acknowledged. I also wish to express my appreciation to the Rev. Dr. W. Cosser, of Rhodes University, under whose careful guidance this study was undertaken and to thank him for his valuable criticism and interest throughout the course of the work. Finally my thanks are due to Mrs. M.A. Frost and Miss J. Melvin for their painstaking work in typing the manuscript.

J.H.L.D.

Grahamstown,

September, 1960.

1. For an extensive bibliography and a masterly review of the different interpretations of the figure of the Servant, cf. C.R. North, "The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah".

List of Abbreviations.

- A = Aquila
- ANET = Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, edited by J.B. Pritchard, Princetown, 1950.
- AV = Authorized Version.
- BDB = Brown - Driver - Briggs, A Hebrew English Lexicon of the Old Testament.
- BH = Biblia Hebraica. Eddit Rudolf Kittel.
- BJRL = Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
- DJ = Deuterocesaja.
- DSIa = The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol.I, edited by Millar Burrows.
- DSIb = The Dead Sea Scrolls, edited by E.L. Sukenik.
- Eng. Tr. = English Translation.
- ET = The Expository Times.
- G = Greek Text.
- G - K = E. Kautsch, " Gensenius' Hebrew Grammar ".
- II Is = Second Isaiah.
- JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature.
- JTS = Journal of Theological Studies.
- KB = Koehler - Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.
- Keth = Kethubim (Written).
- LXX = Septuaginta. Eddit Alfred Rahlfs.
- MSS = Manuscripts.
- MT = Massoretic Text.
- Q = Qerè (Read).
- RV = Revised Version.
- SBT = Studies in Biblical Theology.
- SJT = The Scottish Journal of Theology.
- T = Targum.
- VT = Vetus Testamentum.

Summary.

The study begins with an examination of all the passages which have been suggested as Servant Songs and their precise delimitation. The conclusion reached is that there are four Servant Songs delimited as follows, 42:1 - 4, 49:1 - 6, 50:4 - 9 and 52:13 - 53:12.

The authorship of the Servant Songs is then discussed. The position of the Songs in their present context and their relation to the rest of the prophecy are examined. This is followed by a comparison of the language, vocabulary, metrical form and style of the Songs with the rest of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah. Finally the characteristics of the Servant in the Songs and in the rest of the prophecy are compared and contrasted as are also the respective theological ideas. This discussion leads to the conclusion that the Songs cannot be removed from their contexts without breaking the continuity of thought, that the language of the Songs is not inconsistent with their Deutero-Isaianic authorship, and that there are sufficient correspondences between the theological ideas and the characteristics of the Servant in the Songs and in the rest of the prophecy, to attribute the authorship of the Songs to Deutero-Isaiah.

Next comes a discussion of the date of the Servant Songs. Since Deutero-Isaiah is the author of the Songs, the possible dates are limited to his lifetime. Considerations of style suggest that the Songs were written at a later date than that of the main prophecy, while incongruities within the Songs themselves and their present position in the prophecy suggest that they were composed at intervals. Thus it seems very probable that while some of the earlier Songs may be contemporary with the main prophecy, the later Songs were

composed at a date later than the main prophecy.

A Translation of the Servant Songs, accompanied by a discussion of the text, is then given.

Next, an examination is made of the Servant as he is depicted in the Servant Songs. This shows that the picture of the Servant in the Songs is not entirely consistent.

Finally a very brief survey of the main types of interpretations of the Servant figure is given and the conclusion is stated. From the study of the Servant as he is depicted in the Servant Songs it appears that Deutero-Isaiah did not have a fixed conception of the Servant's identity. There is a measure of fluidity in his thought. Therefore, the most satisfactory solution to the problem of the Servant's identity is to give a fluid interpretation to the Songs. The prophet's thought concerning the Servant oscillates between the conception of him as Israel and the conception of him as an individual figure representing Israel, who would fully actualize the Servant ideal in his own person. It is recognized that this has been fulfilled in Jesus Christ and that through Him the Christian Church has become the heir of the vocation of the Servant as portrayed in the Old Testament.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface	11
List of Abbreviations	1v
Summary	v
CHAPTER I. The Delimitation of the Servant Songs	1
CHAPTER II. The Authorship of the Servant Songs	15
CHAPTER III. The Date of the Servant Songs	58
CHAPTER IV. The Text and Translation of the Servant Songs	64
CHAPTER V. The Servant as Depicted in the Songs	110
CHAPTER VI. The Identity of the Servant	134
APPENDIX A	146
BIBLIOGRAPHY	170

Chapter One.

The Delimitation of the Servant Songs.

Here it is not necessary to argue again the point, which is now generally conceded, that at least the main part of Isaiah 40 - 55 is the work of somebody writing towards the close of the Babylonian exile. For want of any other name, this anonymous writer is referred to as the Second Isaiah or Deutero-Isaiah.

Long before it became customary to speak of the Servant Songs, Rosenmüller had brought together the four passages though he associated them with a few other isolated verses.^{1.} However the first important advance was really made when Duhm published his "Theologie der Propheten" in 1875. He singled out four passages which differed so much from Deutero-Isaiah's work, that the suspicion could not be dismissed that they did not originally belong to the plan of Is. 40 - 55, but were derived from another source. Duhm thought that a prophetic sketch of the life and activity of Jeremiah, perhaps from the pen of a younger contemporary, formed the basis of the Servant Songs. Deutero-Isaiah became acquainted with them after he had written the first part of his work. The passages which Duhm regarded as Servant Songs were 42:1 - 7, 49:1 - 6, 50:4 - 9, 52:13 - 53:12.

In his epoch-making commentary on Isaiah, published in 1892, Duhm modified his position. The first song was

1. Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, iii Iesaiæ vaticinia, Part 3, 1793. Cf. H.H. Rowley, "The Servant of the Lord" p. 6.

limited to the first four verses of chapter 42 (ie. 42: 1 - 4), and he now regarded the Servant Songs as considerably later than the work of Deutero-Isaiah, though not as late as Is. 56 - 66 (Trito-Isaiah).

Since the work of Duhm, there has been disagreement amongst scholars concerning the precise delimitation of the Songs and even concerning their number. Most writers have found four Servant Songs and generally follow the final delimitation of Duhm. However others have attached some of the immediately following verses to some of the Songs. Others again have found additional songs in Deutero-Isaiah or even in Trito-Isaiah, belonging to this cycle.^{1.}

There has, however, never been any doubt about the first two and the last of the Servant Songs, though they have been delimited slightly differently. But for a time there was some hesitation about the third Song, 50:4 - 9. Long before there was any thought of treating the Songs as distinct from the rest of Deutero-Isaiah, it had been common to interpret 50:4 - 9 as an autobiographical fragment.^{2.} ^{3.} Laue still held that 50:4 - 9 had originally to do with the Prophet and that it was later transformed into a Song by the addition of vv.10f. But he agreed that

-
1. Cf. H.H. Rowley, *Op. cit.*, P.6.
 2. So among others, Chrysostom, Grotius, Vogel, Dathe, Koppe, Hensler, Braun, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Matthew Arnold, Knobel, Ley. Cf. C.R. North " The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah", P.127.
 3. *Die E.J.L.* 1888, PP. 7 - 11. Cf. C.R. North, *Op.cit.*, P.127.

the passage is a necessary link between chapters 49 and 53, and proceeded to treat it as such. This was in effect to concede the point in dispute. Since Laue only Levy¹ has excluded it from the Servant-cycle.

Now in this passage the Servant of Yahweh is not named; the metre (Qinah) is different from that of the other three Songs; and of the four Songs this is the only one which has unmistakably influenced the succeeding verses. Thus there is perhaps something to be said for the opinion that it had a separate origin from the rest, and stands in a somewhat unique relation to the main prophecy^c. On the other hand, the experiences of the speaker are in general so similar to those of the Servant in the other three undisputed Servant Songs, that it is practically certain that the speaker is the Servant of the Servant Songs. Cf. 49:4; 53:5. Moreover without this section we are quite unprepared for the final tragedy in the fourth Song, since it is the necessary link between chapters 49 and 52:13 - 53:12. The fact that it has influenced the succeeding verses does not necessarily mean that this passage is not a Servant Song, nor are the arguments from metre and the omission of the name of the speaker decisive. Hence most scholars include 50:4 - 9 as one of the Servant Songs.

While most scholars accept then that there are four Servant Songs, they do not always agree with the precise delimitation which Duhm proposed. Consequently a great number of additions to the four Servant Songs have been proposed. A few scholars go even further than this and

1. Deutero-Isaiah, P.16f. Volz (Jes.II,P.160) says it is not certain that it belongs to the Songs. Cf.C.R. North, Op. cit.,P.127.

suggest that there are more than four Servant Songs. The following are the additional passages which have been suggested. 42:5 - 9; 42:19 - 21; 48:14 - 16; 49:7 - 13; 50:10 - 11; 51:4 - 16; 61:1 - 11; 62:1 - 12; 63:7 - 14.^{1.}

42:5 - 9.

Many scholars have taken these verses or part of them as referring to the Servant. Duhm regards vv.5 - 7 as a kind of secondary song, a later addition by the editor who inserted vv.1 - 4 into the prophecy. Most scholars agree that verse 5 begins a new song. Some say it extends to ver. 9, while others think that it ends at ver. 7. Yet another group of scholars treat vv. 1 - 9 or vv. 1 - 7 as a unity.^{2.}

In ver.5 we find a new introductory formula which marks it off from vv.1 - 4. But none of the recognised Servant Songs have such an introductory formula marking the beginning of a new section within them. The style of address in these verses is also quite different from that in vv.1 - 4. Hence we are not justified in treating vv.1 - 9 or vv. 1 - 7 as a unity. We must separate them from vv.1 - 4.

An examination of vv.8 - 9 shows that they are a typical Deutero-Isaianic prophecy, with references to "graven images", "former" and "new" things, which elsewhere in the prophecy have no immediate connection with the Servant. Hence the majority of scholars are agreed that vv.8 - 9 cannot be part of the Servant Song.

1. Cf. H.H. Rowley, Op. cit., P.6.
2. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.131.

What about vv.5 - 7 then? Some scholars say that 42:8 is a continuation of 41:29. We must admit that there is sufficient continuity of subject-matter to make this plausible. On the other hand, 41:29 has the appearance of being the end of an oracle. Further, vv.8 - 9 are an equally good continuation for vv.5 - 7, which would end abruptly if nothing followed it. Now if vv.8 - 9 are the continuation of vv. 5 - 7, we would have to regard vv.5 - 9 as a unity, and consequently we could not regard them as part of the Servant Song, as we have already rejected vv. 8 - 9. But the unity of vv. 5 - 9 is only probable and we must have other reasons to exclude vv. 5 - 7 from the song before we can adopt this procedure. An examination of the literary characteristics of vv.5 - 7 shows that the language and style of these verses not only marks them off from vv.1 - 4,^{1.} but is more characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah than of the recognised Servant Songs. Cf.44:24, 41:9, also 49:6,8.

This, together with the fact that vv.5 - 9 probably form a unity, suggests that it is very improbable that vv.5 - (7)9 are part of the Servant Song. Hence we will regard 42:1 - 4 as constituting the first Servant Song.

42:19 - 21.

In his "Serubbabel" and in his "Studien", Sellin argued that this passage was a fragment of a Servant Song,^{2.} but he later abandoned the view. More recently Hans Schmidt^{3.} supposed that the passage contains the Prophet-Servant's estimate of his own condition as blind and deaf.

1. See supra, P. 4.

2. Cf. C.R. North, Op.cit.P.135.

3. "Gott u. das Lied im A.T. ", P.45. Cf.C.R. North, Op.cit., P.135.

He has just described the people thus (ver.18), and he is too modest not to acknowledge his own share in their disability. He resumes his description of the people in ver.22, the first word of which, says Schmidt, should be emended from the singular וְהוּא "and he" to the plural וְהוֹנְוּ "and they". But there is not the slightest justification for this textual change. Nor is there any good reason why we should separate vv.19 - 21 from their context vv.18 -25.

It seems very unlikely that this passage is one of the Servant Songs. An examination of vv.18 - 25 as a whole shows the prophet addressing Israel in its present state of blindness and wretchedness. He calls on the exiles to reflect on all that they have suffered at the hand of their God, and to recognise in it the effect of their obduracy and unfaithfulness to their calling, their misuse of religious privileges, and their positive transgressions of the law of Yahweh. Now the Servant of ver. 19 is expressly identified with the people of Israel; Cf. vv.22, 24. Thus the prophet is speaking about Israel as such and not about the Servant of the Servant Songs. The Servant is described here as spiritually blind and deaf. Therefore he is altogether unfit for Yahweh's purpose. But this is a startling contrast to the Servant in the recognised Servant Songs and particularly 42:1 - 4, where he is described as the perfect worker for God. This passage cannot therefore be regarded as a Servant Song.

48:14 - 16.

Schmidt holds that the Prophet-Servant is the speaker

1. "Gott u. das Lied im A.T.", P.45. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.136.

in 48:14 - 16. But ver. 15 certainly cannot refer to him, for elsewhere in the prophe^cy the calling and commissioning of Cyrus is Yahweh's sole purpose and His doing, Cf. 41:2, 4,25f; 44:28; 45:1 - 4. Here Yahweh must be the speaker.

It may be different with 48:16b, " And now the Lord Yahweh hath sent me, and his spirit". Here the speaker can only be the prophet. Just because the speaker is regarded as being inspired, he need not necessarily be the Servant. The prophets were also thought to be inspired men. Yet this sentence does not have any relation to what precedes or what follows. In addition many scholars have noted that the metrical form of this sentence is impossible and consequently they delete it as a gloss in a heavily interpolated chapter. It is very doubtful that this sentence can be regarded as referring to the Servant of the Servant Songs.

In the rest of this passage the prophet is speaking of the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. This is the crowning proof of Yahweh's abiding presence with His people. There is no such specific mention of an historical situation in any of the recognised Servant Songs. Since there is such a difference of subject-matter, we cannot regard this passage as one of the Servant Songs.

49:7 - 13.

The question whether these verses, or any part of them, refer to the Servant has been much disputed. Some divide the passage into two songs ver. 7 and vv. 8 - 13. Others

think that there should be a break at the end of ver. 9a.^{1.}

The interpretation of ver. 7 and its relation to ver. 8 is obscure. The introductory formula is as Deutero-Isaianic as anything can well be. We expect that what follows after " the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One ", will deal with Israel. But unfortunately the text and the interpretation of the rest of the verse is so uncertain, that what we have might apply equally well to Israel or to the Servant. However, the verse is very remarkable as anticipating the main idea of 53:3 and 52:15. As a new beginning is made in ver. 8 with " Thus saith the Lord ", ver. 7 seems to be only a fragment.

The supposition of a break at the end of ver. 9a looks like an expedient to claim vv. 7(8) - 9a as referring to the Servant, since what follows in vv. 9b - 13 reads exactly like a typical Deutero-Isaianic oracle on the deliverance of Israel. But this expedient is not justified by the text as it stands, for it is not at all obvious that ver. 9b makes a new beginning. In fact, except for ver. 12, which seems to be an interpolation, vv. 8 - 13 read as a unity. Were it not for the last part of ver. 8 " and I will form thee and give thee for a covenant of the people ", we could confidently assert that vv. 8 - 13 refer to Israel. Hence we must look more closely at these words. They are repeated in 42:6. In 49:8, however, the LXX omits $\overline{\pi} \overline{\gamma} \overline{\delta} \overline{\lambda} \overline{\iota}$ " I will form thee ", and reads " in a day of salvation I have

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.129.

helped thee and I have given thee for a covenant of the people". The order of the verbs used in this verse is also suspicious. In ver. 8 as it stands the order is "answer", " help ", " form ". A more natural order would be for "form" to come earlier in the series and before " help ", Cf. 43:1; 44:2. These peculiarities give weight to the suggestion that since vv. 8 - 13 follow closely on a Servant Song, the difficult words of ver. 8 might be explained as an insertion to make an original Israel song a Servant Song. We can therefore confidently assert that vv. 8 - 13 refer to Israel and are not to be regarded as a Servant Song.

50:10 - 11.

The view that these verses are an original part of the third Song has never found much support. The speaker in 50:4 - 9 is the Servant, but in ver. 10 we find a fragment in which both Yahweh and the Servant are referred to in the third person. In ver. 11 Yahweh is presumably the speaker. Now admittedly there is more than one speaker in 52:13 - 53:12, but there is an inner unity there which is entirely wanting here. Further the verses have scarcely any literary affinity either with the Songs or with the main prophecy, Cf. 42:16. They seem to form an appendix to the preceding description of the Servant by drawing lessons from it for the encouragement of believers and the warning of unbelievers. This leads us to suspect that they were inserted to form a transition from 50:4 - 9 to what follows in chapter 51. We therefore do not regard 50:10 - 11 as being part of the third Servant Song.

51:4 - 16.

1.
 W.B. Stevenson reckons the Servant Songs to be five in number, including 51:4 - 6. Van Hoonacker would take 51:4 - 8, introduced by 50:10, as a separate Servant Song. These are hazardous suggestions. No doubt there are strong resemblances to 42:1 - 4, but whose can the "arms", "righteousness" and "salvation" be but Yahweh's? The speaker is clearly Yahweh and not the Servant. Moreover, the subject-matter of these verses is certainly not the work of the Servant. They tell us of Yahweh's actions. Hence 51:4 - (6) 8 can certainly not be regarded as a Servant Song.

3.
 Berich thinks that 51:9 - 16 reflects the experience of the Prophet-Servant between the period of his eschatological expectations and the advance of Cyrus against Lydia, though he would not reckon it among the Servant of Yahweh texts proper. Sellin in his Jehoiachin period took 51:16 as referring to the Servant, and again in his first advocacy of the autobiographical theory reckoned 51:12 - 16 as a Song, but he later abandoned that view.

-
1. "Expositor", Sept., 1913, "Werden u. Wesen des A.T.s", B.Z.A.W. 66, P.89, n.2. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.136.
 2. "Expositor", 1916, P. 192; "Het Boek Isaias", P. 245f. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.136.
 3. "Studien", PP. 73, 114, 141. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.137.
 4. "Rätsel", PP. 127ff. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.137.
 5. N.K.Z. 41, 1930, P. 157f. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.137.
 6. Z.A.W. 55, 1937, P. 199. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.137.

Bentzen also regards 51:9 - 16 as a Servant Song.^{1.}
 Though the "arm of the Lord" is mentioned in 53:1, in its present context (51:9) it has nothing to do with the Servant of the Songs. Here it is connected with Yahweh's creative activity. The only other verse in this passage which is reminiscent of the recognised Servant Songs is ver. 16, Cf. 49:2; 50:4. Yet this same verse also reminds us of Deutero-Isaiah's account of Yahweh's creative activity, Cf. 40:22; 48:13. Similarly vv. 9 - 15 also remind us of Yahweh's creative activity, Cf. 40:1,6,10,22; 43:16; 45:13; 48:13; 52:10. The passage informs us that Yahweh is over all and that the captured exiles will speedily be released. Since this subject-matter is entirely different from that of the recognised Servant Songs, it is most improbable that 51:9 - 16 is a Servant Song.

61:1 - 11.

A number of scholars^{2.} have held that the words used by our Lord in the Synagogue at Nazareth, "The Spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me..." (Isaiah 61:1ff; Luke 4:18f) were originally intended as an utterance of the Servant. This view was not uncommon as long as Isaiah 40 - 66 was thought to be a unity, and before Duhm proposed to treat the four Songs as distinct from the rest of the prophecy. Since the time of Duhm it has generally fallen into abeyance. It has however been maintained by a few scholars who reckon 60 - 62 as a part of Deutero-Isaiah now separated from the main work.^{3.}

1. "Introduction to the O.T. ", vol., II, P.110.
 2. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.137.
 3. Ibid., P.137. Cf. H.H. Rowley, Op. cit., P.6.

Now, to argue that a passage must be a Servant Song because our Lord quoted it as describing His own ministry, is invalid. We cannot use our own particular interpretation of the undisputed Servant Songs as a criterion for judging whether other passages are Servant Songs or not. The only valid criteria are the literary characteristics and the subject-matter of the recognised Servant Songs. Only if the literary characteristics and the subject-matter of a particular passage are very similar to the undisputed Servant Songs, can we consider that passage as a Servant Song.

In 61:1 - 11 there is no similarity of literary characteristics or of subject-matter with those of the recognised Servant Songs, except that the spirit of Yahweh is said to be upon the speaker; but this is not sufficient to prove that the passage is a Servant Song. Moreover, those writers who treat it as a Servant Song do not agree on the number of verses which refer to the Servant. Some limit the fragment to vv. 1 - 3. But it is quite impossible to separate vv. 4ff from what precedes, for vv. 1 - 9 clearly form a unity. Others make the Song comprise the whole chapter; but this is impossible for there is no similarity between this chapter and the Servant Songs. There is therefore no valid reason to include this chapter, or any part of it, amongst the Servant Songs.

62:1 - 12.

1. C.C. Torrey has suggested that this chapter is also one of the Servant Songs. This however is most

1. "Second Isaiah". Cf. H.H. Rowley, Op. cit., P.6.

improbable. The passage predicts the restoration of the exiles to their own land, and foretells the future of the glory of Zion. This has no connection whatsoever with the subject-matter of the recognised Servant Songs. The literary characteristics too are quite different from those of the Servant Songs. This chapter cannot therefore be regarded as a Servant Song.

63:7 - 14.

1.
C.C. Torrey has also suggested that this passage is one of the Servant Songs.

The content of 63:7 - 14 seems to be a prayer of the People for the renewal of Yahweh's former loving-kindnesses. The prayer begins with the thankful commemoration of Yahweh's goodness to the nation in the days of old, when He continuously manifested Himself as their Saviour, bearing them through all dangers. Now this ideal relation between Israel and its God has been broken through the rebellion and ingratitude of the people. In seasons of distress, however, the better minds of the nation dwell wistfully on those ancient wonders of grace, and they long that Yahweh may again put forth His strength and vindicate His glorious name. Thus the reference is clearly to Yahweh and not to the Servant. There is also no similarity of literary characteristics between this passage and the Servant Songs. This passage cannot, therefore, be a Servant Song.

1. "Second Isaiah". Cf. H.H. Rowley, Op. cit., P.6.

Hence we conclude that 42:1 - 4; 49:1 - 6; 50:4 - 9; 52:13 - 53:12 are the only passages which can definitely be treated as the Servant Songs. The probability that other suggested passages belong to the Servant Songs is very slight and does not warrant their inclusion.

Chapter Two.

The Authorship of the Servant Songs.

The impression that the Servant Songs are somehow distinct from the rest of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah is now so firmly rooted in critical opinion, that we must consider carefully the grounds on which this impression rests. We must decide whether the Songs are organically related to the work of Deutero-Isaiah, or whether they were inserted by a later editor without much regard to the context. In deciding this question, the burden of proof naturally rests upon those who would remove the Servant Songs from their present context, since there is no textual evidence that the Songs are separate from the work of Deutero-Isaiah.

Duhm thought that the Servant Songs were considerably later than Deutero-Isaiah's work.^{1.} They were the work of a single poet and formed only a portion of his composition. A later editor inserted the Servant Songs into the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah wherever there happened to be room enough in the manuscript, without regard to the appropriateness for their new settings. However, at various points the editor inserted additions to create a connection between the prophecy and the Songs.^{2.}

1. "Das Buch Jesaja übersetzt u. erklärt", Einleitung, P.XV, Sect. 24 - 25, P.XX, Sect., 32.

2. Ibid; P. 284. "Ob die Gedichte einmal als besonderes Buch existiert haben oder nur zu dem Buch Dtjes. hinzugedichtet wurden, darüber kann man streiten, aber wegen gewisser Zusätze (f. c 42,5 - 7. 50, 10 - 11) ist die erstere Annahme viel wahrscheinlicher; diese Zusätze

This interpolation theory has been followed in general, though not in all its details, by a number of scholars. The arguments on which this theory is based are briefly these:-

It is alleged that the passages are introduced abruptly into the work of Deutero-Isaiah. They could be removed from their present context without creating any obvious discontinuity or destroying the train of thought.

There are no signs of dependence on the Servant Songs in the rest of the prophecy.

The Servant Songs are distinctive because of their style, restrained language and the symmetry of their stichoi and strophes. The author of such quiet poems as these cannot for temperamental reasons be identical with the author of the dazzling utterances in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah.

Finally the characteristics of the Servant in the Songs are said to be different from those of the Servant in the other prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah. The theological ideas also vary.

Thus a number of scholars have concluded that Deutero-Isaiah cannot be the author of the Servant Songs and that they were inserted into his work by a later editor. But let us examine these arguments more closely.

Scheinen von dem schriftsteller herzurühren, der jene Gedichte in Dtjes. Schrift einschob, an solche Stellen einschob, wo ein genügend freier Raum am Rande oder zwischen Absätzen oder Papierlagen vorhanden war, ohne auf den dtjesaian. Zusammenhang Rücksicht zu nehmen."

The passages are said to be introduced abruptly into the text and can be removed from their context and leave no blank space. Even if this be true, it cannot be decisive, for the same thing can be said of other passages in Deutero-Isaiah, Cf. 41:8 - 20; 44:24 - 28. Indeed, as Marti has said, "If one says that these pieces can easily be removed from their connexion, it is to be noticed that this is equally true of other pieces, but that by doing so one tears the heart out of Deutero-Isaiah, and wounds the most vital part of the whole structure of his message of comfort!"^{1.} Nowadays it is admitted that Duhm's assertion cannot be held of the original Servant Songs themselves, which was the form in which he advanced the interpolation theory. Even disciples of Duhm, like Schian, felt that he had treated the subject somewhat cavalierly, and were more careful to base their conclusion that the Songs were not from Deutero-Isaiah, on less fortuitous grounds. They saw that if there was to be any excision at all, it had to be the excision of larger sections than 42:1 - 4 and 49:1 - 6. Duhm yielded to their arguments in the first instance, but not in the second. He consequently found that the true continuation of 41:29 was 42:8 and accordingly cut out the first seven verses of chapter 42, admitting that vv. 5 - 7 presupposed vv. 1 - 4. He further allowed that vv. 5 - 7 were a successful imitation of the style of Deutero-Isaiah, being in fact so successful that, in the first edition of his commentary on Isaiah, he attributed them to Deutero-Isaiah.

1. K. Marti, "Das Buch Jesaja", P. 361. Cf. L.E. Browne, "Early Judaism", P. 4.

We find a similar instance in chapter 49. Here, however, Duhm adhered to his opinion that vv. 7ff were the work of Deutero-Isaiah, while vv. 1 - 6 were inserted. But his successors claimed that vv. 7ff presupposed vv. 1 - 6 just as clearly as 42:5 - 7 presupposed 42:1 - 4. Therefore they held that vv. 7ff were an appendix to the Servant Song written by an editor. In the other two Songs we do not find similar instances, though 50:10 - 11 may have been added by a redactor.

This means that at least two of the Songs are closely connected with verses which, as even the advocates of the interpolation theory must admit, have all the marks of Deutero-Isaiah's style. Hence it is also possible that instead of being inserted by an editor, the Servant Songs passed through the hands of the prophet and form an integral part of Deutero-Isaiah's work. Certainly the procedure, which Duhm and the advocates of the interpolation theory suggest, can only be justified if there are other reasons for thinking that the Songs cannot have been part of the main prophecy.

Next there are said to be no signs of dependence on the Servant Songs in the rest of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah. It is true, if we omit the passages we have just discussed, that there are very few instances in which definite and unambiguous points of contact can be made out. However, the agreement between 51:6a, 8a, and 50:9b is too striking to be merely accidental. But it is an almost solitary instance. Other examples have been adduced of affinities between the Servant Songs and the

rest of the prophecy. But these are all more or less constructive. They are presumably valid if we construe the thought of Deutero-Isaiah on the assumption that the Servant Songs belong to him. By themselves, apart from that assumption, they are too uncertain to establish a connection.

At this point we must take note of modern developments in the study of the prophets.^{1.} The most recent view is that there is no "main body of the prophecy" in anything like the sense in which it was once the custom to use the phrase. Scholars have learned to think of the prophetic books as "collections of independent and usually short oracles, poems and the like".^{2.} This, as Snaith^{3.} correctly points out, renders Duhm's position much less secure, for now we no longer argue either on the basis of a formal connection of the Songs with their contexts, or on the lack of such formal connection, that the Servant Songs are, or are not, the work of Deutero-Isaiah. For want of any surer criterion, we are forced to a consideration of the vocabulary, metrical forms, style, and ideas of the Songs in relation to those of the rest of the prophecy.

We begin therefore with an examination of the vocabulary of the Servant Songs in relation to the rest of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.

-
1. Cf. O. Eissfeldt, "The Literature of Israel: Modern Criticism", in "Record and Revelation", Ed., H. Wheeler Robinson, PP.90 - 102.
 2. Ibid., P.94. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., PP.157 - 160.
 3. N.H. Snaith, "The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah" in "Studies in O.T. Prophecy", Ed., H.H. Rowley.

42:1 - 4.

Ver. 1. ׀ ף ך ׀ ׀ "my servant". Cf. 49:3,5,6; 52:13; 53:11.

This phrase and such variations of it as "His servant" and "Yahweh's servant" occur frequently in the rest of II Is. where it is equated with Jacob-Israel. Cf. 41:8,9; 42:19(2); 43:10; 44:1,2,21(2),26; 45:4; 48:20; 49:7; 50:10.

׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ "whom I uphold". Cf. 41:10.

׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ "my chosen". Cf. 43:20; 45:4. The verbal form ׀ ׀ ׀ is found often in II Is. Cf. 40:20; 41:8, 9,24; 43:10; 44:1,2; 48:10; 49:7.

׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ "delighted" used in 40:2 in Niph., with the sense of "pardoned".

׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ "I have put my spirit upon him". Cf. 44:3 where we have a similar expression ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ .

׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ "judgement/true religion". Cf. 42:3,4.

The only passage outside the Songs where this word might be used in the peculiar sense here, is 51:4.

׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ "he shall bring forth". Cf. 42:3. Here it means "to announce" and it is only found in this sense in 48:20. The Qal is used in a similar sense in 45:23; 48:3; 51:4; 55:11.

Ver. 2. There are no uncommon words in this verse.

Ver. 3. ׀ ׀ ׀ "reed" is used in different senses "sweet cane" and "beam of a balance" in 43:24 and 46:6.

׀ ׀ ׀ "bruised" (from ׀ ׀ ׀ "to crush") and

׀ ׀ ׀ "be broken" (vs. 4) are only found in this Song and nowhere else in II Is.

ג ו י ש ׁ "he shall break". It is only used in the Qal here, but the Pi'el form is found in 45:2.
 ה ה ש ׁ "wick". Cf. 43:17. Outside these two passages the word is not used in the sense of "wick" but rather of growing flax or linen.

ה ה פ and ה ה כ ׁ (ver.4) "dimly burning" and "he will become weak" do not appear elsewhere in II Is.

Ver. 4. ׀ ׁ ׁ "coastlands". Cf. 49:1. Cf. also 40:15; 41:1,5; 42:10,12,15; 51:5. A striking parallel to the whole phrase ו ל ׁ ׁ ׀ ׁ ׁ is found in 51:5, ו ו פ ׁ ׀ ׁ ׁ .

Thus only ׁ ו ׁ ג , ׁ ו ג ׁ (vv.3 and 4) and ה ה פ , ה ה כ ׁ (vv.3 and 4) do not appear in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah. We might perhaps add the peculiar sense in which ׀ ש ׁ ׁ is used. All the other expressions have parallels elsewhere in the prophecy.

49:1 - 6.

Ver. 1. ׁ ל ׁ ׁ ׀ ׁ ׁ ׁ ׁ "hearken ye coastlands to me". This phrase is found in 46:3,12; 48:12; 51:1,7; 55:2. See 42:4 for ׀ ׁ ׁ .
 ו ו ש ׁ פ ׁ ! "and hearken". Cf. 42:23; 48:18; 51:4.

׀ ׁ ׁ ל "peoples". Cf. 41:1; 43:4,9; 51:4; 55:4(2). Only in 41:1 is ׀ ׁ ׁ ל used as a parallel to ׀ ׁ ׁ .

פ ׁ ג ׁ "from afar". Cf. 43:6; 49:12 (alternative reading?).

ׁ ׁ ׁ ׁ "from the womb". Cf. 49:5. Cf. also, 44:2,24; 48:8.

- Ver. 2. פֶּשֶׁט וְשֵׁן " and he made my mouth
like ". For פֶּשֶׁט with acc. and פֶּ Cf. 41:15;
50:7; 51:3,23.
- חַרְפָּן חַרְפָּן " sharp sword". Hap. leg.,
in II Is. Only 4 times in the rest of the O.T.
- בְּצֵל יְדוֹ " in the shadow of his hand ".
Cf. 51:16 but it is not found elsewhere in the O.T.
- וַיַּעַשׂ לִי " and he made me into ".
Cf. 41:15,18; 42:15f; 49:11; 54:12.
- חֵץ מְפֹאֵר " polished arrow ". Hap. leg.,
in II Is.
- בְּקִיבוֹ " in his quiver ". Hap. leg.,
in II Is.
- Ver. 3. מְגִלָּה Cf. 42:1.
אֶתְפָּאֵר " I will be glorified ". Cf.
44:23; 55:5. The noun is found in 46:13.
- Ver. 4. אֶתְפָּאֵר " in vain have I laboured ".
This phrase is not found anywhere else in II Is.
- לֵב נֶפֶשׁ " for nought ". Cf. 40:17,23; 41:29;
44:9; 45:18f.
- לֵב נֶפֶשׁ " vanity ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- כֹּחִי " my strength ". Cf. 40:9,26,29,31; 41:1
(alternative reading ?); 44:12(2); 50:2.
- אֶתְפָּאֵר " I have spent ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- כִּי־אֵל " surely ". Cf. 40:7 (addition?); 45:15;
53:4.
- אֶתְפָּאֵר " my legal right ". For this sense
of the word Cf. 40:27.
- אֶתְפָּאֵר " my reward ". Cf. 40:10.

Ver. 5. $\text{לֹא־בָרָאֵנִי מִבֶּטֶן$ " who formed me from the womb ". See 49:1. Cf. 44:2,24 for the whole phrase attributed to Israel. Cf. also 48:8; 46:3 (parallel to בָּרָאֵנִי).
 $\text{לְשׂוּבָה$ " to restore ". Po'lel of שׁוּבָה Cf. 47:10 " pervert ". Cf. also 49:6; 42:22 (Hiph'il).
 $\text{וְאֲנִי מְהוֹדָה בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה$ "and I am honoured in the eyes of Yahweh ". Cf. 43:4 (of Israel).

Ver. 6. $\text{לְקֵלִים$ " too light ". The root לָקַט is not found elsewhere in II Is.
 $\text{נִשְׁמְרָה$ " preserved ". Cf. 49:8.
 לְאוֹר לְגוֹיִם " for a light of the nations ". Cf. 42:6 and 51:4 לְאוֹר לְגוֹיִם .
 שִׁמְעוֹתַי " my salvation ", Cf. 49:8; 51:6,8; 52:7,10.
 $\text{עַד־אֶחְסֶה אֶת־הָאָרֶץ$ " to the end of the earth ". Cf. 40:28; 41:5,9; 42:10; 43:6; 48:20.

The words or phrases which occur only in the Servant Songs and not in Deutero-Isaiah are, בְּרוּרִי , חֲדָה , אֶת־שִׁמְעוֹתַי , לְאוֹר לְגוֹיִם , חֲבֵל , פְּלִיטָה , בְּקֵל . For the other words and expressions there are parallels in the rest of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah.

50:4 - 9.

Ver. 4. $\text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה$ " the Lord Yahweh ". See vv. 5, 7,9. Cf. 40:10; 48:16; 49:22; 52:4.
 תַּלְמִידָיו " disciples ". See end of this verse. Cf. 54:13 (but it occurs only three times in the rest of the O.T.).
 לְעֹזֵרִי meaning doubtful, " help ". Hap. leg., but the reading is also doubtful.

שׁוֹן " moth ". Cf. 51:8.

Six words used in this Song are not found in the rest of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah. The correspondences with Deutero-Isaiah are not so numerous as in the previous two Songs.

52:13 - 53:12.

52:13. לֵשׁוֹן " shall prosper ". Not in II Is., in this sense.

רָוַח " he shall be exalted ". Only in 49:11 of a highway.

וַיִּשָּׂא " and lifted up ". Cf. 40:4 of a valley.

וַיִּגְבַּהּ " and high ". Cf. 55:9 of God's ways.

52:14. וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " were astonished ". Not in II Is., in this sense.

רַב־מְאֹד " many ". See 52:15; 53:11f. Cf. 54:1.

וַיִּשְׁחַתְּ " marred ". This form is hap. leg.

וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " his appearance ". See 53:2. Not elsewhere in II Is.

וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " and his form ". See 53:2. Not elsewhere in II Is.

52:15. הִשְׁתַּחֲוּ " startle ". Usually means " sprinkle ". Hap. leg., in this sense.

וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " they shall shut ". Hap. leg., in II Is. Root only seven times in the O.T.

וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " was told ". Cf. Pi'el 43:21,26.

וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " they have seen ". Cf. 40:5; 41:5; 49:18; 52:8,10.

וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " they have perceived ". Cf. 48:18.

53:1. וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ " believed ". Cf. 43:10.

שָׁמַעְנוּ מִתְּנַיִם " what we have heard / our report ".
 Hap. leg., in II Is.

זֶרַע יְהוָה " arm of Yahweh ". Cf. 40:10f;
 48:14; 51:5,9; 52:10.

נִגְלָה " been revealed ". Cf. 40:5.

53:2. וַיִּגְדַּל " for he grew up ". Cf. 55:13(2).

יֹגֵן " a succulent ". Hap. leg.

שֹׁרֵשׁ " a root ". Hap. leg., in II Is.

הָאֵרֶץ " dry ground ". Cf. 41:18.

הַדָּוָה " dignity ". Cf. LXX reading of 40:6.

וְנִחַתְנוּ אֵת " that we should desire him ".
 Hap. leg., in II Is.

53:3. נִבְדָּה " despised ". Cf. 49:7.

לִדְרֹךְ " rejected ". Hap. leg., in II Is.,
 but only three times in the O.T.

אֲנָשִׁים " men ". Hap. leg., in II Is., but
 only three times in the O.T.

אִישׁ אֶבְרָתָא " a man of sorrows ". Cf.
 53:4. Not elsewhere in II Is.

וַיִּדְרֹךְ " and acquainted with ". Qal ptc.,
 only here and in Dan. 1:13,15.

חֲלָה " disease ". See 53:4. Not elsewhere in
 II Is.

כִּסְיוֹ " hiding ". See 50:6. Cf. 54:8.

וַיִּשְׁבַּח " we esteemed him ". Qal not in II Is.,
 but Niph'al. Cf. 40:15,17.

53:4. כִּי־כֵן " surely ", See 49:4. Cf. 40:7 (addition?);
 45:15.

וַיִּשָּׂא // וַיִּבְרֹךְ " carried // bore them ".
 See 53:11; 46:4,7.

- נִגְוַע " stricken ". Cf. Root used in a different sense in 52:11.
- נִכְּחָה " smitten ". Cf. 49:10.
- נִמְעַנֶּה " afflicted ". See 53:7. Not elsewhere in II Is.
- 53:5. נִחְלַל " pierced ". Cf. 51:9.
- נִשְׁמַעְנוּ // נִשְׁמַעְנוּ " our transgressions // our iniquities ". Cf. 50:1.
- נִדְּכָא " maimed ". See 53:10. Not elsewhere in II Is.
- נִדְּוָה " chastisement ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִדְּוָה " his stripes ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִרְפָּא " it is healed ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- 53:6. נִצְאָה " sheep ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִלְגַּנּוּ " we went astray ". Cf. 47:15.
- נִנְּוּ " we have turned ". Cf. 40:3; 45:22.
- נִלְאֵה " Caused to light ". Cf. 47:3.
- 53:7. נִגְשָׁה " he was oppressed ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִבְּחָה " slaughter ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִבְּלָה " led ". Cf. 55:12.
- נִחְלָה " ewe ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִגְדָּה " its shearers ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִלְאָה " is dumb ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- 53:8. נִעֲצָה " oppression ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִקָּחָה " he was taken ". Cf. 49:24f; 52:5.
- נִשְׁחָחָה " reflected ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִגְזָרָה " cut off ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- 53:9. נִבְּרָה " his grave ". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- נִחָחָה " violence ". Hap. leg., in II Is.

- הַחֲזִיק "deceit". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- 53:10. יָצַח הַיְהוָה "Yahweh was pleased". Cf. 42:21; 55:11.
- שֶׁאֵל "sin offering". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- יִפְרֹא "he shall prolong". Cf. 48:9; 54:2.
- יִפְרוּ "prosper". Cf. 48:15; 54:17; 55:11.
- 53:11. לַחֲמֵל "travail". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- יִשְׂבֹּעַ "he shall be satisfied". Cf. 44:16.
- יִצְדֵּק "he shall justify". See 50:8. Cf. 43:9,26; 45:25; 51:5.
- 53:12. יִלְקַח אֵלַי "I will appertion to him". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- אֲזַרְזֵל "powerful". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- לִשְׁלֹל "spoil". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- הִקְרַח "poured out". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- מֵת "death". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- אֲשֶׁר "transgressions". Cf. 46:8; 48:8.
- הִנְחָל "he was numbered". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- אֲחַת "sin". Hap. leg., in II Is.
- יִפְדֶּה "he shall intercede". Hap. leg., in II Is.

There are about forty words in this Song which are not found in the rest of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah. Many of these words are very common in Hebrew and would undoubtedly be known to Deutero-Isaiah. e.g. אֵרָאֵה "his appearance", נִחְמָדְךָ "that we should desire him", חֲלָל "sickness", אֲרַפֵּא "to heal", צֹאן "sheep", יִצְרֹא "to shear", לִשְׁלֹל "spoil", and מֵת "death". Hence our decision concerning the authorship of the Song cannot be made to depend solely on the statistics which

this study has yielded.

This study of the vocabulary of the Servant Songs shows that in the first and second Songs the number of peculiar words is small and that there are many parallels with the rest of Deutero-Isaiah's prophecies. In the third Song the parallels are not quite so numerous, but the number of peculiar words is still comparatively small. The fourth Song contains a large number of words which are not found in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah's work.

What help can be gained from this study in determining the relationship of the Servant Songs to the work of Deutero-Isaiah? Given two passages sufficiently alike in vocabulary, we may perhaps affirm identity of authorship. But if the two passages differ widely in vocabulary, we cannot assert that they were not written by the same author.

Vocabulary depends a great deal on the subject-matter, which might require the use of words which the author would not normally use. As North remarks: "Every writer employs some rare words, and what is rare we cannot expect to find uniformly distributed, or to be other than hap.¹ leg., in any one writer".

Now the subject-matter of the Servant Songs is unique. Hence we may expect to find some peculiar words. The evidence obtained from the study of the vocabulary of the Songs cannot be decisive. We cannot assert, on grounds of vocabulary alone, that the Songs were written by Deutero-Isaiah, nor can we deny it. The most we can say at this

1. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.168.

stage is that the evidence, for the first three Songs at least, strongly favours their Deutero-Isaianic authorship.

We cannot assert the Deutero-Isaianic authorship of the fourth Song with the same confidence. A number of scholars^{1.} have suggested that it comes from a different source, because its general feeling, tone and subject-matter are so different. Sellin and Elliger have argued the matter in more detail and undertake to prove conclusively that 52:13 - 53:12 were written by Trito-Isaiah.^{2.} After examining Elliger's arguments, C.R. North comes to the following conclusion :-

" All things considered, the verdict must be that Elliger's theory that the last Song is the work of ' Trito-Isaiah ' is unproven. It is based almost entirely upon literary statistics, and although the argument from statistics may have its uses ... it can easily be overdone. I do not insist that 52:13 - 53:12 must on grounds of language, be assigned to Deutero-Isaiah. All I claim is that there is nothing in the language that is inconsistent with his authorship, and that the passage has definite points of contact with his writing, indeed more in common with his work than with that of any other writer known to us. "^{3.}

We conclude therefore that the language of the Servant Songs is not inconsistent with their Deutero-Isaianic authorship. The arguments of those who attack

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.169.

2. For an examination of this contention, Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., PP.169 - 177.

3. Ibid., P.177.

their Deutero-Isaianic authorship on linguistic grounds have not been proved. However, from the nature of the method used, it must be remembered that the conclusions reached can only be probable.

It is difficult to base an argument for the excision of the Servant Songs from the rest of Deutero-Isaiah on grounds of their metrical form. In the first place, the rhythm of the third Song (Qinah) is entirely different from that of the other three (3:3). Secondly, both metrical forms are freely used by Deutero-Isaiah. Indeed it would be precarious to deny the Servant Songs to Deutero-Isaiah on the grounds that their metre is different from his, for neither Itkonen^{1.} nor Köhler,^{2.} who have dealt with the subject most fully, makes any such suggestion. Moreover, rhythm alone cannot be an argument for independent authorship, because there is no reason why the author should not fall into a particular rhythm when dealing with a subject transcending the usual level of his thoughts. This is very likely, for the rhythm does change frequently in Deutero-Isaiah and the subject-matter of the Songs is unique.

While the Servant Songs cannot be clearly distinguished from the rest of Deutero-Isaiah in language or in metrical structure, we must grant the advocates of the interpolation theory that there is a certain " temperamental " difference between the subdued concentration and the artistic thought of the Songs and the more exuberant strains which dominate the rest of the prophecy. But, as Skinner remarks, " it is

1. D.J. Metrisch untersucht. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.178.
 2. D.J. Stilkritisch untersucht. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.178.

difficult to measure the range of Second Isaiah's 'temperament'; and even if the content were too great for a single mind to have originated, it would not follow that the prophet could not have so far assimilated the spirit of the poems as to embody them in his message".^{1.} Now we must admit that it is possible that the difference in "temperament" is due to a difference of authorship. Yet it is equally possible that the Songs derive from a different mood, or a different period, in the life of one author.

Thus far our study of the context, language and style of the Servant Songs has not led to any definite conclusions about their authorship. The most we have been able to assert are certain probable conclusions. Taken separately they do not have much weight, but taken together they indicate that the interpolation theory has not been proved, and that it is very probable that Deutero-Isaiah was the author of the Songs.

Finally we must examine the content of the Servant Songs very carefully. Do they contain anything contrary to the rest of the work of Deutero-Isaiah? Are there any ideas in the Songs which we have good reason to believe could not have been expressed by Deutero-Isaiah? The advocates of the interpolation theory believe that there are. They assert that the characteristics of the Servant in the Songs are so different from those of the Servant in the other prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah, that Deutero-Isaiah cannot have been the author of the Servant Songs.

1. Isaiah XL - LXVI, P. 259.

The term אֲבִידָה in the phrase אֲבִידָה לַיהוָה is used in connection with Yahweh as the corresponding root is used in other Semitic languages in connection with "lord" or "master", under which designation the Semitic peoples addressed their gods. Thus in the first instance the phrase אֲבִידָה לַיהוָה merely defines a man as one who acknowledges Yahweh as his God. Hence it corresponds very closely to what we would call a worshipper of Yahweh. Naturally, therefore, it may stand in antithesis to a similar phrase in which the name of another deity takes the place of that of Yahweh. Thus the "servants of Yahweh" and the "servants of the Tyrian Baal" are contrasted in II Kings 10:20 - 23.

It will be readily understood, therefore, that any Israelite might be called "a servant of Yahweh". As a matter of fact, a large number of individuals received this phrase as their name. It is familiar to English readers in the form Obadiah, which was originally pronounced, as the LXX indicates, Abdiyah. (Cf. The parallel name Abdiel - "servant of God").

Now just as modern terms denoting religious attachment, like "Christian" or "believer", may, according to the connection in which they occur, differ greatly in the fulness of their meaning, so "the servant of Yahweh" might imply a higher degree, or more special form, of service than is necessarily involved in the proper name Obadiah, or in the distinction between the "servants of Yahweh" and the "servants of Baal". Such fuller significance attaches to the phrase when a priest or Levite (Ps. 134:1) is specified as "the servant of Yahweh".

Among the individuals specifically termed " the servant of Yahweh " (which in speeches of Yahweh of course becomes " my servant ") are Abraham, (Gen. 26:24); Isaac, (Gen. 24:14); Jacob, (Deut. 9:27); Moses, (Ex. 14:31, Numbers 12:7f, and often); Joshua, (Jos. 24:29, Judges 2:8); Caleb, (Numbers 14:24); Job, (Job 1:8, 2:3, 42:8); David, (II Sam. 3:18, and often); Eliakim, (Is. 22:30); Zerubbabel, (Hag. 2:23); and the person who is termed the " Shoot " (E.V. " the branch "), (Zech. 3:8).

The reason why these persons are specifically termed " the servant(s) of Yahweh " seems to be that they have advanced to a higher degree of service, by showing special devotion to Yahweh, and by performing some special mission for Him. Thus the title $\text{אֲדָמָה} \text{ אֲדָמָה} \text{ אֲדָמָה}$ may also be one of distinction and honour.

Now the prophets were also men who had advanced to a higher degree of service than the ordinary worshippers of Yahweh. Thus a prophet is called " the servant of Yahweh " and Yahweh speaks of the prophets as His servants - $\text{אֲדָמָה} \text{ אֲדָמָה} \text{ אֲדָמָה}$ " my servants the prophets " Cf. II Kings 9:7, 17:13 and others, Jer. 7:25 and often, Ez. 38:17, Amos 3:7.

As we have seen, some of the individual persons who are called $\text{אֲדָמָה} \text{ אֲדָמָה} \text{ אֲדָמָה}$ were given some special mission to perform for Yahweh. This could also be the lot of a whole people. In ancient times the people of Israel was God's servant only through its highest representatives - the patriarchs, the prophets, and the idealised David. But in the post exilic age, due to Deutero-Isaiah's influence, the noblest sections of the people assimilated more and more the elevated idea that Israel itself was in the highest sense Yahweh's servant.

The use of the term in Deutero-Isaiah is, therefore, revolutionary. The very grandeur and universality of his conception of Yahweh appears to necessitate a profounder interpretation of Israel's place in history than any previous prophet had explicitly taught. Deutero-Isaiah's exalted conception of Yahweh might easily have led to the thought that since Yahweh was so exalted, He could not enter into special relations with any particular nation. Israel, therefore, would be no more to Him than any other nation. Deutero-Isaiah repudiates this idea, by stating that Yahweh cherishes a purpose of grace towards the whole human race (45:18ff) and that He has chosen Israel as His instrument in the execution of that world-wide purpose of salvation.

This view of Israel's position amongst the nations is expressed in the title יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ which is applied to the people in numerous passages . In these passages the reference is clearly to the nation of Israel, conceived throughout as a moral individual whose life and consciousness are those of the nation. Though the personification is extremely bold at times, no one can doubt that the passages refer to the actual people of Israel.

Since outside the Servant Songs, the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah is unquestionably Israel, anything which is said of Israel in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah may be attributed to Israel as the Servant.

On the one hand Yahweh had been angry with His servant Israel because of their sin and He punished them by giving them into the hands of the Babylonians.

" Behold, for your iniquities were ye sold and for your transgressions was your mother put away" (50;1).

Israel had turned against Yahweh in despair. " My way is hid from Yahweh ", Israel said, " and my judgement is passed away from my God " (40:27). In his rebellion he turned to idols and became obstinate making his neck like an iron sinew, and his brow as brass (48:1 - 19)^{1.} Because Israel, Yahweh's servant, is so blind and wicked he is " robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes and hid in prison houses, they are a prey ... and a spoil (42:18 - 25).

But this chastisement is now a thing of the past. Yahweh has freely forgiven His people, because Israel has " received of Yahweh's hand double for all her sins" (40:2). Deutero-Isaiah repeatedly asserts that Israel's sin has been blotted out and that Yahweh has redeemed His Servant.

" I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins ". (43:25. Cf. 43:1 - 13, 44:21 - 23).

Once the people have been regenerated, they become fit to be Yahweh's chosen servant, and can be assured of the Divine presence amongst them.

" But thou, Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen,
The seed of Abraham my friend,

1. For developments in the interpretation of this passage, Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 181.

Those whom I have taken hold of from the end of the
 earth,
 And called thee from the corners thereof,
 And said unto thee, Thou art my servant,
 I have chosen thee and not cast thee away. (41:8f).

Israel, as Yahweh's servant, has no need to fear the nations, for Yahweh will give him strength to overcome them.. Through the wonderful deliverance of Israel, the nations will learn the might of Yahweh - " that they may see and know and understand together that the hand of Yahweh hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it". (41:8 - 20. Cf. 48:20 - 22; 49:8 - 13).

A further advance seems to be made in 42:5 - 9 . Although some scholars consider this section as part of the first Servant Song, the majority regard it as either the work of Deutero-Isaiah or of a redactor.¹ Although it is not definitely stated to whom 42:6 refers, its close similarity to 41:9, 13, makes it almost certain that in 42:5 - 9 Israel is addressed as the Servant.² Israel is called and guided by Yahweh. But instead of the Gentiles learning to recognise Yahweh in Israel's deliverance, Israel now consciously brings light to them. " I give you for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." 42:6f. If Browne³ is correct in seeing in $\square \mu \quad \Omega \quad \gamma \quad \eta$ an allusion to the primitive state of human society as portrayed in Gen. 11:6, when mankind was $\tau \quad \eta \quad \lambda \quad \square \mu$

1. See supra, P.4.

2. Cf. L.E. Browne, " Early Judaism ", P.5.

3. Ibid., P.5f.

" one people ", then the thought here is that Israel is to be the means by which the world enters into the covenant relationship with Yahweh. Grammatically the subject of נָּפְסֵי " to open " and נִסְיָהָ " to bring out " ^{1.} (ver. 7.) may be either Yahweh or the Servant. Skinner thinks that Yahweh should be the subject and that the blindness and imprisonment refer to Israel. This is possible, for as we saw in 42:18 - 25 Israel is described as the blind Servant of Yahweh. But in the present context it is better to make the Servant the subject of the infinitives, for ver. 7 continues the thought of ver. 6, where the Servant gives light to the Gentiles. From this one expects the Gentiles to be those who are blind and those who dwell in darkness. Hence 42:5 - 9 develop the idea of Israel's mission to the world as Yahweh's Servant.

We find much the same argument in 43:1 - 13. Yahweh has redeemed Israel because she is precious in His sight. Israel is Yahweh's witness to the nations. The Servant may be blind and deaf, yet he has eyes to see, and ears to hear, and can bear witness to the fact that Yahweh has given incontestable proof of His Divinity. This testimony of Israel achieves its own good, as Simon points out, for " it is in its loyal witness that it (i.e. Israel) receives knowledge and faith". ^{2.} In the very act of bearing witness, Israel's mind is to be awakened to the truth of which its own history is the evidence - the sole Divinity of Yahweh, and its own unique position as His Servant.

1. Isaiah XL - LXVI, P.33.

2. U.E. Simon, " A Theology of Salvation ", P.105.

Once Israel's sin has been forgiven, and it accepts the task of being Yahweh's Servant, then Yahweh can call His Servant " Jeshurum " (the upright one). Yahweh will bless Israel, and lead the nation back to their own land. The nations will come to join the commonwealth of Israel and accept Yahweh as their God. This, we presume, is through the missionary work of the Servant. Cf. 44:1 - 5. The universalism of Yahweh's religion is referred to again in other passages in Deutero-Isaiah. Cf. 45:14, 15, 22, 23; 49:7, 22 - 26; 51:4f; 55:4f. Thus for Deutero-Isaiah the boundary of Yahweh's religion is the boundary of the world; and Israel, His Servant, is the instrument which He uses for the conversion of the nations.

Two leading ideas are found in these passages in Deutero-Isaiah. Firstly, Israel has been chosen by Yahweh and brought into a special relationship with Him. Israel is " called ", " chosen ", " created ", " formed ", " made "; and these terms all refer to the formation of the nation when they entered into a covenant with Yahweh at Mt. Sinai. Secondly, Israel has been entrusted with a mission to the nations. Israel is to be for a covenant of the people and for a light of the Gentiles 42:6. This is naturally implied by the term " Servant ", and is made very clear by the parallelism in 42:19, " Who is blind, but my servant, or deaf as my messenger that I send ? " As far as the historic Israel is concerned, the mission to the nations is fulfilled more by passive experiences than by voluntary action on the part of the nation. It has proved itself blind, deaf and sinful. And yet, as the prophetic nation,

it has already served a purpose, for it is a witness to the truth of Yahweh's prophecy and so to His true Divinity. This will become even more clear when Yahweh has caused His people to return to their own land where they will prosper. When the nations behold this demonstration of Yahweh's Godhead, they will turn to Israel with the confession, " Surely God is in thee; and there is none else, there is no God " (45:14).

One cannot fail to be struck by the marked difference between Deutero-Isaiah's use of the phrase עַבְדִּי יְהוָה and the use made of it by earlier writers. No longer is the servant an individual who merely worships Yahweh, or one who stands between Yahweh and His people. No longer is the servant an individual who represents his own people before Yahweh; nor has he merely a mission to Yahweh's people alone. Deutero-Isaiah's conception rises far above this. Yahweh is not concerned with His people Israel only. He is concerned with all the nations of the world. He intends to redeem them, and He has chosen Israel, not only that it might receive the benefits of His grace, but that it may be Yahweh's Servant in bringing about the salvation of the world.

We turn now to the Servant Songs to consider whether they contain anything which contradicts the descriptions of the Servant which we have just examined in the rest of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.

The First Song 42:1 - 4 .

1. " Behold, my servant, whom I uphold,
 My chosen in whom my soul delights.
 I have put my spirit upon him,
 He shall bring forth mishpat to the nations ".
 Cf. 41:8 " But thou, Israel, my servant,
 Jacob whom I have chosen." Cf. also
 41:9; 44:1; 45:4.
 43:10 " ... and my servant whom I have chosen."
 41:10 " I will uphold thee."
 44:3 " I will pour out my spirit upon thy seed."
 42:6 " I will give thee ... for a light of the
 nations."

We cannot cite 51:4 " I will make my mishpat for a light of the peoples." as a parallel, despite its strong resemblances, since Yahweh is the speaker in that passage. The only passages which contradict this description of the Servant are 42:18 - 25 and 48:1 - 19. But they also contradict other passages in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah.

- 2 - 3. " He shall not cry, nor lift up
 Nor make his voice heard in the street;
 A bruised reed he shall not break,
 And the smoking flax he will not quench."

There is nothing in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah which is parallel to this description of the Servant's gentle method in performing his work.

- 3 - 4. " In truth shall he bring forth mishpat ,
 He shall not be dishearted nor be discouraged,
 Until he has set mishpat in the earth
 And the coastlands wait for his law."

The only passage in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah which is reminiscent of this part of the Song is 51:5, "The coastlands shall wait for me, and on mine arm shall they trust". But there the speaker is clearly Yahweh and not the Servant.^{1.}

The Second Song 49:1 - 6.

1. " Listen to me, O coastlands,
And hear ye peoples from afar.
Yahweh has called me from the womb
From the bowels of my mother has he made mention
of my name."
Cf. 44:2,24 " formed thee from the womb."
43:1 " I have called thee by name."

2. " And he has made my mouth like a sharp sword,
In the shadow of his hand has he hidden me;
And he has made me a polished arrow,
In his quiver has he hidden me away."
Cf. 51:16 " I have put my words in thy mouth,
and have covered thee in the shadow of
mine hand."

3. " And he said to me, thou art my servant,
Israel in whom I will be glorified."
Cf. 44:21 " Remember these things, O Jacob,
And Israel, for thou art my servant."
44:23 " For Yahweh hath redeemed Jacob
And will glorify himself in Israel."

1. See supra, P.10.

4. " But I said, I have laboured in vain,
I have spent my strength for nought and vanity,
Yet surely my mishpat is with Yahweh,
And my recompense with my God."

Cf. 40:27 " Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest,
O Israel,

My way is hid from Yahweh, and my mishpat
is passed away from my God ? "

5. " And now says Yahweh,
Who formed me from the womb to be his servant,
To return Jacob to him
And that Israel might be gathered to him;
For I am honoured in the eyes of Yahweh
And my God has become my strength."

Cf. 44:2,24 " formed thee from the womb."

43:4 " Since thou hast been precious in my sight,
And honourable, and I have loved thee."

We cannot cite 49:8 " to raise up the land, to make
them inherit the desolate heritages ", as a parallel,
since the preceding stichos may be a later insertion.^{1.}
Originally, therefore, these words would have referred to
the work of Yahweh and not to that of Israel.

6. " And he said, it is too trifling
That thou shouldst be my servant,
To raise up the tribes of Jacob
And to return the preserved of Israel."

1. See supra, P.8f.

Nowhere else in Deutero-Isaiah do we find the idea of Israel, the Servant, actively restoring Israel. This function is peculiar to the Servant of the Song.

" Therefore I will give thee for a light of the nations,
To be my salvation to the end of the earth."

Cf. 42:6 " I will give thee... for a light of the
nations."

55:4 " I have given him for a witness to the
peoples."

45:22 " Look unto me and be ye saved,
all the ends of the earth."

52:10 " And all the ends of the earth shall see
the salvation of our God."

Though the last two parallels cited do not actually refer to the work of Israel as the Servant of Yahweh, they show that the conception of God's salvation extending to the ends of the earth is not incompatible with Deutero-Isaiah's thought.

Once again the only two passages in Deutero-Isaiah which are in striking opposition to the picture of the Servant presented in this Song are 42:18 -25 and 48:1 - 19.

The Third Song 50:4 - 9.

4. " The Lord Yahweh has given me
The tongue of those who are taught,
That I should know how to sustain
The weary with a word.
In the morning he awakens my ear,
To hear as those who are taught."

Cf. 51:16 " And I have put my words in thy mouth."

54:13 " And all thy children shall be taught
of Yahweh."

48:17 " I am Yahweh, thy God, who teacheth thee
to profit."

5. " The Lord Yahweh has opened my ear,
And I have not rebelled,
Nor turned away backward."

Cf. 44:2 " And thou Jeshurum (i.e. upright) whom
I have chosen."

In contrast to this see 48:8, " Yea, thou heardest
not; Yea, thou knewest not; Yea, from of old thine ear was
not opened for I knew that thou didst deal very treacherously,
and wast called a transgressor from the womb." See also
48:18, " Oh that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments ! "

6. " My back I gave to the smiters,
And my cheeks to them that pluck out the beard,
My face I hid not from shame and spitting."

Cf. 51:23 " ... them that afflict thee,
which have said to thy soul,
Bow down that we may go over:
And thou hast laid thy back as the ground,
and as the street, to them that go over."

7. " But the Lord Yahweh is helping me,
Therefore am I not dishonoured, ('אָן לְךָ יְיָ)
Therefore have I set my face like flint,
And I know that I shall not be ashamed."

- Cf. 41:10, 13f " Fear not... I will help thee."
 44:2 " Thus saith Yahweh... who will help thee."
 45:17 " Ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded." (יָנֹס לֹא יִשְׁבָּח)
 49:23 " They that wait for me shall not be ashamed."
 54:4 " Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed, neither be thou confounded."

Two references express an opposite view.

- 40:27 " Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel,
 My way is hid from Yahweh, and my mishpat is passed away from my God ? "
 49:14 " But Zion said, Yahweh hath forsaken me, and the Lord hath forgotten me."

8. " My vindicator is near, (יִפְּרֹץ יְהוָה)
 Who will proceed against me ?
 Let us stand up together !
 Who is my adversary ?
 Let him come near to me ! "

- Cf. 45:25 " In Yahweh shall all the seed of Israel be justified." (יִפְּרֹץ יְהוָה)
 49:25 " For I will contend with him that contendeth with thee,
 and I will save thy children."

The passages contrary to this view are those in which Israel despairs. Cf. 40:27 and 49:14.

9. " Behold ! the Lord Yahweh will help me." ^{1.}
 Who then can convict me ?
 Behold, they will wear out as a garment,
 The moth shall consume them ! "
 Cf. 41:11 " They that strive with thee shall be as
 nothing, and shall perish."
 12 " Thou shalt seek them and shalt not find
 them... that contend with thee."
 51:7 " Fear ye not the reproach of men,
 neither be ye dismayed at their revilings."
 8 " For the moth shall consume them like
 a garment,
 and the worm shall devour them like wool."

The only passages in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah which seem to contradict the statements in this Song are those which show Israel as despairing (40:27 and 49:14) and those where Israel is described as blind, deaf and rebellious, 42:18 - 25, 48:1 - 19. Although we have been able to cite many parallels to this Song, we must admit that the Servant's confidence in Yahweh reaches a much higher level in the Song than in the parallel passages in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah.

The Fourth Song 52:13 - 53:12.

The text of this Song is very corrupt in some places and this makes it difficult to decide what the meaning should be. However, we cannot be sure that the meaning was originally clear, for the textual corruptions may be attempts to explain what was already obscure. Scholars do not agree as to who the speakers are in chapter 53:1f.

1. See supra, ver. 7.

It is generally agreed that at the beginning and at the end of the Song, Yahweh is the speaker, whereas in the other section either Israel or the Gentiles are the speakers.^{1.}

13. " Behold ! My servant shall prosper,
He shall be exalted and lifted up,
And shall be very high.

14. As many were astonished at him -
For his appearance was so marred, beyond human
semblance,
And his form beyond that of the sons of men -

15. So shall he startle many nations,
Kings shall shut their mouths at him,
For that which had not been told them, they shall see,
And that which they had not heard, they shall perceive."

Cf. 40:31 " But they that wait upon Yahweh shall
renew their strength;
They shall mount up with wings as eagles."

49:7 " Thus saith Yahweh, the redeemer of Israel
and his Holy One,
to him whom man despiseth, to him whom
the nation abhorreth, to a servant of
rulers :
Kings shall see and arise; princes, and
they shall worship."

1. " Who has believed what we have heard ?
And to whom has the arm of Yahweh been revealed ?

1. For a discussion of this, Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit.,
PP.150 -152.

2. " For he grew up before him as a succulent,
 And as a root out of the dry ground.
 He has no form or dignity that we should look at him,
 And no beauty that we should desire him.
3. He was despised and rejected by men,
 A man of sorrows and acquainted with disease;
 And as one from whom one hides the face,
 He was despised and we esteemed him not."
 Cf. 52:10 " Yahweh has made bare his holy arm in
 the eyes of all the nations."
 42:22 " But this is a people robbed and spoiled,
 They are all of them snared in holes,
 and they are hid in prison houses:
 They are for a prey, and none delivereth;
 for a spoil, and none saith, Restore."
 49:7 " Thus saith Yahweh, the redeemer of Israel
 and his Holy One,
 to him whom man despiseth,
 to him whom the nation abhorreth,
 to a servant of rulers."
4. " Surely it was our sickness which he bore,
 And our sorrows which he carried.
 Yet we esteemed him stricken,
 Smitten of God and afflicted.
5. But he was wounded for our transgressions,
 He was bruised for our iniquities;
 The chastisement of our peace was upon him,
 And by his stripes we were healed.

6. " All we like sheep have gone astray,
 We have turned everyone to his own way,
 And Yahweh has laid upon him the iniquity of us all."
 Cf. 47:6 " I was wroth with my people,
 I profaned mine inheritance,
 And gave them into thine hand."
 51:21 " Therefore hear now this, thou afflicted."
 54:11 " O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest,
 and not comforted."

The only parallels to this section of the Song are those which show Israel as being afflicted. Nowhere in Deutero-Isaiah do we find the thought that Israel suffers for the sins of others. Israel suffers for its own sin. " Behold, for your iniquities were ye sold and for your transgressions was your mother put away" (50:1). Cf. 42:24f., 40:2. Nor do the Gentiles benefit from the sufferings of the Servant Israel, as they benefit from the Servant's sufferings in 53:5. It is rather Israel's delivery from suffering, by Yahweh, which will attract and benefit the Gentiles. Cf. 41:8 - 20; 45:14f., 22f.; 49:7, 22 - 26; 51:4f.; 55:4f. Though in 42:6 Israel seems to have an^{1.} active mission to the Gentiles.

Consequently some scholars believe that the attitude to the heathen in the Songs is far more sympathetic than that in the rest of the prophecy. The Servant in the Songs has an active mission to the Gentiles, while in the prophecy Israel is the passive recipient of salvation.

1. See supra, P.37f.

This, they maintain, is further evidence against the Deutero-Isaianic authorship of the Songs.¹

These statements seem to be confirmed by a first reading of the relevant passages, given above. However, when we consider the use made of hyperbolic language in the Orient, these passages lose much of their offensive character. We must remember too, that the message of Deutero-Isaiah was that Yahweh was concerned with all the nations of the world and that he intended to redeem them. Israel was to be His instrument in bringing about the salvation of the world. Israel may be passive, but it is still the means by which the Gentiles come to know Yahweh. Furthermore, in 42:6 Israel is to be a light of the Gentiles. Thus it is not only Israel who receives the benefits of Yahweh's grace. The Gentiles are also to be redeemed.

Hence we cannot agree that the attitude towards the Gentiles in the Songs is so different from that in the rest of the prophecy, as some scholars suggest. Such differences as there are, need not necessarily be explained by postulating two authors. It seems more likely that the passages were written by one author. In both passages the ultimate aim is the salvation of all mankind, though there may be some differences in the manner in which it is achieved, by the Servant on the one hand, and Israel on the other.

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., pp. 182 - 185.



7. " He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself,
 And he opened not his mouth,
 As a lamb that is led to the slaughter
 And as a sheep is dumb before its shearers,
 So he opened not his mouth.
8. By oppression and judgement he was taken away,
 And among his generation who would reflect
 That he was cut off from the land of the living ?
 On account of the transgression of his people he
 was smitten.
9. And one has set his grave with the wicked
 And his sepulchre with the rich,
 Although he had done no violence
 Neither was there any deceit in his mouth. "

While absolute sinlessness is not explicitly predicated of the Servant but only freedom from " violence " and " deceit " the image of the lamb led to the slaughter, and his patient resignation to the will of God suggests a sinless character.

The closest parallels to this idea in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah are those passages which state that Yahweh has blotted out Israel's sin and that therefore Israel may be called " Jeshurum " (Upright).

Cf. 43:25 " I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions, for mine own sake; and I will not remember thy sins."

44:22 " I have blotteth out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and as a cloud thy sins: return unto me, for I have redeemed thee.

44:2 " And thou, Jeshurum, whom I have chosen."

10. " Yet Yahweh was pleased to crush him with sickness;
 Though thou make his life a sin offering.^{1.}
 He shall see his seed and prolong his days,
 And the pleasure of Yahweh will prosper in his hand.
11. Of the travail of his soul he shall see light
 And be satisfied with his knowledge.
 My righteous servant shall justify many,
 And he will bear their iniquities.^{1.}
12. Therefore will I divide to him a portion among many,
 And he will divide spoil with the powerful,
 Because he poured out his soul unto death;
 And he was numbered with transgressors,
 Yet he bore the sins of many
 And makes intercession for transgressors. "^{1.}

The idea of the Servant rising again from death to a new and prosperous life is not found in the rest of the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.

In comparison with the other Songs, the number of parallels between this Song and the rest of Deutero-Isaiah is considerably smaller. For this reason some scholars think that 52:13 - 53:12 may have originated separately^{2.} from the other Servant Songs.

There are still certain differences or alleged differences between the characteristics of the Servant in

1. See supra, vv. 4 - 6, P.49f.
 2. Cf. W.F. Lofthouse, " Some Reflections on the ' Servant Songs ' ", PP.173f., in J.T.S. vol., 48, 1947.

Deutero-Isaiah and those of the Servant in the Songs which we must examine to make our study complete.

It is generally agreed by scholars that the anonymity of the Servant in the Songs heightens the individualisation in the portrait of the Servant. In the other prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah the Servant is the nation Israel. In the Servant Songs it is not clear who the Servant is, and the personalization is carried much further than in Deutero-Isaiah. The description of the Servant also becomes more detailed as we proceed from the first Song to the last. Now some scholars believe that this heightened personification in the portrait of the Servant in the Songs gives weight to the view that Deutero-Isaiah cannot be the author of the Servant Songs. But, we should note that even in Deutero-Isaiah, the personification can be extremely bold at times, Cf. 44:2; 40:27. Hence the evidence before us may be capable of another explanation. Instead of indicating that there were two authors, the evidence may equally well be explained by postulating one author writing about two Servants.

Finally it is alleged that there is a radical difference between the conceptions of salvation and atonement in the Servant Songs and in the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.¹ As we have seen, nowhere in Deutero-Isaiah do we find the thought that Israel suffers for the sins of the Gentiles and so makes atonement for them.² The nearest parallel we can find to this idea is the statement that Israel has received double for all its sin. (40:2). But the ultimate

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., PP. 185 - 186.

2. See supra, P.50.

aim, both in the Songs and in the prophecy, is the salvation of all mankind. In the Songs atonement is wrought for mankind by the Servant who suffers and dies for the sins of mankind. In the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah the nations come to recognise Yahweh as their God through the fortunes of Israel his Servant. Hence we are bound to recognise the differences, though they may not be quite so radical as some scholars would suggest. The question which now confronts us is whether the differences between the two conceptions of atonement and salvation are so great that they could not have been subscribed to by one author. Once again this is a question which cannot be decided in isolation. The evidence before us is not decisive on its own, it only adds to the probability that there were two different authors if we have other evidence to suggest this. But in our study of the authorship of the Songs, the probability has been strongly in favour of their Deutero-Isaianic authorship. Moreover, "the very fact that the emphasis in the main prophecy is apparently one-sided should lead us to expect that so great a prophet would have more to say by way of complement to it. The scope of his imagination is so vast that we should be surprised if he had had nothing more to deliver than the eschatological message with which he began. What we have in the Songs restores the balance."¹ It is possible that when Cyrus proved a disappointment to the prophet's eschatological expectations, he was forced to reflect more deeply on Yahweh's purpose for mankind and the spiritual needs of man. Consequently he would be forced to alter his

1. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.186.

conception of Salvation and Atonement. Indeed, as North points out, " many poets, not to mention prophets, have travelled as far as Deutero-Isaiah did between their first work and their last. " ^{1.} Hence the theological standpoint of the Songs need not necessarily be inconsistent with their Deutero-Isaianic authorship.

Our comparison of the characteristics of the Servant in the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah and in the Songs has shown that there are many parallels but also differences. ^{2..} As we proceed from the first to the fourth Song, the number of parallels decreases, particularly in the fourth Song where there are very few. However we conclude that the number of parallels is still sufficient to attribute the authorship of the Songs to Deutero-Isaiah. Such differences as exist are not necessarily inconsistent with the Deutero-Isaianic authorship of the Songs.

Finally, therefore, we conclude from this study that the interpolation theory has not been proved. The Songs cannot be removed from their context without breaking the continuity of thought. The fact that there are few signs of dependence on the Songs in the rest of the prophecy is not decisive. The language of the Songs is not inconsistent with their Deutero-Isaianic authorship. The argument from style and metre is precarious. However we admit that

1. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.186.

2. For a convenient table of the chief likenesses and differences between Israel in the prophecy and the Servant in the Songs, Cf. B.W. Anderson, " The Living World of the O.T. ", P.419. Note that in the table of likenesses, the scripture reference for the Anonymous Servant in No.4, should be 49:2 and not 51:16.

there are certain " temperamental " differences between the Songs and the prophecy. There are sufficient correspondences between the theological ideas, and the characteristics of the Servant, in the Songs and in the rest of the prophecy to attribute the authorship of the Songs to Deutero-Isaiah. Hence we conclude that the Servant Songs were most probably written by Deutero-Isaiah.

Chapter Three.

The Date of the Servant Songs.

In determining the date of the Servant Songs two questions must be answered. Are the Servant Songs earlier or later than the main prophecy? Secondly, were the Servant Songs composed simultaneously or were they composed at different intervals?

The answer given to these questions will depend to a very large degree, on the view held concerning the authorship of the Servant Songs. If Deutero-Isaiah is not the author of the Songs, they may be much earlier or much later than the main prophecy. If Deutero-Isaiah is the author, they can only be slightly earlier, contemporaneous, or slightly later than the main prophecy. If the Servant Songs are the work of more than one author, they may have been written at many different dates. Hence it is not surprising to find that many different answers have been given to the two questions above. Some scholars believe that the songs are the work of an earlier writer which Deutero-Isaiah incorporated in his own prophecies. Others think that they were added by an editor. Others again believe that Deutero-Isaiah himself was the author and that he later incorporated them into his other prophecies.¹ Duhm in his commentary on Isaiah maintained that the Servant Songs are considerably later than the work of Deutero-Isaiah and were inserted into the prophecy by a later editor.²

1. Cf. J. Skinner, "Isaiah XL - LXVI", P.262. Cf. also, A.S. Peake, "The Servant of Yahweh", P.6f.

2. See supra P.15. Cf. also, W.O.E. Oesterly, "Studies in Isaiah XL - LXVI", P.42f.

Now the discussion of the authorship of the Servant Songs in the previous chapter, led to the conclusion that the Servant Songs were most probably written by Deutero-^{1.} Isaiah. This therefore limits the possible dates which may be assigned to the Servant Songs to the lifetime of Deutero-Isaiah. The question now is: Did Deutero-Isaiah write the Servant Songs before the main prophecy, together with it, or after it?

To answer this question it is necessary to recall certain differences between the Servant Songs and the main prophecy which were discussed in the previous chapter.

First of all it has been pointed out that there are very few signs of dependence upon the Servant Songs in the rest of the prophecy.^{2.} This suggests that the prophet was unacquainted with the thought of the Servant Songs when he composed the oracles of the main prophecy. Deutero-Isaiah must, therefore, have composed the Servant Songs after he had composed the oracles of the main prophecy.

Most scholars agree that there is a certain "temperamental" difference between the subdued concentration and the artistic thought of the Servant Songs and the more exuberant strains which dominate the rest of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah.^{3.} This difference in "temperament" might have been due to difference of authorship. But it is equally possible that the difference derives from a different mood, or a different period in the life of the author. The fact that the language of the Servant Songs is so subdued in comparison

1. See supra, P.57.
 2. See supra, P.18f.
 3. See supra, P.31f.

with the exuberant language of the main prophecy, suggests that the Songs may have been written during a later period of Deutero-Isaiah's life when his thought became more mellowed and mature.

Finally it was noticed that there were differences between the conceptions of Salvation and Atonement in the Servant Songs and in the main prophecy.^{1.} Once again these differences may be explained by saying that there were two authors. But they may equally well be explained by saying that after more experience in life and after more mature reflection upon the ways of God with man, the prophet altered his conception of Salvation and Atonement. It is possible that Cyrus proved a disappointment to the prophet's eschatological expectations, and that this made him reflect more deeply upon the ways of God with man and consequently forced him to alter his conception of Salvation and Atonement. Now it is generally agreed that the conception of Salvation and Atonement in the Servant Songs is more profound than in the rest of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah. Would the prophet then discard completely such a profound and mature conception as is found in the Servant Songs, and leave no traces of it in his prophecies, in which he adopts a more superficial view? It seems very unlikely. A far more satisfactory explanation is that Deutero-Isaiah began with a superficial view and later on in life, after deeper reflection, reached a more profound and mature conception of Salvation and Atonement. Thus the Servant Songs seem to have been composed after the main prophecy had been given.

1. See supra, P.54ff.

Finally in examining these differences between the Servant Songs and the main prophecy, it is important to notice that these differences become greater as we proceed from the first to the fourth Song.

Hence, from the examination of differences between the Servant Songs and the main prophecy, a case may be made for the composition of the Servant Songs, particularly the latter Songs, at a later date than the main prophecy.

Now we must consider whether the Servant Songs were all composed at one time or at intervals.

The Servant Songs themselves do not present a uniform picture of the career of the Servant. The first Song creates the impression that the Servant will be very successful in his mission. There is not the slightest hint of the suffering of the Servant or of his violent end, which are related in the third and the fourth Songs. The suffering of the Servant seems to be hinted at in the second Song where the Servant despairs because he thinks that all his labour has been in vain. But elsewhere in the second Song the Servant is confident and successful. Now why is there such a contradiction in the presentation of the Servant's career if all the Songs were composed together? No satisfactory explanation can be given. Hence we must question the idea that the Servant Songs originally formed one collection or were composed together. The picture of the career of the Servant presented in the Servant Songs suggests that the prophet only gradually perceived the profound thoughts which are expressed in the fourth Song. Thus it does not seem very likely that the Servant Songs were all composed in one burst of inspiration. A far more likely explanation is that they were composed over a considerable period during which the prophet's thought developed and matured.

Furthermore, the position of the Servant Songs in the main prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah is striking. Instead of being placed together in a group, they are scattered throughout the prophecy. If the Servant Songs were all composed at the same time, or if they originally formed a single collection, why would they be dispersed throughout the work of Deutero-Isaiah? Why were they not placed together in the main prophecy? Duhm's explanation that the editor inserted the Servant Songs wherever there happened to be room enough in the manuscript seems very unlikely. No probable explanation can be found for such a procedure. Thus once again we must question the idea that the Servant Songs originally formed one collection or were composed together. The fact that the Servant Songs are dispersed throughout the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah suggests very strongly that they were not all written at the same time and that they did not originally form a single collection. They were composed at intervals and were later included among the other prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.

While this argument from the position of the Songs in the main prophecy suggests very strongly that the Servant Songs were composed at intervals, it does not necessarily prove that they are contemporary with the main prophecy. We cannot be sure that the present order of the prophecies in Deutero-Isaiah is the exact chronological order in which they were composed. We do not regard all collections of prophetic oracles as having been put together at random; but neither do we think of Deutero-Isaiah as sitting down and writing out his prophecies for publication.

As Eissfeldt has pointed out, scholars have nowadays learned to think of the prophetic books as "collections of independent and usually short oracles, poems and the like".¹ Thus it is possible that the Servant Songs are not exactly contemporaneous with their context. Possibly the Servant Songs were included among earlier compositions when the prophetic oracles of Deutero-Isaiah came to be written.

Thus it seems very probable that the Servant Songs were composed at intervals. While the earlier Servant Songs may be contemporary with the main prophecy, the differences between the main prophecy and the Servant Songs - which become greater as we proceed from the first to the last Song - suggest that the later Songs may have been composed at a date later than the main prophecy.

1. Cf. O. Eissfeldt. "The Literature of Israel : Modern Criticism", in "Record and Revelation", Ed., H. Wheeler Robinson, pp. 90 - 102.

Chapter Four.

The Text and Translation of the Servant Songs.

(See also Appendix A.)

The First Song 42 : 1 - 4.

1. Behold! My Servant whom I uphold,
my chosen in whom I delight !
I have endowed him with my spirit,
He will bring true religion to the nations.

2. He will not cry, nor clamour,
Nor make his voice heard in the street.

3. A bruised reed he will not break,
And a glimmering wick he will not quench.

Faithfully he will bring forth true religion,

4. He will not be disheartened or discouraged
Until he has established true religion in the earth,
And the coastlands eagerly await his instruction.

Ver.1. Behold My Servant) The LXX reads " Jacob my servant...
Israel my chosen ..." This seems to be an insertion
for it would give a 4:4 line in a 3:3 context and
thus disturb the rhythm. This addition is not found
in DSIa. Although it is an addition, it is interesting
for it shows how the ancient readers identified the
Servant with the nation under the influence of 44:1;
45:4 and 41:8.

whom I uphold) Cf. 41:10, where Israel is similarly
described.

my chosen). This term is applied to Israel in 43:20; 45:4. Cf. also the verb in 41:8.

in whom I delight). 'שׂוֹשֵׁי is an intensive " ego" ^{1.}

I have endowed him with my spirit). Like the prophets the Servant is endowed with the spirit of Yahweh in order that he might fulfill that purpose for which Yahweh has chosen him. Cf. 44:3 (of Israel).

He will bring true religion to the nations). This is the ultimate purpose for which the Servant has been raised up. Through his ministry true religion will be diffused throughout the world.

True religion). The Hebrew word שׁוֹשֵׁי " judgement " occurs 3 times in this Song, and is used in the special sense of " true religion ". שׁוֹשֵׁי is used in two primary senses in the O.T. It may be a synonym for the statutes of God, viz. His testimonies and His Law. But the word is generally in the plural when it is used in this sense. In the second sense is God's judgement on the affairs of man and of nations, both in history and at the end of history.

The origin of the use of שׁוֹשֵׁי in the sense of statutes of God is found in the custom whereby a man went to the local shrine to seek a ruling from God on a particular matter of faith or practice.

1. For the use of שׁוֹשֵׁי as a pronoun, Cf. A.R. Johnson, " The Vitality of the Individual in the thought of Ancient Israel ", pp. 19ff.

If the question was a new one, the cult official would seek an oracle from God, and the reply given was known as קָרָאָה "instruction". If the same question arose again, the cult official could give a ruling according to precedent. Such a ruling was דָּבַר יְהוָה , which gradually became associated with the declared will of God - His statutes.

But as Isaiah reminds us, Yahweh is also a God of judgement (30:18). He judges man in history. Gradually the idea grows of a great Day of the Lord, which will be a great day of judgement at the consummation of history, when God will set righteousness on high and pass judgement on those who are unfaithful to Him. In the O.T. God partly delegates His function of judge on earth to the messianic prince who is destined to establish the earthly kingdom.^{1.}

There are numerous instances of " judgement " being pronounced by kings, priests and local justices, but it is not clear whether similar authority was vested in a prophet. Only Deborah (Jud. 4:5) and Samuel (1 Sam. 3:20) are mentioned as giving judgement. But they may have done so in their capacities as judges rather than prophets. Hence the exercise of דָּבַר יְהוָה was probably a regal function rather than a prophetic one.

1. Cf. " A Theological Wordbook of the Bible ", Ed., A. Richardson, PP. 117f.

In the Songs the word seems to be used in a wider sense. Thus, in the light of 11 Kings 17:26f and Jer. 5:4f commentators usually interpret לִשְׁׁוֹן as the sum - total of the Judgements of Yahweh. When this is announced to the heathen nations, they receive it as the Yahweh religion. Since Yahweh is the only true God, this religion is the true religion. Thus Delitzsch maintains that לִשְׁׁוֹן is here the name for the true religion, "viewed on its practical side, as a norm and standard for life in all its relations, religion as a law of life, νόμος." 1.

"Judgement" means here the whole complex of religious ordinances, which is the true religion. Many commentators have pointed out the close parallel with the Arabic *dīn*, which has the same latitude of meaning, denoting a system of usages and a religion.

The difficulty with the translation "religion" is that the term has associations for men today which it would not have for the men of the O.T. Hence Volz prefers to translate לִשְׁׁוֹן by the more general term "truth" (Wahrheit). 2. But the same objections may be raised against this term.

"True religion" is the most satisfactory expression to convey the meaning of לִשְׁׁוֹן in the Song. Ver. 2. nor clamour). Lit. "nor lift up" (sc. his voice). The object has been postponed to the end of the line..

1. F. Delitzsch, "Commentary on Isaiah", Vol., II, P.166.
2. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.141.

This is possible, cf. Num. 14:1. But after $\rho\upsilon\sigma'$ which has no object, we would expect a parallel which would not require an object. Hence some commentators follow the Targum in reading $\lambda\ \times\ \psi'$ "roar" instead of $\times\ \psi'$ "lift up". On this point the reading $\kappa\rho\alpha\upsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ "cry out"; "clamour" in Matt. 12:19 is interesting. Peake following Giesebrecht objects that the word seems too strong. But alliteration favours $\lambda\ \times\ \psi'$.

Ver.3. Faithfully) $\eta\ \times\ \lambda'$. Giesebrecht, ^{2.} suggests that we read $\eta\ \dot{\iota}\ \times\ \lambda'$ ($\eta\ \dot{\iota}\ \times\ \lambda'$ footnote in B.H.) "to the peoples". Thus we would get a correspondence with ver. 1. "He will bring forth true religion to the nations." The objection against this emendation is that Deutero-Isaiah nowhere uses this word. He uses $\square\ \times\ \lambda'$ as a parallel to $\square\ \times\ \lambda'$. ^{3.} The LXX follows the M.T. and reads $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\eta}\ \theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\upsilon$. In the translation above the text has not been altered for it makes good sense as it stands.

true religion). Cf. ver.1.

Ver.4. He will not be disheartened nor discouraged). Read, with the footnote in B.H. $\psi\ \dot{\iota}\ \gamma'$ (Impf. Niph. of $\psi\ \varsigma\ \gamma'$) "be discouraged". The words "disheartened" and "discouraged" correspond in the original Hebrew to the words "glimmering" (lit. "dimly burning") and "bruised" in ver. 3.

1. A.S. Peake, "The Problem of Suffering in the O.T.", P.39.
2. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 39.
3. See supra, P. 16.

true religion). Cf. ver. 1.

his instruction). According to " A Theological Wordbook of the Bible ", $\eta \tau \iota \sigma \eta$ denotes " the guidance or instruction which comes from God through the oracular utterances of the priests or through the prophets; it is the whole content of God's revelation of his nature and purpose, which incidentally makes clear man's responsibility before God. In so far as this responsibility is clarified by a collection of maxims into a legislative code , the term may be applied to such a code, and in this restricted sense it coincides with one meaning of $\nu \acute{o} \mu \omicron \varsigma$, a single enactment or the legal corpus of a given community, commonly esteemed among Gentiles as ' the invention and gift of the Gods, the judgements of wise men, the correction of transgressions, and the common covenant of a state, in accordance with which all members of the state ought to live.' (Contra Aristogitonem, 774, quoted by Dodd, op. cit., p.26)^{1.} The LXX translators understood most of the O.T. references to $\eta \tau \iota \sigma \eta$ in this sense, and supplied the translation which passed into N.T. thought and into our English Bibles as ' law ', creating thereby a misleading impression of the way God had dealt with Israel to make them his people. It obscures the wider and more personal communication which is partly suggested by ' teaching ' and implies that Israel is bound

1. " The Bible and the Greeks ".

to God in a revelation which is adequately expressed by strict obedience to a code of law.^{12.}"

Notice that here the LXX does not read *καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν*. It reads *καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν* "and nations shall hope on his name". This means that the LXX translators understood *הַגִּידָה* in its wider sense of instruction or teaching and not in the restricted sense of *νόμος*. Furthermore in this verse *הַגִּידָה* is parallel with *לִשְׁמֹעַ* (Cf. Hab. 1:4, Ps. 89:31). Hence we must give *הַגִּידָה* its wider sense in this verse and translate it as " instruction ".

And the coastlands eagerly await). It is doubtful whether the verb *יִלְכְּדוּ* should be rendered " shall wait " or " do wait ". If the second rendering is correct, the prophet expresses the remarkable thought that the heathen are dissatisfied with their religious systems and eagerly desire the truth which the Servant will bring. We might compare this liberal estimate of the heathen with the beautiful description of their willingness to receive the truth, given in the Book of Job.

1. " A Theological Word Book of the Bible ", Ed., A. Richardson, PP.122f.

The Second Song 49:1 - 6.

1. Hearken, ye coastlands, unto me,
And listen, ye distant peoples !
Yahweh has called me from the womb,
From my mother's bowels He made mention of my name.
2. And He made my mouth like a sharp sword,
In the shadow of His hand He hid me;
And He made me a polished arrow,
In His quiver He concealed me.
3. And He said to me, Thou art my Servant,
Israel in whom I will glorify myself.
5. (e) So was I honoured in the eyes of Yahweh,
(f) And my God became my strength.
4. (a) But I said, In vain have I toiled,
(b) For nought and vanity have I spent my strength;
(c) Yet surely my cause is with Yahweh,
(d) And my recompense with my God.
5. (a) And now, thus saith Yahweh,
(b) Who formed me from the womb to be His Servant,
(c) To restore Jacob unto Him
(d) And that Israel might be gathered to Him,
6. It is too trifling that thou shouldest be my Servant,
To raise up the tribes of Jacob
And to restore the preserved of Israel.
So I make thee a light to the nations,
That my salvation may reach to the ends of the earth.

Ver. 1. Ye coastlands... ye peoples). This parallelism refers to the heathen nations.

Yahweh has called me from the womb). In chapter 44:2,24 the same metaphor is used of the nation at the beginning of its history.¹ The idea is not that the Servant consciously received a call and responded to it at his birth. It means, as was Jeremiah's experience (Jer.1:5), that later in his lifetime the experience of vocation sheds light, meaning and purpose on his earlier life from its very origin.

From my mother's bowels he made mention of my name). Delitzsch points out that " wherever Israel is spoken of in the same way we read merely $\gamma \text{ מִן} \text{ בֶּטֶן} \text{ אִמִּי}$ (XLIV.2, 24, XLVI. 3, along with $\square \text{ מִן} \text{ בֶּטֶן} \text{ אִמִּי}$, XLVIII.8), but without mention of the mother, which (except in such allegorical connections as are found in li.1,2; Ezek. XVI. 3) is inapplicable to the people collectively."² The rest of the sentence means either " to keep in remembrance " or simply " to utter ". In the context the second meaning seems the most suitable. Here the Servant states his claim to receive a hearing. From his earliest days he had been ordained and nominated to be Yahweh's Servant.

Ver.2. polished arrow). The LXX has $\beta \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \omicron \varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \acute{\omicron} \nu$; and the Targum $\gamma \text{ מִן} \text{ בֶּטֶן} \text{ אִמִּי}$ " chosen arrow ". This rendering of the LXX and the Targum does not accord very well with the nature of an arrow, nor does it

1. See supra, P. 34.

2. Op. cit., P. 235.

suit the parallelism in this verse. Therefore we should, understand the phrase as a cleaned, polished, sharpened, or pointed arrow, as in Jer. 51:11.

ver. 3. Israel, in whom I will glorify myself). The genuineness of the word " Israel " in this context was first questioned by J.D. Michaelis.^{1.}

Following him many interpreters would strike out " Israel " as an incorrect gloss, because it is fatal to the individual conception of the Servant. Those who favour the collective interpretation retain the word. But there are some exceptions on both sides. Such a procedure creates the impression that the scholars judgement is liable to be determined by his attitude to the whole problem.

Only one Hebrew manuscript (Kennicott 96) omits " Israel ". All the other manuscripts retain it, as well as the LXX and DSia. Thus the manuscript evidence is not sufficient to allow the deletion of " Israel " in this verse.^{2.}

Yet the retention of the word, even on the collective interpretation, causes difficulties,

1. Cf. B. Duhm, " Das Buch Jesaja ", P. 340.

2. For an opposite view, Cf. S. Mewinckel, " He that Cometh ", Add. Note XI, P.462f. He argues that since " Israel " disturbs the metre and is also missing in several MSS., of G., those MSS., represent the genuine LXX which is older than the M.T. The word " Israel " should therefore be deleted.

for in ver. 5f the Servant is given a mission to Israel. Commentators overcome these difficulties in various ways.

Some maintain that we should still delete the word " Israel " in this verse as a gloss. Apart from this verse the Servant in the Songs is anonymous. Outside the Songs, wherever Israel is called Servant it is always parallel with " Jacob " in the other stichos.¹ Since 49:3 is trimeter, we should expect " Jacob " in the one stichos if " Israel " had been in the other. It may well be, therefore, that the word " Israel " should be deleted as a gloss in imitation of 44:23. Other scholars object that the deletion of " Israel " would result in a 3:2 line in a 3:3 context. But these arguments from the metre of the Song cannot be decisive, for, as Lindblom points out, " the metre of this Song varies greatly. The line of V. 3 can be scanned in different ways. $\text{'}\text{ל } \text{ך } \text{ן } \text{ן } \text{'}$ can be regarded as integral to the metre, or as falling outside the metre. ' ל can be taken as an independent word, or be connected enclitically with $\text{ך } \text{ן } \text{ן } \text{'}$."²

Many scholars have also pointed out that there was a tendency to insert " Israel " in the Servant Songs, which is evident from the LXX in 42:1. Therefore they maintain that " Israel " must also be regarded

-
1. An exception might be claimed in 48:20b, where " Jacob " is used without the parallel " Israel ". But there the metre is Qinah (3:2), and although parallelism within the Qinah line is possible, it is not constant; the second part of the line may complete the idea begun in the first. Both types of line are seen in 48:20f.
 2. Joh. Lindblom, " The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah ", P.30.

as a gloss in 49:3. But why was "Israel" added, and not "Jacob" as in the LXX in 42:1? No satisfactory answer can be given. Hence the argument from the tendency of the LXX to insert "Israel" and "Jacob" cannot be decisive in retaining or deleting the word "Israel" in 49:3.

Giesebrecht in "Der Knecht Yahwes" goes one step further. He thinks that the whole of ver. 3 may be an insertion.¹ We must admit that there is some confusion in the text. Ver. 3 is much shorter than the other verses of the Song, and ver. 5e - f (which is inserted after ver. 3), is an awkward parenthesis in the present position in the text. But the expedient of cutting out the whole of ver. 3 in order to avoid the difficulties caused by the word "Israel", is far too drastic and is not warranted by the evidence before us.

Another group of scholars retain "Israel" in ver. 3 and remove the difficulties by interpreting vv. 5 - 6: "' And now saith the Lord, that formed me from the womb to be his servant - i.e. and now the Lord hath decided, promised (cf. 1 Sam. XXX, 16; Esth. IV, 7) - to bring Jacob again to him. ' In XliX,6, it is probably necessary, as Duhm himself realized, to reject the words ' that thou shouldst be my servant ', and read: ' It is too light a thing for me to raise up the tribes of Jacob, etc. ' "² Thus they make Yahweh the subject of the infinitives in vv. 5 - 6. But this translation

1. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 40.

2. A. Lods, "The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism", P. 246. Cf. also, B. Duhm, Op. cit., P. 342, and Joh. Lindblom, Op. cit., P. 30f.

is a forced one. It is far more natural to make the Servant the subject of the infinitives.

Since the methods of overcoming the initial difficulty caused by the word " Israel " in ver. 3, create so many other difficulties, we should hesitate to follow them. If we remove the word " Israel " from ver. 3, we can do so only on theoretical, and not on textual or metrical grounds.^{1.} Hence it is better to retain the word " Israel " in the translation, but at the same time to bear in mind that the collective interpretation cannot be assumed on the basis of this single text without further evidence.

Ver.5e-f. Duhm^{2.} first transposed this section of ver. 5 to this position following ver. 3. It forms a very awkward parenthesis to ver. 5 a-d, and fits in much better after ver. 3 since it completes the stanza. Kissane,^{3.} who thinks that in this Song the Servant is Israel, suggests a different revision of the text. He maintains that the main difficulty is that the meaning of ver. 5c - f is unsuited to its context. It contradicts the teaching of the preceding poems on the purpose of Israel's election (42:1f; 45:6) and also the express statement of ver. 6 which reveals that the Servant's task is not the restoration of Israel's national life, but the conversion of the nations. Moreover the natural sequel to ver. 5a - b is ver. 6. Therefore he transposes ver. 5c - f

1. This is exactly what Duhm does. He deleted the word for grammatical reasons and does not argue on textual or metrical grounds. Cf. Duhm Op. cit., P. 340f.
 2. Op. cit., P. 340.
 3. E.J. Kissane, " The Book of Isaiah ", Vol.II, P. 127f.

to follow ver. 4a - b . But in order to establish a logical sequence throughout, he has to read the verbs in ver. 5c - f as optatives.¹ Thus Kissane's revision is clearly governed by his assumption that in this Song Israel is the Servant, and that therefore it is impossible that he (the Servant) should restore Israel. Moreover this revision leaves ver. 4c - d isolated. In the translation above Duhm's revision of the text has been followed since it does not affect the interpretation of the Song. Following the footnote in B.H. we may point the verb " honoured " as a waw consecutive.

Ver. 4. my cause). לִּי הַיְשׁוּבָה is used here in its legal sense, meaning (legal) right, claim or due. It is parallel with לִּי הַשְּׂכָר " my recompense " or " my reward ".

Ver. 5a. A number of manuscripts with the LXX and the Syriac add וְעַתָּה and read, " And now, thus saith Yahweh ".

5d. And that Israel might be gathered to Him). The translation above follows the Qere יָבֵן . The Keth . reads יָבֵן , but 9 mss., A, T, the LXX and DSIA all read יָבֵן .

In the translation above, the Servant is distinctly conceived as having a mission to fulfill for the people of Israel. But this view is very difficult to harmonise with the theory that the Servant is Israel.² Therefore a number of scholars translate

1. See infra, ver. 5.

2. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., pp. 172f.

this verse differently. ^{1.} Budde ^{2.} translates the infinitives in a gerundical sense. ^{3.} with Yahweh as the implicit subject, " in bringing back Jacob to Himself." This construction may be correct in grammar, but in exegesis it is wrong because it carries back the reference to the forming of the nation at the time of the Exodus. This is opposed ^{4.} to the sense of the verbs employed. Kissane emends the text to $\text{וְיָבֹא יְהוָה אֵלָיו}$ (5c) and $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִגְדָּל בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה}$ (5d) and reads the verbs as optatives, giving the following translation:-

- 5.(c) " If only He would bring back Jacob unto Him,
 (d) And if only Israel were gathered,
 (e) And I were honourable in the eyes of Yahweh,
 (f) And My God were my strength ! " ^{5.}

This emendation, however, has no textual support, and is purely conjectural.

It is clear that here in ver. 5 we again have an instance where the exegesis of the passage can so easily be determined by the scholar's attitude to the problem of the interpretation of the Songs. We are on surer ground if we translate the verse naturally and take the Servant as the subject of the infinitives.

Ver. 6. The resumption $\text{וְיָבֹא יְהוָה אֵלָיו}$ has become redundant with the removal of the parenthesis (ver. 5e - f) and may therefore be deleted.

1. See supra, ver. 3.
 2. Cf. J. Skinner, Op. cit., P. 100. Cf. also A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 41.
 3. Cf. A.B. Davidson, " Hebrew Syntax ", sect., 93.
 4. Op. cit., PP. 123 - 128.
 5. Ibid., P. 123.

It is too trifling ... Jacob). This clearly means that part of the Servant's function is to restore Israel from exile. But Dillman^{1.} maintained that if the prophet had meant this, the Hebrew would have been different. Peake, following Dillman, suggests the following translation; " Too light a thing for thy being my Servant is it to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel. This may be explained in two ways; (a) It is not worthy of the Servant's position that he should simply restore Israel from exile; (b) it is not worthy of the Servant's position that Yahweh should restore Israel from exile. But the Hebrew, as thus correctly interpreted, is very clumsy. "^{2.} But this translation has been determined by Peake's belief that the Servant is Israel.

Many commentators like Duhm^{3.}, Cheyne,^{4.} Marti,^{5.} Giesebrecht and Peake^{6.} maintain that the words " that thou shouldest be my Servant " are a gloss in the Hebrew text. The excision of the phrase does not affect the sense and is even favoured by the metre. However, the gloss is not incorrect, for it defines more closely in what respect the restoration of Israel was " too trifling ". Mowinckel, on the other hand, omits " and to restore the preserved of Israel " as a variant of the preceding member.^{7.} In the translation above the M.T. has been followed.

1. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 42.

2. Ibid., P. 42.

3. Op. cit., P. 342.

4. " The Book of the Prophet Isaiah " in " Sacred Books of the O.T. ", P. 85.

5. D. Karl Marti, " Das Buch Jesaja ", P. 328.

6. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 42.

7. S. Mowinckel, " He that cometh ", P. 191.

the preserved of Israel). The LXX reads " the dispersed of Israel ", but DSia confirms the M.T. The translation above follows the Qere

That my salvation may reach to the ends of the earth). Lit. " in order that thou might be my salvation to the end of the earth. " Hebrew usage also allows the interpretation, " that my salvation may extend to the end of the earth. " This is the interpretation which is preferred by most commentators.

The Third Song 50:4 - 9 .

4. The Lord Yahweh Himself has given me
A disciple's tongue,
That I should know how to sustain
The weary with a word.
Morning by morning He awakens my ear
To listen as disciples do.
- 5.(a) The Lord Yahweh Himself has opened my ear

And I have not rebelled,
Nor turned away backward.
6. My back I gave to the smiters,
And my cheeks to those who pluck out the beard;
My face I hid not
From shame and spitting.
- 7.(a) But the Lord Yahweh Himself is helping me;
Therefore am I not dishonoured:
Therefore have I set my face like flint,
And I know that I shall not be ashamed.

- 8.(a) Near is my Vindicator,
 Who will take proceedings against me ?
 Let us stand up together !
 Who is my adversary ?
 Let him come near to me !
- 9.(a) Behold ! The Lord Yahweh Himself is helping me !
 (b) Who then can convict me ?
 Behold ! They will all wear out as a garment,
 The moth shall consume them !

Ver. 4 (disciple's tongue). Lit. " the tongue of them that are taught. "

That I should know how to sustain the weary with a word). The word rendered " to sustain " נָשַׁן is difficult. There is no other occurrence of a verb נָשַׁן in Hebrew. The LXX ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$) evidently derives the verb from the Hebrew root נָשַׁן , meaning " time " and paraphrases " to speak in season ". DSia sheds no light on the difficulty. The Vulgate reads " sustenare " (so also Aquila), which may be correct since the Arabic and Aramaic roots have this meaning (cf. the Hebrew שָׁנַן). König ^{1.} derives the word from the Arabic ghâtha " to refresh ", " to quicken ". Duhm ^{2.} emends נָשַׁן to נָשַׁן " to answer "; while Cheyne ^{3.} emends it to נָשַׁן " to teach ". Peake ^{4.} maintains that the general drift of the passage suggests that the Servant's adversaries should be mentioned here instead of the

1. Eduard König, " Das Buch Jesaja ", P. 411, n.2.
 2. Op. cit., P. 351.
 3. " Introduction to the Book of Isaiah ", P. 426.
 " Prophecies of Isaiah ", Vol. II, P. 149.
 4. Op. cit., P. 43.

weary. He therefore renders the clause as follows;-

" That I might know to answer the godless
With upright words ".

For הַיָּוֵד " the weary " he adopts Duhm's emendation and reads הַיָּוֵד " the godless". Further he changes דְּבָרַיִם into דְּבָרַיִם and reads " דְּבָרַיִם " words of uprightness ", assuming that the yodh at the end of the first word has fallen out because the next word began with it.

However, as North ^{1.} points out, these textual emendations have no bearing on the problem of interpretation. The only one which might affect the main problem is the emendation based on the Targum " teach " for which an original לְרַמֵּן " to feed " has been suggested. Some scholars have held that this indicates that the Servant is a ruler, because this verb " to feed " or " to shepherd " in its figurative use, is always used of a ruler. But even this emendation is too uncertain to contribute to the interpretation of the passage.

Morning by morning ...). A much better sentence results if we omit, with Cheyne ^{2.}, the first word וְעָרַב (or the first two words with Duhm ^{3.}) as an uncorrected dittograph, and read the adverbial expression with the following verb - " morning by morning (or in the morning) he awakens my ear to hear." Kissane ^{4.}, however, maintains that the reversed order of the words is against Duhm's hypothesis that the scribe repeated the words by

1. Op. cit., P. 121.

2. " The Book of the Prophet Isaiah ", in " Sacred Books of the O.T.", P. 87.

3. Op. cit., P. 351.

4. Op. cit., P. 150.

mistake. He suggests that the first ר'ע' is not an interpolation, but is a slight corruption of a word which should be read with the preceding clause, and offers three possible emendations, דְּבַר־דַּעַת "words of knowledge", דְּבַר־עֵזֶר "words of help" and לִמְעַל־רַגְלֵךְ "a word that avails". Of these suggestions the second is the most likely one, since it only requires the alteration of ' to ר . Unfortunately this emendation has no textual support.

Ver. 5. The text of this verse is not in order. Mowinckel ^{1.} claims that 5a is an unnatural and clumsy sequel to verse 4, and is not logically connected with what follows in ver. 5. Therefore he transposes it to follow רַגְלֵךְ in ver. 4. But this measure is too drastic. It is far more likely that in ver. 5 either something no longer recoverable has been lost, or the opening sentence is a dittograph. Consequently ^{2.} Duhm, ^{3.} Cheyne, and ^{4.} Marti omit this couplet as a variant of the clause "in the morning he awakens my ear". In this way the connection between vv. 4 - 5 is improved. The omission does not affect the meaning of the Song. None of the proposed emendations has any textual support, therefore the couplet has been retained in the translation on the assumption that the following clause has been lost.

Ver. 6. smiters). The LXX reads $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ "scourges".

1. Op. cit., P. 193.
 2. Op. cit., P. 351f.
 3. Op. cit., P. 87.
 4. Op. cit., P. 334.

those who pluck out the beard). DSIA reads
 □ ם ל ן ן " rods of wrought iron ".

I hid not). The Vulgate and DSIA read " I did not
 turn aside " (i.e. averti and ם ן ן ן ן)

Ver. 7. is helping me). Many scholars translate this as a
 future tense. But from the context it is better to
 take ן ן ן ן as the present tense, which is quite
 grammatical. The Servant is confident that despite
 the suffering which he has to endure, God is with
 him to vindicate him. The fact that God is near
 " is not intended to denote the proximity of an
 event still future, but to describe his intervention
 as constantly within reach and available."^{1.}

Ver. 8. Vindicator). ן ן ן ן is strictly a forensic term
 meaning " to acquit " or " pronounce innocent " in
 case of accusation, and " to do right " or " to do
 justice to " in case of civil controversy. Cf.
 Deuteronomy 25:1 for the use of this word and
 correlative expressions. In the present context
 ן ן ן ן means " he who declares me innocent ".

take proceedings against me). Lit. " will contend ".
 ן ן ן ן denotes specifically " litigation " or
 " forensic strife ". So here we must understand it
 as " entering into a legal encounter".

stand up together). The Hebrew verb is used here
 in a technical sense, meaning to stand at the bar,
 or before the judgement seat.

1. J.A. Alexander, " Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah ",
 Vol. LL, P. 253.

adversary). Lit. " master of my case " i.e. one who has a controversy with me; my opponent or adversary.

come near to me). i.e. confront me, or engage in conflict with me.

Ver.9. is helping me). See ver. 7.

convict me). Lit. " put me in the wrong ". Here it is used in a forensic sense meaning to secure a verdict against somebody. It is the technical antithesis to " vindicate " - " convict ".

Mowinckel omits ver. 9a which he regards as a repetition of ver. 7a and an intrusion into the regular strophic structure of the poem. He inserts ver. 9b after ver. 8a, to form the natural sequel in antithetical parallelism.¹ At first sight this seems a very attractive solution, but it also has its difficulties. The metrical scheme of this Song is somewhat obscure, particularly in ver. 5 where the text is corrupt. This makes it difficult to decide how far the irregularities are due to textual confusion or poetic licence. Moreover ver. 9 is intelligible as it stands. Therefore it is better to leave the text as it stands in ver. 9 rather than to resort to emendations which can only be hypothetical.

1. Op. cit., P. 194.

The Fourth Song 52:13 - 53:12.

- 52:13. Behold ! My Servant shall deal wisely,
He will rise and lift himself up and be greatly
exalted.
- 52:14(a). As many were appalled at him,
(b). -
(c). For his appearance was marred beyond human semblance
(d). And his form beyond that of the sons of men -
- 52:15. So shall many nations be amazed at him,
Kings shall shut their mouths;
For what had not been told them they shall have seen,
And what they had not heard they shall have perceived.
- 53:1. Who could have believed what we have heard ?
And to whom has the arm of Yahweh been revealed ?
- 53:2. For he grew up before him as a succulent,
And as a root out of the dry ground.
He had no form nor stateliness that we should look
at him,
And no appearance that we should desire him.
- 53:3. He was despised and forsaken by men,
A man of pains and familiar with sickness;
And as one from whom men hide their faces,
He was despised, and we esteemed him not.
- 53:4. Nevertheless, ours were the sicknesses that he
carried,
And ours the pains that he bore;
Yet we supposed him stricken,
Smitten of God, and afflicted.

- 53:5. But he was pierced for our transgressions,
He was crushed for our iniquities,
The chastisement leading to our welfare was upon him,
And by his scars we were healed.
- 53:6. All we like sheep have gone astray,
Each to his own way have we turned;
But Yahweh thrust upon him
The iniquity of us all.
- 53:7. He was harshly treated, yet he humbled himself,
And opened not his mouth.
As a sheep that is led to the slaughter,
And as a ewe before her shearers is dumb,
So he opened not his mouth.
- 53:8. Excluded from judgement he was taken away,
And who reflected on his fate ?
For he was cut off from the land of the living,
For the transgressions of his people he was smitten
to death.
- 53:9. And his grave was made with the wicked,
And with the rich his sepulchre;
Although he had done no violence,
Nor was any deceit in his mouth.
- 53:10. Yet Yahweh was pleased to crush him with sickness;
Truly he gave himself as a guilt offering.
He shall see posterity that prolongs life,
And the purpose of Yahweh will prosper in his hand.

53:11. After his travail of soul he shall see light,
 He shall be satisfied with his knowledge;
 My Servant shall justify many,
 And their iniquities shall he bear.

53:12. Therefore will I divide to him the many as a portion,
 And the numerous he will share as spoil;
 Because he poured out his soul unto death,
 And was numbered with transgressors.
 Yet he bore the sin of many,
 And makes intercession for transgressors.

Ver. 13. shall deal wisely). Scholars do not agree about the translation of לִּפְשֵׁי . Duhm^{1.} strikes out the word because he thinks that if it is taken in its usual sense it does not fit the context. North^{2.} follows the R.V. margin and reads " shall prosper ". Cheyne^{3.} gets the same sense by emending the text to לִּפְשֵׁי . Peake^{4.} thinks that it is much better to accept Budde's emendation לִּפְשֵׁי " Israel ", which is supported by 49:3. Now, as we have seen 49:3 has its own difficulties. There is no textual evidence to support Budde's emendation here. It is, however, interesting to notice that those who emend לִּפְשֵׁי to לִּפְשֵׁי are those who think that the Servant in the Songs is Israel. This suggests that the emendation has been prompted by the scholar's attitude to the whole problem of the interpretation of the Songs. Thus there is a great danger that the scholar is reading his own views into the text.

1. Op. cit., P. 365.

2. Op. cit., P. 121.

3. Cf. " Servant of the Lord " in " Encyclopaedia Biblica ", col. 4406.

4. Op. cit., P. 45.

In the translation above, therefore, the M.T. has been followed.

ל' ד' ש' literally means "to deal wisely". Only in a secondary sense does it mean "to prosper". In the present context it is better to retain the primary meaning of the word. Many modern commentators give the word its secondary sense. But this is unsatisfactory, for as Alexander points out, "the parallel expressions in the present case are not synonymous but simply correlative, the mutual relation being that of cause and effect. He shall be exalted, because he shall act wisely in the highest sense, i.e. shall use the best means for the attainment of the highest end. This kind of wisdom involves prosperity, not merely as a possible result, but as a necessary consequence. We have no right, however to substitute the one for the other, or to merge the primary idea in its derivative".^{1.}

He will rise). □' 7' is omitted by all the Greek and the old Latin Versions. DSia reads □ 7' 7'. Many scholars think that it is also metrically superfluous and consequently omit it. On the other hand, it suits the sequence of thought very well and is therefore retained in the translation.

Ver.14. The text of this verse is very confused.

As many were appalled at him). Many scholars follow the Peshitta and Targum and read 7' 7' "at him" instead of 7' 7' "at thee". The LXX, however, preserves the second person throughout ver. 14. Lindblom objects to the emendation "at him", which he maintains is "unnatural", and from a stylistic point

1. J.A. Alexander, Op. cit., P. 283.

of view impossible ", and argues for the text on the basis of the prophetic style in general. ^{1.}

The present text creates a very serious difficulty by inserting a parenthesis introduced by " so " after the protasis beginning with " as ". The ךֶּ which introduces the apodosis to $\text{כִּי־יִשְׂמְחוּ־בְּיָדָיו־כִּי־יִשְׂמְחוּ־בְּיָדָיו־כִּי־יִשְׂמְחוּ}$ is not the ךֶּ in ver. 14c, but that in ver. 15. One group of scholars solve the difficulty by taking ךֶּ as an adverb modifying " marred ". ^{2.} Duhm however, thinks that a line containing the apodosis has fallen out after " As many were appalled at him ". He suggests " so shall he shine forth before many " as a possible apodosis, while Cheyne ^{3.} suggests " so will many in him take delight ". ^{4.} Marti suggests a more drastic remedy. He transfers the parenthesis 14c - d to the end of 53:2, and so brings the protasis and apodosis together. He agrees with Duhm that a line has been lost, but he thinks that it contained a parallel to the preceding line and not its apodosis. In this way he obtains two parallel lines in the protasis corresponding to the two in the apodosis, and suggests that since in ver. 15 " kings " is parallel to " many nations ", the missing line should be " and princes shuddered at him "

The widely differing reconstructions of the missing line show how difficult it is to restore it. Hence, while it is agreed that a line has been lost,

-
1. Joh. Lindblom, " The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah " , P. 38.
 2. Op. cit., P. 365.
 3. " The Book of the Prophet Isaiah " in " Sacred Books of the O.T. ", P. 93.
 4. Op. cit., P. 345.

no attempt has been made to restore it.

Much may be said for reading 14c - d after 53:2. Where it stands in the M.T. it is an awkward parenthesis. If we insert it after 53:2 we have a fine example of inversion (53:2 $\text{הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ} \dots \text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַיְיָ}$ and 14c - d $\text{וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ} \dots \text{וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$), similar to 49:24f and 51: 6,8.¹ However, there are serious objections to Marti's transposition of the parenthesis, It immediately raises the question; How was 14c - d misplaced if it originally followed 53:2 ? No satisfactory answer can be given to this question. If 14c - d was originally a marginal note explaining 14a, we can understand how a later copyist inserted it into its present position in the text. But it seems most unlikely that a copyist or an editor would remove 14c - d from its supposedly original context (following 53:2) and insert it after 14a where it forms an awkward parenthesis. Moreover,² Giesebrecht and Peake maintain that 14 c - d is too strong to be appropriate after 53:2. The real objection to 14c - d in its present position in the M.T. is not that it is a parenthesis, but that it is introduced by "so". They remove this objection by the simple remedy of changing כֵּן "so" to וְכֵן "for". This emendation has been adopted in the translation above and 14c - d has been left in its present context as a parenthesis³, giving the reason for the fact that many were appalled at the appearance of the Servant.

1. Cf. L. Köhler, " D.J. stilkritisch untersucht ", PP.78f., 95. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 124.

2. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 46.

marred.). The M.T. has the Niph'al participle or the verbal noun שָׁחַט , while the Syriac has the Heph'al participle ܫܚܝܬ . DSIa has ܫܚܝܬ which is difficult to explain. Strictly the word means "corruption", but in the present context it means "disfiguration" or "deformity". The idea expressed in the parenthesis 14c - d is that the Servant was so disfigured that he no longer looked like a man, De Dieu's derivation of this word from שָׁחַט "to annoint" has not found any adherents^{1.}

ver.15. be amazed at him). The verb שָׁחַט is difficult^{2.} It is the Hiph'il of שָׁחַט but is used elsewhere only in the sense of sprinkling a liquid in ceremonial acts.^{3.} Young supports the traditional reading "he will sprinkle" and interprets it in a priestly sense.^{4.} H.S. Nyberg offers another solution. He takes שָׁחַט as the subject of שָׁחַט and translates the whole phrase as follows, "many peoples offer sacrifices of purifying (for his sake) and kings shut their mouths against him". Thus they attempt to protect themselves from the infection spread by the Servant, as if he was a leprous man.^{5.} Lindblom translates the line differently, "he (i.e. the servant) will (at some time in the future) besprinkle many peoples, i.e. purify many peoples

-
1. Cf. J.A. Anderson, Op. cit., P. 288.
 2. For a thorough discussion of the problem, cf. Edward J. Young, "Studies in Isaiah", pp. 199 - 206, or "The Interpretation of שָׁחַט in Isaiah 52:15", in "Westminster Theological Journal", III (1941), pp. 125 - 132.
 3. Cf. K.B., P. 604, and BDB., P. 633.
 4. "Studies in Isaiah", P. 206.
 5. H.S. Nyberg, "Smärtornas man", in "Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok", 7, 1942, P.47f. Cf. Joh. Lindblom, Op. cit., P.40.

from their sins ".^{1.} While on this interpretation the correspondence between the protasis and apodosis is not strictly logical,^{2.} Lindblom maintains that " we have to reckon with a sort of anaclouthon, caused by the parenthetical clause inserted between the two comparative members".^{3.}

Many scholars maintain that the primary meaning of נָזַח - " to sprinkle " - is impossible in the present context. In their view נָזַח in the present context means " to cause to spring up " or " to startle " which is derived from the Arabic word نَزَح " to leap ".^{4.}

Other scholars like Cheyne^{5.} object that this word is rare in Arabic classical literature. Hebrew itself has many words for " leap " and it is not necessary to resort to Arabic. Thus on the basis of the LXX reading Θαυμάσονται scholars have suggested various emendations. Cheyne^{6.} suggests that instead of נָזַח we should read נָזַח from the root נָזַח meaning " to spring, start up ". Marti^{7.} suggests that we should emend the text to $\text{וַיִּנְזַחוּ$ " prostrate themselves ", and make the nations the subject of the verb. G.F. Moore^{8.} prefers to substitute $\text{וַיִּזְחֻ$ " they shall be moved " for the present text. Duhm^{9.} accepts this on the basis of the

1. Op. cit., P. 41.

2. " As many (before) were appalled at you, so he (in the future) will purify many nations ".

3. Op. cit., P. 41.

4. Cf. BDB, נָזַח . P. 633.

5. " The Prophecies of Issiah ", Vol. LL, P. 149f.

6. Ibid., P. 150.

7. Op. cit., P. 346.

8. JBL, 1890, PP. 216ff. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 123.

9. Op. cit., P. 365f.

LXX reading, but he also emends the M.T. to

פֶּן יִזְהַר [אֶרְבֵּי] רַבִּים " so will he shine

forth before many ". He thinks that the clause before us may represent the remains of two lines, of which the first has been retained in a mutilated form by the Hebrew and the second by the LXX, and renders vv.14 - 15 as follows:-

14. As many were horrified at him,

So will he shine forth before many.

15. Nations shall be agitated because of him,

Kings shall shut their mouth.^{1.}

This translation represents a text reconstructed somewhat as follows:-

פֶּן יִזְהַר אֶרְבֵּי רַבִּים
 פֶּן יִזְהַר אֶרְבֵּי רַבִּים
 יִרְגְּזוּ אֲגוּלֵי
 יִקְפְּצוּ אֲלֵכִים פִּיהֶם

From the discussion above it is clear that the M.T. presents difficulties which can only be solved by scholars who have an expert knowledge of Hebrew and Arabic. Therefore the translation given above is based on the LXX, without attempting to decide what may have stood in the original.

they shall have seen... they shall have perceived).

The verbs יִזְהַר and יִרְגְּזוּ have the force of future perfects. See the LXX ὄψονται and συνήσουσιν.

1. 14. Wie über ihn sich viele entzetzten,
 So wird er erglänzen vor vielen.

15. Und erregen werden sich Völker um ihn,
 Zuhalten Könige ihren Mund. (P.365.)

53:1. what we have heard). $\eta \mu \gamma \psi$ is the passive participle Qal of $\mu \gamma \psi$ " to hear " and not of the Hiph'il $\mu \gamma \psi \eta$ " to cause to hear ". The feminine is used like the neuter to denote what is heard, and may therefore be applied to rumour, instruction, or speech in general. (compare the LXX $\acute{\alpha} \kappa \omicron \eta$ " a thing heard "). Hence the speakers are those who have been preached to and not those who have preached.^{1.} The translation " report " is misleading for it fails to make clear whether the speakers uttered the report or whether they just heard it. What is it that they have heard ? Some scholars think that it was the preaching of the great prophets; others, the Servant Songs or the prophet's previous message. Still others like Engnell^{2.} see the word $\eta \mu \gamma \psi$ as the central cult word of the myth used in the Tammuz liturgies. But the most obvious explanation is that they have just heard Yahweh's words in 52:13 - 15. The close connection of the two strophes clearly suggests this. The disclosure seemed absolutely incredible for the speakers express wonder and surprise. " Who could have believed what we have heard ? " The expected answer is " no one ".^{3.}

And to whom has the arm of Yahweh been revealed?). Lit. " And the arm of Yahweh over whom has it been revealed." The LXX has the Dative $\tau \acute{\iota} \nu \iota$ while DSia has $\gamma \alpha - \lambda \acute{\iota}$ " to whom ", which is followed in the

-
1. Cf. G.A. Smith, " The Book of Isaiah XL - LXVI ", P. 343.
 2. " The Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in Deutero-Isaiah " in BJRL, vol. 31, 1, January, 1948. Cf. A. Bentzen, " King and Messiah ", P. 56.
 3. Cf. E. Kautzsch, " Genenius' Hebrew Grammar ", sect., 151a.

translation.

Who are the speakers in the vv. 1 - 6 ? Three different suggestions have been made. (1) The Gentiles, (2) the Jews, (3) the Prophet speaking in the name of his fellow-countrymen. This too is a matter in which a scholar's decision has been guided by his interpretation of the Songs as a whole. Those scholars who think that the Servant is Israel naturally favour (1); those who think he was an individual or a godly nucleus of Israelites are in favour of (2) or (3). Recently, however, a few scholars who think that the Servant is an individual have nevertheless admitted that the speakers are the Gentiles.¹ Without allowing the interpretation of the Songs to influence the decision, it seems most probable that the Gentiles are the speakers. In 52:15 the Servant amazes many nations and kings. Here the startled spectators express their wonder and surprise at the things they have heard and seen. Moreover, the reference to the Arm of Yahweh in the second half of the verse corresponds with the central and crucial contents of the foregoing poems (40:10-11); 48:14; 51:5; 52:10, and to the impassioned cry of 51:9ff where the nations are referred to. Thus it seems most probable that in the present context the nations, or Gentiles are also referred to.

Ver. 2. before him). Many scholars, following Ewald, alter

$\begin{matrix} \text{ו} & \text{י} & \text{פ} & \text{ל} \\ \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} \end{matrix}$ to $\begin{matrix} \text{ו} & \text{י} & \text{פ} & \text{ל} \\ \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} \end{matrix}$ "before us".² Marti³
 suggests $\begin{matrix} \text{ו} & \text{י} & \text{פ} & \text{ל} \\ \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} \end{matrix}$ "aforetime" and Volz⁴ $\begin{matrix} \text{ו} & \text{י} & \text{פ} & \text{ל} \\ \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} & \text{ר} \end{matrix}$

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., pp. 150ff.

2. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., p. 47.

3. Op. cit., p. 347.

4. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., p. 123.

1.
 "uncomely". North follows a suggestion by G.R. Driver (in JTS 38, P.48.) who takes the suffix as referring back to the subject of the verb and means "he grew straight up". But the M.T. which is supported by the LXX and DSIa is quite intelligible as it stands and there is no reason why we should alter it. The picture presented in these two stichoi is that of a sickly sapling which grows up in the most unfavourable conditions. It is stunted and wretched in appearance.

that we should look at him). If this word is retained in the text, it is necessary to transfer the athnah to it, and so make it parallel with $\text{וְהָיָה כְּנֶחֱמֶה}$. But many scholars believe that this makes the stichos too long. Consequently some scholars delete $\text{וְהָיָה כְּנֶחֱמֶה}$ while others delete $\text{וְהָיָה כְּנֶחֱמֶה}$ "and no comeliness". Some other scholars also emend $\text{וְהָיָה כְּנֶחֱמֶה}$ to $\text{וְהָיָה כְּנֶחֱמֶה}$ "attractiveness" Cf. LXX $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. But the argument from metre is not decisive. Hence in the translation above $\text{וְהָיָה כְּנֶחֱמֶה}$ is retained and the athnah is transferred to it.

Ver. 3. forsaken by men). This expression is unusual. Literally it means "ceased of men". Job 19:14 uses the verb in a similar context, "my relatives and my close friends have failed (ceased) me".
 3.
 Marti, following Cheyne, thinks that this phrase is very suspicious. The form $\text{וְהָיָה כְּנֶחֱמֶה}$ as

1. Op. cit. , P.123

2. Ibid., P.123 Cf. also, A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P.48.

3. D.K. Marti, Op. cit., P.347.

Ver. 4. ours were the sicknesses ... ours the pains).

Notice that the pronouns should be emphasised because of their order in the Hebrew text.

Insert אֲנִי after אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי with some 20 manuscripts, the Syriac and the Vulgate.

stricken). Duhm¹ interprets אֲנִי אֲנִי of leprosy and refers to Lev. 13-22 (comp. V.3, 9 etc.) and 11 Kings 15:6 (Ver. 5. in B.H.) where it is used specifically for leprosy. But he admits that אֲנִי אֲנִי can also mean any other illness sent by God. This identification of the disease with leprosy is as old as the early rabbis and the Vulgate.² Skinner³ thinks that leprosy is suggested by several particulars in the description such as his marred and disfigured form and his isolation from human society. But he also points out that the leprosy may only be a strong image for sufferings. Many other scholars, challenge the theory that the Servant was a leper. They maintain that the Servant was executed as a malefactor and that therefore he could not have been a leper.³ Whatever was the cause of the Servant's death, the most important point to notice in this verse is the fact that the Servant's death was such that normal Jewish belief saw in it a judgement of God.

Ver. 5. he was pierced). Cheyne with Gunkel reads

לְהַכְרִיז׃ "dishonoured" for לְהַכְרִיז׃⁴

but parallelism favours the M.T.

1. Op. cit., P. 369.

2. Op. cit., P. 140f.

3. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit. P.149.

4. "Introduction to the Book of Isaiah", P. 428.

The chastisement leading to our welfare). Lit.

"The chastisement of our peace was upon him".

1.

"Chastisement" is pain inflicted for moral ends.

כִּלְיָוִי is a very inclusive word in Hebrew, and here it denotes both spiritual and physical well being.

And by his scars we were healed). Lit. "healing

has come to us". כִּרְבֵיבָה means the "seam" or

"scar" of a wound, and is taken from the root

כִּבֵּן "to unite". The traditional translation

"stripes" is derived from the other meaning of

this word viz. "stroke" or "blow".

Ver. 6. thrust upon him). The usual translation "cause to light on him" does not convey the meaning of the Hebrew very clearly. מִלֵּךְ does not simply mean

2.

"to meet". It often denotes a violent collision.

Such a meaning suits the context much better.

Mowinckel's emendation of מִלֵּךְ to מִלֵּךְ מִלֵּךְ

3.

"brought upon him" is not convincing.

Ver. 7. So he opened not his mouth). Many scholars delete this final line of the verse as a dittograph. But Köhler

4.

maintains that this kind of repetition is characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah. "It is the most beautiful and expressive repetition in the whole writing."

5.

Some scholars delete מִלֵּךְ מִלֵּךְ

because if it is taken with what precedes it, it

-
1. Cf. F. Delitzsch, "Commentary on Isaiah", Vol. II, P.284f. (Third Edition. All the other references are to the fourth Edition of this book).
 2. Cf. J.A. Alexander, Op. cit., P.297f.
 3. Op. cit., P.197.
 4. "D.J. stilkritisch untersucht", P.94f. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.124.
 5. Ibid.

causes metrical difficulties. But such a procedure spoils the metaphor. Others emend it to the masculine form making the Servant its subject, and suggest¹ that the "rhythmical incompleteness of the line" is "deliberate and impressive" and cite Job 4:16 as a parallel. Such an emendation, however, is purely arbitrary and has no textual support. The meaning of the passage is quite clear if $\begin{matrix} \eta \chi \lambda \chi \lambda \\ \tau \tau \dots \end{matrix}$ is read with the previous line.

Ver. 8. This verse is notoriously difficult since the text is uncertain and almost every word is ambiguous. Consequently a large number of translations and interpretations have been suggested.²

Excluded from judgement). The root meaning of is "restrain" or "retain".³ The difficulty in the translation is caused by the $\gamma \chi$ which is prefixed to $\gamma \psi \mu$. The R.V. renders it "by", while the margin gives "from". Other renderings have been "by reason of" and "after".

From the context it is very difficult to decide which rendering best conveys the meaning of the passage. Hence Marti⁴ has suggested a simple emendation $\begin{matrix} \mu \psi \chi \chi \\ \tau \tau \dots \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \gamma \psi \mu \\ \tau \end{matrix}$ "restrained from judgement". It is quite possible that the γ and the χ were confused in the transmission of the text. The χ is possibly a dittograph of that of the following word. This reconstruction suggests that the Servant

1. H.H. Rowley "Israel's mission to the World", P.22n. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.124.
 2. For a summary of the principal interpretations, Cf. J. Skinner, Op. cit., P.143f. Cf. also, C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 124f.
 3. Cf. BDB, P.783.
 4. D.K. Marti, Op. cit., P. 350.

was refused a fair trial. This is also confirmed by the general meaning of the LXX rendering "In oppression his judgement was taken away". Marti's emendation has been adopted in the translation above.

judgement). The word here means the legal procedure - a trial.

his fate). Lit. " his generation ". The literal translation " who shall declare his generation " given in the A.V. does not fit the meaning of the verse. Grammatically it is possible to take $\text{---} \text{וְיִשְׁׁרָאֵל}$ as a reinforcement of the subject ^{1.} and render the line " and as for his generation, who among them will consider " with the R.V. Duhm ^{2.} takes וְיִשְׁׁרָאֵל in its Aramaic sense of " dwelling-place " and translates, " Who asks after his dwelling-place with God?" Skinner ^{3.} prefers to think of his earthly dwelling-place. Nobody cares about it, or thinks about it; the Servant has vanished from the thoughts of men. But this sense of the word is very rare. The simplest solution is to follow Cheyne ^{4.} and Marti, ^{5.} and read וְיִשְׁׁרָאֵל " his way " i.e. " his fate ".

his people). The M.T. reads וְיִשְׁׁרָאֵל " my people " and is followed by the LXX. DSIa reads וְיִשְׁׁרָאֵל " his people". Many commentators maintain that the nations are still speaking in this verse. " my people "therefore

-
1. Cf. A.B. Davidson, "Hebrew Syntax", sect.72 Rem,4.Cf.also G - K sect. 117 1 - m; BDB, P.85a,3.
 2. Op. cit., P.372.
 3. Op. cit., P.144.
 4. " Introduction to the Book of Isaiah ", P. 428.
 5. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 49.

does not suit the context. Budde, Marti and Peake¹, who believe that the Servant is the actual nation of Israel, emend the text to $\text{וְנִשְׁפָּטוּ עָמָלֵנוּ}$ "for our transgressions". This emendation is purely conjectural and has no textual support. In the translation above the Dead Sea Scroll reading "his people" has been adopted since it is the most suitable reading in the present context.

smitten to death). Lit. " a stroke was to him " which is difficult. The LXX reads " he was led to death " which suits the context much better. Hence it is generally agreed that we should read $\text{וְנִשְׁפָּטוּ לְמָוֶת}$ ($\text{וְנִשְׁפָּטוּ$) " he was smitten to death ".

Ver. 9. And his grave was made). The Hebrew is impersonal reading literally " one has set his grave ". DS1a has the plural verb, " and we set ".

And with the rich). Many scholars maintain that we need a parallel for " the wicked ". Thus the M.T. is generally emended to עֲמָלֵי עוֹלָם " workers of evil ", or עֲשֵׂי עוֹלָם " the defrauder ", or עֲשֵׂי עֲרִיבָה " wilderness demons ". The LXX and DS1a have the plural " the rich ". It is possible that the allusion to the rich has been lost to us, or that it is meant to be synonymous with " the wicked " as in the prophets. Hence the translation follows the LXX and DS1a.

1. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P.50. Cf. also D.K. Marti, Op. cit., P. 350.

his sepulchre). The M.T. "in his deaths" is difficult. The LXX has the singular. DSia has יִשְׁרָאֵל lit. "his high place". This might be interpreted as "his burial mound", which would give an excellent parallel to "his grave" in the previous line. The only difficulty with this interpretation is that the word does not have this meaning anywhere else in the O.T. Other scholars have emended the text to יִשְׁרָאֵל יִשְׁרָאֵל (or יִשְׁרָאֵל יִשְׁרָאֵל) "his sepulchre". Lindblom reads DSia as a poetic plural of יִשְׁרָאֵל "day"- "earlier in his lifetime he had been among rich people". This interpretation is very unlikely.

Ver.10. The text of this verse is very corrupt.

Yet Yahweh was pleased to crush him with sickness). Lit. "But Yahweh was pleased to crush him the sickness". The Vulgate has "The Lord was pleased to crush him with sickness" and the LXX "The Lord was pleased to cleanse him from sickness". Many scholars follow the LXX and derive יִשְׁרָאֵל from the Aramaic where it means "cleanse". But if we follow this procedure, we take the same verb in two different senses in the same passage (Cf. יִשְׁרָאֵל ver. 5). Another difficult word is יִשְׁרָאֵל. It has been explained as the Hiph. Perf. of יִשְׁרָאֵל, on the order of the יִשְׁרָאֵל verbs, the יִ being dropped out as quiescent.² The line would

1. Op. cit., P.44.

2. Cf. G-K. sects. 74 K., 75 ii.

then read "Yahweh was pleased to crush him and make (him) sick". DS1a has a different reading, ^{1.}
 יְהוָה לָלַחַם " and he pierced him". Duhm contends that the general sense required here is, "While men judged the Servant in the way described, Yahweh judged otherwise". He therefore follows the LXX in this translation. But Duhm's contention has now been contradicted by the reading in DS1a. Other scholars have preferred to reconstruct the passage, but these reconstructions differ widely and are purely arbitrary.^{2.} Of all the different solutions offered, that of the Vulgate is the most satisfactory one. Therefore in the translation above ^לנָחַם has been emended to ^לנָחַם and is read as an adverbial accusative "with sickness" following Torrey, Rowley and North.^{3.}

Truly he gave himself as a guilt offering.). The subject of this sentence is ambiguous in the Hebrew text. It may be either "his soul" (R.V. margin) or "thou" (R.V.). The meaning of the sentence is further obscured by its hypothetical character, for which no satisfactory explanation can be given. North^{4.} remarks that another difficulty is that the Hebrew text as it stands is not "end-stopped" (i.e. the sense does not run on from one line into another, as it quite commonly does in English). This is

1. Op. cit. P.373f.
 2. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 52.
 3. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.126
 4. Ibid., P.126.

uncommon in Hebrew Poetry. Consequently many different emendations have been suggested.

In the translation above $\square \dot{\psi} \eta - \square \lambda$
 has been emended to $\square \dot{\psi} \quad \eta \lambda \lambda$ following
 1. Rowley and North.

himself). Lit. "his soul". In Deutero-Isaiah $\psi \eta \eta$ with the suffix is frequently used as a
 2. pronoun.

guilt offering). For the use of $\square \dot{\psi} \lambda$ see
 Lev. 5:14-6:7; 7:1-7.

posterity). Lit. "seed". It is difficult to decide what exactly is meant by "seed". It is variously interpreted by scholars, depending on their interpretation of the Servant in the Songs.
 3.

that prolongs life). Lit. "he shall prolong days". DSIa reads $\eta \lambda \lambda$ "and he shall prolong". The meaning of this phrase is also dubious. Hence it is variously interpreted by scholars. The translation is based on the view that although the Servant is cut off with the wicked, his fate is different from theirs in two respects - the wicked (according to popular believe^f) leaves no posterity, and all his efforts end in failure; but the Servant will have enduring posterity and will accomplish his task.

-
1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P.126.
 2. Cf. N.H. Snaith, "The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah", in "Studies in O.T. Prophecy", P.200. Cf. Also A.R. Johnson, "The Vitality of the Individual in the thought of Ancient Israel", PP.19ff.
 3. Cf. C.R. North, "Isaiah 40-55", P.139.

purpose). Lit. " pleasure ". Cf. 44:28. This purpose is described more closely in 42:1 - 4 and 49:1 - 6.

Ver.11. After). For the temporal use of \int of. G - K sect. 119 y, N.3.

light). The LXX reads " light " after " see ". This is confirmed by DS1a and may be regarded as firmly established.

with his knowledge). Following the LXX \int is taken with the preceding line.

My Servant). Many scholars delete $p' \tau s$ as a dittograph which is metrically superfluous and grammatically impossible. It is wanting in 3 manuscripts. Other scholars retain the word and quote G - K sect. 132b to support their argument.

shall justify). In the present context is used in a forensic sense. The primary meaning is one of acquittal, i.e. vindicate, declare right.

Ver.12. Therefore will I divide to him). Duhm^{1.}, Cheyne^{2.}, Marti^{3.} and Peake^{4.} follow the LXX reading, " he shall inherit " instead of " I will divide ", because they think that the change from the third person and the repetition of the same verb in the first and the second lines is unlikely. On the other hand, since Yahweh is the speaker (on this there is

1. Op. cit., P. 376.

2. " The Book of the Prophet Isaiah ", in " Sacred Books of the O.T. ", P. 93.

3. Op. cit., P. 352.

4. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 52.

general agreement) it is quite natural that He, Himself should reward His Servant by giving him the many as a portion. Thus the translation above follows the M.T.

many). $\square \text{ ' } \text{ד } \text{ל}$ which is repeated in 52:14f; 53:11 and 53:12 is consistently rendered " many ". In the translation above $\square \text{ ' } \text{ד } \text{ל}$ is taken as the direct object of the verb, the ל being part of the verb, like $\text{ל } \text{ל } \text{ש } \text{ל}$ " to rule over ".^{1.} It should however be noted that some scholars would disagree with this translation.^{2.}

numerous). Lit. " powerful ", but it is used with the meaning " numerous " in Prov. 7:26 where it is also parallel to " many ".

spoil). $\text{ל } \text{ל } \text{ש}$ is usually interpreted as material possessions and worldly power, but the whole tenor of the poem suggests that the term is here employed more generally of recompense as in Prov. 16:19 and 31:11.

because he poured out his soul). Like blood, which is the seat of life,^{3.} Lev. 17:11.

makes intercession). Many scholars translate $\text{ל } \text{ל } \text{ש } \text{ל}$ " and interposed ". In the present context the word is used intensively, meaning to intercede with prayers, with the ל of the person on whose behalf it is done.^{4.}

1. Cf. E. König, " Das Buch Jesaja ", P. 442. Cf. also G - K sect. 119k.
 2. Cf. J. Skinner, Op. cit., P. 149.
 3. Cf. A.R. Johnson, in " Studies in O.T. Prophecy ", P.86.
 4. Cf. F. Delitzsch, Op. cit., P. 312. Cf. also BDB. P. 803.

It should be noted that DS1a reads $\mu\lambda\delta'$ instead of $\mu'\lambda\delta'$ in the M.T. ^{1.} Stauffer ^{2.} makes the interesting comment that if we vocalize the reading in DS1a as a Pu'al $\mu\lambda\delta'$ "he was stricken" it agrees with Test. Benj. 4:8 and the LXX $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{o}\theta\eta$. Paul (Rom. 4:25, 1 Cor. 15:13) and Justin (Apol. 51:5) understand the text in the same way. Stauffer thinks that Is. 53:12 played a very large part as a proof text in the Christology of the early church. In order to cut the ground from under it, the rabbinate substituted a new spelling $\mu'\lambda\delta'$ and a new interpretation ^{3.} which is now contained in the M.T. Stauffer's theory, however, is very unlikely. It is not surprising that Paul and Justin understand the text in the same sense as DS1a and the LXX, since it is well known that the N.T. writers and the early Christian writers used the LXX version of the O.T. It is not very likely that the rabbinate would deliberately have altered the consonantal text, since it is well known that the Massoretes revered the sacredness of the text to such an extent that they even refrained from correcting the most obvious errors in it. It is far more likely that the variant reading in DS1a is due to a scribal error. Finally it should be noted that DS1b confirms the M.T. ^{4.} Hence the M.T. has been followed in the translation above.

-
1. Cf. Millar Burrows, "The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery" Vol. I, Plate XLIV, line 22. This particular variant is not mentioned in the list of variants given in the Seventh Edition Of B.H.
 2. E. Stauffer, "Jesus and His Story", p. 185, n. 29.
 3. For further discussion on this subject, Cf. W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, "The Servant of God", pp. 50 - 78.
 4. Cf. E.L. Sukenik, "The Dead Sea Scrolls", Plate 10, line 25.

Chapter Five.

The Servant as Depicted in the Songs.

The First Song 42:1 - 4 .

In this Song Yahweh is the speaker who introduces His Servant, but it is not stated who forms the audience. Several suggestions have been made. Some scholars think that the nations of the world are addressed.^{1.} North thinks that the audience can hardly be the Gentiles, since they are referred to in the third person. He suggests that they might be a supra-mundane assembly.^{2.} Lindblom thinks that it is far more simple to interpret this Song as a revelation from Yahweh to the prophet, just as if it had been introduced by "Yahweh said unto me" or "Yahweh 's word came unto me", or a similar expression, since such expressions are frequently omitted in Deutero-Isaiah.^{3.}

The identity of the audience does not seem to be decisive in the interpretation of the Song and we can safely leave the audience unspecified.

To continue - Yahweh introduces the Servant as one whom he holds firmly in His hand, as His chosen one in whom He takes delight. We then learn how the Servant has been equipped for his mission. Yahweh has put His spirit upon him that he may bring to the heathen a knowledge of the true religion.

Yahweh next describes the Servant's unobtrusive manner

1. e.g. T. Henshaw, " The Latter Prophets ", P. 232.
2. Op. cit., P. 142.
3. Op. cit., P. 15.

of working. He will accomplish his great work, not by clamorous self-assertion in public places, but by silent spiritual influences. The Servant is contrasted with the early ecstatic prophets, who worked themselves up into frenzied excitement, crying and shouting in the streets and in the market places. If the Servant is the nation Israel, this description may mean that Israel would fulfill its missionary task by unobtrusive activity rather than by participation in the politics of the great empires.

The Servant will also be gentle in his treatment of the faintest spark of good or truth which he encounters. Instead of crushing the expiring elements of truth, as would a more exuberant prophet, he will strengthen and purify them by his gentleness. But in whom are these faint sparks of true religion found, the heathen or the Israelites? The view that they are found among the heathen seems to be in keeping with the scope of the passage as a whole (Cf. ver. 4). It is to this view that the national interpretation most readily accommodates itself.¹ But the Servant's gentle treatment may also refer to the rekindling of the smouldering flame of truth and goodness in Israel, for in the second Song a mission to Israel is clearly assigned to the Servant. Hence we must question Peake's statement that "there is no reference to any efforts to rekindle the smouldering flame of truth or goodness in Israel".² The fact that the Servant is to bring forth true religion to the nations, indicates that his task is universal. The expiring elements of truth and goodness, which the Servant will encounter, are therefore to be found

1. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., P. 39.

2. Ibid., P. 39.

both in Israel and among the heathen, and not exclusively in either of them.

Finally Yahweh speaks of the Servant's constancy in fulfilling his mission. He will not be disheartened nor discouraged. He will go steadfastly forward with his mission until he has established true religion among the heathen who wait for his instruction. Supported by Yahweh, he overcomes all possible resistance. He is not thrown down, but stands firm and endures. C.C. Torrey maintains, correctly, that there is no place for any allusion to weakness or suffering on the part of the Servant in this sketch. ^{1.}

A different interpretation is suggested by N.H. Snaith. ^{2.} He thinks that the ^atask of the Servant is to dispense justice to the Gentiles. If we see Deutero-Isaiah as an essentially nationalistic prophet, then he speaks here of an execution of justice in the sense of strict retribution. That the Gentiles "wait" signifies that they wait with dread. But the words, "He will not cry nor clamour, nor make his voice heard in the street" are inexplicable on Snaith's interpretation. The interpretation of the Servant as one who unobtrusively brings the knowledge of true religion to the heathen fits the details of the description of the Servant's work much better.

Begrich ^{3.} presents a very original interpretation of the expression in ver. 3. He interprets the Servant as "the servant of the king", an official who made public the judicial sentences of the sovereign. Moreover, he holds that there existed a custom whereby judicial sentences were

-
1. "The Second Isaiah", pp. 325f. Cf. Joh. Lindblom, Op. cit., p. 17.
 2. "The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah", in "Studies in O.T. Prophecy", pp. 193f.
 3. "Studien", P.P. 135ff, 161ff. Cf. E.R. North, Op. cit., p. 142.

proclaimed in the open street and were confirmed by the breaking of the staff and the extinguishing of the lamp of the person condemned. The particular judgement which the Servant will announce to the world is Yahweh's pardon of Israel. This interpretation, as Begrich himself admits, is largely conjectural. Its usefulness depends on the meaning we give to לִפְשׁוֹ and הַרְוֵהוּ . It is not very likely that we are to interpret these terms as Yahweh's pardon of Israel. From their context in this Song it is better to give them the meaning "true religion" and "instruction" which the Servant will bring to the nations of the world. Moreover, in the Song it is stated that the Servant will not break the staff, nor extinguish the lamp. Thus, presumably, the Servant will not act in the same way as the "servant of the king" whom Begrich describes.

Further, there is a sharp difference of opinion amongst scholars on the question whether the Servant is depicted as a king or as a prophet. Most of the features in the description could be applied to both. However, it should be noted that while there are numerous instances of לִפְשׁוֹ being pronounced by kings, priests, and local justices, it is not clear whether similar authority was vested in a prophet.¹ On the other hand, so far as we know, הַרְוֵהוּ ² was only given by priests and prophets and never by a king. Thus it is very likely that the Servant is conceived of as combining something of the functions of both prophet and king, and is not to be placed in either category to the exclusion of the other. On the one hand it seems very probable that the Servant is contrasted with Cyrus the

1. See supra, P. 66.

2. See supra, P. 69.

Persian king and conqueror, who, however much he may have helped Israel's cause, did so perforce in the grand manner of an ostentatious oriental despot. The Servant may therefore be thought of as a vassal king, the Servant of Yahweh the king of heaven, entrusted with the mission of making the nations subject to the laws and the will of his Lord and his Sovereign. And on the other hand, the Servant is also contrasted with the prophets who cried and shouted in the streets. We conclude therefore that both kingly and prophetic functions are combined in this description of the Servant.

Thus in the first Song, the Servant has been introduced by Yahweh to an unspecified audience. He is now present and is endowed with Yahweh's spirit. The mission of the Servant and his method of executing it are outlined, but its fulfilment still lies in the future.

The Second Song 49:1 - 6.

Here the Servant is the speaker; and his audience ~~this~~ this time is indicated. He is addressing the far coasts and distant peoples - the whole world. He tells them of his election from birth and of his prophetic equipment. Yahweh has called him from the womb to be a prophet, a feature strongly reminiscent of Jer. 1:5. This suggests that later in his lifetime the experience of vocation gave meaning and purpose to his earlier life from its very origin. Then he speaks of a time before he appeared as a prophet, when Yahweh was preparing him for his prophetic work, making his mouth like a sharp sword. Yahweh kept him in instant readiness like a sword in the scabbard, or an arrow in the quiver, until the time was ripe. Then, probably through a special

experience, he received the explicit call from Yahweh to be His Servant Israel in whom He would glorify Himself. Looking back over his career, the Servant confesses his failure. He is wearied and exhausted, and this all for nothing. Yet he is confident that he can leave his vindication to God. This brings him to what is the main point in this passage - the answer which Yahweh has given to his complaint. Yahweh will entrust him with a greater and more glorious mission. So far his mission had been to restore Jacob to Yahweh and to gather Israel to Him; to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel. But this mission is too trifling. Therefore Yahweh will make him a bearer of light, a preacher of true religion to all the nations, in order that the whole world may share in the Salvation of Yahweh.

It has been suggested that a contradiction is involved in the fact that in this Song the Servant only gradually recognizes that his mission is to the heathen world, whereas in the first Song this has already been clearly stated. North resolves the difficulty by saying that in the first Song Yahweh was addressing a supra-mundane audience and that therefore it is not necessary to assume that the Servant overheard the Divine address. The Servant's situation is similar to that of Job, who was ignorant of the discussion that went on about him in heaven.¹ However, a careful consideration of the two accounts of the Servant's calling and commissioning shows that there is no contradiction. They are merely accounts of the same event, written from two different points of view. In the first Song Yahweh relates how He has called and equipped the Servant for his

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 144.

mission. In the second Song the Servant relates how he came to the recognition of his task. It was a gradual process, through frustration and disappointment in a lesser task, - the mission to Israel - which led him to the knowledge of his calling in its widest extent - the mission to the heathen. Thus in the second Song the Servant addresses himself to the nations and briefly recounts the stages by which his conviction of his ultimate calling dawned upon him. In this way he presents his credentials to his hearers. He has been commissioned by Yahweh and can therefore claim to receive a hearing.

An obvious difficulty presents itself in the fact that the Servant is called Israel (ver.3) and also has a preliminary ministry to Israel assigned to him (vv.5 - 6). This causes embarrassment to exponents both of the individual theory and of the collective theory. In order to prove their theories, both sides are reduced to desperate attempts to avoid the plain meaning of the passage. Consequently many different emendations and translations of the passage have been suggested to suit the respective theories advanced. Such a procedure cannot be justified. The manuscript evidence is insufficient to delete " Israel " in ver.3 and the rhythmical scheme demands its retention.^{1.} Budde's expedient of making Yahweh the subject of the infinitives in vv. 5 - 6^{2.} and Kissene's rendering of the verbs as optatives^{3.} are also unacceptable. If, then, we are not free to delete " Israel " in ver. 3, and if Israel has a mission to Israel in vv. 5 - 6, is there any way of resolving the difficulty ?

1. See supra, P. 73f.
 2. See supra, P. 78.
 3. See supra, P. 78.

One way out of this difficulty is to qualify "Israel" in ver 3 and interpret it as the "true (embodiment of) Israel".^{1.} This expedient was adopted by commentators of a century ago, who clung to an individual interpretation while still retaining the word "Israel". Although this expedient has latterly been rare, it has been adopted by Praetorius.^{2.} E. Burrows maintains that "it is to be observed that 'Israel' is not a term of address (vocative), and not merely an apposition to 'my Servant', but a name which is predicated. It need not therefore be an indication of the Servant's proper name. It can be understood as a name of honour applied to him for the reason indicated in the last clause ... it is here honorific".^{3.} Lindblom, who interprets this Song allegorically, suggests a similar solution by translating the verse as follows: "And he said to me: You, my Servant, you are (i.e. symbolize) Israel, and through you I shall be glorified".^{4.}

These solutions, however, are not satisfactory. They are all based on the assumption, which is almost axiomatic in Western thought, that the prophet's view of the identity of the Servant is consistent throughout the Song. They are, therefore, attempts to find an identification of the Servant which will be applicable throughout the Song. Recent studies of Hebrew ways of thinking prove that the

1. Cf. C.R.North, Op.Cit., P.145.

2. Cf. C.R.North, Op.cit., P.144f.

3. E.Burrows, "The Gospel of the Infancy and other Biblical Essays", P.63. Cf. C.R.North, Op.cit., P.145, n.6. For a similar interpretation, Cf. M.Buber, "The Prophetic Faith", P.223. "If the saying really was directed to Israel, there was no need to say 'Thou art Israel'. If however, what is meant by the Servant is a person, but a person standing in quite a peculiarly close relationship to Israel, it is fairly evident that God speaks to him: 'Thou art the Israel in whom I glorify myself'".

4. Op. cit., P.30.

assumption, on which these solutions are based, is quite misleading. The Hebrew way of thinking is very strange to those who are accustomed to Western ways of thought. Hence it becomes clear that the difficulty in interpreting this passage is due to a failure to recognise how the Hebrew thought. Therefore, as A.R. Johnson points out, "any attempt at successful interpretation of the Bible seems bound to take note of the fact that Israelite thinking, like that of the so-called 'primitive' peoples of the present day, is predominantly synthetic"^{1.}

H. Wheeler Robinson has explained this Hebrew way of thinking as a concept of "Corporate personality".

"This is a conception strange to the modern mind, for our sense of 'social solidarity' is of a different order, denoting as it does the combination of individuals on the basis of common interest or obligation. 'Corporate personality', on the other hand, denotes the primitive idea of a family, a clan, a tribe or a nation as one, so that on occasion the whole group and the individual member of it, may be treated as identical, whether in law or religion, with fluidity of transition from the one to the many and vice versa. Thus the prophet can feel, not only that he represents, but that he actually is Israel"^{2.}

Therefore, "we are to think of the prophet's consciousness as capable of a systole and diastole, an ebb and a flow, so that though he utters his own experience in the service of Yahweh, it is always with the sense implicit or explicit that these things are true of all

-
1. A.R. Johnson, "The Vitality of the Individual in the thought of Ancient Israel", P.7.
 2. H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Old Testament: Its Making and Meaning", P. 79.

devout disciples of Yahweh, and that they are Israel ".^{1.}

If we apply this concept of " corporate personality " to the Servant in the second Song, we find a solution to the problem of his identity, which occurs there. The concept of " corporate personality " leaves us free to recognize that there are some features in the description of the Servant which clearly indicate that he is the nation, Israel. At the same time it leaves us free to admit that there are other factors which indicate equally clearly that the Servant is an individual. There is no contradiction here, for the prophet's thought concerning the Servant's identity is fluid. Therefore, in ver. 3 he can think of the Servant as Israel, while in vv. 5 - 6 he thinks of the Servant as an individual who has a mission to Israel.

This fluid view of the identification of the Servant provides the only satisfactory solution to the problem of the Servant's identity in this Song.

Finally the second Song raises the problem whether the mission of the Servant to Israel is purely spiritual, or whether it has political implications as well. Some scholars such as Mowinckel^{2.} and Young^{3.} think that the Servant has a purely spiritual mission to perform. Even though Yahweh has made the Servant like a sharp sword and a polished arrow, a consideration of what is said about his equipment in the first Song makes it clear that there is no allusion here to any political or military activity. Moreover, the text does not suggest that the Servant himself is thought of as leading those who return. Finally, the Servant's task to restore Jacob and Israel^{4.} and Yahweh is a

1. H. Wheeler Robinson, " The Cross of the Servant ", in " The Cross in the Old Testament ", pp. 78f.
 2. Op. cit., P. 192.
 3. " Studies in Isaiah ", P. 118.

messianic one. Thus, in the very nature of the case, the return to Yahweh is spiritual. But as North^{1.} points out נָשׁוּב is used in a spiritual as well as in a political sense in both the Po'lel and in the Hiph'il. Thus vv.5 - 6 might well apply to political activity as well. Moreover, in ver. 6, the Servant is said to raise up the tribes of Jacob, which can only refer to political restoration, since the tribe is a political entity. It is very likely, therefore, that the mission of the Servant has both spiritual and political implications. This is quite in keeping with conditions in the exile which would make it difficult for any prophet to conceive of a spiritual restoration apart from the political rehabilitation of his nation. Even Jeremiah, who believed that nation and temple must come to an end in the interest of a higher and more spiritual religion, looked forward to what can only be interpreted as a measure of political restoration.^{2.} We conclude, therefore, that while the Servant's mission to Israel was primarily spiritual, it also included some measure of concern for the political restoration of the nation.

The Third Song 50:4 - 9.

In this Song the Servant begins his soliloquy with a description of his intimate communion with Yahweh, who has given him a disciple's tongue, so that by his word he may strengthen⁹ the weary - those who need salvation and feel their need of it. Morning by morning Yahweh has instructed him with His message and the Servant has responded in complete

1. Op. cit., pp. 145f.

2. Cf. J. Skinner, "Prophecy and Religion", p. 309.

self-surrender to the word that guides him. The Servant next speaks of the insults and indignities to which he has been subjected in the discharge of his commission. Not only has he met with utter lack of sympathy; he has even been subjected to physical violence, scourgings, plucking out of the beard, and ignominious spitting. Yet he endured these cruel indignities patiently and did not flinch from his appointed task. Finally he expresses his unwavering confidence in the help of Yahweh. Since Yahweh is his helper, he is not put to shame, and he has set his face resolutely like a flint to accomplish his task. Strong in the assurance that Yahweh is his vindicator, he boldly challenges any adversary to contend with him. Since Yahweh has become his helper, he confidently anticipates the destruction of his foes.

Following North, we might call this Song "The Gethsemane of the Servant"^{1.} The Servant is depicted as a lonely man, utterly forsaken and cut off from all human sympathy or friendship. He has suffered bitter persecution and brutal physical violence. Nevertheless, he is convinced that he is in the right and that Yahweh is helping him. Further, as North points out, it seems that though for the moment he is granted respite, he must expect further trials.^{2.}

This raises the question of the identity of the Servant's adversaries. The text does not state whether the Servant's persecution is the work of his own people or of the Gentiles. Thus we are left to conjecture. It seems most natural to assume that the Servant encountered his adversaries in the course of his ministry. In the second Song we read that the

1. Op. cit., P. 146.

2. Ibid., P. 146.

Servant's first mission was to Israel and that later it was expanded to include all the nations of the world. Most probably, therefore, the Servant's adversaries were Israelites and Gentiles, just as St. Paul in his ministry had to suffer persecution at the hands of both the Jews and the Gentiles. Of course, if the Servant is Israel, only the Gentiles could have been his opponents.

In this connection it should be noted that it is not impossible for the Servant to be Israel in this Song. Although the persecution of the Servant is described as that suffered by an individual, it can also be used to describe the sufferings of the nation Israel.

The Song ends on a note of perfect trust in Yahweh, and of complete confidence in the ultimate issue. There is no suggestion that the Servant is expecting his sufferings to culminate in death. On the contrary his opponents will wear out as a garment and the moth will consume them.

The Fourth Song 52:13 - 53:12.

This Song is by common consent the most important of all the Servant Songs, and has always been the most discussed passage in the Old Testament.

Before we discuss the picture which this Song presents of the Servant, two preliminary remarks must be made. It should be noted that the division of the chapters of the Bible has perhaps never been so disastrous as here, for it has tended to conceal the fact, now generally accepted, that the fourth Song begins with 52:13 and not 53:1.¹ Secondly, as the

1. Very few critics, such as Schian, Laue and Staerk, have separated 52:13 - 15 (53:1) from the following passage, maintaining that these verses did not originally belong to the subsequent poem, but formed an addition by the hand of the redactor who inserted the Servant Songs into the work of Deutero-Isaiah, Cf. C.R. North, *Op. cit.*, pp. 48f, 52, 65. Cf. also, Joh. Lindblom, *Op. cit.*, p. 37. More recently N.H. Sneath has suggested the same division. Cf. "The so-called Servant Songs" in *ET*, lvi (1944 - 45), pp. 79 - 81.

translation of the Songs in the previous chapter made apparent, the text of this Song is seriously corrupt in places, and it is impossible to restore the text with any confidence. This does not necessarily mean that the text or its meaning was originally clear. The textual corruptions themselves may be attempts to explain what was already obscure.

The Song opens with an introduction by Yahweh briefly stating the import of all that follows - the coming exaltation of the Servant in contrast to his abasement. Just as many had turned with abhorrence from his countenance, disfigured beyond human resemblance, so will his true dignity suddenly be revealed. This unexpected transformation will startle the whole world into astonishment and reverence.

By a fine transition the prophet introduces a confession by the nations, heightening the effect by leaving the identity of the speakers to be inferred.¹ Amazed at the wondrous tidings of the Servant's exaltation, they burst into speech with the question; "Who could have believed what we have heard?" The speakers then take us back to the origin of the Servant's career, in order to account for the powerful prejudices with which his contemporaries regarded him. From the first he had been mean and unprepossessing in appearance, like a stunted shrub struggling for existence in an arid soil. Similarly the first impressions of the spectators were of a negative kind. They found nothing attractive or desirable in him. Not only did the Servant fail to attract his contemporaries; there was something in his appearance which excited positive aversion. He is represented as one stricken with a loathsome and disfiguring disease,² so that

1. For the discussion on the identity of the speakers at this point, see supra, P.96.

2. It has been suggested that this disease was leprosy, see supra, P.99.

men instinctively recoiled from him in horror and disgust. Now the nations confess how utterly they had misconceived the truth. While they looked on the Servant as proved by his sufferings to be an exceptional victim of Divine wrath, it was their own pain and sickness that he was enduring. Their rebellion caused his suffering, his chastisement procured their welfare and wrought out their healing. They had gone astray in self-will, and Yahweh had inflicted on him the penalties of their sin. With lamb-like meekness he endured oppression, and was taken away without justice, while none pondered on his fate, that he was smitten to death for the sin of his people. After his death he was buried in a dishonoured grave, though he was innocent of violence or deceit. Yet Yahweh allowed this to fall upon the Servant that they might escape. He gave his life vicariously as a guilt offering. Just because he was willing to pay the guilt offering, Yahweh will raise up the Servant. His greatness and his honour will be restored and he shall see posterity that prolongs life. After the travail of his soul, he shall see light and be satisfied with his knowledge. He will justify many and bear their iniquities. Yahweh will crown his work with success and he will reap all the glory that an eastern poet could possibly describe. Thus springing out of his career of sacrifice and vicarious atonement - though that career seemed to close in ignominy and death - will come the Servant's exaltation, when restored to life he becomes greater than the great rulers of the world.

A few scholars such as Sellin and Staerk^{1.} have contended that there is no description of the Servant's

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 148.

death in this Song. This contention was inevitable since they maintained that the Servant was Jehoiachin. Briefly Sellin's argument was that 53:7, "As a sheep that is led to the slaughter ...", describes no more the dumb and patient bearing of the Servant. In the closely parallel passage Jer. 11:19, Jeremiah is not actually killed. Further, the "land of the living" from which the Servant was cut off (ver.8) is his homeland Canaan. The Exile may be regarded as good as death. Therefore the "grave" (ver.9) is his Babylonian prison. Thus Sellin concluded that there were no positive signs of a real death, but only of expulsion, exile and imprisonment among the Babylonians. Staerk supplemented this argument by remarking that in Psalms which describe acute suffering there are characteristic hyperbolic expressions. Thus in Ps. 88, for instance, the sufferer is described as already on his way to Sheol, cut off from the land of the living and laid in the grave. But as North¹ points out, while a man may describe himself as already dead, there is no analogy in the Psalms for a sufferer not yet dead being described by someone else as though he were dead. Moreover, in 50:6 Sellin interpreted the plucking out of the beard as referring to Jehoiachin having his beard cut off. Thus he interprets that verse literally. But when he comes to an equally vivid description of death and burial in 53:7 - 9, he insists that we interpret it figuratively! Such an interpretation is clearly dictated by the theory that the Servant is Jehoiachin, a procedure which is unacceptable to us. The contention that there is no description of the death of the Servant is rendered even more improbable by the fact that both Sellin and Staerk have subsequently abandoned their identification of the

1. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 148.

Servant with Jehoiachin.

Since we agree, then, that the Servant died, the next question is, how did he die? As we have seen, Duhm thought that he was not judicially executed, but that he died a natural

1. death from leprosy. While such an interpretation is possible, it is very unlikely. The description of the Servant in the third Song suggests that the Servant suffered at the hands of men. In the fourth Song the "piercing", "crushing", "chastisement" and "scars" (ver.5) and the figure of the maltreatment of the dumb sheep (ver.7) accord well with this view. They lead on to the arrest, sentence, death and burial of the Servant which are described in the following verses. Moreover, as North points out, while a leper may conceivably have been executed for felony, it is difficult to see how a "leprous rabbi", as Duhm depicts the Servant, could "contrive to get himself into such a situation that he was executed on a capital charge." 2.

It is far more likely, therefore, that the Servant suffered death by violence, than by leprosy. Nevertheless, while the Servant was executed as a malefactor, he is pictured as one upon whom every conceivable indignity was heaped. The details in the description, which have led some to suggest that the Servant was a leper, are a strong image for such sufferings as are the evidence of God's wrath against sin.

Next, we have to decide whether the Song depicts the resurrection of the Servant or not. 3. The most baffling, as well as the most corrupt passage occurs at the point which apparently relates the turn in the Servant's fortunes (53:10f).

We look for a description of his rising from the dead, or

1. See supra, P.99.

2. Op. cit., P.149.

3. For a recent discussion on this subject, Cf. R. Martin - Achard, "From Death to Life", pp. 109 - 123.

at least a clear statement that he will rise, since it is quite clear that the Servant is to live again and be fully rehabilitated. But there is no circumstantial description of his resurrection. The explanation may be that when the passage was written there was no clearly formulated doctrine of the resurrection from the dead.¹ The writer was therefore not in a position to enter into details about something which he could only dimly apprehend. What he describes is a special miracle wrought by God for the sake of His Servant, in order that his work may prosper. A general resurrection is not presupposed. This makes the resuscitation of the Servant unique, and thus enables it to produce results so convincing and so decisive. The idea that the Servant rose from the dead is therefore of necessity implied. If the Servant is the personification of Israel, his rehabilitation may be merely a figure for national restoration from exile, but if he be an individual it implies Yahweh's justification of his career, however inexplicable that may have appeared in the eyes of those who beheld it.

A number of scholars, Nyberg, Engnell, Widengren and Ringgren among others, have suggested that there is some relation between the Servant - figure and Tammuz, whether it be that the Servant is Tammuz, or as is more usual, that there are conscious literary reminiscences of the Tammuz mystery in the description of the Servant.² This implies

-
1. Volz thinks that the fourth Song is a separate entity which is to be interpreted eschatologically. It is much later than the work of Deutero-Isaiah coming probably from the fourth or third century B.C., when a doctrine of the resurrection began to be formulated. Cf. C.R. North, *Op. cit.*, P. 78.
 2. Cf. C.R. North, *Op. cit.*, PP. 69ff, 101f., 201f., 225 - 233. Alternatively cf. C.R. North, "The Suffering Servant; Current Scandinavian Discussions", in *SJT*, 3, 1950, PP. 363 - 379.

that the resurrection of the Servant should be understood in the same sense as in the Tammuz myth.

Tammuz was a very important god of fertility and vegetation in Babylonian religion. The myths tell of his death and his return to life, which symbolized the fading away and the new germination of plants. The death of the god was enacted as a drama in the cult. Lamentations were performed for his suffering and his death. The god who had disappeared was sought for. Finally his return to life was celebrated with great rejoicing. For our purpose the texts speaking of the death of the god are of particular interest. The god is maltreated and marred so that his figure is unrecognizable. He is afflicted and smitten by suffering. He is imprisoned, killed, and covered with blood. He is the lamb carried off into the netherworld. There he lies in the dust of the earth together with the criminals.

Another root of the idea of the Servant is thought to be found in the kingship ideology. At the New Year Festival, the king of Babylon had to do penance and undergo symbolic suffering. He was deprived of all the signs of his royal dignity. Then the high priest of Marduk pulled his ears and smacked his cheeks. After the king had protested his innocence in certain respects, he was given back his crown and his sceptre. This suffering of the king was regarded as vicarious, because the king embodied the people before the god and atoned not only for his own sin, but for those of his people as well.

Ringgren^{2.} admits, however, that the existence of

1. Cf. H. Ringgren, "The Messiah in the Old Testament", PP. 50ff. For a detailed description cf. I. Engnell, "The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in Deutero-Isaiah", In BJRL, vol. 31, 1, January, 1948. Cf. also, J.B. Pritchard, ANET, PP. 106ff.

2. H. Ringgren, "The Messiah in the Old Testament", PP.50f.

certain formal similarities between the Tammuz literature and the Servant Songs proves nothing as far as its religious thoughts are concerned. Nor does it prove that the prophet was directly influenced from Babylon. But he thinks that it is very likely that a similar fertility cult once existed in Canaan, where the god was sometimes called Tammuz (Ezk. 8:14). Such a cult is frequently condemned by the prophets (e.g. Amos 2:7; Jer. 2:20 - 24). Ringgren therefore believes that certain ideas originally belonging to Canaanite "Tammuz" religion have been expressed in formulas which have influenced the religious language of Israel. The influence on style and imagery is especially pronounced in psalms of lamentation and in prophetic descriptions of disaster and ruin.

It should be noted, however, that there is still confusion in the interpretation of the Tammuz-kingship ideology. For example, Cyrus H. Gordon has renounced what he now calls "the erroneous view" that "Tammuz is said to die and revive annually: a generally accepted idea for which I can find no support in the Mesopotamian mythological texts; annual celebrations prove nothing, for holidays tend to be annual affairs; no one would maintain that Columbus rediscovers America every year because Columbus Day is celebrated every October 12th."¹ Moreover, he maintains that the Ugaritic texts, "tell us nothing of any annual death and revival of Baal. Indeed the widespread notion that the year in Canaan is divided into a fertile and a sterile season is false."² It is very doubtful, therefore, whether we have any right to apply the Tammuz - kingship ideology rigidly to the Servant Songs.

1. "Ugaritic Literature", P.3, n.2.
2. Ibid., P. 4.

While there may be points in the Song which seem to be connected with the Tammuz-kingship ideology, we must bear in mind that in many cases these points can also be explained in other ways. Many of the phrases are clearly ancient clichés used traditionally by the prophet, but it is doubtful whether they retain their original meanings. Indeed, as Bentzen points out, "What is told in Isaiah 53 is the absolutely New, in the sense which this word has got in its setting, that is, throughout the prophet's preaching. Deutero-Isaiah here makes use of old forms taken over from the New Year Festival and also ideas of the "re-creation" of the world. But he does so in a way quite different from that of old cult hymns, the pattern of which he uses for a model of his own. In his poems he not only speaks of the re-iteration in the cult of the 'old' reality of creation, or - what to Israel is the same - the Exodus from Egypt. The 'New' here is something far greater than that which was experienced in the 'old' festival 'over and over again'¹". The decisive fact is not the origin of the expressions in the Tammuz-kingship ideology. In the Servant Songs they have acquired a new meaning which is determined by the prophetic call. It is by his proclamation of the true religion that the Servant becomes the light of the nations, and the means by which Yahweh's salvation extends to the end of the earth. The connection with the Tammuz-kingship ideology cannot, therefore, be as strong as Engnell supposed.

Thus we conclude that while there may be some formal connections with the Tammuz-kingship ideology in the Songs, it does not follow that we should interpret the resurrection of the Servant in the Songs in the same sense as the resuscitation of the god or king in the Tammuz cult.

The fact that many scholars have found connections

1.A. Bentzen, "King and Messiah", P. 57.

between the Servant and the Tammuz-kingship ideology has made it necessary to discuss their views. There is, however, one final objection to all such discussions which proves that they are pointless. We have already come to the conclusion that the Servant Songs were most probably written by Deutero-¹Isaiah himself. In the rest of his prophecy he was concerned to prove to his fellow Israelites that Yahweh their God was the only true God. The Babylonian gods were powerless.

They were mere idols, who could not move and only stood in their shrines because they had been nailed there ! Clearly Deutero-Isaiah had nothing but contempt for the Babylonian cults that were practised around him. Would he, then, make the Servant conform to the ideas of the Tammuz cult ? Most certainly not ! Any identification of the Servant with the Tammuz-kingship ideology is, therefore, patently absurd !

It is difficult to say what is meant by "posterity" or "seed" in ver. 10. It is variously interpreted by scholars and their interpretation is usually determined by their views concerning the identity of the Servant. However, before we can make any attempt to interpret the meaning of the phrase "he shall see posterity that prolongs life", we must decide whether the Servant was restored to life on earth, or to life beyond death. But here the text gives us no clear indication. Thus we are left to conjecture and are forced to interpret this passage in the light of the major conclusion we adopt concerning the identity of the Servant. Further there is also difference of opinion whether we should understand the "seed" as physical or spiritual seed. Once again the view we adopt will depend on our conclusion concerning the identity of the Servant.

1. See supra, P. 57.

Finally, is the portrait of the Servant consistent throughout the Songs ? Many scholars have pointed out certain inconsistencies. According to Staerk, " the Servant of the first three Songs is a spiritual hero-figure, endowed with power from God to act, ready, indeed, to suffer for the cause of God, but by no means a silent sufferer ... On the other hand, the Servant of Isa. liii is a true, martyr-figure, filled with power from God to suffer, consumed for others not in that he labours for them or strives with them, but in willing, silent, vicarious suffering "^{1.}

Volz also stresses the contrast between the active mission of the Servant in the first three Songs, and the act of divine grace accomplished in the fourth.^{2.} Lindblom thinks that the Songs are all allegorical or symbolical pictures. In two cases (42 and 53) the allegorical narrative is created by the prophet's religious imagination, while in the others (49 and 50) his personal experiences form the basis of the narrative. Thus what the Songs have in common is not the figure which they describe, but the one reality which they elucidate.^{3.} Moreover, in the first Song there is not the slightest hint of the suffering of the Servant or of his violent end, which are related in the third and fourth Songs. The suffering of the Servant seems to be hinted at in the second Song where he despairs because he thinks that all his labour has been in vain. But elsewhere in the second Song the Servant is confident and successful. Even in the third Song there is no suggestion that the Servant is expecting his sufferings to culminate in death. On the contrary, his

1. " Die Ebed - Jahwe - Lieder in Jesaja 40ff ", P. 121.

Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 154.

2. Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 154.

3. Op. cit., P. 50.

opponents will be consumed.

We conclude, therefore, that the portrait of the Servant is not entirely consistent throughout the Servant Songs.

Chapter Six.

The Identity of the Servant.

The problem of the identity of the Servant in the Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah has probably received more attention than any other subject in Old Testament studies. So many different interpretations of the Servant Songs have been advanced, that it is impossible to treat them individually and we shall attempt here only to examine each type of theory.^{1.}

Many scholars have followed the LXX and maintain that the Servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah always denotes Israel. This interpretation is commonly known as the collective theory. In the passages in Deutero-Isaiah outside the Servant Songs the Servant is clearly equated with Jacob - Israel.^{2.} Moreover, in one passage in the Servant Songs themselves the Servant is called Israel.^{3.} It is inconceivable, therefore, that the prophet should apply the same title to two distinct subjects without even hinting that he has a double application in mind. The fact that the predicates associated with the title are almost identical,^{4.} makes it all the more difficult to imagine that the prophet had two different servants in mind. There are however serious difficulties confronting it. The Servant cannot be the personification of the nation Israel en masse, throughout the Songs, for there are some instances where the Servant is contrasted with the nation. Whereas the nation suffers

-
1. For a masterly review of the history of the interpretation of the Servant Songs, cf. C.R. North, "The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah". Cf. also H.H. Rowley, "The Servant of the Lord."
 2. See supra, pp. 35 - 40.
 3. Is. 49:3. See supra, pp. 73 - 76, 116 - 119.
 4. See supra, pp. 41 - 53.

double for its own sin, the Servant in the Songs suffers innocently and bears the sins of others.^{1.} Moreover, the Servant has a preliminary mission to restore Israel to Yahweh.^{2.}

Others, modifying the collective theory, maintain that the Servant cannot be the literal historic nation, he is the "ideal" or the "true" Israel, fulfilling the destiny to which God had called Israel. A serious objection to this theory lies in the fact that the Servant labours and suffers for the good of Israel and is the agent of its deliverance from captivity. If the Servant was the "ideal" Israel, this would result in the strange fact that while the actual Israel suffered double for its sins, they were nevertheless atoned for by the sufferings of the ideal Israel. Further it is very doubtful whether the Israelites who had suffered the penalty of the exile would utter the thought that the "ideal" Israel had borne their sins.^{3.} It is most improbable, therefore, that the Servant is the "ideal" Israel.

One final objection to all the forms of the collective theory remains to be stated. Many scholars have pointed out that the portrait of the Servant in the Songs is far more individualized than the figure of the Servant in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy. This is particularly so in the fourth Song. Therefore it is doubtful whether the Servant is conceived of as Israel collectively in the Songs.

Some scholars maintain that the Servant is an individual. This interpretation has been advanced in many different forms.

1. See supra, PP. 49f.

2. Is.49:5f. See supra PP. 77ff.,115.

3. Cf. A.S. Peake, Op. cit., PP. 174 - 178.

In the beginning of the Christian era there were Jews who identified the Servant with the Messiah, though later, in the face of Christian claims, Jewish interpreters abandoned this identification and interpreted the Servant as the nation.^{1.} From New Testament times Christians have interpreted Is. 53 as a prophecy of Christ. Even since the end of the eighteenth century there have been scholars who have maintained this traditional Messianic interpretation. Often they have been "fundamentalists" who have insisted on a mechanical conception of inspiration and who have regarded the book of Isaiah as a unity. Even those who admit that Is. 40 - 55 is separate from the "first Isaiah", see in the Servant an individual figure whom the prophet expected to come in the future. Some have identified him with the Messianic king of the line of David whom the Jews eagerly awaited. There are, however, certain objections to these views. While all Christians believe that the prophecy was fulfilled by Jesus Christ, it does not follow that we must think of the prophet as a mere amanuensis whose writings had no relevance to the circumstances of his own time. The prophet was concerned about the fate of his contemporaries. Therefore it is far more likely that he thought of the Servant as one who would bring about salvation in his own day, or at least in the very near future. In addition the fact that the Servant is to restore the tribes of Jacob suggests that his mission also has some political implications - to lead Israel out of the exile.^{2.} Since Deutero-Isaiah expected a speedy deliverance, he must have had a contemporary in mind. It is very doubtful whether the prophet equated the Servant with the Davidic Messiah. The Davidic Messiah was conceived

1. Cf. W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, "The Servant of God", pp. 43 - 78.

2. See supra, pp. 119f.

of as a strong military leader who would overcome Israel's enemies and lead Israel to victory, not one who would make atonement for Israel by suffering. Indeed, as H.H. Rowley has pointed out, when our Lord spoke of the Messiah in terms of suffering, the disciples did not understand him. Nobody, before the time of our Lord, had equated the concept of the Davidic Messiah with the idea of suffering.^{1.}

In order to avoid these difficulties, a few scholars have advanced, what C.R. North calls, "The Historic Messianic Theory".^{2.} The Servant was an anonymous contemporary of the Prophet, a seer who, the prophet believed, was destined to be the Messiah. Deutero-Isaiah encouraged him to undertake the political restoration of Israel. This course brought him into conflict with the Babylonian authorities and led to his violent death. If we accept this theory, it follows that it was Deutero-Isaiah, of all men, who deflected the Servant from his spiritual vocation to the political career that ended in his death. This is hardly possible. Moreover, is it at all likely that if, during Deutero-Isaiah's lifetime, there was another great leader and prophet who wrought deliverance for the nation by his suffering and death, we would know nothing of him? These objections are fatal to the Historic-Messianic Theory.

Other scholars again have identified the Servant with an individual who was a predecessor or a contemporary of the author of the poems. Some fifteen individuals have been suggested. They are, Isaiah, Uzziah, Hezekiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Job, Moses, Jehoiachin, Cyrus, Sheshbazzar, Zerubbabel, Meshullam, Nehemiah, and Eleazar.

1. "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah" in "The Servant of the Lord", pp. 61 - 88.

2. Op. cit., p. 194.

Now it is possible that certain outstanding figures of the preceding ages, such as Moses and Jeremiah, served, to some degree, as models for the portrait of the Servant. But it is most improbable that Deutero-Isaiah thought of the Servant as a definite person who had lived in the remote past. As was characteristic of all the great prophets, he was concerned about the fate of his contemporaries, and his message was directly relevant to the present and the immediate future. A Servant who had suffered in the dim and distant past, could offer little consolation to Israel in its present time of suffering. This consideration rules out the identification of the Servant with many of the individuals suggested, since the Songs date from the exile and not from the eighth century or earlier.^{1.}

Many scholars have identified the Servant with Jeremiah, and this theory, therefore, demands special attention. While we admit that Jeremiah may have contributed to the portrait of the Servant, it is not very likely that he was the Servant. The parallel between the two is not exact in all points. Jeremiah suffered as a consequence of his mission but he did not endure his suffering patiently. On the other hand, the Servant, who endured his suffering patiently, suffered for more reasons than merely as a consequence of his mission. His suffering was an essential part of his mission, it was itself the means whereby he was to bring his mission to a successful issue. Jeremiah, therefore, cannot be the Servant.

It is interesting to notice that all the individuals who have been identified with the Servant have been either kings or prophets, depending on whether the Servant was

1. See supra, pp. 1, 63.

regarded as a king or as a prophet. Now, as we have seen, the Servant combines the functions of both a king and a prophet.¹ Thus of all the individuals who have been proposed as possibly being identified with the Servant, the only eligible candidate is Moses, since he alone combined the functions of a ruler and a prophet. But there are hardly any other similarities between Moses and the Servant. Sellin's theory that the Servant was Moses was based on a speculation that Moses had been murdered by his own countrymen. There is, however, no substantial evidence to support this speculation. Sellin could only support his theory by making drastic conjectural emendations and by giving a very dubious exegesis of certain passages in the book of Hosea. Moses, therefore, cannot be identified with the Servant. Sellin himself has since abandoned the theory, but it should be noted that it has been revived in a different form by A. Bentzen.²

Since neither Moses nor any of the other individuals proposed can be identified with the Servant, it is futile to seek the identity of the Servant among the past heroes of Israel whose names have been preserved. If we are to look for an historical individual at all, it must be for an anonymous person. The most rigorous exposition of this form of the individual theory is given by Duhm.³ In his view the Servant of Yahweh was a religious teacher (Thoralehrer) who lived after the exile but before the time of Nehemiah. Once again the objection to this theory is that it is most unlikely that a person, who through his teaching and suffering had achieved so much for Israel and for mankind, should remain completely unknown to us.

1. See supra, pp. 113f.

2. "Messias - Moses Redivivus - Menschensohn", Eng. Tr. "King and Messiah".

3. Cf. B. Duhm, Op. cit., pp. xv sect., 25; xx sect., 32; 284.

Consequently, Mowinckel^{1.} suggested the autobiographical theory, although he has since abandoned it in its original form. He maintained that the Servant was none other than the prophet, Deutero-Isaiah himself. The obvious objection to this theory is that it would require us to suppose that the Prophet-Servant composed his own obituary. Some scholars have, therefore, modified the theory. The fourth Song was written by Trito-Isaiah - a disciple of Deutero-Isaiah - as a threnody on his martyred master. But in the discussion on the authorship of the Songs we noticed that there were sufficient similarities between the fourth Song and the rest^{2.} of Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy to attribute the Song to him. Thus the difficulties confronting the autobiographical theory in its original form cannot be resolved by adopting the Trito-Isaianic authorship of the fourth Song. While the portrait of the Servant undoubtedly contains features of the Prophet himself, it is quite a different thing to say that he consciously intended the Servant Songs as a self-portrait.

Finally, many scholars have pointed out that all the forms of the individual theory are faced with an obstinate difficulty. They maintain that if the Servant was an historic individual, more details would have been given about his life.

In recent years the progress of Archaeology has led to the discovery of many ancient Babylonian and Canaanite texts. From them scholars have learned a great deal about the ancient religious myths and cultic practices. Consequently a number of scholars have suggested that the Servant is related to the myth of the dying and rising god Tammuz. As we have seen the obvious objection to this theory is the fact that Deutero-Isaiah had nothing but contempt for the surrounding

1. S. Mowinckel, "Der Knecht Yahwäs", Cf. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 195.

2. See supra, PP. 56f.

foreign cults, and would most certainly not make the Servant conform to ideas and practices which he despised.^{1.}

Recently Lindblom^{2.} has suggested that the only way of solving the problem of the Servant's identity is to interpret the Songs allegorically. The Servant in the Songs is an allegorical figure whose interpretation is not to be pressed in all details. In the second and third Songs the prophet may have drawn his terms in part from his own experience, but he did not think of himself as the Servant. It is, indeed, as foolish to ask "Who is the Servant?" as to ask "Who is the Prodigal Son?". The Servant embodies an idea, and that idea is the mission of Israel to the world. On this interpretation, as on all collective interpretations, all the disappointments, afflictions, uncomeliness, the sicknesses, sufferings, and death of the Servant are just a number of allegorical representations of the exile. There is no movement from the situations in the earlier Songs to the situation presented in the last Song. "Instead of a drama moving steadily to a climax, we have a series of tableaux all representing the same situation."^{3.} The allegorical interpretation, therefore, is not a satisfactory solution to the problem.

H. Wheeler Robinson has presented a very attractive solution to the problem by stressing the importance of the concept of "corporate personality" for the understanding of much of the Old Testament.^{4.} He shows how Hebrew thought could pass easily and naturally from the community to the individual and back again. "The whole group, including its past, present and future members, might function as a single

1. See supra, P. 131.

2. "The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah", PP. 48 - 51.

3. C.R. North, Op. cit., P. 206.

4. See supra, P. 118f.

individual through any one of those members conceived as representative of it. " ^{1.} This produces an oscillation in speech between the individual and the group, which does not rest on an antithesis between them, but on an identification with the group which he represents and vice versa. Hence, in discussing the Servant Songs he says: " The central issue, that between a collective and an individualistic interpretation, is being argued on an antithesis true to modern, but false to ancient modes of thought. " ^{2.} The Hebrew conception of corporate personality can reconcile both, and pass without explanation or explicit indication from one to the other, in a fluidity of transition which seems to us unnatural. In the light of this conception the Servant can be both the prophet himself as representative of the nation, and the nation whose proper mission is actually being fulfilled only by the prophet and that group of followers who may share his views. " ^{3.} O. Eissfeldt, working independently from Wheeler Robinson, has proposed a similar solution to the problem, though he puts more emphasis on the collective side of the fluidity. ^{4.}

There is much to be said for this fluid theory of " corporate personality ", since it overcomes most of the difficulties confronting the other interpretations of the Songs. However, in its original form it needs a slight alteration. Wheeler Robinson thought that there was an oscillation of thought between the nation and the prophet himself. But in this form the theory is confronted by the same difficulties as the autobiographical theory. However,

-
- 1.H. Wheeler Robinson, " The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality " in " Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments " (Ed. by J. Hempel), 1936, P. 49. Cf. H.H. Rowley, Op. cit., P. 39.
 2.Ibid., P. 58.
 3.Ibid., P. 59.
 4.O. Eissfeldt, " Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja ", Eng. Tr. " The Ebed - Jahwe in Isaiah 40 - 55 ", in ET. xliv, 1932 - 3, pp. 261 - 268.

as C.R. North^{1.} and H.H. Rowley^{2.} point out, it is far more probable that the prophet's thought oscillated between the nation and an individual still to come, who would fully actualize the Servant ideal in his own person. In this form the theory is no longer beset with the difficulties confronting the Autobiographical theory. Further it should be noted that in this conception of fluidity North finds only linear progress and rejects the idea of oscillation,^{3.} whereas Rowley finds a "development from the thought of Israel as the Servant to the thought of an individual Servant par excellence, without abandoning the thought of Israel as still the Servant."^{4.}

Who, then, is the Servant? Obviously we must begin where Deutero-Isaiah himself began, with the equation of the Servant and Israel. But this interpretation, as we have seen, is open to serious difficulties. Many scholars have therefore tried to identify the Servant with an historic or an anonymous individual. But there are also serious objections to this view.

Our study of the Servant as he is depicted in the Songs has shown that very often the Songs allow an individual as well as a collective interpretation. Nevertheless, at other points the Songs embarrass those who interpret the Servant as exclusively individual or exclusively collective.^{5.} The difficult passages in the second Song suggest that the prophet did not conceive of the Servant consistently either as an individual or as the nation collectively. Sometimes he thinks of the Servant as Israel and at other times he distinguishes between the Servant and Israel and even

1. Op. cit., P. 207.
 2. Op. cit., P. 56.
 3. Op. cit., P. 216.
 4. Op. cit., P. 54.
 5. See supra, Chapter 5.

conceives of the Servant as having a mission to Israel. ^{1.}
 We further noticed that the picture of the Servant presented in the Songs is not entirely consistent and that, here and there, incongruities appear. ^{2.} Thus it seems that Deutero-Isaiah did not have a fixed conception of the Servant's identity. His thought seems to develop as we proceed from the first to the fourth Song. Above all, the evidence suggests that there is a measure of fluidity in his thought about the Servant, which can be accounted for by the Semitic conception of " corporate personality ".

From this it follows that it is erroneous to make an absolute antithesis between the individual and the collective interpretations of the Servant Songs. In the figure of the Servant, Deutero-Isaiah saw both an individual and a community, and from time to time the one or the other became more prominent, but they were not mutually exclusive. Even though the fourth Song is dominantly individual, the Servant's mission is not merely his own. It is Israel's also. Israel still enters into it in some measure, for the Servant is truly Israel's representative.

Quite apart from the concept of " corporate personality ", the fact that so many and so diverse solutions of the problem have been advanced, suggests that the picture of the Servant is a composite one. Many prophets and kings have contributed to it. This is the element of truth in the historical - individual theories. But as Rowley points out, the content of Deutero-Isaiah's thought is more important, and that may easily have transcended his own grasp. " It may well be that the prophet himself would have been hard put to it to define

1. See supra, pp. 116 - 119.

2. See supra, pp. 132f.

with precision just how he conceived the Servant. For he was carried by the dynamic of a thought which possessed him to the implications of his initial thought, which was more pregnant than he had realized. " ^{1.}

We conclude, therefore, that the most satisfactory solution to the problem of the identity of the Servant is to be found by giving a fluid interpretation to the Songs. The prophet's thought concerning the Servant oscillates between the conception of him as Israel, and the conception of him as an individual figure representing Israel, who would fully actualize the Servant ideal in his own person. While we do not regard the Servant Songs as photographic predictions of Christ, we do recognize that the mission of the historical Jesus Christ, crucified and risen, does fulfil the mission of the Servant in that it fills it with a fuller meaning and an even richer content. The Christian Church as the heir of Christ, and the continuator of His work, and His representative in this world, carries on the Servant vocation which was given to Israel in the Old Testament. It is in the measure that it fulfils this vocation, that the Christian Church will be truly the representative of its Founder and Lord, who in His earthly ministry so clearly identified Himself with that vocation.

1. Op. cit., P. 52.

A P P E N D I X A

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

- A : Aquila
 C : LXX
 DsIa : Dead Sea Scrolls of
 St. Mark's Monastery Vol I
 DsIb : The Dead Sea Scrolls
 - E. L. Sukenik
 Θ : Theodotian
 L : Latin
 m : Massora
 S : Syriac
 Σ : Symmachus
 T : Targum
 V : Vulgate
 Vrs : Versions

 add : additum
 al : alii
 ca : circa
 c : cum
 dittogr : dittographice
 fort : fortasse
 gloss : glossatum
 ins : insere
 l : legendum
 prop : propositum
 Q : Qeré
 transp : transponendum

The First Song 42:1 - 4.

Massoretic Text.

LXX.

בֶּן מְבַדֵּי אֶתְמַן בֶּן

1. Ιακωβ ὁ παῖς μου,
αντιλημψομαι αὐτοῦ.

בְּחִירִי רִצְתָה נֶפְשִׁי

Ισραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου,
προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου.

נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶי לִי מְלִיךָ

ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐπ'
αὐτόν,

מִפְּשָׁמַי לְגוֹיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל

κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει.

אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִרְעָז וְלֹא יִשְׁחָזֵק

2. οὐ κεκράξεται οὐδὲ ἀνήσει,

וְלֹא יִשְׁמָע וְלֹא יִשְׁמָע

οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω
ἢ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ.

וְלֹא יִשְׁבֹּר וְלֹא יִשְׁפָּר

3. κέλευρον τεθλασμένον οὐ
συντρίψει,

וְלֹא יִשְׁפָּר וְלֹא יִשְׁבֹּר

καὶ λίνον καπυζομένον
οὐ σβέσει,

לֹא יִשְׁבֹּר וְלֹא יִשְׁפָּר

ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει
κρίσιν.

אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁבֹּר וְלֹא יִשְׁפָּר

4. ἀναλάμψει καὶ οὐ
θραυσθήσεται,

מִפְּשָׁמַי לְגוֹיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל

ἕως ἂν θῆ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
κρίσιν

וְלֹא יִשְׁבֹּר וְלֹא יִשְׁפָּר

καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ
ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

42: 2, a. אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁבֹּר וְלֹא יִשְׁפָּר // 3, a. מִפְּשָׁמַי לְגוֹיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל // 4, a. מִפְּשָׁמַי לְגוֹיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל //

b. מִפְּשָׁמַי לְגוֹיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל

The First Song 42:1 - 4.Literal Translation.

1. Behold! My Servant whom I lay hold of,
 (LXX Jacob, My Servant ...)
 My chosen one in whom my soul takes
 pleasure. (LXX Israel, my chosen ...)
 I have put my spirit upon him,
 he shall bring forth mishpat to the
 Gentiles.
2. He shall not cry, nor lift up,
 nor make his voice heard in the street.
 (without / in an open place).
3. A bruised reed he shall not break,
 and the dimly burning wick he shall not
 extinguish.
 to truth he shall bring forth mishpat.
4. He shall not become weak (or, fail) nor
 become broken (or, relax himself)
 until he has set mishpat in the earth
 and the isles shall wait for his torah.
 (LXX and nations shall hope on his name.)

Final Translation.

- Behold! My Servant whom
 I uphold,
 My chosen in whom I
 delight !
 I have endowed him with
 my spirit,
 He will bring true
 religion to the nations.
- He will not cry, nor
 clamour,
 Nor make his voice heard
 in the street.
- A bruised reed he will not
 break,
 And a glimmering wick he
 will not quench.
 Faithfully he will bring
 forth true religion.
- He will not be disheartened
 or discouraged
 Until he has established
 true religion in the earth
 And the coastlands eagerly
 await his instruction.

Massoretic Text.

LXX.

וְשָׁמַעְנוּ אֲזַיִם אֵלַי אֲקוּסָתִי מִן הַיָּם

1. Ἀκούσατέ μου, νῆσοι,

וְהִקְשִׁיבוּ לְאָמִים מִרְחוֹק

καὶ προσέχετε ἔθνη.

יְהוָה מִבְּטֶן קִרְבָּנִי

διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ

στήσεσθαι, λέγει κύριος.

מִמְעֵי אֲמֵי הַזִּפְּיִר שָׁמַי

ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου

ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομά μου.

וַיִּשְׁמַע פִּי פִּתְחוֹתַי

2. καὶ ἔθηκεν τὸ στόμα μου

ὡς εἰ μάχαιραν ὀβείην

בְּשַׁל יָדוֹ הַחֲבִי אֲנִי

καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν σκέλην τῆς

χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐκρυψέν με,

וַיִּשְׁמַע נִי לְחַץ בְּרוּר

ἔθηκεν με ὡς βέλος ἐκλεκτὸν

בְּאַשְׁפֻּרְתּוֹ הוֹסֵפֵי נִי

καὶ ἐν τῇ φαρέγγῃ αὐτοῦ

ἐσκέπεσεν με.

וַיֹּאמֶר לִי עַבְדִּי אֲתָה

3. καὶ εἶπέν μοι Δοῦλός μου

εἶ σύ,

יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר בָּרַךְ אֲתָפְאֵר

Ἰσραηλ, καὶ ἐν σοὶ

δοξασθήσομαι.

וַיֹּאמֶר אֲנִי אֲנִי לִרְיָ אֲמַפֵּי

4. καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπα κενῶς

ἐκοπίασα

לְזַהֵר וְהִבֵּל פִּתִּי כֹל יָתִי

καὶ εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν

ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύν μου.

אֲכַן מִשְׁמֵי אֲתָה יְהוָה

διὰ τοῦτο ἡ κρίσις μου

παρὰ κυρίῳ,

וְלִמְלַחְתִּי אֲתָה אֵלֵהי

καὶ ὁ πόνος μου ἐναντίον

τοῦ Θεοῦ μου.

The Second Song 49:1 - 6.Literal Translation.

1. Listen, O isles unto me,
and hearken, ye peoples from afar;
Yahweh from the womb has called me,
from the bowels of my mother has he
caused to remember my name.
2. And he has set my mouth as a sharp
sword,
in the shadow of his hand he has hidden
me.
And he set me for a clean arrow (shaft)
(Targum and LXX a chosen arrow)
in his quiver he hid me away.
3. And he said to me, my Servant art thou
Israel in whom I will be glorified.
4. But I said, in vain have I laboured,
for nought and vanity I have spent
my strength,
(yet) surely my mishpat is with Yahweh,
and my reward with my God.

Final Translation.

- Hearken, ye coastlands,
unto me,
And listen, ye distant
peoples !
Yahweh has called me from
the womb,
From my mother's bowels He
made mention of my name.
- And He made my mouth like
a sharp sword,
In the shadow of His hand
He hid me;
And He made me a polished
arrow,
In His quiver He concealed
me.
- And He said to me, Thou
art my Servant,
Israel in whom I will
glorify myself.
- But I said, In vain have
I toiled,
For nought and vanity have
I spent my strength;
Yet surely my cause is with
Yahweh,
And my recompense with
my God.

Massoretic Text.

LXX.

וְהָיָה לְךָ כֹּחַ יְהוָה וְנִין כֹּחַ לֵעָרֶיךָ וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας
σου λον ἐαυτῷ
τοῦ συναγαγεῖν τὸν Ιακωβ
καὶ Ισραηλ πρὸς αὐτόν —

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

συναχθήσομαι καὶ δοξασθήσομαι
ἐναντίον κυρίου,
καὶ ὁ θεὸς μου ἔσται
μου ἰσχύς —

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

וְנִין כֹּחַ לְיָדְיָךָ

καὶ εἶπεν μοι Μίχα σοὶ ἔσται
τοῦ κληθηνεὶ σε παῖδά μου
τοῦ στήσαι τὰς φουκὰς Ιακωβ
καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ Ισραηλ
ἐπιστρέψαι.
Ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς δικαίωσιν
γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν
σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου
τῆς γῆς.

49:5, w. 10 mas, c 8 + 713 || b. 9 mas ai H, T, DSA ἵλι || c. 1' 57, c 3a.

49:6, w. de. || b-b. gmo? || c. ai 713, c 713, DSA 7' 57.

Literal Translation.

5. And now, (thus) saith Yahweh,

who formed me from the womb
to be his Servant,
to bring back Jacob to him

(but Israel is not gathered). Rather
follow the footnote - and that Israel
be gathered to him.

Now (and) I am honourable in the eyes
of Yahweh,
and my God is become my strength.

6. And he said (LXX to me) it is a small
thing that thou shouldest be to me a
servant,

to raise up the tribes of Jacob

and the preserved of Israel to bring
back. (LXX dispersed of Israel).

And I will give thee for a light of the
Gentiles (LXX covenant of the people)
that thou might be my salvation
(or, that my salvation might be)
to the end of the earth.

Final Translation.

And now, thus saith Yahweh,

Who formed me from the womb
to be His Servant,
To restore Jacob unto Him

And that Israel might be
gathered to Him -

So was I honoured in the
eyes of Yahweh,

And my God became my strength -

It is too trifling that thou
shouldest be my Servant,

To raise up the tribes
of Jacob

And to restore the preserved
of Israel.

So I make thee a light to
the nations,

That my salvation may reach
to the ends of the earth.

Massoretic Text.LXX.

יְהִי נִתְּנָן לִי	4. Κύριος δίδωσίν μοι
לְשׁוֹן לַמְּוֹדִים	γλῶσσαν παιδείας
לְמַעַן אֶשְׂתָּ-מַּעַן אֶשְׂתָּ-מַּעַן	τοῦ γνῶναι ἐν καιρῷ ἥνίκα δεῖ
דְּבַר יְמִיר	εἶπῆν λόγον,
בְּבִקְרִי בְּבִקְרִי לִי אֶזְנִי	ἔθηκέν μοι πρῶί, προσέθηκέν μοι ὠτίον
לְשִׁמְעַם כְּלַמְּוֹדִים	ἀκούειν
וְאֶדְנִי יְהוָה פִּתְּחָה לִי אֶזְנִי	5. καὶ ἡ παιδεία κυρίου ἀνοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα
וְאֶנְכִי לֹא מֵרִיתִי	ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ
אֶחֱזֹר לֹא נִסְוִי גִוְסִי	οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω .
וְאֶזְנִי נִתְּנָה לִי מִפִּי	6. τὸν νῶτόν μου δέδωκα εἰς μάστιγας,
וְלִפְתִּי לַמְּוֹדִים	τάς δὲ σιαγόνας μου εἰς ῥαπίσματα,
פָּנַי לֹא הִסְתַּרְתִּיהֶם	τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα
מִכַּף מוֹת וְרִק	ἀπὸ αἰσχύνης ἐμπτυσμάτων .

50:4, a. dl., (ditto)? DSIa וְיִמִּיר // b. DSIa וְיִמִּיר // s, a-a. gloss? //

6, a. DSIa לַמְּוֹדִים // b. DSIa וְהִסְתַּרְתִּיהֶם .

The Third Song 50:4 - 9.Literal Translation.

4. The Lord Yahweh has given me

the tongue of them that are taught,
(i.e. disciples)
to know how to sustain him that is
weary (LXX to speak a word in season)
with a word. He awakens

morning by morning, he awakens my ear

to hear as they that are taught.
(as disciples).

5. The Lord Yahweh has opened my ear
(LXX And the discipline of the Lord...)
and I did not rebel,

backwards I did not recoil.
(LXX nor contradict).

6. My back I gave to them that smite,
(LXX...to scourges)
and my cheeks to them that pluck out

my face I did not hide

from shame and spitting.

Final Translation.

The Lord Yahweh Himself
has given me
A disciple's tongue,

That I should know how to
sustain
The weary with a word.

Morning by morning He awakens
my ear
To listen as disciples do.

The Lord Yahweh Himself has
opened my ear
And I have not rebelled,

Nor turned away backward.

My back I gave to the smiters,

And my cheeks to those who
pluck out the beard;
My face I hid not

From shame and spitting.

Massoretic Text.LXX.

וְלֹא־תִמְנַן־נִינִן׃ וְיָתֵן־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 και κύριος βοηθός μου ἐγενήθη.

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 δια τούτο οὐκ ἐνεπίση.

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 ἄλλα ἔθηκα τὸ πρῶτον σου
 ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν
 και ἔγνω ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀίσχυνθῶ.

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 8. οἱ ἐγγίξει ὁ δικαίωσας με.

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 τίς ὁ κρινόμενός μου;

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 ἀντιστήτω μοι ἄμα.

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 και τίς ὁ κρινόμενός μου;

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 ἔγγιστω μοι.

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 9. ἰσοῦ κύριος βοηθὸς μου.

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 τίς κακώσεται με;

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 ἰσοῦ πάντες ὑμεῖς ὡς ἰμάτιον
 παλαιωθήσεσθε,

וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ וְיִשְׁלַח־לְךָ
 και ὡς σῆς καταφύγεσαι ὑμῶς.

Literal Translation.Final Translation.

7. But the Lord Yahweh is helping (or, will help) me; (LXX...has become my helper) therefore have I not been ashamed.

Therefore have I set my face like a flint,
and I know that I shall not be ashamed.

8. Near is he who justifies me.

Who will contend with me ? (i.e. start a law case against me)
Let us stand up together.

Who is the master of my mishpat (case)?
(i.e. my adversary).
Let him draw near to me.

9. Behold, the Lord Yahweh is helping me.

Who is he who will put me in the wrong?
(i.e. condemn me)
Behold, all of them (LXX all you) shall wither as a garment,
moth shall eat them.
(LXX and as a moth he shall consume you)

But the Lord Yahweh Himself is helping me;
Therefore am I not dishonoured;

Therefore have I set my face like flint,
And I know that I shall not be ashamed.

Near is my Vindicator.

Who will take proceedings against me ?
Let us stand up together !

Who is my adversary ?
Let him come near to me !

Behold ! The Lord Yahweh Himself is helping me !
Who then can convict me ?
Behold ! They will all wear out as a garment,
The moth shall consume them !

The Fourth Song 52:13 - 53:12.

Masoretic Text.

LXX.

יִבְדֹּל מִשְׁכִּיל וְיִשְׁכַּח מִלִּבּוֹ סוּנְיָתַי מִן־מִן

וְיִבְדֹּל מִשְׁכִּיל וְיִשְׁכַּח מִלִּבּוֹ סוּנְיָתַי מִן־מִן

καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα.

וְיִבְדֹּל מִשְׁכִּיל וְיִשְׁכַּח מִלִּבּוֹ סוּנְיָתַי מִן־מִן

וְיִבְדֹּל מִשְׁכִּיל וְיִשְׁכַּח מִלִּבּוֹ סוּנְיָתַי מִן־מִן

14. ὄν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοί

οὕτως ἀδοξήσῃ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἶδος σου

καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

וְיִבְדֹּל מִשְׁכִּיל וְיִשְׁכַּח מִלִּבּוֹ סוּנְיָתַי מִן־מִן

וְיִבְדֹּל מִשְׁכִּיל וְיִשְׁכַּח מִלִּבּוֹ סוּנְיָתַי מִן־מִן

15. οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ,

καὶ συνέξουσιν βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν

ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται,

καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν, συνήσουσιν.

52:13, a. > c, d del? vs14a □□□□ // 14, a. τ, θ γ' λ' μ // b. ε' ρ //

c. θ σιπיש, vs14a 'σιπיש // 15, a. c, ε θαυμάσονται ηε. ימש' ,

ηε. ימש' , vel ηεπיש' , vel ηε' .

The Fourth Song 52:15 - 53:12.Literal Translation.

13. Behold, my Servant shall deal wisely,

he shall be exalted (omitted in LXX)
and lifted up and shall be very high.

14. Like as many were astonished at thee,
(footnote him)

so (footnote for) his appearance was
marred from a man (LXX thy appearance)
and his form from the sons of men.
(LXX and thy glory from men)

15. So shall he startle many nations,
(LXX so shall many nations be startled
at him)

at him kings shall shut their mouths,

for that which had not been told them
they have seen,

and that which they had not heard
they have perceived.

Final Translation.

Behold !. My Servant shall
deal wisely,

He will rise and lift himself
up and be greatly exalted.

As many were appalled at him, -

For his appearance was marred
beyond human semblance

And his form beyond that of
the sons of men -

So shall many nations be
amazed at him,

Kings shall shut their mouths;

For what had not been told them
they shall have seen,

And what they had not heard
they shall have perceived.

52:13 - 53:12.

Massoretic Text,

LXX.

<p>לְשֵׁמֶעַי בְּנִי : וְיִדְרֵךְ מֵ-לִי נֶגְלֹתַי</p>	<p>1. Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ὑμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκκλύθη;</p>
<p>אֲנִי וְכָל הַיָּמִים וְכִשְׁרָשָׁה יָרִיעַ</p>	<p>2. ἀνηγγείλαμεν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῆ διψώση,</p>
<p>לֹא-וְלֹא לֹו וְלֹא : וְנִגְדָה וְנִגְדָה וְנִגְדָה</p>	<p>οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα. καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος.</p>

<p>וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ : וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ וְנִגְדָה</p>	<p>3. ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον ἐκλείπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους,</p>
---	---

<p>וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ : וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ וְנִגְדָה</p>	<p>ἀνθρώπος ἐν πληγῇ ὢν καὶ εἶδώς φέρειν μαλακίαν,</p>
---	---

<p>וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ : וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ וְנִגְדָה</p>	<p>ὅτι ἀπέστραπται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ,</p>
---	--

<p>וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ : וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ וְנִגְדָה</p>	<p>ἡτιμάσθη καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη.</p>
---	-----------------------------------

52:1, a. D51a אֶל-לִי // 2, a. תַּמְסֵךְ לִי אֶל, אֶל-יְנִיבֵךְ // b. D51a לִי נֶגְלֹתַי

c. add? תַּמְסֵךְ לִי // 3, a. D51a וְנִגְדָה לְאִישׁ.

52:13 - 53:12.Literal Translation.

1. Who has believed what we have heard ?

(LXX Lord, who has...)

And the arm of Yahweh, to whom has it
been revealed?

2. For he grew up as a succulent before

him,

and as a root from the dry ground.

He has no form nor dignity (LXX glory)

that we should look at him, and no
appearance that we should desire him.

(LXX and he has neither appearance nor
beauty)

3. He was despised and rejected by men,

(LXX but his appearance is dishonoured,
being forsaken by all men)

a man of pains, and acquainted with

disease, (LXX a man being in a wound,

and knowing to carry illness)

and as one from whom one hides the face,

(LXX because his countenance has been
rejected)

he was despised and we did not esteem

him. (LXX he was dishonoured and not

reckoned)

Final Translation.

Who could have believed what
we have heard ?

And to whom has the arm of
Yahweh been revealed ?

For he grew up before him

as a succulent,

And as a root out of the
dry ground.

He had no form nor stateliness
that we should look at him,

And no appearance that we
should desire him.

He was despised and forsaken
by men,

A man of pains and familiar
with sickness;

And as one from whom men hide
their faces,

He was despised, and we
esteemed him not.

52:13 - 53:12.

Masoretic Text.

LXX.

וְשֵׂא אֶכְךָ חַלְיִנּוֹ הִוְיָא נְשֵׂא 4. οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει

וְיִמְכַר אֶבְיָנוֹ סִבְלָם καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται,

וְאַנְחֵנוּ וְחִשְׁבָנוּהוּ נִגְוֵי וְהָיָה עִנְיָנוּ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ

וְיִמְעַנֵּהוּ וְיִמְעַנֵּהוּ מִכַּף אֵלֶיהֶם וְיִמְעַנֵּהוּ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει.

וְיִפְשַׁעְנוּ אֶחָלֵל אֶהְיֶה אֹתוֹ 5. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἁνομιὰς ἡμῶν

וְיִמְדַּעְנוּ אֶמְוֹנֵתֵנוּ מִדַּפְאֵם καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

וְיִשְׁלַח אֶשְׁלֵנוּ עַלֵּיוּ παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ' αὐτόν,

וְיִבְחַבְדֵנוּ וְנִפְאֵלֵנוּ תּוֹ מִלֶּחֶם אֹתוֹ הָיָה אֵלֵינוּ καὶ τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἴαθημεν.

וְיִפְלֵנוּ פְּאֵרָה וְיִמְיָנוּ 6. πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν,

וְיִפְנֵנוּ אֵשׁ לִדְרֹכֵינוּ אֶשְׁלֵנוּ ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη.

וְיִהְיֶה הַפְּאֵי מִבּוֹ καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν

וְיִפְלֵנוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶשְׁלֵנוּ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

52:15 - 55:12.Literal Translation.Final Translation.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>4. Surely it was our sickness which he bore
 (LXX The same (he) bore our sins)
 and our pains, he carried them;
 (LXX and for us he suffered pain)
 yet we esteemed him stricken (with
 plague), (LXX and we reckoned him to
 be in trouble)
 smitten of God, and afflicted.
 (LXX and in blows and in affliction)</p> | <p>Nevertheless, ours were the
 sicknesses that he carried,
 And ours the pains that he
 bore;
 Yet we supposed him stricken,

 Smitten of God, and afflicted.</p> |
| <p>5. But he was pierced for our transgressions

 he was bruised for our iniquities,

 the chastisement of our peace was upon
 him, (LXX the discipline...)
 and by his stripes healing has come to
 us.</p> | <p>But he was pierced for our
 transgressions,
 He was crushed for our
 iniquities,
 The chastisement leading to
 our welfare was upon him,
 And by his scars we were
 healed.</p> |
| <p>6. All we like sheep have gone astray,

 each to his own way have we turned;

 and Yahweh caused to light upon him

 the iniquity of all of us.</p> | <p>All we like sheep have gone
 astray,
 Each to his own way have
 we turned;
 But Yahweh thrust upon him

 The iniquity of us all.</p> |

Massoretic Text.

LXX.

וְגַבְרֵי אֱוִיָּוִי וְשִׁבְרֵי קַי וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ תֹּבֵן וְקַי וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ

53:12 a. All? Any to the end of the previous line. // b-h. dialogue? //

g. a-a. typo וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ // b. typo וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ //

c. Vrs = m, & וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ (וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ), DSA 170M //

d-d. & (G.C) וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ (וְאִתְּרֵי שִׁיחַ), V parvaai sum.

52:13 - 53:12.Literal Translation.

7. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted,
 (LXX And he, through being maltreated)
 and he opens not his mouth.

as a sheep that is led to the slaughter,
 and as an ewe lamb before its shearers
 is dumb, and he opens not his mouth.
 (LXX so he opens not his mouth)

8. From oppression and from judgement he
 was taken away, (LXX in oppression
 his judgement was taken away)
 and his generation (footnote way) who
 considered (LXX his generation who
 will relate)
 that he was cut off from the land of
 the living ? (LXX that his life was
 taken from the land)
 for the transgression of my people
 (footnote his) he was smitten to death
 (see footnote). (LXX from the lawless-
 ness of my people he was led to death)

Final Translation.

He was harshly treated, yet
 he humbled himself,
 And opened not his mouth.

As a sheep that is led to the
 slaughter,
 And as an ewe before her
 shearers is dumb,
 So he opened not his mouth.

Excluded from judgement he
 was taken away,
 And who reflected on his
 fate ?

For he was cut off from the
 land of the living,

For the transgression of his
 people he was smitten to
 death.

52:15 - 53:12.Literal Translation.

9. And one has set his grave with the wicked, (LXX and I will set the wicked over against his sepulchre) and with the rich his sepulchre (see footnote); (LXX and the rich over against his death) although he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in h's mouth.
10. And Yahweh has been pleased to crush him with disease(see footnote); (LXX...to cleanse him of the plague) though thou make his life a sin offering. (LXX ...your life) he shall see seed, he shall prolong days, and the pleasure of Yahweh will prosper in his hand.

Final Translation.

- And his grave was made with the wicked,
- And with the rich his sepulchre;
- Although he had done no violence,
- Nor was any deceit in his mouth.
- Yet Yahweh was pleased to crush him with sickness;
- Truly he gave himself as a guilt offering.
- He shall see posterity that prolongs life,
- And the purpose of Yahweh will prosper in his hand.

52:13 - 53:12.Literal Translation.Final Translation.

11. From the travail of his soul he shall see light (footnote with LXX), and be satisfied (with his knowledge?) by his knowledge he shall justify my righteous (LXX with his knowledge, to justify a well justified) servant to many. (LXX servant to many) and their iniquities he will bear.

After his travail of soul he shall see light,
He shall be satisfied with his knowledge;
My Servant shall justify many,
And their iniquities shall he bear.

12. Therefore will I apportion to him the many, (LXX...he shall inherit...) and with the powerful he shall divide spoil;
because that he has poured out to death his soul,
and with those who transgress he was numbered. (LXX...was reckoned) and he bore the sin of many,

and for those who transgress he will intercede. (LXX and because of their sins he was delivered up).

Therefore will I divide to him the many as a portion,
And the numerous he will share as spoil;
Because he poured out his soul unto death,
And was numbered with transgressors.
Yet he bore the sin of many,

And makes intercession for transgressors.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- ALEXANDER, J.A. Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah.
Grand Rapids, Michigan : Zondervan Publishing House,
1846, 1865, 1953.
- ANDERSON, B.W. The Living World of the Old Testament. London :
Longmans, Green & Co., 1958.
- BENTZEN, A. Introduction to the Old Testament. Copenhagen :
G.E.C. Gads Forlag, 1948.
- _____. King and Messiah. London : Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- BROWN, F. DRIVER, S.R. and BRIGGS, C.A. A Hebrew and English
Lexicon of the Old Testament. London : Oxford University
Press, 1907. Corrected Impression 1953, '57, '59.
- BROWNE, L.E. Early Judaism. London : Cambridge University
Press, 1929.
- BUBER, M. The Prophetic Faith. New York : The Macmillan
Company, 1949.
- BURROWS, M. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery Vol.I.
New Haven : American School of Oriental Research, 1950.
- CHEYNE, T.K. The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged.
London : Macmillan & Co., 1870.
- _____. The Prophecies of Issiah, 2 vols. London : C. Kegan
Paul & Co., 1881.
- _____. Introduction to the Book of Isaiah. London : A.&C.
Black, 1895.
- _____. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah : A New English
Translation, The Sacred Books of the Old and New Testaments,
London : James Clark & Co., 1898.
- _____. Isaiah (Book) and Servant of the Lord. Articles in
Encyclopaedia Biblica. London : A. & C. Black, 1903.
- DAVIDSON, A.B. Hebrew Syntax. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1894.
Third Edition 1901, 1958.

- DELITSCH, F. *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, Vol. II. Eng. Tr. from the Third Edition by J. Denny, London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1892.
Eng. Tr. from the Fourth Edition by J.S. Banks and J. Kennedy. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. No date given.
- DRIVER, S.R. *Isaiah : His Life and Times*. London : James Nisbet & Co., Second Edition 1893.
- DUHM, B. *Das Buch Jesaja übersetzt und erklärt, Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, Abt. III, Band I*. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Dritte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage, 1914.
- EISSFELDT, O. *The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah XL - LV in the Light of the Israelite Conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real*, ET, Vol. XLIV, No. 6, 1933, PP. 261 - 268.
- FARLEY, F.A. *Jeremiah and The Suffering Servant of Jehovah in Deutero-Isaiah*, ET, Vol. XXXVIII, No.11, 1927, PP. 521 - 524.
- GINSBERG, H.L. *The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant*, VT, Vol. 3, 1953, PP. 400 - 404.
- GORDON, C.H. *Ugaritic Literature, A Comprehensive Translation of the Poetic and Prose Texts*. Roma : Pontificum Biblicum, 1949.
- HASTINGS, J. (Ed.) *Dictionary of the Bible in one Volume*. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1909. Thirteenth Impression 1954.
- HENSHAW, T. *The latter Prophets*. London : George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1958.
- HOOKE, S.H. (Ed.) *Myth and Ritual*. London : Oxford University Press, 1933.
- _____. (Ed.) *Myth Ritual and Kingship*. London : Oxford University press, 1958.
- THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE. Volume V. *The Book of Isaiah*. New York ; Abingdon Press, 1956.

- JAMES, F. Personalities of the Old Testament. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- JOHNSON, A.R. The Vitality of the Individual in the thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff : University of Wales Press, 1949.
- _____. Divine Kingship and the Old Testament, ET, Vol. LXII, No. 2, 1950, PP.36 - 42.
- KAUTZSCH, E. (Ed.) Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Eng. Tr., by A.E. Cowley. London : Oxford University Press, Second Edition 1910, '46, '49.
- KENNET, R.H. The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology. London : The British Academy, 1910.
- KISSANE, E.J. The Book of Isaiah, Vol.II. XL - LXVI. Dublin : Browne and Nolan Limited, The Richview Press, 1943.
- KOEHLER, L. and BAUMGARTNER, W. (Ed.) Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1953.
- KÖNIG, E. Das Buch Jesaja eingeleitet, übersetzt und erklärt. Gütersloh : C. Bertelsmann, 1926.
- KUHL, C. The Prophets of Israel. Eng. Tr., by R.J. Ehrlich and J.P. Smith. Edinburgh and London : Oliver and Boyd, 1960.
- LINDBLOM, J. The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah : A New Attempt to Solve an Old Problem. Lund : C.W.K. Gleerup, 1951.
- LOFTHOUSE, W.J. Some Reflections on the "Servant Songs". JTS, Vol. 48, 1947, PP. 169 - 176.
- LODS, A. The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism. Eng. Tr., by S.H. Hooke. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1937. Second Impression 1950.
- MARTI, D.K. Das Buch Jesaja Erklärt, Kurzur Hand - Commentar zum Alten Testament, Abt. X. Tübingen : J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900.
- MARTIN - ACHARD, R. From Death to Life. Eng. Tr., by J.P. Smith. Edinburgh and London : Oliver and Boyd, 1960.

- MOWINCKEL, S. He That Cometh. Eng. Tr., by G.W. Anderson.
Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1956, '59.
- NORTH, C.R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. London :
Oxford University Press, 1948. Second Edition 1956.
- _____. Isaiah 40 - 55, Torch Bible Commentaries. London :
S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1952. Reprinted 1958.
- OESTERLY, W.O.E. Studies in Isaiah XL - LXVI. London :
Robert Scott, 1916.
- _____ and ROBINSON, T.H. Hebrew Religion : Its Origin and
Development. London : S.P.C.K., 1930, 1949.
- _____. Introduction to the Old Testament.
London : S.P.C.K., 1934, 1953.
- PALACHE, J.L. The 'Ebed - Jahweh Enigma in Pseudo - Isaiah :
A New Point of View. Amsterdam : Menno Hertzberger, 1934.
- PATERSON, J. The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets. New
York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.
- PEAKE, A.S. The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament.
London : The Epworth Press, 1904, 1947.
- _____. The Servant of Yahweh and other Lectures. Manchester:
Manchester University Press, 1931.
- PEDERSEN, J. Israel : Its Life and Culture, 4 vols. London :
Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press. Copenhagen :
Povl Branner, 1940. Reprinted 1947.
- PFEIFFER, R.H. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York :
Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941.
- PRITCHARD, J.B. (Ed.) Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating
to the Old Testament. Princeton University Press 1950.
- RICHARDSON, A. (Ed.) A Theological Wordbook of the Bible.
London : S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1950. Reprinted 1954.
- RINGGREN, H. The Messiah in the Old Testament. SBT No. 18.
London : S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1956.
- RINGNELL, L.G. Isaiah lii.13 - liii.12, VT, Vol. 3, 1953,
PP 87 - 92.

- ROBINSON, H.W. The Old Testament : Its Making and Meaning.
London : University of London Press Ltd., Hodder and
Stoughton Ltd., 1937, '53.
- _____. The Cross in the Old Testament. London : S.C.M.
Press Ltd., 1955.
- _____. (Ed.) Record and Revelation. London : Oxford
University Press, 1938.
- ROWLEY, H.H. The Missionary Message of the Old Testament.
London : The Carey Press, 1944.
- _____. The Rediscovery of the Old Testament. London :
James Clark and Co., 1945.
- _____. The Servant of the Lord. London : Lutterworth
Press, 1952.
- _____. The Faith of Israel. London : S.C.M. Press Ltd.,
1956.
- _____. (Ed.) Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented
to T.H. Robinson. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1950.
- RYDER SMITH, C. The Bible Doctrine of Salvation. London :
The Epworth Press, 1941, '46.
- SIMON, U.E. A Theology of Salvation. London : S.P.C.K.,
1953.
- SKEMP, A.E. "Immanuel" and "The Suffering Servant of Jahweh" :
A Suggestion, ET, Vol. XLIV, No. 2, 1932, PP. 94f.
- SKINNER, J. Isaiah XL - LXVI, Cambridge Bible. Cambridge :
Cambridge University Press, 1922.
- _____. Prophecy and Religion. Cambridge : Cambridge
University Press, 1922.
- SMITH, G.A. The Book of Isaiah XL - LXVI, The Expositor's
Bible. London : Hodder & Stoughton, 1901.
- STAUFFER, E. Jesus and His Story. Eng. Tr., by D.M. Barton.
London : S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1960.
- SUKENIK, E.L. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Jerusalem : The Magnes
Press, 1955.

YOUNG, E.J. Isaiah Fifty - Three. Grand Rapids, Michigan :

W.M.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952, '57.

_____. Studies in Isaiah. London : The Tyndale Press,
1954.

YOUNG, R. Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible. London :

Lutterworth Press, 1879. Eighth Edition, Revised 1939.

Reprinted 1943, '46, '49, '52, '56, '57, '58.

ZIMMERLI, W. and JEREMIAS, J. The Servant of God. SBT No.

20. London : S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1957.