

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_ibs-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php)

Recent Trends in the Study of Isaiah 53

D.F. Payne

Isaiah 53 continues to exercise its age-old appeal for Christian readers, and its fascinations for OT scholars. If the latter assertion requires demonstration, let the new series of publications, the Supplement series of the Journal for the Study of OT, bear witness. The series began in 1976 with a monograph on Isa.53; and, already, in a list which does not yet number ten, a second has been dedicated to the same chapter.

The recent commentaries - and Isaiah has been blessed with more commentaries in English since World War 2 than any other OT book - make it clear that the difficulties felt and faced by earlier generations of scholars have not been solved. The same wide variety of opinions continues, with few new options. It is by no means easy to spot trends. There is some evidence, however, that one or two specific issues are forcing themselves upon the minds of certain scholars; it will be interesting to observe whether others will follow the same paths, or whether these issues will recede into the background once again.

An initial issue is whether Isaiah 53 is to be taken on its own as a unit complete in itself, or whether Isaiah 52.13ff belongs to the same poem. Since the time of Duhm /1 it has been standard practice to take the whole of Isa 52:13-53:12 as a unit, entitled "The Fourth Servant Song", but it is of interest to observe two notable, recent, dissentient voices, H.M. Orlinsky /2 and R.N. Whybray /3. There is no doubt that the impetus for divorcing ch.53 from the preceding verses has been exegetical; neither Orlinsky nor Whybray considers the depiction of the Servant of the Lord in 52.13 to be consonant with that in ch.53. Methodologically, however, the question ought to be decided on form-critical rather than exegetical grounds, all the more so in a case where the exegesis is so controverted and controversial. Whybray has accordingly sought recently to strengthen his case by a detailed form-critical study. /4/ Meanwhile R.F. Melugin, in a monograph wholly devoted to the literary structure in 2nd Isaiah /5, maintains the more generally held viewpoint; unfortunately neither work was written in cognizance of the

other, and it remains to be seen which view will prove the more persuasive.

Both Whybray and Melugin take the analysis by Begrich /6 as their starting point. Begrich viewed Isaiah 52.13-53.12 as a unit, composed of three parts, an imitation of a thanksgiving Psalm (53.1-10), enclosed by two speeches of Yahweh. There is indeed general agreement that 53.1-10 relates very closely to thanksgiving psalms (which frequently incorporate lament material): but there is a debate as to the exact nature of this relationship. Melugin in effect says that the passage is less than an imitation, thanksgiving Psalms "providing scarcely more than the background" /7, but Whybray makes it more than an imitation; for him the passage is precisely a thanksgiving psalm, "composed for use in a particularly notable act of worship." /8 Whybray's analysis sets the divine oracle of 53.11f in the thanksgiving for which Psalm 91 provides a parallel; by so doing he can isolate 52.13ff altogether, and treat ch.53 as a unit complete in itself.

Whybray's case is by no means watertight. In his classification of Isa 53 as a thanksgiving psalm, he has to make a case for the appropriateness of a speech by Yahweh /9 as part of the structure. Now, on his own recognition, "the divine oracle is not normally an element of the individual thanksgiving" /10; and he is hard put to it to find a psalm which exactly corresponds with the form and structure of Isa 53. If Psalm 91.14ff, for example, offers a comparable divine oracle, the earlier part of the Psalm is quite distinctive, bearing affinities with wisdom poems, and being wholly addressed to the sufferer /11. Moreover, the divine oracles incorporated in the Psalter, seem to presuppose the existence of the Temple and of temple prophets. Who, on Whybray's hypothesis, would have enunciated such an oracle in the circumstances of exile - if not Deutero-Isaiah himself?

On the other hand, Melugin's handling of Isaiah 52.13-53.12 is too brief and cursory to be thoroughly convincing. It is true that the analysis of this passage (drawn from Begrich) into "a song of a group", enclosed within two Yahweh speeches makes for a neat structure, but in order to prove that the two Yahweh speeches belong to the same literary unit, it would be helpful, if not essential, to

that in some way they respond to, or complement, each other. /12 Melugin's claim that "The structure of the poem is basically the prophet's own creation" /13, nevertheless seems to do more justice to the unique quality of the passage than does Whybray's approach to it. It is precisely the uniqueness of Isa 53 which has defied, and evidently continues to defy, a generally agreed form-critical analysis.

Another preliminary difficulty is that of establishing what may be called the literary context of Isaiah 53. Much twentieth century scholarship has followed Duhm in isolating the four Servant Songs from their context, and then placing them together. If so, the Servant of ch.53 is no different from the Servant of the three earlier poems. Some other scholars have argued that, on the contrary, each of these passages belongs in the immediate context in which it is set, and must be interpreted in the light of that context. /14 While these two approaches conflict with each other, both require that the interpreter of Ch.53 take other passages of the prophecy into consideration. But even that much cannot be universally agreed; it is interesting to observe that two of the most recent treatments of the chapter, both dispense with any contextual considerations. Whybray had already laid the foundations for doing so in his commentary where he argued that Isa 40-55 is a compilation of disparate units; /15 and his monograph takes it for granted that Isa 53 stands alone. D.J.A. Clines approaches the chapter (or rather 52:13-53.12) from a very different standpoint, being concerned with the literary qualities and content and meaning of the poem; but he too concentrates his attention on the passage to the exclusion of all else, emphasizing its "autonomy." /16

It may be granted that Isa 40-55 does not offer us "a perfectly integrated, architectonic whole", but as North has shown, "the small-units theory" (on the one hand) and "an elaborately constructed, perfectly integrated edition" (of a written work) represent two extreme positions, and the truth must lie somewhere between. /17 If so, we cannot altogether disregard other passages in the same prophecy, and we should not. P.E. Bonnard's tabulation of the many links between the various passages in 2nd Isa pertaining to a "servant" is itself eloquent proof of the importance of studying each of them in the light of the rest.

No serious study of an OT passage can proceed without careful attention being paid to the text and language. The fourth Servant Song presents some notorious problems especially with regard to the text. The evidence of the two Isaiah scrolls from Qumran Cave 1 now supplements the other textual data but it cannot be said to have resolved all the difficulties. A perusal and comparison of the translations offered by recent English versions of the OT /19 and by some recent commentaries /20 will show the extent of the uncertainty that exists. Apart from the commentaries, four recent detailed linguistic and textual studies deserve special mention; by Driver, Thomas, Clines and Whybray. /21

Many of the details provided by the recent evidence or proffered by the recent scholarly treatments are of minor significance for the understanding of Isaiah 53 as a whole. A variant reading in 1Q Isa.A in 52.14 may provide an illustration. Here the NT reads mišhat, a word which, while not altogether without its problems, is patently derived from the root š-h-t (destroy, and hence "disfigure" and the like). The Scroll (which is unvocalized) has a fifth consonant, a final yod which suggests that the word derives from the root m-s-h ("anoint"). Hence the possible rendering of the Jerusalem Bible margin, "By my anointing I took his human appearance from him." If such a sense was original, then we have a clause which could be taken as identifying the Servant as the Messiah. However, it is not at all certain that a mere additional yod should bear such weight. Driver drew attention to the fact that, in several places, the Scroll writes words with an extra final yod where no change of sense is possible, and concluded that the word mšhty in the Scroll has nothing to do with anointing. /22 This is very probably the case; but even if the sense "I have anointed" could be fully substantiated, it would seem likely that this reading, far from being original was simply a quirk of Qumramic interpretation. We are therefore still dependent on the MT and Versions for our understanding of this verse

Another fascinating new reading /23, found in both of the Cave 1 scrolls, is an additional word in 53.11, "light", (Heb. 'wr) as the object of the verb yir'eh, normally rendered "He shall see": cf NAB rendering, "Because of his affliction he shall see the light in fulness of days." The attestation for this addition is quite strong, and the majority of scholars have accepted it as original. Among modern versions, the RSV stands virtually alone in discarding the noun "light"; and among recent writers, Winton Thomas, Bonnard and Clines are rare exceptions in rejecting it. /24

The issue is complicated by the fact that the verb yir'eh does not necessarily mean "he shall see". The alternative is to derive it from the root r-w-h, literally "to drink one's fill; be saturated." Thus understood, it becomes a stronger synonym for the next verb in the verse, yisba<sup>c</sup> ("He shall be satisfied"), and D.W. Thomas treated the pair as hendiadys, "When he shall have drunk deep (of his anguish)...." Driver utilized the same derivation, but preferred to adopt the object "light", translating the clause, "After his pains, he shall be flooded with light." /25 The option seems a poor one logically; the object "light" virtually limits the sense of the verb to "see", by far its commonest meaning, and a wholly natural one with such an object. We should not allow our familiarity with floodlighting to persuade us that Driver's rendering would have been a common metaphor in ancient Israel!

Basically, there are three possibilities of meaning: on Thomas' view the verb simply reinforces the following verb. "He shall see" has the object "light"; and on the minority view the object of the Servant's sight will be unstated but implied "fruit" (RSV) of the "travail of his soul." The explication of "fruit" or "light", as the case may be, must then be a matter of exegesis. It cannot be said recent discussions on Qumran texts have clarified the sense of Isa 53.11. Other problems in the passage remain as unsolved as ever eg the many possible ways of translating the opening clause of 53.8. The difficulty lies in the fact that word after word is ambiguous or, rather, offers a range of possible meanings; so that purely linguistic arguments, however/

plausible, cannot rule out other possibilities. The present writer has expressed the view that the very ambiguities should lead one to suspect a fixed idiom, probably "after arrest and sentence". /26. This rendering seems to be gaining ground in any case; both Clines and Whybray adopt it. The most favoured alternative, "from prison and lawcourt", in fact envisages a very similar situation. Even so the problem is not resolved to universal satisfaction.

Even more intractable a problem is the text of the last few words of the same verse, 53.8. The final word is in MT  $\text{l\ddot{a}m\ddot{o}}$  "to him"; but the LXX eis thanaton "to death", seems to render an original lemawet; in an unvocalized text the difference would consist in the presence or absence of a final tau. A number of scholars follow the LXX /27, but since the Qumran evidence supports the MT, the question remains wide open.

The textual issue as to the last word of v8, ie whether death is mentioned or not, epitomizes one of the major exegetical questions about the whole chapter. It is indeed an exegetical question where a certain trend in scholarship seems to be apparent. It was Orlinsky who complained that far too much Christian scholarship has been guilty of eisegesis where Isaiah 53 is concerned. It is easy to see that the question of the Servant with Jesus will have led Christians to assume, without serious investigation, that the chapter reported the death of the Servant. Driver, however, was one scholar at least who was not guilty of the charge. As a result of his linguistic study of the passage, he concluded that "No phrase is used which unambiguously implies his death," and indeed denies that Isa 53 reports the Servant's death. Since then Whybray and also J.A. Soggin /29 have argued similarly; and Clines, though neutral on the point, finds himself compelled to list this item as one of the "enigmas" of the Song. /30

This, then seems one of the trends in the study of Isa 53. It remains to be seen whether the arguments are assailable. It can only be admitted that some at least of the phrases used are ambiguous. For/

instance, the statement of Isaiah 53.12 that the Servant "poured out his life unto death" (NIV) could equally well be translated "he has exposed his life even to death" (with Driver). It is worth observing, however, that the various arguments are of various types. It is a textual question whether the word "death" originally stood at the end of v8; it is a semantic question whether, if it did, the word was not intended literally but expressed a superlative; /31 it is an exegetical question whether "they made his grave with the wicked" (v9,RSV) implies that he was actually laid in it. Different again is the question what precisely "the land of the living" (v8) signified: this is a question of idiom, or perhaps register would be a better word. In a previous article, the present writer asserted that this phrase could only refer to death; /32 but this view has been strongly contested, both by Soggin and Whybray, and the question now requires more detailed study. /33 There is no doubt whatever, at least, that the passage in Ezekial 32.22-32 contrasts "the land of the living" with Sheol - the attempt in such a context to make the phrase mean "human society" (ie excluding individuals in solitary confinement) rather than simply "this world" as opposed to the netherworld, is farfetched. Elsewhere it may well be that the reference is to normal human life and society but this usage probably originated as a metaphor. The question with regard to Isa 53.8, therefore, is whether the phrase is to be understood literally or metaphorically. /34 It seems to have been overlooked in some of these discussions that the linguistic picture in Isa 53 is undeniably one of death, with words such as "death", "living", "grave" actually used. The real question surely is not a linguistic one but whether the total picture is literal or hyperbolic. If the latter, then to ask whether the Servant was actually laid in the grave assigned to him, is a wooden and unimaginative approach to the interpretation of a piece of poetry.

Whybray is convinced that such language in Isa 53 is metaphorical, and he draws attention to the occurrence of similar ideas and phraseology in the Psalter, where, as is well-known, the deep distresses of the psalmists may be presented as the encroachment of death. This view is undeniably plausible; and on the analogy of the/



Psalter, the corollary would be that, because of the figurative language, we have no way of knowing the precise circumstances of the sufferer. But this is not Whybray's conclusion; on the contrary, he states that "A number of phrases in the poem strongly suggest that he was arrested, convicted and imprisoned." /35

However, if one reads verses 8f as a unit, one finds a very natural sequence of arrest, sentence, execution and burial. On what basis, it may be asked, does one decide where the literal ends and the metaphorical begins? An eleventh-hour rescue from a waiting grave may have been a literary stereotype in the ancient world, but it must be said that in the parallels which have been cited that fact that the sufferer did after all escape death is anything but explicit in Isa 53. The depiction of honour at the end of the chapter appears to be subsequent to, and indeed because of, the sufferings, not in itself a description of rescue from them. /37

For these reasons among others, then, it seems likely that not all scholars will accept the view that the Servant escaped death; nevertheless the hypothesis that he did so, is certainly here to stay, and is now supported by stronger voices, and with stronger arguments, than was the case till recently.

Another important trend also began with Orłinsky to be later fostered by Whybray; both deny that the sufferings of the Servant are in any way vicarious. Orłinsky insists that the generally held view is a prime case of Christian eisegesis, reading into the passage something that is simply not there. Whybray's judgment is more moderate, preferring to see the vicarious interpretation as a mistaken exegesis. He devotes the whole of Part 1 of his monograph to a detailed investigation of the words and phrases of Isa 53 which have hitherto been taken to describe the suffering as vicarious; and concludes that not one of them need be taken to mean any such thing.

Payne, Isaiah 53, IBS 1, January 1979

Again, only time will show how far Whybray's conclusions will commend themselves. It is not possible here to attempt a detailed examination of his arguments, and two observations must suffice. Firstly, it is remarkable how many terms and phrases in the passage have in the past been thought to describe vicarious suffering rightly or wrongly; and secondly, it only requires the traditional interpretation to be substantiated for a single one of these cases for that interpretation to govern the whole passage. Ultimately in fact all Whybray has done is to show that these various expressions could be otherwise interpreted; whether they should be is another question. There can be no doubt that his interpretation is based more on his linguistic and semantic findings.

Finally, then, we turn to the question of the identity of the Servant, for many of us the most important issue of all. So many theories have been advanced in earlier years that one would hardly expect brand-new hypotheses to have been thrown up in recent scholarship; however, one new identification has been proposed, namely that the Servant is the personification of the city, Zion-Jerusalem. /39 The chief difficulty about this suggestion, as Wilshire recognizes, is that elsewhere in Isa 40-55 the city is personified as a woman, not a man. Wilshire has found a striking parallel of phraseology in a Sumerian lament over the fall of Ur: "O my city, like an innocent ewe, the lamb has been torn away from thee." /40 It is also a virtue of his hypothesis that his identification makes it easier to integrate the teaching of the Servants Songs with the rest of the prophecy than is the case with other theories. All in all, however, it seems unlikely that any new identification will gain wide acceptance today; the very fact that it is new demonstrates that it must be far from obvious!

If there is a new tendency to be observed, it could well be the view that the difficulty scholarship finds in identifying the Servant arises from the author's intention to conceal rather than to reveal. Westermann, commenting on 42.1-4, draws attention to a number of problems in the Servant Songs and states: "Exegesis must never ignore the limits thus put upon it. The cryptic, veiled language used is deliberate. This is true of every one of the servant

songs alike....The veiled manner of speaking is deliberate." /41 Most scholars had been content to assume that the original recipients of the prophecy would not have been puzzled with the problems we find, but Westermann avers that "much in them (the Servant Songs) was meant to remain hidden even from their original hearers." This rather startling declaration which Westermann did not really attempt to justify has now been taken up and amplified by Clines who emphasizes the number and weight of enigmas and ambiguities to be found in 52.13-53.12. /42 His reasoning is that so many and insoluble are the enigmas in the poem that it must be "of its essence that unequivocal identifications are not made." /43

In other respects, too, Clines' approach to Isaiah 53 is very interesting, as he brings to bear on it the canons of rhetorical criticism. He has, in the present writer's view, focussed attention effectively and unerringly on the message and function of the passage - in our concern to identify the Servant (for instance) we have all too often overlooked the obvious fact that, whatever the purpose of the Songs, it was plainly not to identify him. /44

Clines goes further, arguing that the open-endedness of the poem "allows for multiple interpretations" /45; and not only so, but that we should look for them, recognizing only that some are "more or less appropriate interpretations" than others; "The poem can become true in a variety of circumstances - that is its work." /46

In general, numerous scholars have recently been arguing rather similarly that many (perhaps all) OT passages require to be set in more than one frame of reference for their full understanding. In the prophetic literature there are always, at least, the original audience of the individual passage and the original audience of the collected book to consider, for instance. But Clines is going rather further than this, it seems to me /47, in the direction of giving the poem an autonomy from its author (even though he refuses to give it total autonomy). It is, at least, well

to remember that there must have been an original author and an original audience; and, as Clines himself admits, it remains a possibility that "once there was a key to the enigmas of the poem." Moreover the enigmas may well be fewer in number if one takes chs 40-55 as a legitimate context and a frame of reference. In the last resort, after all, nobody knows for sure that 52.13-53.12 ever had a separate existence from the prophecy surrounding it. One could well argue that the only correct starting-point for the study of a biblical passage is the context in which it has been transmitted to us

It is clear, at any rate, that some other scholars have been less satisfied than Clines with Westermann's approach, and have continued the perennial quest for a secure identification of the Servant. There is an observable trend here too in that the identification of the Servant as Second Isaiah himself is commanding considerably more support than it once did /48, though unanimity is as far away as ever. Whybray makes a powerful case in his monograph. The case is in some respects negative however; he is chiefly concerned to deny three commonly-held viewpoints: (1) that 52.13ff belongs to 53; (2) that the Servant died; (3) that his sufferings were vicarious. Even if he has succeeded in establishing these rebuttals, it does not necessarily follow that the Servant can only be the prophet himself; and if he has failed to rebut even one of these viewpoints, his own identification is considerably weakened. For instance, Whybray himself recognizes that the portrait in 52.13ff cannot readily be taken to describe Second Isaiah; but, as we have seen, the arguments for detaching these vss from ch.53 are weak.

Against the (auto) biographical interpretation, /49 the chief argument would seem to be that it seems difficult to explain various statements in the Servant Songs as descriptive of simply a prophet. Isa 53.12, for example, uses the metaphor of the conquering hero; is this really a natural description of a prophet just released from prison as Whybray would have us believe? Isaiah 42.1-4 is similarly prima facie a description of a lawgiver, not a prophet. The difficulty re ident-

ification has always been the fact that the picture is larger than life, and cannot easily be made to fit any known historical figure.

The virtue of either a collective (eg Israel) or a future interpretation is that, by this means, it is possible to embrace more easily the wide range of picture and of statements used by the prophet. The term "messianic" may not be the best choice of word if it is taken in its narrowest sense. It is by no means impossible that, in the prophet's mind, the Servant was an embodiment of the future leadership of Israel - the portrait owing something to kings, and something to prophets, in some ways reminiscent of Moses, and always closely linked with the nation itself. Some such interpretation still seems to the present writer much more satisfactory than the biographical hypothesis. Many of North's perceptive criticisms of other interpretations still remain valid.

/50 The list of names of scholars still supporting collective, or broadly messianic, views is still formidable /51 whatever the recent trends.

We are left, then, with a Servant whom it is difficult as ever to identify, and whose precise experiences in suffering remain enigmatic to us. The value of these sufferings has also been questioned, as we have seen; but it is beyond question that those sufferings were "the will of the Lord." It is God who purposed them and who, in due course, led those who had misunderstood and despised the sufferer, to change their minds drastically, and both to recognize the sufferer as God's Servant, and also to comprehend the value of what he did. "Most impressive in this poem", writes Clines, "is the function of the four personae" /52 The poem's whole message revolves around the pronouns, "I, he, we and they" (the title of Clines' monograph). If we cannot with ease and certainty identify the "he" (nor the "they"), we know at least that the "I" is God himself; and we can, if we choose, identify ourselves with the "we". If we let the poem still in our day create its own world of discourse, then, as Clines says, "perhaps only the language of testimony or confession ....can properly express what the servant is....for me."

/53

Notes

1. B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia Ubersetzt und erklärt (Göttingen 1892)
2. H.M. Orlinsky, The So-called "Servant of the Lord" (VT Supp 14: Leiden 1967)
3. R.N. Whybray, Isaiah 40-66 (New Century Bible, London 1975) and Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet (JSOT Supp. 4: Sheffield 1978)
4. Whybray, Thanksgiving, Part 3
5. R.F. Melugin, The Formation of Isaiah 40-55 (BZAW 141, Berlin and NYork 1976) pp73f.,167ff
6. J. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterjesaja (BWANT 77, 1938, reprinted as TB 20 Munich 1963)
7. Melugin, op.cit. p74
8. Whybray, op.cit. p136
9. There is no disagreement as to the extent of the words of Yahweh but this difficulty need not affect the general question. For Whybray, vss 11b-12 constitute the divine oracle.
10. op.cit. p123
11. Cf A.A. Anderson, The Book of Psalms (New Century Bible London 1972), Vol 2, p655
12. See, however, P. E. Dion, Biblica 51 (1970), pp17-38 whose arguments for the unity of Isaiah 52.13-53.12 are somewhat more detailed but rely more on content than on structural considerations.
13. op.cit. p74
14. Notably S. Smith, Isaiah Chs XL-LV (Schweich Le dures 1940 London 1944) and E.J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah, (Dublin 1943).
15. Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, espec. p27
16. D.J.A. Clines, I, He, we and they: a literary approach to Isaiah 53 (JSOT Supp 1: Sheffield 1976) p60. Clines is here referring primarily to the autonomy of the poem over against its author.

17. C.R. North, The Second Isaiah (Oxford 1964, p12)
18. P.E. Bonnard, Le Second Isaie (Etudes Bibliques, Paris 1972) pp39f
19. Espec. JB, NEB, NIV, RSV and TEV
20. Espec. C.R. North, op.cit; c. Westermann, Isaiah 40-66 (OTL.ET London 1969); and J.L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah (AB, Garden City 1968)
21. G.R. Driver, in M.Black and G. Fohrer (eds), In Memoriam Paul Kahle (Berlin 1968) pp90-105; D.W. Thomas, Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 44 (1968) pp79-86; Clines, op.cit. and Whybray, Thanksgiving
22. Driver, art.cit. p92
23. New in Hebrew mss that is to say; the word "light" does however appear in the LXX rendering of the verse.
24. The present writer has also expressed his doubts, in EQ (1971) p140
25. Cf the NEB rendering, "After all his pains, he shall be bathed in light."
26. D.F. Payne, art.cit. p135
27. Eg NEB, TEV, Thomas, commentaries of McKenzie, Westermann; and G.von Rad, The Message of the Prophets (ET London 1968), p122
28. Art.cit. p104
29. J.A. Soggin, in ZAW 87 (1975) pp346-355
30. op.cit. p29
31. Cf Thomas, art.cit. pp79f; his rendering is accordingly "fearfully smitten."
32. Art.cit. p138
33. Some of the arguments seem to me to be rather specious especially the distinction Soggins draws between the Hebrew verbs g-z-r and k-r-t. It is significant that Whybray/

obviously hesitates to press it (cf Thanksgiving p102)

34. I find the English summary in Soggin's article very revealing (art.cit.p354); "It is demonstrated that the expression nigzar min relates to the hopeless situation in the individual laments when it is said that a man has fallen into the hands of death" (*italics mine*). In other words the language is that of death but the implication (because of the register or literary context) is something other, in Soggin's opinion.
35. Thanksgiving p135. Whybray argues on the basis of some psalms which can be taken to relate to the situation of a lawsuit.
36. The rescue is either explicitly stated, or else the report is made in the first person, with the obvious implication that the speaker had survived to tell the tale.
37. It is the gradual picture which the ch. constructs rather than any semantic considerations, which suggests that the disputed clause in v12 means something stronger than merely "risked his life"; the TEV rendering "gave his life" can thus be justified.
38. Orłinsky, op.cit pp51ff. His chapter title expresses his view succinctly: "Vicarious suffering in Isaiah 53 - a theological and scholarly fiction."
39. Cf L.E. Wilshire, JBL 94 (1975), pp356-7
40. Wilshire, op.cit. 359; the translation is that of C.J. Gadd
41. Westermann, op.cit. 93
42. Clines, op.cit. Ch 2
43. op.cit. p33
44. The Servant is identified admittedly in 49.13 as "Israel". However, Westermann and many other scholars deny the originality of the word; even if it is original it may be a description or attribute rather than an identification.
45. Clines, *ibid*



46. op.cit. p61
47. Indeed he seems to disparage the very notion of an original audience (ibid)
48. See the list of names in O. Kaiser, Introduction to the OT (ET Oxford 1975) p266; to these Whybray must now be added.
49. The identification of the Servant as Second Isaiah allows two possibilities of authorship, the autobiographical hypothesis, and the view that a disciple was writing about his master.
50. Cf C.R.<sup>2</sup> North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (London 1956) ch.10
51. See the names listed in O. Kaiser, op.cit. pp266f
52. op.cit. p37
53. op.cit. p64