An Investigation into the Peshitta of Isaiah

Citation

Permanent link

Terms of Use

Share Your Story

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

DISSERTATION ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, appointed by the

Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations

have examined a dissertation entitled

 An Investigation into the Peshitta of Isaiah

presented by **Zhan Chen**

candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and hereby
certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

Signature David Andrew Teeter (Aug 29, 2020 11:27 EDT)

Typed name: Dr. D. Andrew Teeter (Advisor)

Signature Shaye Cohen (Aug 30, 2020 17:08 EDT)

Typed name: Dr. Shaye J.D. Cohen

Signature Richard Saley (Sep 1, 2020 12:55 EDT)

Typed name: Dr. Richard Saley

Date: *August 27, 2020*

An Investigation into the Peshitta of Isaiah

An Investigation into the Peshitta of Isaiah

Abstract

Through a careful study of P-Isaiah, specifically focusing on several important aspects of the translational text: the status of its *Vorlage*, its dependence on other ancient versions and books, notably the LXX and the NT Peshitta, and other descriptive questions, such as how the translators dealt with difficult roots encountered in the Hebrew text, this dissertation argues that the translation of the Peshitta of Isaiah is most probably the product of at least two different Jewish-Christian translators, each of whom has their own distinctive style and techniques of translation.

The results of this study into the P-Isaiah can bring to light the history of the translation of one of the most important books in the Nevi'im. Through this understanding, the importance of the Peshitta for textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible can also be re-evaluated. Meanwhile, this study will provide us with a new perspective not only on the Christian-Jewish polemic behind the text, but also on the positive Christian-Jewish relationship in the eastern Syriac world.

1   CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Topic of Research

This dissertation will study the Syriac Peshitta of Isaiah. Syriac was the native language used in Edessa and its surroundings, as witnessed by archaeological epigraphic evidence since 6 CE.[1] It is well accepted that, as the users of the language became Christianized, the language, with some minor modifications, became associated with the growing expansion of Christianity.[2] The Syriac "Peshitta," which means "the simple," or "the widespread," was the translation mostly used by Syriac-speaking Christianity, both Jacobite and Nestorian denominations.[3] Though the Peshitta is not the only Syriac version, its status as the most widely used and most

---

[1] Han J. W. Drijvers and J. F. Healey, *The Old Syriac Inscriptions of Edessa and Osrhoene. Texts, Translations and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 140.

[2] E.g., Theodor Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesselschaft, 1966); Aaron Michael Butts, "The Classical Syriac Language," in *The Syriac World*, ed. Daniel King (New York: Routledge, 2019), 222–42.

[3] There are also later Syriac translations and revisions of the Old Testament, especially the Syro-Hexaplaric version and a later translation made by Jacob of Edessa; it is likely that the Philoxenian translation also contained the Old Testament, although no manuscript survived: Peter J. Williams, "The Syriac Version of the Bible," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. Volume 1, From the Beginnings to 600*, ed. Joachim Schaper and James Carleton Paget (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 527–35.

authoritative Syriac version has not been challenged by any other translations, either

earlier or later.[4]

This dissertation will elucidate several aspects of the translation: the status of the

Vorlage of the translation, its dependence on other ancient versions and books,

notably LXX and the NT Peshitta, and descriptive questions, such as how the

translators dealt with the difficult roots encountered in the Hebrew text. The

parameters of this analysis are not exhaustive, for the investigation of all possible

aspects is neither possible nor necessary. However, the selection is not random;

rather, the focus is on a more general approach, the so called "introductory

questions": Who (is) are the translator(s)? Is he one, or are they a group? If a group,

how did they cooperate? What did the translators believe, and did he or they project

the belief into the translation? These questions will guide the whole research, and the

contribution to answering these questions will benefit not only the scholarship of the

P-Isaiah but also that of the *Entstehungsgeschichte* of the entire Peshitta beyond the

book of Isaiah, of which a brief review will be presented in the following section.

---

[4] Milito of Sardis, who lived in the 2nd century, already mentioned a Syriac version
of the Old Testament. Scholars have used this witness to support the theory of an Ur-
Peshitta. According to this theory, the Peshitta text as we have it is the result of a
revision of certain Ur-Peshitta witnessed by Melito of Sardis. This theory, however,
has met fierce challenge: Max Seligsohn, "Peshitta or Peshitto," *The Jewish
Encyclopedia; a Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs
of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* 9:653–55.

1.2   A Review of Previous Scholarship

Despite its importance and extensive usage, the introductory questions concerning the

Entstehungsgeschichte or *Literargeschichte* of the Peshitta remain obscure to a large

extent.[5] In the first half of the last century, a prevailing theory held that there was an

Aramaic Ur-Targum. Based on this theory, in the 1950s and 1960s, Vööbus further

argued in his monograph for an Ur-Peshitta, which is a free and targumic Syriac

translation, as the primary source text of the Peshitta, partly because of old Syriac

patristic citations that differed from those of the Peshitta.[6] This modified theory was

taken over by Running, who dedicated her dissertation to confirming an Ur-Peshitta

theory with the help of P-Isaiah. However, all these theories regarding a primary

source text other than MT involve a difficult theoretical presupposition: They all

presuppose a thorough revision of the Ur-text, which leads to the extant Peshitta. Yet,

this presupposed revision is not well-evidenced.[7] Because the similarity between P-

Isaiah and T-Isaiah is scarce, far more scarce than that between P-Isaiah and LXX-

---

[5] Robert P. Gordon, *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon*, Society for Old Testament Study Monographs (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 250.

[6] A. Vööbus, *Peschitta Und Targumim Des Pentateuchs* (Stockholm: Etse, 1958).

[7] Michael Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications ; No. 56 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 107f.

Isaiah, most modern scholars now tend to explain the agreements between the

Peshitta and the Targum as either founded on a process of direct borrowing or the

linguistic similarity between Syriac and targumic Aramaic ("polygenesis").[8] This

hermeneutic circumspection of modern scholars will be accepted by this dissertation

as the starting point: The agreements with Targum will be evaluated without the

presupposition of an Ur-Targum or an Ur-Peshitta. P-Isaiah will be viewed as a direct

translation from a Hebrew *Vorlage* without intermediating forerunner. However,

some influence from LXX-Isaiah or T-Isaiah is not excluded from this translational

process.[9]

In the following section, three introductory questions will be addressed in sequence:

When was the Peshitta translated? Who were the translators? How was the translation

conducted?

---

[8] Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*, Orbis biblicus et orientalis 35 (Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 289f.; Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 86ff.
[9] A good example of a comparison of *the Song of the Vineyard* in different translations as equal versions is provided by John Francis Elwolde, "Isaiah 5:1-7 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, MT, and Versions: Basic Data and Preliminary Observations," *Scr. Biblica*. 14 (2014): 89–132.

When was Peshitta translated? One of the oldest palimpsest fragments for the Peshitta is 5ph1 in British Library.[10] This fragment, containing part of Isaiah and Ezekiel, dates back to 459 or 460 CE. However, it is worth noting that a 5th-century manuscript can only provide a *terminus ad quem* for the translation of Isaiah since it is still too young to tell anything about the emergence of the Peshitta. The other early manuscripts show a high degree of homogeneity and hardly any tendency of variation. As Burkitt put it in his famous St. Margaret's Lecture in Cambridge, 1904:

> "The range of variation found in the extant MSS is very small, considerably smaller even than the range of variation in the MSS of the Latin Vulgate. The variations themselves are for the most part the most trifling description, matters of orthography, slips of writing, and such like . . . a state of things which cannot be paralleled in any other language but Greek, and our Greek MSS. of that age are full of startling variation from later copies."[11]

---

[10] Marinus Koster, "A New Introduction to the Peshitta of the Old Testament," *Aramaic Stud* 1.2 (2003): 211–46.

[11] F. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity: St. Margaret's Lectures, 1904, on the Syriac-Speaking Church* (New York: Dutton, 1904), 42.

Besides, the early dating of a single manuscript does not necessarily show an early form of the text.[12] Under these circumstances, we cannot rely on the tendency of variation in the transmitted texts to generate the date of translation. Aside from manuscripts, patristic citations are possible earlier witnesses: Aphrahat and Ephraim Syrus cites many books of the Peshitta in the fourth century. However, the value of their quotations for understanding the literary history of the Peshitta remains open to question, especially in the case of Isaiah.[13]

From another external-historical perspective, the Hebrew origin of the translation, if it correctly points to its Jewish roots, could suggest a time when the Jewish people faced a relatively massive change of life setting, which led to a new translation. Burkitt sees such an initiative in the diaspora incurred by the Bar-Kochba revolution.

---

[12] Weitzman, for instance, argues that the 9th century manuscript MS 9a1 provides many original readings which are not witnessed in earlier extent manuscripts. See: Michael Weitzman, "The Originality of Unique Readings in Peshitta MS 9a1," in *The Peshitta—Its Early Text and History*, ed. Peter B. Dirksen and Martin J. Mulder (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 225–58.

[13] The most important systematic research into this issue by Running has collated the patristic citations, especially those from the commentary on Isaiah ascribed to Ephrem the Syrian. See: L. Running, *An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah* (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1996). Though the dissertation is unpublished, an abridged version is available: L. Running, "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: Part I," *AUSS* 3.2 (1965): 138–57; L. Running, "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: Part II-III," *AUSS* 4 (1966): 37–148. Her thesis, however, was severely criticized by A. van der Kooij, who pointed out that the commentary ascribed to Ephrem was not a 5th century work, but should be dated to 9th century. See also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 255ff.

Therefore, he dates the translation to the second century CE.[14] This quick deduction

is questionable since a completely new translation of the Hebrew Bible, as we see in

the case of many other ancient versions, does not come out in one go right after the

change of the life setting. However, there is equally scarce evidence for disproving

this early dating into the 2nd century. The fact that all excavated Old Syriac

inscriptions have nothing to do with Judaism or Christianity, unfortunately, does not

negate the possibility of the early existence of a translation of the Jewish canon.[15]

The onus of proving otherwise lies on the shoulders of those who think of an

alternative late dating and pure external-historical evidence around the Peshitta itself

seems to be insufficient for this task. Some new factors must be brought into play for

that purpose.

In recent decades, a series of debates has emerged concerning the relationship

between the Syriac *Diatessaron*, "through [the] four [Gospels]," the first known

Gospel Harmony translated into Syriac, and the OT Peshitta, which has shed light on

the dating problem.[16] According to Joosten, since the Diatessaron dated to around

---

[14] Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, 76.

[15] Drijvers and Healey, *Inscription*, 140.

[16] About the general scholarship on the literary history of Diatessaron, see: Th. Zahn, *Tatians Diatessaron*, Forschungen Zur Geschichte Des Neutestamentlichen Kanons 1 (Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1881); J. Rendel Harris, *The Diatessaron of Tatian, a Preliminary Study* (London: CJClay, 1890); Curt Peters, "Nachhall ausserkanonischer Evangelienüberlieferung in Tatians Diatessaron," *Acta Orientalia* 16 (1937): 258–94;

160-170 AD depends on the OT Peshitta, a safe *terminus ad quem* at least for part of

the OT Peshitta can be determined. Famously, Weitzman based his early dating of the

translation to the 2nd century primarily based on this dependence, which itself,

however, is not indisputable.[17] Yet the paradigm of looking into the OT Peshitta

through the Diatessaron, and further through other Syriac translations of the NT,

remains an indispensable way to approach the core of the dating issue. In Chapter

Four, I will argue against the early dating of the entire Peshitta corpus to the second

century by showing the dependence of P-Isaiah on the Syriac translation of the

Pauline letters (NT Peshitta), which were not yet existent in both the Diatessaron and

other Old Syriac versions (Sinaiticus and Curetonian Gospels). In this way, I am not

going to argue that the whole OT Peshitta, or the entire P-Isaiah, postdates the

Peshitta of the New Testament, as it should not be argued that the entire OT Peshitta

---

Curt Peters, *Das Diatessaron Tatians: seine überlieferung und sein nachwirken im Morgen- und Abendland sowie der heutige stand seiner erforschung*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 123. (Roma: PontInstitutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1939); William L. Petersen, "New Evidence for the Question of the Original Language of the Diatessaron," in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven*, ed. Wolfgang Schrage (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986), 325–43. On the present topic: Jan Joosten, "The Old Testament Quotations in the Old Syriac and Peshitta Gospels," *Textus* 15 (1990): 55–76; R. F. Shedinger, "Did Tatian Use the Old Testament Peshitta? A Response to Jan Joosten," *NovT* 41 (1999): 265–79; Jan Joosten, "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Old Testament Peshitta," *JBL* 120.3 (2001): 501–23; Jan Joosten, "The Old Testament in the New: The Syriac Versions of the New Testament as a Witness to the Text of the Old Testament Peshitta," in *Language and Textual History of the Syriac Bible* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2019), 99–106.

[17] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 248ff. See also the review by Tawny L. Holm, "The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction (Book Review)," *JNES* 62.3 (2003): 227–29.

predates the Diatessaron merely based on the dependence of part of the latter upon the earlier. It suffices to show that, with the example of P-Isaiah, a simplified model holding that the whole Peshitta, or the majority of it, was translated within a short time range in the 2nd century, is neither prudent nor efficient to explain the subtle dependence of P-Isaiah on the NT Syriac versions.

Who translated it? It is well known that people were already puzzled by the origin of the Peshitta by the time of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428).[18] Skipping over the pre-modern period, modern scholars are generally divided into three different, though not mutually exclusive, opinions: those who are in favor of a (non-Jewish) Christian origin, those in favor of a (non-Christian) Jewish origin, and those who hold a mixed view in favor of a Jewish-Christian origin. P-Isaiah, specifically, plays an essential role in this debate.[19] Let us briefly unfold the general standpoints of the respective camps.

---

[18] Anthony Gelston, "Was the Peshitta of Isaiah of Christian Origin?," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 564.

[19] Lienhard Delekat, "Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta," *Biblica* 38.2 (1957): 185–99; Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 240ff.

Among the early supporters of a Christian origin are names like Michaelis, Kirsch,

Hirzel, Gesenius, and Nöldeke.[20] They mainly argue from an external perspective by

calling into consideration the social milieu in which the Syriac translation was done.

Nöldeke, for example, argues in his *Die alttestamentliche Literatur* thme

at, since the Syriac language belonged almost exclusively to the Syriac Christians,

and since the Peshitta found no reference in the rabbinic Jewish community, the

Peshitta seems to have only been related to Christians; therefore, it must be of a

native Christian origin. While he acknowledges that there are Jewish elements in the

Peshitta, he claims that they may be explained away by the presence of some Jewish

assistance, which was also the case for the translation of the Vulgate.[21]

The supporters of the Jewish origin tend to argue more from an internal-generative

point of view by asking how the translation could have been linguistically possible if

not through a Jewish hand. Besides the fact that Hebrew knowledge was rare outside

the circle of learned Jews, especially after the destruction of the Second Temple, the

connection between the Peshitta and the Targumim, as well as rabbinic literature, is

---

[20] Representative publications are listed in: Joshua Bloch, "The Authorship of the Peshitta," *AJSL* 35.4 (1919): 215–22.
[21] Theodor Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur: in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt* (Leipzig: Quandt & Händel, 1868), 262f.

the most crucial evidence for a theory of Jewish origin.[22] As A. Geiger famously

summarized: "Sie gibt nicht bloss ein jüdisches Buch wieder, sondern sie fasst es

auch vollkommen nach damals herrschenden Jüdischen Anschauungen auf."[23] In the

same vein, if the translator(s) had no Jewish roots and thus were gentile Christians,

there should be evidence of more linguistic weaknesses in the translator(s), and they

or he should consult the Septuagint much more often, as is in the case of the Latin

Vulgate.[24]

In this deadlock, the third option is to synthesize both opinions. While the Jewish

origin seems undeniable from the technical perspective, the Christian elements,

though varying in degree among different biblical books, permeate the whole

translation. Widely known is Weitzman's thesis as the third possibility that the

translators were converted non-rabbinic Jews, and the varying degrees of

Christianization are represented by the distinctive translation profiles of different

books. What is more, the distinction between Judaism and Christianity, for

---

[22] The most important are: P. Perles, *Meletemata Peschitthoniana* (Breslau: Friedrich, 1859); Chaim Heller, *Untersuchung über die Peschîttâ zur gesamten hebräischen Bibel* (Berlin: HItzkowski, 1911); Y. Maori, *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis (in Hebrew)* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955).

[23] Abraham Geiger, "Jüdische Begriffe und Worte innerhalb der syrischen Literatur," *ZDMG* 21.3 (1867): 487–92.

[24] Bruce M. Metzger, "The Syriac Version/The Latin Version," in *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 25–34.

Weitzman, is not always as significant as many moderns would typically expect, being too used to thinking of Christianity from non-Jewish perspective and, more importantly, of Judaism in strict rabbinic terms. The possibly Jewish original setting for the translation, as Weitzman suggests, should be within a non-rabbinic "sect" comparable to the Qumran community.[25] Though it is a bit shacky to argue for a possible origin based on the existence an almost undocumented Jewish party, and whether the party responsible for the translation of Peshitta should be called a "sect" is debatable: According to Cohen's definition, a Jewish sect is a small but organized separatist group that claims exclusive possession of the truth.[26] Weitzman's depiction of the translating group of the Peshitta, however, does not point to obvious separatism or exclusiveness; rather, the difference from rabbinic Judaism lies in the concrete attitude towards the laws, the temple and other religious practices like prayer. It suffices to say that many Jewish groups in and shortly after the Second Temple period, except for limited exceptions like Essenes (assuming they are represented by the Qumran community) or Pharisaic group (if it can be counted as a sect), are poorly documented.[27] Under these circumstances, it might be reasonable

---

[25] See the critique of Holm, "Syriac Version"; Han J. W. Drijvers, "Jews and Christians at Edessa," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 36 (1985): 88–102.

[26] Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 3rd ed. (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 123ff.

[27] Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism," in *The Significance of Yavneh and Other Essays in Jewish Hellenism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 40–70.

for us to focus on the traits of the translation per se before coming to the questions of identification, especially when the possible "sect" in question is neither well documented nor well definable. In Chapter 3 (about the usage of LXX) and Chapter 5 (about further translation techniques), this pragmatical prudence will be assumed. We can still achieve impressive results based on purely descriptive research, namely that the translation was most probably assigned equally to two translators, though their denominations remain in obscurity.

How was the Peshitta translated? Did the translators refer to other translations for help? The Peshitta's murky origin is highly associated with the fact that the Peshitta stands under both Targumic and Septuagint influence. We start from the Targum. After J. Perles systematically showed that a fair amount of Syriac readings point to Jewish influences,[28] the paradigm of "Peshitta as Targum" continued to dominate well into the first half of the 20th century.[29] At the peak of this wave the theory of the "Ur-Targum" is proposed by Baumstark and Kahle.[30] According to the theory of

---

[28] Perles, *Meletemata Peschitthoniana*, 13, 27 and 48.

[29] J. M. Schoenfelder, *Onkelos und Peschittho: Studien ueber das alter des onkelos'schen Targums* (Muenchen: JLentner, 1869); Carl Heinrich Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: JCHinrichs, 1886), 154ff.; H. Mager, *Die Peschitto Zum Buche Josua* (Fribourg, 1916), 54–63., etc.

[30] Paul Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen; Heft 1, 4 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1927), 3ff; Anton Baumstark, "Peschitta und palästinensisches Targum, in Biblische Zeitschrift," *BZ* 19.3 (1931): 257–70.

Kahle, the Peshitta is a revision of an Ur-Targum, an early Aramaic translation of the

Hebrew Bible. This Ur-Targum originated in Palestine, and later came to

Mesopotamia, where it subsequently evolved into the Syriac version, as well as into

the Targum Onkelos. The Ur-Targum theory has witnessed many variations,[31] yet

more recent scholarship tends to understand the agreements between the Peshitta and

the Targum in other ways. Besides, research about the most ancient manuscripts, like

5b1 and 5ph1, shows that the mutation of the Peshitta manuscripts goes in the

direction of becoming a freer text rather than a more literal one, which speaks directly

against the claims of the Ur-Targum theory.[32] Our research shows that the

dependence of P-Isaiah on the Aramaic Targum is quite scarce and sporadic, which

makes an Ur-Targumic theory quite impractical.

In contrast, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible has proven to be very

influential on P-Isaiah. Two dissertations, or more precisely, two collations of the

Peshitta of Isaiah at the very end of the 19th century, have largely confirmed this

---

[31] See also Schaje Wohl, "Das palästinische Pentateuch-Targum: Untersuchungen zu den Geniza-Fragmenten und ihrem Verhältnis zu den übrigen Targumen und der Peschitta" (PhD diss., 1935), 30; A. Vööbus, "Der Einfluss der altpalästinischen Targums in der Textgeschichte der Peschitta des Alten Testament," *Le Muséon* 68 (1955): 215–18.

[32] See the summary in Gordon, *Ancient Versions*, 251 and 259.

impression.[33] How this heavy influence can be understood, however, requires further

analysis. A more detailed presentation about the relationship of other translations to

the Peshitta will be provided by Chapter 3.

Finally, the question already mentioned in the last section, i.e., the question about one

translator versus multiple translators, should be viewed against the more general

debate about the homogeneity of the whole OT Peshitta. On the one hand, scholars

like Gelston tend to highly value the lexical and stylistic variations among the books

of the Peshitta, emphasizing the differences among the books.[34] One the other hand,

scholars like Weitzman would emphasize the homogeneity throughout the translation

and bases his theory about one single Peshitta school on this emphasis. A more

radical suggestion comes from Greenberg, who, building upon the analysis of P-

Jeremiah, proposes one individual translator not only for Jeremiah but the entire OT

Peshitta.[35] My search, in contrast, will be dedicated to showing the stylistic diversity

within a single book of Isaiah, which points to a cooperative essence in the

translational work.

---

[33] L. Warszawski, "Die Peschitta Zu Isaia (Cap. 1-39), Ihr Verhältnis Zum
Massoretischen Texte, Zur Septuaginta Und Zum Targum" (PhD diss., Grossherzogl.
Landes-Universität zu Giessen, 1897); Heinrich Weisz, "Die Peschitta zu
Deuterojesaia und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX. u. Trg" (PhD diss., Friedrichs-
Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1893).
[34] Gelston, "Peshitta of Isaiah," 565.
[35] Gillian Greenberg, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah*,
Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 203ff.

1.3 Some Methodological Reflection on "Translation Technique"

Since the 1970s, a series of monographs dedicated to the translation technique utilized in various books of the Peshitta has emerged.[36] These studies generally follow a similar scheme: An introductory chapter about the *status questionis* is followed by a thorough analysis of the Syriac text vis-à-vis the Hebrew text. After this comparison, other translations, like the Greek, Aramaic, and Old Latin, will be brought into the discussion. These general steps of data analysis will also be followed in this research, yet with a nuanced emphasis: Rather than being a descriptive report of all significant results, this research will be driven by the questions mentioned above. For instance, under the category of "pluses and minuses" of the Syriac translation as against MT, there are abundant examples that can be nicely analyzed and sub-divided into different patterns on the basis of function (e.g., those pluses for the sake of clarity, or minuses for the sake of stricter parallelism, etc.). However, the

---

[36] To name a few: Anthony Gelston, *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets* (New York: Oxford, 1987); David J. Lane, *The Peshiṭta of Leviticus*, Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1994); Heidi M. Szpek, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job* (Atlanta: Scholar Press, 1992); Craig E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel*, Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Greenberg, *Jeremiah*. Besides, in the realm of the Peshitta of NT: P. J. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2013).

"pluses and minuses" as a translation technique does not contribute to answering any

of our questions: For instance, though "pluses and minuses" is also a common

technique used in LXX-Isaiah, the "pluses and minuses" in the P-Isaiah do not

interact with those in LXX-Isaiah. The translators of the P-Isaiah do not borrow a

paraphrastic addition from LXX, or delete a phrase following LXX. That makes the

research into this translation technique ineffective in addressing the dependence of

the P-Isaiah upon LXX. Nor does the research into it show any sign for different

translators in different sections of the book, which is another important topic for this

dissertation. Therefore, though significant, this translation technical category "pluses

and minuses" will be excluded based on its irrelevance to our concern. Before using

the data accumulated in our analysis, which can embrace all possible aspects of a

translation, it is necessary to give some methodological reflection on what

"translation technique" means.

In a series of articles, Aejmelaeus offers some illuminating insights into this question.

She agrees with most of the scholars that technical translation research aims to take

"into account the various factors at work in the process of translation and thus

provides reliable explanations for the linguistic phenomena encountered in the

translation. The aim of this method is to follow the trail of the Septuagint translators,

to understand their way of working, the problems they met and how they solved

them, and to describe and explain the result of their work on the basis of these

premises."[37] In this process, however, Aejmelaeus warns us that most of these

premises we may have about how translators did their job are not explicit to the

translators themselves. Therefore, it is preferable to understand "translation

technique" as "Übersetzungsweise" instead of a more technical

"Übersetzungsmethode," since a research of the "translation technique" should also

include the investigation into implicit habits or customs in the translation, even when

the translators were unconscious regarding these implicit habits or customs.

I strongly agree with Aejmelaeus in that a biblical translator did not study systematic

theories to do the translation.[38] Yet there is no absolute boundary between awareness

and unawareness. One great example from Aejmelaeus will help illustrate this. The

---

[37] Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), XV.
[38] For instance, from my limited experience of doing the translation of an abstruse book of Troeltsch from German to Chinese, I simply performed the translation between the two languages without consulting translation theory, and without any idea about what this Neo-Kantian would like to say. Yet, that changed after the first 30 or 50 pages. I realized that there are many recurrent words which had no equivalents in Chinese, so I made a lexicographic list of these terminologies just to save time. In this way, the translation of these words became fixed. I also realized that the unbelievably long sentences of a Neo-Kantian writer should be broken down into several sentences in Chinese. Further, my understanding of Troeltsch's theology grew to the point that in some particularly abstruse passages I felt more and more confident, with all my respect to Troeltsch, to paraphrase laconic sentences in order to make sure that the Chinese reader could fully grasp Troeltsch's ideas.

percentage of δέ used to render the Hebrew *waw* within the OG Pentateuch is

respectively:[39]

Gen 777/3053 25.5%

Exod 312/1906 16.4%

Lev 30/1232 2.4%

Num 35/1660 2.1%

Deut 34/1273 2.7%

The proportion of the rendering of *waw* (in the adversative meaning of "but") with

"δέ" drops as the translation of the Pentateuch proceeds. The more idiomatic and

intuitive translation of the *waw* with "δέ" when contextually applicable, gives way to

a rigid translation in which *waw* should be strictly rendered as "καɩ" regardless of its

contextual function. This principle was executed more and more strictly as the

translation went on. Since this principle is against natural language intuition, as the

Hebrew *waw* has a much broader semantic field, it must be executed in a conscious or

deliberative way rather than through instinct.

---

[39] Aejmelaeus, *Trail*, 217.

The translators were not necessarily good translation theorists, but they were human beings with inductive capabilities. Once they realized that the intuitive treatment of a particular phenomenon should be regulated, they were ready to curtail some creative liberty and accept some guiding translation principles or techniques. Aejmelaeus's warning is justified in the sense that the ancient translators did not have many theories as we have; however, it is unfair to thoroughly deny the possibility that they might produce some translation guidelines, like a quick vocabulary or grammatical reference during the process of translation, especially in a large project like the translation of Isaiah. Meanwhile, the conceptual distinction between *conscious* and *subconscious* or *unconscious* "translation technique" is both necessary and helpful for this research, as we will see in Chapter 5, Section 1, when I investigate the translator's approach to difficult roots. The translators often misrecognized obscure roots, as in 14:11 הורד שאול גאונך המית נבליך, of which the second half means "your pride shall be brought to the Sheol and the sound of your harps." The rare word המית in Hebrew "sound, noise" is derived from the root המה. The translator, probably partially mislead by the first half of the verse, perceived another root מות, which makes good sense in the context. Under this circumstance, it is understandable that the translator made this mistake more unconsciously and randomly, as opposed to through the application of specific techniques like metathesis or substituting consonants with similar-sounding ones, which should be the proper subject of my

20

research. For that reason, this case of 17:11 will be excluded from the discussion,

since a merely unconscious (mis-)understanding, which does not lead to any further

translational pattern, should be disregarded in favor of a more robust definition of

"translation technique" and for our purpose of better understanding the translators

behind the surface of the text.

1.4   The Arrangement of the Discussion

The key point of this research is the textual comparison between the Hebrew Isaiah

and the Peshitta of Isaiah. However, the state of the Hebrew text from which the

Syriac was translated is unclear to us. For practical reasons, we do not have the

Vorlage of P-Isaiah as it was. Yet, we can at least examine the existing versions,

especially the discovery of Qumran and the texts from other sites in the Judean desert,

to gain an overview of the distance between them and the possible *Vorlage* of P-

Isaiah. The second chapter will be dedicated to this issue.

Since the Isaiah texts in the discoveries from the Judean desert have undergone

several thorough philological investigations,[40] and there have also been several

---

[40] Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1974); J.

dissertations dedicated to the Isaiah scrolls that contain useful collations of the scrolls,[41] my research will be built on the extant scholarship. It is widely agreed that the extent Hebrew versions of Isaiah are relatively limited in variation, and all of them, as Tov commented, "do not differ from each other *recensionally*."[42] All extant Hebrew manuscripts from the Judean desert, together with other ancient translations like LXX-Isaiah and P-Isaiah, including the most careless versions, like 4QIsa^c, can trace their roots to the proto-Masoretic family.

It seems, therefore, that the variation among the versions of Isaiah is narrower than many other biblical books. However, with closer observation, scholars still see a certain pattern of variation even within the limited space stretched out by different versions of Isaiah. Within the first decade of the discovery of the Great Isaiah Scroll,

Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll, a Literary Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970); van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 74–124; Jean Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'aprés les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1982); Paulson Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll*, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 34 (Sheffield: Acad. Press, 2001); P. W. Flint, "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries*, ed. E. Herberg and E. Tov (New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 229–51; Emanuel Tov, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 491–511.
[41] F. James, "A Critical Examination of the Text of Isaiah: Based on the Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah (DSIa) the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint and the Isaiah Texts of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius" (PhD diss., Michigan University, 1959); Pulikottil, *Transmission*; F. Morrow, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran" (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1973).
[42] Tov, "Text of Isaiah," 511.

scholars discerned some exciting similarities between 1QIsaᵃ on the one side, and P-

Isaiah, the Targum of Isaiah[43] as well as LXX-Isaiah on the other side.[44] After these

initial discoveries, however, no more work was done on the issue. Yet by examining

the materials more carefully and bringing the existing studies together, we can find

more evidence for a relatively well-knit cluster of texts (1QIsaᵃ, P-Isaiah, and LXX-

Isaiah) within the family of proto-Masoretic Isaiah. Just to name one example in Is

8:11:

M: יסרני מלכת בדרך העם־הזה (he chastened/corrected me from going the way…)

1QIsᵃ: יסירני (he turned me away from going the way…)

P: ונסטיני (and he turned me away from going the way…)

The Peshitta, in agreement with 1QIsᵃ, reads a causative form of סור "he turned me

from" rather than a Piel form of יסר "he chastened/corrected me." Kutscher argues

that it does not necessarily mean that the *Vorlage* of the Peshitta is written as it is in

1QIsᵃ, yet it can at least provide us with some interpretative variation shared by

---

[43] Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Die Jesaia-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum," *Bib* 35.1 (1954): 51–71.

[44] Joseph Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta(LXX) und die Erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran," *J. Biblic. Lit.* 78.1 (1959): 34–59.

Peshitta.[45] How close the *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah is to the Masoretic tradition remains open to question, and this question will be an indispensable part of my research. The result of this systematic investigation into the DDS will serve as the basis for our further comparison between P-Isaiah and the Hebrew text.

The third chapter will be dedicated to the parallels of P-Isaiah with LXX-Isaiah. A large number of parallels between the Peshitta and LXX have been observed,[46] and Isaiah is not an exception. Sometimes it is perceived as one of the books most influenced by LXX (e.g., Burkitt). Most recently, van der Kooij listed several agreements between LXX and the Peshitta against MT without further analysis and concluded that "Die vielen Übereinstimmungen zwischen beiden und vor allem die Qualität bestimmter Übereinstimmungen rechtfertigen die Annahme, dass der Verfasser der Pesh. Jes den griechschichen Bibeltext des Jesajabuches gut kannte."[47] However, without exhaustive research and complete statistical data, the degree of

---

[45] Kutscher, *Language*, 77–89. It is not rare in that the 1QIs^a writes a defective Hifil form in *Codex Leningradensis* in a plene way, cf. Is 27:9, where the same verb in Hifil, הָסֵר according to *Codex Leningradensis*, is written *plene* in 1QIs^a. Also: Kutscher, *Language*, 148.

[46] W. Emery Barnes, "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 2.6 (1901): 186–97.

[47] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 287. Van der Kooij thinks that the Baumstark thesis, that the Greek influence is majorly secondary, is at the best unnecessary unless a Lucianic influence is obviously present in the Peshitta text, see 388f.

influence in P-Isaiah is not determinable. The third chapter will provide a relatively

exhaustive search for all the parallels between P-Isaiah with LXX-Isaiah.

Parallels do not automatically entail dependence. Polygenesis is sometimes a possible

factor, or both LXX and the Peshitta may rely on another tradition that provides a

different reading from the Hebrew text. For evaluation, strict criteria should be

introduced in this chapter to guard against the possibility of "false" dependences.

Besides the quantitative statistics, we are also concerned about the manner in which

the reference to LXX took place: Does it solve some lexical difficulty, does it help

improve the flow of the text, or does it import some theological insights? Such

qualitative kinds of questions are another focal point of the third chapter.

The fourth chapter challenges the received view that the translation of the majority

of the Old Testament Peshitta, if not of the complete Hebrew canon, was finished by

the end of the 2nd century. This view was mostly upheld by scholars from Burkitt to

Weitzman. For instance, van der Kooij, based primarily on P-Isa 25:7, dated P-Isaiah

to about 162 CE.[48] In this chapter, P-Isaiah will be looked at through a new

perspective: It is not only taken as an important source for New Testament citations;

---

[48] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 291ff.

it also shows a tendency to approximate its translation, when possible, to relevant

NT-Peshitta passages.

The direction of the dependence is not hard to determine. When the passage in

question in the NT-Peshitta is a faithful translation of the original Greek text, while

the corresponding P-Isaiah passage shows deviation from the Hebrew text towards

the NT-Peshitta, the possibility of the dependence of P-Isaiah upon the NT-Peshitta is

much higher than the opposite. There can be various reasons for the borrowing:

Sometimes it seems to be an unconscious influence from a relevant passage in NT,

and sometimes it seems more to be an intentional reference to a specific NT passage.

In both cases, the familiarity of the translator with the NT-Peshitta text is embodied

in this "reversed" adaption of the Isaiah text, as we will see in the analysis of the

fourth chapter.

If the translator(s) of P-Isaiah constantly referred to not only the Syriac Gospels but

also to the Pauline letters and to Revelation, which are not present in either the

Diatessaron or in the Old Syriac Gospels, it is likely that the authors in charge of

these passages were Christian. It is also then possible that the translation of P-Isaiah

does not predate the Diatessaron or the Old Syriac Gospels; rather, at least part of it

must postdate the NT-Peshitta. What is more, while it is theoretically possible, it is

practically quite unlikely that these approximations of the P-Isaiah text towards the

NT can be attributed to a secondary revision: Most of the cases shown in Chapter

Four are "inessential" borrowings, which means that they seldomly make an essential

change in content or import exclusively Christian theological ideas. These changes

are too "trivial" and mostly stay on the verbal level; thus, they more likely occur due

to unawareness and the familiarity of the author with the NT text.

This kind of "error" based on the translator's familiarity with the NT text can be

demonstrated through a remote, but not irrelevant, example. In his *Demonstrations 17*

(On Christ the Son of God), Aphrahat cited the famous verse 7:14 ("Behold, a virgin

shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel (KJV)"), which is

also cited in Mt 1:23. From the context of the passage in *Demonstrations* in which the

citation was made, we know that Aphrahat was intending to refer back to the OT, not

the NT, especially since Isaiah 9:6-7, Daniel 9:26-27 and Isaiah chapters 52f etc.

were cited in its close proximity. However, the verse he quoted agreed with Matt

1:23:

Isa 7:14 (M)   הִנֵּה הָעַלְמָה הָרָה וְיֹלֶדֶת בֵּן

Isa 7:14 (P)   הא בתולתא בטנת וילדא ברא

(Behold! A virgin is pregnant and bearing a son.)

Aphrahat = Matt 1:23: דהא בתולתא תבטן ותילד ברא

(Behold! A virgin WILL be pregnant and giving birth to a son.)

The typical *futurum instans* ("הנה" plus participles) in Hebrew signifies an imminent future, which does not exist Syriac. When the P-Isaiah translates MT *verbatim*, it has lost this future sense. The Peshitta of Matt wants to emphasize the original future sense, thus modifies the Isaiah verse to be in the future tense.[49] Aphrahat, while thinking of the book of Isaiah, cited the Matt version of that verse instead. In Chapter Four, we will show very similar cases taking place in the P-Isaiah.

The fifth chapter of the dissertation will attempt to deal with several lesser translation techniques utilized in P-Isaiah. The survey will be done with the help of the collations of Warszawski (1897) and Weiss (1893), the monographs of Diettrich (1905), and Running (1964) and the synthesized chapter of van der Kooij (1983).

During the comparison between the Syriac and Hebrew texts, a list of translation techniques that are most significant for P-Isaiah will be examined: the translation of a difficult word through the manipulation of the roots, purely guessing through the

---

[49] Herrie F. van Rooy, "The Syriac Versions of Old Testament Quotations in Matthew," *In Die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi* 49.1 (2015): E1–12.

contextual information, de-metaphorization and de-anthropomorphism especially when it comes to the depiction of God, and the dependence on the Targum, etc. This list is highly selective, as mentioned above, since it does not aim at an exhaustive investigation into every possible translation technique; rather, this work seeks to cover the most significant techniques applied in the translation and to utilize the results for answering the motivational questions raised in the previous section. The results strengthen the idea that the translation is roughly divided into two parts, as the two translating parties, whether individuals or groups, show significantly distinct styles in employing most of the techniques mentioned above.

The final part of my dissertation will be a synthesis and interpretation of all of the evidence generated in the previous four chapters. The main question regarding the homogeneity and diversity of the translation will be addressed in this chapter, and I will propose that the translation was divided in half and assigned to two different translators. The first translator was inclined toward the ideology of *Hebraica veritas*, such that he tried to use LXX as a reference only when necessary, which leads to the declining frequency of his reference to LXX. The second translator, however, held a much more laissez-faire view towards LXX. Further, the first translator appears to be familiar with the technique of modifying the root of difficult words, while the second translator is not.

In addition to the stylistic or technical differences which can be counted as internal evidence for two different translators, I will add in this final chapter two external indications for the division at the halfway point of the book. First, the physical signs show a division in the Great Isaiah Scroll at the end of the chap. 33; second, P-Isaiah also retains two "titles" in the text, which mark the middle point of the book according to the word/verse counting, respectively. These facts do not necessarily point to two translators for P-Isaiah, but they do show that at least the ancient scribes and translators were fully aware of the midpoint of the book and accustomed to dividing the Hebrew text of Isaiah at the midpoint for a practical reason. That, at least, points to the possibility that the organizer of P-Isaiah translation made this decision.

The second question that will be finally addressed in the final chapter concerns the identity of the translator. Our research does not go against the general framework set by Weitzman, among others, that the translators were Jewish Christians, even though they differ in style and techniques. Both translators had excellent command of the Hebrew language, and both aimed at a faithful yet readable translation of the Hebrew *Vorlage* as they had. Meanwhile, both betrayed some influence from the New Testament. The technical differences between them as discerned in the previous

chapters are ultimately minor and can be understood as stylistic or practical rather than due to difference in their religious profiles.

1.5 Conclusion

The results of this study of the translation technique used in the Syriac Peshitta to the book of Isaiah will bring to light the history of the transmission and interpretation of one of the most important books in the Nevi'im. Through this understanding, the importance of the Peshitta for textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible can also be re-evaluated. This study will provide us with a new perspective not only on the Christian-Jewish polemic behind the text,[50] but also the positive Christian-Jewish relationship in the eastern Syriac world. Unlike the western counterpart, the Syriac speaking Christians seemed to have greater respect towards the Hebrew *Vorlage* and turned from the Hebrew Bible to the Septuagint as the authoritative text at a relatively late time.[51] This respect is also reflected in the P-Isaiah. Following in the footsteps of

---

[50] Concerning the polemics between the Jews and Christians in Edessa in the first centuries, see: L. W. Barnard, "The Origins and Emergence of the Church in Edessa During the First Two Centuries A.D.," *Vigiliae Christianae* 21.3 (1968): 161–175; Drijvers, "Jews and Christians at Edessa."

[51] The first systematic revision of the Peshitta towards LXX first came in the late 6th century, i.e., the Philoxenian revision made by Philoxenus, bishop of Mabug (485-519) and the latter revision of Jacob of Edessa (ca. 640-708), probably according to Lucianic recension of the Greek; See also the synthesis made in Bas ter Haar Romeny, "Jacob Of Edessa's Quotations And Revision Of Isaiah," in *Isaiah in*

the translators of Isaiah, our analysis of the text will provide a rare glimpse into the

social-religious history of the Jews and Christians that inhabited the 2nd-3rd century

Syriac world. In this sense, this dissertation will fill a critical lacuna in the

scholarship on the Peshitta and its background history.

Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van Der Kooij on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, ed. A. Kooij et al., Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 138 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 389–406.

2   THE *VORLAGE* OF P-ISAIAH

2.1   Introduction to the Problem of the *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah

The origin of the Peshitta was fiercely debated from the 19th into the mid-20th

century. Suggestions swayed between an Aramaic origin (A. Baumstark, P. Kahle, A.

Vööbus, etc.) and a Hebrew origin (L. Haefeli, etc.), as listed in the introductory

chapter. Most recent scholars, however, favor a direct Hebrew origin for most of the

Peshitta books, yet the influence from other translations like LXX and T remains

affirmed in various degrees.[52]

When we narrow down the scope to the book of Isaiah, the research has precisely the

same scheme, though on a smaller scale. Some early scholars upheld the possibility

of a Targumic origin: P-Isaiah was taken to be "keine selbständige neue Übersetzung,

sondern die Rezension einer noch freieren targumischen Grundlage nach M."[53]

However, Since Rowlands dismissed this theory as "completely unattainable,"[54]

scholars during the second half of the last century tended to see a proto-Masoretic

---

[52] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 15.
[53] Delekat, "Peschitta zu Jesaja," 194.
[54] E. R. Rowlands, "The Targum and the Peshitta Version of the Book of Isaiah," *VT* 9.1 (1959): 181.

Vorlage as the only choice. Arie van der Kooij, for instance, ascribed P-Isaiah to a

Jewish Christian who made it directly from the Hebrew text, which made the

influence from both LXX and T understandable.[55] Van der Kooij's judgment will be

affirmed for the most part in the following chapters of this dissertation. Weitzman

generally accepts van der Kooij's synthesis about the literary history of P-Isaiah,

though with a slightly different view about the identity of the translator. Thus, we

take over this hypothesis and start directly where the P translator should have begun:

the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Peshitta Isaiah.

Even though it is widely accepted that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah is a proto-

Masoretic text, a second question cannot be circumvented: Which kind of proto-

Masoretic text is it? In theory, the Masoretic texts of Isaiah are a well-knit cluster.

The distances between different (proto-)Masoretic texts are not significant, as

illustrated by Tov.[56] However, the excavation from Qumran muddied this clear

picture. The effect that the Great Isaiah Scroll had on the question of the Hebrew

Vorlage of the Peshitta should be valued more dialectically: On the one hand, the

Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaᵃ), in comparison to other Isaiah scrolls from the Judean

desert, deviates more from MT in linguistic characteristics (orthographic,

---

[55] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 290ff.
[56] Emanuel Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, TSAJ 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 52ff.

morphologic, and phonologic), to which a whole monograph is dedicated;[57] and in

the scribal alterations of the substantive contents, be these intentional changes or

mere careless mistakes.[58] In any case, the sheer number of deviations is astonishing.

However, on the other hand, most of the deviations appear to be purely spontaneous

scribal alterations,[59] which prohibits the textual critics from using it as a reliable

source, as Orlinsky one radically stated:

> Where the text of St. Mark's goes its own way from the Masoretic text, it is
>
> because, in addition to faulty copying and spelling, faulty memory was at work.
>
> That is to say, the Hebrew text of St. Mark's is utterly unreliable not because it was
>
> copied from memory, but because the memory of the person who brought it into
>
> being (as well as the scribes who did the writing and copying) was faulty.[60]

---

[57] Kutscher, *Language*.

[58] E.g., John V. Chamberlain, "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 5 (1955): 366–372; Arie Rubinstein, "The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll," *JJS* 6.4 (1955): 187–200; S. Talmon, "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah," *ASTI* 1 (1962): 62–72. In his dissertation, Pulikottil holds a very welcoming attitude towards the deviations of 1QIsa^a from MT, arguing for a more active role of the scribe in this process, see Pulikottil, *Transmission*.

[59] Many of the spontaneous changes were actually corrected, probably by another hand, see Tov, *Hebrew Bible*, 50f.

[60] Harry M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll," *JBL* 69.2 (1950): 165.

The current scholarship has a much milder opinion towards the quality of 1QIsaᵃ.

They insist on the positive value of the attempt of the scroll to actively adapt the text

to the new situation. Yet, it is undeniable that, from the perspective of a textual critic,

"it is usually clear that scribal errors of familiar types have caused the departures of

our Ms. from the tradition preserved in MT,"[61] and thus cannot reflect true variants

from MT. Under this circumstance, 1QIsaᵃ, as a "popular version" (Kutscher) or

"vulgar" text (Tov), is not essentially distinct from MT text, as Tov puts it, "all the

sources of Isaiah differ from each other, but their level of differentiation is not very

high."[62]

On the surface level, both facts point to the lesser value of 1QIsaᵃ for the purpose of

text criticism: 1) that 1QIsaᵃ is based on a proto-Masoretic text makes it similar to our

received text; 2) even if there are some valuable new readings, that it is carelessly

copied, makes it challenging to filter out these valuable readings from the careless

ones.[63] Only gradually did people start to recognize that some true variants do exist

in 1QIsaᵃ, especially those that agree with other ancient versions like LXX, the

Peshitta, and the Targum: In this respect, two names should be named: J. Ziegler and

---

[61] Millar T. Burrows, "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript," *BASOR*.111 (1948): 19.
[62] Tov, *Hebrew Bible*, 57.
[63] Orlinsky, "Isaiah Scroll," 152.

MT. H. Goshen-Gottstein, whose pioneering articles successfully drew the eyes of

scholars to the similarity between 1QIsaᵃ and LXX, and between 1QIsaᵃ and P-Isaiah

/ T-Isaiah, respectively.[64]

Ziegler, in his treatment of LXX variants in agreement with 1QIsaᵃ, went diagonally

against Orlinsky as "bekanntlich ein fanatischer Liebhaber von MT," since the latter

rejected most LXX variants as representing a different *Vorlage* than MT even when

jointly witnessed by 1QIsaᵃ. The difficulty, as Ziegler admits, lies in the fact that the

free renderings of LXX, though often in agreement with 1QIsaᵃ against MT, cannot

be quickly taken as proof of a common *Vorlage*. However, after investigating the

pluses/minuses of words and suffixes, the grammatical-syntactical variations,

including lexical, and the differences in the proper names, Ziegler came to the

conclusion that the *Vorlage* of LXX must have a fair number of variants that are

identical with 1QIsaᵃ.[65]

Goshen-Gottstein's article is more theory-laden. Writing under the influence of the

monistic-pluralistic debate in the LXX scholarship since de Largarde and Kahle,[66]

---

[64] Goshen-Gottstein, "Jesaia-Rolle"; Ziegler, "Vorlage."
[65] Ziegler, "Vorlage," 59.
[66] About the debate, see Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder and H. Sysling (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 161–88.

his article is dedicated to importing this model of debate on the LXX texts into the realm of Hebrew texts as the *Vorlagen* of ancient versions. Within this framework, he searches for similarities between 1QIsaᵃ and the Peshitta/Targum and emphasizes that it is not aimed at "den exegetischen Wert oder Unwert einer Rollenslesart zu ermitteln, sondern es gilt erst die blosse Tatsache zu beweisen, dass es wirkliche Variante sind."[67] In other words, his aim is not the restoration of the "original" Hebrew text; rather, he only seeks to establish the variants in the Qumran text as true variants with the help of other versions. The "egalitarian" attitude towards different *Lesarten* is very pertinent to our research. This approach is more concerned with the appearance of the *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah rather than the quality of the readings in the *Vorlage*, i.e., whether the *Vorlage* has a superior or more ancient reading. So long as a variant reading represented in the *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah is established, i.e., is proven not to be a spontaneous creation or coincidental error by the translator, the variant should be taken seriously. The agreement of a P reading with other ancient versions as against MT, especially when not explainable through factors like a syntactical necessity or obvious mistakes, will strongly point to such an established variant in textual history.

---

[67] Goshen-Gottstein, "Jesaia-Rolle," 53.

Ziegler and Goshen-Gottstein both close their articles with a list of readings common to 1QIsaᵃ and other versions as against MT. Ziegler's is relatively complete in the case of LXX and 1QIsaᵃ agreements against MT, while Goshen-Gottstein's is, unfortunately, rather selective. Among the categories selected by them, one stands out: Goshen-Gottstein is, contra Burrows, confident that the phenomenon of pluses and minuses of *waw* in 1QIsaᵃ, in comparison with other versions, can generate some significant results.[68] Ziegler also agrees with Goshen-Gottstein at this point.[69] However, their method, merely listing the similarities in pluses and minuses between 1QIsaᵃ and other versions, is not sufficient for generating a convincing result. Besides, Goshen-Gottstein's criteria for selecting some categories to be in the list while ignoring others (e.g., variations in prepositions, morphological changes) are unfounded.[70] We will see later in this chapter that the usage of prepositions, which Goshen-Gottstein chose to ignore, is a significant common trait between P-Isaiah and 1QIsaᵃ that further implies a similar *Vorlage*.

The first part of this study will be dedicated to the pluses and minuses of the conjunction *waw* among the versions, with particular attention to the statistical

---

[68] Goshen-Gottstein, "Jesaia-Rolle," 54.
[69] Ziegler, "Vorlage," 38ff.
[70] Goshen-Gottstein, "Jesaia-Rolle," 55.

method involved in this case; the second part will deal with other significant variants

shared by P and 1QIsaᵃ, partly to complete Goshen-Gottstein's list.

2.2   The Pluses and Minuses of *Waw*

The pluses and minuses of *waw* consist of a large portion of the variation. More than

250 pluses/minuses take place between MT and 1QIsaᵃ, which means that there is an

average of more than four cases per chapter. Since a plus or a minus of conjunction

does not often change the meaning, its (in)existence seems to be trivial if only viewed

from the perspective of the content. However, the insignificance concerning the

meaning of the text cannot be equated to its significance for tracing or identifying the

pedigree of the versions. In some sense, the insignificance of the variations in *waw*

can instead help avoid many conscious changes, and its distribution can authentically

reflect the relationship between versions to a certain degree, as Goshen-Gottstein also

noted.[71]

Meanwhile, it is always difficult for practical reasons to determine in each case if the

plus/minus of a *waw* is the more original one. Even when we can find one variant

superior in the sense that it makes better sense within the context, the causal priority

---

[71] Goshen-Gottstein, "Jesaia-Rolle," 54.

is hard to determine. For instance, in 9:19, where MT reads "ויגזר על־ימין ורעב ויאכל על־

שֹמאול" while 1QIsaᵃ reads "ויגזר על ימין ורעב ויאכל וַעל שֹמאול," the plus of 1QIsaᵃ is

obviously an inferior variation due to the parallelism of the verse. However, we can

either take the *waw* before על as a careless mistake of a single copyist or resort to the

principle of *lectio difficultior* and take it for existent in the *Vorlage*. Both ways, the

explanation works no better than the other way round.

Taking both factors into consideration, i.e., the practical difficulty and occasional lack

of theoretical possibility, we should always be hesitant in judging the priority

concerning the plus/minus of the conjunction. Instead, we will focus on the statistical

result from the difference between different versions as they are. Meanwhile, external

resources like LXX are quite helpful in the analysis. Ziegler utilizes LXX in his

analysis of the relationship between MT and 1QIsaᵃ. He carefully lists cases in which

LXX and 1QIsaᵃ share pluses and minuses of *waw* that differ from MT and found 68

times *και* LXX = ו Q] om. MT, 8 times ουδε LXX = ולא Q] לא MT, and 24 times

om. *και* LXX = om. לא Q] hab. MT, respectively.[72] This number will be enlarged

by 19 if patristic witnesses are allowed. The amount of evidence is exciting since two

ancient versions go hand in hand against MT more than 100 times in the places that

MT and 1QIsaᵃ diverge from each other. Nevertheless, this result cannot yet lead to a

---

[72] Ziegler, "Vorlage," 38f., 43.

more affirmative conclusion, because the quantity of the variations, though large, has

not yet been shown to offer a significant result, if not cogently interpreted. Finally,

the instances of *waw* in any version of Isaiah number far more than 119; the

coincidence between any two versions against another one can thus be large even by

random coincidences. Are these 119 cases primarily attributed to established variants,

which existed already in the *Vorlage* of 1QIsaᵃ and LXX, or are they mainly reached

independently and spontaneously by the copyist or translator? The data requires

interpretation, which is not accomplished by Ziegler's descriptive analysis.

In this section, a comparison of P-Isaiah with 1QIsaᵃ will be conducted, with due

attention not only to those cases where P agrees with 1QIsaᵃ, but also those where P

and MT agree against 1QIsaᵃ (negative test). All of the data will be collected, with

exceptions only for either i) the relevant P passage is missing, or ii) the pluses and

minuses are not pure, but result from or involve other contextual issues.[73] The

---

[73] For instance, in 11:6, where MT reads ומריא ("the fatling") while 1QIsaᵃ reads
ימרו. Though Rosenbloom strongly opposes the reading of 1QIsaᵃ, thinking that "no
meaning of מור, מרה, or מרר can remedy the situation," the meaning of מרה can
make good sense ("and the calf and the young lion will be fat together", also LXX
" καὶ ταῦρος καὶ λέων ἅμα βοσκηθήσονται"). This possibility, however, makes the
crux more than a simple plus/minus of conjunction. See Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea
Isaiah Scroll, a Literary Analysis*, 20; Kutscher, *Language*, 317. Another instance is
in 14:2, where the reading of אל אדמת ואל מקומם, as against the Masoretic אֶל־מְקוֹמָם, is
very probably a dittographic reading, borrowing אל אדמת from second half of the
verse. Under this circumstance, the conjunction is an addition based on an error and
will not be considered in this chapter.

starting point will be the (relative) complete collation in DJD 32,[74] corrected and

supplemented with the help of Kutscher's and Ziegler's list.[75]

2.2.1 Data Accumulated

i)   ‍ا P = ‍ و Q] om. MT.

1:3; 1:8; 1:10; 1:16 (2 times); 2:4; 3:7; 3:9; 3:19; 3:20; 3:21; 3:22; 5:6; 5:27; 5:29;

7:4; 8:21; 9:11; 9:20; 10:4; 13:8; 13:16; 13:18; 13:22; 15:1; 15:2; 15:3; 16:10; 16:14;

17:8; 17:14; 19:2; 19:6; 19:7; 27:4 (2 times); 27:6; 28:2; 28:29; 30:17; 30:19; 30:33;

31:5; 32:7; 32:13; 33:6; 33:22 (3 times); 34:2; 34:12; 35:9; 36:15; 37:13; 38:5; 38:11;

38:14; 38:18 (2 times); 39:6; 40:3; 40:28; 40:31; 41:2; 41:3; 41:14; 41:16; 41:25;

41:29; 42:1; 42:7; 42:11 (2 times); 42:16; 42:21; 42:23 (2 times) ; 43:17; 43:19;

44:11; 44:19 (2 times); 45:14 (2 times); 45:16; 45:18; 45:21; 45:23; 46:2; 46:3; 46:6;

46:7; 46:13 (2 times); 47:6; 47:11 (2 times); 48:13; 48:14 (2 times); 48:15; 48:16;

48:20; 49:7; 49:9; 49:16; 50:11; 52:2; 52:9; 52:13; 53:4; 53:5; 53:10; 53:11; 54:1 (2

times); 54:2; 57:2; 57:4; 57:10; 57:11; 57:13; 57:17; 58:6; 58:8; 58:9; 58:13; 58:13;

---

[74] Eugene Ulrich, Peter W. Flint, and Martin G. Abegg, eds., *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 32 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010).
[75] Kutscher, *Language*, 414–27; Ziegler, "Vorlage," 38–43.

59:11; 60:7; 60:11; 61:1; 61:6; 61:8; 62:4; 63:10; 64:3 (2 times); 65:20; altogether

139 times.

ii)   om. P = Q] ו M hab.

5:29 (2 times); 5:30; 6:1; 8:21; 10:15; 13:2; 13:22; 17:8; 28:7; 30:23; 32:11 (2 times);

33:9; 37:26; 43:4; 44:7; 46:4; 48:5; 49:7; 49:13 (*waw* according to the Qere of M);

49:21; 51:15; 51:16; 51:21; 64:3; altogether 26 times.

iii)   ܘ P = ו M] om. Q.

1:23; 3:13; 5:15; 6:9; 6:10; 8:11; 14:13; 14:17; 14:22; 14:23; 15:9; 17:8; 24:22;

30:30; 31:3; 35:8; 37:27; 40:13; 40:25; 41:6; 41:17; 41:28; 42:11; 43:8; 43:10; 43:12;

44:21; 45:5; 45:11; 45:14; 45:24; 46:1; 46:6; 46:13; 48:6; 48:7; 48:14; 49:1; 49:4;

49:7; 51:22; 53:7; 54:16; 56:3; 58:2; 58:5 (2 times); 60:1; 61:2; 62:8; 63:19; 64:5;

66:5; 66:7; altogether 54 times.

iv)   om. P = M] ו Q hab.

7:17; 8:16; 9:3; 9:19 (2 times); 14:8; 16:7; 19:6; 21:4; 21:6; 22:4; 24:9; 24:20; 26:11;

31:8; 32:20; 33:2; 34:11; 35:8; 37:13; 40:17; 40:19; 40:26; 41:2 (2 times); 41:3;

41:12; 41:25; 42:4; 42:8; 42:10; 43:3; 43:9; 43:20; 43:23; 44:9; 44:16 (3 times); 45:4;

46:13; 48:8; 48:18; 48:22; 49:21; 50:4 (2 times); 52:2; 52:5; 52:15; 53:3 (2 times);

53:5; 53:11; 55:3; 55:13; 56:9; 56:12; 57:1; 57:21; 59:13; 59:21; 60:18; 62:1; 62:7;

63:12; 64:7; 66:4; 66:8; altogether 69 times.

2.2.2   Result

	ܘ P	om. P
P=Q	139 (om. MT] P=Q hab.)	26 (ו MT] om. P=Q)
P=M	54 (om. Q] P=M hab.)	69 (ו Q] om. P=M)

The first line indicates the number of the cases in which P aligns with 1QIsa[a] (Q for

short) against the Masoretic Text in having or not having the conjunction, while the

second line, in contrast, shows the number of the cases in which P aligns with the

Masoretic text against 1QIsa[a]. The result of this comparison is much more significant

than in the case of LXX: In 165 (139 and 26) out of altogether 288 decidable cases, P

goes together with Q in witnessing a plus/minus of *waw* against MT (while there are

only 119 for LXX). However, our additional negative test shows that in another 123

(54 and 69) cases, P goes with MT against Q. Though the similarities outnumber the

differences, the outnumbering leads to *no certain* conclusion concerning the *waw* that

P used some *Vorlage* closer to that of Q, especially when both P and Q tend to be

lavish in using a conjunction. As we can see from the statistics, both Q (208/288) and

P (193/288) tend to take more conjunctions in comparison to MT (80/288). When two versions independently add conjunctions where needed to a text with sparse usage of conjunctions, they probably coincide at a large portion of points. In other words, it could be primarily a stylistic issue, without the necessary presupposition of a similar *Vorlage*. In the same vein, the spontaneous deletion of conjunctions can happen independently where it seems awkward to the eyes of the copyist or translator. We need more factors for interpreting these statistics.

The uncertainty will be largely reduced if we bring the statistics of Ziegler concerning LXX together with our extant data: When we compare the similar points between LXX and 1QIsaᵃ as listed by Ziegler with our data, we will find that they largely overlap with each other.[76] I will mark Ziegler's και LXX=ו Q] om. MT., ουδε LXX=ולא Q] לא MT. and om. *και* LXX = Q] hab. MT cases with yellow, while the early Christian cases (Clement, Justin, Eusebius etc.), which are imported from Ziegler's summary, will be marked with blue:

ᵃ P = ו Q] om. MT.

---

[76] With a few exceptions where P cannot be clearly aligned with either Q or MT, yet LXX can, namely 34:10, 16; 50:2; 60:13.

1:3; 1:8; 1:10; 1:16 (2 times); 2:4; 3:7; 3:9; 3:19; 3:20; 3:21; 3:22; 5:6; 5:27; 5:29;

7:4; 8:21; 9:11; 9:20; 10:4; 13:8; 13:16; 13:18; 13:22; 15:1; 15:2; 15:3; 16:10; 16:14;

17:8; 17:14; 19:2; 19:6; 19:7; 27:4 (2 times); 27:6; 28:2; 28:29; 30:17; 30:19; 30:33;

31:5; 32:7; 32:13; 33:6; 33:22 (3 times); 34:2; 34:12; 35:9; 36:15; 37:13; 38:5; 38:11;

38:14; 38:18 (2 times); 39:6; 40:3; 40:28; 40:31; 41:2; 41:3; 41:14; 41:16; 41:25;

41:29; 42:1; 42:7; 42:11 (2 times); 42:16; 42:21; 42:23 (2 times) ; 43:17; 43:19;

44:11; 44:19 (2 times); 45:14 (2 times); 45:16; 45:18; 45:21; 45:23; 46:2; 46:3; 46:6;

46:7; 46:13 (2 times); 47:6; 47:11 (2 times); 48:13; 48:14 (2 times); 48:15; 48:16;

48:20; 49:7; 49:9; 49:16; 50:11; 52:2; 52:9; 52:13; 53:4; 53:5; 53:10; 53:11; 54:1 (2

times); 54:2; 57:2; 57:4; 57:10; 57:11; 57:13; 57:17; 58:6; 58:8; 58:9; 58:13; 58:13;

59:11; 60:7; 60:11; 61:1; 61:6; 61:8; 62:4; 63:10; 64:3 (2 times); 65:20; altogether

139 times, 77of which are found in Ziegler's register.

ו M] om. P = Q.

5:29 (2 times); 5:30; 6:1; 8:21; 10:15; 13:2; 13:22; 17:8; 28:7; 30:23; 32:11 (2 times);

33:9; 37:26; 43:4; 44:7; 46:4; 48:5; 49:7; 49:13 (*waw* in Qere of M); 49:21; 51:15;

51:16; 51:21; 64:3; altogether 26 times, 11 of which are found in Ziegler's register.

ס P = ו M] om. Q.

1:23; 3:13; 5:15; 6:9; 6:10; 8:11; 14:13; 14:17; 14:22; 14:23; 15:9; 17:8; 24:22;

30:30; 31:3; 35:8; 37:27; 40:13; 40:25; 41:6; 41:17; 41:28; 42:11; 43:8; 43:10; 43:12;

44:21; 45:5; 45:11; 45:14; 45:24; 46:1; 46:6; 46:13; 48:6; 48:7; 48:14; 49:1; 49:4;

49:7; 51:22; 53:7; 54:16; 56:3; 58:2; 58:5 (2 times); 60:1; 61:2; 62:8; 63:19; 64:5;

66:5; 66:7; altogether 54 times, 12 of which are found in Ziegler's register.

ו Q] om. P = MT.

7:17; 7:25 (not sure because of an unclear correction in the 1QIsaᵃ); 8:16; 9:3; 9:19 (2

times); 14:8; 16:7; 19:6; 21:4; 21:6; 22:4; 24:9; 24:20; 26:11; 31:8; 32:20; 33:2;

34:11; 35:8; 37:13; 40:17; 40:19; 40:26; 41:2 (2 times); 41:3; 41:12; 41:25; 42:4;

42:8; 42:10; 43:3; 43:9; 43:20; 43:23; 44:9; 44:16 (3 times); 45:4; 46:13; 48:8; 48:18;

48:22; 49:21; 50:4 (2 times); 52:2; 52:5; 52:15; 53:3 (2 times); 53:5; 53:11; 55:3;

55:13; 56:9; 56:12; 57:1; 57:21; 59:13; 59:21; 60:18; 62:1; 62:7; 63:12; 64:7; 66:4;

66:8; altogether 69 times, 12 of which are in Ziegler's register.

Intuitively, the colored cases are much denser in the first two categories than in the

last two. That means: at the most places in which 1QIsaᵃ (against MT) is supported by

LXX, there is also support from P, and in the same vein, where 1QIsaᵃ is supported

by P there is an apparent majority of instances also supported by LXX. More

precisely: In Ziegler's list, 88 out of 112 cases (78.6%) in which 1QIsaᵃ is supported

by LXX can find support from P, and from our list, 88 out of 165 cases (53.3%) in

which 1QIsaᵃ is supported by P are also supported by LXX; on the other hand, only

24 out of 123 cases (19.5%) where MT is supported by P can find support from LXX.

The result is impressive: When P supports MT, it does so more randomly and

spontaneously, and thus individually and without support from LXX; and when it

supports 1QIsaᵃ, it does so more collaboratively with LXX and more through extent

Lesarten shared with LXX. The same situation applies to LXX. The result is

statistically cogent enough to prove that the pluses and minuses are not purely due to

stylistic differences for the translators of P and LXX and the scribes of 1QIsaᵃ.

Of course, there is the practical possibility that the correlation comes not from similar

Vorlagen but from the direct influence of LXX upon P.[77] However, as will be

shown, the way in which the P translator(s) consult LXX is rather specialized and

more focused on specific abstruse phrases or words. In other words, the translator(s)

of P used LXX more as an occasional reference book than as a constant *Vorlage*. He

consulted LXX more when the original Hebrew text seemed not understandable or

was in need of better content. Since the pluses and minuses of conjunctions are

generally irrelevant for these two purposes, the influence of LXX cannot be

---

[77] Undeniable evidence of this influence will be shown and analyzed in chapter 3,
which is dedicated to the relationship between LXX and P-Isaiah.

systematic regarding the translation of *waw*. What is more, from roughly Chapter 34 through Chapter 39, the influence of LXX in terms of content recedes almost entirely from the translation, yet the resonance between P and LXX regarding *waw* still takes place. Therefore, the direct influence of LXX upon P cannot have much impact on our statistical results concerning the conjunction.

A much more reasonable model than the direct influence of LXX upon P would be this: There are similar *Vorlagen* behind both the translators of P and LXX, and these *Vorlagen* show a different style from MT concerning the assignment of conjunctions. LXX remains relatively faithful, if not strictly faithful, to the preservation of the (non-)existence of conjunctions, while P treats them more freely. That explains the more significant deviation of P from 1QIsa[a]. Both LXX and P preserve most of the variants of *waw* in their respective *Vorlage*, which was similar to 1QIsa[a]. This explains why and how P confirms the vast majority of LXX readings against MT, and vice versa: 1) In the case of P, 88 out of its 165 relevant points that agree with 1QIsa[a] are confirmed by LXX, the majority of which can be established as existent in the *Vorlage* and the other 77 cases can be traced back to the freedom that P translator enjoyed. 2) In the case of LXX, 88 of its 112 relevant points that go with 1QIsa[a] are confirmed by P. In other words, LXX tends to support P significantly where P agrees

with 1QIsaᵃ, but not so where P agrees with M; meanwhile, P tends to support LXX

significantly where LXX agrees with 1QIsaᵃ, but not so where LXX agrees with MT.

The mutual support between LXX and P in favor of the 1QIsaᵃ readings gives us a

clear indication that P, 1QIsaᵃ, LXX are bound by a certain stable group of

plus/minus of *waw* against MT. The robustness of this cluster is not only guaranteed

by the positive facts that they are supported by all three versions against M; it is also

confirmed by the negative comparison: Only a small portion (21.4%) of LXX

readings in agreement with 1QIsaᵃ failed the test from P. It shows that the majority of

the LXX conjunctions shared by 1QIsaᵃ but not found in MT are so robust that it

cannot be boiled down to mere coincidence. To be sure, a certain degree of freedom

on the part of the translators/scribes is always allowed, but there is less freedom in the

case of LXX than in the case of P, as just analyzed. However, it suffices to point to a

common style of assignment of conjunctions among P, LXX, and 1QIsaᵃ as opposed

to that found in MT.

At this point, we can answer the unresolved question raised above: How can we

understand the 112 cases of LXX and the 165 cases of P, which agree with 1QIsaᵃ but

against MT? As we mentioned, two possible factors make 1QIsaᵃ different: a

different *Vorlage* and the freedom of the translator/copyist. Through the research, we

have seen that both factors are working simultaneously. The difficulty for previous

studies lies in differentiating these two factors. Luckily, in our study, the

differentiation can be done statistically with the help of three similar versions

together. The final result for both P and LXX is not hard to draw. In the case of P,

more than half (88) of the 158 cases agreeing with 1QIsa[a] are more probably due to a

common *Vorlage*, while the other half arise from the individual freedom of the

translator(s). In the case of LXX, the individual freedom is more limited, since most

(88 out of 112) of LXX=1QIsa[a] cases are due to the *Vorlage*. The difference lies in

the style of P and LXX translator. While LXX is conservative in keeping the form of

conjunctions, P shows much more freedom in spontaneously making pluses and

minuses of conjunctions.

2.2.3   Conclusion about the Pluses/Minuses of Conjunction

It is true that the translation of a conjunction is insignificant since it usually makes

only a slight difference to the meaning. However, precisely because of its

insignificance, it can evade most conscious influences on translation that arise from

somewhere other than the *Vorlage*, and the translation of a conjunction can thus

faithfully reflect the *Vorlage*. In the case of P, though it is evident that the translators

of P consulted LXX very often, it is almost impossible that the P-translator was

interested in imposing the distribution of καὶ in LXX upon his translation, as discussed before.

In this chapter, we started from Ziegler's comparison of LXX with 1QIsaᵃ and came to the question of how to interpret 119 cases in which LXX conjunction goes with 1QIsaᵃ. While they are many, we were not yet sure whether LXX mainly inherited these cases from some *Vorlage* different from MT, or they could be primarily attributed to the translator's personal activity. The same question applies to the 165 cases of P which goes with 1QIsaᵃ against MT.

Yet, when we bring the results of both comparisons (P/1QIsaᵃ against MT and LXX/1QIsaᵃ against M) together, we find that the LXX cases, though smaller in number, enjoys higher support from P than the other way round: Eighty percent of them also find support in P. In this case, we can reasonably presuppose a similar *Vorlage* for LXX, P, and 1QIsaᵃ, which has a significantly different style of distributing the conjunctions in comparison to MT. While LXX treats the conjunction more carefully, P treats it more freely. Both factors are significantly at work in the case of P, i.e., individual freedom and having a different *Vorlage* from MT, as the statistical analysis has shown.

Though we reasonably affirm some *Vorlage* behind translation of LXX and P that is different from MT, we should be aware that this *Vorlage* is now determined only in its distribution of conjunctions. This sample test only helps to provide some abstract genetic relationships among the versions. How similar the related versions look like in concreteness needs to be depicted more concretely. The next section will be dedicated to this purpose.

2.3   Other Instances in which P Agrees with 1QIsaᵃ and with Other Ancient Versions

In this section, the search for evidence of P's agreement with Q against MT will proceed. Other ancient versions of Isaiah (the Targum, the Vulgate, and, when possible, Old Latin readings) as differing from MT will also be recorded here. All of the samples will be categorized under these titles: 1) differences in prepositions; 2) differences in the spelling of proper names; 3) differences in the number of nouns; 4.1) differences in the number and person of verbs; 4.2) differences in the tenses and voices of verbs; 5) substantially different words or phrases; 6) different word orders; 7) omissions or additions of words or phrases. The starting point is, again, the collation in DJD 32, double-checked against the collations done by Goshen-Gottstein and Ziegler. Because there are no more than thirty cases under each category, the

statistical method has difficulty generating valid results. Therefore, this section will

be only dedicated to accumulating as many variants as possible, which are quite

probably extant in the *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah. The lists generated in the following

section, together with the apparatus of BHS and HUB, will serve as a basis for further

chapters.

1) Prepositions

M רמוס [Q=P=T לרמוס 1:12

M הביא [Q=P=T להביא 1:13

M חרב תאכלו [Q=P=T בחרב תאכלֹו 1:20

M=S צדיק [Q=P=σ'=T לצדיק 3:10

M קרא [Q=P לקראו 8:4

M יום (vid)[Q=P=LXX ביום 9:13

M יהוה (vid)[Q=P=V ליהוה 12:5

M ופרי [Q=P=T ועל פרי 13:18

M שמוע [Q=P=T לשמוע 28:12

M כהר [Q=P=V בהר 28:21

M יין [Q=P=T מיין 29:9

M מצרים [Q=P=LXX=T למצרים 31:1

M עדרים [Q=P=T‏ לעדרים‏ 32:14

M אפס [in nihilum L ,‏εἰς ἀπώλειαν‏ LXX ,P‏ לאבדן‏ ,Q‏ כאפס‏ 34:12

M עבדי [Q=P=T‏ מעבדי‏ 36:9

M הלוך [Q=P=T‏ להלוך‏ 42:24

M וזבחיך [Q=P=LXX‏ ובזבחיכה‏ 43:23

M שבי־לארץ [Q=P=LXX(?)‏ שבי על הארץ‏ 47:1

M לחץ [Q=P=LXX=T‏ כחץ‏ 49:2

M מעמקי [Q=P‏ במעמקי‏ 51:10

M גבהו [Q=P=LXX‏ כגובה‏ 55:9

M ומצא [Q=P=T‏ ולמצא‏ 58:4

M=T עשות [Q=P=LXX‏ מעשות‏ 58:13

M בעול [Q=P=LXX=T‏ כבעול‏ 62:5

M מכה [Q=P=LXX=T‏ כמכה‏ 66:3

Though Goshen-Gottstein dismissed the difference in prepositions among versions as
unimportant and thus refused to register the prepositions in his collation, the
difference in using prepositions does betray some pattern. At the variant points where
1QIsa[a] =P differs from MT in prepositions, there usually is at least one other version
aligned with 1QIsa[a] =P. Whenever 1QIsa[a] differs from MT yet finds no support from
P (5:5, 7, 8, 13; 9:12, 18; 10:24, etc.), other versions never have the same preposition

56

as 1QIsaᵃ. In other words, P seldom stands with 1QIsaᵃ exclusively against other versions; rather, it almost always has another ally when it supports 1QIsaᵃ. This phenomenon, again, reminds us of the fact that the lavishness of 1QIsaᵃ should be understood dialectically. On the one side, most of the changes in 1QIsaᵃ are spontaneous due to the free nature of 1QIsaᵃ; on the other hand, P seems to provide a valid screening test for "real" variations. Once a variant in 1QIsaᵃ can pass this screening test of P, it is almost certain to have more support from other ancient versions.

2) Proper names

1:1 עוזיה Q=P] עזיהו M

1:1 יחזקיה Q=P] יחזקיהו M

2:1 ישעיה Q=P] ישעיהו MT, also 7:3; 13:1; 20:2, 3; 37:2; 38:1; 39:3, 8

4:1 חהזיקה Q=P] חהזיקו M

6:1 עוזיה Q=P] עזיהו MT, also 7:1

7:1 רומליה Q=P] רמליהו, also 7:9; 8:6

7:8 דרמשק Qᵈⁱˢ=P] דמשק MT, also 8:4; 10:9; 17:1ᵈⁱˢ, 3

8:2 זקריה Q=P] זקריהו M

8:2 יברכיה Q=P] יברכיהו M

57

M ליש Q=P] לישה 10:30

M מרמנה Q=P] מדמנה 10:30

M דיבון[bis] Q=P] דימון 15:9

MT, also 36:3, 22 חלקיה Q=P] חלקיהו 20:20

MT, also 36:14, 15 הזקיה Q=P] הזקיהו 36:1

MT, also 38:1; 39:1 יחוזקיה P] חזקיה Q, חזקיהו 37:3

At almost all of the places where Q and MT have different spellings for proper names (for persons or locations), P follows Q. The majority of the differences in the spelling of proper names are due to different orthographic systems. Concerning the *waw* ending of the names, "the plene forms (i.e., those with the "ו") are the rule for the First Temple Period, whereas the defective forms (i.e., those lacking the "ו") are very rare in the literature of that period."[78] Obviously, MT, with an exception of אוריה, follows the *plene* forms (with *waw*), while 1QIsa[a] and P often follow the *defective* forms.

3) Number of nouns and suffixes

M=LXX וגבורותיך Q=P] וגבורתך 3:25

---

[78] Kutscher, *Language*, 4.

5:3   יושבי Q=P=LXX [יושב M

6:3   וקראים Q=P [וקרא M

6:7   וחטאותיך Q=P [וחטאתך M

7:24   ובקשתות Q=P [ובקשת

8:18   לאות ולמופת M=LXX [לאתות ולמופתים Q=P

10:10   האלילים Q=P [האליל M

17:9   כעזובת Q=P=LXX [כעזובות M

26:6   ענים Q=P=LXX [עני M

33:15   כפיו Q=P [כפו M

33:15   אוזניו Q=P [אוזנו

33:20   מועדינו Q=P=M^mss [מועדנו M

37:14   ויקראם Q=P [ויקראהו M

49:6   קצוי הארץ Q=P [קצה ארץ M

56:5   להמה Q=P=LXX [לו M

57:10   דרכיך Q=P=LXX=T=V [דרכך M

59:9   באפלה Q=P=LXX=T [באפלות M

62:11   קצוי Q=P=T [קצה M

64:7   ידיכה Q=P=LXX [ידך MT (var or orth?)

65:23   ברוכי Q=P=LXX [ברך M

59

This category is of minor importance, since in many cases the agreement among

different versions can be an independent adaptation of MT text in different

translations. E.g., where MT reads "the inhabitant of Jerusalem," 1QIsa^a=P=LXX

reads "the inhabitants of Jerusalem," which is much more natural to our intuition.

Such a coincidence can be reached independently without a common *Vorlage*.

4.1.1) Number of verbs (including participles)

M יחלף [Q=P=LXX=V יחלופו 2:18

M יכל [Q=P=V יכלו 7:2

M=T עברו [Q=P=LXX עבר 10:29

M והיה [Q=P=LXX והיו 13:14

M תמו [Q=P=LXX תם 16:5

M ירנן [Q=P=LXX ירננו 16:10

M שבר [Q=P=T=LXX=V שברו 21:9

M אמלל [Q=P אמללו 24:4

M לחש [Q=P לחשו 26:16

M ונתן [Q=P ונתנו 29:12

M תבכה [Q=P תבכו 30:19

M יקרא [Q=P יקראו 32:5

M הנמצאה [P=Q הנמצאים 37:4

M ויבוא [P=Q ויבואו 41:25

M ישאו [T=LXX=P=Q ישא 42:11

M יצאו [P=Q יצאה 48:3

M נגרש ... יוכל [P=Q נגרשו ... יוכלו 57:20

M תקרא [T=LXX=P=Q תקראו 58:5

Significantly, the Hebrew in the Second Temple period and after tends to use the third person plural to substitute an impersonal passive form.[79] For this reason, e.g., out of seven cases of יקרא in the Nifal form in M-Isaiah, six are replaced with a third person plural impersonal active form. Though the plural readings are secondary, for our research purposes the coincidences will be recorded. The Syriac language does not seem to have this tendency, at least according to P-Isaiah. In many cases, it trimmed the apparent inconsistency of MT as 1QIsa[a] did (e.g., 10:29; 24:4), which gives the coincidences less philological value.

4.1.2) Person of verbs

M (Inf.) הסר [P=LXX=Q אסיר 5:5

---

[79] Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, 401ff.

M ‏[ואעידה Q=P=LXX] והעד‎ 8:2

M=T=V ‏ואמר [Q=P ואמרת‎ 25:9

M ‏הקציו ורננו [Q=P=LXX] יקיצו וירננו‎ 26:19

(piel) M ‏יסד [Q=P (participle)] מיסד‎ 28:16

4.2)   Tense and voice of verbs

M=LXX=V ‏מלֹאה [Q=P=T] תמלאה‎ 11:9

M ‏היתה [Q=P] תהיה‎ 14:24

M ‏הרגיו [Q=P] הורגיו‎ 27:7

M ‏יאמר [Q=P] אמר‎ 32:10

M ‏לבזה [Q=P=T] לבזוי‎ 49:7

M ‏וידוע [Q=P=T (in participle active)] ויודע‎ 53:3

M ‏ויסדתיך [Q=P=T (noun)] ויסודותיך‎ 54:11

M ‏יכירנו [Q=P=LXX] הכירנו‎ 63:16

M=LXX ‏ירש [Q=P] ירשו‎ 63:18

There is one difficulty due to the interchangeability between י and ו in 1QIsaᵃ, about which debates have taken place that have yet to reach a definite conclusion.[80] Since the interchanges between the two letters are not consistent, it is often impossible to tell the difference between, for instance, וחצה (1QIsaᵃ) and יחצה (MT) in 30:28. Due to the high uncertainty of the interchanging between the two alphabets, all cases entangled with this interchangeability issue will be left out.

5) Different words or phrases

3:11 ישוב Q=P] יעשה M; συμβήσεται LXX

5:24 ואש לוהבת Q=P (vid.); καὶ συγκαυθήσεται ὑπὸ φλογὸς LXX] וחשש להבה M

9:18 נתעם (from תעה?) Q, cf. conturbata V = זעת P] נעתם M

11:4 לעניי Q=P cf. πτωχους σ'] לענוי M=LXX

14:4 מדהבה Q=P=LXX=T] מרהבה

14:11 המות Q=P] המית M=LXX (vid.)

15:1 עיר Q=P=LXX (vid.)] ער M

21:8 הראה Q=P] אריה M=LXX=V

24:6 וישמו Q=Pᵐˢ(7a1)=T] ויאשמו M=P (other manuscripts)=LXX=V

---

[80] Millar T. Burrows, "Waw and Yodh in the Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll (DSIa)," *BASOR* 124 (1951): 18.

27:2 חומר [Q=P=Mᵐˢˢ חמד Mᴸ=LXX

29:5 זריך [זדיך Q, דיושיכי P, τῶν ἀσεβῶν LXX

32:6 חושב [Q=P=LXX=T יעשה M

41:20 ויבינו [Q=P, ἐννοηθῶσιν LXX וישימו M

41:29 אין [Q=P=LXX=T און MT (to be sure, און can also mean "nothingness," yet

אין is a much more obvious reading for this meaning)

44:16 וטויו בסרא על גומרוהי ואכלו וסבעו ואף שחיו [Q, וחציו בשר ויאכל ועל גחליו ישב ויחם

P] על חציו בשר יאכל יצלה צלי וישבע אף יחם M. Though 1QIsaᵃ does not reflect a direct

Vorlage of P, it does retain the important element, "on his coals," that is also reflected

in P.

45:8 הריעו to shout or to blow the horn, אתבסמו [P, εὐφρανθήτω LXX] הרעיפו M

49:24 עריץ [Q=P=LXX=T=V צדיק M

50:6 למרטים [M לשוקפא Q, לשוקפא P, εἰς ῥαπίσματα LXX] למטלים Q,

50:6 הסירותי [Q=P=LXX=V הסתרתי M=T

Under this category, only those cases in which substantially different words or

phrases are witnessed by P and 1QIsaᵃ against MT are recorded. In many cases, P

reading is quite valuable, e.g., in the famous and highly debatable verse about the

"lion on the watchtower" according to 21:8 of MT, P serves as the only ancient

version that supports the 1QIsaᵃ reading, which makes perfect sense as against the "lion" reading.[81]

6) Different word orders

36:12 אליכמה ועל אדוניכמה Q=P (not only the word order, but also the numbers of the suffixes are identical)] העל אדניך ואליך M

37:1 הוזקיה המלך Q=P] המלך הזקיהו M

43:3 מצרים כופרך Q=P] כפרך מצרים M

49:25 לקוח ... ושובי Q=P] שבי ... ומלקוח M

60:7 לרצון על Q=P=T, δεκτὰ ἐπὶ] על רצון M

62:8 עוד דגנך מאכל Q=P] את דגנך עד מאכל M=V

7) omissions or additions of suffixes, words, or phrases.

7:23 ההוא Q=P=LXX] +יהיה M

8:9 התאזרו וחותו Q=P] התאזרו וחתו התאזרו וחתו M

[81] Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 2. Isaie, Jeremie, Lamentations* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1986), 154f., where he traces the correct suggestion for the "watcher" variant back to Lowth and Michaelis. See also related discussions in: Donald W. Parry, *Exploring the Isaiah Scrolls and Their Textual Variants*, Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 3 (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2020).

13:22 ענוגו Q=P (notice though P has a plural suffix, it already renders ‑ו into a

plural one in the previous half verse)] ענג M

14:18 גואים Q=P=LXX] גוים כלם M

22:14 יכפר לכם Q=P=LXX (vid.)] יכפר [MT

26:5 ישפילנה Q=P=LXX] + ישפילה M

26:6 רגלי Q=P=LXX] רגל רגלי M

26:8 קוינו Q=P=LXX=T] קוינוך M

36:9 מעבדי Q=P=T] עבדי M

38:11 יה Q=P] יה יה [MT

39:6 בבל יבואו Q=P=LXX] בבל M

40:12 בזרתו Q=P] בזרת M

40:26 כוחו Q=P] כוח M

42:3 יכבנה Q=P=LXX=T] יכבה M

42:21 וישדרהה Q=P] וישדיר M

43:9 ישמיעו Q=P] ישמיענו M

44:6 צבאות שמו Q=P] צבאות M=LXX=T=V

44:13 נטהו קו Q, ומשחה P] נטה קו M

44:20 שקר Q=P=LXX] הלוא שקר M

46:6 ויעשה Q=P=LXX] ויעשהו M

48:17 אשר תלך בה Q=P=LXX] תלך M

66

52:6 ביום Q=P=LXX] לכן ביום M=T

54:8 ובחסדי Q=P] ובחסד M

58:6 הצום אשר Q=P=T] הצום M

63:11 המעלם Q=P=LXXX] המעלה M

63:16 הואה Q=P] > M=LXX

64:1 לצריכה Q=P=LXX] >M

65:1 שאלו Q=P=LXX=T] שאלוני M

Some omissions are habitual or idiomatic. For instance, when the three words אדני

יהוה צבאות are put together, it is normally translated as מריא חילתנא (10:23, 24; 22:14,

15; 28:22, etc.), as in LXX-Isaiah, where אדני יהוה are contracted into one word.

These cases are left out in this section.

2.4   Final Conclusion and Discussion

As we mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, our task is not to search for the

original or superior reading. An example is in 32:6, where the heart of a fool "does

(יעשה) wickedness" according to MT. The 1QIsaᵃ has a more reasonable verb

"conceive" (חושב)=P, which, however, might be only a secondary endeavor to

improve the understandability of the original reading and should be refused by a

67

textual critic.[82] Yet, the direction of variation does not lie in the focus of our

research. Our main concern is to determine the possible *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah. For that

purpose, the probable secondary reading, since it found wide acceptance among many

ancient versions, such as LXX, T, and P, is of great importance to us. Based on the

witnesses of the ancient versions, we have full reason to presuppose a *Vorlage* with

the reading "חושב," with the awareness that this might be secondary or later than

יעשה.

One must not forget that the room the ancient Hebrew versions left us is far more

limited than many other biblical books, as Tov states:

> Any comparative analysis of the Isaiah texts is based on the fact that the amount
>
> of variation between the texts is relatively limited. The known textual data for
>
> Isaiah point to a picture of textual unity, more than in the Torah and much more
>
> than in the other two comparable books of the Prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel.[83]

Thus all our comparison work took place within a small number of variation points

between the texts. Even so, we have already achieved quite impressive results.

---

[82] Orlinsky, *Studies,* 152ff; Rosenbloom, *Isaiah Scroll*, XXXII.
[83] Tov, *Hebrew Bible*, 53.

In the first part of this chapter, it was statistically confirmed that, with the help of 1QIsaᵃ, the *Vorlage* of P has a different style in distributing conjunctions. In the second part, this *Vorlage* was shown to have additional idiosyncrasies shared by 1QIsaᵃ and other ancient versions. This *Vorlage* is still within the domain of the proto-Masoretic family. However, through statistical as well as descriptive-analytical methods, we can determine that P and 1QIsaᵃ often aligned as a group with each other, and we can statistically depict the extent of this alignment. As we see in the section about the additional prepositions, the readings in P can serve as an effective indicator for differentiating the "true" variations of 1QIsaᵃ, which are inherited from the tradition behind its *Vorlage*, from its spontaneous variations, which are more probably attributed to the individual scribes for the scroll.

Another practical benefit of this investigation is that, during the following analyses, we should be aware that MT cannot be assumed to be the exact *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah. Let's take 32:6 again as an example: When we take the MT reading, "the heart of a fool does wickedness," as the *Vorlage* of the P reading, "the heart of a fool conceives wickedness," one might plausibly attribute this to a kind of translation technique at this point. However, it is not the case, since the latter reading should already have existed in the *Vorlage* of P as supported by 1QIsaᵃ. This research does help excavate

many possible variants in the *Vorlage* of P, which will be very beneficial for laying a

solid foundation for understanding the *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah and for further research

into the translating activities of P-Isaiah.

3   THE DEPENDENCE OF P-ISAIAH ON LXX

As reviewed in the introductory chapter, the parallels between P and LXX have long been noticed and variously investigated. P- Isaiah is one of the Peshitta books whose influence from LXX is obvious. Already in his St. Margaret's lecture about P in 1904, Burkitt pronounced that "I do not forget that the influence of the Greek Bible, especially in Isaiah, often makes itself felt,"[84] though his emphasis on LXX's influence on P-Isaiah must be qualified.[85] Various research endeavors have been dedicated to different biblical books concerning the influence of LXX, and attempts, most notably by Barnes and by Weitzman, have been made to synthesize the general relationship between the two.[86] The general proposal concerning the utilization of LXX in P by Weitzman reads:

"The influence of LXX, as noted above, is far from systematic. There is no difficulty, however, in supposing that P's translators made sporadic use of LXX, alongside a Hebrew text as their main source."[87]

---

[84] Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, 71.
[85] Barnes, "Influence"; Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 68f.
[86] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 3.I., especially at 68f., where he lists much previous scholarship.
[87] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 78f.

These comments, as we will see, should also be applicable to P-Isaiah. Before

reaching this conclusion, we will go through three steps: i) We will formulate our

methodological criteria according to which proper judgments can be made about a P

variant, specifically whether it is related to LXX or it merely agrees with LXX due to

mere coincidence or a common *Vorlage*; ii) we will then analyze all of the dependent

cases and come to a conclusion in each case about how P is related to LXX. iii)

finally, we will reach a conclusion about how LXX was used, that is, under which

circumstances was LXX consulted? Was it used merely as a lexical reference or as a

more substantial source for translation? Did different sections of P-Isaiah have

different ways of using LXX, as it occurs among different P books? The conclusion

to be reached will point to the possibility that P-Isaiah is not a homogenous work, but

a work of different translators.

3.1   Methodological Comments

The parallels between P-Isaiah and LXX are first listed as part of two dissertations in

the 1890s,[88] of which that of Weisz is more complete than that of Warszawski. Both

works, though especially Warszawski, try to provide a neutral description of the

deviants of P from MT in agreement with LXX, with no further comment or

---

[88] Warszawski, "Peschitta"; Weisz, "Deuterojesaia."

judgement on them. Whether those coincidences are attributed to direct reference or

polygenesis, remains open. For instance, in 1:31, there is an agreement between P and

LXX at the extra suffix possessive pronoun "their" against MT which is registered by

Warszawski. This coincidence, however, does not demand any consultation of LXX

due to P's habitual practice of changing possessive suffixes freely. Years later,

Diettrich's apparatus added some unnoticed P=LXX variants, however, again the

apparatus itself does not provide any analysis.[89] During the past century, sporadic

researches, especially those of Barnes, Delekat, van der Kooij and Bodor, have

constantly revisited some P=LXX cases in due depth, but none of them have tried to

exhaust all cases. Admittedly, no one could proclaim to have done that due to the

practical difficulty in telling the true dependence from mere coincidence.

Concerning the difficulty in deciding which agreements should stay in the register of

"real dependence," various methodological reflections have been made by scholars.

H. MT. Szpek, for instance, in his dealing with P-Job, phrased the question this way:

"Can we justify similar departures from MT in P and LXX as the result of anything

but LXX's influence on the Peshitta?"[90] Szpek's answer can be synthesized as

---

[89] G. Diettrich, *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pesitto zum Propheten Jesaia*, Beihefte
zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 8 (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann,
1905).
[90] Heidi M. Szpek, "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta," *CBQ* 60.2
(1998): 252.

follows: Only those i) exclusive agreements between P and LXX, which are ii)

neither explainable through some translation technique of P (in case of conscious

polygenesis), iii) nor insignificant or trivial (in case of unconscious polygenesis), can

be retained in the pool.[91]

This sounds quite natural, but the real work of comparison cannot proceed with

mathematical accuracy, and the scheme of a black-white dichotomy is never

attainable. The problem lies rather in the different grades and different ways in which

the P relies on LXX. Attila Bodor, in his newly published article *the Reception of the*

Septuagint in the Peshitta of Isaiah, has made significant progress in this direction.

He categorizes three layers of LXX influence: literal, free adoption, and theological

modification.[92] The first class of influence, the literal reception, is the most common

and definable way that the P-translator uses LXX. When the original text is hard to

understand, LXX is referred to as lexicographical and synthetical assistance, and thus

the variants are imported from LXX into P text through a direct translation. The

second class, called by Bodor the "reception of LXX interpretation," is delineated in

---

[91] Another very practical, but not necessary argument which Szpek made is worth being mentioned here: When the immediate environment does not continue the "parallel", this may be further evidence suggesting that a congruent reading, in particular an insignificant one, is not the result of versional influence. That means, the effective traces of LXX influence often come together in close proximity.

[92] Attila Bodor, "The Reception of the Septuagint in the Peshitta of Isaiah," *VT* 69.1 (2019): 19–32.

this way: These variants are not directly borrowed from LXX, but any variant of this class "derives from the imitation of LXX translation."[93] It is, therefore, necessary to show that the P variant in question can be most probably developed from corresponding LXX variants rather than from somewhere else. The greatest difficulty in identifying variants in this category is that, since the P variant in question is not exactly the same as LXX, it should betray both slight difference and enough affinity with LXX so that the provenance of the P variant can best be explained by the latter. In other words, the P variant should be similar to, but not identical with, LXX variant in comparison to other versions, including MT. The criteria for filtering such cases are, in practical terms, highly precarious. The example Bodor gives is from Isa 2:6, which, as we will see, is quite debatable:

MT	LXX-P
ובילדי נכרים <u>ישפיקו</u> and with the children of foreigners *clap hands*	καὶ τέκνα <u>πολλὰ</u> ἀλλόφυλα <u>ἐγενήθη</u> αὐτοῖς and many foreign children were born to them
	וסוגאא דבניא נוכריא רביו and *they have brought up many* foreign children

---

Bodor suggests that, while the verb שפק has two meanings, "to suffice" and "to clap," LXX takes the earlier one, and adapts this meaning into "πολλὰ … ἐγενήθη" "many were born." In this case, the translator used two Greek words together to render the meaning "to suffice" of this single Hebrew word: The adjective πολλὰ takes charge of the meaning of "multiplication" while the verb ἐγενήθη serves merely an auxiliary function. The P-translator, in turn, did a translation with two words "סוגאא ... רביו" in accord to the Greek translation. According to Bodor, if P could be a direct and exact translation of the given Hebrew text, it should have been " ודבניא נוכריא רביו"; thus, the Syriac translation can very probably be a modified translation from LXX.[94]

As reasonable as it may seem, the coincidence could be easily explained away by a common Hebrew *Vorlage* "ורב ילדי נכרים ישפיקו," which is only different from MT by one letter. Given that the Masoretic text at this point is very difficult,[95] our P variant, together with that of LXX, might just go back to the same *Vorlage* that is different from the Masoretic text. In fact, the probability of a common *Vorlage* "ורב ילדי" instead of "ובילדי" seems to be no less than that of Bodor's suggestion of dependence on LXX.

---

[94] Bodor, "Reception," 29f.
[95] See H. G. M. Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC): A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (London: Bloomsbury, 2006), 194f.

I think this example fully reveals the difficulty of determining whether or not a case

belongs to the class of P's "free adoption" from LXX. Since the P version is not

identical with LXX against MT under this class, we can never determine for sure that

the causal chain between P and LXX is significantly shorter than between P and any

other possible *Vorlage*, especially when the "length" of the causal chain is very

subjective.

The third class, "reception of the LXX theology," is of great value. Bodor attempts to

establish the reception of LXX by revealing a Messianic tradition behind the LXX

verb ἀνατέλλω and the Syriac verb דנח. He bases his assertion on the usage of both

words for translation in other Messianic passages (Num 24:17, Zechariah 3:8; 6:12),

though the only effective support might be Num 24:17, since the Greek and Syriac

versions of Zechariah may be dependent on the respective versions of Isaiah.[96] The

idea that there is a Messianic tradition at play here according to which the root צמח

(sprout) should be translated into ἀνατέλλω=דנח (to rise up) is illuminating. It shows

the possibility that the influence on translation from another version occurrs not only

at a word-to-word level but also in some indirect but more systematic way, such as

---

[96] Greenberg discussed the issue concerning the influence of Isaiah upon other
prophetic books in: Greenberg, *Jeremiah*, 191ff.

through some systematic theological setting or tradition. This idea will be deeply

important in the next chapter about the relationship between P-Isaiah and P-NT.

The third class of theological influence under Bodor's taxonomy is related to another

problematic situation this research will face: The investigation into individual cases is

often stuck between two different—even contradictory—perspectives, the technical-

philological one and the literary-theological one. The first perspective is purely

technical, which raises questions about the likelihood that the translator of P

consulted and borrowed from LXX, and the second one asks about the (theological)

relevance of the variation in question. These two perspectives often generate results

that contradict each other. For instance, in the famous verse 7:14, where the virgin

birth seems to be supported by P, technical consideration points to the dependence of

P upon LXX wording, but theological consideration seems to contradict that, since a

loyal translator would have no difficulty finding the cognate of עלמה and a factual

reference to LXX is not a necessary factor for the translator to choose בתולתא over

עלמתא. However, people are more interested in theology-laden points, so one must

remember that the more theologically sensitive a passage is, the more theological

theories and interpretations could influence the text, which renders a direct yes-no

question concerning the technical-factual reliance upon LXX less relevant. In 7:14, it

is almost impossible for any contemporary translator to ignore its theological

consequence, be the translator Jewish or Christian. The theological significance of

this verse is such that that the pure technical judgment, from the perspective of

translation technique, seems secondary. When the theological motivation overrides a

normal translation process, it is incomplete to answer whether a variant in P is

directly taken from somewhere in LXX or not; rather, one should dive into the

tradition from which the variant is derived. With this difficulty in mind, in the second

part of this chapter, a detailed analysis will be provided of all passages which betray

all possible influence of LXX on P.

3.2   Analysis

1:22

MT	LXX-P
כספך היה לסיגים סבאך מהול במים Your silver has become dross, Your drink diluted with water.	τὸ ἀργύριον ὑμῶν ἀδόκιμον οἱ κάπηλοί σου μίσγουσι τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι Your silver is rejected, your sellers mix the wine with water.
	כספכי אסתלי חנוייכי חלטין מיא Your silver was rejected, your innkeepers mix water.

LXX translates the word לסיגים into ἀδόκιμον, "rejected." The Septuaginta Deutsch points to LXX-Prov 25:4, which has the same translation, without explaining this LXX tradition.[97] The meaning of "turning down" might be derived from the root סוג, "to retreat, to draw back." In any case, P has the same translation, "rejected." The fact that the P-translator seems to be unaware of the noun סיג "dross," for in 1:25 he also fails to recognize the same word and employed a different meaning other than "reject, turn back," adds to the possibility that he depended on LXX at this point.

In addition, there is another agreement between the LXX words κάπηλοί σου, "your sellers (of wine)," and the P word חנוייכי, "your innkeepers," in the second half of the verse, so it is almost certain that the P-translator turned to LXX for this verse.

1:25

MT	LXX-P
ואצרף כבר סיגיך ואסירה	καὶ πυρώσω σε εἰς καθαρόν τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀπολέσω
כל־בדיליך	καὶ ἀφελῶ πάντας ἀνόμους ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ πάντας

---

[97] Martin Karrer et al., eds., *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament. Bd. 2: Psalmen bis Daniel* (Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelges, 2011), 2508.

and I will smelt away your dross as lye and will remove all your dross.	ὑπερηφάνους ταπεινώσω and I will purge you into cleanness, and I will destroy the rebellious and will take away from you all lawless, and all arrogant I will humble.
	ואצרוף מרודיכי לדכיו ואעבר עוליכי כלהון and I will purge the rebellious into cleanness and will take away all your wicked.

The Targum has a similar reading, "and I will scour away all the wicked, as cleansed with lye, and take away all your sin," which reads סיג and בדיל in its metaphorical sense. However, it is more probable that P directly borrowed the following three elements from the expanded rendering of LXX: כבר is translated into εἰς καθαρόν, "into cleanness," though lye is also used for purifying (cf. Job 9:30); the noun סיג, not recognizable both to LXX and P as shown in the previous case, is translated into ἀπειθοῦντας, "rebellious," which is again probably derived from the root סוג, "to retreat, to draw back";[98] בדיל, "dross," is translated into more concrete ἀνόμους, "lawless, wicked," i.e., the target domain of the metaphor.

---

[98] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2509. Also Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, ed., *The Book of Isaiah*, The Hebrew University Bible Project (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1995), 5.

1:26

MT	LXX-P
ואשיבה שפטיך	καὶ ἐπιστήσω τοὺς κριτάς σου
and I will restore your judges	and I will establish your judges
	ואקים דיניכי
	and I will establish your judges

This similarity looks trivial. Yet, taking its proximity to the last verse in which the dependence took place, this parallel can also be considered seriously: It is imaginable that the translator might have read more verses for context when referring to LXX.

2:6* (the asterisk here, as well as in the following cases, signifies that the relevant case shows a *less certain* yet *possible* dependence of P on LXX).

MT	LXX-P
ובילדי נכרים ישפיקו	καὶ τέκνα πολλὰ ἀλλόφυλα ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς
and with the children	and many foreign children were born to them
of foreigners *they*	וסוגאא דבניא נוכריא רביו

clap hands	and *they have brought up many* foreign children

As cited above, Bodor suggests that P version retained some LXX elements ("many")

while the verb seems to be derived from MT (instead of LXX "were born," it has

"bring up").[99] As discussed above, a dependence of P upon LXX is not necessary

since there is a better solution to suggest a common *Vorlage* of both LXX and P: " ורב

ילדי נכרים ישפיקו."

2:20

MT	LXX-P
להשתחות לחפר פרות ולעטלפים To bow to the *hapar parat* and to the bats.	προσκυνεῖν τοῖς ματαίοις καὶ ταῖς νυκτερίσιν to worship vanities and the bats.
	למסגד לסריקותא ולפרחדודא to worship vanity and the bats.

The abstruse words *hapar parat* seem to be difficult for all ancient versions. While

the Targum also made some moralized interpretation of the "חפר פרות" as "errors," P

aligns itself with LXX in translating the word(s) as "vanity." The original Hebrew

---

[99] Bodor, "Reception," 29f.

meaning is difficult to guess, thus the words are either dismissed as meaningless,[100]

or understood as a mistakenly split into two; under the latter circumstance, the

original form חפרפרות or the form in 1QIsa^a חפרפרים (which rhymes better with

עטלפים) is a reduplicated form of חפר meaning "dig."[101] Whatever living animal it

may point to in Hebrew, the meaning "vanity" is a relatively vague guess. The

dependence between P and LXX is thus quite probable.

3:5

MT	LXX-P
ונגש העם And the people will be oppressed	καὶ συμπεσεῖται ὁ λαός and the people will fall
	ונפל עמא And the people will fall

[100] E.g., Hans Wildberger, *Jesaja 28-39 (BK)*, Biblischer Kommentar X/3
(Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978), 95.
[101] Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 203.

The MT word נגש "to oppress," is translated into the result of it συμπίπτω, "to fall,"

probably influenced by verse 8 where the verb נפל appeared in MT.[102] The

agreement of P with LXX against all other versions is salient.

3:17

MT	LXX-P
ושפח אדני קדקד בנות ציון and the Lord will afflict with scabs the heads of the daughters of Zion	καὶ <u>ταπεινώσει</u> ὁ θεὸς ἀρχούσας θυγατέρας Σιων and the Lord <u>will humble</u> the chief daughters of Zion
	נמכך מריא רשיתא דבנת the Lord will <u>lay low</u> the heads of the daughters of Zion,

Due to the rarity of the word שפח "to make scabby," the Targum also has a deviating

translation שעבד "to enslave or to subjugate." LXX=P has a more physical rendering,

"to humble, to lower." Williamson suggests that P and T are "only further

extensions" based on the common word in MT.[103] The targumic element of

"enslavement" can be derived from the similar word שפחה (maiden), while LXX=P-

[102] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2512.
[103] Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 276.

translation ("to humble, to lower") fits the context better, since the bodily "head"

should be, semantically, lowered or humbled rather than enslaved.[104] Whatever

reason it might be, the exact coincidence between LXX=P is significant.

3:17

MT	LXX-P
ויהוה פתהן יערה and the Lord lay bare <u>their</u> <u>forehead</u>.	καὶ κύριος ἀποκαλύψει <u>τὸ σχῆμα αὐτῶν</u> and the Lord will expose <u>their form</u>.
	ומריא <u>אסכמהין</u> נפרסא and the Lord will expose <u>their form</u>.

The Hebrew word פתהן is rare and mostly taken to be denoting the pudenda.[105] This

euphemistic function of the Hebrew word "forehead" does not function in the same

way in Greek, which leads to the translation with a different word, σχῆμα, "form."

The translation of P must be taken directly from LXX, especially because P uses a

Greek loanword אסכמא, which is identical with LXX.

---

[104] Williamson suggests שפל or שחח as the bridge from the word שפה to the
meaning of physical lowness.

[105] Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 276. Ludwig Köhler, *Hebräisches und
aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1967ff.), 924.

3:18

MT	LXX-P
תפארת העכסים והשביסים והשהרנים the glory of anklets, headbands, crescents	τὴν <u>δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν</u> καὶ <u>τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν</u> καὶ τὰ ἐμπλόκια καὶ τοὺς κοσύμβους καὶ τοὺς μηνίσκους the glory of their garments, their ornaments and the plaits and the fringes and the crescents
	שׁובחא דנחתיהין ו<u>דצבתהין</u> ודגדוליהין the glory of their garments, their ornaments, and their plaits.

Here is a great example that P modified LXX text according to the form of MT. The

LXX text is, if the MT text could be its *Vorlage*, a free rendering: While the MT

verse has three items, the corresponding LXX translation has five related items, only

some of which are explainable from MT.[106] The P-translation is an abbreviated

---

[106] For instance, there seems to be a double translation of תפארת "glory" or "ornament" through δόξαν "glory" (with an additional genitive qualification) and κόσμους "ornaments." See also Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2514; Arie van der Kooij, "Schwerpunkte der Septuaginta-Lexikographie," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der griechischen Bibel, Bd. 2*, ed. S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch, BWANT 161 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 119–32.

version of LXX: It retains the first three items of LXX, while deleting the final two, though the three items retained do not correspond to the MT items. It is very interesting to notice this formal consistency with MT: The translator intended to stay as close as possible to MT, at least formally, though he was not sure whether the content of the LXX translation was an accurate rendition of the original MT.

3:20

MT	LXX-P
והצעדות and the anklets…	τὸν κόσμον τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν (verse 19) the ornaments of their faces
	וצבתא דאפיהין and the ornaments of their faces.

Failing to understand the abstruse Hebrew word צעדות,[107] the P-translator turned to LXX. This time, however, he jumped to a wrong place, i.e., verse 19 of LXX, which in turn is not a faithful translation of MT, and picked up the item "the decorations of their faces" from v. 19 of LXX.

---

[107] Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 280.

However, we should recognize that in verses 18-20, P generally keeps the identical

amount of the items as appears in MT.

3:23

MT	LXX-P
והגלינים והסדינים והצניפות והרדידים hand mirrors, undergarments, turbans, and veils	καὶ τὰ βύσσινα καὶ τὰ ὑακίνθινα καὶ τὰ κόκκινα καὶ τὴν βύσσον σὺν χρυσίῳ καὶ ὑακίνθῳ συγκαθυφασμένα καὶ θέριστρα κατάκλιτα and those (garments) made of fine linen, and the violet and the scarlet (garments) and the fine linen, interwoven with gold and purple, and the light coverings for couches.
	ונחתיהין ותכליתהין וזחוריתהין וצמדא כלה דצבתהין their coats, their violet and their scarlet (garments), and wrappers, all ornaments.

The P-translation is the result of the combination of several translation techniques:

The first item, "their coats," may, as Warszawski suggests, come from the faulty

association of the Hebrew word "גליון" directly into the Syriac word "גלא" (coat). [108]

---

[108] Warszawski, "Peschitta," 15.

The second and the third item, "their violet and their scarlet garments," are taken

from the counterpart of LXX. This, unfortunately, is not an exact translation of MT,

but supposedly taken from other legal regulation like Ex 26:31 or Ex 28:5 in which

"purple," "scarlet" and "fine linen" also come up simultaneously.[109] Only the fourth

element, "wrappers," is a legitimate translation from MT "veils." Finally, P put an

additional explanation, "all ornaments," at the end of the four items, which seems to

be a synthesis of the above-mentioned items. The logic at work here is rather

interesting: MT has four items, of which the P-translator supposes himself to know

the first and fourth one. For the second and third one, since the translator was not

certain about the meaning, he adopted them from LXX. The additional explanation

"all ornaments" can be understood as a generalization of his understanding or as a

compensatory comment, out of uncertainty, for any possible missing or wrongly

translated elements in his patchwork.[110]

4:2

MT	LXX-P

[109] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2514; Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias,* Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12 (Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934), 207.
[110] This kind of translation with a more general comment is also present in LXX 3:19f., where the original Hebrew items need to be upgraded for better understanding, see also the discussion in Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 203.

יהיה צמח יהוה	ἐπιλάμψει ὁ θεὸς
it will be the sprout of the Lord	God will shine.
	נהוא דנחה דמריא
	it will be the shining/rising of the Lord

As Bodor discusses in his article, there is a translational tradition in LXX whereby

the root צמח is translated into the verb ἐπιλάμπω. According to him, the translational

tradition in P that renders the same root into דנחה is adapted from LXX as a

whole.[111]

4:5

MT	LXX-P
ועל־מקראה	καὶ πάντα τὰ περικύκλῳ αὐτῆς
and upon its convocation	all the region around it
	על חדריה
	on its surroundings

---

[111] Bodor, "Reception," 28.

The LXX reading understands מקראה as derived from קרא, "to encounter" rather

than "to call" under the same root. Under this perspective, it is easy to understand

מקראה as a participle, "that, which lies next to it (Zion)."[112] This erratic reading is

inherited by P.

The Targum also has a locative reading (על אתר בית שכינתא), which is, however, very

influenced by targumic theology and, thus, remote from that of LXX. The suggestion

of HUB that LXX and P read a "קריה" in their *Vorlage* is not sustained, since קריה,

especially in the book of Isaiah, unanimously means "city" (1:21; 26; 22:2; 24:10;

25:2f; 26:5; 29:1; 32:13; 33:20) and is always translated with Syriac מדינתא or

קריתא.

5:1*

MT	LXX-P
בקרן בן־שמן on a hill which belongs to the class of being fertile	ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι on a hill, in a fertile place
	בקרנא דאתרא שמינא on a hill which is a fertile place

---

[112] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2515.

The dependence of P upon LXX is not certain, since it is easy to substitute the

Hebrew expression בך־ "belong to the class of…" with the word "place" in this

context. It could have been reached independently by both LXX and P. Therefore,

this case is marked with an asterisk to signify its uncertainty.

5:2

MT	LXX-P
ויעזקהו ויסקלהו and dug and removed the stone	καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα and I made a partition round it, and fenced it
	ופלחה ואחדרה סיגא and he worked on it and made a fence round it.

LXX fails to recognize the first two verbs of the verse, of which עזק is a *hapax*

legomenon; thus, the meanings are deduced according to v.5,[113] in which the "fence"

and "wall" are going to be removed.[114] This translation, however, is slightly

redundant if read apart from v.5, "and I made a fence round it, and fenced it." That

---

[113] Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 318f.
[114] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2516.

might be the reason that P, dependent on LXX, chose to slightly generalize the first

verb due to the redundancy. In one word, LXX stands closer to MT than P in the

same dimension: P inherited the image of fencing a vineyard and generalized one

verb due to the redundancy of LXX translation.

5:3

MT	LXX-P
ועתה יושב ירושלם ואיש יהודה and now dwellers of Jerusalem and men of Judah	καὶ νῦν ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ιουδα καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν Ιερουσαλημ and now men of Judah and dwellers of Jerusalem
	השא גברא דיהודא ועמוריה דאורשלם now men of Judah and dwellers of Jerusalem

The order of LXX=P for the two peoples in the vocative is different from MT.

Though this coincidence is somewhat trivial, due to the systematic dependencies

taking place in its context, it can be also considered as a possible example of

unconscious dependence.

5:7

MT	LXX-P
נטע שעשועיו the plant of his delights.	νεόφυτον ἠγαπημένον (Isa. 5:7 BGT) newly planted, beloved (plant).
	נצבתא חדתא וחביבתא the new and beloved plant.

The Hebrew word שעשעים is by no means a common one, so it is not hard to imagine that the P-translator might have difficulty in rendering this word, which could be the prompt for turning to LXX. The additional LXX sense of "newly planted," whatever its origin,[115] is inherited by P.

5:9*

MT	LXX-P
באזני יהוה צבאות in the ears of the Lord of hosts	<u>ἠκούσθη</u> γὰρ εἰς τὰ ὦτα κυρίου σαβαωθ for <u>it was heard</u> in the ears of the Lord of hosts
	באדני מריא חילתנא <u>אשתמע</u> <u>it was heard</u> in the ears of the Lord of hosts

The Hebrew text, especially as preserved by MT in which a *qamatz* is noted under the

noun in באזני (=22:14), requires an emendation of the Hebrew text due to the lack of

a verb, and there are a variety of possible ways to do so.[116] T follows a slightly

different path, "the prophet said in my ears, (which) I have heard," while LXX and P

agree with each other in the additional verb "in the ears of the Lord of hosts it was

heard." Williamson proposed a variation from נשבע (implied by the following אם־

לא) to נשמע (as witnessed by P and LXX), of which the latter finally disappeared

during the later copying process.[117] However, without any existent evidence like

from 1QIsaᵃ, this long chain of variation is too fragile to sustain.

5:13

MT	LXX-P
וכבודו מתי רעב והמונו צחה צמא	καὶ <u>πλῆθος ἐγενήθη</u> νεκρῶν <u>διὰ</u> λιμὸν καὶ δίψαν ὕδατος
and their honorable men are (in) hunger, and their multitude is parched (with) thirst	and there came to be a multitude of dead bodies, because of hunger and of thirst for water.

---

[116] Barthélemy, *Critique*, 33f.
[117] Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 347f.

	וסגיו מיתיהון <u>מן</u> כפנא ועשנו <u>מן</u> צהיא
	their dead from hunger have multiplied, from thirst they have become strong

The original meaning of the Hebrew verse, as Williamson, Blenkinsopp and Beuken suggest, differs from the LXX reading, since the latter may have conflated כבוד and המון in πλῆθος, and understood מתי as "dead bodies." This specific reading, in contrast to other ancient versions (V=T), is identical with P. This is idiosyncratic for P, which always translates the root כבד in a verb using one of three Syriac roots: יקר (3:5; 6:10; 23:8; 29:13 etc.), עשׁן (8:23; 24:20; 32:2 etc.) or שבח (24:15; 25:3; 30:27 etc.), yet never through סגי. Besides, P, like LXX, supplements a preposition מן before "hunger" and "thirst" to specify them as the reason for death. Considering the difficulty of MT, it is very probable that P inherits these elements from LXX.

5:14

MT	LXX-P
וירד הדרה והמונה ושאונה ועלז בה and <u>her multitude</u> will go	καὶ καταβήσονται οἱ ἔνδοξοι καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ λοιμοὶ αὐτῆς and <u>her honored, great, rich and the pestilent</u> will

down, <u>her crowd and all</u> <u>exultant in her</u>	go down.
	נחתון לֹה משבחא ומיקרא ועשׂינא And the <u>honored and great and strong</u> will go down to it.

LXX translator renders the abstract Hebrew concepts into concrete persons in LXX.[118] Again, P aligns with LXX and takes over the concrete translation of the latter.

5:18

MT	LXX-P
הוי משכי העון <u>בַחבלי השוא</u> woe to those who draw iniquity with the cords of falsehood	οὐαὶ οἱ ἐπισπώμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας <u>ὡς σχοινίῳ</u> <u>μακρῷ</u> woe to those who draw sins as with a long rope
	וי לדמורכין חטהיהון <u>איך חבלא אריכא</u> woe to those who draw their sins as a long rope

---

[118] Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 360f.; Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2517.

It is very interesting to note that the preposition before the "cords of falsehood" in

MT is בְּ, which signifies an instrument. The instrumental sense is represented in

Greek in the dative σχοινίῳ μακρῷ, while an additional preposition "ὡς" is added. It

is interesting that the P text retains the meaning rendered by "ὡς" while leaving out

the instrumental sense of בְּ/dative σχοινίῳ μακρῷ. The dependence of P on LXX is

further confirmed by the adjective "long" (P=LXX) instead of the noun "the vanity."

5:24

MT	LXX-P
לכן כאכל קש לשון אש <u>וחשש</u> <u>להבה ירפה</u> therefore, as a tongue of fire consumes stubble and <u>dry grass collapses into the flame</u>	διὰ τοῦτο ὃν τρόπον καυθήσεται καλάμη ὑπὸ ἄνθρακος πυρὸς <u>καὶ συγκαυθήσεται ὑπὸ φλογὸς ἀνειμένης</u> therefore, as stubble shall be burnt by a coal of fire, and <u>will be consumed by the released flame</u>
	מטל הנא איך דמתאכלא חבתא בלשנא דנורא דאחדא <u>מן שלהביתא דמשתבקא נתאכלון</u> therefore as the stubble is consumed by the tongue of fire that burns, <u>by the flame which is released to burn they will be consumed</u>

The translator was obviously puzzled by the phrase "וחשש להבה ירפה."[119] The one-to-one correspondence between P and LXX is quite obvious: Both do not translate חשש, "dried grass"; both have συγκαυθήσεται=נתאכלון "will be consumed" and ὑπὸ φλογὸς ἀνειμένης, "by the released flame" = מן שלהביתא דמשתבקא, "by the flame which is released."

5:28*

MT	LXX-P
אשר חציו שנונים וכל־קשתתיו דרכות פרסות סוסיו כצר נחשבו	ὧν τὰ βέλη ὀξεῖά ἐστιν καὶ τὰ τόξα αὐτῶν ἐντεταμένα whose arrows are sharp, and their bows are bent;
וגלגליו כסופה that the arrows are sharp, and <u>all</u> its bows are bent;	גאריהון שנינין וקשתתהון מלין their arrows are sharp, and their bows are bent;

The variant cannot justify itself by the difficulty of the original text; rather, it is equally possible due to some common *Vorlage* containing no כל at all. Therefore, the coincidence is minor and trivial.

---

[119] Also 33:11: Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 9.

6:10

MT	LXX-P
השמן לב־העם הזה make the heart of this people fat!	ἐπαχύνθη <u>γὰρ</u> ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου for the heart of this people has become dull
	אתעבי לה <u>גיר</u> לבה דעמא הנא for the heart of this people has become hardened

Taking the fact that גיר and γὰρ are not only acoustically but also semantically and syntactically similar,[120] it is very probable that the translator may have referred to LXX and thus retained the impression of the word γὰρ and brought it, unconsciously, into his translation.

6:13

MT	LXX-P
כאלה וכאלון אשר בשלכת מצבת	ὡς τερέβινθος καὶ ὡς βάλανος ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ ἀπὸ τῆς

---

[120] Aaron Michael Butts, *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in Its Greco-Roman Context*, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 11 (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2016), 392ff.

בם זרע קדש מצבתה	θήκης αὐτῆς
like a terebinth and like an oak whose stump remains when it is felled, so is the holy seed its stump	like a terebinth, and like an acorn when it falls out of its husk.
	איך בטמתא ואיך בלוטא דנפל מן קערתה זרעא הו קדישא נצבתה
	like a terebinth, and like an acorn which falls out of its husk, the holly seed is its stump

The difficulty in understanding what is going on between MT and LXX is multilayered. First, the original meaning is unclear, especially of the word מצבת, which has stirred up much discussion.[121] Second, the corresponding translation θήκη in LXX is even more puzzling due to its polysemy of both "grave, tomb" and "shell." It could be, as Seeligmann suggests, that θήκη, with the meaning of "grave," is a proper translation of מצבת (also Gen 35:20).[122] In this case, θήκη anchors itself with מצבת as a memorial stone (BDB, s.v. "מצבת I"). In contrast, van der Kooij suggests that the literal meaning "and like an acorn when it falls from its *husk*" was already intended by the LXX translator himself as a simile pointing to the idea of losing a

---

[121] Arie van der Kooij, "Stump or Stalk: Isaiah 6:13 in the Light of the Ancient Versions," *JNSL* 40.2 (2014): 17–26.

[122] Isaac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*, FAT 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 49.

position or office.[123] In this case, θήκη has nothing to do with the word מצבת. Either

way, the text of LXX per se does not prohibit any reader from understanding it in van

der Kooij's way, but rather tends to be read so, since the contextual mentioning of

acorn indicates. Even if the LXX-translator might have intended to read the word

מצבת as a tomb and used the word θήκη in its equivalent meaning, the P-translator

read the LXX text as van der Kooij suggests. The result is that P unambiguously

consolidates the idea of a fallen oak tree into an acorn which falls out of the husk,

which is a meaning at least enabled through the polysemy of the Greek word, if not

explicitly intended by the LXX translator. P's (mis-)understanding of the word,

together with the coincidence of "acorn" instead of "oak tree" as the subject of

falling, is a clear indication that P referred to LXX at this point, since both have

nothing to do with the original Hebrew text.

7:9*

MT	LXX-P
אם לֹא תאמינו כי לֹא תאמנו	ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσητε οὐδὲ μὴ συνῆτε
If you will not believe,	if you will not believe, you surely will not understand

[123] Arie van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah and Priesthood," in *Let Us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Iain Provan and Mark Boda, VTSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 69–78.

you surely will not last	ואלא תהימנון אף לא תסתכלון[124]
	if you will not believe, you surely will not understand

The difference between the LXX translation and the MT text of this famous verse has been noticed for some time.[125] The Greek version brings noetic elements of intellectual understanding into the original religious sense of MT, and the P text follows this lead. It is not possible to exclude the possibility that both translators of LXX and of P had a similar *Vorlage* of תבינו in front of them, which is secondary to MT;[126] however, without support from other versions, the burden of this presupposition is high.[127] Taking the difficulty brought about by the paronomasia into consideration, it is easier to explain the agreement by a direct reference than by an unwitnessed common *Vorlage*.

7:14*

MT	LXX-P

---

[124] According to the majority of versions like 6h3, 8a1ᶜ, 10d1, and 11d1; cf. 7a1.

[125] E.g., Ronald L. Troxel, "Isaiah 7,14-16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint," *ETL* 79.1 (2003): 10–13; Glen W. Menzies, "To What Does Faith Lead? The Two-Stranded Textual Tradition of Isaiah 7.9b," *JSOT* 80 (1998): 111–128.

[126] This possibility is discussed, e.g., by H. G. M. Williamson, *Isaiah 6-12 (ICC): A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018), 101f.

[127] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 26.

הנה העלמה הרה וילדת בן	ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν
behold, a young woman will be with child and bear a son	behold, a virgin shall conceive in the womb, and shall bring forth a son
	הא בתולתא בטנת וילדא ברא
	behold, a virgin conceives and bears a son

Much energy has been put into the interpretation of this verse since as early as Justin

Martyr's lifetime, as reviewed in the introductory chapter. For our sake, it suffices to

say that, since this verse is too central to the theological significance of the text, its

coincidence with LXX prevents us from drawing any certain conclusion about P's

dependence on LXX.[128] It is imaginable that any individual other than the

translators/correctors can be tempted to tamper with this verse and to bring in a

variant supporting either side.

7:25*

MT	LXX-P
וכל ההרים אשר במעדר יעדרון לא־	καὶ πᾶν ὄρος ἀροτριώμενον ἀροτριαθήσεται καὶ
תבוא שמה יראת שמיר ושית	οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ ἐκεῖ φόβος ἔσται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς

---

[128] Bloch, "Authorship," 215–22.

and all the hills which shall be cultivated with the hoe: You will not go there (for) the fear of briars and thorns	χέρσου καὶ ἀκάνθης and every plowed hill will be ploughed: No fear shall come there; it will be (turned) from the barren land and thorn (into the food of the sheep and the trampling (place) of the cattle).
	וכלהון טורא דדברא הות בהון פדנא נתדברון ולא תעול לתמן דחלתא דיערא ודכובא and for all the hills there was plowed place in them, the field will be plowed, the fear of briars and thorns shall not come there

Here is another positive interpretation of LXX: The original meaning, according to the Masoretic punctuation, is that the hills once cultivated will be deserted. LXX turned the statement into a positive one: The land will be free from enemies, and the fear will not exist;[129] P does as well, contrary to what Williamson states.[130] In order to realize this, both read תבוא in the 3rd person feminine rather than 2nd person masculine, while reading the inverted adverbial clause of place "and the hills […]: You will not go there […]" as an independent command.

---

[129] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2523.
[130] Williamson, *Isaiah 6-12 (ICC)*, 178.

However, it is not unimaginable that both translators reached this point

independently, because תבוא can theoretically be read both ways. Therefore, this

case is marked with an asterisk.

8:7

MT	LXX-P
והלך על־כל־גדותיו and it will go over all its banks	καὶ περιπατήσει ἐπὶ πᾶν τεῖχος ὑμῶν and it will go on all your walls
	ונהלך על כלהון שׁוריהון and it will go on all their walls

HUB raises two possible ways for LXX to translate גדות, "water banks," into τεῖχος,

"walls": It is either misunderstood as גדרות, the walls," or τειχος could be a

misreading of χειλος. The possible common *Vorlage* of גדרות does not fit the context

about the river and is a pure guess, and the latter possibility is irrelevant for our

purpose, since however χειλος came into being, it does not change the possibility that

P depends on LXX at this point. Taking the fact that the word גדות (banks) is quite

rare, it is not hard to imagine the translator of P refers to LXX for help.

8:23*

MT	LXX-P
הקל ארצה זבלון וארצה נפתלי והאחרון הכביד	ποίει ταχὺ ποίει χώρα Ζαβουλων ἡ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ ὁδὸν θαλάσσης
he treated the land of Zebulun with contempt and the land of Naphtali with contempt, but later on he will make glorious.	act quickly, act, the country of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali
	סרהבת ארעא דזבולון וארעא דנפתלי ואוחדנא עשׁן
	the land of Zebulun act quickly, and the land of Naphtali and strong power

The verb הקל in its Hifil form should not mean "to be quick or swift" oneself, but to

"lighten" or "treat with contempt" someone else. The meaning of "being swift or

light" comes rather from its Qal form (e.g., 2 Sam 1:23, Jer 4:13, and Hab 1:8). In

this case, however, both translations could have reached this deviation independently.

9:15

MT	LXX-P
ויהיו מאשרי העם־הזה <u>מתעים</u> ומאשריו <u>מבלעים</u> For those who guide this people are <u>misleading</u> them; And those who are <u>guided</u> by them are <u>brought to</u> <u>confusion</u>.	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ μακαρίζοντες τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον <u>πλανῶντες</u> καὶ <u>πλανῶσιν</u> ὅπως <u>καταπίωσιν</u> αὐτούς And they that bless this people will <u>mislead</u> them; and they <u>mislead</u> them that they may <u>devour</u> them.
	ונהוון מטאבנוהי דעמא הנא <u>מטעין</u> ו<u>מטבעין</u> לה And they that are good to this people will <u>mislead</u> and <u>devour</u> them.

There are two ambiguous roots in this verse: The root אשר, which can mean "to

bless" or, more rarely in its Piel form, "to guide," comes up twice in this verse, while

the root בלע can mean both "to devour" (Qal) and "to confuse" (Piel). LXX

translator, against the MT reading, chooses "to bless" for the first occurrence of the

root אשר and "to guide" for the second one; the translator chooses "to devour" for

the root בלע. The P-translation seems to contract the redundant part in the LXX

translation "(they) shall mislead them; and they mislead them" and thus made a

sentence shorter than the MT text. This redundancy is produced by the misreading of

LXX of מאשר "to guide (in a straight way)" as "to mislead" = מתעים.

10:13

MT	LXX-P
ואוריד כאביר יושבים And I brought down, like a mighty one, their inhabitants	καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν προνομεύσω καὶ σείσω πόλεις κατοικουμένας And I will spoil their strength and I will shake the inhabited cities.
	וכבשת מדינתא דיתבן And I have subdued the inhabited cities.

LXX seems to have a redundant translation of the word אביר: In the first clause, אביר

is translated as "strength" which is going to be spoiled; in the second, as "cities"

which might be, as the apparatus of HUB indicates, derived from the understanding

of אביר as "stronghold."[131] The latter understanding of the word אביר, even if it did

lead to the translation of πόλεις, is an anomaly, since אביר is elsewhere only

applicable to living beings or to God in the Hebrew Bible. Even if אביר can be

understood as an impregnable location, there is a more usual Syriac/Greek translation

for it (Syriac תוקפא / Greek ὀχύρωμα). Therefore, the coincidence between מדינתא in

P and πόλεις in LXX can be best explained by a direct literary dependence, while P

left out the first (redundant) translation of LXX.

---

[131] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 40.

13:9

MT	LXX-P
הנה יום־יהוה בא אכזרי ועברה וחרון אף Behold, the day of the Lord is coming, <u>cruel</u> and fury and burning anger.	ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἀνίατος ἔρχεται θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς Behold! The <u>incurable</u> day of the Lord is coming, of wrath and anger
	הא יומה דמריא אתא דאסיו לית בה אכתן וחמים רוגזה Behold! The day of the Lord is coming, which <u>has no healing</u>, angry and hot is his wrath.

The LXX translation of the Hebrew word אכזרי "cruel" with ἀνίατος is an oddity,

though not singular (see also Deut 32:33). However, the Syriac translators generally

had no problem understanding this rare word (e.g., Gen 32:33; Jer 6:23; 3:14; 50:42).

The rendering in P here, דאסיו לית בה, "without healing," is likely derived from

LXX's inaccurate translation ἀνίατος "incurable."

13:21

MT	LXX-P
ומלאו בתיהם אחים and their houses will be full of howling animals	καὶ ἐμπλησθήσονται αἱ οἰκίαι ἤχου and the houses will be full of sound
	ונתמלון בתיהון בנת קלא and their houses will be full of sounds

LXX seems to get the right meaning of "אח" as "howling animal," be it an owl or a

hyena (see HALOT s.v.), but only emphasizes the vocal side of it. It is thus quite

probable that P, failing to recognize this hapax legomenon, chooses to go with the

(deviating) LXX translation.

18:2

MT	LXX-P
השלח בים צירים The sender of the envoys by the sea.	ὁ ἀποστέλλων ἐν θαλάσσῃ ὅμηρα The sender of the hostages by the sea.
	דמשדר המירא בימא That the sender of the hostages by the sea.

The verse concerns the sending of some personnel from or to Cush. It is probable, though not guaranteed, that this verse points to the diplomatic event in 724 BC described in 2 Kgs 17:4.[132] The dependence of P upon LXX is obvious due to the correspondence between the borrowed Syraic word "המירא" and the very word from which it is borrowed "ὅμηρα," both of which mean "hostages," and this meaning deviates from the Hebrew word "צירים" (envoys). It is quite reasonable that any translator has reached this meaning by deriving this from the root "צרר" (to bind, to tie up), as Andrew Teeter mentioned in a private message to me. That might be the case for LXX; yet for P, it is probably not directly translated from M. To be sure, the root "צרר" can generate various meanings: i) to oppress (or to treat like an enemy), ii) to be restricted (in both physical or psychological sense) and iii) to bind. For each sense, the Syriac translators has a relatively fixed way of treating the original text: for instance, for the sense ii), the Syriac translators almost unanimously use the Syriac root אלץ for translation, while for the case iii), they quite consciously use the cognate צרר in Syriac (Exod 12:34; Josh 9:4; 1 Sam 25:9; Isa 8:16; Hos 4:19; 13:12). Only at this point, the translator used such a rare word "המירא" (there is, except for the Peshitta of 1 Macc, only one occurrence elsewhere in the Peshitta), which is a Greek loanword. It is much more probable that the P translation is directly

---

[132] W. A. Beuken, *Jesaja 13-27 (HThKAT)*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 151.

borrowed from LXX 18:3 than that LXX and P simultaneously reach the same

deviating translation of "hostage, pledge."

18:6*

MT	LXX-P
וְקָץ עָלָיו הָעַיִט And the bird of prey will spend the summer on it.	καὶ <u>συναχθήσεται</u> ἐπʼ αὐτοὺς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανου And the bird of the sky will be gathered on it.
	וְתכנֹשׁ עלוהי טירא And the bird of prey will gather on it.

LXX and P, in contrast to other versions like the Vulgate and the Targum, which

agree with MT, seem to read קבץ instead of קץ.[133] It is hard to evaluate how

probable it is that קבץ appears in the *Vorlage* of P due to the absence of witnesses;

what is more, it is not surprising for P-translator himself to guess קבץ from the

difficult קץ, as he, for instance, can read the Syriac word בדק, "to inspect," out of the

Hebrew word בד, "false prophecy," purely from the similarity of the two unrelated

---

[133] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2551.

roots. Overall, it is hard to guarantee a direct dependence of P upon LXX here due to

the above-mentioned two possibilities. This case is thus marked with an asterisk.

19:6

MT	LXX-P
קנה וסוף קמלֹו The cane and reed will decay.	καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἕλει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου And in every marsh, reed and papyrus.
	קניא וארבנא ופפירון נאבשׁון Cane and reed and papyrus will be dried up.

The LXX translation of this half verse is quite free, especially with the addition of "in

every marsh," which seems unfounded or at best hinted at by the contextual items.[134]

The dependence of P upon LXX is evidenced through the correspondence between

Syriac "פפירון" and Greek "παπύρος," which does not exist in MT. The translator of P

could have simply pieced MT and LXX text together: "cane and reed" and "reed and

papyrus" into "cane and reed and papyrus."

---

[134] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2552.

25:10

MT	LXX-P
כהדוש מתבן במי מדמנה as straw is trodden in the water of a dung pit.	ὃν τρόπον πατοῦσιν ἅλωνα ἐν ἀμάξαις as they tread threshing floor with wagons.
	איך דמתדיש תבנא בגרגרא as straw is trodden with threshing sled.

LXX presents a different picture in comparison to MT: While in MT, the straw is trampled in the water of a dung pit, in LXX, the picture is that something, presumably some grain, is trodden on the threshing floor with wagons. Ziegler thinks that this translation is under the influence of 28:27f,[135] while HUB comments that this verse shares a similar picture of threshing with 41:15.[136] To be sure, the word מדמנה is difficult, and Warszawski suggests that the *Vorlage* of LXX should be "במורגים," which is, however, too remote from "במי מדמנה."[137] However that might be, the similar imagery of LXX and P against MT and other versions shows a clear possibility of a direct dependence.

---

[135] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 186.
[136] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 95.
[137] Warszawski, "Peschitta," 45.

28:16*

MT	LXX-P
אבן אבן בחן פנת יקרת … a stone, a tested stone, a cornerstone, precious	λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον a precious stone, selected, a cornerstone, precious
	כאפא כאפא בחירתא בזויתא יקירתא … a stone, selected stone, in the corner, precious

The coincidence of reading the word "בחן" as a passive "בחר" might be due to a

common *Vorlage*, but is also explainable through a direct borrowing, which puts

things in a similar situation to that of 18:6. In this case, a direct dependence is

possible but not certain (*).

28:25

MT	LXX-P
והפיץ קצח וכמן יזרק ושם חטה	τότε σπείρει μικρὸν μελάνθιον καὶ κύμινον καὶ

שׂורה ושׂערה <u>נסמן</u> וכסמת גבלתו And he will sow black cumin and scatter cumin, and plant wheat <u>in rows</u>, barley <u>in its place</u>, and rye within its area.	πάλιν σπείρει πυρὸν καὶ κριθὴν καὶ ζέαν ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις σου then he sow the small black cumin and cumin, and again sow wheat, and barley, and rye in your borders.
	בדר שבובנא וכמונא זרע ורמא חטא וסערא וכונתא בתחומיה He scattered black cumin and cumin he sowed and casted wheat, and barley, and rye in his borders.

The two difficult words "שׂורה" and "נסמן" are left out by LXX, or more exactly,

condensed into a single phrase "ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις σου." It cannot be an accident that P

does exactly the same thing.

29:10*

MT	LXX-P
ויעצם את־עיני<u>כם</u> את־הנביאים ואת־ראשי<u>כם</u> החזים כסה And he has shut <u>your</u>	καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς <u>αὐτῶν</u> καὶ τῶν προφητῶν <u>αὐτῶν</u> καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων <u>αὐτῶν</u> οἱ ὁρῶντες τὰ κρυπτά and he will shut <u>their</u> eyes, and the eyes of <u>their</u>

| eyes, the prophets; And he has covered your heads, the seers. | prophets, and of <u>their</u> rulers, who see secret things. |
| | ועשׁנת על עיני<u>הון</u> ועל נביא ועל רישׁי<u>הון</u> דחזין כסיתא

and it has been heavy upon <u>their</u> eyes and upon the prophets, upon the heads of those who see secret things. |

The main difference between MT and P=LXX lies in the reading of the word כסה, which, according to the reading of MT, can be understood as a parallelism to the verb "shut," whereas according to P=LXX against other versions, it should be understood as a passive form that signifies something concealed yet seen by the prophets. In addition, LXX and P have third person plural pronouns instead of second person as in MT. However, this reading, though interesting as it is due to its common apocalyptic idea, can also be inspired independently by the following verse which mentions "words of a sealed document." We therefore mark it with an asterisk.

29:16

MT	LXX-P
ויצר אמר ליוצרו לא הבין And what is formed says	ἢ τὸ ποίημα τῷ ποιήσαντι οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας Or the work to the maker, you have not made me

to him who formed it, he	wisely.
has no understanding.	וגבילתא אמרא לגבולה דחכימאית לא גבלתני and what is formed says to the former, you have not made me wisely.

The LXX variant, which is also imbedded in Rom 9:20, is explainable from MT: The

translator tried both to retain the intellectual sense conveyed by the verb הבין, and to

keep the sub-verse parallel to the previous one ("he did not make me"), from which

he strived for a synthesis of both elements. For the P-translation, it is probable, as we

will see in the next chapter, that an unconscious influence from the NT Peshitta is at

work here, but this does not explain the origin of the adverb חכימאית, since this does

not exist in the NT Peshitta Rom 9:20. In addition, the second person in LXX=P is

different from MT. Therefore, a direct dependence of P upon LXX is a more probable

alternative.

30:4f.

MT	LXX-P
ומלאכיו חנם יגיעו: כל הבאיש	ἄγγελοι πονηροί μάτην κοπιάσουσιν πρὸς λαόν ὃς

על עם לא יועילו למו	οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτοὺς
And his messengers <u>reached Hanes. Everyone will be ashamed</u> because of a people who cannot profit them.	<u>evil</u> messengers <u>will toil in vain</u> because of a people who will not profit them.

And his messengers <u>reached Hanes. Everyone will be ashamed</u> because of a people who cannot profit them.	ומלאכוהי חלפא נלאון לות עמא דלא מותר להון And his <u>evil</u> messengers <u>will toil</u> for a people who does not profit them.

LXX, together with P, deviates from MT at the words underlined. At first glance, all deviating items are individually explainable, yet it is quite probable that P depends on LXX once all deviations come together: 1) On the one side, the Syriac word חלף "evil" is a standard translation of the Hebrew adjective חנף (9:16; 10:6; 32:6), so that it is easy to suppose that LXX and P share a common *Vorlage* with חנף instead of חנס. On the other side, however, the word "in vain" seems abrupt in LXX, which can only be explainable by the reading of חנס as חנם.[138] In this case, there seems to be a double attempt of LXX to translate חנס: the first as חנף (into πονηροί) and the second as חנם (into μάτην). It is much more probable that the difficult חנס in the *Vorlage* that leads to the double translation, and the P-translation followed LXX in having the "evil" messengers. 2) The (mis)understanding of יג(י)עו as derived from the root יגע instead of from נגע is totally reasonable for LXX, as it is the same case

---

in P. 3) כל הבאיש are absent from both LXX and P. Though it is probably immerged

into the adjective "evil" in the preceding text due to its similarity to "ביש," why both

LXX and P takes this syntactically impossible move simultaneously still remains a

question. All three agreements together point to a possible direct influence.

30:20

MT	LXX-P
ולא יכנף עוד מוריך והיו עיניך ראות את־מוריך Your teacher will no longer hide himself, but your eyes will see your teacher.	καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἐγγίσωσίν σοι οἱ <u>πλανῶντές σε</u> ὅτι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονται τοὺς <u>πλανῶντάς σε</u> and yet they that <u>lead you astray</u> shall no more at all come near to you; for your eyes shall see those that <u>lead</u> <u>you astray</u>.
	ולא נכנש תוב <u>למטעיניכון</u> ונחזין עיניכון <u>במטעיניכון</u> No more will he assemble them that <u>lead you astray</u>, and your eyes will see those who <u>lead you astray</u>.

The MT text offers a very positive imagery concerning ONE teacher, while LXX a negative plural group. [139] Under this circumstance, LXX points to a group of false teachers who lead the people to idolatry depicted in 30:22. The coincidence of the verb πλανάω = טעי points to a direct influence of LXX upon P. Otherwise, P can easily translate the Hebrew מורה using the standard root מלף (see Job 36:22; Prov 5:13; Hab 2:18).

30:23

MT	LXX-P
ירעה מקניך ביום ההוא כר נרחב your cattle will graze, on that day, the wide pasture.	καὶ βοσκηθήσεταί σου τὰ κτήνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τόπον πίονα καὶ εὐρύχωρον and your cattle will graze, on that day, in a fat and wide place.
	רעיא דבעירכון ביומא הו באתרא שׁמינא and the pasture of your cattle, on that day, in a fat place.

The translation of LXX "fat and wide place," in addition to the Hebrew "כר נרחב,"

could be influenced by Isa 5:1, where the phrase τόπον πίονα also comes up

(corresponding to בן־שׁמן there). P seems to maintain the number of the adjectives,

reducing it to one according to MT. However, he falsely deleted the "wide" one

which corresponds to MT, leaving "fat" behind. What is more, the word τόπον=אתרא

partially deviating from MT is another sign that the P-translator consulted LXX at

this point.

32:4

MT	LXX-P
ולשׁון עלגים תמהר לדבר צחות	καὶ αἱ γλῶσσαι αἱ ψελλίζουσαι ταχὺ μαθήσονται λαλεῖν εἰρήνην
And the tongues of stammerers will hasten to speak clear things.	And the stammering tongues will soon <u>learn to speak peace</u>
	ולשׁנא דלעגא נסתרהב לממללו שׁלמא
	And the tongue of the stammerer will hasten to <u>learn to speak peace</u>.

Both P and LXX must have some difficulty in recognizing the rare word צח, and the

coincidence between them in rendering the word as "peace" might be a coincidence

since "speak peace" is a common phrase.[140] Yet, it cannot be a coincidence that both

LXX and P have an additional "learn to," which, together with the previous evidence,

almost guarantees a dependence.

32:7

MT	LXX-P
ובדבר אביון משפט … and when the needy speaks what is right.	καὶ διασκεδάσαι λόγους ταπεινῶν ἐν κρίσει … and to reject the words of the needy in judgement
	ומלתה דבישׁא בדינא … and (to destroy) the word of the needy in judgement

The LXX translation represents a typical biblical prohibition against crushing

disadvantaged people in court (Isa 1:23; 11:4; Amos 5:12; Prov 22:22 etc.) in parallel

to the previous half verse ("to destroy the poor with unjust words"), which is slightly

different from or more contextualized in comparison to MT.[141] This drift of meaning

---

[140] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2589.
[141] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2590.

is realized through two slight changes: the omission of the preposition ב in front of

דבר and the insertion of another preposition, "in," in front of the word משפט. These

two features are shared by P, which strongly indicates a dependence, be it conscious

or unconscious.

32:9 = 33:20 (cf. 32:11)

MT	LXX-P
נשים שאננות קמנה Rise up, women who are at ease (or who are untroubled)	γυναῖκες πλούσιαι ἀνάστητε Rich women, rise up!
	נשא עתירתא קומין Rich women, rise up!

The LXX translator probably had difficulty in identifying the adjective שַׁאֲנַן "be at

ease," so he either translates it as "being rich" (32:9; 18; 33:20) or leaves it out

altogether (32:11). It could be that "being at ease" indicates a luxurious or privileged

enough life style that aligns with the idea of being rich for the Greek speaking

translator.[142] In any case, P systematically adopted this incorrect understanding not

---

[142] See also Aristotle's discussion about *noble leisure*, which is intrinsically good, in: *Nicomachean Ethics* (1177b6-18).

only at 32:9 and 33:20 where LXX has the same rendering, but also at 32:11 where

LXX omits this word.

32:14

MT	LXX-P
המון עיר עזב <u>עפל ובחן</u> היה בעד מערות עד־עולם The crowd of the city will be forsaken, <u>hill and watchtower</u> will (be turned) into dens forever.	πλοῦτον πόλεως καὶ <u>οἴκους ἐπιθυμητοὺς</u> ἀφήσουσιν The wealth of the <u>city and the pleasant houses</u> they will abandon.
	חילא דקריתא אשתבק <u>ושופרהון דבתא</u> הוא למערא עדמא לעלם And the strength of the <u>city</u> will be abandoned, and <u>the pleasance of the houses</u> will become dens forever.

עפל ובחן היה בעד מערות עד־עולם, which probably means "the hill and watchtower will

(be turned) into dens forever," is an abstruse sentence and multiple emendations have

been suggested by scholars.[143] The reading of LXX, "the pleasant houses," could

either be derived from the root בחן, "test," (see also 28:16 where the same word is

translated into ἐκλεκτὸν) or from another root under עפל, "show heedless,

---

[143] W. A. Beuken, *Jesaja 28-39 (HThKAT)*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 2010), 239.

presumptuous," (Josephus merely transliterated it into Ὀφλᾶς). Either way, this

conspicuous translation is inherited by P.

32:20

MT	LXX-P
אשריכם זרעי על־כל־מים משלחי רגל־השור והחמור Blessed are you who sow by every water and who let out the foot of the ox and the donkey.	μακάριοι οἱ σπείροντες ἐπὶ πᾶν ὕδωρ οὗ βοῦς καὶ ὄνος πατεῖ Blessed are they who sow by every water, where the ox and donkey tread.
	טוביכון דזרעין על כל מאין כר דדרך תורא וחמרא Blessed are they who sow by every water, where the ox and the donkey tread.

There is an obvious nuance in the translation of the word רגל. The phrase "let out the

foot (or footprint) of the ox and the donkey" is not an easy expression, and it is no

wonder that translators modified the phrase a little into "where the ox and donkey

tread." Interestingly, Ziegler points out that the translation points to the practice of

ancient Egyptians and Greeks of using animals to tread the soil after sowing.[144] The

---

[144] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 188f.

P text has undergone an identical modification, which likely indicates a direct

dependence.

33:23

MT	LXX-P
‏נטשו חבליך בל־יחזקו כַן־‏ ‏תרנם בל־פרשו נס‏ Your ropes are loose, they cannot hold the base of their mast, or spread out the sail (or sign).[145]	ἐρράγησαν τὰ σχοινία σου ὅτι οὐκ ἐνίσχυσεν ὁ ἱστός σου ἔκλινεν οὐ χαλάσει τὰ ἱστία οὐκ ἀρεῖ σημεῖον Your ropes are broken, for they are not strong: Your mast has bent, it will not spread the sails, it will not bear a sign.
	‏אשתריו חבליכי דלא אשתררו ואתרכנו עמודיכי דלא פשטו אתא‏ Your ropes are loose, for they are not strong, and your masts have bent, so that they will not bear a sign.

There are many ways to understand the word כן. The Masoretic tradition reads it as a

noun, "the base of the mast," while the translator of LXX derives the meaning "lean

to the ground" from the verb "כנן," which actually means "be established (on the

---

[145] Whether a military sign or the sail of a ship is described here, is open to interpretation. See the discussion in: Beuken, *Jesaja 28-39*, 262.

ground)," alongside the negative particle בל. Warszawski suggests that P reads it as

the comparative conjunction "so," but this is not embodied in the translation.[146] It is

much more probable that P imported the translation "to bend" from LXX. This

suggestion is further confirmed by the simultaneous change of the third person plural

suffix to the "mast" to the second person by P and LXX.

40:10

MT	LXX-P
וזרעו משלה לו and his arm is ruling for him.	ὁ βραχίων μετὰ κυριείας the arm is with strength
	ודרעה בחילא and the arm is with strength

LXX has rendered the second *membrum* of the parallelism closer to the first one ("the

Lord comes with strength" as LXX reads it) by translating the verse into "the arm is

with strength." The exact parallel between them suffices to establish direct

dependence.

---

[146] Warszawski, "Peschitta," 57.

40:13

MT	LXX-P
מי־תכן את־רוח יהוה ואיש עצתו יודיענו Who has measured (established) the spirit of the Lord, or his counselor has instructed hiMT?	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ <u>σύμβουλος</u> ἐγένετο ὃς <u>συμβιβᾷ</u> αὐτόν Who has known the mind of the Lord? and who has been his <u>counsellor</u>, who has <u>given</u> him <u>counsel</u>?
	[147] מנו תקן רוחה דמריא או מנו הוא לה <u>מלך מלכא</u> Who has established the spirit of the Lord, or who has been for him the one who has <u>counseled</u> <u>counsel</u>?

There are two similarities between LXX and P: First, P resembles LXX in repeating "who" instead of translating "איש" as the subject of the second half verse, which makes the text much smoother. Second, the *figura etymologica* in P, though slightly different from LXX, might be inspired by the latter. HUB realized the different arrangement of P, while failing to discern its probable source in LXX.[148]

41:9

---

[147] 7a1 reads "בעל מלכא," which should be a modification towards the Hebrew phrase "איש עצתו"

[148] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 175f.

MT	LXX-P
ומאציליה קראתיך And I have called you from its corners	καὶ ἐκ τῶν σκοπιῶν αὐτῆς ἐκάλεσά σε and from its watchtowers I have called you
	ומן דוקיה קריתך and from its watchtowers I have called you

It is understandable that LXX understands the Hebrew word "אציל," which should

mean "sides" or "corners," as "σκοπιά," a high place such as watchtower or

mountaintop, which is the upper extreme of the earth. It is possible that the Greek

translator, as Ziegler suggests, was thinking of "astronomical observatory," which can

be traced back to the sagas about Abraham.[149] However, it is much more natural to

mean the mountaintop, since God (or his angel) appears quite often on the mountain.

However, in Syriac, the word "אציל" is narrower, only for artificial building like

"watchtower" or "lookout post." It is hard to explain why he translates the "corner"

into a "watchtower," especially when there is a parallel "you whom I have taken from

the ends of the earth" in the previous half-verse, unless we accept some influence

through LXX (cf. 21:8, where MT mentions a watchtower: MT "מצפה"=P

"דוקא"=LXX "σκοπιά").

---

[149] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 123f.

42:5

MT	LXX-P
רקע הארץ <u>וצאצאיה</u> Who spread out the earth and <u>its offspring</u>	ὁ στερεώσας τὴν γῆν καὶ <u>τὰ ἐν αὐτῃ</u> who settled the earth, and <u>the things in it</u>
	ורקע ארעא <u>וכל דבה</u> And who spread out the earth and <u>all that is in it</u>.

In the Hebrew verse, God beats out the earth and "what comes out of it (יצא)." LXX

modifies it to "the things in it," as it is contrasted with the Symmachus, which tries to

bring it back in line with the Hebrew: "τα πορευομενα επ αυτης." The modified

expression is inherited by P.[150]

42:6

MT	LXX-P
קראתיך בצדק ואחזק בידך <u>ואצרך</u> I have called you in	ἐκάλεσά σε ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ κρατήσω τῆς χειρός σου καὶ <u>ἐνισχύσω σε</u>

---

[150] Weisz, "Deuterojesaia," 23.

righteousness, and I will hold you with your hand and <u>watch over you</u>.	I have called you in righteousness, and I will hold your hand, and <u>strengthen you</u>.
	קתירך בזדיקותא ואחדת באידך <u>וחילתך</u> I have called you in righteousness, and I have held your hand and <u>strengthened you</u>.

The word אצרך can be understood in various ways. It could be derived from נצר, "to preserve, to watch over," as the MT reading and the Vulgate suggest; it can be understood as derived from צור, "confine, besiege," which, as HUB suggests, leads to the reading of LXX.[151] Ziegler suggests that the LXX translator reads an אזר here (see also 45:5) and uses "ἐνισχύσω" for the translation.[152] It can also be the case that the translation is influenced by 41:10, where LXX renders the Hebrew word "אמצתיך" with "ἐνισχύσω." In any case, LXX rendition is far from natural, and the fact that P coincides at this point with LXX points to a dependent relationship.

42:14

MT	LXX-P

---

[151] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 187. This meaning, however, is also far from the sense of "empowering."

[152] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 153.

אתאפק כיולדה אפעה אשם אשם ואשאף יחד (According to Masoretic punctuation) I have restrained myself, like a woman in labor I will <u>groan</u>, I will <u>gasp</u> and <u>pant</u> at once.	καὶ ἀνέξομαι ἐκαρτέρησα ὡς ἡ τίκτουσα ἐκστήσω καὶ ξηρανῶ ἅμα I have <u>endured</u> like a woman in labor. I will <u>amaze</u> and stiffen out at once.
	סיברת איך ילדתא אתמה ואתור אכחדא I have <u>endured</u> like a woman in labor. I will <u>amaze</u> and <u>wonder</u> at once.

Two facts point to a direct dependence of P upon LXX. First, while there are three verbs in MT ("groan," "gasp" and "pant"), there are only two in LXX and P. Second, while the subjective state of "being amazed" is not explicit in the original MT text ("to gasp and to pant," which might indicate amazement), it is not illegitimate for LXX to translate it in this way.[153] However, it cannot be explained by mere coincidence that both LXX and P choose to ignore the imagery of breathing convulsively at the same point and end up with the meaning of "amazement." These two similarities taken together point to a consultation of LXX.

44:12

---

[153] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2651.

MT	LXX-P
חרש ברזל מעצד ופעל בפחם ובמקבות יצרהו And he fashions iron into an axe and worked on it over the coal and with the boring tool he shaped it.	ὅτι ὤξυνεν τέκτων σίδηρον σκεπάρνῳ εἰργάσατο αὐτὸ καὶ ἐν τερέτρῳ ἔτρησεν αὐτό For the artificer sharpened an iron, fashioned it with an axe, and drilled it with a chisel
	דלטש פרזלא נגרא ובעשפא שפיה ובמקרא גלפה For the artificer sharpened an iron, smoothed it with an axe, and carved it with a chisel

The original sentence of MT is thoroughly rephrased in LXX: The artificer does not create an instrument "with the coal fire," and the axe is read as an instrument rather than the object; the מקבות, which is derived from נקב and should denote some piercing tool, is identified with a chisel, which facilitates the making of a hole.[154] P takes over almost all of these characteristics.

44:13

MT	LXX-P

---

[154] John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC)* (London: Bloomsbury, 2006), I:351.

136

חרש עצים נטה קו יתארהו בשרד יעשהו במקצעות ובמחוגה יתארהו He shaped wood, he extended a measuring line; he outlines it with red chalk. He works it with planes, and outlines it with a compass	τέκτων ξύλον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέτρῳ καὶ ἐν κόλλῃ ἐρρύθμισεν αὐτο The artificer has chosen wood, marked it out with a rule, and joined it with glue
	גבא נגרא קיסא ומשחה ובתתא דבקה The artificer has chosen wood, and measured it, and joined it with glue

Again, LXX rephrases the original complex Hebrew text by omitting some elements (e.g., the extending of a line or the using of a compass) while adding in new elements (e.g., the joining of two parts with glue). One of these deviations ("the compass") can be well explained through homoioteleuton, but others cannot.[155] Yet, as in the previous verse, P takes over almost all of these modifications.

44:(13)14

MT	LXX-P
(לשבת בית) לכרת־לו ארזים <u>ויקח תרזה</u> <u>ואלון ויאמץ־לו בעצי־יער נטע ארן</u> וגשם	στῆσαι αὐτὸ ἐν οἴκῳ ὃ ἔκοψεν ξύλον ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ ὃ ἐφύτευσεν κύριος καὶ ὑετὸς

ἐμήκυνεν	יגדל
to put it in a house, for which he cuts wood out of the forest, which the Lord planted, and the rain made it grow.	(for the idol) to sit in a house, so that he himself cuts cedars, <u>and takes a cypress or an oak, and raises it for himself among the trees of the forest.</u> <u>He plants a fir,</u> and the rain makes it grow.
(ואקימה בביתא) לקיסא דפסיק מן עבא דבמטרא אתרבי And he put it up in a house, the wood, which is cut from the forest, which grew in the rain.	

The manner in which LXX compresses the long MT text into a much shorter version is up for debate: Ottley suggests a homoioteleuton ארן – ארזים,[156] although HUB denies the possibility.[157] Rather, there is another homoioteleuton at work here (לוֹ – לוֹ).[158] In the latter case, the translator still sees the word ארן but falsely read it as אדן, which is the reason for the extra clause "which the Lord planted."[159] P almost inherited the result of this homoioteleuton, while deleting the false extra clause of LXX.

44:17

---

[156] Richard Rusden Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 315.
[157] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 201.
[158] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC)*, I:355.
[159] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2654.

MT	LXX-P
ושאריתו לאל עשה לפסלו יסגד לו וישתחו But the rest of it he made a god, his graven image. He fell down before and worshipped it	τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐποίησεν εἰς θεὸν γλυπτὸν καὶ προσκυνεῖ αὐτῶ And the rest he made a graven god, and worshipped it
	ושרכא עבדו אלהא גליפא וסגדו לה And the rest they made a graven god, and worshipped it

Two signs points to the dependence of P on LXX: i) Both LXX and P turn the פסלו,

the apposition to the word "god," into the same adjective, "graven," which qualifies

god and thus omitted the second ל; ii) both LXX and P combine two synonyms, יסגד

לו וישתחו, into one verb, "worship."

45:8*

MT	LXX-P
הרעיפו שמים ממעל	εὐφρανθήτω ὁ οὐρανὸς ἄνωθεν

The heavens dripped from above.	Let the heaven rejoice from above.
	אתבסמו שמיא מן לעל
	The heavens rejoice from above.

The joy of the heavens before the Lord is a common motif in the book of Isaiah (e.g., 44:23 49:13), which might lead to this reading of LXX. In this case, the sheer difference between MT on the one side and LXX-P on the other is hard to explain outside of a dependence of P on LXX.[160] However, if we take into consideration that the 1QIsaᵃ has a הריעו instead of הרעיפו, which is an attempt to replace the less familiar word,[161] we might have a case in which P and LXX make the translation independently, since "shout" in a positive sense is not far from "joyfulness." Because of this uncertainty, this case is marked with an asterisk.

46:5

MT	LXX-P
למי תדמיוני ותשוו ותמשלוני ונדמה	τίνι με ὡμοιώσατε ἴδετε τεχνάσασθε οἱ
To whom would you liken me, and	πλανώμενοι

---

make me equal and compare me, that we should be alike?	To whom have you compared me? See, contrive, you who go astray.
	למן דמיתונני ופחמתונני לדטעין To whom have you likened me? and you have compared me to those who go astray.

The reason why LXX has a participle, "those who go astray," at this place is far from clear. Ottley suggests that LXX probably derived the meaning of ונדמה out of נדד.[162]

However it came into being, P takes over this element and makes a synthesis of MT and LXX.

49:4

MT	LXX-P
לתהו והבל כחי כליתי And for nothing and vanity I have finished my strength.	εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύν μου And for vanity and for nothing I have given my strength.
	ויהבת חילי לסריקותא And I have given my strength for vanity.

P-translator is expected to translate the Hebrew verb כלה with גמר, as it is the most

natural case (see 28:22, 29:20 etc.), while he uses the conspicuous phrase "give the

strength," which could be best explained by the influence of LXX, consciously or

unconsciously.

51:20

MT	LXX-P
כתוא מכמר like an antelope (in) a net	ὡς <u>σευτλίον</u> ἡμίεφθον as a half-boiled beet
	איך <u>סלקא</u> דכמיר as a beet which is heated

LXX understands כמר according to another meaning than the "net" under the same

root, "to be hot," and translates the whole phrase as "half-boiled beet." [163] P shares

this translation, yet may reach this point independently. However he reads תוא as

σευτλίον, "beet or turnip," is hard to determine. The HUB suggests the reading of

---

[163] Gillian Greenberg and Donald M. Walter, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Syriac Peshitta Version with English Translation* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2012), XXIV; John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC)* (London: Bloomsbury, 2006), II:252; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 99.

"כתומכ(כ)מר" (heated bitter herbs), which leads to the LXX reading. However, the

possible rabbinic Hebrew תמכה, "bitter herb," and LXX=P "(sweet) beet root," are

still different enough for determining the P-translator's dependence upon LXX.

52:4

MT	LXX-P
ואשור באפס עשקו then the Assyrian oppressed them without cause	καὶ εἰς Ἀσσυρίους βίᾳ ἤχθησαν and they were lead away with force to the Assyrians
	ואתוריא בקטירא דברה As the Assyrian took them by force.

The phrase באפס is open to interpretation: When אפס is understood as an expression

of non-existence, the phrase may mean "for nothing" or "out of no reason."[164] If אפס

is understood as a geographical border as in Deut 33:17, באפס may be a locational

adverbial denoting Assur ("in the far end of the world"), which may explain the LXX

reading of "leading." The Septuaginta Deutsch explains the LXX reading by a

---

[164] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC)*, II:258.

metathesis between אסף – אפס.[165] However the sense of "carry, bring" in LXX=P

came into being, its significant distance from the MT sense allows no room for poly-

genesis.

54:12

MT	LXX-P
ושמתי <u>כדכד שמשתיך ושעריך לאבני</u> <u>אקדח</u> וכל־גבולך לאבני־חפץ And I will make <u>rubies your battlements and your gates sparkling stones</u>, and your entire wall boundaries precious stones.	καὶ θήσω <u>τὰς ἐπάλξεις σου ἴασπιν καὶ τὰς πύλας σου λίθους κρυστάλλου</u> καὶ τὸν περίβολόν σου λίθους ἐκλεκτοὺς and I will make <u>your battlements jasper, and your gates crystal</u>, and your boundaries precious stones.
	ואבנא אסיכי <u>בכאפא דאיספון ותרעיכי בכאפא</u> <u>דקרוסטלוס</u> ותחומיכי בכאפא גביתא will build <u>your walls with stones of jasper, and your gates with stones of crystal</u>, and your boundaries with precious stones.

---

[165] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2665.

The question of dependence in this passage is determined according to which

materials the walls (battlements) and gates are constructed. The Hebrew text indicates

some (red) rubies and some shining stones, respectively, while LXX reads them as

"jasper" (anything but rubies) and "crystal" more specifically.[166] P not only

coincides with LXX in the sense, but uses exactly the cognates "איספון" (=ἴασπιν) and

"קרוסטלוס" (=κρυστάλλου) at this point, which makes its obvious dependence on the

Greek text explicit.

54:15

MT	LXX-P
הן גור יגור אפס מאותי מי־גר אתך עליך יפול Behold, <u>anyone really stirs</u> <u>up strife, it is not from me</u>; who stirs up strife with you, will fall because of you.	ἰδοὺ προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονταί σοι δι᾽ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ καταφεύξονται Behold, strangers <u>will come to you</u> through me, and shall run to you for refuge.
	וכל דמתפנין מן אידי נעלון לכי ותהוין בית גוסא לעמוריכי All who are turned by my hands <u>will come to you</u>, and you will be a house of refuge for your inhabitants.

---

[166] Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC)*, II:354.

Many similarities between LXX and P against the abstruse MT can be found here. First, though it is almost certain that LXX understands both גור יגור as derived from another root "sojourn" under the same "גור,"[167] MT does not say that one should "come to you" (LXX=P) even understood this way; second, the (mis)-interpretation of the Hebrew "falling" as "finding a refuge" is reasonable,[168] yet also unique enough that the dependence of P upon LXX at this point is obvious.

57:1

MT	LXX-P
הצדיק אבד The righteous perished.	ἴδετε ὡς ὁ δίκαιος ἀπώλετο Behold, how the righteous perished.
	הא זדיקא אבד Behold, how the righteous perished.

---

[167] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2670f.
[168] See also the discussion of Goldingay and Payne, *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC)*, II:359.

LXX sometimes uses "behold" as an extra demonstrative particle to give a warning

sign, which is not the case in MT (see also 56:10).[169] Though unnecessary, P may

have referred to LXX here and brought the demonstrative particle into the P-

translation unconsciously.

57:16

MT	LXX-P
כי־רוח מלפני יעטוף	πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται
For the spirit will grow faint	for the spirit will go out from me
from before me.	מטל דרוחא מן קדמי נפקא
	for the spirit will go out from me

The meanings of the root עטף are multiple ("to faint"; "to envelope oneself"; "to turn

aside"), yet none fit the translation in LXX=P.[170] Ziegler has dealt with the case of

LXX at this point, raising the possibility that the change of the verb from עטף, which

mostly possibly means "grow faint," into "go out," might be due to the theological

motif represented by, e.g., Ps 103(104):30: "You send forth your spirit, they are

---

[169] David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66*, JSOTSup 318 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001), 42–51.

[170] John Goldingay, *Isaiah 55-66 (ICC)* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 98.

created,"[171] i.e., the activity of the spirit in the creation. Be it the case or not, this

unlikely variation is inherited by P.

57:17

MT	LXX-P
וילך שובב בדרך לבו And he went on faithless, in the way of his heart.	καὶ ἐπορεύθη στυγνὸς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ and he went on, grieved, in his ways.
	ואזלת חנגתה באורחא דלבה And she went on, grieved, in the way of her heart.

The Hebrew word שובב, "faithless, rebellious," is a rare one, which only comes up in

Hebrew Bible elsewhere in Jer 3:14, 22. Unable to determine its meaning, the LXX

translator makes a conjecture from the earlier part of the same verse, "on account of

sin for a short time I grieved (ἐλύπησα) him," which, however, is again a false

translation.[172] This conjecture is further imported into P.[173]

57:18*

---

[171] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 129.
[172] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2680.
[173] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 142.

MT	LXX-P
ואַרפאהו ואַנחהו And I will heal him and I will lead him.	καὶ ἰασάμην αὐτὸν καὶ παρεκάλεσα αὐτὸν And I healed him and I comforted him
	ואסיתה וביאתה And I healed her and I comforted her

The crux of this deviation lies in the reading of the word "ואנחהו," which the LXX

translator might read as derived from נחם. However, the semantic kinship among

נחם, נח and נחה leads to quite a few confusions, especially between "leading" and

"consoling" in 40:11; 49:10 and 51:18, as the apparatus of HUB indicates.[174] This

makes a common *Vorlage* of LXX and P (and also of the T) specifically at this point

unnecessary, since it might be the case that it was a contemporary custom to read

them interchangeably. It might also be the case that the rendition of this single word

is influenced by the following sub-clause, "I will repay them with comfort."

However, considering how intensively the P-translator refers to LXX in this passage,

a direct borrowing by P from LXX would be a likely option. This case is thus

retained but marked as an uncertain dependence.

---

[174] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 258.

58:10

MT	LXX-P
ותפק לרעב נפשך And you give yourself to the hungry…	καὶ δῷς πεινῶντι τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ ψυχῆς σου And you give the bread to the hungry from your heart…
	ותתל לחמך לכנפא And you will give your bread to the hungry…

LXX seems to lean on verse 7 and understand the object of תפק to be bread.[175]

However, the translation weakens the point of the original Hebrew text that this verse is a strengthening of v.7, not an exact repetition. Instead of "giving bread" in v.7, it is admonished to "give oneself" in this verse.[176] P turned to LXX and decided to take this dis-intensified reading.

58:14

MT	LXX-P

---

[175] Karrer et al., *Septuaginta Deutsch II*, 2681.
[176] Goldingay, *Isaiah 55-66 (ICC)*, 178f.

אז <u>תתענג</u> על־יהוה והרכבתיך על־ במותי ארץ Then you will <u>take delight in</u> the Lord, and I will make you ride on the heights of the earth	καὶ ἔσῃ <u>πεποιθὼς</u> ἐπὶ κύριον καὶ ἀναβιβάσει σε ἐπὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς then you will <u>trust</u> in the Lord; and he will bring you up to the <u>good things</u> of the earth
	היד ין <u>תתכל</u> על מריא דאתכבך על עושנה דארעא Then you would <u>trust</u> in the Lord, so that I will make you <u>on the strength</u> of the earth

The misreading of the verb ענג, which should mean "take delight in," as "trust in" is

at first glance understandable due to its rarity. Yet both have just arrived in a correct

translation of the same root in verse 13. The very fact that both LXX and P have a

same deviating reading points to a direct dependence.

59:5

MT	LXX-P
והזורה תבקע אפעה And (from) which is crushed a snake breaks	συντρίψας οὔριον εὖρεν καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ βασιλίσκος having crushed, he found wind, also in it a basilisk.
	ודתברה משכח שעטא

forth.	And when he breaks it, a snake is found.

The translator of P can well understand the meaning of בקע as "to break out" in the verse (see also 34:15), but he is influenced by LXX here and inherits the verb "find" from the latter,[177] which is probably due to the appreciation of the streamlined text in LXX.

64:1

MT	LXX-P
כקדח אש המסים מים תבעה־אש as fire kindles brushwood and the fire causes water to boil…	ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ πυρὸς τήκεται καὶ κατακαύσει πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους as wax melts before the fire; and fire will burn up the enemies...
	ואתפשרו איך דמתפשרא שעותא מן קדם נורא ותוקד נורא לבעלדבביך and they melt as wax is melted before the fire; and fire will burn up the enemies…

---

[177] Weisz, "Deuterojesaia," 53.

The first impulse for the very different translation of LXX from MT is the

understanding of the word המסים as derived from מסס, of which the niphal form

means "to melt, to dissolve," instead of as a *nomen proprium* "brushwood." המס is a

hapax legomenon, and this reading is shared by LXX, P and V. HUB and Ottley

suggests that the picture of wax melting should be an excerpt from Ps 68:2, yet it is

more probably influenced by Ps 97:5, where the "mountains" are also mentioned.[178]

What's more, the additional translation, "and fire will burn up the enemies," is quite

peculiar. Its overall coincidence with P cannot be explained by mere accident.

65:23

MT	LXX-P
ולא ילדו לבהלה And will not bear children for terror	οὐδὲ τεκνοποιήσουσιν εἰς κατάραν nor will they beget children to be a curse…
	ולא נולדון ללוטתא and they will not beget children to be a curse…

The reading of לבהלה as "into a curse" is not hard to explain through the context:

There are various suggestions of a *Vorlage*, such as לקלל or לאלה, or merely

---

[178] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 282; Ottley, *Isaiah LXX*, 378.

153

conjectured "according to the *usus loquendi* of the Egyptian Jews."[179] It could also,

more simply, be hinted by the following "blessed offspring" as a contrasting element.

The reference to LXX by P is practically unnecessary yet certain.

66:9

MT	LXX-P
האני אשביר ולא אוליד Shall I make to break through and not give birth?	ἐγὼ δὲ ἔδωκα τὴν <u>προσδοκίαν ταύτην</u> But I have given this expectation …
	<u>אנא יהבת סוכיא הנא</u> I have given this expectation …

The hifil form of שׁבר only occurs once in the Hebrew Bible, making the most

common translation of this word dependent on its context of birth giving, i.e., "to

open the womb" or "cause (the child) to break through." The reason for a different

reading might be a probable recognition of the root שׁבר as שׂבר: Though שׂבר also

has no hifil form in the Hebrew Bible, it often means "to hope" or "to expect" (e.g.,

Ps 104:27; 119:116, 166; 145:15; 146:5; Is 38:18). Despite the theoretical

possibilities of the root(s) שבר in general, the P verse is undeniably dependent on

---

[179] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 291; Ottley, *Isaiah LXX*, 383.

LXX due to the one-to-one mapping of the elements that do not appear in the Hebrew

text: the verb "give," the noun "expectation" and the specific demonstrative pronoun

"this."[180]

66:18

MT	LXX-P
ואנכי מעשׂיהם ומחשׁבתיהם באה לקבץ את־כל־הגוים והלשׁנות And I—their deeds and their thoughts—it will come to gather all nations and tongues.	κἀγὼ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτῶν <u>ἐπίσταμαι</u> ἔρχομαι συναγαγεῖν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὰς γλώσσας And I <u>know</u> their deeds and their thoughts. I come to gather all nations and tongues
	ואנא <u>ידע</u> אנא עבדיהון ותרעיתהון מא דאתית למכנשׁו לכלהון עממא וללׁשנא And I <u>know</u> their deeds and their thoughts; when I come to gather all nations and tongues

There are several difficult points which make the verse quite unintelligible. First, the

verb באה is read by MT as feminine singular (either as perfect or a participle), while

---

[180] Weisz, "Deuterojesaia," 65.

155

by LXX, P and V, it is turned into first person masculine singular. Second, the

relationship between the first person pronoun and the phrase "their deeds and their

thoughts" is not clear: They could be understood as the object of the sentence or as

independent aposiopesis ("And I – (as) for their deeds and thoughts …").[181] Both

LXX and P chose the first possibility, which demands a transitive verb lacking in

MT. The verb "I know," which is added for smoothing the text, might be imported

from Ps 94:11, as HUB suggests,[182] yet it would be too coincidental if P and LXX do

exactly the same compensation independently.

66:19*

MT	LXX-P
אשר לא־שמעו את־שמעי who have not heard my report	οἳ οὐκ ἀκηκόασίν μου τὸ ὄνομα who have not heard my name
	דלא שמעו שמי who have not heard my name

---

[181] See the discussion by Goldingay, *Isaiah 55-66 (ICC)*, 511f.

[182] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 297.

Ziegler raises two reasons for the LXX translation: similar sound between שמעי and

שמי, and the often parallel between "name" and "glory" in Isaiah.[183] The second

reason, especially, cannot not be applicable to the P-translator, since, unlike the

translator of LXX, is much literal and tends to use the Syriac cognate (23:5; Jer 37:5;

50:43 etc.). Under this circumstance, the dependence of P upon LXX is rated as

probable.

3.3   Many Hands in P-Isaiah?

Are different Peshitta books ascribed to different translators? Barnes, in his 1901

article, "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta," already took the

proposition for granted that P is not homogeneous; the voices of multiple individuals

are detected in the translational text of the Peshitta.[184] This position is also more of

the starting point rather than the conclusion of Weitzman's discussion about "the

background of the Peshitta" in his monograph.[185]

In a similar vein, we can raise the question on a smaller scale: Is the book of P-Isaiah

assigned to different translators or different cooperative groups? In this final part of

---

[183] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 175.
[184] Barnes, "Influence," 186.
[185] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 206ff.

the chapter, a temporary answer will be given, summarized from the data drawn by

the analysis of the cases noted in the previous section: It is significant that the manner

in which the Peshitta of Isaiah uses the Greek translation varies from part to part in

the book of Isaiah, both quantitatively and qualitatively, which points to the existence

of more than one translator in charge of the Peshitta of Isaiah. To be more specific:

the intensity and the tendency of P-Isaiah's references to LXX vary from the first half

to the second half of P-Isaiah. However, before coming too soon to more concrete

results, some methodological remarks should be made:

Facing the fluctuation of the intensity of P-Isaiah's dependence on LXX, there are

various possibilities for explaining the observed data: 1) A change in pattern can

always be explained by the possibility of a new translator. 2) If there is an attenuation

of the reference frequency, it could be correlated to the familiarity of the translator

gained through the translating process. The more confidence he gained through this

process, the less assistance the translator would need from LXX. 3) A radical change

of the style in using LXX can also be attributed to the difference between chunks of

the original text. This possibility can be applied to the narrative in Ch. 36-39, which

differs significantly from its poetic context. In this case, the translation of these

chapters shows no evidence of dependence, not because of a different strategy applied

to translation, but because, due to the narrative essence of these chapters, there is comparatively no technical need for the translator to consult LXX text.

The most general description summarized from the data is as follows: The translation of the opening chapters of P-Isaiah has witnessed a heavy trace of LXX reference, which is pervasive in almost every section of the text. For instance, in Chapter 5 alone, which consists of 30 verses, there are nine significant dependence cases on LXX, many of which are not overly difficult cases (e.g., 5:2, 3, 7). This means that the translator, at least when beginning with the opening chapters, refers to LXX not only in moments of desperation; rather, he checks LXX more than one would think necessary in order to secure his own translation.

The density of evidence for reference declines as the translation progresses, and the hints of dependence almost fade from our sight after Chapter 15. For instance, from chapter 10 to chapter 20, there are only six possible cases with evidence of reference, most of which take place at difficult words, if not at *hapax legomena* (13:13, 13:9, 18:2, 18:6). In other words, the translator for these chapters became much more economical in using LXX.

A small climax of dependence on LXX happens roughly from chapter 30 until

chapter 33, where the P-translation has at least ten places in which there is evidence

of using LXX. In the following chapters, evidence fades again from sight until the

end of the section from Chapter 36-39. From the beginning of Deutero-Isaiah, the

translation bears a large number of examples of dependence upon LXX: More than 30

cases are found from Chapter 40 to the end of the book, where they are relatively

evenly distributed.

To be clear, the frequency of *demonstratable* cases only represents a small part of the

actual references to LXX by the P-translator(s). To show or even to prove a case of

direct dependence with assurance, we heavily depend on LXX variations deviant

from MT. At those points where LXX renders a decent translation of MT, we have no

evidence whatsoever for a referring act even if it did happen. Yet the quantity of these

evincible cases of dependence, which represents the actual population of all

dependent cases, is already large enough for generating significant results.

What conclusion can we draw from this observed data? An attempted hypothesis

can at least be made based on different manners in which the translation of P-Isaiah

utilizes LXX: T**he translation of P-Isaiah is the result of a cooperation between at**

least two translators. The first translator was assigned the first half of the book,

starting from the beginning. While translating the opening chapters, he made frequent

references to LXX, but the density of the references declined as the translation

progressed. The second translator took over from roughly the beginning of Chapter

30 or Chapter 34 and was evenly and heavily dependent on LXX throughout. This

hypothesis will be further confirmed in the next chapters.

The evidence supports this conclusion in four ways. **First**, from the simple

consideration of the quantity of text to be translated, a half-division is reasonable:

When a translation job is assigned to multiple consignees, it is most natural that the

text is supposed to be evenly sub-divided to the number of parts, each one equal in

size. Though each section, due to variations in difficulty, may cost a different amount

of time, this information might not be accessible for the consigner and might not

affect the general tendency of even distribution.

Second, a close look into the quantitative distribution of all observed dependent cases

shows that the minimalistic division of the translation into two parts is reasonable. As

mentioned above, Chapter 1-29 of P-Isaiah shows an obvious decline of the LXX

dependence: While there are more than 20 cases in Ch.1-5 and 9 cases in Ch.6-10, the

frequency converges and stabilizes itself at the rate of 5 cases from Ch.11-20 and 6

cases from Ch.21-29. This phenomenon can be explained by the confidence and linguistic skill the translator gradually gained through his practice.

Chapters 30-39 contain some anomalies, which cast some doubt on our claim about the division point: There are 10 cases in Ch.30-33, followed by no cases detected in Ch.34-39. Though the latter can be largely explained by the prosaic style of Ch.36-39, the sudden rise in intensity in Ch.30-33 remains a problem, making it difficult to decide whether the division could start from the beginning of Ch. 30 or of Ch. 34, which remains open to further study.

Chapters 40-66 witness an even distribution of dependent samples. Many of them do not only take place on the verbal level, as was the tendency in the first half of the book; rather, there are borrowings of whole sentences from LXX. This pervasive dependence on LXX lasts through the final chapter, which marks a consistent frequency at which this translator made use of LXX.

The exact counting is presented in the following table. Since the length of different chapters varies to a large extent, the numbers of the dependent cases are normalized according to the number of verses in each chapter. For instance, out of the 115 total verses in Ch. 1-5, there are 21 cases that show some influence from LXX, which

makes the density of these five chapters 21/115*1000=183. The tendency of the

density line is closely related to our conclusion that there were different translators.

Chapter	1-5	6-10	11-20	21-29	30-33	34-39	40-49	50-59	60-66
Verses	115	115	151	182	86	117	242	159	124
Cases	21	8	6	6	10	0	14	11	5
Density= *1000/ver.	183	70	39	33	116	0	58	69	40

Third, the way in which the translator uses LXX in the first half of the book differs

from in the second half. In the first 29 chapters, the translator of P-Isaiah has a much

clearer sense of doing a literal translation, i.e., a translation strictly following the

Hebrew *Vorlage*. This awareness is mostly embodied in the tendency only to turn to

LXX for help when necessary, that is, only where the original Hebrew text is too

abstruse or the Hebrew vocabulary is too rare. It is especially clear in the translation

where the translator has settled into a stable working habit: For instance, in Ch. 11-

20, all six cases are due to individual rare words, of which four are *hapax legomena*

as mentioned above. In other words, LXX is purely used as a lexicon for difficult

vocabulary. What is more, the translator for the first half of Isaiah was concerned

about the free style of LXX: When he referred to LXX, he refrained from borrowing

a whole phrase from LXX. Rather, the translator of the first half of P-Isaiah does not

hesitate to modify the free-style LXX, making it at least formally conformed to the

original MT. As evidence, here are two examples of how the P-translator modified

LXX text towards MT:

3:18

MT: "the beauty of anklets, headbands, crescents."

LXX: "the glory of their garments, their ornaments and the plaits of the hair and the

fringes and the crescents."

P: "the glory of the garments, their ornaments, and their plaited hair."

The P-translator, perplexed by the difficult vocabulary for items of personal

decoration in the Hebrew text, turned to LXX for lexicographic information. LXX,

unfortunately, provides a rather free translation in this verse, turning three items in a

Hebrew text, magically, into five items in Greek. While not knowing exactly which

item in Greek corresponds to which one in Hebrew, the P-translator did what he

could: He retained the first three items in the Greek text to fill the three "slots" set by

the Hebrew verse while leaving out, unfortunately incorrectly, the last two. From this

example, we can see quite clearly the way in which the translator tries to confine the

functionality of LXX within the domain of a secondary auxiliary rather than treat it as

another proper *Vorlage* of the translation. The translator was only willing to consult

LXX for the meaning of individual words, not for the grammatical structure of the

verses. Another example takes place later in Ch 30:

30:23

MT: "your cattle will graze, on that day, the wide pasture."

LXX: "and your cattle will graze, on that day, in fat and wide place."

P: "and the pasture of your cattle, on that day, in a fat place."

LXX translated one Hebrew participle, "broad," into two adjectives, "fat and wide."

The P-translator, while obviously referring to LXX as analyzed above, did not follow

the LXX translation verbally, but, again falsely, deleted the second adjective in LXX

in order to preserve the form of MT.

There are more examples for showing this tendency to bring the LXX translation

back in line with MT in the first 30 chapters (e.g., 5:13, 14; 10:3, etc.), which clearly

contrasts with the practice in Ch. 40-66. In the latter chapters,   the dependence is

more often a verbatim borrowing of a large chunk of the LXX text, as in 42:14;

44:12-14, 17, etc., where the free translation of LXX deviates from MT significantly, but this does not bother the P-translator at all. Quite often did the P-translator totally ignore the Hebrew *Vorlage* at those points where he translates the entire verse or passage directly from LXX, which never happens in the first half of the book.

Fourth, the aforementioned difference in the attitudes of different translators towards the Hebrew *Vorlage* is correlated to this final point, i.e., the difference in the attitude of the translators towards the usage of LXX. In the first 33 chapters of the translation, especially when the translator has gained his confidence, most of the identifiable cases in which P is dependent upon LXX are attributed to rare or difficult words or phrases in Hebrew. Only occasionally do we see cases for quite unnecessary borrowings from LXX (1:26, 5:2f, 7-9, 25*, 21:15, 28:16*, 29:16*, out of more than 40 cases), most of which are centered in Ch 1-5, where it can be supposed that the translator has not fully gained his self-confidence. However, in Ch.40-66, we see a much higher frequency of "unnecessary" borrowings (40:10, 13, 42:6, 44:17, 45:8, 46:5, 49:4, 52:4, 54:15, 57:1, 58:10, 58:14, 59:5, altogether 13 out of 25 cases). It means that the first translator tended to use LXX as an auxiliary dictionary in emergencies, while the second one utilized LXX much more liberally; even at those passages where the meaning of the Hebrew text seems plain and clear, and no other translation should be necessary, the second translator sees no harm in consulting

LXX for a better option. The translator seems, at least at those points, to feel no absolute obligation to stick to the Hebrew text as closely as possible, but gives himself certain freedom to follow LXX where he deems it proper.

To sum up, LXX was consistently consulted by the P-translators, while different parts of the translation show quantitative as well as a qualitative differences in the usage of LXX. Based on these differences, we can make the following initial conclusions: The P-Isaiah seems not to be the work of a single person but was rather divided and assigned to at least two different translators or translating groups. **Quantitatively**, the curve of the frequency of evincible cases of deviation points to such a division: On the one hand, the density drops from 183 units (which means averagely 0.183 evincible cases in each verse) in Ch.1-5 to 70 units in Ch.6-10, and then to 30-40 units in Ch.11-20 and Ch. 21-29; on the other hand, the density remains stable throughout Ch. 40-66 at around 60 units. Only Ch. 30-33 shows an anomaly, and Ch. 34-39 contains a large chunk of narrative, which makes these chapters different from the rest of the book. Therefore, the statistical data are relatively ineffective for evaluating these ten chapters. **Qualitatively**, the two translators have different attitudes towards the Hebrew text as well as towards the LXX text. The translator of Ch. 1-29 (33) is more conservative in two senses: 1) Concerning the Hebrew *Vorlage*, he tries hard to stay as close as possible to the Hebrew text. Even in cases where he

mostly depends on LXX text, he attempts to maintain at least the outer shape of the

Hebrew text by trimming LXX according to the shape of the Hebrew text. The

translator in charge of the second half of P-Isaiah, in contrast, quite often directly

translates LXX text as it is and does not concern himself with the fact that LXX text

in question is often quite remote from its Hebrew counterpart. 2) Concerning LXX,

the first translator makes an effort to minimalize the existence of LXX, as is

evidenced by the decline of the frequency of his references and his treatment of LXX

when he does refer to it. In contrast, the second translator makes much more frequent

use of LXX. He did not "discriminate" against LXX, so that even at passages where it

seems unnecessary, he happily consults LXX and adopts readings that he prefers. Put

in an anachronistic way, the first translator is more a follower of the idea of *Hebraica*

Veritas, while the second one is more a practitioner of eclecticism.

To be sure, it could be too arbitrary to assume only two translators instead of, say,

four translators. It is even harder to exclude the possibility of two translating groups

instead of two translators. However, a more complex model would demand more

empirical evidence than we have. For the moment, it is better to strike a balance

between the complexity of the model and the limits of the evidence at hand. At least,

with the minimal presupposition about two different translators, each in charge of half

of the text, and with the help of the observed data, we are able to see the fact that,

under the seemingly homogenous surface of the very literal translation of P-Isaiah,

different parts of the translation will show certain distinct patterns in employing

certain translation techniques. This difference hidden behind the seemingly intact

surface can be detected through careful comparison and calculation.

4 THE "QUOTATION" OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES IN P-ISAIAH

4.1 The Nature of the Enquiry

The relationship between the Old Testament and the New Testament Syriac Bible is largely represented by the research into the characters of the quotations of the OTP passages in various NT Syriac texts. There are, next to the NT-Peshitta, the Diatessaron and Old Syriac Gospels (=Curetonian and Sinaitic Gospels).[186] According to the received opinion, OTP was done in the second century, even as early as the mid-second century for part of the translation.[187] Specifically in the P-Isaiah, van der Kooij points to two verses that denote the fall of world power (25:7 and 33:21), associating them with the fall of Roman dominance during the conquest

---

[186] For a general overview of all the early Syriac versions of NT: Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 3–82; Matthew Black, "The Syriac Versional Tradition," in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare: der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte*, ed. Kurt Aland (de Gruyter, 1972), 120–59. The text of both the Old Syriac Gospels, together with NTP and the later Harklean version, are prepared in: George Anton Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshitta and Harklean Versions*, New Testament Tools and Studies 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1996). For the Diatessaron, though there have been attempts made to reconstruct the Syriac text, there is no widely accepted reconstruction, see: William L. Peterson, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

[187] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 251ff.

of Syria by Parthian king Vologases IV in 162 AD.[188] Under this circumstance, it is

theoretically possible that part of OTP, especially the Peshitta of Isaiah, was available

for citation by the earliest NT Syriac version known to us – the Syriac version of the

Diatessaron.

To be sure, the "quotations" in NT Syriac texts are not necessarily direct quotations

of the OT Peshitta; rather, they can be translations of Greek NT texts that are

recognizable quotations from "the scripture," be it in exact LXX form or in another

form. Thus, a question emerges: When the Peshitta translators of the NT dealt with

the recognizable OT quotations, did they tend to translate the quotations directly from

NT-Greek as they are, or did they tend to isolate these passages and treat them

specially, i.e., to check original passages in the OT in some version (Greek, Hebrew,

but most likely Syriac)?

This question has been answered in various ways. In line with Brock's general

suggestion,[189] Joosten, in two successive articles, proposes a direct dependence of

---

[188] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 295. He incorrectly named Vologases III as the invader, which is a mere mistake; see A. D. H. Bivar, "The Political History of Iran Under the Arsacids," in *The Cambridge History of Iran, Volume 3(1): The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods*, ed. E. Yarshater, vol. 3 of (Cambridge: University Press, 1983), 66.

[189] Sebastian P. Brock, "Limitations of Syriac in Representing Greek," in *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M Metzger (Cambridge: University Press, 1977), 96–98.

the Diatessaron on OTP, which accounts for further similarities between OTP and other NT Syriac translations due to the influence of the Diatessaron.[190] According to Joosten, it was the Diatessaron's producer, as the earliest translator of Syriac Gospels, who referenced OTP when coming across OT citations and thus brought the OTP readings into the NT Syriac versions. The later translators of other Syriac NT versions, since they could have the famous Diatessaron before them, adapted the form of the quotations, which are more or less identical with the text of OTP. In the end, it is Tatian who should be given the credit for channeling the OT Peshitta readings into the Diatessaron, as well as further into other Syriac NT scriptures.

Joosten's insightful idea about the inner-relationship among the NT Syriac versions is illuminating. He carefully depicts the tendency in the textual history of the Syriac Gospels, a tendency "to correct the text of the OT quotations on the basis of the Greek (NT). This tendency is much stronger in P than in the Old Syriac (C and S)."[191] Just to name one example:

Matt 4:6 (= LXX Ps 90:12) ἐπὶ χειρῶν = MT Ps 91:12 על־כפים "on the hands" / C, S

על דרעיהון (=OTP) "on their arms" / NTP על אידיהון "on their hands"[192]

---

[190] Joosten, "Quotations"; Joosten, "Diatessaron."
[191] Joosten, "Quotations," 59.
[192] Joosten, "Quotations," 60.

That is the reason why NTP has "on their hands." For Joosten, this represents an attempt to correct C and S quotation of OTP translation "on their arms" towards the Greek NT "on the hands." Because NTP reading is an intermediate station between the older C and S readings of "on their arms" and the NTG reading of "on the hands," the NTP translation is neither exactly translated from NTG, nor a faithful inheritance from older Syriac versions. The reliance of NTP on earlier Syriac versions and its benevolence towards the Greek NT is thus ccumulatively confirmed by examples like this one.

However, when it comes to the relationship between OTP on the one side, and the Syriac versions on the other side, there is a methodological deficit in Joosten's research: He based his model on the presupposition of OTP's temporal priority over the Diatessaron and other NT Syriac versions, so that whenever there is a deviation in one of the NT Syriac versions from NTG, and to the extent that this variant reading agrees with OTP, it is judged to be taken from OTP. Returning to the aforementioned example, NTG Matt 4:6 is a verbal citation from LXX Ps 91:12. While NTG = LXX text has "on the hands" in line with MT, the Curetonian as well as the Sinaitic Gospels have "on their arms," which is identical to OTP. Since C=S variant would be an inexact translation of the Greek NT if it were, and since they both agree with OTP,

this inexact variant is more probably taken from OTP rather than directly translated

from NTG.

The implicit presupposition behind the cases represented by this one is clear: OTP

was ready to be cited when C and S were made. This chapter will challenge the

absolute temporal privilege of OTP over all Syriac NT versions. By doing that, there

will not be proposed the opposite temporal order, i.e., the temporal privilege of the

Diatessaron over OTP; rather, the possibility will be brought into serious

consideration that OTP, as a translation that may have gone through various

redactions until it reached the form we have in the oldest manuscripts, should not be

understood as having a static existence for the NT translators. Instead, we must

understand OTP as having its own literary history from the earliest attempt of

translation to the final completion, and the references to the Syriac NT texts is

possible in a late stage of OTP's development. At least, as it will be showed by this

chapter, the completed form of P-Isaiah shows rather significant dependence on

various Syriac NT passages as opposed to being already cited in all of the NT Syriac

versions from the time of Tatian . This will blur the clear cut boundary between the

literary history of the earlier OTP on the one side, and that of the later Syriac NT

texts on the other side.

By mentioning the literary history of OTP, we are not fortunate enough to have

multiple versions of it as is the case with NT Syriac texts so that the history can be

more concretely outlined. However, according to the textual history of OTP

concerning those passages known to be quoted by the NT, we do have evidence that

OTP text was modified towards the NTP text. If one only looks in the book of Isaiah

there are examples for this phenomenon. Here are two examples indicated by

Brock:[193]

a)   P-Isa 9:1 "ודיתבין בארעא דטללי מותא נוהרא דנח עליהון" (6h3.5, two early manuscripts)

P-Matt 4:16 "ואילין דיתבין באתרא ובטללא דמותא נוהרא דנח להון"

We can see the difference between the earliest extant manuscripts of Isa 9:1 and NTP

Matt 4:16. All of the manuscripts used by the Leiden Peshitta later than 7a1 have להון

instead of עליהון, and most of these also modified ודיתבין according to the NTP

reading. This is a clear sign that the scribes, at some point, emended the OTP text

quoted in NTP according to the "cited" text in NTP. Another example of a less

popular variant:

---

[193] Sebastian P. Brock, "Text History and Text Division in Peshitta Isaiah," in *The Peshitta—Its Early Text and History*, ed. P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 64.

b) Isa 66:1 MT הדם רגלי / OTP כובשא דתחית רגלי (7a1), כובשא דרגלי (other

versions) / NTP Matt 5:35; Acts 7:49; Heb 1:13; 10:13 דכובשא דתחית רגל (NTG

ὑποπόδιόν τῶν ποδῶν)

In OTP, the idiomatic translation of the Hebrew phrase "הדם־רגליו" is "כובשא דרגלי"

(Ps 110:1; Lam2:1; Isa 66:1), while in NTP, "the footstool (which is) under the

feet…" is overwhelmingly more common, such that the copyist of OTP manuscript

7a1 modified the OTP text in Isa 66:1 towards the NTP wording.

This tendency to modify the cited OTP text towards NTP readings in the course of

textual transmission does not need to show, as Gelston suggests, "that the version was

not originally of Christian provenance, and that a desire was later felt to make it

conform more closely to a Christian text." However, it suffices to show that, like the

Syriac NT versions standing in the fluidity of mutual influence, the OTP text was still

under the process of developing even hundreds of years after different NT versions

came into being. This possibility that the OTP text was still in fluidity during the

literary history of the Syriac NT versions makes it challenging to take the OTP

influence upon any Syriac NT texts for granted. The mere fact that a Syriac NT text

deviates from the Greek NT text and agrees with the corresponding OTP text cannot

conclusively determine its dependence on the latter. It must be further showed that

the OTP text does not deviate from the Hebrew text to the same degree, because if

this is the case, an inverse influence could be equally possible.

There is another problematic conclusion to draw from the assumption that OTP was

accomplished, probably in one action, before its possible citation by the Diatessaron

(Joosten) or by other early Syriac versions of the NT. If, as Joosten supposed, Tatian

often cited the OT Peshitta *verbatim*, there should have been an already established

OT Peshitta that Tatian felt obliged to follow.[194] Considering the early date of the

Diatessaron as the *terminus ad quem* on the one side (160–175 AD), and the

prevalence of the Syriac language as the *terminus a quo* on the other side, could a

massive and organized translation and canonization of the OT books be imaginable,

especially considering the case of LXX? The small time window limited by the early

dating of the majority of the OTP books, by *modus tollens*, casts a shadow over

Joosten's thesis.[195]

Another difficult implication of the early dating of the majority of the OTP books is

even more crucial. The root of the Peshitta has long been debated, with scholars split

over OTP as a Christian or Jewish translation, as stated in the introductory chapter.

---

[194] Joosten, "Quotations," 76, n.42.
[195] Holm, "Syriac Version," 228; Shedinger, "Tatian," 278f.

The "Quotation" of New Testament Passages in the Peshitta of Isaiah

The early dating of the OTP translation suggests that the complete translation of

Laws and Prophets would predate the abridged Diatessaron, which tends to oppose

the option for Christian origin of the translation.[196] In addition, the early dating of

OTP can influence the judgment about its authorship in a more nuanced way. We take

Weitzman's argument as an example: According to Weitzman, the majority of the

OTP books are of Jewish origin and were brought into Christianity by converted

Jews: "A Jewish community converted to Christianity, bringing with it a version of

the Hebrew Bible" (i.e., OTP).[197] This community is an anti-cultic, non-rabbinic one,

which puts much emphasis on prayer, as well as faith and hope. This spiritual

emphasis, as Weitzman viewed it, can be comparable to the addressees of the Epistle

to the Hebrews, which should be dated between 60 and 100 AD.[198] As exemplified

for Weitzman by the readers of Hebrews, who were most probably converted Jews,

this kind of conversion can also be imaginable in the communities that produced

---

[196] The most basic order for a community to develop or to have a translation of its own canon is to produce a rudimentary or abridged form of the authoritative text first, and then develop a fuller text later, either based on or next to the shorter form. It is, for instance, the Q collection that should be given temporal priority over the generation of the Gospels in the literary history of the NT, and it is the Diatessaron that precedes the production of other Old Syriac Gospels and other NT books. Due to the growing need of ever burgeoning communities, this is how the limited literary resources and energy should be prioritized. It is also the logic most researchers would follow: see F. Haase, "Zur Ältesten Syrischen Evangelienübersetzung," *TQ* 101 (1920): 270.
[197] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 260.
[198] Harold W. Attridge and Helmut Koester, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 6–9.

OTP, whereby the translation can be introduced to the Jewish-Christian community through this conversion process. This comparison would make limited sense if the supposed conversion of the community that brought OTP into Christianity was too remote from the addressees of the Hebrews. In other words, one important supporting factor for Weitzman's Jewish-Christian provenance hypothesis for the origin of OTP is the early dating of this translation.

In a newly published article, Bodor examines the Isaiah quotations in the Old Syriac (C and S) and Peshitta Gospels and concludes that only at two passages, Isa 40:3-5 in Luke 3:4-6 (C and S, partly P) and Isa 42:2 in Matt 12:19 (C and S), does the NT text show a clear dependence on OTP. At the same time, at most other points, the Old Syriac and the Peshitta of the Gospels tend to render the Greek text as faithfully as possible.[199] Bodor thus challenged the conclusion of Joosten, at least within the scope of the citations of Isaiah, which represents the largest amount of quotations in the Gospels.

While Bodor chooses to remain within the framework of the "Syriac NT text citing the OTP," this chapter will reverse the perspective: Instead of the Syriac NT versions

---

[199] Attila Bodor, "The Use of the Peshitta of Isaiah in Rendering Isaiah Quotations in the Old Syriac and Peshitta Gospels," *AS* 16.1 (2018): 20–41.

citing OTP whenever there is a similarity between them, we will take an investigation

into OTP cited passages as being under the influence of the Syriac NT. Gelston has

examined this possibility, but he only finds Isa 28:11 in 1 Cor 14.21 as convincing

evidence for the influence of the Syriac NT on P-Isaiah. In this chapter, more

passages that evince this influence will be listed, most of which are not discussed in

the previous literature. We will re-visit the famous passage of Isa 25:6-8, which

stands for many scholars as one of the most conspicuous passages for a Christian

translator, and a new interpretation will be provided, which might illuminate the

understanding of the (mis-)translation.

4.2   Evidences for Dependence on NT Syriac Texts

In this section, cases are ordered according to their place in the book of Isaiah. Those

cases marked with a star are cases less certain to be evidence of dependence.

Isa 6:10 – Mark 4:12

MT	פן־יראה בעיניו ובאזניו ישמע ולבבו יבין ושב ורפא לוֹ
	Lest it sees with its eyes, hear with its ears, understand with its heart, and return and be healed…

OTP	דלא נחזא בעינוהי ונשמע באדנוהי ונסתכל בלבה ונתוב ו<u>נשתבק לה</u>
	Lest it sees with its eyes, hear with its ears, understand with its heart, and return and <u>be forgiven</u>…
NTP	(=Greek Mk 4:12) דלמא נתפנון ו<u>נשתבקון</u> להון חטהיהון
	Lest they return and their sins <u>be forgiven</u>.

It is well known that the Targum Isaiah tends to interpret suffering and disease as inequity and sin, thus systematically translating the bodily healing into forgiving of transgressions (שׁבק, 6:10; 53:4f twice; 57:18f twice).[200] However, this targumic tradition is not shared by OTP elsewhere, and P, except at this point, provides strictly literal translation (אסי = "heal"), though sometimes the context also allows for or even tends towards the forensic interpretation, since many passages substantially talk about secular crimes and religious transgressions more than this verse (e.g., Isa 19:22; Jer 3:22; Hos 7:1, 14:5). However, only the translation of verse 6:10 embodies this targumic idea: If it is only a random importation of targumic imagery, why not at other more receptive points?

---

[200] Jintae Kim, "Targum Isaiah 53 and the New Testament Concept of Atonement," *JGRChJ* 5 (2008): 81–98.

Meanwhile, this targumic idea, though insignificant in OTP, takes a much more central role in New Testament (see Matt 13:14–15; Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10; John 12:40; Acts 28:26; Rom 11:8), especially in Mark: It is not only Jesus' Jewish opponents (10:5) but also the crowds that follow him (4:12) and even his disciples whose hearts are hardened.[201] From the textual relationship in this citation between Isa 6:10 and Mark 4:12, a very probable answer for the singularity of this targumic interpretation in Isa 6:10 is not a random infiltration of targumic tradition at this point, but an influence by the NTP idiomatic expression through the citation relationship.

Isaiah 13:6 – Mark 13:35f.

MT	הילילו כי קרוב יום יהוה כשד מ<u>שדי</u> יבוא
	Wail, for the day of the Lord is near; it will come like destruction <u>from the Almighty</u>.
OTP	איללו מטל דקריב הו יומה דמריא ואיך בזתא <u>מן שליא</u> נאתא
	Wail, for the day of the Lord is near; it will come like plundering, <u>suddenly</u>.
NTP	אתתעירו הכיל דלא ידעין אנתון אמתי אתא מרה דביתא ברמשא או בפלגה דלליא או במקרא

---

[201] M. Eugene Boring, *Mark: A Commentary* (Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing Corporation, 2006), 95.

(=Greek) תרנגלא או בצפרא   דלמא נאתא <u>מן שליא</u> ונשכחכון כד דמכין אנתון Therefore, be on the alert, for you do not know when the master of the house is coming, whether in the evening, at midnight, at the cockcrowing, or in the morning, lest he come <u>suddenly</u> and find you when you are sleeping.

To be sure, there is no other ancient version that shows the same translation, which

makes a common *Vorlage* for OTP and NTG=NTP passage quite improbable. The

same Hebrew verse in Joel 1:15 is correctly translated into Syriac, while here it is not.

The "sudden" coming of the punishing Lord is a recurrent motif in the NT (e.g., Matt

24:43; 25:13; Mark 13:35f; Luke 12:39f; 1 Thess 5:2-4; 2 Pet 3:10; Rev 3:3; 16:15),

but not a typical one in the Hebrew Bible, especially not in the book of Isaiah.[202]

Although there are sporadic phrases about a sudden calamity, like 29:5, 30:13, 47:11

("לפתע" and "פתאם"), they are insignificant and never associated with eschatological

motives like "the day of the Lord." In summation, it is likely a theological grafting as

opposed to a mere translational mistake: It is quite probable that the influence comes

from NTP.

Mark 13:35f is a typical expression of this idea. With the same wording ("מן שליא,"

translated from ἐξαίφνης) and the same motif (the day of the Lord), it serves as an

---

[202] David Daube, *The Sudden in the Scriptures* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 4ff.

optimal candidate for the source of the influence. Other passages, like Luke 21:34 and 1 Thess 5:3, with the same wording and similar eschatological motif could also serve the same function. Though none of these NT passages is a direct citation of Isa 13:6, the borrowing of the idea as well as the idiomatic wording from a pertinent and established NT motif is fully reasonable.

Isa 28:11f – 1 Cor 14:21

MT	כי בְלַעֲגֵי שׂפה ובלשון אחרת יְדַבֵּר אֶל־הָעָם הַזֶּה: אשר אמר אליהם זאת המנוחה הניחו לעיף וזאת המרגעה ולא אבוא שׁמוע
	Indeed, through stammering lips and another tongue, <u>he will speak</u> <u>to this people</u>, to whom he has said "This is rest; give rest to the weary; and this is repose"; yet they would not hear.
OTP	מטל דבממללא עֶטְלָא ובלשנא אחרנא אֲמַלֵּל עַמֵּה עם עמא הנא דְּאָמְרֵת להון [...]
	For with stammering speech and another tongue, <u>I will speak</u> <u>with him, i.e., with this people</u>, to whom I have said…
NT	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι ἐν <u>ἑτερογλώσσοις</u> καὶ ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέρων <u>λαλήσω</u> <u>τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ</u> καὶ οὐδ᾽ οὕτως εἰσακούσονταί μου, λέγει κύριος.
	In the law it is written, "By people of <u>foreign</u> tongues and by the lips of other

	people, <u>I will speak</u> <u>to this people</u>; yet even then they will not listen to me," says the Lord.
NTP	בנמוסא כתיב דבממללא <u>נוכריא</u> ובלשנא אחרנא <u>אמלל</u> <u>עמה עם</u> עמא הנא אפלא הכנא נשמעונני אמר מריא
	In the law it is written, "With a <u>foreign</u> speech and through another tongue<u>, I will speak</u> <u>with him, i.e., with this people</u>, yet even then they will not listen to me," says the Lord.

First of all, OTP and NTP coincide in this verse with a strange translation of the Hebrew "אל־העם הזה" (LXX=NTG: "τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ") into "עמה עם עמא." Second, עם,"with," is in both cases not an exact translation to the Hebrew "אל." Third, both use the rare repetitional structure, i.e., a preposition takes a suffix to anticipate its object, after which the preposition is repeated, which takes the real object (elsewhere only in OTP Gen 21:20 and Jer 41:3, the second of which is due to the same structure in Hebrew). This inaccurate translation together with its conspicuous structure points to a direct dependence between OTP and NTP. The question left now is the direction of it.

The key to the latter question lies in the person who speaks to the people. The MT reading is consistent with its context: God is the "He" who admonishes his people.

185

He will make Assyrians or Babylonians say peaceful words to the Jewish people with

"stammering lips and another tongue" (i.e., the language foreign to the Jews). [203] The

NT, due to the free style of the citation, switches to the perspective of the first person.

The NTP translation is a fair translation in comparison to the NT text, yet OTP is not

quite so: OTP strangely moves from the third person perspective in the immediate

context to the first person, as in the NTP text, which results in some inconsistency

(see verse 9 and 13). Since OTP goes away from MT towards NTP, which is a proper

translation of the NT Greek, we can see that the weight of evidence speaks in favor of

OTP's dependence on NTP.

Isaiah 28:16 - 1 Peter 2:6

MT	הנני יסד בציון אבן אבן בחן פנת יקרת מוסד מוסד Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone, a stone tested, a costly cornerstone for the foundation, firmly placed (according to NAS)
OTP	הא אנא מתקן אנא בצהיון כאפא כאפא בחירתא בזויתא יקירתא ריש אסתא דשתאסתא Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone, a stone tested, in the honorable corner, the head of the foundation of the wall.

---

[203] The LXX reading is different: The subject of the narration switches from God to
"they," i.e., the enemies, who say "contemptuous things" to the Jews. The enemies
are so contemptuous to proclaim the death and end of the Jewish people.

NT	ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον <u>ἀκρογωνιαῖον</u> ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον
	Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone, chosen and <u>precious, lying at the extreme</u>
	<u>corner</u>
NTP	דהא סאם אנא בצהיון כאפא בחירתא ויקירתא <u>בריש זויתא</u>
	…that "Behold, I am laying in Zion a tested and <u>precious stone in the head</u>
	<u>of the corner</u>."

The OTP translation contains a strange phrase, "the head of the foundation of the wall," which seems redundant and does not come from LXX (εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς). The question becomes, then, why does OTP translate the Hebrew "מוסד" (foundation) into "the head of the foundation"?

When we look into NTP, there is an answer: NTP is a legitimate translation of the Greek text, though there is an abstruse adjective, ἀκρογωνιαῖον. The word consists of ἄκρος "extreme" and γωνία "angle" which exactly corresponds to the phrase, " ריש זויתא," "the head/extreme of the corner," in NTP.

The OTP translator did not copy the NTP translation, since this, due to the free style of NTG, is obviously not an exact translation of the Hebrew text. According to the analysis from the previous chapter, the translator of the first 30 chapters is a follower

of *Hebraica Veritas*: When he borrows a reading from LXX, he tends to modify the

borrowing according to the original Hebrew text. The same applies to his borrowing

from NTP: He tries to supplement the succinct NT reading according to his

understanding of the Hebrew text. However successful the result is, it retains a

redundancy, "the head of," which does not correspond to any Hebrew but find its root

in the translation of NTG into NTP.

Isa 33:21 - Rev 21:23f (21:23-27) *

MT	כי אם־שם אדיר יהוה לנו מקום־<u>נהרים</u> <u>יארים</u> רחבי ידים בל־<u>תלך</u> בו <u>אני־שיט</u> וצי <u>אדיר</u> לא יעברנו:
	For, there, the majestic One, the LORD, shall be for us a place of broad <u>rivers</u> <u>and streams</u>, on which no <u>boat with oars</u> shall <u>go</u>, and on which no <u>mighty</u> <u>ship</u> shall pass.
OTP	מטל דמריא *שמא* הו לן *משבחא* והו נהוא לן אתרא <u>נהירא ונהירותא</u> וארוחתא דאידיא. דלא <u>תמלך</u> <u>מרותא דשליטא</u> <u>ועשינא דנשתכח</u> לא נעבר בה
	For the Lord is a glorious name for us, he will be a <u>shining</u> place for us, <u>an illumination</u>, a spacious place, where the <u>authority of the ruler</u> will not <u>reign</u>, and the <u>powerful one, who is *present*</u> (emendation: glorious), will not pass over it.

NTP	תשבוחתה גיר דאלהא אנהרתה [...] ומהלכין עממא בנוהרה ומלכא דארעא מיתין לה
	תשבוחתא
	for the glory of God enlightened it […]The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it.

First of all, the Syriac word דנשתכח (in italics) should be amended into דנשבכח, since it is a direct translation of the Hebrew adjective אדיר, which has nothing to do with שׁכח (see Jg 5:13; Ps 8:1, 10; 16:3; 76:5; 93:4; Ez 17:23). Rather, אדיר is always translated with the Syriac root שׁבך, as in the first half of the same verse. The original Hebrew text depicts God, metaphorically, as a place of rivers where ships can sail. However unusual the metaphor seems to be at first glance,[204] after this correction, the translation still deviates from the Hebrew text systematically, making Warszawski comment that "dies ist eine sehr freie, für die Pes. ungewöhnliche Wiedergabe des Textes": i) נהרים יארים, "rivers and streams," are both read as associated with "light" (from נהר "to shine" and from "אור"); ii) תלך is read as תמלך. iii) אני־שיט is read as from און, "strength" (see also Is 40:26, 29), and שליט, "domineering." iv) צי is understood as "powerful," in parallel to מרותא, "the authority." With all of these "misreadings," a new picture is created: Instead of God as a watery place where no

---

[204] A reasonable interpretation associated with the creation is given by Beuken, *Jesaja 28-39*, 291f.

boat or ship should travel, God, according to the Syriac transition, is a shining place

itself in which powerful human beings shall not reign, but only God himself. The

eschatological picture immediately reminds one of the image depicted by the ending

of Revelation: Here, in the same vein, God is the lamp for the new Jerusalem (21:23),

and the city is ever bright (21:25), from which the undeserved will be banned (21:27).

Independently, all of these deviations from the Hebrew text are, in some sense,

reasonable, and some of them are even possible readings. However, when at least

three impossible readings (שליט as from שיט; מלך as from תלך; אור as from יארים)

come up within one single verse, coincidence hardly suffices to explain it. Its

similarity to verse 23f. of Rev 21, not only in respect to the vocabulary (תשבוחתה,

אנהרתה, מהלכין, מלכא as underlined in the NTP verses), but also in its motif, becomes

very intriguing to us.

It is certain that this creative translation also shared a lot of common traits (the

glorious light, the kings in pilgrimage) with Ch. 60 of Isaiah, yet Revelation 21 has

more parallel elements: 1) The ever-shining city is an important image shared

exclusively by Is 33 and Rev 21. 2) While Ch. 60 of Isaiah and Ch. 21 of Revelation

both mention that in the final days the gates through which the foreigners bring

tributes into the city will not shut, it is תשבוחתא (Rev 21, which also comes up in Isa

33:21) versus חילא (Isa 60) used for the tributes. To be sure, we cannot exclude the

possibility of a double influence, since, finally, the image of Rev 21 is inspired by Isa

60. Out of this doubt, this case will be marked with an asterisk (uncertainty).

Isa 34:4 – Rev 6:13

MT	וכל־צבאם יבול כנבל עלה מגפן וכנבלת מתאנה:
	And all of their hosts will also wither away like a leaf that withers from the vine, or like *one* that withers from the fig tree.
OTP	וכלה חילהון נתר איך טרפא דנתר מן גפתא ואיך פקועא מן תתא
	And all of their host will fall like a leaf that falls from the vine, and like an unripe fig from the fig tree.
NT	καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔπεσαν εἰς τὴν γῆν, ὡς συκῆ βάλλει τοὺς ὀλύνθους αὐτῆς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου μεγάλου σειομένη
	And the stars of heaven fell to the earth, as a fig tree casts its unripe figs when shaken by a great wind.
NTP	וכוכבא דשמיא נפלו על ארעא איך תתא דשדיא פקועיה מן רוחא עשינתא מא דמתתזיעא
	And the stars of heaven fell on the earth, as a fig tree casts its unripe figs when it is shaken by a strong wind.

The Hebrew text is a bit puzzling due to the omitted component that should be qualified by the feminine singular participle נבלת. LXX simply duplicates the עלה, "a leaf," in another *membrum* of the parallelism, which, however, does not fit the gender of the participle. The Targum reads it as a noun, and leaves it almost untouched as "נבלא," though it is not a typical Aramaic word. The Vulgate has the same *Vorlage*, which forces him to delete נבלת as redundant to the previous נבל ("defluit folium de vinea et de ficu").

The Hebrew word for "unripe fig" פַּגָּה is a *hapax legomenon* (Song 2:13). In both OTP and NTP, it comes up elsewhere only in Isa 34:4 and Rev 6:13. Though Rev 6:13 is a citation of Isa 34:4, the word fits the context of OTP less cthan that of NTP. In Isa 34:4, the analogy between all falling hosts, stars and falling leaves is constructed through the *tertium comparationis* in their similar falling momentum, not their early death. Confronted with a question: "Something falls like an autumn leaf, like a(n) __ apple that withers," the best guess would be "ripe" rather than "unripe." In contrast, the "unripe fig" in the context of Revelation makes much better sense: Here, the figs fall because shaken by "great wind," not due to natural process. Its early death is hinted by the violent wind. Under this circumstance, the reading "unripe fig" is most likely to have been introduced into OTP from NTG through NTP.

Isa 40:13 – Rom 11:34

MT	מי־תכן את־רוח יהוה ואיש עצתו יודיענו
	Who has directed the spirit of the Lord, <u>and</u> as his counselor has instructed hiMT?
LXX	τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου <u>καὶ</u> τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο <u>ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν</u>
	Who has known the mind of the Lord <u>and</u> who has become his counselor <u>that will instruct hiMT?</u>
OTP	מנו תקן רוחה דמריא <u>או מנו הוא לה בעל מלכא</u>
	Who has established the spirit of the Lord? <u>Or</u> who was his counselor?
NT	τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; <u>ἢ</u> τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;
	For who has known the mind of the Lord? <u>Or</u> who has become his counselor?
NTP	מנו גיר ידע רעינה דמריא <u>או מנו הוא לה בעל מלכא</u>
	For who has known the mind of the Lord? <u>Or</u> who was his counselor?

The NT text is generally based on LXX, with two noticeable adaptions relevant to our case: First, it substitutes the conjunction καὶ with ἢ; second, it deletes the subordinate clause "ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν." Both features are inherited by the NTP translation. Both features, which are not existent in either MT or LXX, take place in the OTP

193

translation. The identical phrase או מנו הוא לה בעל מלכא, which is structurally remote

from MT or LXX, is most probably directly copied from NTP.

In addition, we should notice that there is, if not a grammatical mistake, a

grammatical irregularity in both OTP and NTP: The phrase "מנו הוא" is far from

standard, especially in the context of OTP. The word מנו here is a contraction of the

interrogative pronoun מן with the third person enclitic, which means "who is" and

expects an immediate predicate if the predicate is a nominal. The redundant הוא

between מנו and its nominal predicate is elsewhere not witnessed in either OTP or

NTP. This further confirms the dependent relationship between OTP and NTP.

4.3   Isa 25:6-8: A Systematic Citation of 1 Cor 15?

Isa 25:6-8 depicts a feast on Mount Zion. This passage resumes the theme of "the

Day of the Lord" in 24:21-23: There, the kingdom of God on Mount Zion is

proclaimed; and here, a feast will be prepared:[205]

---

[205] The feast due to the enthronement of a King is an usual scene in the Hebrew Bible
(1 Sam 11:15; 1 Kgs 1:9, 3:15; Esth 2:18); Beuken, *Jesaja 13-27*, 248.

In this mountain the LORD of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich

food, a feast of well-aged wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged

wines strained clear. And he will destroy on this mountain the shroud that is

cast over all peoples, the sheet that is spread over all nations; he will swallow

up death forever. (Isa. 25:6-8 NRS)

Van der Kooij has noted some eschatological themes imbedded in the translation of

P-Isa 25:6-8.[206] To be sure, the eschatological elements (the Day of the Lord; the

punishment of the wicked rulers, the overcoming of death, etc.) are already abundant

in the original Hebrew text.[207] Whether the new elements in the Syriac translation

make a huge theological difference will be the question of this section. Verses will be

analyzed individually.

Verse 6:

MT	ועשה יהוה צבאות לכל־העמים בהר הז And the Lord of hosts will make for all peoples on this mountain, *משתה שמנים משתה שמרים*

---

[206] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 273–77.

[207] Hans Wildberger, *Jesaja 13-27 (BK)*, Biblischer Kommentar X/3 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978), 963.

	a feast of oily foods, a feast of *aged wine* (1), שמנים ממחים שמרים מזקקים oily foods *full of marrow* (2), and *aged* (3), *refined wine* (4).
OTP	ונעבד מריא חילתנא בכלהון עממא נטורא הנא And the Lord of hosts will make for all the peoples on this mountain, משתיא <u>שמינא</u> ומשתיא נטירא <u>ושמינא</u> an <u>oily</u> (i) feast, and a feast *reserved* (1) and <u>oily</u> (i), <u>דמחינן שמינא ועשׁינא</u> *which gives us life* (2) (ii), <u>*oily*</u> (3) (i), and *strength-giving* (4) (iii).

A close analysis of the ambiguous translation can yield impressive results. All of the concrete differences in vocabulary choice will be marked with italic and Arabic numbers: (1) The translator has difficulty in recognizing the noun שמר as "dregs," instead understanding it as derived from another root meaning "keep, watch." (2) He does not follow the Masoretes in reading ממחים as the pual form of מחה, but as the preposition *mem* plus a (causative) participle of the verb חיה. (3) In the only real mistake in this translation, the translator renders the Hebrew word שמרים, "dregs," into the Syriac שׁמינא, "oily," which might be an influence from the context in which the word "שׁמינא" repeatedly comes up. (4) Meanwhile, the understanding of מזקקים as עשׁינא is, again, a deviation, probably arrived at by deriving the meaning of מזקקים from the similar root חזק. Meanwhile, in Isa 25:2, 3, 4, 5, i.e., the four verses preceding this one, the translator continuously used the same word to translate בצורה, "impregnable (city)," עז, "fierce (nations)," and עריץ, "ruthless (wind and person,

respectively)." It might be a rhetorical device that the translator uses the different

meanings of the same adjective to reach a climatic effect. In addition to the issues

enumerated, the Syriac translation contains a structural deviation from the Hebrew

text by dividing the second and third sub-verses between שמנים and ממחים instead

of between שמרים and שמנים.

As we can see, the deviating readings of the Syriac translator take place on different

levels: Some of them are reasonable derivations from the same consonantal text (1

and 2), while some are "midrashic" (4) or simply incorrect (3). These deviations

taken together point to a totally new feast: It is now not a feast of "aged wine," but a

feast "reserved" for the future (1); instead of providing "marrow," now it "gives life"

(2) and instead of providing "refined wine," it now gives strength (4). The spiritual

transformation of the meaning in the Syriac is systematic: In this sense, van der Kooij

is correct in elucidating an eschatological tendency within the Syriac translation.

However, van der Kooij has neglected a strange phenomenon concerning this

translated verse: There are many equivocal words used in this translation. All of the

equivocal words, which can have two quite different meanings under the same

consonantal appearance, are underlined and marked with roman numbers: (i) First,

the Syriac word שׁמינא "oily" can also mean "heavenly." (ii) Second, the word

"דמחינן" should mean "made of something which gives us life," when taken as a proper translation. However, if we understand the *nun* at the end as a genitive objective suffix, the same word can be read as "of our savior." In NTP, the word מחינא, is exclusively attributed to Jesus as the savior ("σωτήρ"), outside of one occurrence in 1 Cor 15:45, where it denotes the life-giving spirit.[208] If we further understand the "ד" as taking a *genetivus materialis*, this whole word דמחינן no longer explains a mere *accidental property* of the feast as something "refreshing," but indicates the *causa materialis* of it as made out of (the flesh of) our savior. (iii) Finally, the word עשׁינא in Syriac can be read as positive in the sense of "being strong," but it also can be negative in the sense of "violent, ruthless," as it is used in verses 3, 4 and 5, immediately preceding this passage. The question is, which noun is qualified by the adjective if understood as "violent, ruthless" instead of as "strength-giving"? Obviously, that adjective, under this circumstance, does not refer to "our savior," but to the feast made of our savior: The consumption of our savior is brutal.

If we put all of these possible readings together, a brand-new translation unfolds in front of our eyes: "And the Lord of hosts will make for all the peoples on this mountain, a heavenly feast, and a feast, reserved and heavenly, made of our heavenly

---

[208] It is further a typical usage in Aphrahat's *Demonstration*, see van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 273.

savior, and (therefore) brutal." This is almost a Christological hymn. The interesting

thing is, this second reading is almost hidden behind the earlier reading: The earlier

reading, though containing a spiritual tendency, was still a decent translation of the

Hebrew *Vorlage*. This new reading, however, is far from the original meaning. These

second sense, however, is realized through all of the "mistakes" together with the

equivocal words employed by the translator. Taking into consideration how faithful

the translator normally is to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, it is very dubious that all of these

elements could come together merely by accident.

Verse 7:

MT	ובלע בהר הזה פני-*הלוט הלוט* על-כל-העמים *והמסכה הנסוכה על*-כל-הגוים
	And he will devour on this mountain the side of *the covering*, *the covering* (1) which is over all peoples, and *the veil* (2) that *is stretched* (3) *over* (4) all peoples.
OTP	ונתבלע בטורא הנא אפי *שליטא דשליט* הוא על כלהון עממא *ונכסתא דאתנכסת על אפי* כלהון עממא
	And it will be <u>devoured</u> (i) on this mountain the face of *the ruler who rules* (1) over all the peoples, and *the sacrifice* (2) that *is slaughtered* (3) *for the sake of* (4) all peoples.

(1) The original Hebrew text is abstruse: Why is the covering devoured instead of, for instance, removed?[209] It is probably related to the humble face-covering act of Moses and Elijah before the Lord (לוט also in: 1 King 19:13 where Elijah wrapped his face; בלע also in Num 4:20 and 16:30ff., where the presumptuous people before the Lord are devoured). It may also simply mean the divine comfort echoing verse 8, since the covering of the face is also associated with distress (e.g., 2 Sam 15:30; 19:5; Jer 14:3-4). However, the P-translator continued to exert his Midrashic technique, reading שלט out of לוט, translating it as "the ruler (singular) who rules…" This translation might be influenced by 24:21f. about the worldly kings to be punished. However, there, the Syriac text points to plural kings without ambiguity (נכנשון); so why is the word singular here? What is more, why is "the face of the ruler who rules" devoured? The idea that God swallows up some human face is rather irregular.

Again, if we know that in Syriac, the verb בלע (i) can mean not only "to devour," but also "to wound, to suffer,"[210] we can no doubt understand that it is the face of the one ruler that is wounded! Does it hint Jesus whose face is struck (see Matt 26:67; Mark 14:65; John 18:22; 19:3)? At this point, a further tradition in the Christian community in Edessa should be mentioned:

---

[209] See discussion in Beuken, *Jesaja 13-27*, 349.
[210] e.g., Luke 22:51 "וקרב לאדנה דהו דבלע" (And he touched the ear of him that was smitten).

When Hannan, the keeper of the archives, saw that Jesus spoke thus to him,

by virtue of being the king's painter, he took and painted a likeness of Jesus

with choice paints, and brought it with him to Abgar the king, his master. And

when Abgar the king saw the likeness, he received it with great joy, and

placed it with great honor in one of his palatial houses. (Doctrine of Addai,

13)

At least by the death of Eusebius (339/40), since this story is also present in his

Church History, the legend of the *Image of Edessa* had already been established,

according to which the miraculous image of the face of Jesus, imprinted on a cloth, is

venerated. Without pushing the causal chain too far, it suffices to say that this

tradition might be one impulse for the translator to associate the MT reading "the side

of the covering" with the possible Syriac meaning "wounded face of the ruler" as

suggested above.

(2) and (3) Again, with a Midrashic metathesis of the נכס into נסך, the translator

turns "the veil that is stretched," which according to Hebrew should be "devoured,"

into "the sacrifice that is slaughtered."

(4) There is an additional אפי after the preposition על, turning a spatial preposition "over" into the causal "because of," which can be explained by a random influence of the same word from the previous sub-verse. However, "על אפי" is a typical expression for substitutionary atonement or prayer in the NT Peshitta (1Th 5:10; 2 Th 2:13; 1 Pe 3:14; 4:14; Eph 1:16; 3:1; 5:25, etc., and especially 1 Cor 15:3), which perfectly fits the "midrashic" translation about the sacrifice done for all peoples.

In conclusion, again, the Syriac translation deviates systematically from the Hebrew text. Under the surface of the translation "And it will be devoured on this mountain the face of the ruler who rules…" there is a possible Christological reading "And it will be wounded on this mountain the face of the ruler who rules…"

Verse 8 (//NTG 1 Cor 15:54):

MT	בלע המות לנצח
	He has swallowed up death <u>forever</u>…
OTP	ונתבלע מותא לזכו לעלמין
	And death has been swallowed up <u>to victory</u> <u>forever</u>…
NTP	דאתבלע מותא בזכותא
NTG	κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος <u>εἰς νῖκος</u>

	That death has been swallowed up <u>in victory</u>

There is a doublet translation of לנצח, which should mean "forever" in Hebrew, as

לזכו, "in victory." The latter is the understanding of the same Hebrew phrase

pervasive in LXX (εἰς ν(ε)ῖκος, Josh 36:7; 2 Sam 2:26; Amos 1:11; 8:7; Jer 3:5; Lam

5:20) and in the Targum or Kaige-Theodotion.[211] However, this tradition is not

shared by OTP: At all of these mentioned points where LXX translates לנצח as "in

victory," OTP consistently uses "לעלמין." Only in this verse does OTP add a

redundant לזכו. I think the only probable explanation for this singularity is that, being

aware that this verse is associated with 1 Cor 15:54, the translator imported this

variant from NTG through NTP, consciously or unconsciously.

Up to this point, we see that there are many deviations from the original Hebrew.

Though all of these deviations seem to be individual and somehow random, taken

together they lead to a spiritual and much more eschatological, if not Christian, sense

as we noted earlier.[212] They cumulatively serve to strengthen the image of an

eschatological feast on a mountain with some extra element: The life-giving feast,

which is reserved for the future, the sacrifice for the sake of the people. These are all

---

[211] Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Vol. 3* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 460.
[212] In addition to van der Kooij, also Warszawski, "Peschitta," 10.

compatible with a Christian worldview, yet cannot point univocally to Christ: The

eschatological feast is the original undertone of the Hebrew text, and the worldly

leader (see also Targ. 25:7), as well as the sacrificial motif, need not be Christian.

Our analysis of all possible readings of the formally identical words מחינ, שׁמינא,

עשׁינא and נתבלע shows that beneath the translation there is another layer of

Christological meaning within the entire translation:

> And the Lord of hosts will make for all the peoples on this mountain, a
>
> heavenly feast, and feast, reserved and heavenly, made of our heavenly savior,
>
> and brutal. And it will be wounded on this mountain the face of the ruler who
>
> rules over all the peoples, and the sacrifice which is slaughtered for the sake
>
> of all peoples. And death has been swallowed up in victory forever.

This "deeper" meaning of the translation is sophisticatedly imbedded into the same

consonantal text. All of the equivocal words can so well be fit into this new reading

seamlessly, both in respect to the grammar or to the content, that a coincidence can be

almost excluded.

The Christian root of this translation can be further strengthened. In the following

part, a new perspective into this translational passage will be provided through the

comparison between it and the NT. The first point is the fact that Isa 25:8 is cited in 1

Corinthians 15:54. As we have seen, the singular doublet in P-Isaiah 25:8 "לזכו" (in

victory) already echoes NTP= NT Greek text. Through this connection, a thorough

investigation will be made into the context   of 1 Cor 15:54, and a large amount of

similarities between the text of 1 Cor 25 and the deviations of P-Isaiah 25:6-8 from

MT will be noticed:

1) שמינא (Isa 25:6)

(1 Cor 15:40)ואית פגרא שמינא ואית פגרא ארעניא אלֹא אחרין הו שובחא דשמינא ואחרין דארעניא

"There are also heavenly bodies and earthly bodies, but the glory of the heavenly is

one, and the glory of the earthly is another."

(1 Cor 15:48)דאיתוהי הו דמן שמיא הכנא אף שמינא

"and as is heavenly, so also are those who are heavenly."

2) דמחינן   (Isa 25:6)

(1 Cor 15:45)ואדם אחריא לרוחא מחיניתא

"The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. "

3) שׁלִיטא דשׁלִיט (Isa 25:7)

(1 Cor 15:24) מא דבטל כל רישׁ וכל שׁולטן וכל חילין

"when he has abolished all rule and all authority and power."

4) על אפי (Isa 25:7)

(1 Cor 15:3) דמשׁיחא מית על אפי חטהין איכנא דכתיב

"that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures."

5) לזכו (Isa 25:8)

(1 Cor 15:54) דכתיבא דאתבלע מותא בזכותא

"Death is swallowed up in victory."

The majority the words of P-Isaiah 25:6-8 that deviate from MT (5/9 cases) find their

resonance (in identical form or in the form of cognate) in a single chapter of 1

Corinthians, chapter 15. The corresponding Syriac words in NTP, in contrast, are all

decent translations of the Greek *Vorlage*. It is interesting that there is a systematic

shift of the vocabulary towards 1 Cor 15.

The reason behind this systematic influence occurring in the first place can only be a guess: It might be that because the death of Jesus with all of the associated motives like the consumption of his body was a greatly desired message for the translator, and because the whole of 1 Cor 15 is about the meaning of the death of Jesus (and his followers), the translator was attracted to this NTP chapter through the citational relationship, consciously or unconsciously. It could even be imagined that he intentionally built all of the vocabulary and motif of NTP 1 Cor 15 into OTP Isa 25:6-8 in order to strengthen the "prophetic" character of Isaiah for a Christian reader. The way he realized this theological intertextuality, however, is brilliant, since he is not creating a free essay, but a translation that is always within the confines of its *Vorlage*. Through similar roots, reasonable "mistakes," and especially through equivocal Syriac words, he successfully expressed his Christological ideas while not damaging the accuracy of his translation if read properly. They travel parallel through the same consonantal text.

4.4   Conclusion and Further Consideration

There are, as listed in the previous section, at least seven cases for the influence of the NTP passages upon the corresponding verses in P-Isaiah. These OTP verses are, unlike those two examples mentioned in the first section of this article, not later

emendations as attested by ancient manuscripts. However, this is not to conclude that these readings that betray influences from the NT are an coriginal creation of the translator. This is a pure *argumentum e silentio*, and as Weitzman said, it is always possible that there is "a different hypothesis to explain the inconsistent attitude towards the Jewish people […] that the translation is the work of Jews but has undergone Christian interpolation."[213] With this possibility on the horizon, any positive conclusion about the identity of the original translator based on these seven or eight cases would be premature. Further investigation into the influence of the Syriac NT text upon other OTP books, which is done far more sparsely in comparison to the research into the OTP influence on various Syriac NT versions, is a necessity before a general conclusion can be drawn.

What can be learned from this chapter is the fact that P-Isaiah, as the extant manuscripts can witness, is far from a static text, finished in one go and at the ready disposal of Tatian or later translators of other Syriac versions; rather, it has gone through Christian hands, even if Christians may not have initially translated it. The consequence is that the direction of influence between the quoted verses of P-Isaiah and the NT-quotations is more open than our intuition might normally expect. Finally, especially for a gentile Christian, it is entirely reasonable to remember by

---

[213] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 246.

heart an OT quotation in its NT form, which makes it more possible for him to alter

the OT verses unconsciously than the other way round. As a consequence, when a

case is found in which the Syriac NT text agrees with its corresponding OT Syriac

wording, it is always too arbitrary to conclude that the Syriac NT text depends on the

OTP one if the opposite possibility cannot be cogently excluded.

What can we learn from the echoes between P-Isa 25:6-8 and NTP 1 Cor 15? Due to

the systematicity of the intertextuality between the two passages, not only on the level

of vocabulary but also on the level of theological motifs, it is impossible to conclude

that the intensive deviations of the P-Isaiah text towards NTP 1 Cor 15 is a mere

coincidence. Something more sophisticated must be taking place here. The double

meanings (*les paroles*) of the Isaiah translation, the one relatively literal, the other

Christological, are expressed through the same consonantal text (*la langue*). The pun

is so sophisticatedly enabled through the cooperation of all of the "mistaken" or

"deviating" translations, so that it can be confirmed again that it is not the

coincidence which is at work. However, why should the translator take pains to

equivocate both meanings?

To be sure, the passages mentioned in this chapter that depend on the NTP are not the

only evidence for the Christian origin of P-Isaiah. Van der Kooij lists in his

dissertation other cases demonstrating supposedly Christian ideas (49:1, 4; 51:15; 53:2, etc.);[214] more recently, Greenberg also points out other possible evidence for a Christian translator in the Servant Songs.[215] However, taking theses passages as evidence can never evade Bloch's question regarding the determination that these Christian traces are not attributed to later redactions rather than to the original translator. This almost irrefutable possibility leads him to believe that "one cannot possibly assert with any air of definiteness that the Peshitta of the Old Testament is a work of Christian authorship."[216] Our cases in 4.2, however, can avoid this charge to some extent, since most of our cases are merely reliant on the NTP yet not imbued with Christian theological ideas. Even though the approximation of a translational passage towards the NTP takes place during the process of transmission, it should be realized unconsciously rather than intentionally: To actively alter the text in this way is theologically unrewarding. And our discussion in 4.3 shows that the author in charge exerts a great effort to convey the Christian message: if he tries to actively Christianize the text, it would be very difficult to explain why he still hides it in the subtext.

---

[214] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 277ff.
[215] Gillian Greenberg, "Indications of the Faith of the Translator in the Peshitta to the 'Servant Songs' of Deutero-Isaiah," *Aramaic Studies* 2.2 (2004): 175–92.
[216] Bloch, "Authorship," 218–19.

This question might be answered by Weitzman's famous suggestion that the

production of OTP overlapped with the massive conversion of the community of the

translators from Judaism to Christianity.[217] If a translator is a Jew converted to

Christianity in a community, in which many traditionalists are still existent and

vigilant to the spread of new ideas, what is the best way for him to confess his belief

without losing his job?

Another implication of this research is the prudence we should have in dating the

Peshitta. As stated earlier in this chapter, from the time of Burkitt scholars have

tended to date P prior to the Syriac NT texts, including the Syriac Diatessaron. The

reason for the early dating of OTP is that OTP sometimes is identical with the Syriac

NT texts, which makes the existence of OTP necessary for a verbatim NT citation.

This research opens another possibility that a coincidence between OTP and its

Syriac NT citation might be due to a dependence of the earlier upon the latter. The

"converse" dependence can be attributed to later Christian emendation, as Weitzman

suggests, but there is no evidence against the possibility that the primary translator

brought in these NT readings. If the latter is true, at least part of the Peshitta would

have been produced after the existence of NTP (the beginning of the 4th century). In

order to reach that conclusion with more confidence, more research into the same

[217] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 237ff.

phenomenon in other Peshitta books is necessary, which exceeds the limit of this

research. For the moment, it suffices to say that, based on our observation, a more

open view concerning the dating of P should be kept in mind.

5   OTHER RELEVANT TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES USED IN P-ISAIAH

5.1   Translation through Similar Roots.

This section is dedicated to a special way of translation in which the translator dealt

with difficult words: Translating a Hebrew word by utilizing the the similar Hebrew

root. This phenomenon, broadly speaking, can be witnessed in three circumstances: I)

The translator chooses a graphically similar, but morphologically impossible root for

better translation. For instance, he reads עני, "the eyes, the appearance," in 3:8 as

derived from the noun ענן, "cloud," aiming at not only a better translation not only

according to its immediate context, but also a more profound one which may hint to

the presence of God on Mount Sinai ("against the cloud of his glory" instead of

"against his eyes/appearance of glory").[218] In this way, the translator actively

changes the root and picks up a theoretically impossible one. II) The translator makes

a reasonable guess, yet selects the root or the meaning different from MT.

Sometimes, it is debatable whether the reading of MT or that of P could be the more

probable original meaning. For instance, המית in 14:11 can be either derived from

המה, "to murmur" (MT), or from מות, "to die" (P). This kind of deviation from MT

---

[218] See the discussion of Greenberg and Walter, *Isaiah*, XXIV.

will not be listed as an exemplification of the "technique," since they can

understandably be sincere attempts by the translator to provide a faithful translation,

especially when, sometimes, it is even debatable whether MT reading or P reading is

the more desirable one. III) There are also sheer mistakes. For instance, the translator

misuses some Syriac cognates to Hebrew without recognizing the difference between

the cognates, or mistakes similar roots like ר with ד without further possible

intention behind the mistakes. Sheer mistakes, as they are mistakes without quotation

marks, will not be categorized as an application of the translation technique, either.

In summation, the crucial criterium that differentiates the first category from the latter

two is the *consciousness* of the translator himself to *positively* change the root during

the act of translating. Otherwise, the translator merely refers to another root by

accident, not by intention. To be sure, all three categories will be of great value if

analyzed properly. However, in this chapter, we will only focus on the first category

as a "discriminator" (according to Weitzman's terminology) for discerning different

translational styles.

When we come to whether or not the use of a similar substitute root in translating the

text is intended by the translator, we should evaluate every case with care, since there

is no standard answer to this question. For instance, when some common type of

transformation of the root, like metathesis, takes place in the translation, which

creates a better sense, it would be both technically possible and rhetorically desirable

for the translator to apply the translation technique consciously. However, the

possibility of a mere mistake as not intended by the translator can be never excluded,

and the boundary between an intentional and an unintentional misreading of the root

is often imaginably blurry.

I will take a short passage as an illustration. In the passage 42:13-15, there is in each

verse one meaning perceived differently in the Syriac translation than in MT: In verse

13, the Hebrew word צרח, "to cry out," is read as רצח, "to kill"; in verse 14, אשם,

according to MT punctuation, should be based on נשם, "to pant," rather than שמם,

"be astonished," as in P; in verse 15, עשב, "grass," is translated into Syriac עשן, "be

strong," which is quite an interesting mistake. There should be two consecutive

mistakes at work here: First, the root might be perceived as Hebrew עשן, "smoke,"

and the Syriac translator, unaware of the fact that the Hebrew cognate עשן ("smoke")

means something different from the Syriac one ("be strong"), picks up the cognate for

convenience.

In verse 13, the original word צרח, "yell, cry," is quite rare, and we see that the root

רצח, "to kill," can fit into the context quite smoothly, since the Lord "like a warrior"

is, according to the context, dealing with his enemies: "Like a warrior he stirs up the zeal, he cries out, indeed, he __, he prevails against his enemies." We can explain this change quite naturally: Due to the difficulty in understanding the rare and difficult verb צרח, the translator has to guess the word. But how? He makes a shortcut by reading רצח out of צרח, also because the root רצח could fit into the series of climactic actions of God against his enemies, especially after the translator switches the position of the final two verbs of his translation: "Like a warrior he stirs up the zeal, he cries out, he prevails against and he kills his enemies." Though the verb has a general negative sense (e.g., in the ten commandments, Ex 20:13), it can also take "God" as the subject (Ex 13:15; Isa 27:1; Am 4:10; 9:1, etc.).[219] We can understand the motivation behind this change: There are both *causa effeciens* (צרח is a difficult Hebrew word) and *causa finalis* (רצח makes good sense against the context according to the translation) involved which can lead the translator to do so even though he might have perceived the correct consonantal root as it is in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Therefore, this case can be retained as an example in which the translator *intentionally* uses a similar root for getting a (better) sense out of a difficult root (falling into the above mentioned Category I).

---

[219] See: *ThWAT,* s.v. "רצח."

Things are different in verse 14, where the Masoretic punctuation points to the root

נשׁם, "to pant, to gasp." However, it is hard to judge whether a reading of אשׁם should

be based on נשׁם or on שׁמם, since they could look the same in the *Vorlage*, and the

P-translator is not the only one ancient translator to make the latter choice: LXX and

T both utilize the root שׁמם.[220] It is obvious that the choice of שׁמם as the root for the

form אשׁם is preferable to the ancient readers, so that the P translator can do the same

without any special intention to change to root. Whether the choice of MT or the

choice of LXX=Targum=P is preferable to MT, is another question. Under this

circumstance, this case would be excluded from our list for the manipulation of the

root, but would be counted under Category II (a reasonable guess).

In verse 15, the Syriac translation with "עשׁן" for the Hebrew "עשׂב" seems to be a

careless mistake (Category III): The Hebrew word עשׂב is not a difficult word,

because the translator could easily use the Syriac cognate עסבא to translate it (e.g.,

37:27), and it is easy to imagine that the translator mistakes the ב for a נ (here *nun*

is not in its *finalis* form), which is step one, and further uses the Syriac cognate עשׁן

to translate Hebrew עשׁן, which we number as step two. However, this chain of

explanation is very unlikely due to one reason: The Syriac word "עשׁן" (strong) is a

---

[220] LXX uses the meaning of "be appalled," while T the meaning of "be desolated,"
under the same root.

false cognate to the Hebrew "עשן" (smoke), and the P-Isaiah translators are fully

aware of that and never make this mistake, but correctly uses Syriac word "תננא"

to translate it (4:5; 6:4; 7:4; 9:17; 14:31; 34:10; 51:6; 65:5). Thus, if he (falsely)

perceived the consonantal string עשן from his Hebrew *Vorlage* (step one fulfilled),

he would most probably use the correct Syriac word "תננא" rather than the false "עשן"

(step two would fail).

How can we explain the translation? If we turn back to two verses earlier, we notice

that the Lord was just "going forth like a warrior" to "prevail against his enemies"; it

seems to be discontinuous if he now intends to dry all of the grasses (וכל־עשבם אוביש)

rather than to destroy his enemies, though to dry nature is a typical motif associated

with theophany.[221] Meanwhile, in Syriac, the meaning of the verb יבש, in

comparison to its Hebrew cognate, can additionally mean "be paralyzed, crippled";

due to the NT influence (Matt 12:10; Mark 3:1ff; Luke 6:6ff; also ActsThom 220:2;

229:19), we can understand the Syriac translation "וכלה עושנהון אובש" as (the Lord

says:) "I will paralyze all their strength," which better fits the context. Now we see

the incentive for the translator to translate the Hebrew "עשב" into Syriac "עשן": He

probably simply does not want to diverge from talking about the enemies and tries to

---

[221] Ulrich F. Berges, *Jesaja 40-48 (HThKAT)*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar
zum Alten Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 2008), 256f.

make the text more coherent. In this case, it is highly probable that the translator, by

taking advantage of the similarity between the Hebrew "עשב" and Syriac "עשן," exerts

his exegetical freedom within the domain of the translation technique in question and

generates a more coherent translation. Therefore, this case should be listed under

Category I.

Through this analysis, we see that, although the eventual psychological status of the

translator in question cannot be determined with absolute certainty, there are often

some indirect evidences which tend to speak for whether the translator decides to

manipulate the word for a better sense (Category I) or not (Categories II and III).

Careful analysis must be implemented, through which good reasons for the translator

to emend the word must be shown in order to confirm his intention to do so.

Otherwise, it would be difficult to say the deviation from MT is not a pure mistake.

5.1.1 Intentional Attempt to Improve the text Through Similar Words

3:8 ומעלליהם אל־יהוה למרות עני כבודו. The word עני does not seem to fit in the context

at all, whether it is read as "eyes" or "poor." Various commentators make different

attempts to resolve the problem without coming to a definite conclusion.[222] The

---

[222] Previous suggestions summarized in: Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 237.

translator, aware of this difficulty, switches עני into ענן. This reading might be influenced by the image of cloud over the tabernacle (4:5; further Ex 16:10, 40:34), as indicated by the apparatus of HUB (see also 40:34, where the Syriac vocabulary עננא ואיקרה coincides exactly with Is 3:8).[223]

9:4 כי כל־סאון סאן ברעש. "For every boot of the booted man in tumult …" Though Syriac has the cognates סאון (shoe) and סאן (to put on a shoe) for the Hebrew word סאון, the translator does not go this easier way; rather, he chooses to read both Hebrew words as derived from שׂאה, "to roar, to rumble," and makes an easier translation of "all the sound will be heard in tumult."

10:31* (30:2) ישבי הגבים העיזו. When God strikes, "the inhabitants of Gebim bring (themselves) into refuge." The root עוז comes up in the Hebrew Bible no more than six times: Ex 9:19; Isa 10:31, 30:2; Jer 4:6, 6:1; the same translation for the same root happens in Isa 30:2. Both cases will be dealt with together.

To begin with, LXX and Vulgate also do not handle its translation appropriately. The translator of P-Isaiah simply does not know the root, instead referring to a much more common one, עזז, for the translation: "The inhabitants of Gebim are strong"

---

[223] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 11.

(=Vulgate). LXX derives it from עזר and translates the verses as "the inhabitants of Gibbir ask for help." Does the P translator think that his decision might be correct, or does he know that it cannot be correct? At 10:31, it is hard to say, since the hifil form of עזז, if written in *plene scriptorium*,[224] would look the same as that of עוז. However, it is not the case in 30:2, since the form here, "לעוז" in MT cannot be derived from עזז, even though the translation still does. For this reason, it can be deduced that the translator probably knows that he is not correct, but there is nothing better that he can do than guess a most similar root.

11:3 והריחו ביראת יהוה. The verbal root רוח ("to feel relieved, to enjoy") of the verb והריחו is not quite a usual one; therefore, the difficulty in recognizing this root is not exclusive to the P-translator. LXX reads "ἐμπλήσει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα φόβου θεοῦ," which derives the meaning from the noun "breath" under the same root רוח, here (falsely) verbalized. Vulgate has exactly the same rendering as LXX, which shows possible dependence as well as that the translator also had difficulty at this point. Neither did the Targum understand precisely the word, because it instead uses a rather vague קרב to circumvent this difficulty. The P-translator, however, makes a bolder attempt: "He (the savior) will rise/shine (דנח in Syriac=זרח in Hebrew) in fear

---

[224] W. Th van Peursen, *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*, Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 41 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 46ff.

of the Lord." The image that the savior shines upon the people in a gloomy state is

not uncommon in Isaiah (also 4:2, 9:1, etc., especially 58:8-10 and 60:1-3, where P

uses the Syriac word דנח to translate the Hebrew זרח).

16:6, לֹא־כֵן בַּדָּיו, "Not thus are his empty words," while the Syriac translation reads,

לא הוא הכנא בדקו עלוהי קצומוהי, "Not thus do his diviners research for him." Greenberg

takes the Syriac phrase בדקו עלוהי קצומוהי, which has no equivalent in Hebrew, to be

imported from P-Jeremiah 48:30.[225] However, the *Lesart* of P-Isaiah is likely more

original, and the redundant phrase בדקו עלוהי קצומוהי can be attributed to a double

translation. First, the noun בד can mean a personal diviner (Koehler-Baumgartner's

HALOT), is often translated by P into קצומא, "diviner" (Isaf 44:25; Jer 48:30, 50:36).

Second, the word can be understood as derived from the root בדד, "to separate,"

which is closely connected to another similar noun בדק, "fissure." It is likely that this

loose connection leads the translator to use the Syriac root בדק, "to investigate," for

translating בדיו in Hebrew, which fits the new context of divination cogently.

18:1 (17:11) When the translator meets the difficult word צלצל, which shows a

duplication of two radicals of the root, he tries to leave out the duplication and tries to

---

[225] Greenberg, *Jeremiah*, 87.

get the meaning out of these two radicals.[226] Thus the translator guesses a צל

"shadow" at this place. A similar guess happens in 17:11.

19:9 * חורי וארגים שׂריקות פשתים עבדי ובשׁו "and the workers in flax will despair, and

the carders and those at the loom *will grow pale* (חורי)." Whatever the word חורי

means, it is a difficult word that should be derived from the root חור, "to be white."

The translator, obviously failing to figure this out, chooses to use a similar Syriac root

חדה, "to rejoice," for translation.[227] However, this possibility is based on the

difficulty of the root חור which may lead the translator to employ the translation

technique. It is equally possible, as Teeter privately and as Greenberg in her endnotes

suggests, that the translator simply recognizes a *dalath* instead of a *resh* at this

point.[228]

22:17 עטה ועטך גבר טלטלה מטלטלך יהוה הנה. "Behold, the Lord is about to hurl you

violently, O man, and grasp you violently." The word עטה, "to grasp," is a scarce

word, for which LXX (=Vulgate) can only guess from its context ("and will take

away thy robe," probably influenced by verse 21 "and I will clothe him with your

---

[226] See the discussion in Rudolf Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 150f.
[227] Warszawski, "Peschitta," 36.
[228] Greenberg and Walter, *Isaiah*, XXII.

robe"), while Targum chooses the other meaning of the same root עטה, "to cover." P, however, does a metathesis: It renders the root עטה into טעה, "and he forgot you entirely."

25:6f. as analyzed in section 4.3, the translator systematically and intensively changes the meaning of this passage using similar roots for his own purpose: 1) He does not read ממחים as the pual form of מחה, as the Masoretes do; rather, he reads it as the preposition *mem* plus a causative participle of the verb חיה. 2) The translator translates the Hebrew שמרים, "dregs," with a similar Syriac word שמינא, "oily" or "heavenly." 3) He derives the word הלוט, "wrapping," from the root שלט "rule." 4) He turns the root נסך, "cover," into the root נכס, "slaughter." All of these changes together point to a new picture of an eschatological feast that is associated with the idea of a Christian communion.

27:8   בסאסאה בשלחה תריבנה   "By expulsion, by sending, you contend with them." Again, since the word סאסאה is a rare word, the translator splits the pilpel form and reduces it to the Syriac "סאתא": "By *seah*… you contend with them" (similar technique in 17:11; 18:1)

28:7 נבלעו מן־היין תעו מן־השכר שגו בראה "They are confused with wine, they stagger with strong drink; they err in *vision*." The root ראה seldomly serves as the noun "vision." The P-translator translates it into "רויות" ("saturation"). The translator may have varied the root into a similar one, רוה, since the latter makes much better sense if read as a response to to היין and השכר, though it is not the correct one: "They are confused with wine, they stagger with strong drink; they err in *saturation*."

28:10: כי צו לצו צו לצו צו לצו קו לקו קו לקו. Both צו and קו are probably only syllables imitating prophetic speech.[229] The translator, not satisfied with merely transcribing both words, makes a sophisticated development. He takes צו and קו as initiatives of two Hebrew nouns, צואה, "excrement,"[230] and קיא, "vomit," and translates them into Syriac.[231] By doing this, he analogizes the words of the false prophets to bodily discharges.

28:20 כי־קצר המצע מהשתרע: "For the bed is too short to stretch oneself (on it)." The translator has difficulty in understanding the Hebrew מהשתרע, using the Syriac למסתרה, to cover," as a result. In this case, he modifies the Hebrew word into

---

[229] William Lee Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), s.v. "קו."
[230] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 107.
[231] Warszawski, "Peschitta," 49; Abraham Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel: in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judentums*, 2. Aufl. (Frankfurt: Madda, 1928), 411.

מ(ה)שֹׁתר. In this way, the translation goes more parallel to the second half of the

verse, "and the covering too narrow to wrap oneself."

33:2 היה זרעם לבקרים אף־ישׁועתנו בעת צרה "was their arm every morning, our salvation

in the time of trouble." The P-translator renders זרע, "arm," into עדור, "help," in

Syriac. Strictly speaking, it is not an *in situ* attempt to alter the root, but a custom

existing in the Syriac translation due to the difference between the meanings of the

Hebrew word זרע and its Syriac cognate דרעא. While the Hebrew word זרע, in a

metaphorical way, can also mean "power, help," the Syriac cognate has a more

concrete semantic meaning. When the translators decide that the Hebrew word has

nothing to do with the bodily arm, they sometimes choose to specify the denoted

meaning concretely (see Dan 11:22, 31; Ps 83:9). This also happens in Is 33:2, where

the translator chooses to use a word, עדור, that is not only similar in the form

concerning the root but also more concrete in the meaning (see Ps 83:9).

33:21 כי אם־שׁם אדיר יהוה לנו מקום־נהרים יארים רחבי ידים בל־תלך בו אני־שׁיט וצי אדיר לא

יעברנו. This is an excellent example of an active changing of several words within the

framework of similar roots for certain purposes, and the translator decides to take a

bold step of transforming some words: He associates נהרים יארים, both nouns for

rivers, with verbs נהר and אור, "to shine," תלך with the root מלך, אני with אדן, שׁיט

with שלט, and צי probably with מצא. The eschatological sense of the manipulated

reading is distinct: והו נהוא לן אתרא נהירא ונהירותא וארוחתא דאידיא. דלא תמלך מרותא

דשליטא. דנשתכח לא נעבר בה "…will be a <u>shining</u> place for us, a <u>splendor</u>, a spacious

place, where the <u>authority</u> of the ruler will not <u>reign</u>, the power one, <u>who is present</u>,

will not pass in it." The original Hebrew text associates YHWH's presence with the

image of spacious watercourses where no ships are allowed, be they hostile fleet or

merchant ships in the Nile.[232] The Syriac, on the other hand, describes a place full of

light (see 58:10; 60:1ff; 60:19f., etc.) where no worldly authority is allowed because

of the absolute reign of the Lord, which is the topic of the following verse, "the Lord

is our judge, the Lord is our ruler, the Lord is our king; he will save us."

42:13 אַף־יַצְרִיחַ עַל־אֹיְבָיו "he will shout aloud against his enemies…" צרח is a

difficult root, and the translator renders it into נקטול, "he will kill," presumably

reading another root, רצח, instead.

65:4 וּפְרַק פִּגֻּלִים כֵּלֵיהֶם "and the broth of abominable things (in) their vessels." The

concept of פגל is rare in the Bible. The translator might have read it as פגר, "corpse,"

and translated it as "שׁלדא."

---

[232] Beuken, *Jesaja 28-39*, 290ff.

5.1.2   The Translator Tried his Best yet Failed

Since this category is irrelevant to the conscious translation technique in question,

only some examples are presented here:

14:11 הורד שׁאול גאונך המית נבליך. The Hebrew word המית, according to MT

punctuation, should be derived from המה, "to murmur," instead of from מות, "to die."

However, the consonantal forms of both verbs in hifil look the same, so it is quite

possible the translator chooses מות, "to die" subconsciously, taking into additional

consideration that he might be influenced by the first half of the verse, "your loftiness

is brought down to Sheol." Indeed, the hifil form of מות should not go with נבליך,

"your harp": How can an instrument kill?[233] The translator thus modifies it from hifil

form to qal form, resulting in an understandable phrase, "your harp is dead." No trace

shows that the translator changes the root actively and consciously, making his

translation a sincere endeavor yet without success.

14:20 לא־תחד אתם בקבורה the translator recognizes the תחד as derived from חדה,

"rejoice," rather than from the correct יחד, "join." Though the translation makes good

sense ("You will not rejoice with them in the grave") and the reading seems to be

---

[233] Greenberg and Walter, *Isaiah*, XXII.

morphologically possible, the short form of a *verba tertiae infirmae* does not exist in

the second person singular. This grammatically impossibility makes the case an

understandable mistake.

31:9 The translator is mistaken with the noun ממגור, "terror," taking its root to be גור

and thus translating the noun into Syriac as מעמרה, "his living place."

56:12 אקחה־יין ונסבאה שׁכר "I will get wine, and will drink heavily of strong drink."

Rather than deriving the word נסבאה as from the root סבא "to drink, to tipple," the

translator recognizes it as derived from the root נסב, "to take," which is partly

implied by the immediately preceding verb.

In most of these cases, a minimal possibility that the translator was conscious or even

intentional in respect to his mistakes cannot be excluded. For instance, the translator

is likely aware that he reaches occasionally for an impossible root, as in dealing with

56:12, since otherwise the *alef* in the word cannot be explained according to the most

strict biblical Hebrew grammar. However, more evidence shows that the translator

often neglects the (non-)existence of *alef*,[234] which makes it quite probable that he

does not take the *alef* seriously, and the mistake is thus likely unconscious.

---

[234] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 246.

5.1.3　Mis-translations out of Carelessness

In cases falling under this category, the translator but simply "glides" into the similar word he deems right as a translation. This category will also be excluded from our list. Therefore, only the most typical mistakes are selected and presented as follows.

a) The misrecognition of similar consonants like שׂ and שׁ, ר and ד, א and ע, etc. 7:20 ביום ההוא יגלח אדני בתער השׂכירה. The difficulty lies in the word שׂכירה, which means "hired." The P-translator reads it as derived from שׁכר, "to be drunk," which should refer to the Assyrian king who invaded Israel. b) 17:11 נד קציר, "the harvest will be a heap" or "the harvest will flee away." The translator reads נד as נר and translates it as Syriac ניר, "yoke." c) 14:17 שׂם תבל כמדבר, "he set the world like a wilderness." The translator reads שׂם as שׁם, the latter having the root שׁמם, "destroy," so that he translates the verse into ואחרב תביל איך מדברא. d) 41:3 The translator confuses יעבור with יעבוד. e) 41:8 אתה with עתה. All of these mistakes are most probably unconsciously or carelessly made, which makes them irrelevant for our purpose.

Sometimes false cognates are the reason for an incorrect translation. For example,

23:18 כי לישבים לפני יהוה יהיה סחרה לאכל לשבעה ולמכסה עתיק, "but for those who dwell

in the presence of the Lord, her gain will become sufficient food and *choice*

clothing." The P-translator uses the false Syriac cognate "עתיקיה" (*antiquus*) to render

the Hebrew word "עתיק" (choice), resulting in a translation that reads, "to cover her

old clothing."

5.1.4   Conclusion

As stated above, though the roots are much more often changed or mistaken by the

translator during the process of translation, he does not do that consciously in most of

the cases. An active consciousness for manipulating the root is the key criterion. Only

those cases in Category I are relatively demonstrable examples for this kind of

manipulation. The translator modifies the root of those words for various reasons:

Sometimes he aims at solving some rare and difficult words; sometimes he aims at

producing a better translation that can fit the context more smoothly; only

infrequently does he do this because of his theological point of view, as witnessed in

25:6-8. In the end, where the translator exerts this technique, he still holds a relatively

conservative attitude towards the Hebrew text, reluctant to rewrite the *Vorlage* or

totally change the root, and in most cases he does so only to decipher a difficult

word.[235]

A second observation is that most of the changes consciously done to the roots are

dispersed within the first 33 chapters. Only in 42:13(15) and 65:4 in the second half

of the book of Isaiah are examples detected as conscious changes done to the root.

That further confirms the different authorship between the first half and second half

of the P-Isaiah translation due to their different aptitude for this translation technique.

Finally, the familiarity that the translator has with Hebrew is significant, which

allows the translator to employ such intricate translational maneuvers: The ability to

associate צואה and קיא with צו and קו , for instance, betrays the sizeable linguistic

capacity the translator has with Hebrew. This further favors the theory of Jewish

participation in the translation.

5.2   Pure Guesswork Prompted by the Context

---

[235]   Seldomly does the translator exert substantial freedom to aggressively change
the root in order to imbue additional interpretative information into the translation, as
best exemplified in 3:8, 25:6f. and 33:21

This section is dedicated to those translation variants that fulfill all of the following difficult criteria:

i) The translation is *significantly* different from the corresponding Hebrew word, i.e., the inspiration for creating a variant comes from the context as opposed to the translated word or phrase itself. For instance, Is 33:2 היה זרעם לבקרים, "(to the Lord) is their *arm* in the morning," is translated into Syriac as הוי עדורן בצפרא, "be our *strength* in the morning." The Hebrew word "זרע" and Syriac word "עדר" in Syriac are interconnected in various ways, so that the translation "strength" might be prompted by the context, yet not exclusively so, as analyzed in the previous section. In this sense, the translator does not perform any guesswork from the context; rather, he improves the understandability of the Peshitta text within the framework of a faithful translation. The two words are associated in every respect: Their physical shape, meaning, translational tradition; therefore, this translation should be excluded from this category based on any of these reasons.

ii) The difficulty of the Hebrew word or phrase is a prerequisite for the translator to choose to guess purely from the context. If the word is familiar enough, it is likely that the translator, if he chooses a less faithful translation, should do so out of other

active reasons (theological, rhetorical etc.) rather than taking the passive strategy of

merely relying on the contextual information.

iii) There should be no other extant ancient version that has a similar variant unless

explainable through independent variation. The reason is apparent: The possibility of

borrowing the translation of a difficult point from another version, or the possibility

of a common *Vorlage* other than MT, would save the translator from guesswork.

Under these three rigorous criteria, only eight cases can be attributed to the category

of pure guesswork prompted by the context with relatively high assurance.

1:24   הוי אנחם מצרי ואנקמה מאויבי, "(God says) *I will be relieved* (I will not cease?) of

my adversaries, and avenge on my foes." The sense "be relieved of" as demanded by

the text is highly unusual, which leads to treatments of the ancient as well as modern

versions that vary greatly.[236] The P-translator gives up treating the word and merely

relies on the second part of the parallelism, taking אנחם as a synonym for ואנקמה

and translating it as אנא מתפרע, "I will revenge."

---

[236] The various translations are listed in: Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC)*, 123f.

5:5 הסר משׂוכתו והיה לבער פרץ גדרו והיה למרמס, "I will remove its hedge, and it will be devoured; I will break down its wall, and it shall be trampled down." The word משׂוכתו, "fence," based on the root שׂוך, "to hedge," is not an easy one. It is obviously some part of the vineyard. The translator, remembering the content as he (falsely) translated it in 5:2, "he surrounded it with a wall… built a tower in the middle of it," concludes that the other item to be torn down, parallel to the wall, should be the tower: "I will remove its tower…. I will break its wall…."

19:10 והיו שתתיה מדכאים כל־עשׂי שׂכר אגמי־נפש, "Its weavers will be dismayed, and all who work for wages will be grieved." The P-translator reads שׂכר as שׁכר "strong drink," which is an understandable mistake (also do LXX in the same verse and P in 7:20). Based on this mistake, the translator makes a guess about the word אגמי, which he renders as "the feast."[237]

22:24 ותלו עליו כל כבוד בית־אביו הצאצאים והצפעות, "And they will hang on him all the glory of his ancestral house, the offspring and offshoots." The nouns " הצאצאים והצפעות," especially הצפעות since the root צפע is always associated with "a snake" in the book of Isaiah (11:8; 14:29; 59:5), are difficult for the translator. Therefore, the

---

[237] Greenberg and Walter, *Isaiah*, XXII. The Aramaic root גמי can mean drink in Aramaic, yet not in Syriac.

translator guesses "the venerable and the praiseworthy" based on the contextual information "all the glory."

23:13 הקימו בחיניו עררו ארמנותיה שמה למפלה, "They erected their siege towers, they tore down her palaces, they turned it into a ruin." The translator (falsely) understands בחיניו as the agent for the בחן, "an inquirer" or "a supervisor," and so translated it (בצויא in Syriac). Then comes the difficult verb עררו, "to lay bare" , with which the translator is unfamiliar. He can only guess what a supervisor does to the palaces: a supervisor supervises. Therefore he translated the verb עררו into the Syriac בצו, "to supervise."

27:4 מי־יתנני שמיר שית במלחמה אפשעה בה אציתנה יחד, "Should anyone gives me thorns and briers in battle, I will step on them, I will burn them up completely." The word אפשעה from פשע, "to step," is beyond the capacity of the translator, who chooses to render it as אפוח, "I will blow on it," which should be derived from the scene that God burns the briars and thorns while blowing wind into the fire.[238]

28:17 ויעה ברד מחסה כזב, "hail will sweep away the refuge of lies." The word יעה, "sweep away," is an hapax legomenon in the HB. Neither have T and LXX figured

---

[238] Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB Isaiah*, 102.

out the meaning, either choosing to circumvent the word (LXX) or making a guess according to the context (T: "and the wrath will surely burn their lies"). The P-translator, in contrast to the more paraphrastic T, guessed a most possible verb for the hail: נחבוט, "it will strike down."

29:24 וידעו תעי־רוח בינה ורוגנים ילמדו־לקח, "And those who err in spirit will know, and those who grumble will learn instruction." The parallel verse presents two scenes in which previously impossible things now happen: Those who diverted from the way will gain insight, and those reluctant to learn now have that motivation. First of all, P paraphrased the first half of the verse a bit: "These foolish ones (סכלא) will know that their spirit erred." Now, there is a difficult word, רוגנים, in the second half, which depicts someone who "murmurs" when having to learn. However, as the P-translator does not understand this word, he chooses to understand it as parallel to the first *membrum*: "And the foolish (שׁטיא) ones…"

33:4 ואסף שׁללכם אסף החסיל כמשׁק גבים שׁוקק בו, "And your spoil is gathered as the caterpillar gathers; As locusts rushing about, men rush about on it." As the two verbs משׁק and שׁקק are both inaccessible to the translator, he instead chooses to repeat the verb he already has in the same verse: "… and as the gathering of the locust which is gathered."

From chapter 33 on, this phenomenon or translational technique fades out from the

translation text, and no evidence for the "pure guess" according to the context,

especially according to the immediate membrum of parallelism, has been registered.

It is probably due to the change of the difficulty, especially in chap. 36-39. However,

it cannot explain other difficult poetic passages from chap 40 on, in which the

technique is not detected. The implication and consequence of this switch will be left

to the discussion of the final chapter.

5.3   Conclusion

In a broader sense, the "deviations" of the translation dealt with in this chapter can be

viewed as results of some exegetical strategies rather than mere "accidental errors" or

"deliberate corrections."[239] The translator is deeply committed to the "sufficient

notion of participation" (*l'idée souple de la participation* according to Koenig) that

the sense of a word or phrase is not solely fixed down by its lexical definition or

denotation (its "extension" according to Frege's terminology), but actualized in its

---

[239] David Andrew Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*, Forschungen Zum Alten Testament 92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 181ff. Though the discussion of Teeter is conducted in another sphere than translation activity, the logic is transferrable to my discussion here.

active participation in and connection with other passages/words with similar

features. To quote Koenig:

> In Judaism the biblical text is not strictly a material entity of written signs and a
>
> logical coherence; it is also a dual participation: (1) participation of writings with
>
> one another—textual modification by means of scriptural borrowing being the
>
> manifestation of this. But also (2) participation of words with extra-contextual
>
> values, opened up by means of homonyms, homographs, and all types of formal
>
> resemblances that can be discerned. [240]

In this chapter, the attempt of the translator to decipher words through similar roots

(5.1) and his guesswork prompted by the context (5.2) are examined. These are

exactly the semantical "participation" of the words/phrases in the source text in its

contextual or extra-contextual values/senses, and this "participation" transfers the

meaning back to the source words or phrases from its surrounding co-text or from

formally similar roots for the better understanding of the broader "sense" of the

original text. This notion of "participation" is strongly witnessed in the first half of

the translation.

---

[240] Jean Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'aprés les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 35, here cited according to Teeter's translation in Teeter, *Scribal Laws*, 181.

6 FINAL DISCUSSION: ONE TRANSLATOR OR MANY TRANSLATORS?

In treating the unity and diversity in Peshitta, Weitzman refers to Perles' warnings that the investigators of Peshitta books should be very cautious. Though the translation of different parts of the Bible may show different features, these features might be conditioned by the Hebrew text rather than a change of translator.[241] In particular, he mentions the dependence of P upon LXX: In his mind, the different degrees of dependence should not be taken literally, but are likely to be at least partly related to the varied difficulty of each book. Finally, he notes that every book strives to "strike a balance between fidelity and intelligibility."[242] These cautions, made for those undertaking research into the whole Peshitta, should also be applied to the investigation into a single book, in our case, Isaiah, especially when one of the main concerns of this dissertation is to show that there is a change of translational style somewhere in the middle of the book. We shall always be alert that different features in different parts of P-Isaiah are not necessarily associated with a new translator, rather, they can also be determined by the status of Hebrew *Vorlage* or by

---

[241] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 164.
[242] Ibid.

spontaneous novelty of the translator.[243] For instance, in Chapter 36-39 of P-Isaiah,

few cases of dependence on LXX or of other translation techniques are detected; that

surely cannot reflect a new hand, but the plainness of the original prosaic text itself,

which demands no special translation techniques. The diversity regarding the

application of different translation techniques in a text does not necessarily speak

against the unity of the translation's authorship.

Being aware of the dynamic balance between the diversity and unity among different

translators, Weitzman moves on to investigate the "discriminators" that might be

immune to the change of the style of the original texts. The "discriminators" are

namely those Hebrew words translated differently throughout the Peshitta books. For

instance, the word דבר is translated into both מלתא and פתגמא in Syriac, which

makes it an indicator for different translators regardless of how difficult the original

text is. By examining nine different discriminators (Hebrew words גר, עולה, עיר,

תורה, חסד, ארון, ארצות, חג, כסף), Weitzman tries to locate all of the OTP books on a

one-dimensional scale, from the most conservative to the most modern usage of

vocabulary. Unfortunately, all of these discriminators fail in the books of Isaiah and

Psalms. Some of them are infrequent words here: For instance, the word ארון does

---

[243] Sebastian P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint—The Witness of
Tradition," *OTS* 17 (19972): 32.

not show up in Isaiah; Others perform irregularly: For instance, OTP uses קריתא and

מדינתא for the Hebrew word עיר; yet in P-Isaiah, the translation jumped back and

forth between the two options. This shows "the lack of a coherent policy towards

innovations" in using these indicators by P-Isaiah.[244] For this reason, these two

books have no fixed position on the conservative-modern spectrum of Weitzman.

This judgment opens up the possibility that both Isaiah and Psalms, because they are

both difficult and long books (only comparable to Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor

Prophets if viewed as one book), may be assigned to more than one translator in order

to facilitate the translation process. It is probable for this reason that both books show

a "lack of a coherent policy." In order to substantiate this possibility, something more

than the test about the "discriminators" must be provided.

Comparable research has been conducted in the area of Septuagint studies. In the

Pentateuch, Wevers indicates that there are multiple translators active in each

book;[245] in the Prophets, the opinions are gathered on the other end of the spectrum:

Thackeray thinks that the Minor Prophets were translated into Greek by a single

---

[244] Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 177.

[245] John W. Wevers, "The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-Partum Re- Flections," in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*, ed. C. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).

hand;[246] in a same vein, Tov supports the possibility of a single author in charge of

the LXX-Jeremiah.[247] For the book of Isaiah, however, though the majority opinion

agrees on a single translator (or group) behind the LXX-Isaiah (Thackeray, Wutz,

Fischer and Ziegler), some (Gray and Baumgärtel) oppose such the unity within this

LXX book.[248] More recently, Seeligmann also favors the model of one translator

after synthesizing all of the previous debates, and he attributes the temptation for

presupposing more than one translators to the (seemingly) "lack of consistencies and

uniformity that baffles the investigator."[249] All of this research, not unexpectedly,

also bases its results on the lexical and syntactical differences, as well as other

stylistic inconsistencies between different parts of the translation. In other words, the

research into the problem of the unity/diversity of the LXX books are also based on

the status of the translational text per se, i.e., on the distinctive styles of how various

translation techniques are employed.

Coming back to the books of OT-Peshitta, most significantly, Greenberg concludes in

her research into the translation technique of P-Jeremiah that, despite the occasional

---

[246] Henry St John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (London: Oxford University Press, 1923), 28–39.
[247] Emanuel Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch - A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8* (Missoula: Harvard University Press, 1976).
[248] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 31ff.
[249] Seeligmann, *Septuagint*, 179ff.

inconsistency in the translation of Jeremiah, the homogeneity is overwhelming in all

aspects that she has examined. The suggestion that the work of more than one man is

discernible is thus rejected. In her final remark, she tries further to generalize her

perception of the homogeneity of P and points to the extreme possibility of single

authorship for P that is comparable to the work of Jerome or Tyndale.[250] For sure,

the "single authorship" remains open to interpretation: Could there have been a real

translator or merely a single senior member who imposed his style on a large part of

the Peshitta of the Hebrew Bible? Finally, the recent research would agree that the

role played by Jerome or Tyndale, or even Luther, in the translations assigned to their

names was quite limited, contrary to received opinion: Jerome's Vulgate is primarily

based on *Vetus Latina*, and thus would not have occurred without the help of many

"scribes" whose role remains unknown;[251] Tyndale only finished part of the Old

Testament (Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Kings, and Chronicles), and his translations

have not survived in their original forms;[252] Luther, famously, relied on his

Wittenberg colleagues such as Philipp Melanchthon, Matthäus Aurogallus, and

Caspar Cruciger for the translation of the Hebrew Bible because of his deficient

Hebrew knowledge. There is no strict dichotomy between a one-hand model and a

---

[250] Greenberg, *Jeremiah*, 205.
[251] Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "The Latin Bible," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to 600*, ed. Joachim Schaper and James Carleton Paget, New Cambridge History of the Bible (Cambridge: University Press, 2013), 514–17.
[252] Paul Arblaster et al., *Tyndale's Testament* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 53.

multiple-hand one for a complex project such as the translation of the entire Hebrew

Bible in pre-modern times: Even when the authorship is commonly attributed to those

big names, the possibility should not be excluded that there are many secondary

sources/helpers/layers behind those names.

In her final comment about the book of Isaiah, Greenberg mentions that:

"A verse by verse analysis of the translation technique in P-Isaiah and P-Psalms,

supported if appropriate by the application of statistical techniques, would go some

way towards showing exactly how these books do and do not stand apart. This kind

of approach, including quantitative as well as qualitative aspects, could elucidate

the question of style and might then be applied to other books of the Peshitta; it is

planned as an extension of the present analysis."

This dissertation partly fulfills Greenberg's expectation for further examination into

the coherence of P-Isaiah. At first glance, the translators (if plural) show their pure

intention to base their translation upon the Hebrew *Vorlage* as they have it: They try

to produce a precise verbatim translation. This common loyalty to *Hebraica Veritas*

shared by all translators of P-Isaiah will cause a great difficulty to any philologist

trying to discern several different hands in the translation.

As mentioned, Weitzman's intention to differentiate books by certain "discriminators" is not applicable to the book of Isaiah. Luckily, where the lexicographical selection cannot be a useful discriminator, other types of markers work perfectly as substitutes: The utilization of LXX, the guesswork from the contextual information, and the usage of the similar root for an extant word that is challenging to decipher.

i)   Proof for Two Translators from Chapter 3 about the Dependence of P-Isaiah upon LXX

Chapter 3 dealt with the way in which the translators of P-Isaiah used LXX as a secondary source. An important implication of this survey is that we can discern two different intensity curves of the dependence. In the first half of the book, the curve drops from 183 units (which means an average of 0.183 evincible cases in each verse) in Ch. 1-5 to 70 units in Ch. 6-10 to 33 units in both Ch. 11-20 and 21-29. Ch. 30-39 is hard to categorize since Ch.30-33 has an unexplainably high density, while Ch. 36-39 is of a different literary genre. The density starting from Ch. 40 stays at around 60 units until the end the book.

Chapter	1-5	6-10	11-20	21-29	30-33	34-39	40-49	50-59	60-66
Verses	115	115	151	182	86	117	242	159	124
Cases	21	8	5	6	10	0	14	11	5
Density	183	70	33	33	116	0	58	69	40

This unevenness of the density can be largely explained by different policies employed by two translating persons. The **first translator** tried to use LXX as infrequently as possible. However, due to the lack of confidence at the very beginning of the book (as reflected in 1:25, 2:20, 3:4, 3:17 etc.), he frequently consulted LXX for help. As soon as he became used to the difficult language and style of the book of Isaiah, he tried to refrain from using LXX translation. That explains the decline in the frequency of using LXX in the first 30 chapters.

The reasons for refraining from LXX can be various, one of which might be his obvious awareness that LXX is not an accurate translation from Hebrew. This awareness is confirmed by the "trimming" technique applied to the translation dependent on LXX: Even at those verses where he largely relies on LXX, like 3:18 or 10:3, he adapts LXX translation according to the supposed Hebrew *Vorlage* by making the text translated from LXX match the structure of the Hebrew text, at least formally. In another case at 3:23, when the translator seems almost sure that LXX

could not convey all of the information in the Hebrew *Vorlage*, he feels compelled to make the generalized comment "(in a word, these are) all ornaments" to cater to his uncertainty that there might be some items missing from LXX. Another conspicuous tendency of the translator of the first 30 chapters is that his consultation of LXX is mostly need-based. In most of the cases, he checks LXX only when the Hebrew text is difficult or problematic, while only seldomly does he replace the Hebrew text with the Greek translation merely based on rhetorical reasons going beyond strict linguistic need.

There seems to be a most important motivation lying behind all of the above-mentioned features of the first translator, which can be anachronistically labelled as the pursuit of *Hebraica Veritas*.[253] Because of the respect towards the Hebrew text, the translator tries to gradually abstain from the Greek translation; because of the same reason, he makes only need-based reference to the Greek translation, mostly only as a lexicographical reference. His commitment to the Hebrew text is so great that, even at some passages where the translator's dependence on LXX was systematic, he still tries to steer the Syriac translation of LXX text back towards the

---

[253] Anachronistically, because the idea or belief that the Hebrew Bible was the "original" Old Testament text in comparison to other ancient translations has been largely associated with Jerome, see: Stefan Rebenich, "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas,'" *Vigiliae Christianae* 47.1 (1993): 50–77.

form of the original Hebrew text, since the latter is the only safe harbor in which he

can set his anchor.

In contrast, the **second translator** was much more liberal in his approach. His

linguistic knowledge is not necessarily worse or better than the first one, but his

attitude towards LXX is much more open. It seems for him just as well to follow a

LXX reading. He consults LXX at a rather stable rate from the beginning through the

final chapter of the book. He neither becomes gradually addicted to using the Greek

translation, nor consciously abstains from it; rather, he maintains the intensity of

dependence at 60 units (which means averagely 0.060 evincible cases in each verse).

Evidence shows that the "unnecessary" adaptation of LXX readings by this second

translation takes place much more frequently than by the first one.   It means that his

reference to LXX is more than need-based. He seems not to be bound by the Hebrew

text, often translating LXX directly into Syriac without any modification, even when

LXX readings are remote from the Hebrew *Vorlage*. He is happy to translate a whole

sentence or even a whole passage of LXX into Syriac without going back to the

Hebrew, as we see in 42:14; 44:12-14, 17 and as discussed in section 3.3.

To be sure, Ch. 30-33 is an anomaly that does not fit into a too perfectly bisected

scheme; with a density of 116 units, the dependence on LXX in this section is much

heavier than in the previous chapters, but also more than in Ch. 40-66. In front of an

anomaly, every statistician feels annoyed. He can either i) take away the sample

secretly, which is inappropriate and methodologically dishonest,   ii) develop a more

complex model so that this anomaly can be explained away within the new

framework, or iii) accept it. For the moment, it will be satisfactory to choose the third

option and leave undetermined the question of to which translator Ch. 30-33 belongs.

ii)   Proof for Two Translators from Chapter 4 about the Guesswork from Similar

        Roots

Part One of Chapter 5 of this dissertation deals with a particular translation technique:

to maneuver the consonants of the Hebrew words, switching the consonants, or

substituting them with similar ones in order to make better sense of the Hebrew

words. This technique is not uncommon in the ancient world, as it is also witnessed in

LXX and in other Midrashic passages from the Qumran,[254] as well as in rabbinic

works.[255] The degree to which the translators of P-Isaiah aggressively apply this

---

[254] Emanuel Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Winona
Lake: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015), 162–68; William H. Brownlee,
"Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951):
60–62.

[255] *B. Shab.* 55b: רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר הַמּוֹדָעִי אוֹמֵר: הֲפוֹךְ אֶת הַתֵּיבָה וְדוֹרְשָׁהּ, "as Rabbi Elazar
HaMod'i said: Reverse the order of the letters and then interpret it." For more general

technique into their translation is our primary concern. In this section, all possible

cases are evaluated and categorized into three possibilities: i) Those active and

conscious changes of simple words in order to improve an already readable text; ii)

Those passive attempts to deal with difficult words—the resultant translation may

deviate from MT without being necessarily inferior or superior to the MT reading—

and iii) merely unconscious mistakes, like the misreading between ד – ר or mis-use

of false cognates.

Because categories ii and iii are without conscious intent, they have nothing to do

with translational techniques in the strict sense. Alone in category i can we see that

the translators allow themselves to exert this freedom of transforming the root into a

similar one in order to make better literal or, sometimes, theological sense out of the

text.

A further observation is also crucial to us: Most of the changes consciously done to

the roots are located in the first 33 chapters. Only 42:13, 15 and 65:4 from the second

half of the book of Isaiah are recorded as examples of this technique. That further

discussion, see J. A. de Waard, "Metathesis as a Translational Technique," in
Traducere Navem: Festschrift für Katharina Reiss zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Katharina
Reiss, Justa Holz-Mänttäri, and Christiane Nord (Tampere: Tampereen, 1993), 249–
60.

confirms the different translational styles between the first half (Ch.1-33, since Ch.

33 witnesses two changes of the root, it tends to be divided into the first half where

this technique prevails) and second half (Ch.34-66) of P-Isaiah.

The implication of the unevenness of the distribution of this technique can be

interpreted variously, since the technique is not bound to any sectarian identity, as

mentioned above. However, there is no doubt that an important prerequisite for

transforming the roots in this way is a competent linguistic facility in the Hebrew

language. For instance, the association of צו and קו with צואה and קיא, of which

the latter two are themselves rare, sufficiently betrays the mastery of Hebrew. This

sign of linguistic proficiency tends to speak to a Jewish origin of the translators.

iii)   Proof for Two Translators from Chapter Four about the Guesswork from the

         Context

Translational work is never free from the context. Every word has a certain fluid

semantic field, and an exact position in the field should always be determined against

its context. In some sense, every translation of a single word is more or less

"guesswork" according to its context.

In order to evade this too philosophical pan-definition of "guesswork from the context," a very rigorous set of criteria was articulated for determining the "true" guesswork at the beginning of the second part of Chapter 5: i) The translation should differ *significantly* from the original Hebrew word, so that the translation, even in a derivative sense, cannot be deduced from the original word. ii) No other ancient versions can provide the variation that P-Isaiah provides, so that the reading is less likely to be borrowed from a third-place. iii) The original Hebrew word should be hard enough to trigger such guesswork since; if a substitution of a meaning unit is not necessary, imaginably, it is done out of other active reasons (theological, rhetorical and so on), which makes the variant no longer a matter of guesswork.

All of the cases that passed the rigorous test are confined within the first 29 chapters. This distribution, again, confirms the subdivision of P-Isaiah into two parts: Ch. 1-29 (33) and the rest.

This preference of the first translator for employing the guesswork technique about a single word purely from its context is also of great interest. Based on our criteria, the translator, at those points, does not consult other versions, but instead tries to fill in a blank with the mere help of its context. This endeavor also reflects the reluctance of the translator to rely on sources other than the Hebrew *Vorlage*: At least at these

points, he would rather prioritize his own comprehension of the Hebrew text over

other versions.

This is the evidence for two translators from previous chapters. The dividing point

should lie at the end of Chap. 29 or 33. From the perspective of pure quantity, a fair

division of the book before translation opts for the 1-33 (649 verses)/34-66 (642

verses) model. Yet, all of the above-mentioned evidence is all *internal* evidence. At

this point, two additional pieces of *external* evidence for the Chap 1-33/34-66 model

of P-Isaiah can be provided: The bifurcation of 1QIsaᵃ and the peculiar additional

headings at the beginning of Ch. 34 of P-Isaiah.

iv)   The Bifurcation of 1QIsaᵃ

For the discussion of the bifurcation of 1QIsaᵃ, we should clarify two different layers

of bifurcation: the bifurcation of the production process of the physical scroll, and the

bifurcation of the textual tradition behind the scroll. The confusion of the two, in my

mind, troubles many discussions.

Ulrich and Flint, in their DJD introduction, summarized the evidence for the

bifurcation categorized under "physical evidence" and "linguistic features." The

physical evidence includes: 1) There is the three-line lacuna at the bottom of column

XXVII, which ends with the ending of Chapter 33; 2) the leather that contains

columns XXVI and XXVII are significantly narrower than other columns, which

shows that the scribe, noticing that his part was going to finish within less than two

columns' usual space, "took considerable pains to end Chapter 33 at the bottom of the

column XXVII,"[256] or just attempted to save the leather material. This physical

evidence strongly supports the theory of two scribes, which concerns the bifurcation

of the producing or copying act and of the physical scroll per se.

Another category, the linguistic features, touches both levels, because the linguistic

difference between the two parts of the scroll can be attributed to the difference

between two scribes or the difference between the two parts of the *Vorlage*. When

Kutscher argues against the theory of bifurcation, he mainly disagrees with the

linguistic evidence, since the changing of the spelling style does not occur at one

single point, e.g., the feminine suffix ־נה gradually emerges as early as Chapter 12

and grows more frequent as the text goes on.[257] In other words, the "bifurcation," as

Ulrich and Flint call it, is a "graduation" and cannot be explained by a new scribe

taking over at a certain point of the manuscript. This argument, however, only refutes

---

[256] Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1. II*, 40.
[257] Kutscher, *Language*, 565. Tov also provided a good reflection on the topic of the "continuity" of the scribal practice in: Tov, *Essays*, 36–44.

the validity of the linguistic difference among parts of the manuscript in 1QIsaᵃ as a

sufficient proof for different scribes. It does not address the physical evidence as

supporting the bifurcation in scribing practice.

Without going into the intricate detail of the linguistic tendency in each half of

1QIsaᵃ,[258] we can see that the physical evidence for two scribes, or at least for two

different phases of a single job, as argued by Ulrich and Flint, still stands fast. The

whole enterprise of copying the book of Isaiah is *physically* divided at the end of Ch.

33. On the one side, this physical division seems arbitrary at first glance, since the

dividing point seems to coincide with no section/paragraph breaks in any other

ancient version (LXX, Peshitta, Syh) outside of a relatively less important Masoretic

setuma.[259] On the other side, however, the working division does not need to follow

the division between the sense units: The manuscript 1QIsaᵃ itself does not have a

section break at the end of Chapter 33 for breaking sense units. Therefore, the

division of the copying job at the end of Chapter 33 does not need to be ideologically

or theologically driven at all. From the very practical perspective of an organizer of a

copying job, the physical length of the scroll might be a more important factor for

---

[258] A full review of the scholarship for the bifurcation of 1QIsaᵃ in this respect is provided in: Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 30.

[259] Brock, "Division," 49–80.

subdividing the *Vorlage*, of which 1QIsaᵃ is not the only example among Qumran

scrolls.²⁶⁰

The way in which the *Vorlage* of 1QIsaᵃ was assigned to different scribes might shed

some light upon the way in which the *Vorlage* of P-Isaiah was assigned to different

translators: For the consigner of the *Vorlage* of 1QIsaᵃ, the division was not made at

the junction points between larger sense units (e.g., the beginning of Ch. 36 or 40,

etc.) but at the physical middle point of the book. Coincidentally, this point is the

beginning of Ch. 34, which happens to be one of the two options generated from the

previous analysis of the *internal* evidence.

v)   The Additional Heading before Chapter 34 of P-Isaiah

It is quite rare that P adds an extra title to the text that is not syntactically connected

to the text. Such titles can mark a beginning of a section in whatever sense. In

manuscript 5ph1, there are two such titles through the whole translation, one of which

seems to point to the midpoint of the text. The one lies before 34:1 ("the place of

judgment"), the second before 35:3 ("an admonition and an encouragement of the

---

²⁶⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 69–74.

weak people").[261] In later versions, such as the Paris Polyglot, there is a further

addition to the 35:3 title in Syriac, "שלמת פלגותא קדמיתא" (the first part ends here).

This addition makes quite probable that these titles can be understood simultaneously

as the markers of text divisions in P-Isaiah, though the content of the titles seems

irrelevant for this purpose.

Is one of these two titles the supposed midpoint of Isaiah? If so, is it 34:1 or, as the

Paris Polyglot comments, is it 35:3? The *masorah finalis* of MT Isaiah provides no

more information than "the sum of the verses of the book: one thousand and two

hundred and ninety and one," which is identical with the number of verses in the

modern division first introduced in Bomberg's Bible.[262] Different from the *masorah*

finalis for Pentateuch, it does not further specify the midpoint of Isaiah, so we have to

count for ourselves.

In which way should we count? Inspiration can be found from Talmud.

---

[261] A similar title "The praise of Isaiah" is present before 42:10, yet absent from many later manuscripts, like 9a1fam, 9d1, 11d2, etc., or exists in slightly different forms in other earlier versions, which testifies to the understandably unstable status of this title.

[262] Bruce Nielsen, "Daniel van Bombergen, a Bookman of Two Worlds," in *The Hebrew Book in Early Modern Italy*, ed. Joseph Hacker and Adam Shear (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 72f.

"Therefore the early sages were called *Soferim*, for they counted all the letters of

the Torah. They said the letter *vav* of the word Gachon (Lev 11:42) is the

midpoint of the letters of the Torah. The words "*darosh darash*" (Lev 10:16)

represent the midpoint of the number of words. The verse that begins with the

word "*Vehitgalach*" (Lev13:33) is the midpoint of the number of verses..."

(*Kidushin* 30a)

The counting does not quite fit MT as we have it, and how far the error (in the

statistical sense) can be understood, is highly debated.[263] However, the citation

shows that there used to be various ways to determine the midpoints of a certain

book(s): according to the number of letters, the number of words, and the number of

verses. Now, let us turn back to the book of Isaiah. Based on the Masoretic base text

and the main text of the Leiden Peshitta, the following statistics are generated:

	Verses	Midpoint according to verses	Words	Midpoint according to words
MT	1291	33:20-21	15100	"עיני עורים" 35:5
P			17476	"עמירא וקניא" 35:7

---

[263] Menachem Cohen, "On the Number of Verses, Words and Letters in the Bible,"
13 March 2020,
http://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/dilugim/StatSci/middle_english.pdf.

The midpoint of Isaiah is at 33:20-21 according to the number of verses, and at 35:5 according to the number of Hebrew words as well as 35:7 according to the number of Syriac words. The result is impressive since both candidates for the midpoint markers in P-Isaiah lie no more than four verses away from our Syriac titles as markers (after 33:24 and before 35:3, respectively).[264] Would it not be a reasonable guess that some of the translators were aware of the various counting traditions based on different criteria of words and verses, as shown in the Talmud, and knew, specifically concerning our book of Isaiah, where the respective midpoints were? Thus it is likely that they decided to divide the translation project according to one of these midpoints. This possibility of an established tradition about the midpoints of the book of Isaiah, as represented by the marking titles, also supports the hypothesis about a dividing point (before 34:1 or before 35:3) for the translation project.

6.1   Conclusion

---

[264] The error, in a statistical sense, of the ancient *Soferim* in determining the midpoint of a book is normally much larger than four verses. According to Cohen's modern counting, the midpoint of the Masoretic Torah according to letters and verses should be roughly at Lev 8.29 and 8:18, which is much further away from the Talmudic report than in our case.

The translation of P-Isaiah was finished most probably by at least two translators. The dividing point most probably lies at the end of Ch. 33. A more important implication related to this bifurcation of the translation is the difference in characters between the two different translators. In his famous monograph about LXX-Isaiah, Ziegler fixes its purpose almost one century ago: "Um das Verhältnis der Js-LXX zum MT recht zu würdigen, muss zunächst die ganze Persönlichkeit des Übersetzers vor uns erstehen."[265]

The same also applies to our project. In order to fully appreciate and evaluate the translational relationship between P-Isaiah and its Hebrew *Vorlage*, it is now proper for us to attempt a description of the *Persönlichkeiten* of the respective translator based on the results of our analysis.

As we mentioned, under the superficial differences in various translation techniques used in their respective translations, there seems to be a core value that marks the first translator as different from the second: the loyalty to the *Hebraica Veritas* and the prioritization of the Hebrew text over other translations like LXX. This ideology motivates him to rely on the Hebrew text itself faithfully. He tries to refrain from referring to LXX, though he has to do so at the beginning of the translation. And even

---

[265] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 7.

if he consults LXX, he does it carefully and prudently, often refraining from deviating too far from the Hebrew text. In contrast, the second translator is much more reliant on LXX; he makes reference to LXX quite freely, even when the Hebrew *Vorlage* seems to be quite understandable. He adapts new readings from LXX, and not only in cases of extreme difficulty, as shown at the end of Chapter 3. When facing a word either too rare to understand or too strange in its context, the first translator often tries to draw inspiration from within the Hebrew text: He either manipulates the problematic words and generates meaning through changing the root, or relies on the context for a reasonable reading. These drives do not exist in the second half of the translation. In a word, the degree to which the translator committed himself to the idea of *Hebraica Veritas* is the key to understanding the difference between the two translators.

That leads to a further intriguing question: Does this bisection of P-Isaiah interact with another question about the Christian/Jewish origin of the translation? At first glance, the relative distrust of LXX and the loyal engagement with the Hebrew text, together with the mastery of Hebrew betrayed through his manipulation of the Hebrew roots, point to Jewish roots for the first translator. However, the evidence also speaks for the Christian roots of the first translator: In Chapter 4 above about the influence from the New Testament, there is more evidence for NT dependence in the

first 33 chapters than from the latter chapters. Especially in 25:6-8, explicit Christian ideas intensively influence the translation.[266] In addition, these Christian traits should belong to the primary translator rather than be attributed to a later hand, as argued above. It may still be satisfactorily said that the first translator, possibly of Jewish origin, can also be a Christian in faith; while the second translator, though slightly less committed to the exact wording of MT, does not show any obvious non-Jewish traits. All of these results still stand within the framework of Weitzman's general conclusion about the identity of the translators of Peshitta as converted Jewish Christians.

---

[266] van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 273ff.

7   BIBLIIOGRAPHY

7.1   Texts, Translations and Tools

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 2. Isaie, Jeremie, Lamentations*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1986.

Berges, Ulrich F. *Jesaja 40-48* (HThKAT). Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2008.

Diettrich, G. *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pesitto zum Propheten Jesaia*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 8. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1905.

Goldingay, John. *Isaiah 55-66* (ICC). London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Goldingay, John, and David Payne. *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC), Vol. I*. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.

———. *Isaiah 40-55 (ICC), Vol. II*. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H, ed. *The Book of Isaiah*. The Hebrew University Bible Project. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1995.

Greenberg, Gillian, and Donald M. Walter. *The Book of Isaiah According to the Syriac Peshitta Version with English Translation*. Piscataway: Gorgias, 2012.

Holladay, William Lee. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Ulrich, Eugene, Peter W. Flint, and Martin G. Abegg, eds. *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010.

Warszawski, L. "Die Peschitta Zu Isaia (Cap. 1-39), Ihr Verhältnis Zum Massoretischen Texte, Zur Septuaginta Und Zum Targum." PhD diss., Grossherzogl. Landes-Universität zu Giessen, 1897.

Weisz, Heinrich. "Die Peschitta zu Deuterojesaia und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX. u. Trg." PhD diss., Friedrichs-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1893.

Wildberger, Hans. *Jesaja 13-27 (BK)*. Biblischer Kommentar X/3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.

———. *Jesaja 28-39 (BK)*. Biblischer Kommentar X/3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.

Williamson, H. G. M. *Isaiah 1-5 (ICC): A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.

———. *Isaiah 6-12 (ICC): A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

7.2   Studies

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

Arblaster, Paul, Gergely Juhász, Guido Latré, and Museum Plantin-Moretus. *Tyndale's Testament*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

Attridge, Harold W., and Helmut Koester. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Baer, David A. *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66*. JSOTSup 318. Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001.

Barnard, L. W. "The Origins and Emergence of the Church in Edessa During the First Two Centuries A.D." *Vigiliae Christianae* 21.3 (1968): 161–175.

Barnes, W. Emery. "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 2.6 (1901): 186–97.

Baumstark, Anton. "Peschitta und palästinensisches Targum, in Biblische Zeitschrift." *BZ* 19.3 (1931): 257–70.

Beuken, W. A. *Jesaja 13-27 (HThKAT)*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.

———. *Jesaja 28-39 (HThKAT)*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten

Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2010.

———. "What Does the Vision Hold: Teachers or One Teacher? Punning Repetition

in Isaiah 30:20." *The Heythrop Journal* 36.4 (1995): 451–466.

Bivar, A. D. H. "The Political History of Iran Under the Arsacids." Pages 21–99 in

*The Cambridge History of Iran, Volume 3(1): The Seleucid, Parthian and

Sasanian Periods*. Edited by E. Yarshater. Vol. 3 of. Cambridge: University

Press, 1983.

Black, Matthew. "The Syriac Versional Tradition." Pages 120–59 in *Die alten

Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare:

der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die

griechische Textgeschichte*. Edited by Kurt Aland. de Gruyter, 1972.

Bloch, Joshua. "The Authorship of the Peshitta." *AJSL* 35.4 (1919): 215–22.

Bodor, Attila. "The Reception of the Septuagint in the Peshitta of Isaiah." *VT* 69.1

(2019): 19–32.

———. "The Use of the Peshitta of Isaiah in Rendering Isaiah Quotations in the Old

Syriac and Peshitta Gospels." *AS* 16.1 (2018): 20–41.

Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. "The Latin Bible." Pages 514–17 in *The New Cambridge

History of the Bible: From the Beginnings to 600*. Edited by Joachim Schaper

and James Carleton Paget. New Cambridge History of the Bible. Cambridge:

University Press, 2013.

Boring, M. Eugene. *Mark: A Commentary*. Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing

Corporation, 2006.

Brock, Sebastian P. "Limitations of Syriac in Representing Greek." Pages 96–98 in

The Early Versions of the New Testament. Edited by Bruce M Metzger.

Cambridge: University Press, 1977.

———. "Text History and Text Division in Peshitta Isaiah." Pages 49–80 in *The*

Peshitta—Its Early Text and History. Edited by P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder.

Leiden: Brill, 1988.

———. "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint—The Witness of Tradition." *OTS* 17

(19972): 11–36.

Brownlee, William H. "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea

Scrolls." *BA* 14 (1951): 54–76.

Burkitt, F. *Early Eastern Christianity: St. Margaret's Lectures, 1904, on the Syriac-*

Speaking Church. New York: Dutton, 1904.

Burrows, Millar T. "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript." *BASOR* 111 (1948):

16–24.

———. "Waw and Yodh in the Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll (DSIa)." *BASOR* 124 (1951):

18–20.

Butts, Aaron Michael. *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in Its Greco-Roman Context*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 11. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2016.

———. "The Classical Syriac Language." Pages 222–42 in *The Syriac World*. Edited by Daniel King. New York: Routledge, 2019.

Chamberlain, John V. "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll." *VT* 5 (1955): 366–372.

Cohen, Menachem. "On the Number of Verses, Words and Letters in the Bible," 13 March 2020.

http://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/dilugim/StatSci/middle_english.pdf.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. 3rd ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

———. "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism." Pages 44–70 in *The Significance of Yavneh and Other Essays in Jewish Hellenism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Cornill, Carl Heinrich. *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel*. Leipzig: JCHinrichs, 1886.

Daube, David. *The Sudden in the Scriptures*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

Delekat, Lienhard. "Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta." *Biblica* 38.2 (1957): 185–99.

Drijvers, Han J. W. "Jews and Christians at Edessa." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 36 (1985): 88–102.

Drijvers, Han J. W., and J. F. Healey. *The Old Syriac Inscriptions of Edessa and Osrhoene. Texts, Translations and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Flint, P. W. "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 229–51 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E. Herberg and E. Tov. New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 2002.

Geiger, Abraham. "Jüdische Begriffe und Worte innerhalb der syrischen Literatur." *ZDMG* 21.3 (1867): 487–92.

———. *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel: in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judentums*. 2. Aufl. Frankfurt: Madda, 1928.

Gelston, Anthony. *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets*. New York: Oxford, 1987.

———. "Was the Peshitta of Isaiah of Christian Origin?" Pages 563–82 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Gordon, Robert P. *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon*. Society for Old Testament Study Monographs. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Die Jesaia-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum." *Bib* 35.1 (1954): 51–71.

Greenberg, Gillian. "Indications of the Faith of the Translator in the Peshitta to the 'Servant Songs' of Deutero-Isaiah." *Aramaic Studies* 2.2 (2004): 175–92.

———. *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah*. Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute 13. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Haase, F. "Zur Ältesten Syrischen Evangelienübersetzung." *TQ* 101 (1920): 262–72.

Harris, J. Rendel. *The Diatessaron of Tatian, a Preliminary Study*. London: CJClay, 1890.

Heller, Chaim. *Untersuchung über die Peschîttâ zur gesamten hebräischen Bibel*. Berlin: HItzkowski, 1911.

Holm, Tawny L. "The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction (Book Review)." *JNES* 62.3 (2003): 227–29.

James, F. "A Critical Examination of the Text of Isaiah: Based on the Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah (DSIa) the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint and the Isaiah Texts of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius." PhD diss., Michigan University, 1959.

Joosten, Jan. "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Old Testament Peshitta." *JBL* 120.3 (2001): 501–23.

———. "The Old Testament in the New: The Syriac Versions of the New Testament as a Witness to the Text of the Old Testament Peshitta." Pages 99–106 in

Language and Textual History of the Syriac Bible. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2019.

———. "The Old Testament Quotations in the Old Syriac and Peshitta Gospels." *Textus* 15 (1990): 55–76.

Kahle, Paul. *Masoreten des Westens*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen; Heft 1, 4. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1927.

Karrer, Martin, Wolfgang Kraus, Eberhard Bons, and Kai Brodersen, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament. Bd. 2: Psalmen bis Daniel*. Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelges, 2011.

Kim, Jintae. "Targum Isaiah 53 and the New Testament Concept of Atonement." *JGRChJ* 5 (2008): 81–98.

Kiraz, George Anton. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshitta and Harklean Versions*. New Testament Tools and Studies 21. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Koenig, Jean. *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'aprés les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Köhler, Ludwig. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1967ff.

van der Kooij, Arie. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 35. Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

———. "Schwerpunkte der Septuaginta-Lexikographie." Pages 119–32 in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der griechischen Bibel, Bd. 2*. Edited by S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch. BWANT 161. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004.

———. "Stump or Stalk: Isaiah 6:13 in the Light of the Ancient Versions." *JNSL* 40.2 (2014): 17–26.

———. "The Septuagint of Isaiah and Priesthood." Pages 69–78 in *Let Us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Iain Provan and Mark Boda. VTSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Koster, Marinus. "A New Introduction to the Peshitta of the Old Testament." *Aramaic Stud* 1.2 (2003): 211–46.

Kutscher, Edward Yechezkel. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Lane, David J. *The Peshiṭta of Leviticus*. Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute 6. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Mager, H. *Die Peschitto Zum Buche Josua*. Fribourg, 1916.

Maori, Y. *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955.

Menzies, Glen W. "To What Does Faith Lead? The Two-Stranded Textual Tradition of Isaiah 7.9b." *JSOT* 80 (1998): 111–128.

Metzger, Bruce M. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.

———. "The Syriac Version/The Latin Version." Pages 25–34 in *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

Meyer, Rudolf. *Hebräische Grammatik*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992.

Morrison, Craig E. *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel*. Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute 11. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Morrow, F. "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran." PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1973.

Nielsen, Bruce. "Daniel van Bombergen, a Bookman of Two Worlds." Pages 56–75 in *The Hebrew Book in Early Modern Italy*. Edited by Joseph Hacker and Adam Shear. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Nöldeke, Theodor. *Die alttestamentliche Literatur: in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt*. Leipzig: Quandt & Händel, 1868.

———. *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche

Buchgesselschaft, 1966.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll." *JBL* 69.2 (1950): 149–

166.

Ottley, Richard Rusden. *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex

Alexandrinus)*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1904.

Parry, Donald W. *Exploring the Isaiah Scrolls and Their Textual Variants*.

Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 3. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2020.

Perles, P. *Meletemata Peschitthoniana*. Breslau: Friedrich, 1859.

Peters, Curt. *Das Diatessaron Tatians: seine überlieferung und sein nachwirken im

Morgen- und Abendland sowie der heutige stand seiner erforschung*. Orientalia

Christiana Analecta 123. Roma: PontInstitutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1939.

———. "Nachhall ausserkanonischer Evangelienüberlieferung in Tatians

Diatessaron." *Acta Orientalia* 16 (1937): 258–94.

Petersen, William L. "New Evidence for the Question of the Original Language of the

Diatessaron." Pages 325–43 in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen

Testaments zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven*. Edited by Wolfgang

Schrage. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.

Peterson, William L. *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance,

and History in Scholarship*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Peursen, W. Th van. *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*. Studies in

Semitic Languages and Linguistics 41. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Pulikottil, Paulson. *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large

Isaiah Scroll*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 34.

Sheffield: Acad. Press, 2001.

Rebenich, Stefan. "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas.'" *Vigiliae

Christianae* 47.1 (1993): 50–77.

Romeny, Bas ter Haar. "Jacob Of Edessa's Quotations And Revision Of Isaiah."

Pages 389–406 in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van Der Kooij on

His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by A. Kooij, MT. Meer, P. Keulen, W. Peursen,

and R. Haar Romeny. Vetus Testamentum, Supplements 138. Leiden: Brill,

2010.

van Rooy, Herrie F. "The Syriac Versions of Old Testament Quotations in Matthew."

In Die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi 49.1 (2015): E1–12.

Rosenbloom, J. *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll, a Literary Analysis*. Grand Rapids:

Eerdmans, 1970.

Rowlands, E. R. "The Targum and the Peshitta Version of the Book of Isaiah." *VT*

9.1 (1959): 178–91.

Rubinstein, Arie. "The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah

Scroll." *JJS* 6.4 (1955): 187–200.

Running, L. *An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah*. PhD diss., Andrews

    University, 1996.

———. "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: Part I." *AUSS* 3.2 (1965):

    138–57.

———. "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: Part II-III." *AUSS* 4

    (1966): 37–148.

Schoenfelder, J. M. *Onkelos und Peschittho: Studien ueber das alter des*

    onkelos'schen Targums. Muenchen: JLentner, 1869.

Seeligmann, Isaac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*. FAT

    40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Seligsohn, Max. "Peshitta or Peshitto." *The Jewish Encyclopedia; a Descriptive*

    Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People

    from the Earliest Times to the Present Day 9:653–55.

Shedinger, R. F. "Did Tatian Use the Old Testament Peshitta? A Response to Jan

    Joosten." *NovT* 41 (1999): 265–79.

Szpek, Heidi M. "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta." *CBQ* 60.2

    (1998): 251–66.

———. *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text*

    with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job. Atlanta: Scholar Press, 1992.

Talmon, S. "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah." *ASTI* 1 (1962): 62–72.

Teeter, David Andrew. *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*. Forschungen Zum Alten Testament 92. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Thackeray, Henry St John. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins*. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Tov, Emanuel. *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

———. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Winona Lake: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015.

———. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Vol. 3*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. "The Septuagint." Pages 161–88 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and H. Sysling. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.

———. *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch - A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8*. Missoula: Harvard University Press, 1976.

———. "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran." Pages 491–511 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Troxel, Ronald L. "Isaiah 7,14-16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint." *ETL* 79.1 (2003): 1–22.

Vööbus, A. "Der Einfluss der altpalästinischen Targums in der Textgeschichte der Peschitta des Alten Testament." *Le Muséon* 68 (1955): 215–18.

———. *Peschitta Und Targumim Des Pentateuchs*. Stockholm: Etse, 1958.

de Waard, J. A. "Metathesis as a Translational Technique." Pages 249–60 in *Traducere Navem: Festschrift für Katharina Reiss zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Katharina Reiss, Justa Holz-Mänttäri, and Christiane Nord. Tampere: Tampereen, 1993.

Weitzman, Michael. "The Originality of Unique Readings in Peshitta MS 9a1." Pages 225–58 in *The Peshitta—Its Early Text and History*. Edited by Peter B. Dirksen and Martin J. Mulder. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

———. *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications ; No. 56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Wevers, John W. "The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-Partum Re- Flections." *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*. Edited by C. Cox. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Williams, P. J. *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*. Piscataway: Gorgias, 2013.

Wohl, Schaje. "Das palästinische Pentateuch-Targum: Untersuchungen zu den Geniza-Fragmenten und ihrem Verhältnis zu den übrigen Targumen und der Peschitta." PhD diss., 1935.

Zahn, Th. *Tatians Diatessaron*. Forschungen Zur Geschichte Des Neutestamentlichen Kanons 1. Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1881.

Ziegler, Joseph. "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta(LXX) und die Erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran." *JBL* 78.1 (1959): 34–59.

———. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias,*. Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12. Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934.