Torah From Zion: Gentile Conversion and Law Observance in the Septuagint of Isaiah

Torah from Zion: Gentile Conversion and Law Observance

in the Septuagint of Isaiah

A dissertation presented

by

Alexander Peterson Douglas

to

The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

April, 2017

Dissertation Advisors: Andrew Teeter   Alexander Douglas
and Richard Saley

Torah from Zion: Gentile Conversion and Law Observance in the Septuagint of Isaiah

Abstract

The book of Isaiah envisions a future where foreigners will one day receive *torah* and worship Yahweh, but neither the text nor its later interpretation is univocal in its understanding of the relationship between foreigners and Israel's law. For example, does Isaiah imply that righteous Gentiles will observe all Mosaic law (purity laws, circumcision, etc.), or will they worship God *as Gentiles*, honoring the law but not observing commands meant for Israelites?

This dissertation examines the concepts of conversion and Gentile law observance in Isaiah and outlines the history of their interpretation, particularly in the Septuagint of Isaiah (LXX-Isaiah). Numerous semantic and cultural shifts took place around "law" and "conversion" from the eighth to second centuries B.C.E., and oracles that would have originally been interpreted as speaking of instruction and reverence for Yahweh came to be understood as speaking of Mosaic law and the conversion of foreigners to Judaism. This trend comes to fullest expression in LXX-Isaiah, where we see significant changes meant to emphasize such a later understanding. This happens in isolated instances, such as LXX-Isa 14:1–2, 24:16, 26:9, 41:1, 45:16, and 54:15, but the author of LXX-Isaiah also reworks entire sections to focus on law and conversion, such as LXX-Isa 8. Small changes can likewise be seen throughout the so-called "Servant Songs" in LXX-Isaiah, where the Servant's role as a "covenant of people" and "light of nations" (Isa 42:6) is reinterpreted to refer to Gentile observance of the law. The changes evident in LXX-Isaiah illuminate a strand of early Jewish thinking on conversion and law observance, and they help us understand the background of the debate surrounding these issues in nascent Judaism and Christianity.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations Used

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ATA	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibS(F)	Biblische Studien (Freiburg, 1895–)
Bijdr	*Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BO	*Bibliotheca Orientalis*
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
BVC	*Bible et vie chrétienne*
BWA(N)T	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
DI	Deutero-Isaiah
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
EncJud	*Encyclopedia Judaica*. Edited by Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum. 2nd ed. 22 vols. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
Imm	*Immanuel*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
LD	Lectio Divina
LHBOTS	The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
NAWG	*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*

NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OTL	Old Testament Library
OtSt	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
PI	Proto-Isaiah
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RPP	*Religion Past and Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion.* Edited by Hans Dieter Betz et al. 14 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2007– 2013
RTP	*Revue de théologie et de philosophie*
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SR	*Studies in Religion*
SwJT	*Southwestern Journal of Theology*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*
Text	*Textus*
TI	Trito-Isaiah
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Chapter 1: Introduction, Method, and the State of Current Research

Introduction

The Hebrew Bible devotes considerable attention to the place and status of non-Israelites.

Pentateuchal legislation outlines the rights of the גר, prophetic oracles speak of the judgment or

exaltation of foreign nations, and stories from Abraham to Ruth to Naaman to Nehemiah speak

to a keen interest in how foreigners should relate to the God of Israel. But perhaps no book has

played a more central role in defining the ultimate place of foreign nations than the book of

Isaiah.

Isaiah is often hailed for its inclusive attitude and universalistic stance toward foreign

nations. Through Isaiah's visions we hear that in the future, "תורה will go forth from Zion" (2:3),

the nations will learn the ways of the Lord (2:3), entire nations will be counted among the Lord's

people (19:25), and foreigners who "hold fast [the Lord's] covenant" will offer sacrifice in the

temple (56:6–7)—some apparently even as priests and Levites (66:20–21). These verses, among

many others, seem to predict the wholesale conversion of non-Israelite nations to Yahwistic

worship, and these pronouncements have had a profound impact on the subsequent history of

Judaism and Christianity. As Joseph Blenkinsopp points out, "the Isaian tradition served as one

of the most powerful vectors of the broader and more inclusive way of thinking about God's

saving purpose for the world throughout the period of the Second Commonwealth."[1] If one

wanted to know what would happen to foreigners in the eschaton, Isaiah was the place to look.

---

[1] *Isaiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 3 vols, AB 19–19B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2003), 1:320.

Yet despite Isaiah's apparent clarity regarding foreigners' conversion, neither the text itself nor its subsequent interpreters are univocal in their understanding of what that conversion would look like. We read that the Egyptians will build altars and swear oaths by the name of the Lord (Isa 19:21), but does this entail that they will observe Israelite purity laws or undergo circumcision? תורה goes out to the nations in Isa 2:3, but does this תורה encompass the entirety of Mosaic law, or is תורה better understood as a type of natural law or political dominance? Will the foreigners in Isa 56:6–7 worship in Jerusalem *as foreigners*—that is to say, giving reverence to the law but not obeying commands meant specifically for Israelites? Or does foreign inclusion in Yahwistic worship mean that foreigners will be indistinguishable from Israelites in their observance of תורה? Isaiah never clarifies the envisioned relationship between foreigners and Israel's law in the eschatological future.

These questions might seem like idle speculation, but they burst into the world's consciousness in the middle of the first century CE, when a small group of messianic Jews believed that the death of Jesus had actually inaugurated the final age.[2] Suddenly this idle speculation took on immediate importance: if Gentiles were to begin the long-awaited

---

[2] Jesus's own view on the eschaton is complex (see Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, trans. John Bowden [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998], 240–80), but the first generation of his followers seem to have generally held that the final age either was imminent or had already begun. Bart Ehrman writes, "there is little doubt as to how the first persons who believed in Jesus' resurrection would have interpreted the event. Since the resurrection of the dead was to come at the end of the age and since somebody had now been raised (as they believed), then the end must already have begun" (*The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 5th ed. [New York: Oxford University Press, 2012], 299). Thus the statements throughout the New Testament: "the form of this world is passing away" (1 Cor 7:31), "in these last days" (Heb 1:2), "the end of all things has come near" (1 Pet 4:7), "the world is passing away… it is the last hour" (1 John 2:17–18), etc. For Paul, Christ's death seems to have brought about a mixed eschatology, which James D. G. Dunn summarizes: "Christ's coming and resurrection were indeed perceived as the eschatological climax — 'the fullness of time' (Gal. 4.4), the beginning of 'the resurrection of the dead' (Rom. 1.4). But the end did not come: the dead were not raised; the judgment did not take place. The eschatological climax was thus incomplete; the completion of the divine purpose required a further climactic act. Christ, who had already come, must come — again!" (*The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 463). Thus "the believer lives in the overlap of the ages and belongs to both" (ibid., 474–75). While other groups in the Second Temple period also believed that the final age was imminent or had already begun, the nascent Christian movement made a concerted effort to preach to Gentiles, thus bringing issues of Gentile law observance to the fore.

conversion to Yahwistic worship, what religious laws should they observe? The letters of Paul,
Acts, and even the four canonical gospels give ample witness to just how much confusion,
passion, and polemic surrounded these issues, and in this battle the book of Isaiah was central.

New Testament scholarship has long recognized the importance of Isaiah in
reconstructing how early Jews and Christians thought about law, foreigners, and eschatology.[3]
Yet despite this recognition, and despite the considerable attention given to these themes in the
Hebrew text of Isaiah, relatively little attention has been paid to how these themes were
transformed in the Septuagint version of Isaiah (LXX-Isa),[4] the version most commonly used by
the early church. If we want to understand the early church's debate as fully as possible, we need
to understand LXX-Isa, which acts as a mediating link between the 8th-century prophet and the
way his words were received at the turn of the Common Era.

The goal of this dissertation is to contribute to our understanding of this mediating link.
The Septuagint version of Isaiah gives us an avenue to see how the concepts of foreign
conversion and law observance changed in the centuries leading up to the turn of the era, and by
better understanding LXX-Isa, we are then better able to see how LXX-Isa in turn affected
debate within the nascent Christian church. Chapter 1 introduces the problem and lays out the
history of scholarship surrounding the Hebrew text of Isaiah, LXX-Isa, and each text's treatment

---

[3] To give but a few examples, see Christopher Begg, "The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh in the Book of
Isaiah," in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of John T. Willis*, ed. M. Patrick Graham, Rick R.
Marrs, and Steven L. McKenzie*, JSOTSup 284 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999); Joseph Blenkinsopp,
Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006);
James Flamming, "The New Testament Use of Isaiah," *SwJT* 11 (Fall 1968): 89–103; Darrell D. Hannah, "Isaiah
within Judaism of the Second Temple Period," in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J.
Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 7–33; Scot A. McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary
Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); and Florian Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des
Jesajabuches für Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998). In the index to James D. G. Dunn's *The
Theology of Paul the Apostle*, references to Isaiah take up nearly an entire page.

[4] For the problems associated with the term "Septuagint," see discussion immediately following.

of law and foreigners. Chapter 2 traces how the concepts of law and conversion changed over time, and Chapter 3 examines the interaction of eschatology, law observance, and foreign nations in the Hebrew texts of Isaiah. Chapter 4 looks at LXX-Isa and explores how these themes are modified in the course of translation. Chapter 5 continues the examination of LXX-Isa by focusing on the so-called "Servant Songs" and seeing how the Isaianic servant can be understood to reimagine the relationship between Israel, law, and the foreign nations. The Conclusion draws the results together to better understand how these themes are transformed from the Hebrew to (and within) the LXX version of Isaiah, and it lays out some of the insights this analysis can bring to New Testament scholarship.

The scope of this dissertation is therefore at once both dauntingly broad and narrow. On the one hand, each of these subtopics (the concept of law in the Hebrew text of Isaiah, the concept of law in LXX-Isa, the influence of the Septuagint on Paul's theology, etc.) could be—and often has been—turned into a book or even a series of books in its own right, and to do justice to each would require more space than one dissertation can provide. Each subtopic represents its own field of inquiry with its own extensive bibliography, and I have done my best to do justice to these fields in the space I have. Yet my interest is not in law *per se*, foreigners *per se*, or even LXX-Isa *per se*. My primary focus is on LXX-Isa's role in the history of interpretation of eschatological law observance by the nations. Thus while it will be necessary to lay out the work done in each of these subfields, my engagement with them is necessarily limited to the extent to which they shed light on this dissertation's larger thesis.

For example, the scholarship surrounding the place of foreigners in LXX-Isa is sharply divided on even the most basic issues, such as whether LXX-Isa is friendlier or less friendly than the Hebrew text toward the nations. This debate is interesting and worth consideration on its own

terms. But while I will try to account for the full range of evidence, this dissertation will not treat in detail those passages in LXX-Isa that are not directly relevant to the question of foreigners' law observance in the eschaton. The same principle holds for the Hebrew text of Isaiah's conception of the law; one can hold a fascinating debate on whether "the law of our God" in Isa 1:10 includes any or all Pentateuchal legislation, but this debate is only relevant to this dissertation insofar as it sheds light on the history of interpretation of foreigners' law observance in the eschaton. Thus while I cannot explore any one of these fields in full depth, I do treat their interaction throughout the Isaianic tradition.

Terms

If this dissertation is to contribute anything meaningful to the discussion of foreigners' law observance in the eschaton, we need to keep clearly in view what we mean by such terms as "law," "foreigners," and "eschaton." In large part due to their common usage, these seemingly simple terms can cover a wide range of meanings, and we must be careful not to let terminological imprecision cloud our discussion.

The term "Isaiah" has two primary referents, namely the 8th-century prophet (also known as "Isaiah of Jerusalem") and the book bearing his name. The book of Isaiah itself has long been recognized as stemming from multiple authors, and the theories accounting for the present shape of the book are legion.[5] I have no desire to embroil myself in the complex debates surrounding the book's redaction, but in this dissertation I accept the widely-held view that the book of Isaiah roughly divides into pre-exilic material ascribed to Proto-Isaiah (PI), exilic material ascribed to

---

[5] For a summary of recent work on this issue, see H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 1–20, as well as Jacob Stromberg, *An Introduction to the Study of Isaiah* (New York: T&T Clark, 2011), passim.

Deutero-Isaiah (DI), and post-exilic material ascribed to Trito-Isaiah (TI).[6] It is common to use

the term "Proto-Isaiah" to refer to Isaiah 1–39, "Deutero-Isaiah" to refer to Isaiah 40–55, and

"Trito-Isaiah" to refer to 56–66, but as has long been recognized, not all the material in these

blocks can be ascribed to their respective authors, and the work of exilic and post-exilic editors

can be seen in all stages of the book.[7] Thus when I use these term "Proto-Isaiah," I am referring

only to that material which can be ascribed to the 8th-century prophet and the pre-exilic editors

who contributed to the book of Isaiah. Though I will frequently speak of how "Deutero-Isaiah"

or "Trito-Isaiah" interprets earlier passages within the book, these terms are used as shorthand to

refer to the book's exilic and post-exilic contributors respectively, regardless of how many such

contributors there were or where their words are found.

"Law" is perhaps the most difficult term to define, for its meaning changes depending on

the speaker, language, and time period under discussion. These changes are central to my

argument, so a detailed discussion of them will be undertaken in Chapter 2. In the meantime,

however, it will be useful to draw out some of the possibilities inherent in the use of the word

"law." When some scholars use the word "law," they use the word in what is traditionally seen

as the original sense of תורה, namely, "instruction."[8] This is the kind of sage advice a father

might pass to a son, or a craftsman to an apprentice, and it is often connected with the Wisdom

---

[6] According to Hans-Winfried Jüngling, this three-fold division "[behauptet] sich bis heute als Grundpfeiler des Jesajaexegese" ("Das Buch Jesaja," in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, ed. Erich Zenger et al., 8th ed., Studienbücher Theologie 1.1 [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012], 523). Specifics of the theory have been hotly contested, so much so that Irmtraud Fischer can write, "Das wohl gefügte Gebäude des Buches, wie es seit dem letzten Jahrhunderts von der Forschung errichtet wurde, ist derart baufällig geworden, daß kaum noch ein Stein am anderen hält" (*Tora für Israel – Tora für die Völker: Das Konzept des Jesajabuches*, SBS 164 [Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995], 12). But the general consensus has remained as the foundation of critical scholarship, even if particular verses or theories of redaction continue to be debated.

[7] E.g., see Stromberg, *An Introduction*, 12–21.

[8] Jensen, for example, argues for this interpretation in *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah: His Debate with the Wisdom Tradition,* CBQMS 3 (Arlington, VA: Information Products & Services Corp), 1973.

tradition. In this definition, the תורה that goes out from Zion (Isa 2:3) would best be seen as advice—perhaps something analogous to the ethical statements of Proverbs or Ecclesiastes—or the righteous example of the Israelites (compare the דרך טובים וארחות צדיקים of Prov 2:20 with the nations' exhortation in Isa 2:3, ירנו מדרכיו ונלכה בארחתיו).

Closely related to this definition is what is referred to as "natural law," or that which is "attributed through philosophical, moral, or religious conviction to the very nature of things."[9] Natural law of itself is not binding, though a sense of natural law often forms the basis of a society's legal norms. Thus when Abimelech complains that Abraham has committed מעשים אשר לֹא יֵעָשׂוּ (Gen 20:9), this is an appeal to natural law—that which most people would naturally agree is right.

A third definition of law, and probably the most prevalent in discussions of foreigners' law observance, is the sum of legislation that eventually comes to be compiled in the Pentateuch, including dietary restrictions, circumcision, civil law, etc. At times I refer to this legal body as "Mosaic law" or "the law of Moses," due to its traditional attribution to Moses. Intimately bound up in this definition of law is the idea of covenant, for in the Pentateuch, Israel is given Mosaic law not as a series of individual laws, but as part of a larger covenant.[10] Therefore observing Mosaic law is often taken as synonymous with incorporation into the Mosaic covenant as revealed on Sinai.[11] This identification need not *necessarily* be made, but it is worth noting, for

---

[9] Douglas Knight, *Law, Power, and Justice in Ancient Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011), 30.

[10] Paul, for example, often uses the term νόμος "to sum up Israel's covenantal obligations, as set out by Moses" (Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 132).

[11] E. P. Sanders interprets the rabbinic statement, "everyone who confesses to (accepts) the commandment [concerning] interest confesses to (accepts) the exodus from Egypt," in this way, though this is in reference to those who are already in the covenant (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977], 93–4, 135; brackets in original).

example, that early interpreters may have understood Isa 56:6 ("foreigners… who hold to my covenant") to entail full observation of the Mosaic law.

When speaking of Mosaic law in relation to foreigners, we could further distinguish different types of law observance. According to some, foreigners might only be required to observe the so-called "ethical" portions of the law, while the ritual laws might be safely ignored.[12] In this view, foreigners might be bound not to give false testimony or take bribes (Exod 23:1–8), but they would not need to wash for ritual impurity (Lev 15:2–6). Of course, in this system it is usually unclear how one determines which laws hold ethical significance, but the ritual/ethical divide is nevertheless a frequently used category in modern scholarship.

Closely related to both the ritual/ethical divide and the category of natural law is Noahide law. Probably beginning shortly after the Second Temple period, interpreters focused on the commands given to Noah in Gen 9 as being the only laws applicable to foreigners.[13] In this view, "law" as it relates to foreigners might encompass no more than these basic commands.

The term "law" can also refer to the books of the Pentateuch, or even the entire Bible. In 1 Cor 14:21, Paul quotes Isa 28:11–12 and says that this quotation is found "in the law" (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ).[14] If "law" is used in this sense, the law that goes out from Jerusalem (Isa 2:3) would be

---

[12] See Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 112; and Thomas R. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1993), 40 for discussion of this distinction and its validity in New Testament studies.

[13] See Marc Hirshman, "Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries," *HTR* 93.2 (April 2000): 112, especially n. 30. Shaye J. D. Cohen summarizes the viewpoint as follows: "Righteous gentiles need not convert to Judaism in order to have a share in the world to come. They need obey only a certain basic minimum, which God revealed to Noah and which was to be observed by all of Noah's descendants, that is, the gentiles. The rabbis debated among themselves the number and identity of these laws (the usual number was seven)." *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 2nd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 209.

[14] See Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment*, 36. This conception of the law goes back to the Hebrew Bible itself, where Deut 30:10 speaks of "this book of the law," apparently referring to some form of the commands of Deuteronomy. Jean-Pierre Sonnet writes, "The book traditionally called in Hebrew דברים, 'Words,' is therefore characterized by an overall homogeneity between the represented action (Moses' linguistic communication) and the

some or all of the Hebrew Bible, though it remains unclear what it would mean for foreigners to obey this law.

In English, political domination can also be expressed through the word "law," as when we say that a colony was "under British law." The polyvalence of the word "law," as both a written statute and a general term denoting political domination, mirrors the semantic range of the word "rule," as when people speak of a country being "under British rule" (as opposed to obeying specific rules). There is much to commend this interpretation of law within the book of Isaiah, for one of Isaiah's most consistent themes is the eventual rise of Israel and subservience of the nations.[15] It remains unclear, however, how well this polyvalence maps onto Hebrew תורה or Greek νόμος.[16]

The final meaning of "law" relevant to our discussion is what Knight calls the "ideological valence" of law.[17] In this sense, "the Law"—often capitalized to emphasize its distinct nature from individual statutes—represents the transcendent ideas that law and order can come to represent. Knight writes, "As the sum total of all legitimate components of legal control within the society in question, it embraces and yet also transcends the mass of individual positive

---

representing medium (the book as linguistic communication)" (*The Book Within the Book: Writing in Deuteronomy*, BibInt 14 [Leiden: Brill, 1997], 236; see also 103–12).

[15] E.g., Isa 14:1–2; 49:22–26; 60:4–16; 61:5–7; 66:18–20.

[16] Perhaps it is best to think of this sense of "law" as an analogical extension of the political power necessary to enforce laws in the first place. If, as Walter Gutbrod states, "Νόμος is the compulsory command or order of a state, with punishment for violation" ("νόμος, ἀνομία, κτλ.," *TDNT* 4:1024), one could see how this command or order might be imposed on other states in a relationship of political dominance—just as it is usually imposed on individuals—without any appreciable difference in definition of νόμος.

[17] Knight, *Law, Power, and Justice*, 50.

laws. Termed *jus* in ancient Roman law, 'the law' possesses symbolic power insofar as it

expresses the ideological objectives of social harmony."[18]

Of all the Hebrew terms dealing with the legal sphere, תורה seems to correspond most

closely with the Roman concept of *jus*, and as Knight points out, תורה primarily functions in the

Hebrew Bible "as a theocratic symbol—to affirm that the legal order is ordained by God."[19] If

this is the type of law that goes out to the nations in Isaiah, our mental image of foreigners'

obedience to the law might more closely approximate an adaptation to Israelite belief rather than

conformity to any set of legal or religious rules.

Unfortunately, apart from legal specialists these distinctions in law are rarely discussed,

but they are crucial if we are to speak of law observance by foreigners with any degree of

precision. Of course, we must be cognizant of the fact that these are etic categories, and in an

ancient worldview there would have been considerable overlap between what we consider

different types of law.[20] For an easy example, we need look no further than Paul, whose loose

use of the term νόμος has exercised scholars and theologians for centuries. But the overlap in

ancient usage should give us all the more reason to be precise in our own discussion, especially

---

[18] Ibid. Dale Patrick similarly notes, "The Law is more than the sum total of laws" (*Old Testament Law* [Atlanta: John Knox, 1985], 5).

[19] Knight, *Law, Power, and Justice*, 51. He writes, "Biblical Hebrew does not have a strict correspondence to such terms as *jus* and *lex*, yet there is a near equivalence to *jus* in the word תורה, *tôrâ*, which is itself set off from such other legal terms as 'precept' (פקוד, *piqqûd*), 'statute' (חק, *ḥōq*), 'commandment' (מצוה, *miṣwâ*), and 'judgment' (משפט, *mišpāṭ*). Occurring by far most frequently in biblical texts in the singular form (208 out of 220 times), *tôrâ* seldom appears within any of the biblical laws themselves: it occurs twenty-one times formulaically ('this is the law…' or 'these are the laws…') in Leviticus and Numbers to introduce or conclude ritual or cultic ordinances on various subjects, and then notable three times in Deut 17 to refer to the law of the priests and the law of the king."

[20] It is widely acknowledged, for example, that in ancient Israel "[t]here is… no clear dividing line between laws and moral precepts" (Raymond Westbrook and Bruce Wells, *Everyday Law in Biblical Israel: An Introduction*, [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009], 1) and that "Hebrew tradition did not distinguish between norms of religion, morality, and law. As befitting their common divine origin, man was bound to obey all of them with equal conscientiousness" (Ze'ev W. Falk, *Hebrew Law in Biblical Times: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. [Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press and Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001], 4).

since our goal is to unravel what Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah, Trito-Isaiah, and the translator of LXX-Isa meant by the term "law" in reference to foreigners.

The second terminological group to be defined—namely, that pertaining to foreigners—is thankfully much simpler than "law." By foreigners and foreign nations, I am referring to anyone who would not have been considered Israelite. This includes the נכר, זר, גוי, עם, ἀλλότριος, ἀλλογενής, ἔθνος, and λαός, which are the primary terms used when speaking of foreigners. As with most categorizations, these terms impose a binary distinction on what was undoubtedly a fluid continuum,[21] but for our purposes we do not need the same level of precision with discussion of foreigners as we do with law. To say that "foreigners" refers to non-Israelites leaves ambiguous the place of the גר, the Samaritans, and other marginal categories, but neither Isaiah nor its later interpreters seems to have these marginal categories in mind. In these writings, "foreigner" (in a variety of terms and languages) seems to envision the unambiguously non-Israelite: Egyptians, Assyrians, etc. The only major distinction drawn in Isaiah is between those foreigners who will ultimately be blessed by the Lord and those who will be destroyed in God's judgment. Since those destroyed in God's judgment will not likely be observing any laws, we can henceforth set them aside in our discussion.

Throughout this dissertation I use the term "Gentile" interchangeably with "foreigner" and "non-Israelite." While the word "Gentile" is of later origin and has its own theological

---

[21] As one example of this continuum, Shaye Cohen writes of Hellenistic Judaism: "The Jews (Judaeans) of antiquity constituted an *ethnos*, an ethnic group. They were a named group, attached to a specific territory, whose members shared a sense of common origins, claimed a common and distinctive history and destiny, possessed one or more distinctive characteristics, and felt a sense of collective uniqueness and solidarity. The sum total of these distinctive characteristics was designated by the Greek word *Ioudaïsmos*. As we shall see, the most distinctive of the distinctive characteristics of the Jews was the manner in which they worshipped their God, what we today would call their religion. But *Ioudaïsmos*, the ancestor of our English word *Judaism*, means more than just religion…. Perhaps, then, we should translate *Ioudaïsmos* not 'Judaism' but 'Jewishness'" (*The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999], 7–8). There were, therefore, different ways in which a person could be Jewish and foreign (or Israelite and foreign, if we are speaking of earlier periods). This will be addressed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

baggage, my own use of the term is by convenience and is meant to reflect nothing more than the Latin sense of *gens/gentes*. Gentiles, in this dissertation, are simply people who would not be identified as Israelite.

The "eschaton" is another tricky term whose meaning depends on the religious outlook and time period of the speaker. The book of Isaiah deals extensively with the future, and while some of these prophecies deal with events within the range of historical time, others envision a future transcending known history, where even the cosmic order is rearranged. In this future, God creates "a new heaven and a new earth" (Isa 65:17), where Jerusalem is elevated above the nations, war is done away, wolves and lambs live together in peace, and foreigners worship Yahweh alongside Israelites (see, e.g., Isa 2:2–4; 11:6–9; 56:6–7). The terms "eschaton" and "last days" describe this latter category of Isaiah's prophecies, where a break in cosmic order distinguishes the present world from a radically reimagined future. In this future, "the character of what will happen moves beyond the world as humans had known it," wherein "the experience of time, natural order, social existence, religious affiliation, even Yahweh's lordship, will be of a fundamentally different sort from that which had existed earlier."[22] We cannot assume that Isaiah of Jerusalem held the same full-blown eschatology that developed in the post-exilic period,[23] but those passages dealing with foreigners' law observance do show at least an incipient belief in an eschatological break. By the time the book of Isaiah reached its final form, the "new heaven" and

---

[22] David L. Petersen, "Eschatology: Old Testament," *ABD* 2:578.

[23] See, however, Louis F. Hartman, who says that many of Proto-Isaiah's prophecies "have a genuine eschatological ring," including a prediction of universal destruction, the return of a remnant, and the return of the earth to an Eden-like state ("Eschatology," *EncJud* 6:491–92).

"new earth" announced in Isaiah 65–66 show a fully developed notion of eschatological—and

even apocalyptic—drama.[24]

The problem with words such as "eschaton" is that they have come to be applied to a

wide range of phenomena, which in turn creates the danger of blurring the lines between

categories when any particular phenomenon is discussed. Enoch, Daniel, Paul, the rabbis, and

Jesus, for example, all had different ideas about what this final period would look like, yet each

individual outlook is described as "eschatological." In this dissertation, my use of these terms is

meant only to distinguish this final glorious period from other events predicted by Isaiah. Isaiah

certainly shared in a tradition of eschatology that can be seen throughout the prophets, but we

must be careful not to let phrases such as באחרית הימים (Isa 2:2) and יום יהוה (Isa 13:6) lead us into

thinking that the future envisioned in the book of Isaiah was identical to that of Amos or Paul.[25]

The final term that requires definition is "Septuagint." In this dissertation, the

"Septuagint" version of Isaiah refers to the Old Greek text translated in the second century BCE.

No original copies of LXX-Isa have been found, and our only access to it comes through our best

efforts at using later manuscript evidence, such as the Alexandrian, Lucianic, Hexaplaric, and

other versions, to reconstruct the text. The earliest partial manuscripts we do have of LXX-Isa

date from the second century CE, while the major codices that form our primary witnesses

(Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, etc.) come from the fourth century CE, all of which were

preserved by Christian scribes. This leaves four hundred to six hundred years between the

translation of LXX-Isa and our earliest manuscripts. During this time period, the Hebrew

tradition was still in flux, and there is ample evidence that the Old Greek tradition—beyond

---

[24] See Hans Peter Müller, "Eschatology: Old Testament," *RPP* 4:534–39.

[25] For a discussion of prophetic eschatology and its definition relative to the concept of historical continuity, see von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 2:112–25.

simply Isaiah—was being revised to reflect common Hebrew texts.[26] Beyond these revisions, there also seems to have been ample interaction between various strands of the Greek textual tradition of Isaiah before our earliest manuscript evidence.[27]

The term "Septuagint of Isaiah" is therefore problematic insofar as it implies that such a text is readily accessible. The Göttingen edition, edited by Joseph Ziegler, collates the information we have and uses it to reconstruct an archetype from which later textual witnesses can be derived, but it is worth emphasizing that nearly half a millennium separates this archetype from the original translation—half a millennium during which substantial textual revision may have taken place. Our reconstructed text, therefore, cannot be taken at face value as a representation of what the original translator of LXX-Isa wrote. Despite these limitations, however, the label "LXX-Isa" is nevertheless useful in distinguishing this tradition from other translations or revisions, such as Aquila or Symmachus.

The History of Scholarship

Because this dissertation covers a wide range of fields, my review of the history of scholarship has been broken up into the following sections: law and foreign nations in the Hebrew texts, law in LXX-Isa, foreign nations in LXX-Isa, research on LXX-Isa, and identifying authorial intent and translation method.

Law and Foreign Nations in the Hebrew Texts of Isaiah

---

[26] See Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Atlanta: The Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 67–83.

[27] See, e.g., Isac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*, FAT 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 135–78.

As we will see in more detail in Chapter 3, the Hebrew texts of Isaiah do not represent a univocal witness to the place of foreigners in the eschaton or their relationship with the law. Even if we ignore individual differences within the Hebrew tradition, such as those between the Masoretic texts and the scrolls found at Qumran, Isaiah preserves a bewildering number of different statements about foreigners and law observance.

Probably resulting in no small part from this very multivocality, Isaiah quickly became a fertile battleground for competing interpretations. When Paul argues that Gentiles should not observe Mosaic law (e.g., Gal 2–3), he does so while simultaneously presenting himself in the role of the servant on whose law the Gentiles wait.[28] Conversely, when the *Sibylline Oracles* describe how the nations will "change the terrible custom we have received from our ancestors" (5:494), the language used to describe their adoption of Yahwistic worship draws from Isa 19:19.[29]

Unfortunately, modern scholarship has been equally as divided in its understanding of the message of the book of Isaiah. With so many writers interpreting Isaiah in so many ways, it is practically impossible to lay out broad trends within the history of scholarship; thus perhaps it would be most productive to lay out some of the ways people have addressed the issue of law and foreigners in the Hebrew texts, rather than trace out broad patterns across time.[30]

---

[28] This is most prominently seen in Gal 1:15–16. See J. Ross Wagner, "Isaiah in Romans and Galatians," in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 130–31; Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches*, 4; and idem, "Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians," in Moyise and Menken, *Isaiah in the New Testament*, 152–53.

[29] *Sib. Or.* 5:501 reads, "Then there will be a great holy temple in Egypt, and a people fashioned by God will bring sacrifices to it. To them the imperishable God will grant to reside there." Translation from James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983–1985).

[30] In the ensuing discussion, I have not included Jensen's foundational work, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah*, primarily because Jensen does not deal with law observance by foreigners. It is worth noting that Jensen's conception of תורה in Proto-Isaiah is wisdom based ("In the case of each *tôrâ* text of Isaiah it has been possible to bring forward strong

In modern scholarship, at one end of the spectrum are those scholars who argue that, according to Isaiah, foreigners will observe all Mosaic law in the eschaton. André Feuillet, for example, writes that the תורה and דבר יהוה that go out from Zion "should designate the whole of the written or oral revelation."[31] Thus the nations that walk in the paths of the Lord (Isa 2:3) would obey the entirety of Israel's revealed law—possibly that found in both pentateuchal and non-pentateuchal texts. Feuillet does not argue out the case in great length, and it is unclear how this law observance might work in practice, but the underlying premise seems to be of total foreign obedience.

Christopher Begg likewise points out how fully the nations are incorporated into Israel, which presumably entails full inclusion in law observance. He notes, "it is especially striking to observe how the texts foresee the nations as Yahweh's worshippers, entering fully and equally into the privileges of Israel."[32] The nations will have their own altar, priests, and sacrifices (Isa 19:20–21; 56:6; 66:23); they are part of Yahweh's covenant (Isa 56:6); they observe Sabbath and other holy days (Isa 66:23); they send out missionaries (Isa 66:19); and God speaks of them in terms elsewhere reserved only for his own people (Isa 19:25). In Begg's mind, foreigners are fully incorporated into Israel, possibly to the point of losing their distinct identity as foreigners, but certainly to the point of observing Israelite law.

---

arguments in favor of… the meaning 'wise instruction'" [120]), which would cast later interpretation of foreigners' law observance in a decidedly non-legal light, but Jensen himself never addresses the issue.

[31] "Grâce à cette *Loi* (cf. Osée 8, 1) et à cette *Parole* qui doivent désigner l'ensemble de la révélation écrite ou orale et en particulier le Décalogue (cf. Ex. 34, 28), Yahweh se fera le Docteur des nations…. car elles auront trouvé dans l'adhésion à la vraie religion l'apaisement de toutes leurs querelles" (Feuillet, "La conversion et le salut des nations: chez le prophète Isaïe," *BVC* 22 [1958]: 15).

[32] Begg, "The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh," 55.

At the other end of the spectrum are those scholars who draw a distinction between Israelite law and the law that foreigners will one day observe. Most prominent on this side of the debate are Norbert Lohfink and Irmtraud Fischer. Lohfink argues that from the very beginning of Isaiah, the reader is confronted with two separate laws. In Isa 1:10, the Israelites are commanded to give ear to תורת אלהינו, while in Isa 2:3 the foreign nations receive a separate תורה that goes out from Zion.[33] According to Lohfink, these two laws are not identical, and they stand in tension throughout the book of Isaiah. The word תורה stands in parallel with דבר יהוה in both verses, and though some might argue that this is sufficient grounds for seeing the two laws as identical, Lohfink insists that the parallel only entails that the תורה going out to the nations "has to do with the Torah of Israel. Nothing more."[34]

Further complicating the facile identification of תורה in Isa 2:3 with Mosaic law is the fact that often when Isaiah speaks of God's relationship to Israel, the covenant language is blended with terms from both the Noahic and Davidic covenants.[35] It is thus far from clear that any of Isaiah's authors envisioned the Israelites—much less foreigners—obeying Mosaic law in the eschaton. Within this reimagined covenant, it is possible that foreigners would still relate to God on the same terms as righteous foreigners did previously, or perhaps these foreigners would take Israel's former role in the Davidic covenant, while Israel would in turn fulfill the role David

---

[33] Norbert Lohfink and Erich Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker: Untersuchungen zum Jesajabuch und zu den Psalmen* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994), 45.

[34] "Abschließend läßt sich also sehr wohl sagen, daß der Grundtext von der Wallfahrt der Völker zum Zion den Völkern als Frucht ihres Zuges eine Tora verheißt, und daß diese Tora mit der Tora Israels zu tun hat. Mehr nicht. Nicht, daß es nun die Tora des Mose sei, die an die Völker weitergegeben würde" (ibid., 44).

[35] Lohfink draws particular attention to Isa 54:8–10, where God says, "this is like the waters of Noah to me; just as I swore never again to let the waters of Noah go over the earth, thus I now swear that I will not be angry with you," and the wider pericope invokes ברית שלומי, חסד עולם, and God's רחמים, presumably in allusion to Gen 9. Isa 55:3 provides an unambiguous reference to the Davidic covenant, where God promises to make with Israel a ברית עולם, חסדי דוד הנאמנים.

once played as mediator with God.[36] We will examine the content of this covenant in more detail in Chapter 4.

Even in those passages which seem to speak unequivocally of foreign inclusion, as in Isa 56, Lohfink is quick to point out that "the talk is of individual integration into the people of Israel, not of a transfer of the covenant to the peoples."[37] He grants that some foreigners might be incorporated into Israel, but foreigners *as* foreigners have an entirely different, non-covenantal relationship with God in eschatological time. In sum: "The 'covenant' in the entire book of Isaiah is attached only to Israel and is never, not even for the future, promised to the peoples."[38]

Fischer builds on Lohfink's work, and she begins her analysis with the same distinction between the two types of תורה in Isa 1:10 and 2:3—one for Israel and one for the people. But according to Fischer, although the nations were originally under a Noahic-like covenant,[39] this covenant was broken through disobedience. As Isaiah announces, "the earth is polluted under its inhabitants, for they have transgressed תורת… they have broken ברית עולם" (Isa 24:5). After this broken covenant, Isaiah proclaims a new covenant for the nations, this time with the Servant/Israel as a mediator (Isa 42:6, 49:8). Fischer writes, "Their Torah is mediated by YHWH's servant Israel…. The Torah for the peoples is thus not simply the Torah given at Sinai,

---

[36] Lohfink and Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker*, 52–53.

[37] "Auf jeden Fall ist hier von einer Integration einzelner in das Volk Israel die Rede, nicht von einer Übertragung des Bundes auf die Völker" (ibid., 55).

[38] "Nach einer Analyse der Grundstellen zur Völkerwallfahrt soll, auch der vollen Ehrlichkeit halber, zunächst dargelegt werden, daß – entgegen bisweilen geäußerten Vermutungen – der »Bund« im ganzen Jesajabuch allein Israel zugeordnet und niemals, auch nicht für die Zukunft, des Völkern zugesagt wird" (ibid., 39).

[39] It is hard to say what exactly Isaiah (or Deutero-Isaiah, or Trito-Isaiah) would have had in mind when referring to a covenant in the days of Noah. There are a number of apparent allusions to Genesis in Deutero-Isaiah, such as the waters of Noah (Isa 54:9), Abraham and Sarah (Isa 51:2), and the polemic interaction with Gen 1 first argued by Moshe Weinfeld (for discussion, see Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985], 325–26), but without further research we do not know whether Deutero-Isaiah had access to Genesis in some form or if he engages with the traditions lying behind the final form of Genesis. Thus we cannot assume that the reference to Noah's covenant in Isa 54:9 would have entailed everything we currently find in Gen 9:1–17.

but the Torah as prophetically interpreted and mediated through Israel."[40] In this way Fischer is able to distinguish two separate laws or covenants: one for Israel, which is presumably identical with the covenant given at Sinai (though Fischer never clarifies this point), and a second for the foreign nations, which is emphatically not the תורה given at Sinai.

Aside from those scholars who take a clear position regarding eschatological law observance, most scholars simply discuss foreigners' observing law without clarifying what this law might entail. They simply state that foreigners will observe the law and leave it at that. John Oswalt, for example, describes "the worshipping nations" as crucial to understanding Trito-Isaiah's message, and he recognizes the importance of the nations' "coming to Jerusalem to learn the Torah of Jerusalem's God," but he never discusses issues such as circumcision, purity laws, or any other ambiguous area of law observance for the nations.[41] The fact that he capitalizes the "Torah" that goes out from Jerusalem might imply that this law is identical with Mosaic law, but if this is his meaning, it is never explicitly stated. The same ambiguity surrounds treatment of this topic in both Roy Melugin and Friedrich Huber.[42]

---

[40] "Ihre Tora aber wird durch JHWHs Knecht Israel vermittelt.... Die Tora für die Völker ist damit nicht einfach die am Sinai gegebene Tora, sondern die durch Israel prophetisch ausgelegte und vermittelte Tora" (Fischer, *Tora für Israel*, 122).

[41] Oswalt, "The Nations in Isaiah: Friend or Foe; Servant or Partner," *BBR* 16.1 (2006): 49, 42.

[42] The ambiguous nature of foreigners' law observance in these scholarly works is not due to laziness, but rather to the fact that 1) the book of Isaiah itself is not clear on this topic, and 2) according to these authors, foreigners are at most a peripheral concern in Isaiah. Melugin acknowledges that the nations are given "Torah" (capitalized), but he explains that "Yahweh's actions toward Israel and the nations are… subservient to the more basic purpose of universal recognition of Yahweh as God" (Melugin, "Israel and the Nations in Isaiah 40–55," in *Problems in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Rolf Knierim,* ed. Henry T. C. Sun and Keith L. Eades [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 260). Huber likewise states that for Proto-Isaiah, the nations are essentially a sideshow to Isaiah's greater purpose: "Es ist auch nicht eine die Grenzen der eigenen Nation übersteigende weltgeschichtliche Perspektive oder ein universales religiöses Denken, das ihn zum Reden von anderen Völkern führt. Vielmehr ist auch in all den Sprüchen, die von anderen Völkern handeln, das Verhältnis Judas zu Jahwe das Hauptthema" (Huber, *Jahwe, Juda und die anderen Völker beim Propheten Jesaja*, BZAW 137 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976], 175).

The above interpretations have been based exclusively on the Masoretic tradition, but with the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, there has been some interest in whether 1QIsaᵃ exhibits a unique viewpoint on foreigners and law observance. We will return to this question in more detail in Chapter 3, but it is sufficient to note here that most scholars have shied away from attributing any distinctive theology to 1QIsaᵃ on this question.[43] The two main exceptions to this trend are Paulson Pulikottil and Jean Koenig, whose objections will also be discussed in Chapter 3.

Law in LXX-Isa

When it comes to the place of law in LXX-Isa, practically everyone agrees that the translator "had a special concern for the Torah and its abrogation,"[44] but beyond this agreement, little work has been done on the concept of law, its implementation, or its application to foreigners in this source.

Ross Wagner, for example, notes "the prominence given to the νόμος in the OG version of Isaiah," particularly in condemning lawless people (οἱ ἄνομοι) and lawlessness (ἀνομία) in Isa 1.[45] Through these condemnations, "the translator signals that the νόμος (and its transgression) has been a central concern of the vision as a whole," which in turn speaks to the increasingly

---

[43] Blenkinsopp typifies the larger field's response when he writes, "in general, 1QIsaᵃ provides no basis for a distinctive and consistent approach to the interpretation of the book" (*Opening the Sealed Book,* 91). See also Arie van der Kooij, "The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah: Some General Comments," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester 1990)*, ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, S.S.F, SCS 33 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 197.

[44] Ronald Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, JSJSup 124 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 235.

[45] Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), 237.

central role played by Mosaic law in this period.[46] Even for Jews living in Egypt, their cultural

identity was coming to be defined more and more by their unique law, which regulated diet,

social interactions, and so on. According to Wagner, "By framing the prophet's call to social

justice as a summons to the faithful practice of God's Law, the Old Greek translator makes his

own distinctive contribution to the formation and preservation of Jewish identity in the

Hellenistic diaspora."[47]

Wagner's argument highlights one of the fundamental difficulties with translation, for it

is unclear to what degree terms such as ἄνομος and ἀνομία would have referred specifically to

Mosaic law—or how much of this reference would have been intentional. As Staffan Olofsson

points out, LXX-Isa falls at the latter end of a trend toward using νόμος-derived words to refer to

general wrongdoing, with or without reference to Mosaic law.[48] In other words, the heightened

place of οἱ ἄνομοι and ἀνομία in Isa 1 could be a deliberate attempt to sharpen focus on law, or it

could simply be part of a broader linguistic shift within the LXX in how iniquity is described.[49]

LXX-Isa also shows a number of differences from the Hebrew text that explicitly address

issues of law observance. As Klaus Baltzer et al. point out in *Septuaginta Deutsch*, LXX-Isa

takes the phrase לתורה ולתעודה in Isa 8:20 and interprets it to mean that God "gave law as a help"

(νόμον γὰρ εἰς βοήθειαν ἔδωκεν); further in LXX-Isa 26:9, God's commands

(משפטיך/προστάγματά σου) are described as a "light over the earth" (φῶς… ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), while

---

[46] Ibid., 100.

[47] Ibid., 237

[48] Staffan Olofsson, "Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms – a Case of Theological Exegesis," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte,* ed. Erich Zenger, BibS(F) 32 (Frieburg: Herder, 2001), 299, 304.

[49] Another possible instance of this trend at work is LXX-Isa 24:16, where the rejection implied in בוגדים בגדו is clarified as referring specifically to law: οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον (see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 234 and discussion in Chapter 4).

the Hebrew text reads differently,[50] and in LXX-Isa, "at its core the law deals with

δικαιοσύνη."[51] Of particular note is the emphasis LXX-Isa places on the relationship between

Moses and the law, which will be important in our discussion of the Isaianic Servant, and in this

regard Klaus Baltzer et al. point to Isa 8:16, 20; 24:5, 16; 30:9; and 33:6.[52]

      The final major point of scholarly contention regarding law in LXX-Isa centers on Isa 8.

Vigorous debate has broken out between scholars such as Seeligmann, Lust, Koenig, van der

Kooij, and Troxel regarding whether LXX-Isa 8 has been updated to refer to an antinomian party

during the Antiochene persecutions. Isaiah 8 figures prominently in my own discussion of

foreigners' law observance, and rather than rehearse each scholar's argument here, I will hold off

until a more detailed examination can be made in Chapter 4.

The Foreign Nations in LXX-Isa

      The foreign nations in LXX-Isa have received considerably more attention than law in

recent work, though scholars have yet to agree on even basic issues such as whether the nations

are portrayed positively or negatively. The most extensive work in this area has been carried out

by David Baer, who devotes two chapters of a recent monograph to "Nationalism and Diaspora

Perspective" in LXX-Isa. In Baer's view,

> LXX Isaiah appears to display a nationalistic tendency towards disdain of the
> Gentiles and an exaltation of Israel/Judah…. this nationalistic bias comes to
> expression in translations that identify God exclusively with Israel, in pejorative
> references to Gentiles, in an enhanced stature for Zion and/or Israel, in the
> clarifying provision of words like "Israel" or "Jerusalem" where this is merely

---

[50] See Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2 Vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009–2011), 2:2492 and discussion in Chapter 4.

[51] "In seinem Kern handelt das Gesetz von der δικαιοσύνη" (ibid., cf. Isa 33:6).

[52] "Anders als im MT kommt in der JesLXX ein großes Interesse am Gesetz bzw. am Mose zum Ausdruck" (ibid., 2:2491).

implicit in the source text, in exclusive and/or expansive territorial claims, and in translations that embellish Israel's standing vis-à-vis the nations.[53]

Baer sees this disdain toward the nations come out in translations such as Isa 54:5, where in MT God "is called the God of the whole earth" (אלהי כל־הארץ יקרא), whereas in Greek he "is called the God of Israel in the whole earth" (θεὸς Ισραηλ πάσῃ τῇ γῇ κληθήσεται).[54] Baer also sees the translator drawing a distinction in Isa 66 between Jewish and foreign pilgrims to Jerusalem, which in turn entails a view of foreigners as excluded from many aspects of eschatological worship. According to him, such changes were made because the translator "simply could not envisage Gentile hands on sacred vessels," showing "his inability or unwillingness to allow them full rights as paid-up Yahwists in the Lord's restored Jerusalem."[55] The tendency to disparage foreigners can even be seen in how the translator deals with the root זו"ר, which only in LXX-Isa and LXX-Prov is translated with explicitly negative terms, such as ἀσεβής.[56]

Other scholars also claim that the foreigners fare poorly in LXX-Isa. Arie van der Kooij sees the reinterpreted oracle of Tyre as proclaiming a subordinate place for Tyre and Phoenicia relative to Jerusalem,[57] and Wilson de Angelo Cunha understands the phrase ἡ γὰρ βουλὴ αὕτη

---

[53] *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66*, JSOTSup 318 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 230.

[54] Ibid., 202–3.

[55] Ibid., 275–76.

[56] Ibid., 204–5. Baer's conclusions are based on his identification of the σεβομένοις in Isa 66:14 as "God-fearers" as the term is later used. In my view, this places too much weight on the technical nature of σεβόμενος well before its first attestation of this usage in the first century CE. See David Sim, "Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes," in *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. idem and James S. McLaren, LNTS 499 (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 15. McKnight also writes, "there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the term 'fearing' was a technical designation in this literature for those who 'partially converted.'" (*A Light Among the Gentiles,* 92).

[57] Van der Kooij's reading "only makes sense if Tyre, and Phoenicia as well, is thought of as becoming politically dependent on Jerusalem," which in turn "reflect[s] the hope of a world-wide kingdom with Jerusalem as center"

ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (Isa 25:7) as proclaiming God's counsel *against* the nations. In Cunha's view, LXX-Isa 25:8 even says that the nations will be swallowed by death.[58]

According to J. C. M. das Neves, LXX-Isa's negative attitude toward foreigners extends to their exclusion from eschatological cultic worship. Over and over again, he sees the Hebrew text describing "the conversion of pagan peoples… with the same rights as the people of Israel," whereas the Greek text either undermines or ignores this future parity.[59] As one example, das Neves sees Isa 19:25 as thoroughly universalistic (ברוך עמי מצרים), whereas the LXX reworks this verse to clarify that only the Israelites are blessed: Εὐλογημένος ὁ λαός μου ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ.[60] In short, "while the Hebrew affirms religious universalism, the Greek, by contrast, describes the salvation of one group, intimately related to the Diaspora."[61]

These results contrast sharply with E. R. Ekblad's argument that LXX-Isa "stresses salvation for the nations more strongly than does the MT."[62] Ekblad analyzes the so-called Servant Songs and finds an increased emphasis on Israel's role as a mediator to foreign peoples,

---

(*The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*, VTSup 71 [Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1998], 104, 106).

[58] De Angelo Cunha, "Greek Isaiah 25:6–8 and the Issue of Coherence," in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters, SCS 59 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 288. I find Cunha's analysis unconvincing, however. As one example, he claims: "The past tense of the verbs of v. 8 (ἀφεῖλεν 2x) indicate that the Lord has started the process of bringing this oppressive rule of the 'nations' to an end" (ibid.), but as we will see below, one of LXX-Isa's most distinguishing characteristics is that it translates perfect verbs with the Greek aorist. These same problems beset his argument of death swallowing the nations, etc.

[59] "Em conclusão, enquanto o H descreve a conversão dos povos pagãos (egípcios e assírios), com os mesmos direitos que o povo de Israel, o G, au contrário, visa apenas o povo eleito, o único abençoado pelo Senhor, relacionado, além disso, com a diáspora no tempo do nosso tradutor" (J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías* [Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973], 216).

[60] Ibid., 214–16.

[61] "[E]nquanto o H afirma o universalismo religioso, o G, ao contrário, descreve a salvação duma classe, intimamente relacionada com a diáspora" (ibid., 219).

[62] Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*, CBET 23 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 277.

especially in verses such as Isa 42:6 (καὶ ἐνισχύσω σε καὶ ἔδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους, εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν).[63]

Research on LXX-Isa

Because LXX-Isa figures so prominently in this dissertation, we need to review some of the basic problems surrounding this source and its interpretation before diving into the text itself. Further, it will be impossible to understand the methodology used here without first understanding the problems that give rise to this method.

A profile of LXX-Isa and its translator has been painstakingly composed over the last century or so, and the three landmark works in this regard are Richard Ottley's *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint,* Joseph Ziegler's *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* and Isac Seeligmann's *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*. Though much modern research has refined and even rejected portions of these works, many of their basic findings have withstood the test of time and still stand as the basis of current scholarship.

Ziegler first noted that LXX-Isa has a particularly high concentrations of "Ägyptizismen" and language that would have been particularly meaningful to Alexandrian Jews, and since his work an Alexandrian provenance has been widely assumed.[64] Most scholars also agree that the translation took place in the mid-second century BCE, arriving at this conclusion largely on the

---

[63] Ibid., 63, 80.

[64] Ziegler was not the first to make this argument, but he did provide the most robust support for it; see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, ATA 12/3 (Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), 175–76; and Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 132–33. The most vocal modern dissenter from this view is Arie van der Kooij, who argues that LXX-Isa is better understood as originating in Heliopolis (see van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah," in *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom: On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version*, ed. idem and Johann Cook, CBET 68 [Leuven: Peeters, 2012]), though so far the suggestion has not found widespread support.

basis of contemporizing exegesis or vocabulary usage, and the evidence appears convincing.[65] In addition, it has long been recognized that the *Vorlage* of LXX-Isa was quite close to what is now MT.[66] This does not hold true across the board, and as we will see, there are often good grounds for proposing alternative *Vorlagen* for various verses, but the agreement between MT and the presumed *Vorlage* of LXX-Isa is nonetheless striking.

In over a century of critical research into LXX-Isa, scholars have built up a profile of the translator that should be kept in mind as we move into more detailed analysis of the verses relevant to this dissertation. It has become cliché to note the circularity of this process, that the construction of the translator's *Übersetzungsweise* depends on how accurately we reconstruct the *Vorlage*, which in turn depends on our understanding of the translator's *Übersetzungsweise*.[67] Nevertheless, considerable agreement has been reached by various scholars using various approaches to the text, and it is these aspects of the translator's profile that I present here.

LXX-Isa is frequently described as a "free" translation, a description that is problematic and to which I will return below. If we look at LXX-Isa without reference to the Hebrew texts, we can see that LXX-Isa is written in good Koine Greek, with good syntax and plenty of

---

[65] Van der Kooij places the translation around 140 BCE on the basis of the destruction of Babylon mentioned in LXX-Isa 21:1–9 (*Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981], 72–73), and Seeligmann comes to the same result on the basis of reading LXX-Isa 11:14 to refer to Maccabean conquests of Philistia (Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 245). Troxel puts the date at 145 BCE due to the mention of γραμματικοί in LXX-Isa 33:18: "It was only in the early second century, when such study became distinct from the work of poets, that Alexandrian scholars claimed the title γραμματικοί (previously applied to 'the elementary teaching in writing and reading') to designate themselves as 'professional "men of letters".' Accordingly, the use of γραμματικοί in Isa 33:18 reflects conditions no earlier than the second century" (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 22). See also Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 19.

[66] Ziegler, for example, states, "LXX hatte in ihrer Vorlage einen Text, der so ziemlich mit dem heutigen MT identisch gewesen ist" (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 30), and van der Kooij likewise acknowledges "dass OTTLEY, FISCHER, ZIEGLER, und SEELIGMANN gleichermassen zu dem Ergebnis gelangten, dass die Vorlage der LXX Jes ein weithin mit MT übereinstimmender Text gewesen sei" (*Die alten Textzeugen,* 29). When the two texts are compared, LXX-Isa "displays a significant degree of isomorphism with the parent text… though serial fidelity appears to be a secondary, rather than a primary, norm for the translator" (Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book,* 228).

[67] E.g., Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 74.

particles, conjunctions, and adverbs that combine to produce a smooth text.[68] Transcription

occurs occasionally, but it is relatively rare. The text appears to be written at a high literary level,

with many examples of chiasm,[69] alliteration, paranomasia, etc.[70] In the words of Wagner, the

translator "aspires to a measure of verbal artistry in the target language."[71]

When we compare LXX-Isa with the presumed *Vorlage*, many differences can be seen as

motivated by the desire for a smooth Greek text. Thus the translator frequently "improves"

Hebrew parallelism to increase coherence within and between verses.[72] He (translators were

usually male) makes subjects and objects explicit to clarify meaning,[73] deletes instances of

repetition and gemination,[74] and shows a "preference for repeating the same Greek work in a

sentence" when MT has two different words.[75] LXX-Isa also shows different pericope division

from our known Hebrew sources, which lends itself to the theory that the translator aimed to

create a self-standing, coherent text.[76] Other changes are more difficult to classify. The author

---

[68] Klaus Baltzer et al. note a marked "Streben nach gutem Koine-Griechisch in idiomatischer, syntaktischer und stilistischer Hinsicht" (*Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2490). The high frequency of particles, etc. has been noted by Klaus Baltzer et al. (ibid., 2:2491) and Seeligmann (*The Septuagint Version*, 184) and. See also Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 287.

[69] See Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2490.

[70] See Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book*, 232.

[71] Ibid., 73.

[72] Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, "LXX Isaiah and the Use of Rhetorical Figures," in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives*, ed. Arie van der Kooij and Michaël van der Meer, CBET 55 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 184; also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta,* 58.

[73] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta,* 59.

[74] Gemination is "the immediate repetition of a word, as in Isa 40:1: 'Comfort, comfort my people.'" According to van der Vorm-Croughs, "as many as twenty one of the thirty four cases of *geminatio*… are removed in the Greek translation" ("LXX Isaiah and the Use," 185–86).

[75] "Vorliebe für das Wiederholen desselben griech. Wortes in einem Satz (diff. MT)." (Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2491).

[76] See ibid., 2:2491 and especially Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book*, 16, 229–37.

occasionally adds or subtracts negative particles, which sometimes has no impact on meaning and sometimes gives the opposite meaning of the Hebrew text.[77]

The degree to which the Greek translation precisely reflects knowledge of Hebrew has been hotly contested, with scholars such as Ziegler and Seeligmann "not rating [the translator's] knowledge of grammar and syntax very highly, *i.e.* on a lower level than his lexicological knowledge. The numerous cases in which his interpretation deviates from the syntax and the devision [*sic*] of the verses of the Masoretic text are practically always to be explained by his lack of mastery of Hebrew accidence and stylistics."[78] On the other extreme, Jean Koenig sees a complex hermeneutic at work in LXX-Isa, wherein the author borrows from and engages with a wide range of scriptural texts. According to Koenig, "the level of knowledge of texts, *and thus of the language*, required by the use of borrowing excludes the possibility of frequent misunderstandings."[79] In Koenig's view, differences between the Hebrew and Greek should almost never be explained by poor mastery of Hebrew. Most scholars fall somewhere in the middle, with Baer for example claiming, "If Ziegler's translator was occasionally too dim, Koenig's is almost certainly too bright."[80]

What we can tell with certainty is that freer translations tend to occur where the Hebrew is obscure or difficult, which would imply that the translator's knowledge of Hebrew was not

---

[77] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 204.

[78] Ibid., 203. According to Seeligmann, the translator's Hebrew knowledge was undoubtedly "a product of theoretical study rather than of living experience" (*The Septuagint Version*, 194), a claim which Baer outright denies (*When We All Go Home*, 23).

[79] "[L]e niveau de connaissance des textes *et donc de la langue*, requis par l'usage des emprunts exclut des incompréhensions fréquentes" (*L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*, VTSup 33 [Leiden: Brill, 1982], 32, emphasis added).

[80] Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 16.

perfect (whose is?).[81] On the other hand, the translator does show a sophisticated knowledge of etymology and lexicology, though his etymological reasoning is not always sound according to modern standards.[82] He frequently employs so-called *Lückenbüßer* ("stop-gap words"), such as ἀθετέω and ἡττάω, though it is unclear whether their usage stems from the translator's confusion or from a conscientious effort to shape the meaning of a passage in a particular way.[83] Finally, as Koenig and others have pointed out, the translator does show a high degree of familiarity with Isaiah, the Pentateuch, and the interpretive traditions surrounding these texts.[84]

Identifying Authorial Intent and Translation Method

The translator of LXX-Isa did not create this document *ex nihilo*; rather, he mirrors the Hebrew text(s) of Isaiah quite closely, and as a result, much of the content of LXX-Isa is essentially pre-determined due to its nature as translation. Thus if we wish to better understand the translator's ideas—and through these better understand Alexandrian or even broader Second Temple attitudes toward foreigners and law observance—our point of access is necessarily limited to the translator's choices in translation. It is in these choices that the translator's beliefs might have swayed his translation one way or the other; thus our analysis of LXX-Isa must take

---

[81] Rodrigo F. de Sousa, *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1–12*, LHBOTS 516 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 17. This can even be seen on the word level, as Ziegler points out, "Bei manchen selteneren und schwierigen Wörtern errät der Übers. ihre Bedeutung aus dem Zusammenhang" (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta,*, 9, see also 47).

[82] See Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 200 and Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 288.

[83] Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 13. Michaël van der Meer has recently brought papyrological evidence to bear on the issue of "stop-gap words," and he concludes that, rather than showing the translator's incompetence, these words were deliberately chosen to convey ideas current in Ptolemaic Egypt. See van der Meer, "Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah," in idem and van der Kooij, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*.

[84] For a moderate view on the translator's knowledge, see Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 25.

into account the translator's technique, which is in turn affected by the translation's origin and purpose.[85]

The Origin of LXX-Isa

The first question we need to answer, then, deals with the origin of LXX-Isa. Why was this translation written, and what function or purpose did it serve in the community? One of the most consistently popular answers to this question has been that the LXX as a whole (and LXX-Isa in particular) arose in the Alexandrian synagogue in response to internal needs of the Jewish community.[86] As knowledge of Hebrew died out in the Diaspora, Jewish communities translated their sacred books into Greek and incorporated these translations into synagogue worship, much as presumably happened with the Targums. On a broad scale, even the order of translation mirrors synagogue usage, with the most heavily read books (Pentateuch) being translated first, and those books without a spot in the lectionary cycle (most of the Writings) being translated last.[87]

As for LXX-Isa, most scholars have noted free renderings and high literary quality as indicative of the translation's synagogal origin.[88] Wagner, for example, uses Descriptive

---

[85] Scholars have long recognized the need to concentrate theological analysis on those areas that present the translator with a legitimate translation choice. Baer, for example, writes that "the translator's own ideology and understanding of the book are accessible to careful analysis of his translation technique" (*When We All Go Home*, 17), and similar ideas can be found in Cook, "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint," in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007,* ed. A. Lemaire, VTSup 133 (Boston: Brill, 2010), 636; Joosten, "Une théologie de la Septante? Réflexions méthodologiques sur l'interprétation de la version grecque," *RTP* 132 (2000): 34; and Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie, Methodologische Überlegung zur Theologie der Septuaginta," in *The Septuagint and Messianism,* ed. Michael Knibb, BETL 195 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006), 23.

[86] The "interlinear model," which is also commonly appealed to, will be treated below.

[87] See Roger le Déaut, "La Septante, un Targum?" in *Etudes sur le Judaïsme hellénistique. Congrès de Strasbourg 1983*, ed. Raymond Kuntzmann and Jacques Schlosser, LD 119 (Paris: Cerf, 1984), 158.

[88] E.g., Seeligmann argues that "the text character of the translation… points to the likelihood that this too originated in the oldest sermons in the synagogue" (*The Septuagint Version*, 50). As one example of the connection he has in mind, he points to the free translation of Isa 26:13, which "might indicate the influence of a liturgical text" (ibid. 267).

Translation Studies (DTS), a tool designed to identify a text's function through discourse

analysis and translation technique,[89] and he notes particularly "the translator's studied attempt to

produce a translation with a high degree of textual cohesion, thematic coherence and rhetorical

(or 'literary') power."[90] In light of these findings, he concludes that for the locus of translation,

"the most obvious setting would be that of the Hellenistic synagogue."[91] Troxel comes to similar

conclusions by similar means. He observes that 37% of all occurrences of γάρ have no

equivalent in MT, which "further attests [the translator's] interest in creating smother

connections between clauses than would obtain by simply reproducing parataxis."[92] This freer

style shows that the translator was "more interested in bringing the book of Isaiah to his readers

than in bringing his readers to the text."[93]

    Baer argues for a synagogal setting for LXX-Isa, but he does so through analyzing the

types of changes made in translation. According to Baer, LXX-Isa shows almost one hundred

instances of imperativization, two hundred instances of personalization, and many cases of

---

[89] The goal of DTS is to determine "what systemic slot [a text] is designed to fill within the recipient culture," wherein "analysis of 'product' ('discourse analysis') and of 'process' ('translation technique') go hand in hand with 'function,' i.e., the prospective cultural position of the translation" (Albert Pietersma, "LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies," in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, ed. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, BTS 14 [Leuven: Peeters, 2013], 281). Thus in theory, we can determine what cultural slot LXX-Isa was intended to fill (e.g., synagogue lectionary, private study, etc.) by analyzing its translation technique and the literary texture of the final product.

[90] *Reading the Sealed Book*, 234.

[91] Ibid. Wagner does not rule out the possibility that LXX-Isa was also intended for study, since liturgical and educational origins are not mutually exclusive.

[92] Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 92.

[93] Ibid., 101.

ameliorative translations, which shows "that this translator is a preacher whose homiletical purpose is to be glimpsed with remarkable frequency."[94]

If LXX-Isa did originate in the synagogue, as opposed to the educational paradigm that we will examine next, this could have profound implications for how we identify authorial exegesis. On the one hand, we might expect more updating, contextualization, resolving of contradictions, etc. In a synagogal understanding, "The point of departure is not the text alone, but the text and its interpretation."[95]

But more than giving us a different view of the translator's style, the synagogal paradigm also opens up the possibility of multiple translators for LXX-Isa. If Isaiah was read in Alexandrian synagogues as part of the lectionary cycle, it stands to reason that numerous piecemeal translations—even if only in oral form—may have already existed by the time the final translator/editor/redactor of LXX-Isa translated the entire book into one continuous document. Here we need to distinguish between the archetype of LXX-Isa, which is the "text, or presumed text, from which all members of a manuscript 'family' are descended," and any previous stages the translation may have gone through.[96] Scholars have largely (but not unanimously)[97] agreed that there is only one archetype for LXX-Isa, but if the translator/editor/redactor of LXX-Isa did incorporate previous translations, we cannot base our analysis solely on comparison of the archetype with the presumed Hebrew *Vorlage*. Our

---

[94] Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 22. By imperativization, Baer means the change of non-imperatives in MT to imperatives in the Greek (see p. 38), while personalization is the change of third-person to second- and first-person verb forms (see p. 59).

[95] "Le point de départ n'est pas le texte seul, mais le texte + son interprétation" (le Déaut, "La Septante, un Targum?" 194).

[96] Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint*, ed. Michael A. Knibb (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 59.

[97] Seeligmann, for example, states, "The endeavor to reconstruct, or even only come close to an Urtext of the Septuagint is, so we fear, no more than an illusion" (*The Septuagint Version*, 52).

comparison would need to reach behind the archetype to the previous translations incorporated into LXX-Isa so that we could see how the translator/editor/compiler worked with these sources. If we cannot reach this far back, then we must content ourselves with discussing the general theological atmosphere of Hellenistic Alexandria rather than the theological outlook of one particular translator.[98]

LXX-Isa does show some characteristics that might imply multiple translators. Most striking is the translator's non-uniform style. For example, at times he translates אישׁ as ἄνθρωπος, but sometimes it is rendered with ἕτερος.[99] Some passages show great skill and creativity on the translator's part, while others are literal to the point of unintelligibility. Often the same phrase is rendered differently in different verses, such as כפה ואגמון in 9:14(13) and 19:15(14).[100] In sum, "any generalizations about the translator's technique run afoul of the startling variations in his approach."[101]

On the other hand, the translator also shows some consistent idiosyncratic tendencies. When confronted with a Hebrew infinitive absolute and a finite verb, the translator shows a marked preference for 1) translating the infinitive absolute with a Greek noun or 2) ignoring the infinitive absolute and rendering the entire construction with only one Greek finite verb.[102] This

---

[98] A similar problem besets pentateuchal criticism. Once we grant the presence of multiple sources, we cannot assume that any particular verse represents the theological outlook of the final redactor. Instead, we have a number of different theologies that have been combined into one (sometimes coherent and sometime incoherent) whole.

[99] Moisés Silva, "Esaias: To the Reader," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G Wright (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 824.

[100] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 181.

[101] Silva, "Esaias," 823. Seeligmann provides a copious list of such differences, and he notes: "that the examples now following differ greatly from those given by Ziegler surely proves that our respective lists constitute a mere choice at random from a wealth of material" (*The Septuagint Version*, 181).

[102] Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva overstate the evidence when they claim, "The translator of Isaiah rendered the Hebrew infinitive absolute with only a finite verb" (*Invitation to the Septuagint,* 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015], 305). The actual distribution can be found in Tov's article, "Renderings of Combinations of the

contrasts with the rest of the LXX, where the preference is usually to render this construction with a Greek noun or participle. The translator is also fairly consistent in rendering Hebrew perfect verbs with the Greek aorist, which "lends a distinct and odd quality to his translation."[103] Unfortunately, this evidence could fit equally well with the hypothesis of one translator or of one translator/redactor who reworked and left his mark on a series of earlier translations.[104]

How do we bring this conflicting evidence together into one theory of translation? Ziegler notes that LXX-Isa "does not represent a uniform whole,"[105] and he proposes the following process: "It may be that the Isaiah translator already had a translation (if not the whole book, then some parts); perhaps this first version was made for synagogue reading, of which he did not use all, but only suitable portions."[106] Dines similarly credits one translator/compiler with gathering various preexisting translations when she writes that "[t]he evidence so far suggests that an initial stage of very close rendering of Hebrew texts, perhaps even oral, may well have

---

Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX – Their Nature and Distribution," in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages,* ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Williams Wevers, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 190 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 70, where he shows that of twenty-three infinitive absolute + finite verb constructions in the Hebrew text of Isaiah, LXX-Isa renders eleven (48%) of these with nouns, ten (43%) with finite verbs, and two (9%) with participles. In the LXX more broadly, roughly 42% of such constructions are rendered with nouns, 13% with finite verbs, and 39% with participles. Thus LXX-Isa is certainly outside of the normal range regarding how it deals with such constructions, but it is not too far out of the norm.

[103] Silva, "Esaias," 824.

[104] At an early stage of scholarship on LXX-Isa, it was common to attribute the translation of Isa 1–39 and 40–66 to two separate translators, but in my view this theory has been convincingly shown to be deficient. For discussion of this point, see Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 179; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 45; Abi Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis*, FRLANT 245 (Bristol: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 21–22; and Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 19.

[105] "Jedenfalls steht fest, daß unsere heutige Js-LXX auf der einen Seite zwar eine Sonderstellung zur übrigen Propheten-LXX einnimmt, die stark für einen Übers. spricht, auf der anderen Seite aber keine einheitliche Größe darstellt" (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 46).

[106] "Es mag sein, daß der Js-Übers. bereits eine Übersetzung (wenn auch nicht des ganzen Buches, so doch einzelner) Teile vorfand; vielleicht war diese erste Version für Vorlesungszwecke der Synagoge verfertigt worden, die nicht alle Teile auswählte, sondern nur geeignete Stücke" (ibid., 45).

existed and have left its mark on the LXX, but that most of the translations as we now have them witness to a more consciously literary development."[107]

A different approach to combining the data is taken by those scholars who recognize LXX-Isa's variety but prefer to attribute the entire translation to one person. Troxel notes the variety in translation technique, but he still holds that the translator "employed no method, but used whatever devices were at his disposal to deliver a translation that would make the book's sprawling networks of meaning intelligible to his Greek-reading coreligionists."[108] Even Seeligmann, who, as we have seen, was open to the idea of preexisting translations, allows for the possibility that "the great majority of the inconsistencies here discussed must be imputed to the translator's unconstrained and carefree working method, and to a conscious preference for the introduction of variations."[109]

Several criticisms have been levelled against the theory of synagogal origins, most notably by Albert Pietersma. Pietersma's primary argument is that "liturgical use does not tend to produce continuous translations of whole books, but instead tends to be selective."[110] Yet as we have seen, the synagogal paradigm is in fact well-equipped to deal with this issue, as it can account for the variety of translation techniques seen in LXX-Isa. Granted, our knowledge of the

---

[107] Dines, *The Septuagint*, 57.

[108] Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 291.

[109] *The Septuagint Version*, 182. As one example, Seeligmann notes that in LXX-Isa 55:8–9, "the translator uses three different words side by side" for מחשבה, which would be difficult to explain as the work of three separate translators (*The Septuagint Version*, 181).

[110] Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer—The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference, Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique, 'From Alpha to Byte,' University of Stellenbosch, 17-21 July 2000*, ed. Johann Cook (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 358. The same point is made by those who oppose a purely synagogal origin for the Targums (See Ze'ev Safrai, "The Origins of Reading the Aramaic Targum in Synagogue," in *The New Testament and Christian–Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser*, ed. Malcolm Lowe [Jerusalem: Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel: 1990], 188).

synagogue lectionary for this early period is sparse, and the synagogal paradigm runs the risk of retrojecting later practice onto second-century Alexandria,[111] but it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that some reading of some parts of Isaiah would have taken place in early Hellenistic synagogues.

The other major paradigm put forward for understanding the Septuagint (which in this context usually refers to the Pentateuch, but the theory is often applied to other books) is the interlinear paradigm, which presupposes an educational origin for the translation. In this model, scholars do not dispute that the LXX arose out of needs internal to the Jewish community, but they claim that "these needs were not just liturgical, but also, and perhaps primarily, educational."[112] The Greek translation may have served as a type of crutch for students to learn Hebrew, in a sense bringing students to the text rather than the text to the students. The main pillars of this theory are 1) the observed one-to-one correspondence between the Greek and Hebrew texts and 2) the frequent unintelligibility of the Greek translation when read without reference to the Hebrew parent text. Pietersma lays out the paradigm as follows:

> [T]he term "interlinear" is meant to signal a relationship of subservience and dependence of the Greek translation *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew parent text. What is meant by subservience and dependence is *not* that every linguistic item in the Greek can only be understood by reference to the parent text, nor that the translation has an isomorphic relationship to its source, but that the Greek text *qua* text has a dimension of unintelligibility.[113]

If we do accept the interlinear paradigm, this has no small impact on how we identify authorial exegesis. Under the synagogal paradigm, exegesis—especially exegesis deriving from a

---

[111] Dines makes this point in *The Septuagint*, 48.

[112] Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," in *The witness of tradition; papers read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference held at Woudschoten, 1970*, ed. M. A. Beek et al., *OtSt* 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 16.

[113] Pietersma, "A New Paradigm," 350.

holistic reading of Isaiah or the wider canon—can be seen as an integral part of translation process, as the translator presumably tried to bring the text to his audience. In the interlinear paradigm, by contrast, exegesis takes a back seat to a more atomistic approach, and questions of translation are better answered by appeal to *Vorlage*. For this model, "what *appears* to be 'demanded by the context' may in fact have to be disregarded, if the word in question can be shown to have been produced by linkage with its Hebrew counterpart."[114] While the interlinear paradigm does not rule out authorial exegesis, it shifts the burden of proof more heavily toward those who claim such exegesis.[115]

The interlinear paradigm has found no shortage of critics, and though its critique is presented here, I should note that the very endurance of this paradigm in spite of its critics gives witness to its explanatory power for much of the LXX. First, much as we lack clear evidence about synagogue practice in antiquity, so we have little information about the kind of school setting the interlinear model presupposes.[116] One might reasonably assume that such schools existed, but we have to recognize that these are still assumptions. Further, the earliest evidence we have for the LXX's use points to its independent role, as can be seen in the *Letter of Aristeas* and in early Jewish exegesis.[117] Those scholars who see evidence of extensive exegesis in the

---

[114] Ibid., 353.

[115] Ibid., 356.

[116] Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 69.

[117] Troxel points out that "the earliest examples of Jewish exegetes in Egypt already base their work on the LXX" (ibid., 69), and by the time LXX-Isa was written (which was around the time most scholars place the composition of *Aristeas*), the LXX seems to have been viewed as an independent document. Benjamin Wright notes, "the Jewish community of Alexandria recognized this character and adopted the LXX as its sacred scripture. In short, the LXX, as far as Ps.-Aristeas is concerned, effectively replaces the source text" ("Transcribing, Translating, and Interpreting in the *Letter of Aristeas*: On the Nature of the Septuagint," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta [Leiden: Brill, 2008], 150).

LXX, such as harmonizations across verses, argue that such interpretation "would be out of place in an interlinear version,"[118] and they further note that the one-to-one character of much of the LXX does not necessarily lead to an interlinear model.[119]

For our purposes, we do not need to decide whether the interlinear paradigm holds for the Pentateuch or even entire LXX; rather, what concerns us here is its applicability to LXX-Isa. Pietersma and Wright claim that the paradigm holds for "the vast majority of books," though they never clarify whether this includes Isaiah.[120] Other scholars have not been sanguine on the question when it comes to LXX-Isa. For example, LXX-Isa is frequently described as a "free translation," and it is difficult to see how free translations could function within an interlinear model.[121] Further, as was noted above, LXX-Isa was written in the mid-second century BCE, presumably well after the Pentateuch had already been translated. At this late stage, we would expect the linguistic character of LXX-Isa to be heavily influenced by the language of LXX-Pentateuch, so the presence of awkward or stilted Greek—which is rare in LXX-Isa, though it

---

[118] Joosten, "Une théologie," 176. Note that interpretation is not *impossible* in an interlinear paradigm; rather, if we accept the paradigm as it has been articulated by Pietersma—particularly in regard to the Greek's non-independent status relative to the Hebrew text—we would expect such interpretation to be less common. As a counter-argument, one could point to the Targums, which are generally conceived of as being dependent and interlinear, and which nevertheless show extensive interpretation. Targumic origins and function are highly debated, however, with many of the same solutions offered as we see with LXX origins. Unless we can firmly establish that the Targums arose in a similar manner to Pietersma's interlinear paradigm, it is problematic to use the Targums in defense of the paradigm's applicability to the LXX. See especially Willem Smelik, *The Targum of Judges, OtSt* 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1–41.

[119] Joosten writes that if we set aside the problematic Greek and Roman analogues for interlinear translation and focus solely on the linguistic makeup of the LXX, then "the stylistic peculiarity of the Septuagint can be, and has been, explained equally well by other factors" beyond the interlinear model (Joosten "Une théologie," 171–72). As one example, Troxel notes, "Perplexing sentence structure and phrases in a translation are not necessarily marks of an aid to reading the source text in its own language. They may be marks of the translator's own perplexity or ineptitude" (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 69).

[120] *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, xiv.

[121] See Joosten, "Une théologie," 177.

can still be found—can no longer be used as a reliable indicator of interlinear origins. Wagner puts the point succinctly:

> Consequently, the presence of source-language interference in a translated text from this later period does not, by itself, indicate that the translator followed an "interlinear" model of translation…. The "biblical" sound of these later translations (including the occasional "unintelligibility" of their translationese) would have assured a monolingual audience that the Greek versions of these scriptural texts faithfully represent their Hebrew parents.[122]

In other words, if we assume that LXX-Isa was meant to serve as scripture for a target audience, we would expect the translation to mirror LXX-Pentateuch in style, regardless of the method used for translation.[123] In addition, as discussed above, numerous studies have been carried out on LXX-Isa, many using quite different approaches, and all support the hypothesis that LXX-Isa most likely originated in the synagogue. This can be seen from the standpoint of DTS, increased use of imperativization/personalization/ameliorative translation, high literary quality, the free nature of translation, and the instances of contextual exegesis and *Erfüllungsinterpretation* to be discussed below. All of this points away from an interlinear model and toward a synagogal paradigm.[124]

Translation Technique

---

[122] Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book*, 62.

[123] Brock advances this same point but on different grounds. In addressing the occasional opaqueness of the text and its use in the synagogue, he writes, "the inevitably high degree of incomprehensibility that the literal style involves would have been no very great objection, since on most occasions when people heard scripture read, they also heard it expounded" ("The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," 29).

[124] It is worth noting one major exception to the trend, namely Troxel, who comes closest to embracing an interlinear model when he writes, "The dragoman remains the only model of translation we can be confident the translators would have known" (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 70). For a discussion of the dragoman theory in broader LXX scholarship, see Chaim Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint." *Text* 6 (1968): 21. As for the general incompatibility of the interlinear with the synagogal paradigm, Dines tries to create a middle ground when she writes, "it is a mistake to treat 'liturgical' and 'educational' activities as mutually exclusive" (*The Septuagint*, 44). I would agree with Dines's point, but as has been noted above, these two paradigms do lead us to very different conclusions regarding the nature of translation and how we identify authorial exegesis. In this light, I find the synagogal paradigm much more convincing.

In addition to questions of origin, considerable scholarly debate has focused on how the translator worked with his *Vorlage*. As was mentioned above, most commentators characterize LXX-Isa as a "free" translation,[125] but this descriptor is misleading in a number of ways. First, as James Barr lays out in his groundbreaking work, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, "there are different ways of being literal and of being free, so that a translation can be literal and free at the same time but in different modes or on different levels."[126] Thus the question is not whether LXX-Isa is a free translation, but rather *in what way* LXX-Isa is free and in what way it is literal.

Most LXX scholarship uses the criteria laid out by Emanuel Tov to determine how a translation is free or literal. These criteria are: 1) internal consistency, by which is meant the tendency of an author to use the same translation equivalents regardless of context; 2) "The representation of the constituents of Hebrew words by separate Greek equivalents," as when words such as בשמעך are broken down and rendered into Greek as ἐν + τῷ ἀκοῦσαί + σε; 3) preservation of word order; 4) quantitative representation, where the translator strives to represent each Hebrew word with one Greek equivalent; and 5) "Linguistic adequacy of lexical choices."[127] By these varying criteria, LXX-Isa can be seen to be both literal and free in different

---

[125] E.g., Seeligmann writes, "the translator's attitude towards the texts which the [sic] understood was one of freedom, and his attitude towards those he did not understand, a free-and-easy one" (*The Septuagint Version*, 205). Ziegler states the issue bluntly, "Der Js.-Übers. ist nicht ängstlich darauf bedacht, die einzelnen hebr. Wendungen seiner Vorlage genau zu übersetzen" (*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta,* 83, see also 24). The only notable exception I have found to this trend is Jobes and Silva, who for unknown reasons state, "the Greek Pentateuch, Joshua, and Isaiah are as a whole moderately literal translations of the Hebrew" (*Invitation to the Septuagint*, 123). No examples, evidence, or citations are given for this claim, so it is difficult to tell in what way they see Isaiah as a literal translation.

[126] *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, MSU 15/*NAWG* 11 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 6.

[127] Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3rd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 22–25. Barr presented his own categories, which were: "division into elements or segments," "The quantitative addition or subtraction of elements," "Consistency or non-consistency in the rendering," "Accuracy and level of semantic information," "Coded 'etymological' indication of formal/semantic relationships," and "Level of text and level of analysis" (*The Typology of Literalism*, 20). However, Barr's categories have largely fallen out of

ways. The translator often eschews internal consistency, as when he renders מחשבה using three different Greek words over the course of two verses,[128] but he frequently renders constituent parts of words separately, as when בהמצאו is translated ἐν τῷ εὑρίσκειν αὐτὸν (Isa 55:6). Thus while LXX-Isa is rightly classified among the freer translations of the LXX, this freedom only occurs in certain aspects, and it does not entail a general disregard for either form or structure of the underlying Hebrew.

We also must be careful not to equate free translation style with an increased tendency for the translator to consciously insert his own ideas into the text. A wide range of scholars have echoed Steven Schweitzer's point:

> What was of prime importance was conveying the meaning, rather than the exact literal contents, of the Hebrew *Vorlage*…. OG Isaiah may be termed a "rather free translation" insofar as *it is not slavishly literal but is faithful to the meaning of the parent text*; but it is not "rather free" in the sense that the translator paraphrased or changed what he understood to be the meaning of the parent text.[129]

Even van der Kooij, a champion of *Erfüllungsinterpretation,* calls LXX-Isa "a 'faithful' rendering in so far [as] it expresses faithfully the meaning of the underlying Hebrew text as this text was understood and interpreted by the translator and his milieu."[130] We need to distinguish,

---

use since Tov's work on the subject (see Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek,* 24–25; and Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 90–97).

[128] In LXX-Isa 55:8–9, this is rendered with βουλαί, διανοήματα, and διανοίας (Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 181).

[129] Schweitzer, "Mythology in the Old Greek of Isaiah: The Technique of Translation," *CBQ* 66.2 (Apr 2004): 230, emphasis in original. Baer similarly notes, "he is certainly not free from 'commitment to the *Vorlage*.' On the contrary, his much-observed paraphrastic and even midrashic tendencies have almost entirely concealed from scholarly view a pronounced conservatism that binds him, first, to the immediate text of his own *Vorlage* (flights of fancy are virtually absent, most divergences being limited to one to three words) and, then, to other biblical texts in Isaiah and elsewhere" (*When We All Go Home*, 16). According to Troxel, "claims that he liberally injected his own ideas misrepresent his work" (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 291).

[130] *The Oracle of Tyre*, 188. De Sousa claims that differences between the Greek and Hebrew "are born out of the fact that the translator of LXX Isaiah, while displaying a marked commitment to his *Vorlage*, belonged within an interpretive and ideological context which shaped his reading in particular ways" (*Eschatology and Messianism,* 18).

therefore, between translations that are free with regard to syntax or grammar and translations that are free with regard to meaning. Dines summarizes the point: "Deviations from the source-text do not necessarily mean that the translator was not attempting to translate 'literally,'" especially since "the translator will most probably have thought that his occasional manoeuvring of the text was in fact producing the correct meaning."[131] By the latter measure, our translator should not be classified as free.

Because the words "free" and "literal" are imprecise, when I examine passages where the Greek and Hebrew differ I will use Baer's classification system of authorized, semi-authorized, and unauthorized changes. In this system, authorized changes are those that "require only an alternative vocalization of the existing consonants," while semi-authorized changes "reflect a vocalization that is divergent from MT *and* some element of consonantal alternation."[132] Unauthorized changes are "those which are carried out with no apparent basis in the Hebrew text."[133] I take some issue with the pride of place this system gives to MT-Isa, which after all represents only one branch of the Hebrew tradition, but these categories are nevertheless useful as long as our comparisons are built on a sound text-critical foundation.[134] This system further

---

[131] Dines, *The Septuagint,* 127. This is analogous to Andrew Teeter's argument that "scribes served as custodians of textual meaning, and thus became participants – however minor – in the ongoing process of scriptural formation and reception. The textual pluriformity characteristic of [the late Second Temple] period, then, is not merely the result of careless copying, but also of active interpretive engagement within the process of transmission" (*Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*, FAT 92 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014], 9–10).

[132] Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 29.

[133] Ibid.

[134] More will be discussed on this point below, but scholars have long recognized the need to critically examine the Hebrew tradition before making comparisons with LXX. This was especially evident after the discovery of the Qumran scrolls: "in several readings the Qumran Isaiah MSS show that the LXX was not translating from a *Vorlage* like the MT but faithfully attempting to translate a text which was simply a different Hebrew text" (Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls found at Qumran," in *The Bible as a Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Emanuel Tov and Edward D. Herbert [London: British Library, 2002], 194 n. 20, quoted in Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 75).

provides the advantage of being able to specify whether a certain interpretation falls within a reasonable reading of the reconstructed consonantal text, thus giving us greater latitude to classify "free" interpretations according to the type of freedom taken.

When the translator does depart significantly from the *Vorlage*, most scholars divide into two camps (neither of which necessarily excludes the other) regarding how these departures should be viewed. In one camp are those who advocate contextual interpretation, i.e., seeing the role context plays in influencing translation decisions, and in the other camp are advocates of fulfillment interpretation, of *Erfüllungsinterpretation*. Both can have a significant impact on how we understand the author's translation technique—and therefore his theology.

Contextual Interpretation

The modern champion of contextual interpretation is Arie van der Kooij, who developed the idea as an extension of reading LXX-Isa as a self-contained, stand-alone document. By "context," van der Kooij refers primarily to "the immediate literary context (pericope or chapter)" of a given verse, or in a broader sense, "the text of LXX Isaiah as a whole."[135] Contextual interpretation, in van der Kooij's formulation, arises from the fact that LXX-Isa can be shown to have a structure independent of the Hebrew tradition, often marking pericopes and sections differently from Qumran or MT.[136] Not only does LXX-Isa have its own structure, but many divergences of the translation from the presumed *Vorlage* "impl[y] an interpretation of the

---

[135] *The Oracle of Tyre*, 17. In this usage, context does not refer to the historical context of the author or translator, nor does it primarily denote the canonical context of LXX-Isa. Van der Kooij's approach is designed to understand translation issues using a passage's immediate literary context for clues to meaning.

[136] Speaking of Isa 23, van der Kooij writes, "The differences between MT and LXX are not only on the word level, but also on the discourse level: the LXX passage as a whole has a structure different from MT" (ibid., 14). All throughout the translation, "Significant renderings and passages appear to be related to each other. It points to a translator who aimed at producing a meaningful text" (87).

text, not only of single words, but also on the level of clauses and sentences."[137] In other words, the translator must have been a learned scribe familiar with a reading tradition, and he took the broader context into account when making translation choices.[138]

The contextual approach largely spawned as a reaction against earlier attempts to understand LXX-Isa by means of atomistic exegesis, where deviations from the *Vorlage* were explained through technical confusions such as ה/ח or ע/א interchanges. We should note, however, that a contextual approach does not rule out seeing the cause for individual changes at an atomistic level. Even Koenig, who takes an extreme view of contextual interpretation, often sees the translator arriving at his translation by means of what he calls "empirical" methods. In Koenig's mind, the graphical similarity between ד and ר, along with other such similarities, are the means by which a contextualizing scribe arrived at his interpretations; "they were real modalities, and these relationships *could be exploited* by the hermeneutic."[139] For Le Déaut, "ancient exegesis was at once synthetic (its context was *the whole* Bible!) and 'atomistic.'"[140]

Thus while contextual and atomistic exegesis are often contrasted as conflicting approaches,[141] it would be better to see contextual exegesis as providing a different emphasis when dealing with questions of *Vorlage*. Per van der Kooij, a contextual approach "means that emphasis will be put more on the level of clauses and sentences than on that of single words."[142]

---

[137] Ibid., 116.

[138] Ibid., 112–14.

[139] "[Ils] étaient donc des modalités réelles, et ces relations étaient *exploitables* par l'herméneutique" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 183, emphasis added). For a list of such "empirical" influences on the text, see van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 67–68.

[140] "[L]'exégèse ancienne est à la fois synthétique (son contexte est *toute* la Bible!) et 'atomistique.'" ("La Septante, Un Targum?" 188, quoted in Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek,* 50; emphasis in original).

[141] E.g., van der Meer, "Papyrological Perspectives," 107.

[142] *The Oracle of Tyre*, 119.

The contextual approach also rules out misunderstanding when the translation departs significantly, since "it is more plausible to regard such a case as part of the 'reading' of the text that was current in his milieu."[143]

The contextual approach has become widespread in LXX-Isa studies. Baer, Tov, Troxel, Koenig, and many others employ a contextual approach analogous to van der Kooij's, and a similar understanding of scribal practice can be seen in the broader field of biblical studies.[144] This has had the additional effect of drawing the field further away from Pietersma's educational origin for LXX-Isa, since contextual exegesis is generally seen to be incompatible with an interlinear paradigm.

Fulfillment Interpretation

The second major point of view in understanding LXX-Isa is that of *Erfüllungsinterpretation*, which likewise claims van der Kooij as its most vocal proponent.[145] In van der Kooij's formulation, *Erfüllungsinterpretation* refers to the way in which LXX-Isa has

---

[143] Ibid., 122.

[144] See Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 12–13; "the translators' concept of 'context' was wider than ours" (Tov, *The Text-Critical Use*, 45); "His willingness to, in effect, substitute words from another passage for those in the passage at hand attests his belief in a sort of legitimate intertextuality among the scriptures of his Jewish community" (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 290). This is remarkable given that Troxel espouses a dragoman model for translation, which is usually taken as incompatible with contextual exegesis (see ibid., 70); "Par opposition à l'exégèse empirique, l'exégèse impliquée par l'herméneutique analogique et méthodique, dont nous avons préconisé ici l'existence, est caractérisée par sa volonté d'être en relation organique avec la source hébraïque…. l'herméneutique analogique appliquée dans les interprétations secondaires reste en relation culturelle avec *le texte hébreu considéré dans son ensemble*" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 196–97). For the way scribes dealt with the biblical text holistically, Andrew Teeter writes, "words and phrases are frequently adapted to accord with a certain conception of 'context,' a notion which ranges in scope from the level of the individual phrase, sentence, or pericope, to the level of the book as a whole, and at times well beyond the boundaries of the individual composition. These variants occur with such density and determination in particular manuscripts and textual traditions that… they suggest the operation of a different concept of 'faithfulness' or fidelity in the scribal task" (*Scribal Laws,* 208–09).

[145] The idea that LXX-Isa reflects an "updated" text can be seen well before van der Kooij. Even Seeligmann claims, "This translation, in fact, is almost the only one among the various parts of the Septuagint which repeatedly reflects contemporaneous history" (*The Septuagint Version*, 128). In fact, many see the entire LXX as an exercise in fulfillment interpretation: "C'est une nouvelle Bible mise à jour, actualisée et adaptée" (le Déaut, "La Septante, un Targum?" 151). Van der Kooij's major contribution in this regard is in seeing LXX-Isa as a rewritten prophecy rather than simply an updated text.

been "updated" in light of then-current events, and he believes that the final translation is not simply a text that could refer to the translator's day, but a text that had been shaped as a new prophecy in its own right. According to van der Kooij, *Erfüllungsinterpretation* boils down to a question of genre, namely: "has a *prophetic* passage from the book of Isaiah been translated into Greek as a text only from a linguistic or philological point of view, or as a text which should make sense as 'prophecy' at the time of the translator?"[146] Van der Kooij sees much of LXX-Isa as an updated prophecy—a product of Hellenistic Judaism, wherein "the mode of reading prophecies as predictions about the present and the near future of one's own time was the prevailing one."[147]

In evaluating *Erfüllungsinterpretation*, the field is much more divided, with some scholars convinced that LXX-Isa engages in systematic updating of the text, while others are convinced that fulfillment interpretation misrepresents the translation. In this dissertation, Isa 8 will figure prominently, and due to the intense controversy regarding whether this chapter should be interpreted in light of *Erfüllungsinterpretation*, it is worth spending some time reviewing the arguments for and against it. For those in favor of fulfillment interpretation, supporting evidence can be found at practically every turn. LXX-Isa updates place names and institutions with their contemporaneous equivalents, as when ארם is rendered with Συρίαν (Isa 9:11), or ממלכה with νομός (Isa 19:2). On a broader scale, sections of Isaiah that diverge significantly from the Hebrew are still internally coherent, and they can be applied to the Maccabean revolt or other contemporaneous events, which lends credence to this style of interpretation. This was van der

---

[146] *The Oracle of Tyre*, 11. Emphasis in original.

[147] Van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism: Some Comments on LXX Isaiah 8–9," in *Die Septuaginta – Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 600.

Kooij's primary argument regarding Isa 23 in his landmark work, *The Oracle of Tyre*. The productive nature of this approach leads many scholars to conclude that the translator is "a contemporizing expositor of his source,"[148] whose work is characterized by "prophetic actualization"[149]

Those who argue against fulfilment interpretation claim that the *Erfüllungsinterpretation* camp gives too much weight to possible parallels and not enough to alternative explanations. Peter Flint approaches this problem using place-name equivalents, and he argues that fulfillment interpretation should only be seen in cases of "non-literal and semantically inadequate interpretation."[150] As we saw earlier, due to LXX-Isa's nature as a translated text, our understanding of the translator's theology is limited to those areas where we can see deliberate translation choices being made, and Flint's criterion can help as a primary step to weed out specious connections to contemporaneous events. Troxel takes this a step further and declares:

> It is not enough that a passage that differs from the MT—even one demonstrably not based on a *Vorlage* different form the MT—can be aligned with circumstances or events of the Hellenistic period. It must be shown that the translator did not arrive at his rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader contexts but that he fashioned it with an eye to conditions or events in his day, as indicated by vocabulary or images that can be explained in no other way. Measured by this standard, most suggested cases of *Erfüllungsinterpretation* fail to persuade.[151]

---

[148] Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 22.

[149] "[L]'«actualisation» prophétique" (Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega,* 283). Koenig similarly concludes, "L'interprétation oraculaire de noms géographiques, ethniques ou personnels établit sans conteste que le livre d'Is a été utilisé par G à des fins oraculaires contemporaines" (*L'herméneutique analogique*, 23). Though Blenkinsopp does not clarify how thoroughly he sees such actualization, he states, "At several points the translator shows an interest in bringing the text to bear on current issues and situations" (*Isaiah: A New Translation,* 1:77).

[150] Flint, "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1–14 and the Massoretic Text," *BIOSCS* 21 (1988): 54. If this is the bar, he claims that *Erfüllungsinterpretation* is "seen to be lacking" in LXX-Isa, at least with regard to updated place names (ibid.).

[151] Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 166–67.

Key to Troxel's argument is that *Erfüllungsinterpretation* must be found in words or phrases "that can be explained in no other way." In other words, fulfillment interpretation should be the conclusion of last resort, not an assumption that might lead us to connect any phrase from LXX-Isa with any second-century event it could reasonably describe. In Troxel's mind, the passage's literary context is a much more likely source for a divergent translation.

In my view, Troxel sets the bar too high for determining instances of *Erfüllungsinterpretation*, for he seems to discount such interpretation a priori as inherently less likely.[152] Van der Kooij has convincingly shown that fulfillment interpretation was not unheard of in Hellenistic Judaism—as Dan 9 and the Qumran pesharim can attest—and I see little grounds for ruling it out if it can satisfactorily explain the text.[153] With that being said, however, Troxel's point is well taken, that it is not enough to show that a given phrase *could* apply to contemporaneous events. In making a decision between contextual interpretation and *Erfüllungsinterpretation*, contextual explanations are often not given enough weight, especially given their prevalence throughout LXX-Isa. When competing explanations are thus weighed, we should go with whichever theory best accounts for the evidence.[154]

---

[152] As one example of the high bar Troxel sets, he states: "We should, for example, expect to find evidence that the translator believed that he was living in 'the last days'…. An equally telling mark would be his translation of [all] toponyms with Hellenistic place names, so as to help his readers connect the oracles of Isaiah with their own day" (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 173). But one could easily imagine contemporizing translation that does not do these things.

[153] LXX-Ps 37 is a great example of fulfillment interpretation according to van der Kooij's original formulation, namely a Hebrew text being translated into a new prophecy. See John Sailhamer, *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3–41*, Studies in Biblical Greek 2 (New York: Peter Lang, 1990)*,* 150–72, and cf. 4QpPs37.

[154] See Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book*, 218. De Sousa approaches the problem similarly, where he does not rule out *Erfüllungsinterpretation* in principle, but he believes that "van der Kooij seems to overstretch the evidence in claiming that the translator is 'rewriting' his oracle into Greek" (De Sousa, *Eschatology and Messianism,* 16). See also Ross Wagner, "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies in Old Greek (OG) Isaiah: Isaiah 8:11–16 as a Test Case," *JBL* 126.2 (2007): 267.

Method of this dissertation

The goal of this dissertation is to better understand LXX-Isa and the way its formulation relates to prevailing notions regarding eschatological law observance by the nations. What criteria, then, do we use to determine authorial intent and identify theological exegesis in this source?

The Author vs. the Translator

First, any interpretation of the translator's intent can only be as secure as our reconstruction of both the Greek text and its Hebrew *Vorlage.* There is an unfortunate tendency in LXX studies to find divergences and draw conclusions after comparing only one Hebrew text (usually the Leningrad codex) with one Greek text (usually the Göttingen critical edition), but as we will see repeatedly, our earliest witnesses to both the Hebrew and Greek texts show a wide variety of readings. When our interpretation hinges on single words or phrases, we need a solid grasp of the many textual witnesses at our disposal. Thus, when we come across a divergence between the Leningrad Codex and the reconstructed text in the Göttingen edition, we need to make every effort to determine what variables could be responsible for the differences. This entails ample text-critical work, including accounting for possible origins in Hebrew or Greek transmission history, looking at attested Greek and Hebrew variants, comparing similar translations across LXX, and investigating the translator's *Übersetzungsweise*. Only then can we talk about translation choices.

Yet even in such a case, where we have examined all possible Hebrew and Greek manuscripts to determine the origin of a given change, the very nature of our investigation means that the results will still be uncertain. Differences could easily arise from a variant *Vorlage* that is

now lost, or perhaps the difference lies in the translator's decisions or in a simple scribal mistake (whether in Hebrew or Greek). The Greek evidence further complicates this picture, as multiple centuries separate the original translation of LXX-Isa from the archetype reconstructed for the Göttingen critical edition. How many changes were introduced during those centuries, and how extensive was the revision? These questions are beyond our ability to answer with the available evidence.

Often within LXX studies, however, differences between Greek and Hebrew texts are ascribed to the translator by default, as if the translator were always guilty of tampering with the text unless proven innocent. This assumption is problematic, for all the reasons outlined above. Yet despite our uncertainties regarding the point of origin for each change, *someone* has to have made the change resulting in the written text we now have. Thus, when I speak of the person responsible for the Greek text as we now have it, I opt to refer to this person as the "author," leaving open the possibility that this author was a Hebrew scribe, the Greek translator, or a later tradent within the Greek tradition.

As an example, Isa 56:6 mentions עבדים in the Leningrad Codex, but in the Göttingen edition the text reads δούλους **καὶ δούλας**. The person ultimately responsible for the differing Greek reading may be a Hebrew scribe, who wrote עבדים **ושפחות** in the *Vorlage*, which the translator dutifully translated as δούλους καὶ δούλας. In that case, this Hebrew scribe would be the "author" of the Greek text as we now have it, in the sense that he is the author of the variant reading. If the change arose in the process of translation, then the translator would be the author of the Greek text. But suppose the *Vorlage* read עבדים, the translator translated this as δούλους, but a later scribe changed the text to δούλους **καὶ δούλας**. In that case, the later Greek scribe would be the author of the text. The term "author" is therefore imprecise, but its imprecision

matches our ignorance of where any particular change may have originated. Using the term "author" thus enables us to speak about the person(s) behind the differing reading without simultaneously making a claim about where the difference originated. Of course, whenever specification is possible, or whenever the data points to either a Hebrew scribe, Greek translator, or later Greek scribe, the term will be adapted accordingly.

Vorlagen, the Hermeneutic of Multivalence, and the Translator's Scribal Milieu

As we look at the translation process proper, it is also important to keep in mind how the textual situation in the second century would have impacted this process. Even if we assume that the translator's *Vorlage* consisted of only one Hebrew manuscript (an assumption that is by no means certain but that most scholars nevertheless make), we still have to wrestle with how he understood this manuscript. As Christopher Stanley argues, "no two manuscripts of a literary work were exactly alike," and thus, "the physical *realia* of the manuscripts would have encouraged not a reverence for the wording of this or that exemplar, but rather a critical attitude toward the text of any individual manuscript."[155] In other words, the translator's very familiarity with ancient textual variety could have led to a tendency to "read" what we think of as common scribal mistakes—such as ר/ד or א/ע interchanges—into the *Vorlage* even where none existed: "The translator's willingness to 'reread' his source in this way reflects, to a great extent, the expectation of all ancient readers that their manuscripts would contain copyist's errors that

---

[155] Stanley, "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigation and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 23, 25.

required correction."[156] As many have noted, this was "an established technique for wresting meaning from an otherwise intractable text."[157]

Andrew Teeter has recently shown that this type of scribal activity, which he labels "facilitating," was both commonly practiced and accepted in the late Second Temple period.[158] Teeter builds on Koenig's work to show that "within this ancient Jewish scribal mentality words (as semantic entities) and even letters (as graphic signs) within the text were conceptualized as connected to others with similar features," a notion which Koenig refers to as "the supple idea of participation."[159] Scribes—including translators—were thus liable to see their *Vorlagen* as multivalent, and they operated under an accepted "hermeneutic of multivalence" that allowed them to interpret the text in new ways, often by means of what text critics usually classify as "scribal errors."

Not only could the translator have made up scribal "variants" through creative re-reading, but it is also possible that he was familiar with actual variant readings derived from other manuscripts then in circulation.[160] Ziegler comes to this conclusion after examining variant

---

[156] Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book*, 25–26.

[157] Ibid.

[158] A "facilitating" scribal model is "characterized by a certain latitude with respect to permitting textual intervention, especially as regards matters of linguistic updating and interpretive changes or expansions. This scribal model can be contrasted with another, also widely represented, which aspired to precise replication of its *Vorlage*, and which appears to have actively avoided the scribal behaviors just described" (*Scribal Laws*, 264). On the acceptance of this practice, see ibid., 199.

[159] "[L]'idée souple de la participation" (see Teeter, *Scribal Laws,* 181 and Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 389). By "participation," Koenig refers to a process stemming from "la plurivalence, par adaptation au principe de l'homogénéité scripturaire. Dans les analogies scripturaires la plurivalence résulte de la différence des contextes scripturaires des 2 textes que l'herméneutique combine. Dans la méthode des analogies verbales, la plurivalence résulte des diverses valeurs lexicographiques tirées des ressemblances formelles repérables. Mais, dans les 2 cas, le principe fondamental est la participation d'un terme ou d'une expression à une ou plusieurs valeurs autres que la valeur déterminée par la syntaxe contextuelle" (382).

[160] Teeter writes, "given the extent and character of the variation attested, as well as the manifest literary and exegetical sophistication of scriptural engagement in the period, it is not at all plausible to assume that ancient scribes were oblivious to the plurality that obtained…. Scribes were certainly aware of textual variation," and any kind of scribal work "involved productive engagement with a multivalent text" (*Scribal Laws*, 21). We must be wary

readings shared between 1QIsaᵃ and LXX-Isa, which he sees as arising from either direct or indirect knowledge of variant readings.[161] Das Neves takes this one step further, as he sees the translator consciously selecting those variants which fit his overall goals best.[162] If this is true, our translator would have fit right into the interpretive milieu of his time, for "Jewish exegetes were accustomed to choosing among variants the reading which suited their interpretation, or to exploiting more than one."[163]

If we take this into account, it has a profound impact on how we understand the translation process and reconstruct the *Vorlage*. At the end of the day, we cannot know with absolute certainty what the translator's *Vorlage* read. We can retrovert the Greek text back into Hebrew and compare this hypothetical *Vorlage* with all known Hebrew witnesses, and if there is still no agreement we can ask whether this retroversion might plausibly be derived from scribal error—even a scribal error that existed only in the translator's mind. If we can find a Hebrew variant that might account for the LXX reading, it seems reasonable to infer that this variant forms the basis for the author's translation, even if the translator's manuscript did not actually

---

of "the improbable assumption… that readers would only be aware of the manuscript before them, that they were oblivious to textual plurality and difference" (ibid., 194).

[161] "Jedoch ist erwiesen, dass bereits der LXX-Übersetzer die von M abweichenden Varianten in Qu kannte.... Es besteht auch die Möglichkeit, dass solche Varianten... von einer Gelehrtenschule mündlich tradiert und auch schriftlich in separaten Verzeichnissen fixiert wurden" (Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die Erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsᵃ)," *JBL* 78.1 [Mar 1959]: 59). Van der Kooij, on the other hand, thinks we must also allow for the possibility that overlaps between LXX-Isa and 1QIsaᵃ show a similar method of interpretation at work, or possibly that both attest to a Hebrew text-form earlier than MT (*Die alten Textzeugen,* 113). Since both texts were produced at different locales around 140 BCE, we can rule out any direct influence of one text upon the other (ibid.).

[162] "[L]es variantes sont triées de façon à mieux pouvoir server les buts du traducteur" (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega,* 283).

[163] Richard D. Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13–21)," in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 161.

contain the variant in question.[164] This is the natural conclusion if we take seriously 1) Second Temple exegetical technique, 2) the textual milieu of the time, and 3) our ignorance of the *Vorlage* used by the translator.

We should be careful to note that the translator's choice between Hebrew variants, or even the translator's choice to "create" a scribal variant, may well reflect theological exegesis. One can easily imagine a scenario in which the translator could change the text to better fit his theology by switching a ד or ר, and such changes undoubtedly did happen. But our ignorance of the *Vorlage* leaves us with no reliable way to control for these choices. Instead, we can only speak about translation in terms of what is authorized by the Hebrew texts (plural), which is why Baer's system of "authorized," "semi-authorized," and "non-authorized" translation is so useful.

If we are to confidently ascribe any given difference to the translator, a number of conditions must be met. First, there should be no way to derive LXX-Isa's reading from known Hebrew variants or from common scribal errors that might have worked on these variants. In this case, we can be as confident as possible that the divergence between Hebrew and Greek comes from the translation process itself or from a later Greek scribe, not from the translator's (real or imagined) *Vorlage*.[165] Second, there should be no way to derive LXX-Isa's reading from common Greek scribal mistakes that could have worked on a literal translation of the Hebrew text(s). For example, Isa 42:4 describes תורה, while LXX-Isa renders this word with ὀνόματι; it seems highly likely in this case that the translator rendered תורה with νόμῳ, while in the process

---

[164] Moshe Zipor advocates this same approach from a different angle: "The methodological claim, therefore, of 'we have no evidence of such a Hebrew variant,' is not sufficient to discount the possibility that ancient Hebrew variants did exist that formed the text which was used for the translation of the Septuagint" ("The Use of the Septuagint as a Textual Witness: Further Considerations," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998*, ed. Bernard A. Taylor, SCS 51 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015], 77).

[165] See ibid., 581.

of transmitting the Greek text this was changed to ὀνόματι, which makes it difficult to ascribe this difference to the translator.[166] Finally, if a series of translational choices can be shown within LXX-Isa pointing in the same interpretive direction, even if each such rendering might be classified as "authorized" in Baer's terminology, we can reasonably conclude that these interpretations stem from the translator—especially if the Hebrew text could have been read in multiple ways.[167]

Limiting instances of theological exegesis to these cases means that our conclusions are likely to exclude some verses where the translator did deliberately change the text, and our method cannot fully account for every choice the translator may have made between possible variants. But I see this limitation as a strength of the method rather than a weakness. By excluding dubious cases of theological exegesis—cases where the translator *may* have been responsible for the change but about which we cannot be sure—our results, though less far-reaching than those of other modern scholars, will stand on more solid ground.[168] According to Pietersma, translations strive (at least in theory) to be faithful to their *Vorlagen;* therefore, "The exegete of the Greek thus needs to *prove* that the translation says something other than the

---

[166] See discussion in Chapter 5, n. 49.

[167] Cf. Baer, whose work "notices recurrent patterns of translation within LXX Isaiah… in order to argue for a *tendency* on the part of the translator to display his theological understanding of the text" (*When We All Go Home*, 18). We do find cases in Hebrew texts of multiple interpretations pointing in the same direction, as with the Covenant Code in the Samaritan Pentateuch (see Teeter, *Scribal Laws*, 162). Thus, if we find that the translator of LXX-Isa has consistently interpreted the text in a certain direction, we will have to weigh this conclusion against the available manuscript evidence and the probability that these changes were present in the *Vorlage*. As stated above, we can never be absolutely sure what the translator's *Vorlage* read, but these criteria make it much less likely that our conclusions will be based on insufficient data.

[168] My approach in this dissertation thus differs from the target-oriented approach advocated by Wagner. Wagner writes, "Orientation to the target further implies that 'transparent' and even 'default' renderings hold as much interest for the interpreter as do those we judge to be 'non-transparent'" (*Reading the Sealed Book,* 54). My approach instead focuses on deliberate changes to the text, and thus default renderings are of interest, but only insofar as they represent a choice between either 1) other possible Greek renderings that would be true to the Hebrew or 2) variants known from other Hebrew manuscripts.

original."[169] These three cases are the only instances in which I believe we can claim a reasonable degree of certainty.

The method advocated in this dissertation appears on the surface to be in conflict with the method advocated by Tov. According to Tov, "Only after all possible translational explanations have been dismissed should one address the assumption that the translation represents a Hebrew reading different from the MT."[170] In my method, only after addressing Hebrew readings different from MT should we move to translational explanations. Tov is a well-respected scholar who has written extensively on the LXX, so I do not take this difference lightly, but the contrast between these methods can illuminate why I have chosen this approach over any alternative. Tov writes from the perspective of textual criticism, which means that his criteria are meant as a control on wild speculation regarding possible Hebrew variants. From a text-critical point of view, one's results should rest on as solid a foundation as possible, which means that any data that might reasonably have arisen through alternative explanations should not be included. If a divergence between translation and *Vorlage* can be explained through translation method, this "taints" the data point for reconstructing the Hebrew text. The goal of my method, on the other hand, is completely opposite. My criteria are meant as a control on wild speculation regarding the translator's theology. *Mutatis mutandis*, any divergence that can be explained through Hebrew variants thus "taints" the data for reconstructing the translator's theology. These two methods are thus similar, but they diverge due to the type of results sought in each case.

Constructing a Theology of the Translator

---

[169] Pietersma, review of *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, *BO* 54 (1997): 187.

[170] Tov, *The Text-Critical Use,* 40.

Numerous scholars have called into question the enterprise of reconstructing the translator's theology based on the few divergences we can find between the translation and *Vorlage*.[171] According to these scholars, "it may be wondered how far it is possible from isolated instances of change to develop a coherent view of the intellectual and theological world of the translator such that one can speak of the theology of the translation."[172] This criticism is valid, and we should recognize at the outset that if we cannot assemble enough examples using the above criteria, or if our examples do not point in one consistent direction of interpretation, we will be forced to conclude that the evidence is inconclusive. Finding the evidence to be inconclusive would not be a total loss; after all, "Even if it is unclear whether a divergence between the LXX and the MT comes from the translator or from his source-text, a difference of interpretation between the two texts has significance. If nothing else, it shows that there were different streams of tradition."[173] But as we will see throughout this dissertation, LXX-Isa does provide a sufficient basis to reasonably draw conclusions about the worldview of its author(s).

---

[171] See, e.g., Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 258.

[172] Michael Knibb, "The Septuagint and Messianism: Problems and Issues," in *The Septuagint and Messianism*, ed. idem, BETL 195 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 19; quoted in de Sousa, *Eschatology and Messianism,* 157. Knibb goes on, "At a minimum there needs to be a sufficient number of cases in an individual book where the Greek, for whatever reason, provides evidence of a different interpretation of the text from the Hebrew; the passages need to display a coherent, not a random, pattern of interpretation" (ibid.). The second case in my method is designed to meet this criterion.

[173] Dines, *The Septuagint,* 133.

Chapter 2: The Historical Evolution of Law, Foreigners, and Conversion

Our investigation of foreigners' law observance begins in the 8th century BCE and goes through the first century CE, and during this time Israelite religion(s) underwent significant change. If we were to compare Pharisaic or Sadducean thought with Israelite popular religion before the Josianic reform—before there was even a Bible to interpret—the differences would be nothing short of jarring. In examining the interpretation of eschatological law observance, therefore, we need a solid grasp of how ideas such as "law" or "conversion" changed over time, and we need to know what these terms would have meant to the various groups that used them.

This chapter traces out the various meanings of these terms. In the first half, I deal with the concept of law from before the exile through the Hellenistic period, and I address some potential issues with the translation of תורה using νόμος. In the second half, I examine how ideas about conversion changed during this same time period, as well as how the idea of conversion was impacted by its transition from Hebrew to Greek. After we have a better understanding of how these terms were used throughout Israelite history, in the next chapter we will be able to apply our findings to the Hebrew texts of Isaiah to see how these texts envisioned eschatological law observance by foreigners.

Law

In the previous chapter we noted eight possible meanings encompassed by the word "law." These meanings are:

1. Instruction.

2. Natural law, or that which is "attributed through philosophical, moral, or religious conviction to the very nature of things."[1]

3. Noahide law, or its pre-rabbinic equivalent.

4. Political domination.

5. A rule or statute governing society.

6. The symbolic/ideological valence of law, or the transcendent ideas that law and order can come to represent.

7. The sum of legislation in the Pentateuch ("law of Moses").

8. The books of the Pentateuch or the entire Hebrew Bible.

Of course there is significant overlap in each of these categories; even as far back as 8th-century Israel, people may well have seen the legislation that now makes up pentateuchal law as "wise instruction," and it is doubtful that they would have made any real distinction between natural law and their society's actual statutes.[2] But despite such overlap, keeping these distinct categories in mind will be helpful as we examine how the concept of law changes over time.

The Hebrew legal terms for these eight categories are varied, and they show a similar degree of overlap. "Instruction" would be most naturally translated with תורה, but תורה could equally well describe a rule or statute governing society, for example, or the symbolic/ideological valence of law (e.g., Lev 7:1; Prov 28:7). Conversely, משפט can also describe both the symbolic/ideological valence of law (as in Gen 18:19, ושמרו דרך יהוה לעשות צדקה ומשפט) and the rules and statutes of a society (as in the introduction to the Covenant Code,

---

[1] Knight, *Law, Power, and Justice*, 30.

[2] "Societies themselves generally do not sense or articulate the difference between positive and natural laws…. As far as we know, ancient Israel did not draw a distinction between positive and natural laws. Biblical law is presented as divine law and is thus cast as being of an order different from human law" (ibid.).

(ואלה המשפטים). If we were to trace out the history of תורה, חק, משפט, מצוה, מוסר, and every other Hebrew legal term, the discussion would bring us far afield of the questions relevant to interpreting Isaianic tradition. For our purposes, we are primarily interested in תורה, the law envisioned by Isaiah as going out to the nations (e.g., Isa 2:3), so understanding the history of תורה will be the focus of this section.[3]

From Origins to First Isaiah

There exists a general consensus among scholars that תורה did not begin as a word for "law," but rather derives from the root ירה and holds the basic meaning of "instruction" or "teaching."[4] From the earliest stages of the Hebrew Bible, תורה can be seen in a wide range of situations, and its semantic range can be divided roughly into three categories: priestly, prophetic, and wisdom.[5]

When used in a priestly context, תורה usually refers to an oracular *responsum* or other cultic instruction.[6] This usage can be seen in Lev 6, for example, where it speaks of תורת העלה, תורת המנחה, תורת החטאת, etc., and it is common in the Priestly strand of the Pentateuch, the

---

[3] Isaiah does mention משפט going out to the nations as well (e.g., Isa 42:1), but משפט played a much more subdued role in ancient interpretation of foreigners' eschatological law observance. משפט usually refers to a statute, rule, or legal judgment, and LXX-Isa seems to have understood the term in this latter sense. With two exceptions (Isa 26:9 and 61:8), every instance of משפט in the reconstructed text of LXX-Isa is rendered with the root κρίνω/κρίσις, and the first of these exceptions will be discussed in Chapter 4. Otherwise, these verses seem to have been understood in the general sense of κρίσις as judgment or condemnation. As a result, my investigation here focuses primarily on תורה.

[4] For a fuller discussion of etymology, including a possible link to the Akkadian *têrtu(m)* and the subsequent understanding of תורה as "omen" or "oracle," see F. García López, "תּוֹרָה," *TDOT* 15:611. Regarding the shift from instruction to law, García López writes, "*tôrâ* means 'instruction' or 'teaching,' handed down either orally or in writing. When this tradition is authoritative and binding, *tôrâ* can take on the character of a law" (15:614).

[5] Ibid., 15:615.

[6] "[T]he semantic spectrum of *tôrâ* in the texts of P[G] remains focused on cultic legislation; the term refers to God's instructions for the ritual ministry of the priests" (ibid., 15:616). See also Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 14.

60

Holiness Code (H), and Ezekiel. These regulations considered in the aggregate can also be referred to as תורה, as at the conclusion of H, where the author summarizes the preceding rules, "These are the תורות that the LORD gave" (Lev 26:46). What we might call a "priestly" usage of תורה also occurs outside of priestly writing, as witnessed by Hos 4:6, "I reject you from being a priest to me; you have forgotten the תורה of your God."[7]

In a wisdom context, תורה occurs with the general sense of "instruction" or "teaching." Typical in this sense is Prov 1:8, which reads, "Listen, my son, to the instruction (מוסר) of your father; and do not abandon the תורה of your mother." Here תורה is not necessarily divine in origin, and it is not binding in the sense that a legal statute would be. This type of תורה holds the same minimal legal force that מוסר holds. תורה in such contexts can be seen throughout the biblical wisdom texts, all of which "emphasize the existence of a *tôrâ* that traces its origin and authority to parents or, more generally, to wisdom (not God or a priest or the prophets)."[8]

Prophetic usage is more difficult to pin down, in part due to the poetic nature of much of prophetic writing and in part due to uncertainty surrounding the origin of many passages within these texts. In general, however, the prophets tend to use תורה in parallel with דברים/דבר, and almost half of all occurrences in the prophetic corpus appear in construct with God—תורת אלהינו (Isa 1:10), תורת יהוה (Isa 5:24), תורתי (Jer 6:19), etc.[9] Amongst the earliest prophets, the only occurrences of תורה that can be securely attributed to 8th-century authors are in Hosea and Proto-Isaiah.[10] Hosea uses תורה in its priestly sense, as we saw above, but he also uses the word with a

---

[7] A similar priestly conception is seen in Hos 8:11–12, where God writes תורה to correct Ephraim's cultic behavior. See García López, *TDOT* 15:623.

[8] Ibid., 15:633.

[9] See ibid., 15:614, 621. Constructs with a referent to God occur in twenty out of forty-four occurrences.

[10] García López excludes Amos 2:4, which falls in the Judah section of Amos's oracle and "is generally considered Dtr" (ibid., 15:622); Jensen likewise excludes this verse, "which virtually all admit to be a later, probably

much more expansive meaning. In Hos 8:1, he accuses the people, "They have broken my covenant (בריתי); they have transgressed my תורה." The parallelism suggests a relation between תורה and covenant, but the nature of this relationship is unclear. The meaning of תורה seems close to the sixth definition of law above, namely its ideological valence, where תורה can represent a transcendent idea such as God's covenant, but again, it is hard to decide on the basis of such limited evidence.

We might be tempted to see the seventh definition here—that Hosea is referring to the law of Moses—but we must be careful of anachronistic reading. As Jensen points out, reading this definition into the text begs the question "of what aggregate of laws it might designate in the Judah [or Israel] of the eighth century."[11] The Pentateuch is undoubtedly composed of earlier legal collections, but we have no evidence that any of these collections was either already compiled or well known in the 8th century BCE. Even if we could establish that the Covenant or Holiness Codes were circulating in written form at this time, the ascription of these laws to Moses and their status as part of God's covenant are most likely later creations. By the time the Book of the Twelve reached its final form, Hos 8:1 may well have been interpreted in light of the law of Moses, but it is unlikely that this was Hosea's original meaning.

Of those passages which can be securely attributed to Isaiah of Jerusalem,[12] we see a considerable range of uses of תורה, but most scholars agree that the term is not "legal" in any real sense. Here תורה is used in the sense of "instruction," "teachings," or even "prophetic oracle,"

---

deuteronomic, interpolation" (*The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 19). Micah 4:2 (=Isa 2:3) is more difficult, with most scholars either seeing the verse as Isaianic in origin (e.g., Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 19) or as a later interpolation (e.g., García López, *TDOT* 15:622).

[11] Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 65.

[12] Generally Isa 1:10, 8:16, and 30:9, though there is disagreement about whether 2:3, 5:24, and 8:20 go back to Proto-Isaiah as well. A more detailed analysis of all these verses will be carried out in Chapter 3.

but in none of these passages does Isaiah seem to refer to law.[13] Laurent Monsengwo-Pasinya summarizes prophetic תורה as follows: "The *tôrah* of the prophets is not a 'law' (since the prophets were not authorized to issue decrees, laws, or ritual ordinances), but it is an instruction on the principles of religion…. Rather, the prophetic *tôrah* means 'divine revelation.'"[14]

Deuteronomy and the time of Deutero-Isaiah

As we move into the seventh century, with the beginning of Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic texts, we can see the definition of תורה beginning to expand beyond priests, prophets, and wisdom circles, and it is in this period that תורה comes to be more closely identified with law. The verb ירה is used in connection with judges as well as priests (e.g., Deut 17:10), and תורה is seen as the rule against which kings and people are measured. Simultaneously, occurrences of תורה in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH) "clearly refer to a written document," possibly an early form of Deuteronomy itself.[15] Thus we find reference to "the words of the תורה which are written upon the scroll" (2 Kgs 23:24), and Joshua reads "all that was written on the scroll of the תורה" (Josh 8:34). This scroll is explicitly associated with Moses, and its legal character is undisputed: the Lord's משפטים, מצות, חקות, and עדות are all said to be כתוב בתורת משה (e.g., 1 Kgs 2:3). As Jensen notes, "*tôrâ* comes to designate

---

[13] Jensen would take issue with the designation of תורה as "prophetic oracle," for after reviewing the occurrences of the term in Hosea and Proto-Isaiah he concludes, "there is no compelling evidence for the use of *tôrâ* as a term to designate the prophetic word" (*The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 26). I disagree with his conclusion, particularly in Isa 8:16, but my argument does not hinge on whether תורה encompasses this specific meaning; the larger point is that the word has not taken on the meaning of "law" by the eighth century BCE.

[14] "La *tôrah* des prophètes, elle, n'est pas une « loi » (puisque les prophètes n'étaient pas habilités à prononcer des décrets, ou des lois, ni des ordonnances rituelles), mais elle est une instruction sur les principes de la religion.… La *tôrah* prophétique signifie plutôt « révélation divine »" (*La notion de* NOMOS *dans le Pentateuque Grec,* AnBib 52 [Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973], 19).

[15] García López, *TDOT* 15:619.

the aggregate of the law during the period of deuteronomic influence."[16] In other words, it is

beginning with Deuteronomy that we have the first clear instance of תורה in the sense of the fifth

("a rule or statute governing society") and seventh ("the law of Moses") definitions cited above.

Although תורה did expand more toward a legalistic meaning in this period, the word also

came to symbolize much more than law. On the one hand, as the signifier of the law given

through Moses, תורה became "a potent, compelling symbol: the law originates with Israel's God,

denoting the set of expectations that have religious weight attached to them, and the people are

'instructed' to comply with them or face dire consequences."[17] But on the other hand, תורה still

carried its earlier connection with wisdom and prophetic teaching. This laid the ground for a

convergence in meaning between all these terms, and by the end of this process, תורה had

become all-encompassing. Speaking of Isaiah as a whole, Fischer writes, "In the final canonical

text… *the whole prophetic book,* even the whole canonical section of the writing prophets,

receives the sense of a 'prophet-Torah,' which takes up *the* Torah and actualizes it through the

prophetic word."[18] In the period of Deuteronomy and DtrH, תורה had not yet reached the level of

labelling an entire prophetic book or section of scripture, but the process leading to this result

was under way.[19]

---

[16] Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 65.

[17] Knight, *Law, Power, and Justice,* 52. Jack Lightstone expresses a similar sentiment: "what, then, is the Torah of Moses? Not a law code. More accurately, Torah is an authoritative paradigm corresponding to a social and cultic organization among Jerusalemites. In form and substance the one functions as a mirror of the other" (Lightstone, "Torah is *Nomos*—Except When it is Not: Prolegomena to the Study of the Law in Late Antique Judaism." *SR* 13.1 [1984]: 32).

[18] "Im kanonischen Endtext bekommt… *das ganze Prophetenbuch*, ja sogar der ganze Kanonteil der Schriftpropheten, die Sinnrichtung einer ‚Propheten-Tora', welche *die* Tora aufgreift und durch das prophetische Wort aktualisiert" (Fischer, *Tora für Israel,* 23, emphasis in original).

[19] The earliest example of תורה/νόμος referring to a section of the canon, for example, does not occur until Qumran and the prologue to ben Sira, though there are some disputed cases in Ezra and Nehemiah (see Neusner, *Torah: From Scroll to Symbol in Formative Judaism*, BJS 136 [Atlanta: Scholars, 1988], 10 and García López, *TDOT* 15:643–45). On the general transformation of תורה in this period, Knight notes, "it was probably not until the exilic and postexilic times, when the religious establishment appropriated the concept and limited it primarily to doctrines

The Deuteronomic period spans roughly the mid-7th century BCE through the Babylonian exile and the composition of DtrH, and it was during this time that Deutero-Isaiah was most likely written. Deuteronomic influence has been widely recognized in DI, as can be seen in DI's repeated appeal to tradition, call to remembrance, exhortation to seek Yahweh, and use of the exodus as a type of Israel's return to Judea.[20] Even the theme of Yahweh's servant, which stands so prominently in DI, can be traced back to the Deuteronomic school; as Blenkinsopp writes, "the term ʿebed, which is standard in the Deuteronomic corpus as a designation for individual prophets… appears in a religiously significant rather than purely sociological sense thirty-two times in Isa 40–66 but is absent from 1–39."[21]

With this close relation between DI and Deuteronomic influence, there has been intense debate over what exactly DI means in his use of תורה. According to Jensen, the word in DI "seems to have the broadest possible sense of 'instruction' or 'revelation,'"[22] and Fischer concurs: "It is striking that there is no mention of Mosaic Torah and that Torah never appears with the article," which suggests that the author did not necessarily have Mosaic law in mind with this word.[23] On the other side of the argument, Louise Pettibone Smith sees Deuteronomy as essential for understanding DI. She writes, "The use of תורה as a self-explanatory term in Isaiah, chapters 42 and 51, can also be accounted for most simply as the result of the influence of

---

about cultic practices and God's will, that *tôrâ* acquired a distinctly theological meaning" (*Law, Power, and Justice*, 52).

[20] See Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:53.

[21] Ibid., 52.

[22] Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 23.

[23] "Auffällig ist, daß nirgends von der Mose-Tora gesprochen wird und daß Tora nie mit dem Artikel vorkommt" (Fischer, *Tora für Israel,* 15).

the claim of Deuteronomy."[24] The fact that the author never refers to Moses or Sinai is irrelevant,

for "[i]n that period when Deuteronomy stood pre-eminent as the book of the law, one could say

תורה without further qualification without risk of being misunderstood."[25] Smith understands the

semantic range of תורה as contracting in this period—a conclusion that seems to go beyond what

is warranted by the evidence—but her assertion that an unmodified use of תורה *could* refer to

Mosaic law does not seem unreasonable. We will examine the occurrences of תורה in DI in more

detail in the next chapter, but it is sufficient to note here the broad range of meanings that could

apply to the word by this period.

Trito-Isaiah and the Second Temple Period

By the time of Chronicles, the association between תורה and a written work connected

with Moses had been considerably strengthened, such that "[i]n the Chronicler's view the *tôrâ* of

Yahweh or Moses is fundamentally a book or document."[26] This may or may not refer to the

Pentateuch, depending on when we date the Pentateuch's final redaction, but the Chronicler does

seem to have some form of pentateuchal tradition in mind. By the time of ben Sira, this transition

is complete, and תורה/νόμος undoubtedly refers to the Pentateuch as we know it. In the rabbinic

period, this meaning comes to dominate so thoroughly that all תורה came to be seen as embodied

---

[24] Smith, "The Use of the Word תורה in Isaiah, Chapters 1–39," *AJSL* 46.1 (Oct. 1929): 18.

[25] Ibid.

[26] García López, *TDOT* 15:634. Smith agrees, though she clarifies that this association is not absolute: "to the Chronicler תורה meant the written law of Moses only when modified by יהוה or משה or when defined by context" (Smith, "The Use of the Word תורה," 8). The written nature of תורה can be seen in its association with verbs such as כתב and its description as ספר התורה (2 Chr 34:15), תורה בספר משה (2 Chr 25:4), etc., much as we see with DtrH.

or deriving from the Bible. As Neusner memorably puts it, for the rabbis, "Beyond *The Torah* there was no *torah*."[27]

We should be careful, however, not to overstate the degree to which תורה came to represent *exclusively* the (proto-)Pentateuch or the Mosaic law associated with it, especially in the early post-exilic period. The picture among other post-exilic writers is not nearly as clear as we see in Chronicles. Outside of Chronicles, no post-exilic biblical author uses the word תורה to refer to the law of Moses, unless תורה is modified or the context specified in some way.[28] And even within Chronicles itself we still see תורה used to refer to specific laws, as in 2 Chr 19:10. Thus while תורה will eventually come to be synonymous with (Mosaic) law, the word does retain many of its other nuances from earlier periods.

The word תורה does not occur in the writings of Trito-Isaiah (TI), but this is the period (i.e., early Second Temple period) in which the book of Isaiah came into its final form. If the Pentateuch had already been completed by this time,[29] TI might have understood phrases such as, "תורה will go out from Zion" (Isa 2:3), or "the coastlands wait for [the Servant's] תורה" (Isa 42:4), quite differently than their original author had intended. In the next chapter, as we explore the theme of foreign law observance in the various stages of the book of Isaiah, we should keep this range of meanings in mind.

The Translation of תורה with νόμος

---

[27] Neusner, *Torah,* 28.

[28] Smith, "The Use of the Word תורה," 8. The only exception to this trend is Neh 8–13, which is debated in its relation to the author of Chronicles.

[29] Fischer takes this as a given: "Es kann als sicher gelten daß in jener Zeit, in der das Jesajabuch seine Endgestalt bekam, der Pentateuch, die Tora, bereits abgeschlossen vorliegt" (Fischer, *Tora für Israel,* 14).

Since תורה's original meaning was not primarily "law" in the sense of "a rule or statute governing society," many scholars have argued that the translation of תורה with νόμος shows a more legalistic interpretation of scripture than the original authors intended. We have already seen how in many instances תורה means "instruction," yet even in these cases we often find the LXX rendering תורה with νόμος rather than a less "legalistic" equivalent, such as διδαχή.[30] Seeligmann advances such an argument, writing that תורה's "character as a binding law and moral prescription is expressed far more strongly by the Greek *νόμος* than by the Hebrew תורה."[31]

In recent years, however, scholars have come to recognize that little semantic change took place when תורה was brought into Greek with the word νόμος. Just as תורה has a rich interpretive history within Judaism, so νόμος has its own varied background in Hellenic and Hellenistic usage, with both words being used along much the same spectrum. Monsengwo-Pasinya's work on the תורה/νόμος equivalence is widely regarded as foundational, and he devotes considerable space to demonstrating their overlap. He writes that νόμος has its own "divine, political, cosmic, and royal dimensions," and he concludes:

> These resemblances between *tôrah* and *nomos*, synthesized notably in the crucial role the two terms played in their respective societies, were of a nature to orient the Alexandrian translators toward the choice of the equivalence *tôrah-nomos*. And all things considered, it seems to us that *nomos* is still the term which best rendered all the resonances of *tôrah*.[32]

---

[30] E.g., Prov 4:2 reads, תורתי אל תעזבו (NRSV, "do not forsake my teaching"), but the LXX renders this verse, τὸν ἐμὸν νόμον μὴ ἐγκαταλίπητε. Monsengwo-Pasinya writes, "A dire vrai, une traduction comme *didachê* ou *didaskalia* rendrait mieux les nuances du terme hébreu *tôrah* ; mais les traductions s'en tiennent hélas, à quelques exceptions près, à un vocabulaire légaliste" (*La Notion de* NOMOS, 19).

[31] *The Septuagint Version*, 271.

[32] "Par ses dimensions divine, politique, cosmique, et royale, *nomos* devenait ainsi le gond autour duquel pivotait toute la vie de la société grecque…. Ces ressemblances entre *tôrah* et *nomos*, synthétisées notamment dans le rôle capital que les deux termes jouaient dans leurs sociétés respectives, étaient de nature à orienter les traducteurs alexandrins vers le choix de l'équivalence *tôrah-nomos*. Et à tout bien considérer, il nous semble que *nomos* est

He is echoed by scholars such as Alan Segal and Stephen Westerholm, while E. P. Sanders concludes outright, "The semantic range of the words is approximately the same."[33]

Also of note is the influence of the translation process itself on the meaning of νόμος. From an early stage in LXX translation—and certainly by the time LXX-Isa was translated—νόμος was seen as simply the Greek equivalent of תורה, and as a result, to Greek speakers νόμος came to acquire those ideas and meanings that had been attributed to תורה.[34] The Greek term νόμος undoubtedly carried its own nuances separate from those ascribed to תורה, as is inevitable when translating such terms, and with this translation the concept of "law" was brought into conversation with an entire tradition of Greek philosophical thought surrounding νόμος. But the fact that νόμος was seen as the equivalent of תורה served to expand the meaning of νόμος to fit the Hebrew term lying behind it.[35] The same images and ideas conjured up by תורת משׁה or תורת יהוה would have been just as well brought up by νόμος Μωυσῆ or νόμος κυρίου.

One major change did take place in the meaning of תורה/νόμος during this period, and that is the continuation of the semantic shift we have been tracing through the previous sections. In the Hellenistic period, Torah did not occupy the same religious or social place as it did during exilic or Persian times. In most Judaisms during the Hellenistic period, the Pentateuch seems to

---

encore le terme qui rendait le mieux toutes les résonances de *tôrah*" (Monsengwo-Pasinya, *La Notion de* NOMOS, 201–02).

[33] *ABD* 4:255. See also Stephen Westerholm, "*Torah*, *Nomos*, and Law: A Question of 'Meaning,'" *SR* 15.3 (1986): 334–36; and Segal, "Torah and *Nomos* in Recent Scholarly Discussion," *SR* 13.1 (1984): 26–27. This conclusion is mirrored in the major Greek-English lexica, such as Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Revised Edition* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 2003), as well as Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009).

[34] According to Walter Gutbrod, "the nuances of תורה which supplement the understanding of the Law in terms of teaching, instruction and revelation also pass over to some degree into νόμος. Hence there is an expansion of meaning beyond the boundaries of traditional Gk. usage" (*TDNT* 4:1047). Segal writes of this transfer, "It is clear, however, that these Jews did not neglect the transcendent aspect of Jewish law by calling it *nomos*." ("Torah and *Nomos*," 22). See also the quotation from Tov below.

[35] See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Boston: Brill, 1999), 262 on this general tendency.

have continued its ascendency as the cornerstone of Jewish religion, and in some cases—such as at the politeuma at Heracleopolis—it possibly functioned as the source of secular legal rulings.[36]

Thus while both תורה and νόμος could still refer to wise instruction or individual laws, these terms became much more strongly identified with "*the* law." By an early point in the Hellenistic period, νόμος was already being used as a *terminus technicus* for the Pentateuch,[37] and with this association it gained the same "ideological valence" attached to this late stage of תורה.[38]

A related shift takes place in Greek renderings of "sin" and "sinfulness." By rendering word such as עון, רשׁע, and חטאת with ἀνομία, the translator brought general terms for wickedness into the realm of law, and specifically Mosaic law.[39] Here it is difficult to tell the degree to which ἀνομία was infused with the nuances of עון or רשׁע, but the shared root between νόμος/ἄνομος/ἀνομία must have influenced subsequent understanding of the translated Hebrew Bible.

---

[36] Hans-Joachim Gehrke builds on the work of Cowey, Maresch, and Tcherikover to argue that the papyri from Heracleopolis (especially P. Polit. Iud. 4, which speaks of το ειθισμενον του αποστασιου [[το]] βιβλιον) show "dass die Tora, neben den anderen Gesetzen und Verordnungen, für die Juden im hellenistischen Ägypten geltendes Recht war" (Gehrke, "Das sozial- und religionsgeschichtliche Umfeld der Septuaginta," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer and Jürgen Peter Lesch, 3 vols., BWA(N)T 161 [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004], 2:51). See also James M. S. Cowey, "Das ägyptische Judentum in hellenistischer Zeit – neue Erkenntnisse aus jüngst veröffentlichten Papyri," in ibid., 2:35, for the authority of the Jewish politeuma in Heracleopolis.

[37] See Westerholm, "*Torah*, *Nomos*, and Law," 331. This can be seen, e.g., in 4 Macc 1:34; 18:10; 2 Macc 15:9; and the prologue to Ben Sira.

[38] As one example of νόμος taking on this ideological valence, Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie define νόμος in Isa 33:6 (ἐν νόμῳ παραδοθήσονται) as "the sum total of religious qualities offering protection against imminent danger" (*Greek-English Lexicon*, 419). Their definition reads a bit too much into the text, in my opinion, but it does show the degree to which νόμος had come to assume those qualities inherent in תורה at this late stage of development. In a similar vein, Muraoka gives the primary definition of νόμος in the LXX as "body of normative rules prescribing man's conduct," with most of the entry devoted to its relation with God and Moses (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 476).

[39] According to Olofsson, the translator's "theological world, where the law of Moses stands in the centre, seems to have influenced his choice of vocabulary" ("Law and Lawbreaking," 297).

Our understanding of תורה, νόμος, and the translation process has immense implications for how we interpret foreign law observance in LXX-Isa. As we will see in more detail in the subsequent chapter, the semantic shift of תורה even in the pre-exilic period means that Isaiah of Jerusalem's understanding of תורה going out to the nations or תורה being sealed up among his disciples would have differed greatly from TI's interpretation of these same verses. By the Hellenistic period, the strong identification of νόμος with the law of Moses would have changed these verses' interpretation even further. Walter Gutbrod claims, for example, that "in Is. 8:16, what the prophet passes on to his disciples is in the LXX immediately identified with the Torah in the later sense; it is the epitome of divine teaching and the divine Law."[40] While Gutbrod overstates the case and does not give adequate room for other interpretations of νόμος current at the time, we can at least see how our understanding of these terms can impact the conclusions we draw.

We should be careful to note, however, that our access to the translator's consciousness as he translated LXX-Isa is limited. Given the wide range of meanings possible for νόμος, we cannot assume that he intended every instance of νόμος to be understood as "the Pentateuch," nor can we assume that in those cases where he *did* intend this meaning that the change was deliberate. Tov provides a word of caution in this regard:

> [T]his exegetical element was not realized on each occasion when the word was used. For example, although when the equivalents יהוה – κύριος and תורה – νόμος were first used, they may have carried certain theological overtones, the first translators seem quickly to have forgotten such implications, since they often merely rendered Hebrew words or roots automatically…. The equivalent is

---

[40] *TDNT* 4:1046.

exegetical; it also had theological implications for the readers of the LXX, but for the translators themselves it involved only semantic exegesis.[41]

In theory, the translator could have rendered תורה in Isa 8:16 with a Greek word closer to the prophet Isaiah's original meaning, perhaps διδασκαλία. But by the time of LXX-Isa's translation, the equivalence of תורה/νόμος was so well established that we should be careful before drawing any sweeping conclusions regarding how the author intended the verse to be read.

Conversion

Isaiah's description of foreigners in the final times is multi-faceted. In some ways it seems to imply their "conversion" to Judaism (whatever that may have meant at the time), while in other ways it seems to imagine a separation between Israelite and foreigners, if not the complete subservience of the latter. Interpreters both ancient and modern "routinely slip from seeing the eschatological *inclusion* of Gentiles as meaning eschatological conversion,"[42] and since "conversion" is a shifting category during this time period, any discussion of Isaiah's interpretation will be overly muddled without a firm grasp of how this idea evolved from the time of Proto-Isaiah to LXX-Isa. Thus before we can examine the text of Isaiah itself, we need to trace the evolution of conversion, much as we did with law.

Origins through the Exile

---

[41] Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 261–62. Frank Austermann makes a similar point in "Von der Tora im hebräischen Psalm 119 zum Nomos im griechischen Psalm 118: was die Wiedergabe über die Gesetzestheologie des Übersetzers verrät und was nicht," in Zenger, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, 338.

[42] Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle*, (New York: Harper Collins, 2009), 98.

Key to our understanding of conversion in this time is that in ancient societies, there was a much greater overlap between secular and religious life than we usually recognize today. Religious affiliation, in most cases, is no longer tied to ethnicity or nationality, such that although the United States is often considered a Christian nation, Americans today span the entire religious spectrum. In ancient times, however, this distinction does not seem to have held. Offices and functions we might consider secular, such as judges, kings, commerce, or even eating meat, were inextricably bound up with the religious world. It is thus not clear that we can separate religious conversion from secular concepts such as citizenship. In all likelihood, complete conversion would have meant complete assimilation into Israel's social and political world as well, with all the rights and privileges this would entail.

As we look at biblical sources through the period of exile, we would be hard pressed to find "conversion" as an operative concept in Israelite society. Foreigners—גרים and בני נכר—certainly lived among the Israelites, but these foreigners do not seem to have been fully integrated into society on either a social or religious level. Religiously, the Bible lays out numerous limitations on foreigners' cultic participation, while on a social level, as Shaye Cohen writes, "there was no legal institution by which a foreigner could be absorbed by a tribal society living on its ancestral land."[43] Many biblical laws are expressly intended to keep property within families and tribes forever, which leaves little room for the social assimilation of foreigners as anything other than landless poor. We can question the extent to which pentateuchal legislation accurately mirrored ancient Israelite practice, but the repeated classification of גרים alongside the

---

[43] *From the Maccabees,* 42. According to Cohen, this reality is why "[t]he Bible nowhere states how a *ger* might ameliorate his status and become equal to the native born" (ibid.).

poor and oppressed, as well as the exhortations to care for them, supports the idea that foreigners were excluded from full participation in Israelite society.[44]

Hand-in-hand with this social exclusion would have come religious exclusion. In ancient Israel, religion was not primarily personal devotion based on one's own encounter with the divine, but rather a communal and societal phenomenon. Thus foreigners would not have been able to participate fully in Israel's religious life, not because Israelites felt that foreigners were unworthy or unable to worship Yahweh, but simply because without social inclusion, full religious inclusion was impossible. When foreigners are excluded from קהל יהוה, for example (Deut 23:4), they are not barred due to any kind of religious inferiority; rather, this was exclusion from the "formal session for religious, military, or political purposes. In some ways, participation in the assembly was tantamount to citizenship."[45] Religious exclusion followed naturally from the fact that קהל יהוה also happened to be the religious center of the community. The intertwined nature of social and religious life thus "precluded the possibility of conversion on the part of outsiders born to other racial groups,"[46] and Shaye Cohen concludes, "The Hebrew Bible is not familiar with… the conversion of gentiles to Judaism."[47]

---

[44] Christiana van Houten challenges the notion that foreigners were not fully integrated into pre-exilic society, particularly by pointing to examples such as the Amalekite in Saul's army and Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam 1:1–10; 11:6). She believes that in the pre-monarchic period, "non-Israelites lived among Israelites, were loyal to Israel and its God, and participated in its social and cultic life. However, they nonetheless retained their ethnic identity as non-Israelites" (*The Alien in Israelite Law*, JSOTSup 107 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991], 160). In my view, the passing narrative references to such foreigners is an insufficient basis on which to reconstruct the status of גרים. Even if we grant the stories' historicity, the very fact that these individuals are identified as foreigners cautions us against seeing them as fully integrated, and we have no information on how they interacted with the larger society in religious, political, or social matters. See also John R. Spencer, "Sojourner," *ABD* 4:104.

[45] Patrick D. Miller, *The Religion of Ancient Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 200.

[46] Sim, "Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes," 10. Sim continues, "The Torah itself reflects this reality by remaining silent on the subject of conversion" (ibid.).

[47] *From the Maccabees,* 41. There are some narrative passages that deal with foreigners worshipping Yahweh, such as Ruth, Naaman, Rahab, etc., but neither their date of composition nor how much social or religious inclusion was envisioned is clear. Lester Grabbe discusses these passages and the legislative texts usually associated with pre-exilic conversion in *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*.

Yet while foreigners were excluded from participation in Israelite religion, this exclusion was not total. Despite their separated status, גרים are allowed to participate in many aspects of religious life. They can observe Passover, provided they are circumcised (Exod 12:48 and Num 9:14); offer sacrifice (Lev 17:8 and Num 15:14); offer freewill offerings and vows (Lev 22:18–19); and keep the annual pilgrimage feasts (Deut 16:11, 14; 26:11). In Deut 29:10–12, גרים are listed alongside Israelite men, women, and children as those who enter into the covenant, and Num 15:15–16 contains the sweeping statement, "As for the assembly, there is one statute for you and for the sojourning גר, an eternal statute for your generations; you and the גר will be alike before Yahweh. There will be one תורה and one ordinance for you and for the גר who sojourns with you." Many of these passages may stem from after the exile, particularly those from the Priestly and Holiness Codes, but it seems reasonable to conclude that there was at least some cultic participation by גרים, even though full conversion was not yet an option.[48]

The fact that non-Israelites could participate in Israelite religion, even to a limited degree, is important for the light it sheds on Isaiah's conception of foreigners' eschatological worship toward Yahweh. At least by the period of D, P, and H—and probably earlier—reverencing Yahweh, swearing oaths by his name, and even offering sacrifice to him did not necessarily imply religious "conversion" as we think of the term. In fact, they *could not* imply conversion,

---

(London: Routledge, 2000)*,* and he concludes that "the question of conversion seems to have become an issue mainly in the Greek and Roman periods" (295). Absent from both law and narrative in pre-exilic times is the recognition that such foreigners could become fully Israelite. In speaking of conversion in the entire Hebrew Bible, the most Beverly Gaventa is willing to admit is a "motif of the sojourner who converts to Israelite worship," but she stops well short of positing the presence of actual conversion or calling this anything more than a literary motif ("Conversion," *ABD* 1:1132).

[48] See especially Matty Cohen, "Le « ger » biblique et son statut socio-religieux," *RHR* 207.2 (1990): 131–58. I should note that this inclusion of foreigners apparently only extended to גרים, not בני נכר. For example, while Exod 12:43–48 specifies that the circumcised גר can observe Passover, the בן נכר is expressly prohibited. Deut 23:3–7 excludes some foreign nations from the קהל יהוה forever, and according to both Lam 1:10 and Ezek 44:6–7, foreign nations are prohibited from entering the sanctuary. The closest we come to religious inclusion for this group is 1 Kgs 8:41–42, where the נכרי is described as praying toward the temple.

since conversion as an institution did not yet exist.[49] Conversion, as opposed to other categories of attachment, implies that an individual would observe Israelite religion completely, including circumcision, dietary laws, purity restrictions, and so on.

Post-Exile through the Hellenistic Period

Babylonian exile fundamentally altered the way Israelites conceived of their social and religious identity. The tribal system that undergirded pre-exilic social life was badly damaged; a Diaspora had evolved with observant Jews living outside the land of Israel, with little access to priests or temple; and autonomous rule would not be reestablished until the Maccabean revolt in the second century. What had been a clear-cut distinction between Israelite and foreigner was now blurred by a series of marginal classes, such as those left in Judah while the elite were carried into captivity, Jews who stayed behind in Babylonia or Egypt, northerners of questionable descent who claimed to worship Yahweh, and so on. These classes pushed the meaning of what it meant to be Jewish, and in this tumultuous period, Jews began the process of redefining their borders along social, political, and religious lines.

Ezra and Nehemiah offer a glimpse of the early stages of this process. Upon returning from exile, the first problems to be confronted were over how to draw boundaries between the community and others. Zerubbabel receives a delegation that claims, "we seek your God as you

---

[49] See discussions of Miller, Matty Cohen, Shaye J. D. Cohen, and Sim cited above. Kellerman claims that in late texts (particularly Ezekiel and the later strata of P), גר has already come to mean "proselyte," and in support he cites examples of religious inclusion, such as Num 15:14, Ezek 14:7, and Ezek 47:22–23. As discussed above, however, partial religious inclusion is not synonymous with what we would consider conversion, at least as long as social exclusion prevented the full assimilation of foreigners into Israelite religion. Ezekiel 47 is an interesting case, for here Ezekiel provides for גרים to receive land alongside native Israelites, which would pave the way for full social and religious inclusion. *Pace* Kellerman, however, our conclusions regarding the idea of conversion in this text are limited by the fact that this is presented as an ideal future state, not as a mirror of social reality in the post-exilic period. See D. Kellerman, "גור, גר, גרות, מגורים," *TDOT* 2:446–48.

do" (Ezra 4:2), while both Ezra and Nehemiah fight to "separate all the mixed company (ערב) from Israel" (Neh 13:3). Conversion is still not mentioned as a possibility, though since this is an argument from silence, the most we can say is that we have no evidence that the institution of conversion existed in this early stage of the Persian period.[50] In the case of Ezra and Nehemiah, ethnic boundaries between Jews and foreigners seem to have won out, as seen with Ezra's concern for the "holy seed" (Ezra 9:2), but the issue was hardly settled here.

Ethnic boundaries continued to operate as a basis of Judaism through the Persian and Hellenistic periods,[51] and they still play a major role in Judaism today, but religious and social aspects were gradually rising in prominence. Over time, "Judaism gradually defined itself more as a religion than as a nationality," a transition that "is clearly under way by the period of Ezra and is more or less complete by the period of the Maccabees."[52] Simultaneously, the disruption of the tribal inheritance system and the creation of the Diaspora allowed individuals to cross the social boundaries surrounding the Jewish community, which in turn paved the way for full social

---

[50] Sim relies too heavily on this argument from silence, but his point (even if overstated) is still valid: "Even at this stage the national/racial definition of the people of Israel still held sway, and conversion for non-Israelites (or non-Jews) was not an option. Certainly no attempt was made to integrate these woman [sic] and children into the covenant community" ("Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes," 11).

[51] Of particular note is the strongly ethnic character of language surrounding Jews and Gentiles. Non-Jews are usually referred to as ἀλλόφυλοι and ἀλλοεθνεῖς, while the Jewish leader is called ἐθνάρχης, literally, "leader of the ethnic group." After surveying both Jewish and non-Jewish Hellenistic sources, John Barclay concludes, "internal and external sources agree in depicting Judaism as primarily an ethnic tradition" (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996], 408; see also 404–8).

[52] *From the Maccabees,* 9, 42. Cohen credits much of this transition to the Hasmoneans themselves, especially in their political and religious incorporation of Idumea. He writes, "in the century following the Hasmonean rebellion two new meanings of 'Judaeans' emerge: Judaeans are all those, of whatever ethnic or geographic origins, who worship the God whose temple is in Jerusalem (a religious definition), or who have become citizens of the state established by the Judaeans (a political definition). In contrast with ethnic identity, religious and political identities are mutable: gentiles can abandon their false gods and accept the true God, and non-Judaeans can become citizens of the Judaean state. Thus, with the emergence of these new definitions in the second century B.C.E., the metaphoric boundary separating Judaeans from non-Judaeans became more and more permeable" (*The Beginnings of Jewishness,* 109–110; see also 136).

inclusion—and therefore conversion.[53] Our sources for the Persian period are notoriously sparse, but by the Hellenistic period, it is clear that Judaism had undergone a major transformation. In the late second century BCE, the book of Judith takes the idea of conversion for granted, and it even portrays the leader of the Ammonites—a group forbidden from ever joining the קהל יהוה in Deut 23:3—converting to Judaism (Jdt 14:10).[54] By the turn of the era, the idea of conversion is indisputably widespread, even if scholars disagree as to how many people embraced conversion in practice.

The earliest clear example of conversion comes from the late Hellenistic period, while earlier sources are either ignorant or silent on the subject. This leaves us in the difficult position of not being able to specify what the later authors and editors of Isaiah may have envisioned regarding eschatological conversion. Did the possibility of conversion exist at the time of DI or TI's composition, even if our sources are silent on the matter? Might TI therefore have understood PI's prophecies as entailing full-scale conversion, or would this be anachronistically attributing ideas to TI that had not yet developed? Unfortunately, we cannot know.

Equally unfortunate is the fact that there are no practices mentioned in Isaiah that would definitively signal conversion. As shown above, pentateuchal law allows גרים to participate in a wide range of religious observances, including even circumcision, but none of these observances implies conversion. Even in the Roman period we read of Gentiles observing Sabbath and

---

[53] The changes allowing for greater social inclusion were critical in the development of conversion in ancient Judaism. See Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora,* 408 for a discussion of the interplay between these forces, as well as Shaye Cohen, *From the Maccabees,* 45. Cohen writes, "Acceptance by the Jewish community is essential if conversion is to be something other than a theological abstraction." For the influence of the *politeia/politeuma* on conversion, see Sim, "Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes," 12.

[54] Concerning Judith, Sim writes, "If this text was written in the decades following the Maccabean revolt, then it suggests that conversion to the Jewish tradition had become an accepted practice by the mid-second century BCE" (Sim, "Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes," 13). See also Shaye Cohen, *From the Maccabees,* 43.

dietary restrictions while still remaining separate from Judaism.[55] Thus when Isaiah speaks of

foreigners' offering vows or sacrifice to Yahweh, we cannot assume that these actions

necessarily imply conversion and full law observance, especially since criteria for membership in

the community would not be codified until centuries later.[56]

Interpreters of Isaiah would have had a wide range of possibilities when it came to

understanding the social place of those foreigners who are portrayed as engaging in Yahwistic

worship. Scot McKnight lays out the following four "levels of adherence" for Gentiles observing

Jewish practice:

> (1) There were Gentiles who simply preferred to do some things that Jews did; these were not converts but a fringe element of Judaism. (2) There were some Gentiles who were officially recognized, most of whom probably had what R. Kanter has called "instrumental commitment."[57] (3) For whatever reasons, most probably marriage, some Gentiles were socially integrated into Judaism but remained Gentiles…. (4) Some Gentiles were converted to Judaism.[58]

In theory, a central religious authority would have been able to classify which activities were

permitted to Gentiles at each level of adherence, but if such a scheme ever existed, we have no

---

[55] Sim, "Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes," 17. Hirshman notes a number of rabbinic passages that imply Gentile observance of Torah, and in speaking of the *Sifra* he writes, "If fulfilling the commandments is the issue, then R. Yirmiya quite clearly speaks of a Gentile observing Torah, not studying it. Nor does he imply conversion. The righteous Gentile, *hā ʾādām*, is rewarded for keeping Torah and will enter the gates of paradise" ("Rabbinic Universalism," 108). He concludes, "The school that I have described here was eager both to have the Gentiles 'do Torah' and was extravagant in its praise of converts…. At the same time, it encouraged Gentile observance of ritual without formal conversion" (ibid., 114). In speaking of Gentiles who observed some aspects of Jewish law, Shaye Cohen writes, "The existence of such gentiles meant that observance of Jewish rituals did not always establish a presumption of Jewishness; a gentile might be mistaken for a Jew" (*The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 149).

[56] See Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:84. Shaye Cohen writes, "there were few mechanisms in antiquity that would have provided empirical or 'objective' criteria by which to determine who was 'really' a Jew and who was not. Jewishness was a subjective identity, constructed by the individual him/herself, other Jews, other gentiles, and the state" (*The Beginnings of Jewishness,* 3).

[57] See Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).

[58] McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles,* 101.

record of it today.[59] We thus have little idea how the author of TI or LXX-Isa would have classified the worshipping foreigners portrayed in Isaiah.

A further problem with understanding the place of foreigners in Isaiah is the eschatological nature of the predicted future. As mentioned in the previous chapter, I classify many of Isaiah's prophecies as eschatological precisely because they imply a break with the current order of things. This break may well have included the nature of conversion, such that in the future there would be no such thing as "Judaism" to which one could convert. Alternatively, perhaps the eschaton included a break with Mosaic law itself, as many biblical and post-biblical authors seem to imply. Jeremiah's description of "a new covenant, unlike the covenant I made with their fathers" (Jer 31:31–32) seems to say that the current form of Mosaic law will no longer be applicable in the end times,[60] and the *Sibylline Oracles* likewise speak of how God "will put into effect a common law for men throughout the whole earth" (*Syb. Or.* 3:757–58).[61] Jewish understanding of law and the eschaton was not monolithic, and this range of possibilities was one of the key factors in propelling Isaiah to the center of these arguments.

Issues of Translation

---

[59] The distinction between types of converts drawn in Philo and the rabbinic sources post-date our material by too long to be superimposed on discussions here. See ibid., 94.

[60] In Jeremiah's conception, this new covenant was undoubtedly related in some sense to Mosaic law in its then-current form, and the case could be made that the only distinguishing features of this new covenant are that it will be written on the people's hearts and that everyone will know the Lord (Jer 31:33–34). Alternatively, one could argue that this new covenant would not be based on Mosaic law, as the author of Hebrews does. The author of Hebrews, after citing Jer 31:31–34 in its entirety, concludes, "in saying, 'a new [covenant],' he has declared the first one old…. it will soon disappear" (Heb 8:13). Regardless of how we interpret Jer 31:33–34, however, there is at least some kind of break envisioned between the "new covenant" and Mosaic law as it was then known.

[61] See Sanders, "Law," *ABD* 4:263.

Just as the meaning of תורה changed in step with Israelite conceptions of law, the

meaning of the term גר underwent a similar shift as the possibility of conversion arose in

Judaism. Before the exile, גרים were not converts, but rather "landless foreigners,"[62] or "an alien,

Israelite or non-Israelite, residing in a foreign land."[63] At some point between exile and the

rabbinic period, גר acquired the additional meaning of "convert," but our sources do not specify

when this transition took place. The most precise we can be is that גר acquired this sense at some

point before the *Mekhilta de R. Ishmael*, which is our first unequivocal witness of this use.[64]

Regardless of when we date this transition, however, the new meaning of "convert" would have

led to a radical reinterpretation of Isa 14:1, which prophesies that the גר will be joined to Israel.

In the LXX, גר is overwhelmingly translated by προσήλυτος, though we also find

equivalents such as πάροικος and γειώρας. A natural conclusion would therefore be that

προσήλυτος simply means "sojourner," as both Muraoka and Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie

imply.[65] But there has been a tendency in modern scholarship to assume that גר had acquired the

---

[62] Westbrook and Wells, *Everyday Law,* 54.

[63] Matthew Thiessen, "Revisiting προσήλυτος in 'the LXX,'" *JBL* 132.2 (2013): 333. Shaye Cohen notes, "The *gēr* remains a legally unassimilable foreign element. Indeed, the social setting of P's references to the *gēr* is unknown, and to import the notion of 'conversion' into the text is simply unwarranted by the available evidence" (*The Beginnings of Jewishness,* 121).

[64] So Thiessen, "Revisiting προσήλυτος," 334. Fixing a date for the *Mekhilta*, however, is not straightforward, as its final compilation was most likely not until the 4th c. CE, though it incorporates sayings from Mishnaic sages (see Jacob Z. Lauterbach, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael: A Critical Edition*, 2 vols. [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2004], 1:ix). According to Blenkinsopp, "During the time of the kingdoms, the *gērim* constituted a purely social category—that of resident aliens; but, by the time Isa 40–55 came to be written, the meaning 'proselyte' was already beginning to be attached to the term (e.g., Isa 14:1)" (*Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:82). In my view, the evidence does not support such an early date for גר to have acquired this meaning.

[65] Their definitions of προσήλυτος look practically identical to Hebrew lexica for גר: according to Muraoka, a προσήλυτος is "one who has arrived at a place as a foreigner" (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 594), while Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie define the term as "one who has come near (to live as an immigrant)" (*Greek-English Lexicon,* 524).

additional meaning of "convert" before the LXX was translated,[66] and subsequently whenever the LXX renders גר with προσήλυτος, the translator intended to convey this new meaning. When the translator wanted to convey the meaning of "resident alien" rather than "convert," as the theory goes, he instead used πάροικος.[67] Scholars may or may not be correct in assigning such an early date for גר to mean "convert," but recent work by Matthew Thiessen, David Moffitt, and Jacob Butera has called into question the view that προσήλυτος conveys the meaning of "convert."[68]

The first major obstacle to seeing προσήλυτος as "convert" is that this term is most likely not a neologism, despite what scholars have long assumed. Moffitt and Butera have drawn attention to P.Duk. inv. 727r, dating from the mid to late 3rd century BCE, which uses προσήλυτος in a non-Jewish setting.[69] The papyrus is fragmentary, but προσήλυτος seems to be used in the general sense of "newcomer" or "resident alien," making it a fitting equivalent for the Hebrew גר. Thiessen has also noted that the distinction προσήλυτος/"convert" and πάροικος/"resident alien" goes back to W.C. Allen's 1894 article on the topic that did not differentiate translation style between books. Once we exclude those books that use only πάροικος or only προσήλυτος, those books that use both terms do not differentiate them as modern scholars assume. Exodus, for example, uses both terms to translate גר, but it describes the Israelites in Egypt as προσήλυτοι (Exod 23:9), even though they presumably were not

---

[66] See the discussion above regarding Kellerman's claim that the meaning "proselyte" had already attached to גר by the time of Ezekiel and the later strata of P.

[67] Such is the implication of Spencer's article in *ABD*. For the word "Sojourner," he gives its equivalents as "Heb *gēr;* Gk *paroikos*," despite the fact that πάροικος is only rarely used to translate גר (Spencer, "Sojourner," *ABD* 4:103).

[68] See the next few paragraphs.

[69] Moffitt and Butera, "P.Duk. inv. 727r: New Evidence for the Meaning and Provenance of the Word Προσήλυτος," *JBL* 132.1 (2013): 159–78.

converts.[70] Προσήλυτος certainly did come to mean "convert" in later Judaism, but the widespread assumption that the LXX used the term exclusively in this sense does not fit the evidence.[71]

If גר had already gained the meaning of "convert" by the time the LXX was translated, then it is possible that in choosing this translation equivalent, the translators were infusing προσήλυτος with an additional meaning that the Greek term otherwise would not have had. This same process took place with words such as πρεσβύτερος, χριστός, and νόμος, as we saw above. But such a conclusion would need to be based on an analysis of Judaism at this time period, not on the presence of προσήλυτος in the LXX; as we have seen, the word προσήλυτος itself gives little information about how conversion or the word גר were understood at this time.[72] Thus as we address occurrences of προσήλυτος in LXX-Isa, we cannot assume a priori that the text refers to either "converts" or "resident aliens." Each determination would need to be made on an individual basis, given the context of the verse.

These same principles apply to the word γ(ε)ιώρας, which is a transliteration of the Aramaic גיורא and appears only rarely in the LXX. In LXX-Isa 14:1, we read that the γιώρας will be joined to the House of Jacob, and on this basis many have claimed that the term γιώρας must have signified "convert."[73] But if the Hebrew term גר and the Aramaic גיורא were multivalent in

---

[70] Thiessen, "Revisiting προσήλυτος," 341–48.

[71] According to Thiessen, the matter can be stated definitively: "at the time of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, the term προσήλυτος meant resident alien," not convert (ibid., 350).

[72] Shaye Cohen is similarly cautious: "What force the word 'proselyte' had in the third and second centuries B.C.E. we cannot be sure; it did not necessarily mean 'convert.'" (*The Beginnings of Jewishness,* 121).

[73] E.g., Moffitt and Butera write, "In cases in which the meaning of גר shades into 'convert,' the translators opt for the transliterated Aramaic word γειώρας" ("P.Duk. inv. 727r," 170), though their only support for this claim is the fact that this verse can be read as implying conversion. See also Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 117.

this period—that is to say, they might mean "convert," or they might mean simply "sojourner"[74]—we should have every reason to suspect that a transliterated equivalent would show the same multivalence. While interpreters are correct to note that LXX-Isa 14:1 could be interpreted to mean "convert," other occurrences in the Greek text are not so straightforward. It is unclear, for example, whether the γιώραις of LXX-Exod 12:19 refers to converts or sojourners, and the two other possible occurrences of the term are in contexts that exclude religious conversion.[75] Thus, as with προσήλυτος, rather than seeing γ(ε)ιώρας as a technical term for "convert," we need to base our understanding of the term on the context in which it occurs.

Having reviewed the range of possibilities of both תורה and conversion, we can now turn to the Hebrew texts of Isaiah to see how these concepts are envisioned in the text.

---

[74] As far as I can tell, no study has been carried out on the meaning of גיורא and its association with conversion in this time period. Jastrow (*A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Bavli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, With an Index of Scriptural Quotations*, 2 vols. [New York: Pardes, 1950], 1:236) and Jacob Levy (*Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, 4 vols. [Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876–1889], 1:327) mention "proselyte" as one of its meanings, in addition to "sojourner," but it is unclear how early this meaning is attested.

[75] These two disputed occurrences are in Lev 19:34 and Exod 2:22. Leviticus 19:34 speaks of the Israelites as sojourners in Egypt, but the reading γειώραι/γηωραι only occurs in a few Hexaplaric manuscripts and seems to be secondary. Exodus 2:22 likewise unambiguously deals with sojourning (this is Moses's reflection that he was a sojourner in another land), but the reading γειωρας is only attested in a quotation of this passage by Philo. See Peter Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*, ed. D. W. Gooding (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 34.

Chapter 3: Foreigners and Law Observance in the Hebrew Texts of Isaiah

To understand how LXX-Isa interprets the theme of foreign eschatological law observance in the book of Isaiah, we first need to investigate the development of this theme within the Hebrew text itself. As will be seen, even before the book of Isaiah had reached its final form, ideas surrounding foreigners and law observance had already undergone significant changes, such that Proto-Isaiah himself would probably have been surprised at the way some of his writings were being recast and reinterpreted by Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah. We therefore cannot ascribe theological changes to the author of LXX-Isa simply because his interpretation of PI differs from the way PI intended his oracles to be read; we have to account for how the idea of eschatological law observance evolved over the course of the book's composition.

The Unity of the Hebrew Tradition

Our knowledge of the Hebrew texts of Isaiah is limited to 1) medieval manuscripts representing the Masoretic tradition, 2) copies of Isaiah among the scrolls at Qumran, as well as citations of the book within the Qumran literature, and 3) Hebrew retroversions of Isaiah's various translations—primarily the Septuagint. The high degree of resemblance between MT-Isa and LXX-Isa was noted in Chapter 1, and the scrolls from Qumran attest a similar degree of textual uniformity. Darrell Hannah notes, "all the manuscripts of Isaiah from the Judean desert either preserve texts which are clearly proto-Masoretic (1QIsa[b], 4QIsa[a,b,d–g]) or are related to the MT (1QIsa[a]; 4QIsa[c])." Thus, "the text of Isaiah circulated in a more homogenous form than other

books of the Hebrew Bible."[1] Hannah is echoed by Blenkinsopp, who writes that "[w]hat is most striking about the Qumran Isaiah fragments in general is that, with few and unimportant exceptions, they are identical with the medieval Masoretic text."[2]

The one possible exception to this homogeneity is 1QIsaᵃ. 1QIsaᵃ shows roughly 1,480 variants when compared with MT,[3] most of which are variations in spelling or otherwise inconsequential, but a fair number could be interpreted to have a significant impact on the meaning of the text. Despite these differences, most scholars have shied away from claiming that 1QIsaᵃ differs recensionally from MT or shows its own consistent theology, and most authors effectively conclude that "in general, 1QIsaᵃ provides no basis for a distinctive and consistent approach to the interpretation of the book."[4]

There have been a few vocal scholars, however, who have challenged this view. Most prominent in this group is Paulson Pulikottil, who claims that "in making explicative changes, the scribe [of 1QIsaᵃ] has exegetical concerns found also in the scribes and tradents of the Second Temple Period. This scribal practice has in general to do with the intention to present a text that is historically and theologically 'accurate.'"[5] While the majority of Pulikottil's thesis falls outside the scope of this dissertation, he does argue that 1QIsaᵃ shows a consistent, differing

---

[1] Hannah, "Isaiah within Judaism," 11.

[2] *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:68.

[3] Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book,* 90.

[4] Ibid., 91. Even Arie Rubenstein, who argues that a number of changes in 1QIsaᵃ are theologically motivated, concedes that "[t]he nature of the variant readings in the Isaiah Scroll is not such as would justify the view that the theology proper of the Scroll differs materially from that of the Book of Isaiah in the MT…. What can be claimed, however, is that the readings admit of the interpretation given of them and are consistent with their suggested purpose" ("The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll," *JJS* 6.4 [1955]: 187). See also Van der Kooij, "The Old Greek of Isaiah," 197.

[5] *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsaᵃ*, JSPSup 34 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 138.

theology regarding the "place and significance that Torah held in the scribe's thinking," especially in its relation to foreigners in the last days.[6] Pulikottil's argument in this area is instructive for how we understand the unity of the Hebrew texts regarding foreigners' law observance, so it is worth examining in some detail.

As Pulikottil points out, the nations' pilgrimage to Mount Zion in 1QIsaᵃ 2:3 shows two differences from MT: first, the scribe has dropped אל הר יהוה. Thus while MT reads, "many peoples will say, 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh, to the house of the God of Jacob," in 1QIsaᵃ the peoples are only going to the house of the God of Jacob, not to the mountain of Yahweh. Second, the phrase "he will teach us his ways" (וירנו) is changed in 1QIsaᵃ to "*they* will teach us his ways" (וירונו). On the basis of these two differences, Pulikottil claims that the concluding phrase, מציון תצא תורה, should be reinterpreted in 1QIsaᵃ to mean that the law has "departed" from Zion, meaning that Zion will no longer be the seat of law or instruction as in MT. He writes, "It is reasonable thus to conclude that the scribe has understood this passage as suggesting that the Law is relocated from Zion to the *house of the God of Jacob*, where 'they' have taken upon themselves the role of teaching the ways of God."[7]

In analyzing Pulikottil's argument, we should note that while the omission of אל הר יהוה from 1QIsaᵃ 2:3 is interesting, it is difficult to know how much significance we should attribute to this difference. For example, does 1QIsaᵃ represent a change from the scribe's base text (=MT), or is it possible that this difference was already present in the scribe's *Vorlage*? If the Qumran scribe did make the change, did this scribe differentiate between "the mountain of Yahweh" and "the house of the God of Jacob," as Pulikottil suggests, or did he see "the

---

[6] Ibid., 145.

[7] Ibid., 146, emphasis in original.

mountain of Yahweh" as simply another name for the temple? (Compare, for example, the opening line of this oracle in Isa 2:2, which speaks of the temple as הר בית יהוה.) For Pulikottil's argument to stand, he needs to present a reasonable case that the scribe did differentiate between the two terms. Further, although Pulikottil argues that the scribe "changes" וירנו (MT) to plural (וירונו, 1QIsaᵃ), it should be noted that the consonantal form in MT could be read as a defectively-written plural, and thus the text of 1QIsaᵃ could simply represent a *plene* writing of a different vocalization tradition rather than a deliberate change.[8] It is also unclear why a "change" from singular to plural should support the view that Zion is no longer the seat of law.[9] This is slender evidence on which to base the sweeping claim that 1QIsaᵃ understands מציון תצא תורה as "the Law has departed from Zion." Additionally, the restored Zion is elsewhere spoken of positively in 1QIsaᵃ (e.g., 4:5; 14:32; 18:7; 24:23; etc.), which makes this reading even more problematic. Thus while Pulikottil's proposed meaning is theoretically possible, there is not enough evidence to conclude that this is the most likely reading or that the scribe held a fundamentally different view of law.

The other major scholar who claims that 1QIsaᵃ shows a differing theology of foreign law observance is Jean Koenig, who writes, "those responsible for 1QIsaᵃ have given their recension another orientation that denies the nations the benefit of the Law and reduces them to the service of Israel."[10] As his primary evidence, Koenig points to Isa 42:4, which speaks of the Servant and

---

[8] 1QIsaᵃ uses *plene* forms much more frequently than MT. See Eric D. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology,* RBS 76 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 35–37, as well as 209–23 for discussion of the morphology of suffixed forms at Qumran.

[9] Additionally, 1QIsaᵃ may simply reflect a variant reading unconnected with the Qumran scribe. The parallel passage in Mic 4:2 is rendered in the LXX, καὶ δείξουσιν ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, suggesting that the translator either read וירונו or understood וירנו as plural.

[10] "[L]es responsables de Qa ont donné à leur recension une autre orientation qui fait perdre aux nations le bénéfice de la Loi, et les réduit au service d'Israël" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 357).

reads in MT, "the coastlands wait for his torah" (ולתורתו איים ייחלו).[11] In 1QIsaᵃ, by contrast, torah is explicitly plural (though again, the form in MT could be understood as a defectively-written plural), and the verb is changed, so that the passage now reads, ולתורתיו איים ינחילו . By Koenig's own admission, this passage in 1QIsaᵃ is highly ambiguous, and it is not at all clear whether the coastlands are seen as inheritors of the laws, receiving inheritance according to the laws, or apportioning inheritance to Israel according to the laws.[12] He argues for the latter interpretation on the basis of Isa 49:8,[13] but again, the evidence on which this conclusion rests is extremely narrow. Much as we saw with Pulikottil, Koenig offers one way to understand this verse, but even if we grant Koenig's reading as the most likely interpretation, one ambiguous verse is an insufficient basis for claiming that the scribe of 1QIsaᵃ had a different conception of foreigners and their future relationship with law. Were we to accept Koenig's claim, what then should we make of the other passages in 1QIsaᵃ that imply foreigners' law observance (e.g., 2:2–3; 19:21; 42:6; 49:6–8; 51:4; 56:6–7; and 66:21)?

Notice how both Koenig and Pulikottil have structured their arguments. These scholars base their conclusions on small-scale changes within one verse, and in both cases, the proposed interpretation of these changes is speculative. Neither scholar appeals to a broader *Tendenz* of the

---

[11] The verb here appears in numerous different forms in various manuscripts. The Masoretic tradition as a whole favors ייחלו, but L has ייחילו, and 4QIsaʰ reads יחילו.

[12] "La forme Qa du texte ne paraît finalement pas se justifier d'une manière plausible par ses éléments internes. Il semble donc qu'elle doive s'expliquer par quelque spéculation qui éclairait le texte par des éléments complémentaires" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 359).

[13] "[I]l paraît clair que, par rapport à l'orientation universaliste sans restriction de H = TM, les 2 retouches de Qa visaient à un même dessein qui était de tourner l'universalisme…. Les îles (partie limite, pour le tout) ne sont plus dans l'attente de la religion universelle dont Israël a le dépôt et que transmet le Serviteur, mais elles sont mises au service d'une mission qui s'exprime dans le vb « faire hériter »" (ibid., 364).

scribe, and we see no evidence of systematic changes beyond the verse in question.[14] In sum,

even those scholars who defend the idea that 1QIsaᵃ reflects a distinctive theology independent

of MT recognize that the scroll does not show widespread evidence of this theology.

For these reasons, I find Koenig and Pulikottil's arguments unconvincing in regard to the

theology of law in 1QIsaᵃ; the evidence marshalled is insufficient to support the weight of the

conclusions drawn from it. In addition, the way they have structured their argument shows the

remarkable uniformity of the Hebrew texts of Isaiah. 1QIsaᵃ does give us an example of "the

kind of glossed and reworked manuscript that the LXX prototype must have been," as van der

Kooij states,[15] but when it comes to the theology of law, foreigners, and eschatological

observance, the Hebrew tradition does not show significant differences across manuscripts.[16] For

the remainder of this chapter, therefore, I will refer to "the Hebrew tradition" as a relatively

homogenous unit, and I will note those areas where any major text or group of texts witnesses a

different reading than the one cited.

Diachronic Analysis of Isaiah

Before we begin an examination of law and foreign worship in the various stages of

Isaiah's composition, we should note that the redaction history of this book is immensely

---

[14] Cf. the criticism of Blenkinsopp: "It is not always easy to determine whether the frequent changes… are intentional.… We would expect a more consistent interpretive pattern throughout. The same uncertainty besets other alleged instances of ideological changes" (*Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:122).

[15] Van der Kooij, "The Old Greek of Isaiah," 202.

[16] This is not to say that the Qumran community held the same notions surrounding eschatological foreign law observance that we find in the book of Isaiah; rather, we do not have sufficient evidence *in the preserved manuscripts of Isaiah from Qumran* to draw conclusions concerning the community's theology. Whatever this community believed about the topic, they do not seem to have encoded their belief in either the manuscripts of Isaiah or the pesharim surrounding it. (For the one tantalizing exception to this, see the fragmentary pesher 4Q163, as discussed in Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 112–13.)

complicated. Much of Isaiah 1–39 can be attributed in some sense to Isaiah of Jerusalem, but much of this material is hotly contested, with many passages (e.g., Isaiah 1, 24–27, 36–39, etc.) attributed to exilic or post-exilic authors. Even within Isaiah 56–66, the section commonly referred to as "Third Isaiah," traces of literary growth are evident, and not all of this material can be safely ascribed to the same author or time period.[17]

While I follow the scholarly consensus on Isaiah's compositional history, for the purposes of this dissertation the exact date of any particular verse is of secondary importance. Instead, my primary concern is in tracing how the various passages of Isaiah would or could have been understood at various times in Israel's history. For example, in Isa 2 we read that תורה will go out to the nations, and the date of this passage is fiercely debated, as I will discuss below. Yet a reasonable case could be made for pre-exilic authorship, and thus it is worth at least considering how readers would have interpreted the text in an eighth-century context.[18] It may well be that the passage was actually composed in the post-exilic period, but by examining the text in a pre-exilic light, as if it came from Isaiah of Jerusalem, we can get a better handle on how the cultural context of this period would have influenced readers' understanding of these verses. Once this datum has been established, it can be enlightening to compare this interpretation with how the passage would have been understood in the post-exilic period, after Israel's institutions had evolved and the book of Isaiah had reached its final form. The same reasoning would hold, *mutatis mutandis*, for exilic and post-exilic passages.

---

[17] See discussion below.

[18] This consideration is particularly important lest our investigation suffer from selection bias. If a priori I label as post-exilic all passages where foreign law observance could be implied, then the selected verses will tell us less about the history of Isaiah's interpretation than about my own thoughts on the evolution of Israelite religion (cf. George Gray, who sees Isa 2:2–5 as a late text because "some of the particular *ideas*… leave the impression of a passage that was written nearer to the time of chs. 40–55 and Ezek" [*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I–XXXIX* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), 43–44, emphasis added]).

With the character of this tradition in mind, we can now turn to the development of law and foreign worship within the book of Isaiah.

Law and Foreigners in the Pre-Exilic Stages of the Book of Isaiah

As was shown in the previous chapter, at the time Proto-Isaiah would have been written, the idea and process of conversion to Israelite religion had not yet developed, as far as we can discern from the evidence. Foreigners could offer homage to Yahweh, as Naaman does, and גרים were likely permitted to participate in a range of cultic activities. But the idea of foreigners one day "converting" to Israelite religion would have been as incongruous as a people "converting" their ethnicity. This is not to say a priori that PI could not have spoken of foreign conversion; after all, there is no reason why a prophet could not have introduced a new concept into Israelite religion. But it does mean that the conceptual framework surrounding conversion did not yet exist, so if PI were to introduce this concept, he would need to simultaneously introduce a frame of reference for people to understand his words.

In this same period, the term תורה had not yet come to signify "law" as we usually think of the term, much less did it signify any standard collection of laws, such as the law of Moses. The word תורה had priestly, prophetic, and wisdom uses, but as we saw in the previous chapter, the term's legal connotations would not fully develop until the seventh century BCE.

As an example of תורה's early usage, consider how Isa 8:16 would have been understood in an eighth-century context. The passage reads: צור תעודה חתום תורה בלמדי, and though the precise meaning is difficult, it is commonly translated, "Bind the testimony; seal the teaching among my disciples." As I will argue in the next chapter, in the Septuagint this passages comes to be understood as referring to Mosaic law, and such a referent even makes sense within the Hebrew

tradition by the time the text reaches its final form.[19] But at the time of Isaiah of Jerusalem, such

a view would be anachronistic.

In the broader literary context, Isaiah has been called to preach a message of destruction

(Isa 6:9–12), and after a failed attempt to persuade Ahaz to rely on Yahweh (Isa 7), Isaiah takes a

scroll, writes of plunder and spoil, and has the scroll attested (עוד) by reliable witnesses (עדים).

Yahweh reiterates his message of destruction "because this people refused the waters of Shiloh"

(Isa 8:6), and the testimony (תעודה) is sealed up while Isaiah "wait[s] for Yahweh, who hides his

face from the house of Jacob" (Isa 8:16–17). In this context, the תעודה of Isa 8:16 most likely

refers to Isaiah's own words and actions, and תורה thus stands in synonymous parallel in its

original meaning of "instruction," as nearly every modern commentator has acknowledged.[20]

The book of Isaiah itself seems to acknowledge this meaning in Isa 29:11, which brings together

the book's title as "the vision of Isaiah" (Isa 1:1, cf. 2:1) and a reference back to the sealed

---

[19] Consider, for example, how the invocation of pentateuchal covenant curses in Isa 1 recasts Israel's rebellion as against Mosaic law, as well as how the Servant figure in Deutero-Isaiah recasts the prophet as a second Moses (see, e.g., Gordon P. Hugenberger, "The Servant of the Lord in the 'Servant Songs' of Isaiah: A Second Moses Figure," in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*, ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995], 105–40). Andrew Teeter highlights the impact that Isaiah's final form has on interpretation of this section, and he notes, "While determining the meaning of 'torah' and 'testimony' in Isa 8 is famously problematic for critical commentators, it appears that the author of *Jubilees* understood the chapter within the sequence and arrangement of the book of Isaiah as depicting a prophet who proclaims the divine decrees of the (Mosaic) 'Torah' (Isa 1:10), is rejected by the people (5:24), writes down his 'testimony' with a view toward the future judgment (8:16–17; cf. 30:8–9), and exhorts others to look ahead to a time of salvation (8:20). Thus, Isaiah's 'witness' in ch. 8 is seen as a functional repetition of the depiction of Moses in the Pentateuch" ("Torah, Wisdom, and the Composition of Rewritten Scripture: Jubilees and 11QPsa in Comparative Perspective," in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, ed. idem and Bernd U. Schipper, JSJSup 163 [Leiden: Brill, 2013], 249). In this context, the prophet Isaiah could be seen as sealing up the (Mosaic) Torah in an act of judgment against the people.

[20] Jensen writes, "the terms 'attestation' (*tᵉʿûdâ*) and 'instruction' (*tôrâ*) obviously refer to teaching of some sort that has already been given and now awaits confirmation and verification" (*The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah*, 107), while Lohfink translates תורה here as "Lehre des Propheten" (idem and Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker,* 47). See also Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 1:243 and Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 154–57.

prophetic word when it says, "the vision of all this has become as the words of the sealed book."[21]

All of this is to emphasize the point made in the previous chapter, that "If *tôrâ* acquired [a legal] meaning during the period in which Dt began to assume its present form, as many hold, then there is a certain presumption that occurrences in texts of an earlier period ought to be understood in some other sense."[22] Blenkinsopp and Smith assert across the board that all instances of תורה ascribed to Proto-Isaiah should be understood as "prophetic teaching" or "wise instruction," and Isa 8:16 provides the clearest case in support of this claim.[23]

With this in mind, let us turn now to one of the pivotal texts in determining how PI would have conceived of foreign nations and their relation to Israel's law. Isaiah 2:2–3 reads:

2 והיה באחרית הימים נכון יהיה הר בית־יהוה בראש ההרים ונשׂא מגבעות ונהרו אליו כל־הגוים	2 In days to come, the mountain of the house of Yahweh will be established at the top of the mountains and will be exalted above the hills, and all the nations will flow to it.
3 והלכו עמים רבים ואמרו לכו ונעלה אל־הר־יהוה אל־בית אלהי יעקב וירנו מדרכיו ונלכה בארחתיו כי מציון תצא תורה ודבר־יהוה מירושלם	3 And many peoples will go and say, "Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh, to the house of the God of Jacob, that he may teach us his ways, and that we may walk in

---

[21] See Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 9. When Isa 8:16 is examined in the context of the final form of the book, Blenkinsopp claims that the sealed תורה and תעודה are "understood as the book of Isaiah read and interpreted from an eschatological-apocalyptic perspective" (ibid., 26).

[22] Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 14.

[23] See Smith, "The Use of the Word תורה," 21; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 1:109; and Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 1, 26, and 67.

	his paths.” For תורה will go out from Zion, and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem.

Before we examine the content of this oracle, the first issue that needs to be resolved is that of authorship. The same prophecy appears with minor variation in Mic 4:1–3, and every conceivable explanation for authorship and direction of dependence has been defended by various scholars.[24] Although absolute consensus will likely never be achieved, I find the arguments in favor of pre-exilic Isaianic authorship to be compelling. First and foremost is the fact that Proto-Isaiah shows a well-developed Zion theology in which Zion is elected and defended by God.[25] Micah, on the other hand, couches his prophecies of renewal in explicitly non-Zionistic terms. As von Rad writes, “for Micah this new beginning is bound up with the elimination of the old royal city, the total obliteration of Jerusalem from the pages of history (Mic. III. 12), whereas… Isaiah looks for a renewal of Jerusalem.”[26] Second, themes present in this oracle fit well with what we see elsewhere in PI’s writing. Jensen has shown PI’s continual engagement with wisdom ideas and polemic against wisdom not deriving from Yahweh, and this passage is saturated with wisdom terminology: ירה, דרך, ארח, דבר, and תורה.[27] Blenkinsopp comes

---

[24] For a summary of these arguments, see Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 86; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 1:190; H. G. M. Williamson, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1–27*, (London: T&T Clark, 2006)*,* 174–79; and Feuillet, “La conversion et le salut des nations,” 13.

[25] See, e.g., Isa 1:27; 4:3–5; 10:12; 12:6; 14:32; 29:8; 31:4; 33:20; and 34:8. Williamson recognizes “that the passage stands squarely within the Zion tradition complex” as articulated in both PI and the Psalms of Zion (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 175), but he claims that the slight differences between how Isa 2:2–4 and the remainder of PI talk about Zion argues against a pre-exilic date for this passage. In my view, such differences (e.g., that the foreign invasion of Judah is described as a flood in Isa 8:7 while the “flowing” [ונהרו] imagery of Isa 2:2 is peaceful) do not represent enough of a traditio-historical development to merit positing a separate author for Isa 2:2–4.

[26] *Old Testament Theology*, 2.170–71. Jensen similarly writes, “the prophet who foretold that Zion would be plowed like a field (Mic 3:12) is unlikely to have seen the same place as the center of the saving pilgrimage of the nations” (*The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 86).

[27] See Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 91 and passim.

to a similar conclusion based on the fact that "the complex of topoi represented in the passage…

is more at home" in Isaiah.[28] Isaianic authorship thus seems more likely than attributing the

passage to either Micah or a later redactor.[29]

Looking at the content of the oracle, we can see that its eschatological tenor is

unmistakable, especially given its setting באחרית הימים and its description of a future in which the

fundamental order of society has been upturned.[30] Jerusalem and the temple will be exalted,

foreign nations will pay homage to Israel and its God, and nations will no longer learn war (Isa

2:4). What kind of relationship, then, is envisioned between these foreign pilgrims and law

observance? Isaiah says that they will be taught in God's ways and walk in his paths, but this

terminology is highly ambiguous, and there is little in the oracle itself that would indicate what

Isaiah meant.

As was noted above, this section is filled with wisdom terminology, and a reasonable

case could be made that "walking in God's paths" entails nothing more than engaging in the kind

of upright conduct advocated in books such as Proverbs. On the other extreme, one could also

say that "walking in God's paths" entails full observance of all God's law, as seen for example in

Ps 119:1 ("Happy are those whose path is perfect, who walk in the Torah of Yahweh"). But

while both of these interpretations are theoretically possible, the historical context in which PI

wrote makes the former much more likely than the latter. As we have seen above, תורה in this

---

[28] *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 1:190.

[29] Attributing the passage to DI, TI, or a later redactor of the book is possible, but the oracle's presence in Micah militates against this option. In addition, scholars have noted that Zech 8:20–23, 2 Kgs 19:31/Isa 37:32, Isa 51:4, and Isaiah 60 all seem to be dependent upon Isa 2:2–4 (see Williamson, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 177, drawing upon the work of Renaud, Fishbane, Sommer, and Clifford). Given this widespread currency and how well the oracle fits the rest of PI, a pre-exilic date of composition seems most likely.

[30] See discussion in de Sousa, *Eschatology and Messianism*, 41–42, as well as Marvin A. Sweeney, "Eschatology in the Book of Isaiah," in *The Book of Isaiah: Enduring Questions Answered Anew*, ed. Richard J. Bautch and J. Todd Hibbard (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 179–95.

period—and elsewhere in PI—is not used in the sense of "law" or any collection of legal material, and we have no evidence for positing that this pericope is unique in using תורה in its later sense. That is to say, Proto-Isaiah says nothing that is explicitly or necessarily "legalistic" vis-à-vis foreign nations, neither here nor in the passage's broader literary context.[31] On the other hand, there is ample evidence that terms such as תורה and "walking in God's paths" were used in wisdom contexts in this period, and PI himself shows a constant engagement with this wisdom tradition.[32] Further leading us away from a legalistic interpretation of this passage is the fact that nowhere else do we see a desire in PI for foreign nations to observe Israelite law; even when the nations are condemned, they are attacked exclusively on the basis of what Blenkinsopp calls "a traditional consensual social ethic" rather than on any specifically Israelite law or custom.[33] The most likely interpretation of these verses is thus that PI did not prophesy complete foreign observance of Israelite law.

A second approach to understanding this text is through the lens of 8th-century ideas surrounding conversion, and this approach confirms what we have just noted. As seen in the previous chapter, foreigners, and particularly גרים, were allowed to participate to a limited degree in Israelite worship, but social exclusion precluded the development of conversion until after the exilic period. Full-scale conversion was not an operative category in pre-exilic Israelite thinking,

---

[31] One possible exception is noted by Fischer, who points out that the nations' goal is הר יהוה, a term which is equated in Num 10:33 with Sinai. She notes, "Der kontext verbindet dort assoziativ den Berg der Tora Offenbarung mit dem Zion" (*Tora für Israel,* 27). The link seems tenuous, however, and without any additional literary ties between the two texts, I am skeptical that the parallel can shed any real light on PI's intentions. See also Lohfink and Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker,* 41, 45–46.

[32] See Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* passim*.* Lohfink likewise claims that תורה is here "am besten mit »Weisung« übersetzbar" (idem and Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker,* 40).

[33] Blenkinsopp writes, "This does not oblige us to conclude that no written legal compilation was in existence in the eighth century B.C.E., but it does suggest that Isaiah and other dissidents of that time authorized their categorical ethical demands and their teaching with reference to a traditional consensual social ethic rather than to specific legal enactments" (*Isaiah: A New Translation*, 1:109).

and nothing in Isa 2 explicitly goes beyond the common pre-exilic idea that foreign nations would one day submit to Israel and recognize Yahweh's supremacy as God. Further, the primary barrier to full conversion—namely, a lack of social integration—seems to be still operative in PI, including in Isa 2. The nations come to Zion not as equals with the Israelites, but apparently as subordinates, after Jerusalem is "exalted above the hills" and "established at the top of the mountains." All throughout PI, the nations are continually depicted as Judah's enemies, and they are never addressed with the kind of inclusive language reserved only for Israel.[34] Given the text's 8th-century setting and its continued subordination of foreigners, it would be a mistake to read later ideas of conversion into this passage. Nothing in the text would indicate that these foreigners would have observed Israelite law or religious practice any more than did contemporaneous גרים.

What type of relationship, then, did PI envision between foreigners and Israelite law? As I have endeavored to show in this section, phrasing the question in these terms is problematic, for the terminology used in this pericope would not have been considered legalistic in the 8th century, nor would either PI or his audience have conceptualized this eschatological period as one of full-fledged "conversion" to Yahwistic religion. It would have likely never occurred to PI that these foreigners might undergo circumcision, observe Israelite purity laws, or enter a covenant relationship with Yahweh. Rather, consistent with broader themes seen in PI's writing, this oracle primarily deals with the exaltation of Zion and worldwide recognition of Yahweh's supremacy.[35] According to PI, Yahweh will teach the nations his ways and they will walk in his

---

[34] See Huber, *Jahwe, Juda und die Anderen Völker,* 9. Huber notes, "Wenn Jesaja von Juda in seinem Verhältnis zu Jahwe spricht, verwendet er oft Nomina, die dem personalen Bereich entstammen. So wird an 10 Stellen von Juda als Jahwes ʿam gesprochen. Dreimal werden die Judäer *banîm* genannt. Dagegen verwendet Jesaja für andere Völker häufig dinghafte Bezeichnungen oder er redet von ihnen in Tiervergleichen" (ibid., 205).

[35] See, ibid., 183.

paths, but these terms are best understood within a wisdom (i.e., not specifically Israelite)

context, where the nations finally internalize the general moral code by which they are

condemned in the rest of PI. In line with this interpretation, PI prophesies that they will beat their

swords into plowshares and no longer learn war (Isa 2:4). The תורה that goes out from Zion is

likewise best understood as wise instruction, as shown by its parallel, "the word of Yahweh" that

goes out from Jerusalem.

Two other passages in Isa 1–39 illustrate this non-legalistic view of foreign worship of

Yahweh. Isaiah 18:7 and 19:18–24 are both of disputed authorship, and they may well stem from

the exilic period or later. But again, it will be useful to examine these texts as if they were

composed by PI—regardless of their actual origin—to see how "universalistic" passages would

have been interpreted in a pre-exilic context.

Isaiah 18 is an oracle of judgment against "those beyond the rivers of Ethiopia" (Isa

18:1), and to this oracle has been appended the following notice in Isa 18:7:

בעת ההיא יובל־שׁי ליהוה צבאות עם ממשׁך ומורט ומעם נורא מן־הוא והלאה גוי קו־קו ומבוסה אשׁר בזאו נהרים ארצו אל־מקום שׁם־יהוה צבאות הר־ציון	At that time, gifts will be brought to Yahweh of Hosts (by)[36] a people tall and smooth—from a people feared near and far, a nation mighty and trampling, whose land is washed (?) by rivers—to the place of the name of Yahweh of Hosts: Mount Zion.

Scholars are divided as to whether this passage should be attributed to PI, DI, or TI,

partly because the prose addition contrasts in style to the preceding oracle in 18:1–6 and partly

---

[36] "By" seems to be the best way to make sense of the Hebrew here, and 1QIsaᵃ even has מעם here instead of עם as attested in the rest of the Hebrew tradition. Other Hebrew witnesses change the passive יובל to the presumably active יבל

because of its positive view of foreign nations' coming to Mount Zion. But if, for the sake of argument, we assume that the verse was written by PI, we can see that nothing in this text necessarily implies either foreign law observance or abstention. Their journey to "the place of the name of Yahweh of Hosts" suggests recognition of Yahweh's rule, but recognition need not entail ritual observance of Yahweh's religious rules, nor does it necessarily follow that this recognition is monotheistic—especially since strict monotheism would not come to full expression until DI and the time of exile. As with Isa 2:2–3, this passage is ambiguous enough that it could be read as supporting either full law observance or full abstention, with the reader being left to fill in the gaps on her own. In such a situation, as we saw with Isa 2:2–3, these gaps would most likely be filled in a manner consistent with the social and religious norms of the time, namely, that foreigners cannot "convert" to Israelite religion, nor would they be expected to adhere to those rules that applied only to Israelites.

In this context, it is worth returning to a point made above, that it is not a priori impossible for PI to have preached a new concept or a radically reimagined relationship between foreigners and the laws connected with Israel's God. But given what we know about the religious milieu of the eighth century, if Isaiah were to have preached such a novel concept, he would need to have also introduced a conceptual framework in which these new teachings could have been understood. This is not to say that he would need a discussion on "theories and methods," as if he were preaching a graduate-level seminar; rather, he would need to have been explicit enough that his words would not have been misinterpreted under then-current ideas about foreigners, conversion, and law observance. If Isaiah were to say, "foreigners will come to the temple," his audience would have envisioned this prophecy using familiar concepts and experiences, such as their knowledge of cultic participation of גרים. Had Isaiah wanted to convey

a break from past experience, this break would need to be articulated clearly enough to displace his audience's current "intertext": the "commonplace phrases or figures from the linguistic or cultural systems in which the text exists."[37] Without such a clearly articulated break, we can assume that contemporaneous readers or listeners would have filled in any ambiguous images or phrases with their contemporaneous intertext. In the two passages cited in PI so far, we have not seen such a break.

The final example potentially from PI—though again, this oracle's authorship is disputed[38]—comes from Isa 19:18–24. Because the Hebrew of this passage is straightforward, I provide only the translation here:

> [18]On that day, there will be five cities in Egypt speaking the language of Canaan and swearing to Yahweh of Hosts. One will be called, "City of Destruction" [עיר ההרס]. [19]On that day, there will be an altar to Yahweh in the midst of Egypt, and a standing stone at its border to Yahweh. [20]It will be a sign and a testimony to Yahweh of Hosts in Egypt, for they will cry out to Yahweh before their oppressors, and he will send a savior, he will contend, and he will deliver them. [21]Yahweh will be known by Egypt, and Egypt will know Yahweh on that day. And they will perform sacrifices and offerings [ועבדו זבח ומנחה], and they will swear and fulfill vows to Yahweh…. [24]On that day, Israel will be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the land, [25]whom Yahweh will bless, saying, "Blessed is my people, Egypt; and the work of my hands, Assyria; and my inheritance, Israel."

On the surface, this oracle is remarkably inclusive of foreigners in Yahwistic worship, and Monsengwo-Pasinya has noted that it "is striking for its universalism."[39] Egyptians will swear

---

[37] Benjamin Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 7.

[38] Ulrich Berges, for example, places its composition in the late Persian period (*The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*, trans. Millard C. Lind, Hebrew Bible Monographs 46 [Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012], 149), while Gray writes, "The style does not point conclusively to any definite date, though it is just such as a late writer familiar with the Scriptures might have written" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 332). Huber goes even further, excluding 2:2–5, 18:7, and 19:18–25 from PI on the grounds that these are passages "bei denen aber weitgehende Einigkeit darüber herrscht, daß sie nicht von dem Propheten des 8. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. stammen" (*Jahwe, Juda und die Anderen Völker,* 3).

[39] "Si d'emblée le texte d'Isa. xix 16-26 frappe par son universalisme, les analyses que nous venons de faire viennent confirmer cette impression d'ensemble. Le jour viendra donc, où les prérogatives spirituelles d'Israël,

oaths to Yahweh, perform sacrifices and offerings on an altar to him, fulfill vows to him, cry out

to him for deliverance, and be blessed as one of Yahweh's people, alongside the Assyrians and

Israelites. This certainly qualifies as an upheaval of the current order. The question that presents

itself, then, is where this oracle would have situated Egypt relative to Israel and Yahweh in the

minds of an 8th-century audience.

Egypt is portrayed as participating in a wide array of religious rites, but it is noteworthy

that none of these rites falls outside that which is permitted to גרים in pentateuchal legislation, as

outlined in the previous chapter. Thus while the extent of religious participation may be

surprising, it does not encroach on what we know of the boundaries separating Israelite and

foreigner in pre-exilic times.

The presence of covenant language merits serious attention. Isaiah says that Yahweh will

be known (נודע) by the Egyptians and that they will know him, language which is elsewhere used

to describe Israel's unique relationship with Yahweh (e.g., Amos 3:2, "Only you have I known,

of all the families of the earth"). Interestingly, Yahweh never says that he will know the

Egyptians; rather, he is passively known by them, but the intimate relationship between them is

nonetheless striking. Further, Israel is identified alongside Egypt as a "blessing in the midst of

the land," which is reminiscent of Yahweh's command to Abraham to "be a blessing" and his

promise that "all the families of the earth will bless themselves by you" (Gen 12:2–3).[40] The

---

fondées sur l'Alliance conclue avec Yahweh, ne seront plus l'apanage du people élu, mais seront étendues a ceux-là mêmes qui incarnaient l'opposition à la réalisation du plan salvifique de Dieu" (Monsengwo-Pasinya, "Isaïe xix 16-25 et universalisme dans la LXX," in *Congress Volume: Salmanca, 1983*, ed. J.A. Emerton, VTSup 36 [Leiden: Brill, 1985], 198).

[40] Berges makes a similar connection but takes a slightly different interpretation: "The key word ברכה (24) points back to the quality of blessing granted to the patriarchs for all extended families of the earth. In Egypt and Assyria, therefore, the fulfillment of the patriarchal promise of blessing in favor of the nations has begun" (*The Book of Isaiah,* 152). Berges thus sees Egypt as a fulfillment of patriarchal promises rather than as the recipient of a new promise from Yahweh.

final piece of covenantal language is in verse 25, where Egypt is called "my people" (cf. Hos 2:23 and Isa 51:16, both of which use the pronouncement "my people" to reinforce God's covenant relationship with Israel). As this language indicates, the relationship between Yahweh and Egypt goes beyond that of lord/servant; Egypt has entered a relationship with God parallel to that of Israel itself, as a "third" along with Assyria.[41]

But key to this discussion is the fact the Egypt's relation to Yahweh is parallel to—not identical with—Israel's. Egyptians do not become Israelite, neither in ethnic identity nor in the precise way they relate to Yahweh. Egyptians have their own altar, separate from any altars or temples in Israel, and we have no idea how their religious life or relation to Yahweh is governed. All we can glean from the text itself is that "they are a people of Yhwh with their own salvation history, their own Yhwh cult, and their own 'Jerusalem.'"[42] If we imagine, as a thought experiment, a pre-exilic date of composition, once again we see that nothing in the text pushes beyond then-current notions about foreign integration into Israel's cultic life or the legal ramifications of how pious foreigners might relate to Yahweh. If we assume a post-exilic date of composition, the status of Egypt relative to Israelite law becomes even more problematic. The presence of an altar outside of Jerusalem flies in the face of Deuteronomy's centralization commands, suggesting that the author saw Mosaic law—or at least some parts of Mosaic law—as either no longer applicable in the eschaton or not meant to apply to non-Israelites.[43]

---

[41] This relationship seems roughly analogous to that envisioned in Amos 9:7, "Are you not like the Ethiopians to me, O Israel? says the LORD. Did I not bring Israel up from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor and Aram from Kir?" These parallel relations call into question Israel's unique place as Yahweh's people, but they do not entail that Yahweh has an identical relationship with Israel, Philistia, and Aram.

[42] Berges, *The Book of Isaiah,* 151.

[43] Ibid.

To summarize what we have seen within PI, although foreign nations are occasionally spoken of positively, there is no indication in the text itself that Isaiah envisioned these foreigners obeying Israelite cultic or civic law in the eschaton. Isaiah 2:3 does state that תורה will go out from Zion, but a number of factors point us away from interpreting תורה in the sense of "rule" or "statute." The wisdom terminology both within this passage and elsewhere in PI points to a meaning more along the lines of "wise instruction" or "natural law." Given the nations' subservience to Yahweh and Israel, we could also interpret תורה here in its ideological sense, i.e., the transcendent ideas that law and order can come to represent, but nothing in these texts would indicate that Isaiah saw this "law" as rules and statutes that govern social or religious life. As many scholars have noted, for PI the dominant picture of eschatological time is one of Israelite triumph and exaltation. Foreign reverence toward Yahweh seems to be tangential in these visions—as simply one detail in a broader picture focused more on Israel than on the nations.[44] As we have noted above, PI's historical setting also cautions us against seeing its description of foreign Yahwistic worship as "conversion" in the way we use the term today.

Law and Foreigners in Deutero-Isaiah

As we move into the exilic period, the picture painted above begins to change. As shown in the last chapter, תורה comes to be associated much more closely with Mosaic law, and though full-fledged conversion will not emerge for some time, DI is much more explicit in its description of the nations' reverence for Yahweh.

---

[44] See especially Huber, who claims that the foreign nations' primary purpose in PI is to serve as enemies, court opponents, and false beacons of hope (*Jahwe, Juda und die Anderen Völker,* 9). As he writes, "*Die anderen Völker sind also kein selbständiges Thema*. Von ihnen ist *im Rahmen des Verhältnisses Judas zu Jahwe* die Rede" (26, emphasis in original; see also 183).

Perhaps no figure has been more central in the discussion of Yahweh, Israel, and the nations in DI than the enigmatic "Servant." Scholars still disagree about the identity of the Servant (is it Israel? Moses? A second Moses? Isaiah? Cyrus? An unnamed prophet? Could the Servant have different identities in different verses?),[45] but regardless of how we identify this figure, we can still see the central role the Servant plays in mediating Yahweh's relationship with the nations.

In Isa 42:6–8, Yahweh addresses the Servant and says:

6 קראתיך בצדק ואחזק בידך ואצרך ואתנך לברית עם לאור גוים	6 I have called you in righteousness; I have grasped your hand. I have given/will give you as a covenant to/of/for (the) people,[46] as a light to (the) nations.
7 לפקח עינים עורות להוציא ממסגר אסיר מבית כלא ישבי חשך	7 To open the eyes of the blind, and to bring out the prisoner in prison, those who dwell in darkness from the house of bondage.
8 אני יהוה הוא שמי וכבודי לאחר לא־אתן ותהלתי לפסילים	8 I am Yahweh; that is my name. I will not give my name or glory to another, nor my praise to idols.

As my translation shows, the Hebrew here is highly ambiguous, and it is not even clear whether the Servant's work has already happened or whether it will take place in some future day. The

---

[45] See, for example, Hugh Williamson, *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah* (Carlisle, U.K.: Paternoster, 1998); Herbert Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja*, EdF 233 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985); and Peter Stuhlmacher and Bernd Janowski, eds., *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).

[46] As mentioned above, 4QIsa[h] has ברית עולם instead of ברית עם, but this appears to be a secondary change under the influence of Isa 55:3.

Servant stands in some kind of relation to foreign nations (גוים/עם), but the precise nature of this relationship is never clarified. What does it mean, for example, that the Servant is "as a covenant"? Does this entail that the Servant stands as a mediator in a covenant that is either identical with or similar to Israelite covenants? Should we even translate ברית as "covenant," or might it be more accurately rendered as "contract" or "obligation"?[47] Does this covenant/contract/obligation exist between God and the nations, Israel and the nations, or only the Servant and the nations?

Unfortunately, the immediate context in Isa 42 does little to answer these questions. The identification of the Servant as a light for those sitting in darkness seems to be a deliberate allusion to Isa 9:1, in which Israel is described as "a people walking in darkness… who dwell in shadow, on whom light has shined."[48] The language here also parallels Isa 49:9–11, in which the Servant says "to the prisoners, 'Come out;' to those who are in darkness, 'show yourselves.' They shall pasture along the ways—their pasture shall be along all the bare heights. They will neither hunger nor thirst… and I will make all my mountains into a road, and my highways will be exalted." This language is unmistakably that of Israel's new exodus from Babylon (see Isa 40:3–5), and in this reading, the Servant's task is more for Israel than for the nations themselves. On the other hand, the polemic in 42:8 against idolatry, the desire that Yahweh's glory not go to another, and the Servant's role "to bring justice (משפט) to the nations" (42:1) would lead us to see the Servant's role as primarily to the foreign nations.[49] The Servant's missions to Israel and

---

[47] See, e.g., Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:212.

[48] The connection between these sections has been noted, e.g., by Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 67–77.

[49] See also 52:15, in which the Servant is once again expressly sent to the nations. I do not include this in the list above, however, since it is unclear whether the Servant's identity is envisioned as constant between these two chapters. See Fischer, *Tora für Israel,* 88.

the nations need not be mutually exclusive, but they do show how difficult it is to get a handle on

what type of relationship DI envisioned with the term עם ברית. In an environment where scholars

cannot even agree on who the Servant is, I see little hope for a definitive resolution of the precise

nature of his task.

Despite this ambiguity, however, there are some things we can say with certainty. At the

very least, DI envisioned a new relationship with foreign nations, and the fact that this

relationship can be described as a ברית—with all the theological implications this term comes to

carry—is nothing short of remarkable. Covenants play a role elsewhere in DI as well, and these

examples might shed some light on the kind of relationship envisioned. For example, in Isa

55:3–5, the concept of a Davidic covenant is renewed and transferred onto Israel, where Israel

fills a new role relative to the nations: "I will make an eternal covenant with you: the faithful

mercies of David (ברית עולם חסדי דוד הנאמנים). See, I set him as a witness to the peoples, a prince

and commander for peoples. See, you will call a nation you do not know, and a nation who has

not known you will run to you, on account of Yahweh your God." Although the covenant in this

case is made with Israel, Israel's position relative to the nations is drawn in parallel to David's

position as a mediator between God and the people.[50] The connection between Isa 42:6 and 55:3

also seems to have been made by at least one Qumran scribe.[51]

DI also mentions God's future covenant with Israel in 54:9–10, this time in terms

evoking the Noahide rather than Davidic covenant. These verses read:

---

[50] Lohfink makes a similar point: "Vers 6 transponiert den Davidbund so auf Israel, daß Israel an die Stelle Davids tritt" (idem and Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker,* 53). On the general "democratization" of the covenant in Deutero-Isaiah, see Scott Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 13–15.

[51] 4QIsaʰ 42:6 has ברית עולם instead of ברית עם. Koenig claims that this represents a case of deliberate borrowing from 55:3 to make the tie between these verses more explicit (*L'herméneutique analogique,* 203).

9 כי־מי[52] נח זאת לי אשר נשבעתי מעבר מי־נח עוד על־הארץ כן נשבעתי מקצף עליך ומגער־בך	9 For this is as the days of Noah to me. As I swore that the waters of Noah would never again cover the earth, so I have sworn not to be angry with you and not to rebuke you.
10 כי ההרים ימושו והגבעות תמוטנה וחסדי מאתך לא־ימוש וברית שלומי לא תמוט	10 For the mountains may depart, and the hills may take leave, but my loving kindness will not depart from you, and my covenant of peace will not take leave.

Yahweh has made a "covenant of peace" with Israel, and his oath is explicitly constructed to parallel the covenant made with Noah. Just as (אשר) he had formerly sworn to Noah, now (כן) he swears a new relationship with Israel in which he will not get angry, and to ensure that we notice the parallel, he says, "this is as the days of Noah to me." The exact content of this covenant is unclear; as many have shown, the author of DI seems to have been familiar with some version of Genesis, in which case the reader might be expected to infer a renewal of God's promises in Gen 8:21–22 or 9:1–17.[53] Or perhaps the author has in mind a broader covenant relationship between God and humankind, perhaps on the basis of a flood tradition in different form than we see in Genesis.

Whatever we decide, however, we can see the important role that ברית played within DI, both in the reimagined relationship between Yahweh and Israel and in the role of the Servant as ברית עם. This is particularly meaningful if, in ancient Israel, "The laws have their place in the

---

[52] The Masoretic tradition is divided between כימי and כי־מי. The former makes more sense in context, and this reading appears to be more likely (see also 1QIsaᵃ), despite LXX's reading of ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος (=ממי).

[53] See, e.g., Reinhard Gregor Kratz, *Kyros im Deuterojesaja-Buch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55*, FAT 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 110.

doctrine of the covenant."[54] By the time of DI, religious and civic laws had long been associated

with the figure of Moses and the notion of a Sinaitic covenant, as is frequently stressed by

Deuteronomistic authors.[55] DI was undoubtedly familiar with these traditions, as discussed

below, and it would not be too much of a stretch to see some idea of religious law bound up in

Yahweh's new covenant to the nations. In fact, DI makes this connection clear in Isa 42:4, when

he says of the Servant that "the coastlands wait for his תורה." As laid out in Chapter 2, the

semantic range of תורה in this period had shifted significantly toward the legal sphere and was

coming to be increasingly—though not exclusively—identified with some form of Mosaic law.

If we understand תורה here in the covenantal context DI has put forward, the Servant is being

presented as a kind of second Moses, a prophetic figure who serves as a mediator between God

and the nations and who delivers תורה to the people. In Fischer's words, the Servant becomes a

"Moses for the people," while Zion becomes a "Sinai for the people."[56]

DI further develops the connection between the Servant, covenant, and law in other ways

as well. In the second Servant Song, DI repeats and expands upon two assertions that were made

in 42:6. In 42:6, Yahweh is presented as telling the Servant, "I have set you as a covenant of

people, as a light to the nations," and in 49:6–8 DI expands on both points:

---

[54] Gutbrod, *TDNT* 2:1036.

[55] See the discussion in Chapter 2 on the development of תורה.

[56] "Israel aber hat seine Tora durch die Vermittlung des Mose, in dessen Nachfolge die Propheten mit ihrem Wort treten. Die Völker erhalten ihre Tora durch die Vermittlung des Knechtes…. Der Knecht Israel wird dadurch zum ‚Mose für die Völker,' und der Zion wird so zum ‚Sinai für die Völker'" (Fischer, *Tora für Israel,* 110, 123). Despite this connection, however, we still do not know what exactly this law entails. Fischer, for example, sees it more as a matter of judgment and justice than promulgation of religious law. She writes, "Wenn die Inseln auf ‚*seine* Tora' harren, so ist das vorrangig der משפט, den der Knecht zu promulgieren hat…. Seine Tora ist das Lebens-Recht der Schwachen" (ibid., 85–86).

....וְנֶתֶתִּיךָ לְאוֹר גּוֹיִם לִהְיוֹת יְשׁוּעָתִי עַד־קְצֵה הָאָרֶץ 6	6 I have set you as a light to the nations, to be my salvation to the ends of the earth[57]....
וָאֶתֶּנְךָ לִבְרִית עָם לְהָקִים אֶרֶץ לְהַנְחִיל נְחָלוֹת שֹׁמֵמוֹת 8	8 I have set you as a covenant of people, to establish the earth, to apportion the desolate inheritances

The repeated emphasis on the Servant as covenant and the Servant as light is significant due to the close connection both have—in general and particularly in Isaiah—with תורה. On a general level, תורה and light were often linked in the Bible and early Second Temple Judaism, as Geza Vermes has demonstrated.[58] This association was based not only on the underlying idea of teaching as a type of enlightenment, but also on the graphic similarity between אור and תורה.[59] In an interpretive environment before modern philology and in which words were seen as inherently connected, it is not difficult to imagine how these two words could come to be seen as related. If the verb יבין could produce תבונה (adding a ת, an o-class vowel, and the suffix –*ah*), it would not be a huge leap to see יאיר as producing תורה along these same lines.[60] These are

---

[57] Or, "that my salvation may be to the ends of the earth." I prefer the translation given above due to the parallel structure between verses 6 and 8: "I have set you as a light (לְאוֹר)… in order to be (לִהְיוֹת)…. I have set you as a covenant (לִבְרִית)… in order to apportion (לְהַנְחִיל)…"

[58] See Vermes, "The Torah is a Light," *VT* 8 (1958): 436–38.

[59] Vermes writes, "Although it would not be wise to underestimate the importance of the similarity of the words, — which is even greater in Aramaic (אורתא — אורייתא) than in Hebrew, — the main emphasis should be laid on the association of meaning between light, on the one hand, and truth, divine revelation, Torah, etc., on the other" (ibid., 437). In light of Koenig's work on analogical interpretation, I would place more emphasis on the similarity between the words, *pace* Vermes, but Vermes shows that the connection existed in ancient interpretation regardless of how it was made. See for example Prov 6:23 and Wis 18:4.

[60] See, e.g., Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2nd reprint of the 2nd ed. (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009), 238 on ת-preformative nominal formation.

precisely the types of connections made in ancient Judaism as outlined by Koenig in what he calls "the supple idea of participation."[61]

The connection between light and תורה is frequently made in Isaiah, as seen in the key text of Isa 2:3–5, where the nations say, "let us walk in his ways, for תורה will go forth from Zion," and the Israelites simultaneously proclaim, "let us walk in the light of Yahweh." Ancient exegetes made the connection between these words explicit here, as the Targum to Isa 2:5 has the Israelites proclaim, "let us walk in the *study of the law* of the Lord."[62]

The pairing of light and תורה is brought even closer in Isa 51:4, where Yahweh states, "תורה goes out from me, and my statute as a light to the peoples" (תורה מאתי תצא ומשפטי לאור עמים). Torah itself *is* the light that goes out to the peoples, and this passage in turn informs our understanding of the Servant Songs, in which the Servant is given as a light for the nations (Isa 42:6, 49:6) who embodies a covenant with the people (42:6, 49:8) and who gives תורה to the coastlands (42:4).[63] And all of these texts call to mind Isaiah's original prophecy that in the future, תורה will go out from Zion and the faithful will walk in Yahweh's light (2:3–5).[64] In short, we can see a web of intertextuality being created across the book of Isaiah that ties these concepts together, and DI utilizes this web to describe the foreign nations' relationship with Yahweh, apparently as a relationship both mediated by covenant and regulated by תורה. Of

---

[61] "Dans la méthode des analogies verbales, la plurivalence résulte des diverses valeurs lexicographiques tirées des ressemblances formelles repérables.… [L]e principe fondamental est la participation d'un terme ou d'une expression à une ou plusieurs valeurs autres" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 382)

[62] See Vermes, "The Torah is a Light," 437.

[63] See also Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:301.

[64] Lohfink additionally calls attention to the repetition in Isa 51:4 of the verb תצא with תורה as its subject, as we saw in 2:3. He continues, "In beiden Passagen ist ein anderer Ausdruck beigestellt: »Licht der Völker«. Das Wort »Licht« erinnert, wenn es im Kontext schon um Israel und die Völker geht, natürlich ebenfalls an Jesaja 2, nämlich an 2,5" (idem and Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker,* 49; see also 48).

course, we are no closer to determining the *content* of this law as envisioned by DI, but there is little doubt of the importance this law was seen to have.

Two final passages relevant to our theme bear mentioning in DI. The first is Isa 45:14, which comes right after one of the most explicitly monotheistic passages in the Bible. Speaking to the Israelites, DI writes, "The property[65] of Egypt, and the merchandise of Ethiopia and the Sabeans, men of stature, will pass over to you and be yours, and they will come after you, and in chains they will pass over, and they will bow down to you, and they will supplicate you: 'God is only among you, and there is no other god.'" Yahweh then continues his speech with a blanket statement of universal worship, that one day, "to me every knee will bow and every tongue will swear" (Isa 45:23).

As in PI, the emphasis here (and all throughout this chapter) is not on the foreign nations; rather, the foreign nations are used to demonstrate Israel and Yahweh's ultimate triumph over all other forces. Foreign gods will be shown to be worthless (45:20–21), foreign nations are "shamed and confounded" (45:16), and Israel is "saved by Yahweh with eternal salvation" (45:17). Though Yahweh was once hidden (45:15), he will finally be recognized in the midst of Israel's own glorification (45:25). Indeed, the foreign nations are not envisioned here as participants in the Israelite cult—they are coming to Israel in chains (45:14)! But despite this negative portrayal, there is still an element of universality that can shed light on the way in which foreign worship was understood. As was pointed out above, the passages in PI that describe foreign worship do not necessarily imply the nations' adopting Yahwistic monotheism. Here, however, there is no question. The nations bow before Yahweh and explicitly state, "there is no

---

[65] The surviving Hebrew witnesses are unanimous in reading יגיע, which is most likely original, but it should be noted that LXX-Isa seems to read יגע here, which it translates as ἐκοπίασεν. This picks up on the theme seen elsewhere in Isaiah of foreign people, not merchandise, coming to Israel.

other god."[66] We are moving much further in the direction of full-blown conversion than we see elsewhere, but again, the foreigners in this passage are not envisioned as equals, worshipping Yahweh alongside other Israelites. Despite their allegiance to Yahweh alone, one can hardly imagine these chained foreigners participating in the pilgrimage feasts or Israelite religious rites.

Our final passage is Isa 52, an oracle of salvation for Zion. In 52:1, Jerusalem is labelled the "holy city" and is commanded to "put on your beautiful garments, for the uncircumcised and unclean will no longer come into you." On the surface, this passage has little to do with foreign worship, but it takes on new significance when it is read in light of previous passages that prophesy a foreign presence in Zion. Isaiah 2:2–4 speaks of foreigners' streaming to Jerusalem, and if we read these two passages synchronically, that would imply that everyone in Jerusalem, including foreigners, is both circumcised and ritually pure.

The question that remains, therefore, is whether circumcision and ritual purity imply full observance of Israelite law, or whether there is still room for separation between foreigner and native Israelite. We have already seen that גרים in the pre-exilic period could be circumcised without being fully converted, and some passages even imply that one need not be Israelite to be considered ritually pure. For example, Lev 17:15 says that if a citizen or a גר eats of certain unclean foods, he or she must wash and would be unclean until evening, at which point he or she would be once again considered clean. Granted, the dating of Lev 17:15 is uncertain,[67] and we

---

[66] Blenkinsopp notes, "adhesion was possible without conversion. In this instance, however, the sequel—bending the knee (*proskynesis*) and a confession of faith—suggests the abandonment of previous cults and a radical religious reorientation" (*Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:117), and Begg likewise highlights the departure here from previous portrayals of foreign worship: "Here for the first time in the book of Isaiah, one hears of the nations adopting a Yahwistic 'monotheism'" ("The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh," 47).

[67] See Michael Lyons, "Transformation of Law: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26)," in *Transforming Visions: Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel*, ed. idem and William A. Tooman, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 127 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010), especially 4–6 for a discussion of the date of H. I tend to agree with Lyons in seeing H as pre-exilic due to the reasons put forward in his article.

should not take one passage as indicative of all pre-exilic thought on the subject, but this passage does indicate that purity and circumcision, while certainly necessary conditions for cultic participation, are not sufficient conditions for seeing a person as fully Israelite or fully "converted." Nevertheless, Isa 52:1 still contributes to our understanding of eschatological foreign worshippers; according to this passage, though their ultimate relationship with law is unclear, they are at least required to be circumcised and ritually pure.[68]

Taken together, DI contributes significantly to our picture of eschatological law observance by foreigners, though each of the passages discussed here remains highly ambiguous. We learn that the Servant brings forth תורה to the nations, and this תורה is bound up in the concepts of light and covenant (e.g., both the Servant and תורה are referred to as "light to the nations" and "light to the peoples" [42:6, 49:6, 51:4], and the Servant himself is given as ברית עם [42:6, 49:8]). What exactly this תורה entails, however, is never stated. The nations' worship is described in explicitly monotheistic terms (45:14, 23), and if Isa 52:1 is read in connection with Isa 2:2–5, these foreigners would be both circumcised and ritually clean. But once again, these passages are not explicit enough for us to confidently stake out a claim regarding issues such as dietary regulations, covenant incorporation, or observance of cultic or civil law.

Lohfink is undoubtedly correct in seeing the expansion of תורה beyond Israel in these chapters. For him, "one cannot read the chapters of Deutero-Isaiah in their final form other than that here, behind the many voices that sound, everything leads toward a narrative plot… in which the effectiveness of Israel's Torah unfolds beyond Israel."[69] What is not clear, however, is what

---

[68] Begg notes that the passage does "make clear that there are conditions attached to [foreigners'] participation—just as there are for Israelites themselves" ("The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh," 48).

[69] "Man wird die Deuterojesaja-Kapitel in ihrer Endtextgestalt gar nicht anders lesen können, als daß hier hinter den vielen Stimmen, die ertönen, alles dirigierend eine narrative Fabel steht, nach welcher dann gegen Ende aus dem

114

this תורה entails. According to Jensen, we should not see any significance in the term beyond its primary meaning of "instruction" or "revelation."[70] And if we take seriously the nations' subservience to—if not downright subjugation by—Israel, perhaps the Servant's תורה which goes out to the nations should be considered in the sense of political domination outlined in Chapter 2. As Graham Davies notes, the primary difficulty in interpreting DI is its multivocality, a problem that will only be compounded as we consider the post-exilic additions to the book of Isaiah.[71]

Law and Foreigners in Trito-Isaiah

Within TI,[72] righteous foreigners come to the center of the author's attention, and this section is pervaded by descriptions of how these foreigners will be incorporated into Israelite worship. Oswalt points out that foreigners devoted to Yahweh "appear prominently in three places: at the beginning (56:1–7), in the middle (cs. 60–62), and at the end (66:18–24)…. [B]y

---

wiedererstandenen Bund Israels die Völkerwallfahrt in Gang gesetzt wird, in der Israels Tora ihre Wirksamkeit über Israel hinaus entfaltet" (Lohfink and Zenger, *Der Gott Israels und die Völker,* 54).

[70] "Deutero-Isaiah uses *tôrâ* five times: 42:4.21.24; 51:4.7. It is not easy to determine an exact significance for the term in any of these passages; it seems to have the broadest possible sense of 'instruction' or 'revelation,' and is employed with other terms that would not usually be considered synonymous or even similar in meaning" (Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah,* 23).

[71] "The prominence of the 'nations' in *ch. 40-55* is well known, and *gōyim* and close synonyms occur no less than 22 times in these chapters. The problem here is the diversity of the interpretations of this material.… Alongside the common picture of Deutro-Isaiah as a prophet who proclaimed universal salvation, there are those who have held that the position reserved for the nations is a purely subservient one, if not worse" (Davies, "The Destiny of the Nations in the Book of Isaiah," in *The Book of Isaiah/Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures: unité et complexité de l'ouvrage*, ed. by Jacques Vermeylen [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989], 102). Despite the nations' prominence, one explanation for the different views on their ultimate station is that, while DI was concerned with both the nations and Israel, his central purpose was the glorification of Yahweh himself. As Melugin writes, "Yahweh's actions toward Israel and the nations are thus subservient to the more basic purpose of universal recognition of Yahweh as God" ("Israel and the Nations," 260).

[72] As noted earlier, it is important to keep in mind that, although I refer to TI in the singular to designate Isaiah 56–66, more than one hand is responsible for the composition of these chapters. Stromberg notes the discord found within this section and remarks that the core chapters (60–62) show "such sharp differences in outlook from what surrounds it (especially 56–59 and 65–66) that attribution of both to a single author seems implausible" (*An Introduction*, 43). We should therefore be wary of expecting TI to show a single coherent view regarding the ultimate fate of foreigners.

placing the worshipping nations at the beginning and end of the section, the author or editor is signaling to us the readers the significance of this idea for understanding the section."[73] Let us consider each of these sections in turn.

At the very beginning of TI, the distinctions between Israelite and foreigner begin to break down. In Isa 56:3,6–8, the author writes:

Hebrew	English
3 ואל־יאמר בן־הנכר הנלוה אל־יהוה לאמר הבדל יבדילני יהוה מעל עמו...	3 Let not the foreigner who is joined to Yahweh say, 'Yahweh will surely separate me from his people'….
6 ובני הנכר הנלוים על־יהוה לשרתו ולאהבה את־שם יהוה להיות לו לעבדים כל־שמר שבת מחללו ומחזיקים בבריתי:	6 And as for the foreigners who are joined to Yahweh, to minister to him,[74] and to love the name of Yahweh, to be his servants—all who observe the Sabbath and keep from profaning it, and who hold to my covenant—
7 והביאותים אל־הר קדשי ושמחתים בבית תפלתי עולתיהם וזבחיהם לרצון על־מזבחי כי ביתי בית־תפלה יקרא לכל־העמים:	7 I will bring them to my holy mountain, and I will make them glad in my house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be acceptable/pleasing on my altar, for my

---

[73] "The Nations in Isaiah," 49.

[74] 1QIsaᵃ omits לשרתו, which many see as stemming from the scribe's discomfort with the idea of foreigners' serving in any kind of cultic function (e.g., "the omission of לשרתו may have been prompted by the desire to exclude an interpretation which would take the latter word in the sense of ministering to Yahweh in a capacity of Priests and Levites" [Rubenstein, "The Theological Aspect," 189; see also Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:68]). This may well be the case, but the scribe has left the most explicit case of foreign cultic service, Isa 66:21, more or less untouched.

	house will be called[75] a house of prayer for all peoples.
8 נאם אדני יהוה מקבץ נדחי ישראל עוד אקבץ עליו לנקבציו:	8 Saying of the Lord Yahweh, who gathers the scattered of Israel: I will gather others in addition to him, to his gathered ones.[76]

In a sense, these verses represent the logical extension of what we have already seen in PI and DI. The pilgrimage to Zion and to the temple has been a consistent theme in Isaiah, beginning in Isa 2:2–5, and here TI makes the implications of this explicit: the temple will be "a house of prayer for all peoples." We saw above that the Servant was given as "a covenant to/for people" (Isa 42:6; 49:8), and here TI assumes that foreigners will be incorporated into a covenant relationship with Yahweh and "hold to my covenant." The nations' offering of sacrifices can likewise be traced back to Isa 19:21 and the description of the sacrifices offered in Egypt.

But despite these continuities, this section also represents a radical break from what we have previously encountered. As we have seen repeatedly, previous verses in Isaiah dealing with foreign worship have all been somewhat ambiguous. Here, the message is much clearer. Foreigners not only reverence Yahweh; they are joined to him (or "join themselves to him," הנלוים על־יהוה, 56:6), and they will not be separated from Yahweh's people (56:3). They unambiguously hold to his covenant (56:6). Not only do they offer sacrifice to Yahweh (Isa 19:21), and not only do they come to the temple (Isa 2:3), but they offer acceptable sacrifice at

---

[75] 1QIsaᵃ has an interesting variant here: unlike the Masoretic tradition, 1QIsaᵃ reads יקרה as opposed to יקרא. The change appears to be secondary, but it gives an interesting new sense that Yahweh's house will *become* a house of prayer for all nations, rather than simply being called such.

[76] Despite its difficulty, לנקבציו is nearly unanimously attested by the Hebrew tradition. 1QIsaᵇ does read לנקבצו here, and one medieval Masoretic manuscript omits the word entirely, but לנקבציו does seem to be the original reading.

the temple's own altar (56:7). The temple itself is known as a house of prayer for all peoples (56:7).

Of course, even with these explicit statements, there is still room for ambiguity. For example, does 56:3 imply that foreigners will be indistinguishable from Israelites, or does it mean that foreigners and Israelites would live freely together? This is an important distinction, especially as the concept of conversion develops and begins to blur the boundaries between native-born Israelites and religious converts. Further, what covenant does the author foresee foreigners adhering to? Is this the Sinaitic covenant, as the mention of Sabbath observance might imply?[77] The "sure mercies of David" mentioned in 55:3? The (potentially Noahic) "covenant of peace" mentioned in 54:10? Are Israelites envisioned holding to this *same* covenant, or is their relationship with Yahweh on a different level? And what does it mean that foreigners will "minister to" (שר"ת) Yahweh? Is this the kind of cultic service previously reserved only for Israelites, or is it more in line with the service (עב"ד) of the enslaved Gibeonites in Josh 9?

I raise these questions to show that while this section does resolve many issues relative to foreign worship, it does not answer the primary questions in which we are interested. There is room for interpreting these verses along the lines of complete assimilation of foreigners: that they would be incorporated into Yahweh's people, minister as religious functionaries, and hold to the same covenant and covenantal obligations that Israelites do. Alternatively, these verses

---

[77] The Sabbath has long been recognized as the sign of the Sinaitic covenant in Priestly writing (see Exod 31:13–16), and as Barclay points out, "Of all the festivals celebrated by Diaspora Jews, the Sabbath was, in social terms, by far the most important, since its observance was so regular, so noticeable and so socially problematic" (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora,* 440). On the other hand, Sabbath observance need not necessarily imply adherence to Mosaic law, as witnessed by the many God-fearers in Hellenistic times who observed Sabbath but did not fully convert (e.g., Sim, "Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes," 17). Nor is it self-evident that TI would have had Mosaic law in mind by using this reference, since Isa 56 goes to great lengths to correct or replace elements of Mosaic law, including its extension of temple rights to eunuchs and foreigners. The fact that this very inclusion would have abrogated certain aspects of Mosaic law need not mean, however, that TI thought the law would be done away with. See Berges, *The Book of Isaiah,* 147.

also leave room to see a continued distinction in cultic and legal observance between Israelites and foreigners, and they do little to settle the question of what religious obligations would be imposed on foreign worshippers.[78]

In Isa 60–62 the nations play a central role, but here their station is much more subdued. The author goes to great lengths to show how the nations will serve Israel or perish (Isa 60:12), give Israel their wealth (61:6), feed the Israelites' flocks and work their fields (61:5), and prostrate themselves at Israel's feet (60: 14). Yet at the beginning of this section, the author evokes the light and darkness imagery that has pervaded PI and DI to say that in this time of restoration, "darkness will cover the earth," but "nations will come to your light, and kings to the brightness of your dawn" (60:2–3). We can read these verses with an eye to the Servant's role as a "light to nations" (Isa 42:6, 49:6) and תורה as "a light to peoples" (51:4), and in this view we might understand the phrase, "nations will come to your light," as a reference to this teaching. But if this is the case, the complete subjugation of foreigners in these chapters strikes an odd chord with the inclusive attitude we have seen elsewhere in Isaiah. As Blenkinsopp notes, it is "painfully clear that the perspective of the author of this poem is far removed from a religiously universalistic world view of a kind expressed, for example, in Isa 19:25," where Egypt is Yahweh's people and Assyria the work of Yahweh's hands.[79] We will return to this problem below, but for the moment it is sufficient to note the wide variety of views espoused in the book

---

[78] Modern scholars have tried to use this passage to arrive at some consensus regarding qualifications for foreign inclusion, but the evidence is not sufficient to say much beyond the fact that some qualifications existed. Begg writes, "the text is set apart by, for example, its emphasis on prior conditions—sabbath observance in particular—demanded of foreigners who would participate in Yahweh's worship," but he is unable to clarify what these conditions are ("The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh," 50). Blenkinsopp likewise notes "the covenant ratified by Sabbath observance" and the surprising absence of circumcision as a qualifier, but he is ultimately forced to conclude, "we are not told under what circumstances these foreigners and eunuchs became members of the community in the first place" (*Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:83).

[79] *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:212.

toward foreigners, or the wide variety of ways in which different groups of foreigners might relate themselves to Israel in the eschaton.

As we move to the final section of TI, the picture of how foreigners will observe תורה comes into sharper relief. Isaiah 66:18–23 reads:

18 ואנכי בא לקבץ את־כל־הגוים והלשנות ובאו וראו את־כבודי:	18 I am coming[80] to gather all nations and languages, and they will come and see my glory.
19 ושמתי בהם אות ושלחתי מהם פליטים אל־הגוים תרשיש פול ולוד משכי קשת תבל ויון האיים הרחקים אשר לא־שמעו את־שמעי ולא־ראו את־כבודי והגידו את־כבודי בגוים:	19 I will place a sign among them, and I will send the survivors from among them to the nations—Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, those who draw the bow, Tubal, and Javan[81]—the far-away coastlands that have not heard of me or seen my glory, and they will proclaim my glory among the nations.
20 והביאו את־כל־אחיכם מכל־הגוים מנחה ליהוה בסוסים וברכב ובצבים ובפרדים ובכרכרות על הר קדשי ירושלם אמר יהוה כאשר יביאו בני ישראל את־המנחה בכלי טהור בית יהוה:	20 And they will bring all your kindred from all the nations as an offering to Yahweh, on horse and chariot, on wagons, on mules, and on camels to my holy mountain, Jerusalem, says Yahweh—just as the Israelites bring an

---

[80] The Hebrew tradition is corrupt and here reads, ואנכי מעשׂיהם ומחשבתיהם באה. The phrase מעשׂיהם ומחשבתיהם seems to have been transposed from verse 16 or 17, which describe the judgment Yahweh executes against the unrighteous, and my emendation of באה to בא is based on the LXX, Vulgate, Targum, and Peshitta. The only other major divergence among Hebrew witnesses is 1QIsaᵃ, which reads, ואנוכי מעשׂיהמה ומחשבותיהמה באו. This appears to be a secondary change, attempting to bring the verb into agreement with "their works and their plans."

[81] The text here is difficult and is contested at various points (e.g., most prefer to emend פול to פוט), but I have simply left the Aleppo Codex as it stands since these issues are irrelevant to my argument.

	offering in a pure vessel to the house of Yahweh.
21 וגם־מהם אקח לכהנים וללוים אמר יהוה...	21 And I will take some from among them as priests and[82] Levites, says Yahweh…
23 יבוא כל־בשׂר להשׁתחות לפני אמר יהוה:	23 All flesh will come to bow down before me, says Yahweh.

The gathering of nations, their worship of Yahweh, and even their responsibility to bring back the scattered Israelites are frequent themes in Isaiah, as we have seen, and this passage represents a continuation of these ideas (e.g., Isa 2:2–3, 18:7, and 49:23). In addition to these continuities, we can also see two major developments here. The first is that foreigners are for the first time described as Yahweh's missionaries or emissaries, proclaiming his glory among the nations. More dramatically—and more important for our purposes—Yahweh seems to proclaim that some foreigners will be taken into the heart of Israelite worship, serving as priests and Levites.

The exact meaning of these verses is unfortunately obscure. Did the author have in mind that foreigners would serve as literal priests inside the temple, or is foreign priesthood simply analogous to Israelite priesthood? A straightforward reading of the text would imply the former, but verse 20 might imply the latter. In verse 20, foreigners bring the repatriated Israelites to the temple as an offering to Yahweh, just as (כאשׁר) Israelites bring their own offering in a pure vessel, which suggests a continuing distinction between Israelite and foreign offerings. In this reading, foreigners may have their own מנחה and their own priests, but these cultic institutions function only in parallel to those of Israel, effectively "limiting the liturgical function of Gentiles

---

[82] This represents an emendation from the majority Hebrew tradition, which reads לכהנים ללוים. This emendation is made on the basis of multiple Masoretic manuscripts, which read לכהנים וללוים.

to providing sacrificial material: their *minḥâ* consists in repatriated Israelites."[83] Further

complicating our interpretation is that the antecedent of those who will be taken as priests (מהם)

is unclear. The most natural antecedent would be "those among the survivors" who are sent out

to declare Yahweh's glory in verse 19 (ושלחתי מהם פליטים),[84] but the reappearance of the Israelites

in verse 20 leaves open the possibility that it is they, not foreigners, who are taken as priests and

Levites.

Claus Westermann sought to clarify these questions by positing that verse 20 was a later

interpolation meant as "a deliberate correction of the unprecedented statement made in [verse

21]" regarding foreigners' serving as priests.[85] According to this theory, these verses originally

spoke of Yahweh sending the survivors of the nations out to proclaim his glory and taking some

as priests and Levites. But by inserting verse 20, the redactor introduced a movement in the

opposite direction, bringing repatriated Israelites back to Jerusalem and creating ambiguity

around who would be taken as priests. Westermann's analysis has found some support among

modern scholars,[86] though it is not universally accepted.

At the very least, we can say that in the final form of the text, foreigners hold an

ambiguous role, and there is room to see their position as one of total inclusion in Israelite

worship, even as priests and Levites. This interpretation is strengthened when we recall that

foreigners are described as "ministering" to Yahweh in 56:6, using a verb (שרת) that is frequently

---

[83] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:315.

[84] This is reading preferred by most modern scholars. Oswalt notes, "while the antecedent is not entirely clear in 66:21, there is a strong likelihood that the 'them' from whom priests and Levites are drawn in 66:21 are the nations" ("The Nations in Isaiah," 51). See also Begg, "The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh," 53.

[85] Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary*, trans. David M. G. Stalker, OTL 19 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 423.

[86] See, e.g., discussion in Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:315 and John Goldingay, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 56–66* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 511.

found in the context of cultic service. If we take this view, the author has essentially obliterated any legal or ritual distinction between Israelites and foreigners. From a religious-legal standpoint, a foreigner who adheres to Yahwistic monotheism (Isa 45:14), worships in the temple (56:7), holds to Yahweh's covenant (56:6), follows regulations to be ritually pure (52:1), and serves as a priest (66:21) would be practically indistinguishable from a native Israelite.

Taking Isaiah Together

As we move from the pre-exilic stages of the book of Isaiah through the post-exilic period, we can see a clear trend toward greater foreign inclusion and more specificity about how that inclusion will come about. In PI, the nations and their ultimate relation to Yahweh are secondary to the author's focus on the redemption of Israel and Yahweh's glorification. When foreign worship is mentioned, as in Isa 19:19–25, this worship is not necessarily monotheistic, nor does the author clarify the nations' position relative to Israel and its law. When תורה is mentioned in relation to foreigners, as in Isa 2:3, we saw how a translation such as "law" or "statute" did not fit with either the context of PI or what we know of the author's cultural milieu.

Within DI, the influence of תורה is conscientiously extended beyond the realm of Israel itself, especially with the commission of the Servant. Foreign worship takes on an exclusively monotheistic character, and it is only at this point that we are able to speak of "conversion" in any sense of the word. Simultaneously, DI expands the notion of covenant to include foreigners, as in the Servant's task as ברית עם, but we are kept in the dark as to what this new covenant relationship entails. The legal aspects of this relationship move to the foreground with DI's repeated emphasis on תורה as light, תורה proceeding to the nations by means of the Servant, and the Servant's role as a light to the peoples.

In TI, the distinction between Israelite and foreigner begins to break down, and there is room to see foreign worshippers as completely assimilated into Yahwistic worship, even as priests and Levites. Foreigners observe Sabbath, hold to Yahweh's covenant, offer sacrifice and prayer at the temple, and in other ways seem to be indistinguishable from Israelite worshippers. Though the word תורה never appears in TI, the connection between תורה and law—especially the law of Moses—grows even stronger in this period, which leads to a subsequent re-evaluation of verses within PI and DI that speak of תורה going out to the nations. From a post-exilic standpoint, the phrase, "תורה will go out from Zion, and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem" (Isa 2:3) takes on an entirely new meaning. While PI most likely meant that instruction or wise counsel would go out from Zion, by the time the book of Isaiah reached its final form, these verses would have been interpreted in light of the law of Moses—an interpretation that is only strengthened by TI's own writing regarding foreign assimilation into the cult.

When we examine the writings of PI, DI, and TI synchronically, as one "book," we can see more clearly how one voice emerges from a wide variety of views on foreigners and how they would one day come to worship Yahweh. On the other hand, by tracing out the multiple layers of authors and editors in Isaiah, we can see that, although the final form of the book does lend itself to being read synchronically, the book as a whole contains a wide variety of voices that are not always easily harmonized. In some passages, foreigners seem to stand on equal footing with native Israelites (Isa 66:21), whereas in others, they are no more than slaves and servants (Isa 14:2). At times they seem to adhere to regulations such as Israelite purity laws (Isa 52:1), and at times their worship is decidedly non-Mosaic (as in the presence of an altar outside of Jerusalem in Isa 19:19). Even the dispute about whether Isa 66:20 is a later insertion is

"testimony, both striking and moving, to the fact that, after the return, Israel had no one voice about the fate to overtake Gentiles on the last day."[87]

As we turn in the next chapter toward how the LXX handles these themes, this multivocality is important to keep in mind. The book in its final form leaves much room for interpretation, and even modern scholars have come to polar opposite conclusions about the nations' ultimate relationship with Yahweh.[88] As we will see, LXX-Isa preserves many of these voices intact, but the translation also adds its own voice and its own interpretation of how foreigners would relate to Israel's God and law.

---

[87] Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 423. Davies similarly writes, "the book is more like a billboard on which different political parties or religious groups daub their slogans one on top of the other than a corpus which has a unified perspective" ("The Destiny of the Nations," 106).

[88] Melugin, for example, writes that the book of Isaiah "has taken only a limited step beyond a traditional Jerusalemite theology in which the nations are merely servants of Israel" ("Israel and the Nations," 261). On the other extreme, Begg writes, "the texts foresee the nations as Yahweh's worshippers, entering fully and equally into the privileges of Israel. Thus, titles used elsewhere of Israel ('my people', 'the work of my hands', 19.25; 'servant[s]', 56.6) will be predicated of them. They will function too as Yahweh's 'missionaries' (66.19) and clergy (66.21). Non-Israelites are to have an altar of their own (19.20), will present acceptable sacrifices to the Lord (19.21; 56.7), participate in his feasts (56.6; 66.23) and have a part in his 'covenant' (56.6). Yahweh for his part will 'teach' the nations (2.3), feed them (25.6), abolish all that causes them grief (25.7–8) and make himself/his 'glory' known to them (19.22; 66.18)" ("The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh," 55). In Begg's mind, it would be difficult for Isaiah to have been any clearer that the nations are being fully incorporated into Israel—including, presumably, observance of Israel's laws.

Chapter 4: Foreigners and Law Observance in the Septuagint of Isaiah

When the Hebrew text of Isaiah was translated into Greek, the same multivocality surrounding foreigners and law observance discussed in the previous chapter passed through to LXX-Isa intact. By its nature as a translated text, LXX-Isa preserves much of the original character of the *Vorlage*, and as a result, we cannot speak of any one coherent view that LXX-Isa shows regarding foreigners or the law. Nevertheless, two major forces did exert a significant influence on LXX-Isa regarding these ideas: the continued passage of time, and the efforts undertaken by the author—whether that be the translator, later scribes, or the author of the Hebrew *Vorlage*—to shape the text to fit his own theology.

Time is the easier of these two forces to engage with, especially since much of the groundwork for this discussion has already been laid. As seen in Chapter 2, the cultural forces shaping the interpretation of תורה/νόμος and conversion continued to change from the early post-exilic period, when TI was composed, to the mid-second century BCE, when LXX-Isa was most likely translated. In the Hellenistic period, Mosaic law and the Pentateuch that contained it came to occupy a central place in most variants of Judaism, and both of these entities came to be increasingly identified with the words תורה and νόμος. As discussed previously, Mosaic law and the Pentateuch were not the only referents of תורה/νόμος, but the association between these terms had grown considerably, such that תורה/νόμος could be used as a *terminus technicus* for either.

This change led to a dramatic reinterpretation of many passages within Isaiah. PI's statement that Yahweh's instruction or wise counsel (תורה) would go out to the nations would have been understood quite differently from LXX-Isa's claim that ἐκ γὰρ Σιων ἐξελεύσεται νόμος (Isa 2:3)—not due to any conscious effort on the translator's part to shape the meaning of

the text, but due entirely to the semantic shift taking place for both תורה and νόμος during this period. Even passages authored by DI or TI would have undergone a similar shift in interpretation, as when LXX-Isa says that νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται…εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν (51:4) or ἐπὶ τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν (42:4). Neither of these passages represent a significant departure from the Hebrew text, and in fact both rely on heavily stereotypical renderings (e.g., תורה=νόμος, יצא=ἐξέρχομαι, etc.). Yet the increased association between "law" and "the Law"— already nascent in the exilic and early post-exilic period, when the Hebrew text of Isaiah was coming to its final form—nudges the reader toward understanding these passages in light of the nations' receiving either the Pentateuch or Mosaic law.

A similar shift occurs with the institution of conversion. Isaiah 14:1–2, which most commentators agree is a post-exilic addition,[1] states, "For Yahweh will have compassion on Jacob, and he will again choose Israel. He will place them upon their land, and the sojourner (גר) will be joined to them, and they will cleave to the house of Jacob. And the peoples (עמים) will take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel will possess them upon the land of Yahweh as male and female slaves." In this context, it is unclear whether the author distinguishes between the גר who joins the house of Jacob and the עמים who are taken as slaves; is it the גרים who join Israel who will be possessed as slaves, or are the גרים afforded a different lot from the enslaved עמים? As we saw in the previous chapter, all throughout the book of Isaiah foreigners have an ambiguous role, sometimes as worshippers of Yahweh, sometimes as slaves, and sometimes as both. We also have little information about what it meant for a foreigner to "join" Israel at this time, which further muddies our understanding of these verses. But by the

---

[1] E.g., Davies: "The whole section should probably be regarded as based on, or written by, Trito-Isaiah" ("The Destiny of the Nations," 89). See also Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 1:282.

period of LXX-Isa, the idea of conversion had become much better established, and the passage has a different tenor when read in this light. In LXX-Isa, the passage reads, "the *gioras* will be joined to them, and he will be joined to the house of Jacob" (ὁ γιώρας προστεθήσεται πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ προστεθήσεται πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ιακωβ). As discussed in Chapter 2, we cannot assume a priori that γιώρας means "convert," but we do need to take into account the context and how the concept of גר (or in this case, the Aramaic גיורא) has changed over time. Parallel to instances of תורה/νόμος described above, the social setting of LXX-Isa does not mean that we must interpret γιώρας as "convert" here, but it does nudge the reader in this direction.

The second major force influencing the interpretation of LXX-Isa is the efforts of the author to shape the text, and it is to this that we now turn. In the first half of this chapter, we will examine various differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts regarding law observance, and in the second half we turn to LXX-Isa's reworking of Isa 8.

Differences Between the Greek and Hebrew Texts

Isaiah 26:9 / 51:4

Drawing new connections between related passages is a long-recognized technique of scriptural interpretation in Second Temple Judaism, and LXX-Isa has been particularly noted for its ample use of this method.[2] Klaus Baltzer et al. even cite "influences from related passages in LXX-Isa… or other biblical books" as one of the most notable characteristics of LXX-Isa's

---

[2] This has been noted by Zillesen, Ziegler, Koenig, van der Kooij, and others. For example, see van der Kooij, "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIsᵃ," *BO* 43 (1986): 366–67.

Übersetzungsweise,[3] and this technique can be seen clearly in Isa 26:9. The passage is part of a

song that will be sung "in the land of Judah" (26:1), and the Hebrew version of this verse reads:

26:9 נפשי אויתיך בלילה אף־רוחי בקרבי אשחרך כי כאשר משפטיך לארץ צדק למדו ישבי תבל	26:9 As for my soul, I long for you in the night; as for my spirit inside me, I am intent upon you; for when your judgments are upon the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness

The Greek text divides the verse differently, and it takes the final line in a completely new

direction:

26:9 ἐκ νυκτὸς[4] ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός, διότι **φῶς τὰ προστάγματά σου** ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. **δικαιοσύνην μάθετε, οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**.[5]	26:9 At night my spirit eagerly seeks you,[6] God, for **your commands are light** upon the earth. **Learn righteousness, you who dwell on the earth!**

Before we can discuss interpretation or authorial intent in the final line, we need to

establish how the Greek text could have arisen, given the Hebrew evidence we have. The two

---

[3] "Auf der Satzebene sind folgende Faktoren zu nennen:…. Einflüsse sinnverwandter Stellen aus der Jes^LXX (vgl. z.B. 31,6 mit 29,15) oder anderen biblischen Büchern (vgl. etwa den Schlusssatz von 15,2 mit Jer 48,37^MT)" (*Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2490–91).

[4] The Greek text takes נפשי אויתיך as going with the previous verse, so I have not included it above. The Hebrew of 26:8 reads: אף ארח משפטיך יהוה קוינוך לשמך ולזכרך תאות־נפש, and LXX-Isa takes this together with the first two words of 26:9 (נפשי אויתיך) to give the following rendering: ἡ γὰρ ὁδὸς κυρίου κρίσις· ἠλπίσαμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μνείᾳ, ᾗ ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν. Most of the renderings here are stereotypical, but the translator seems to have struggled with the combination תאות־נפש נפשי אויתיך. The doubled או"ה and נפש are only rendered into Greek once, and no surviving Hebrew witnesses read נפשנו (though cf. Targum, נפשנא), but to my knowledge no theological motivation has been attributed to these differences.

[5] The Greek textual evidence is remarkably homogenous here. The only major known variant comes from an 8th-century manuscript (393) which adds ποιειν after μάθετε—clearly a secondary addition. There are also no known Hexaplaric variants for the portions of this verse cited above, which is striking considering how different it is from the Masoretic tradition.

[6] Or, "my spirit arises early toward you" (ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ).

main divergences between the Greek and Hebrew texts are כאשר/φῶς and למדו/μάθετε, with the latter representing only a difference in vocalization. For both divergences, there are no known variants within the Hebrew tradition. How, then, does כאשר become φῶς? Most commentators agree that the translator read[7] כאשר as כאור, though ש/ו confusions are rare in scribal transmission.[8] Even with this confusion, we still need to account for the כ, which is left untranslated in Greek, and Ottley posits that the Greek ὡς dropped out during the course of transmission due to its similarity with φῶς.[9]

These explanations are plausible enough, but it seems too great a coincidence that a series of such "mistakes" should be made in a way that just happens to render this verse in a way that reflects and clarifies themes seen elsewhere in Isaiah. The idea of commands or judgment as light draws directly from Isa 51:4, where God states, "law will go out from me, and my judgment (I will establish) as a light of peoples" (תורה מאתי תצא ומשפטי לאור עמים ארגיע / νόμος παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν), a passage that shows multiple points of similarity with LXX-Isa 26:8–9.[10] These verses are so close, in fact, that it seems the Greek is directly

---

[7] It is worth repeating that when I say the translator "read" the Hebrew in a certain way, this simply refers to how he understood the text, regardless of where the divergent reading came from. This reading may have appeared in the translator's *Vorlage,* the translator may have misread the text, he may have deliberately misread the text due to variant readings from other manuscripts he knew, he may have deliberately misread the text to serve an exegetical goal, or the variant may have arisen from a marginal reading.

[8] See Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2569, and Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*, 2 vols. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 2:229. Alternatively, the ש could have been missing from the *Vorlage.* Koenig has a much more complicated explanation, positing first a metathesis (כאשר to כשאר) and then a reinterpretation, either as כ + שֶ + אֹר or through understanding שאר as שחר, with the root's association with light (*L'herméneutique analogique,* 140–41). While ש/ו confusions are indeed rare, to my mind Koenig's explanation fails Occam's razor.

[9] Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah,* 2:229.

[10] For example, both passages focus on Yahweh's judgments (משפטיך/κρίσις [26:8], משפטיך/προστάγματά σου [26:9], משפטי/κρίσις μου [51:4]) and righteousness (צדק/δικαιοσύνη [26:9, 51:5]), and both express the peoples' hope in some aspect of him—his name and remembrance in 26:8 and his arm in 51:5 (קו"ה/ἐλπίζω). Both also begin the clause about commands as light with the word "for" (כי/ὅτι/διότι), and as discussed below, in Greek both direct a command toward the nations. As seen in the previous chapter, DI also makes the connection between law and light (e.g., Isa 42:4,6), so it hardly seems surprising the LXX-Isa 26:9 should show this same link. These two verses also

drawing from Isa 51:4 in its description of God's commands as a light on the earth. In addition, one of the most pervasive questions in the previous chapter was to what degree foreigners would be observing religious law, since the Hebrew texts of Isaiah do not make this explicit. But here, by understanding למדו as an imperative, the Greek has rendered this verse in a way that implies observance: δικαιοσύνην is brought into the realm of God's law (a connection hardly unique to this verse), and the nations are commanded to learn.[11]

In cases of intertextuality, it is not enough to note that an author has drawn a connection between two verses. The broader question remains of why such a connection was made in the first place. In Udo Hebel's words, "a successful allusion does not simply direct the reader to another text on a purely referential level. More specifically, a successful allusion enriches the alluding text semantically" by inviting the reader to fill out her image of the alluding text in light of the characteristics of the text alluded to.[12] "Allusion-markers act like proper names in that they denote unique individuals (source texts), but they also tacitly specify the property(ies) belonging to the source text's connotation relevant to the allusion's meaning."[13] For what purpose, then, does the translation of LXX-Isa 26:9 evoke Isa 51:4? What are the characteristics of Isa 51:4 that the author wished us to connect with LXX-Isa 26:9, or on what basis did he perceive this connection already to exist? It is difficult to answer this question with much certainty, but the

---

share significant thematic similarity with Isa 2:3–5 and 42:1–4, and the overlap in vocabulary is striking (שׁפּ"ט, תורה, גוים/עמים, למ"ד, etc.), which suggests that the Greek author may be drawing upon a whole network of related texts.

[11] Koenig points out that both 1QIsaᵃ and LXX-Isa show variations in Isa 26:8–9 (in Isa 26:8, MT reads ולזכרך תאות־נפשׁ, while 1QIsaᵃ reads ולתורתך תאית נפשׁ), which suggests "qu'elles sont moins les effets d'hésitations ou de confusions sur le sens, que les résultats d'efforts pour exploiter le texte, efforts qui témoignent d'un intérêt particulier porté à ce passage" (*L'herméneutique analogique,* 136).

[12] "Towards a Descriptive Poetics of *Allusion*," in *Intertextuality*, ed. Heinrich F. Plett, Research in Text Theory 15 (New York: de Gruyter, 1991), 138.

[13] Carmela Perri, "On Alluding," *Poetics* 7.3 (1978): 291, quoted in Hebel, "Towards a Descriptive Poetics," 138.

immediate context of Isa 51:4 is saturated with the language of universal salvation and foreigners' trust in God. God declares that his law and justice have gone out as a light to the peoples (51:4), that his salvation has gone out (51:5) and will be eternal (51:6), and that the nations will place their hope in God (51:5). Perhaps the connection was made in order to clarify what the nations should learn, or perhaps the author wanted to fill out the reader's image of what it meant for God's law to go out as a light. According to Koenig, the change "elevates the passage to the height of the grand universalist proclamation of Second Isaiah, relative to the Law, 'light of the nations.'"[14]

The final question necessary for understanding the importance of this link for LXX-Isa is determining whether the connection took place at the stage of translation, or whether it might have occurred earlier (at the level of the Hebrew text itself) or later (in the Greek text's transmission history). As discussed in Chapter 1, if the connection could have occurred before or after translation, the passage's value for understanding the translator's theology is much reduced, though not eliminated entirely.[15] In most instances, we will never be able to determine the locus of change with 100% confidence, but we can make a determination as strong as our available evidence.

For LXX-Isa 26:9, the evidence we have suggests that this change was not introduced in the LXX's subsequent transmission history, given that our available Greek witnesses are

---

[14] "L'introduction de « la lumière »… élève le passage à la hauteur de la grand proclamation universaliste du Second Is, relative à la Loi «lumière des nations»" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 137).

[15] If we cannot prove that the change took place at the level of translation, we can at least speak of the possibility that it did so. This makes our conclusions much more tentative, but tentative conclusions can still be enlightening. At the very least these changes, regardless of their point of origin, speak to interpretive traditions within late Second Temple Judaism.

practically unanimous on the reading in question.[16] In addition, none of the differences in wording or meaning between the Hebrew and LXX can be ascribed to common Greek transmission errors (Δ/Λ interchanges, metathesis in Greek letters, homoioteleuton within the Greek text, etc.). The evidence further points away from seeing this change as originating in Hebrew manuscripts, since the parallels between Isa 26:9 and 51:4 are greater in Greek than they are in Hebrew. For example, both LXX-Isa 26:9 and LXX-Isa 51:4 include a command to foreigners (δικαιοσύνην μάθετε, οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [26:9] and οἱ βασιλεῖς, πρός με ἐνωτίσασθε [51:4]), but the Hebrew text of Isa 51:4 is addressed to Israel, not "kings."[17] Such a parallel within the Greek text does not constitute definitive proof that the change was introduced by the translator rather than at the level of *Vorlage*, but it does suggest this to be the case.

Isa 14:1–2 / 56:6–7 / 65:9

Another example of change and connection within the book of Isaiah can be seen in Isa 14:1–2. The Hebrew of this text reads as follows:

כי ירחם יהוה את־יעקב ובחר עוד בישׂראל והניחם 1 על־אדמתם ונלוה הגר עליהם ונספחו על־בית יעקב:	1 For Yahweh will have compassion on Jacob, and he will again choose Israel. He

---

[16] Once again, qualification is needed here. "The evidence we have" deals only with the earliest form of the text able to be reconstructed from the various manuscript families in early antiquity. Yet these manuscripts are centuries removed from the time of LXX-Isa's original translation. This evidence does not cover the period from when the text was translated to the time the various manuscript families broke apart, a period during which substantial scribal alterations may have taken place. Thus, the most we can say is that "the evidence we have" does not support the thesis that this verse's different rendering should be attributed to LXX-Isa's subsequent transmission history. This may be imprecise, but it is the best we can do with the manuscripts we have.

[17] The differing translations here reflect an oddity of LXX-Isa's style. Throughout the LXX, לאמים/לאם is invariably translated by ἔθνος, φυλή, or λαός, but LXX-Isa translates the word four times as ἄρχοντες (34:1, 41:1, 43:4, and 43:9), and once as βασιλεῖς (51:4), in addition to its usual rendering as ἔθνος (17:12, 17:13, 49:1, 55:4, and 60:2). We should not, therefore, explain this change on the level of *Vorlage*, but as a conscious decision on the part of the translator or redactor.

	will place them[18] upon their land, and the sojourner will be joined to them, and they will cleave to the house of Jacob.
2 ולקחום עמים והביאום אל־מקומם והתנחלום בית־ישראל על אדמת יהוה לעבדים ולשפחות והיו שבים לשביהם ורדו בנגשׂיהם:	2 And the peoples[19] will take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel will possess them upon the land of Yahweh as male and female slaves. And they will take captive those who held them captive, and they will rule those who oppressed them.

Most of the text is relatively straightforward, and there are few variants attested within the Hebrew tradition that have a significant impact on the verses' interpretation. It is worth noting, however, that something odd happens in the opening phrase of 14:2; the first two verbs are plural with a masculine plural suffix, and in context, the subject is עמים and the object is בית יעקב (from the previous verse). But although the next verb, והתנחלום, shows the same form (plural + masculine plural suffix), now the subject has changed to בית ישראל, and we are left to infer the referent of the object from context. As the verse stands, the only feasible option is to understand the object as עמים, but it is highly unusual that the referent of the suffix ם- should switch between successive verbs without additional clarification, especially given that עמים and בית ישראל are both grammatically plural here.

---

[18] Or, "he will give them rest."

[19] 1QIsaᵃ reads עמים רבים here, a reading that is likewise attested in *Yalquṭ Shimʿoni*. The reading appears to be secondary, but it was most likely preserved in the *Vorlage* of LXX-Isa, as we will see.

Complicating this picture is the fact that for both the subjects in this clause (עמים and בית ישראל), the textual evidence is mixed. Both 1QIsaᵃ and *Yalqut Shimʿoni* have עמים רבים as the first subject rather than simply עמים, and LXX-Isa seems to have been aware of the additional רבים,[20] but it has no equivalent for בית ישראל. This leaves open the possibility that either or both subjects were added to the Hebrew text to clarify the confusing string of plural subjects and objects. Consider how the text would read without the two subjects: ולקחום והביאום אל־מקומם והתנחלום על אדמת יהוה לעבדים ולשפחות. Given that the house of Jacob was mentioned at the end of 14:1, this verse would then best be understood as saying that the house of Jacob would take them (presumably the foreigners from 14:1), bring them to their place, and possess them as slaves. This rendering no longer contains the idea of foreigners bringing the repatriated Israelites back,[21] but it does read much more naturally, and it solves the problem of the shifting referent for the suffix ם-.

LXX-Isa renders these verses as follows, with significant differences from the Hebrew in bold:

| 14:1 Καὶ ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν Ιακωβ καὶ ἐκλέξεται ἔτι τὸν Ισραηλ, καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν καὶ **ὁ γιώρας προστεθήσεται πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ προστεθήσεται πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ιακωβ,** | 14:1 And the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and he will yet choose Israel, and they will have rest upon their land, and **the *gioras* will be joined[22] to them, and he will be joined to the house of Jacob.** |

---

[20] That is, LXX-Isa's reading of πληθυνθήσονται in 14:2 presupposes a form of רב״ה in the *Vorlage*; see discussion below.

[21] This is a theme we see, for example, in Isa 66:20, and if both עמים רבים / עמים and בית ישראל are indeed later additions, this theme may have served as the basis for adding עמים רבים / עמים to the text.

[22] This is the only instance in the LXX where ספ״ה is rendered by προστίθημι, though this is a rare word, and it is possible that the translator did not know the root. In any case, the translation is true to the sense of the Hebrew, and

2 καὶ λήμψονται αὐτοὺς ἔθνη καὶ εἰσάξουσιν[23] εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν, καὶ **κατακληρονομήσουσι καὶ πληθυνθήσονται** ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ **θεοῦ** εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας· καὶ ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς, καὶ κυριευθήσονται οἱ κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν.	2 And the peoples will take them and bring (them) to their place, and **they will receive an inheritance**[24] **and multiply** on the land of **God**[25] as male and female slaves. And those who had taken them captive will be captive, and those who had ruled them will be ruled.[26]

The most significant difference for our purposes is that, with בית ישׂראל having no equivalent in the Greek, no longer does Israel possess the nations as slaves; rather, the nations are now the ones receiving inheritance, and they also multiply on the land—an idea absent in the Hebrew. So how did the Hebrew give rise to this text? We can get a good idea by retroverting the Greek text into Hebrew and comparing it with the Hebrew text given above, with differences in bold:

Greek Retroversion:

ולקחום עמים והביאו אל־מקומם והתנחלו **ורבו** על אדמת **אלהים** לעבדים ולשפחות

---

it is possible that the translator chose this rendering due to the similarity of ספ"ח to יס"ף, אס"ף, or ספ"ה, all of which are frequently rendered with προστίθημι.

[23] The Coptic, one branch of the Catena texts, and one Lucianic manuscript (130) attest αὐτοὺς here, but the Göttingen edition does not include it in the main text. The arguments for and against its inclusion in the main text seem equally strong to me; it could have dropped out due to the word's appearance two other times in this verse, or it could have been added to smooth out the syntax of the Greek.

[24] Ottley takes κατακληρονομήσουσι as causal, i.e., "they shall make [Israel] inherit" (*The Book of Isaiah,* 2:175). While he is correct that κατακληρονομέω can be causal, every attested example of this verb in the LXX with a causal meaning has either an accusative or dative object, which is not the case here. Most modern translations therefore reject Ottley's proposal (See, e.g., *La Bible d'Alexandrie, La Biblia Griega Septuaginta, Septuaginta Deutsch, A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, etc.).

[25] The difference here is unexplained, though the possibility exists that this reading is related to 1QIsaˢ, which earlier in the verse reads אל אדמתם ואל מקומם.

[26] As we will see below, there is a great deal of disagreement among Greek manuscripts surrounding these verses, but these changes are all demonstrably secondary.

The nations' multiplying presumes that the translator's *Vorlage* (either real or imagined) included the root רב"ה or רב"ב in the syntactic slot occupied by בית ישׂראל in the Hebrew tradition. While 1QIsaᵃ does have the word רבים earlier in this verse, we would have to further assume a transposition in the translator's mind or manuscript to account for its current position in the Greek translation. This seems unlikely, given LXX-Isa's general adherence to the parent text's word order. If we take account of the evidence discussed above regarding the potentially secondary nature of עמים and בית ישׂראל, it seems more likely that LXX-Isa's *Vorlage* represented a different attempt to make sense of the string of plural verbs and objects in the Hebrew text.[27] The notion of multiplying in conjunction with receiving the land as inheritance is frequent in the Hebrew Bible, as seen in Num 33:54 and Deut 8:1, so the tradition represented by the Greek text is not without precedent. If the *Vorlage* read רבים after (והתנחלו(ם, this would explain why the translator understood some form of רב"ה in this position, and this explanation further accounts for the problems in the Hebrew tradition.[28] As for the Greek form of the phrase πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, this was most likely borrowed from LXX-Isa 6:12.[29]

---

[27] This appears even more likely if, as van der Kooij states, the *Vorlage* of LXX-Isa was precisely "the kind of glossed and reworked manuscript" we see with 1QIsaᵃ ("The Old Greek of Isaiah," 202).

[28] This effort to understand the precise relationship envisioned between Israel and the nations did not stop with the translation. Looking at the Greek manuscript families, we can see numerous attempts to bring Israel back into this text. Codex Sinaiticus, for example, reads, και κατακληρονομησουσι και πληθυνθησονται **οικος ισραηλ** επι της γης, which is closer to the Hebrew, and almost the entire Lucianic recension reads, και κατακληρονομησουσι και πληθυνθησονται **και καταδιελουνται αυτους οι υιοι ισραηλ** επι της γης. Manuscript 301 likewise adds Israel, but it does so in yet another way: πληθυνθησονται επι της γης του **ισραηλ**.

[29] So Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta,* 139. LXX-Isa 6:12, speaking of the Israelites who remain after God's judgment, reads, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μακρυνεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. See also Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*, SCS 61 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 336.

Given the difficulty of the Hebrew text, we will not be able to establish the *Vorlage* with any degree of certainty. Thus we cannot know whether the translator chose to ignore the ם- suffix of והתנחלום or whether this suffix simply did not appear in his *Vorlage*, but we can say that—in line with the principles of Second Temple exegesis in a milieu of textual pluriformity—this translation represents one choice among many for how the passage could have been rendered. Foreigners are still portrayed as slaves, but they receive inheritance, they are no longer possessed by Israel, and they will multiply on the land. Their status as both inheritors and slaves can even be seen as positive, for LXX-Isa 14:2 now evokes LXX-Isa 65:9: "I will bring out the seed of Jacob and Judah, and he will inherit my holy mountain (τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου), and my elect and my slaves will receive inheritance (καὶ κληρονομήσουσιν οἱ ἐκλεκτοί μου καὶ οἱ δοῦλοί μου), and they will dwell there."[30]

This change in the status of foreigners would be interesting in its own right, but yet another difference in translation pulls LXX-Isa 56:4–7 into the orbit of these texts. We discussed Isa 56:6–7 in the previous chapter, as this is one of the central texts for understanding the role of foreigners relative to law observance. The opening verses speak of the blessings to be given to the eunuchs, and in Greek the entire pericope reads as follows, with differences in bold:

56:4 Τοῖς εὐνούχοις…	56:4 To the eunuchs…
5 δώσω αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου καὶ ἐν τῷ τείχει μου τόπον ὀνομαστὸν κρείσσων υἱῶν καὶ θυγατέρων, ὄνομα αἰώνιον δώσω αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἐκλείψει.	5 I will give them in my house and within my wall a famous/named place, better than sons and daughters; I will give them an eternal name, and it will not fail.

---

[30] None of the recorded variants in the Greek manuscripts have any significant impact on the meaning of this verse.

6 καὶ **τοῖς** ἀλλογενέσι τοῖς προσκειμένοις κυρίῳ δουλεύειν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῷ εἰς δούλους **καὶ δούλας**[31] καὶ πάντας τοὺς φυλασσομένους τὰ σάββατά **μου** μὴ βεβηλοῦν καὶ ἀντεχομένους τῆς διαθήκης μου,	6 And **to** the foreigners joined to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the Lord's name, so as to be his male **and female** slaves—and all who observe to not profane **my**[32] Sabbaths, and those who hold to my covenant,
7 εἰσάξω αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου καὶ εὐφρανῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τῆς προσευχῆς μου· τὰ ὁλοκαυτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν ἔσονται δεκταὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου μου. ὁ γάρ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.[33]	7 I will bring them to my holy mountain,[34] and I will cause them to rejoice in my house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be acceptable upon my altar. For my house will be called a house of prayer for/by/to all the peoples.

Two major differences stand out in this text when compared with the Hebrew. First, in the Hebrew text, verses 4–5 describe the blessings bestowed upon eunuchs, while verses 6–7 describe the promises given to foreigners. In the Greek text, however, the promises in these two sections have been blurred. The promises to eunuchs in verses 4–5 are all in the dative, where the Lord describes how he will give "to them" (δώσω αὐτοῖς) a place and an eternal name within the temple. The promises to foreigners in verse 7, by contrast, are all in the accusative; God will

---

[31] The phrase καὶ δούλας is marked with an obelisk in many of the surviving manuscripts, but it is nearly universally attested (with the exception of codex Venetus, a Hexaplaric manuscript from the 8th century).

[32] The addition of μου most likely stems from the occurrence of the parallel phrase (τὰ σάββατά μου) in 56:4. See van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah,* 331.

[33] The quotation of this verse in Matt 21:13 omits πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, as does manuscript 538. Nevertheless, the preponderance of evidence (including this verse's quotation in Mark 11:17) supports its inclusion in our reconstruction of the Greek archetype.

[34] Note how this echoes LXX-Isa 65:9, quoted just above.

bring them to his holy mountain (εἰσάξω αὐτοὺς), and he will cause them to rejoice (εὐφρανῶ αὐτοὺς). Unlike the Hebrew,[35] the Greek text links *both* sets of promises to foreigners by the dative case of τοῖς ἀλλογενέσι in verse 6. The resulting anacoluthon, as the text switches from dative to accusative, reads awkwardly, but the overall effect is quite positive in how foreigners are portrayed.[36] Now, in addition to the promises they receive in the Hebrew text, they are given a famous/named place (τόπον ὀνομαστὸν) and an eternal name (ὄνομα αἰώνιον) within the temple.

The second major difference lies in the addition to verse 6, δούλους **καὶ δούλας**. In Baer's terminology, this is an unauthorized change to the text,[37] and it does not add any new information: δούλους already encompasses both male and female slaves. So why might this phrase have been added? The phrase δούλους καὶ δούλας is not uncommon in the LXX,[38] but within LXX-Isa, the phrase only occurs at 14:2—a verse that is similar to Isa 56:6–7 in its treatment of foreigners' joining Israel in a subservient status.

The coincidence seems too great to ascribe this difference to chance or careless translation. Rather, whoever made this connection seems to have been deliberately attempting to draw the reader's attention back into this web of texts and connections dealing with foreign

---

[35] In the Hebrew, all references to the eunuchs in vv. 4–5 are preceded by -ל (לו, להם, לסריסים), while references to foreigners in vv. 6–7 are not. This difference is unanimously attested in the Hebrew tradition.

[36] An alternative way to read this section involves dividing the punctuation differently. It is possible to read these verses as saying, "I will give to them [eunuchs] an eternal name—and it will not fail—as well as to the foreigners joined to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the Lord's name, so as to be his male and female slaves. And all who observe to not profane my Sabbaths [i.e., everyone, not necessarily foreigners], and those who hold to my covenant, I will bring them to my holy mountain…" In this reading, the eternal name is promised to eunuchs and foreigners, but the subsequent promise of being brought to God's holy mountain is no longer attached to foreigners at all. In this reading, the promise only extends to those who hold to God's covenant. This reading seems less likely, however, given that v. 7 once again speaks of temple worship in the context of foreigners.

[37] The Hebrew tradition is unanimous in reading only לעבדים here, and there is no easy way to derive ולשפחות from common scribal errors on the surrounding text.

[38] E.g., 2 Chr 28:10, Joel 3:2.

inheritance and temple worship. In this case, we can see LXX-Isa 14:2 and 56:6–7 as each shedding light on how the reader should interpret the other. LXX-Isa 14:2 speaks of how the nations will receive an inheritance, and this idea is then evoked and imported into our understanding of 56:6–7, where the nations observe the Lord's covenant. In both cases, our understanding of what it means to be a slave, to receive inheritance, and to hold to the Lord's covenant are bound together, such that no one theme can be fully understood without reference to the others. Taken together, LXX-Isa 14:2, 56:6–7, and 65:9 all function to bring foreigners more fully into the temple and to broaden their promised blessings—both in terms of inheritance and the everlasting name given to them.[39]

The final question that remains to be answered, then, is how much of this we can safely attribute to the translator of LXX-Isa. As shown above, there are good grounds for seeing the difference in Isa 14:2 as tracing back—at least partially—to differences within the Hebrew tradition, though some decision must have been made by the translator regarding how to resolve the Hebrew's difficult syntax. The addition of καὶ δούλας in 56:6 could have just as easily happened at the Hebrew level as the Greek.[40] The extension of the eunuch's blessing to foreigners in 56:6 also has no basis in either known Hebrew manuscripts or common scribal errors that might have worked on those manuscripts. By the criteria laid out in Chapter 1, our most likely (but not certain) conclusion from this is that the change took place on a Greek level.

---

[39] This is in line with how LXX-Isa connects other passages. As van der Vorm-Croughs notes, "the translator has often introduced into his text elements from passages elsewhere in the book of Isaiah. This gave him a means to clarify and interpret difficult portions with the help of other, related passages, but also to create linkages to other sections in Isaiah, thus improving the unity of his translation" (*The Old Greek of Isaiah,* 333).

[40] The thematic similarities between Isa 14:2 and 56:6 are no greater in either Greek or Hebrew. A Greek translator (or scribe) could have added καὶ δούλας to connect these verses just as easily as a Hebrew scribe could do so by adding ולשפחות. For a discussion on the possible sources of anaphoric translation, see van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah,* 301–3.

For all of these changes, the Greek manuscript evidence uniformly attests these changes within the LXX-Isa archetype, but again, our ability to jump the "Göttingen gap" between archetype and the original translation is mitigated by the nature of our sources.

Isa 24:16

The examples cited so far have dealt only with the general state of foreigners and their greater inclusion in temple worship. But some changes in LXX-Isa directly address the issue of law, as with LXX-Isa 24:16. Isaiah 24 speaks of God's judgment against the earth, "because they have transgressed the law" (24:5),[41] and in 24:14–16 Isaiah contrasts the praises sung to Yahweh with the guilt of those who are singing. The Hebrew of 24:16 reads:

24:16 מכנף הארץ זמרת שמענו צבי לצדיק ואמר רזי־לי רזי־לי אוי לי בגדים בגדו ובגד בוגדים בגדו:	24:16 From the end of the earth, we have heard songs, glory to the righteous.[42] But I say, woe is me, woe is me![43] Woe is me! The treacherous deal treacherously; and with treachery the treacherous deal treacherously.[44]

In the LXX, this entire section has been reworked, and instead of contrasting praise with guilt, LXX-Isa 24:14–16 contrasts the guilty who are judged with the righteous who are spared.[45] This same contrast is continued in 24:16, which reads:

---

[41] כי־עברו תורת / διότι παρέβησαν τὸν νόμον.

[42] Or, "glory to the Righteous One." I follow Berges, *The Book of Isaiah,* 166–67 for this choice.

[43] Or, "I pine away, I pine away" (if this is from the root רז"ה), or "I have my secret" (if this is connected with the Aramaic רז, "secret"). Modern scholars are divided on how to interpret this phrase, and LXX-Isa does not include it.

[44] This translation reads awkwardly in English, but it does capture the fivefold repetition of בג"ד.

[45] For example, the Hebrew of 24:14 reads, המה ישאו קולם ירנו בגאון יהוה צהלו מים ("they lift up their voice, they shout for joy; in the majesty of Yahweh they sing from the west"), whereas the Greek reads, οὗτοι φωνῇ βοήσονται, οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου. ταραχθήσεται τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης ("these will

24:16 ἀπὸ τῶν πτερύγων τῆς γῆς τέρατα ἠκούσαμεν Ἐλπὶς τῷ εὐσεβεῖ. καὶ ἐρ**οῦσιν** Οὐαὶ **τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν, οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον.**[46]	24:16 From the ends of the earth we have heard wonders—Hope for the pious. And **they** will say: Woe to **those who reject, those who reject the law.**

The section most relevant for our purposes is the final phrase, where ואמר רזי־לי רזי־לי אוי לי בגדים בגדו ובגד בוגדים בגדו is rendered in Greek as "And they will say: Woe to those who reject, those who reject the law." How can we account for the form of the Greek text? First, the phrase רזי־לי רזי־לי was either missing from the *Vorlage* or ignored by the translator, perhaps due to its difficulty. The word ואמר was read as ואמרו, the phrase אוי לי בגדים was taken as אוי לבגדים,[47] the fivefold repetition of בג"ד has been rendered with ἀθετέω only twice, and the final בגדו was perhaps read as תורה, though this would be an extraordinary mistake were it made simply on the basis of graphic similarity. None of these changes is attested by the Hebrew tradition, and given the difficulty of the Hebrew here, scholars have long recognized that these differences in Greek are best ascribed to an attempt to make sense of the text.[48]

---

shout with their voice, but those who are left in the land will rejoice together in the glory of the Lord. The water of the sea will be troubled").

[46] One strand of the Hexaplaric tradition (V-oII) appears much closer to the Hebrew: και ερουσιν **το μυστηριον μου εμοι το μυστηριον μου εμοι** Ουαι τοις αθετουσιν, οι αθετουντες **αθεσιαν αθετουντων** τον νομον, and this is echoed in the Lucianic recension: **και ειπεν το μυστηριον μου εμοι το μυστηριον μου εμοι και τοις εμοις** και ερουσιν Ουαι τοις αθετουσιν, οι αθετουντες **αθεσιαν αθετουντων** τον νομον. The fact that this reading only appears here and that the addition το μυστηριον μου εμοι το μυστηριον μου εμοι appears in different places in the verse suggests that this is a secondary attempt to bring the Greek more closely in line with the Hebrew text.

[47] This change is mirrored in the Targum, which renders this phrase as וי לאנוסיא. It is difficult to tell whether the Targum is here dependent upon LXX, whether both reflect a similar interpretive tradition, or whether there actually was a Hebrew *Vorlage* with אוי לבגדים, but see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 235 for discussion.

[48] This is the conclusion, e.g., of das Neves, citing Seeligmann (das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega,* 132). Seeligmann's analysis of εὐσεβής is particularly interesting here. He writes, "Εὐσεβής occurs in parallelism with ταπεινοί and πραεῖς (26.6-7; 32.7-8), as well as in contrast to ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον (24:16). We feel accordingly inclined to assume that, in these terms, elements of ethics and ritual practice are intermixed" (Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 270).

Yet while it may be true that the LXX form arises in part from the difficulty of the Hebrew, this is only a partial explanation. How the Greek text arose from the *Vorlage* is just as instructive as what the text actually says. Note, for example, how the major differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts can be explained by appeal to scribal "errors" at work on the Hebrew level—inserting an extra ו after ואמר, deleting the י from לי בגדים and combining the words into לבגדים, or reading בגדו as תורה. This is not translation through free association. The density of these "errors" also makes it highly unlikely that the translator just happened to repeatedly read the text incorrectly in this verse. In addition, the resulting translation fits well within the focus of the broader pericope. The notion of rejecting תורה/νόμος now recalls the initial judgment against the inhabitants of the earth for transgressing this תורה/νόμος in verse 5. All of this is in line with Second Temple exegetical practice, where scribes would manipulate the text in certain acceptable ways to produce acceptable hermeneutical results.[49] This type of interpretation is pervasive in LXX-Isa's rendering of Isa 8, as we will see below.

In terms of how this passage influences our understanding of law observance, here we can see a consistent tendency at work discouraging the rejection of law. Numerous qualifications to this statement are needed, such as the fact that νόμος does not necessarily refer to Mosaic law, and the condemnation of law-rejection may not have foreigners in mind. Nevertheless, it is striking that this woe upon law-rejection comes in a section dealing primarily with the whole earth and its inhabitants (ἡ οἰκουμένη… οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, 24:4–6), and one could

---

[49] As an example, Teeter writes, "these text-altering procedures appear… to derive from a specific conception of language and text. They seem to represent a hermeneutic of analogy, an interpretive approach grounded in a fundamental notion of participation between letterforms, lexemes, and locutions within the scriptural text. The text of scripture was not considered an absolutely fixed or immutable entity; this much is obvious. But neither was it regarded as an open or fluid tradition-stream permissive of arbitrary change according to whim and inclination. For these scribes, there are legitimate forms of textual alteration. Graphemes may be changed, lexemes exchanged, or phrases imported from parallel texts with valid interpretive results, governed by these hermeneutic assumptions, under the control of the tradition, and dictated by textual givens" (*Scribal Laws*, 199–200).

reasonably construe 24:16 as saying that the woe upon law-rejection comes "from the ends of the earth" (ἀπὸ τῶν πτερύγων τῆς γῆς… ἠκούσαμεν). Maximally, this change discourages foreigners from rejecting Mosaic law, but even minimally, it shows this text's heightened concern for law observance. At the very least it leaves the reader with the message: people should not reject the law.[50]

Isa 41:1 / 45:16

The Hebrew text of Isa 41:1 opens with God's command for all the islands/coastlands to listen in silence:

41:1 החרישו אלי איים	41:1 Listen to me in silence, islands/coastlands!

In the remainder of this chapter, God speaks of his help and concern for Israel. The Greek text, by contrast, retains the same focus on God's help for Israel, but it opens with a very different command:

41:1 Ἐγκαινίζεσθε[51] πρός με, νῆσοι	41:1 Consecrate yourselves to me, islands!

LXX-Isaiah's translation of חרש varies throughout the book. In Isa 36:21, the LXX correctly renders this root with σιωπάω, "to be silent," and it usually renders the noun חרש with its proper Greek equivalent, τέκτων, "craftsman." But in Isa 16:11, 41:1, and 45:16, the LXX

---

[50] This sense of concern for the binding force of law is strengthened by van der Meer's recent work on the meaning of ἀθετέω. He writes, "According to the plain sense of the verb, it simply means 'to set aside' (ἀ-τιθήμι). Within the documentary papyri from Ptolemaic Egypt as well as in the contemporary writings of the historian Polybius, the verb is often used in juridical documents with the sense of 'to annul a contract', 'to cancel', 'to break an agreement', or 'to withdraw from lawsuit'" ("Papyrological Perspectives," 122). Taken in this sense, perhaps the verse would be better translated, "Woe to those who annul the law" or "Woe to those who set the law aside."

[51] The extant witnesses of the Greek tradition are unanimous in this reading.

renders חרש with ἐγκαινίζω, as if the text read חד"ש instead, though the manuscript evidence is practically unanimous for חרש in all of these verses within the Hebrew tradition.[52]

Translating ἐγκαινίζω into English is difficult. The nominal and verbal root ἐγκαιν- in the LXX primarily occurs in the sense of "consecration," "renewal," "inauguration," or "dedication," and it is used almost exclusively in reference to the temple and its altar,[53] usually translating some form of חנ"ך. Numbers 7, for example, contains detailed instructions regarding the consecration of the temple altar (חנכת המזבח / τὸν ἐγκαινισμὸν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου [7:10]), while 1 Macc 4 describes how the both the temple and its altar were consecrated (ἐγκαινίσαι [4:36], ἐνεκαινίσθη [4:54]) after their desecration under Antiochus IV. But in a few cases, ἐγκαινίζω can also occur in profane contexts, as in 1 Sam 11:14, where the people go up to "renew (ἐγκαινίσωμεν) the kingship." Thus is it also possible to translate this verse as "Renew yourselves before me," or possibly "Reform yourselves toward me."

Regardless of how we translate the verse—and regardless of whether the *Vorlage* actually read החדישו or whether the passage was deliberately misread—this change has profound effect on how the reader conceives of foreigners. Rather than listening in silence, foreigners are now commanded to set themselves apart, to either renew themselves to the Lord or consecrate themselves to him, much as the temple is consecrated to Yahweh's service. When taken together with foreigners' role in serving God (שר"ת/δουλεύω, Isa 56:6) and working as priests and Levites (Isa 66:21), the command to renewal or consecration reemphasizes their place within Israelite worship.

---

[52] The one exception to this is Isa 16:11, in which one Kennicott manuscript (93) reads חדש.

[53] E.g., Num 7:10, 2 Chr 7:9, Ps 29:1, etc.

This same phrase makes another appearance in Isa 45:16. Isaiah 45, as we saw earlier,

deals with the nations' eventual obeisance to Yahweh and recognition of him alone as God

("God is only among you, and there is no other god" [45:14], "to me every knee will bow and

every tongue will swear" [45:23]), and the Hebrew text speaks of the shame that will come upon

those who make idols:

45:16 בושו וגם־נכלמו כלם יחדו הלכו בכלמה חרשׁי ‏ צירים:	45:16 They all are ashamed and also disgraced; the craftsmen of idols walk together in shame.[54]

LXX-Isaiah translates this verse as follows, substituting the same phrase from 41:1 for the

Hebrew's "craftsmen of idols":

45:16 αἰσχυνθήσονται καὶ ἐντραπήσονται πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι[55] αὐτῷ καὶ πορεύσονται ἐν αἰσχύνῃ. **ἐγκαινίζεσθε πρός με, νῆσοι.**	45:16 All those opposed to him will be ashamed and disgraced, and they will walk in shame. **Consecrate yourselves to me, islands!**

Once again, the translator apparently read the root חר"שׁ as if it were חד"שׁ, despite his familiarity

with the idea of חרשׁ as craftsman elsewhere in Isaiah.[56] The Hebrew word ציר does seem to have

genuinely given the translator trouble (he translates it elsewhere as ὅμηρα [Isa 18:2] and

πρέσβεις [Isa 57:9]), and it is possible that the *Vorlage* here read צורים, as in 1QIsaᵃ. If so,

---

[54] Aside from 1QIsaᵃ's reading of צורים for צירים discussed below, there are no major Hebrew variants in this verse relevant to our discussion.

[55] The translation of יחדו with ἀντικείμενοι is odd, though it was almost certainly made under the influence of 41:11, which reads much like this verse: αἰσχυνθήσονται καὶ ἐντραπήσονται πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοί σοι. Moshe Goshen-Gottstein suggests the translators may have read יחדו as יחרו (*The Book of Isaiah*, 3 vols. *The Hebrew University Bible Project* [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975–1993], 208), much as ἀντικείμενοί in Isa 41:11 translates הנחרים.

[56] He even correctly translates חרשׁ as τέκτων a few verses earlier, in 44:12 and 44:13.

perhaps the idea of "islands" occurred through association with Tyre (צור) and its maritime trade, though this is highly speculative. Alternatively, perhaps the translator read צירים as איים on the basis of this verse's parallel to 41:1. But regardless of what the *Vorlage* read or how the translator understood it, the influence of 41:1 is unmistakable. Whether this influence took place on a Greek or Hebrew level, the final effect is that the Greek text invites foreigners into a closer relationship with God.[57]

The command for consecration or renewal does not directly clarify whether and to what extent foreigners would observe law in the eschaton, but it does emphasize their special—indeed, one might even say, holy—status in LXX-Isa. We have repeatedly seen how the "law" going out to the nations is ambiguous, and it is never clear in the Hebrew text of Isaiah whether this law includes the type of religious observances that set Israel apart from the nations. In LXX-Isa, however, one might reasonably ask how it is that the nations could be consecrated, work in the temple, learn righteousness, receive inheritance, not reject νόμος, and serve as Levites and priests without observing these laws. Again, these differences within LXX-Isa do not answer the question definitively, but they do tilt our interpretation in this direction.

Isa 54:15

Another major difference between the Greek and Hebrew traditions is in Isa 54, a chapter dealing with God's compassion on Israel. The verse of interest to us comes sandwiched between the "covenant of peace" (ברית שלומי / ἡ διαθήκη τῆς εἰρήνης σου, 54:10) and the "eternal

---

[57] The intertextuality so characteristic of LXX-Isa belies Ottley's description of this verse's rendering as arising through "carelessness or helplessness" (*The Book of Isaiah,* 2:321). To my mind, the density of allusions—including another direct quotation from LXX-Isa 41 in this same verse—shows that the author's approach was careful and well thought out. See also van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah,* 349.

covenant, the faithful kindness of David" God will establish with Israel (ברית עולם חסדי דוד

הנאמנים / διαθήκην αἰώνιον, τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ τὰ πιστά, 55:3). In 54:15, God speaks of his

protection:

54:15 הן גור יגור אפס מאותי מי־גר אתך עליך יפול׃	54:15 If one indeed attacks, it is not from me; whoever fights against you, because of you he will fall.

The Greek, by contrast, speaks of proselytes or sojourners:

54:15 ἰδοὺ **προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονταί σοι** **δι' ἐμοῦ**[58] καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ **καταφεύξονται**.	54:15 Behold, **proselytes/sojourners will come to you through me**, and **they** will **take refuge** in you.

The Greek renders גו"ר in its more common sense of "to sojourn" rather than "to attack" or "to be

hostile toward," and the rest of the translation seems to have been shaped around this

understanding. Thus הן was taken to mean "behold," and יפול was taken to mean "to take refuge

in"—a translation equivalent which seems odd, but which does have some support in LXX-Gen

25:18.[59] Other parts of the verse seem to have been ignored completely, such as אפס and מי־גר

---

[58] One major variant is worth noting here. Between δι' ἐμοῦ and καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ καταφεύξονται, many manuscripts insert the phrase καὶ παροικησουσι(ν) σοι. Although the variant is not included in Ziegler's reconstructed text, this reading occurs in numerous manuscripts—B, Q (margin), oI', L`'-62-86ᶜ, C-764, 198, 239′, 403′, 449′, 538, 544, Eusebius, Theodoret, and Jerome, with two slight variants in oII (καὶ παροικησουσιν σε) and lII-86c, 764, and 538 (καὶ παροικησουσιν). Given the reading's distribution and homogeneity in form, the most likely explanation is that it was first introduced in the Hexaplaric group, from which it passed to the Lucianic (attestation outside these two groups is limited to one Alexandrian text, one group of Catena texts, and a handful of mixed manuscripts). On the other hand, it is worth noting that this reading provides an equivalent for מי־גר אתך (read as אתך [יגר]ו), and the variation between παροικέω and προσέρχομαι within one verse would be typical of LXX-Isa's tendency to eschew repetition in Greek, even when the Hebrew uses the same word twice (see van der Vorm-Croughs, "LXX Isaiah and the Use," 185–86). Thus while I am inclined to agree with the Göttingen reconstruction and leave this phrase out of the main text, there is enough ambiguity to merit at least some consideration.

[59] Speaking of Jacob, על־פני כל־אחיו נפל is rendered, κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ κατῴκησεν. As for the plural form, 1QIsaᵃ reads יפולו here, and in line with the methodology outlined in Chapter 1, we cannot therefore ascribe the change in number to the translator.

אתך. On balance, given the uniformity and character of the Hebrew witnesses, we would be hard-pressed to ascribe these changes to a differing *Vorlage*, especially since the Hebrew of this passage is quite difficult. The subsequent Greek transmission is likewise univocal, with the exception of the addition discussed in note 58, so this is as close as we can come to attributing these changes to the translator himself.

We should be careful not to assume a priori that προσήλυτοι indicates converts, but as noted in Chapter 2, the possibility of conversion was most likely fully developed by this time. Given what we have seen elsewhere in LXX-Isa, it seems reasonable to conclude that the author of LXX-Isa did have some type of conversion in mind, but we should at least be aware that προσήλυτοι does not *necessarily* have this meaning. As with many of the previous verses discussed, this translation does not prove anything relative to foreigners' law observance, but it does show an increased awareness of and emphasis on the eschatological *Völkerwallfahrt*.[60] LXX-Isa seems to have been shaped in such a way as to bring these themes to the fore, and this tendency comes to its fullest expression in the substantial reworking of Isa 8, to which we now turn.

Isaiah 8: Nations and the Law

LXX-Isa's reworking of Isa 8 has received a great deal of attention in modern scholarship, and due to the high degree of divergence between the Hebrew and Greek texts, this

---

[60] Terence Donaldson notes, "one can readily understand how the presence of גור, together with an awareness of eschatological pilgrimage traditions, would have led the translators to render the verse as they did." On the idea of "conversion" in this passage, he continues, "if we take the translation literally, they expected these Gentiles to become proselytes. One should not put a great deal of stress on this point; the choice of προσήλυτοι was determined by the presence of גור in the Hebrew *Vorlage* and does not indicate in and of itself that these end-time pilgrims were expected to be circumcised and to become full converts. Still, the choice is not without significance" (*Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007], 20–21).

passage is often used as a test-case for various interpretive strategies (*Erfüllungsinterpretation*, contextual exegesis, etc.). Modern interpretation tends to focus on 8:11–16, but as I will argue, this narrow focus leads to a number of difficulties that can be resolved by the broader context. For reference, I have provided the Hebrew and Greek texts of 8:5–22 below, with major differences in bold.

8:5 ויסף יהוה דבר אלי עוד לאמר:	8:5 Yahweh spoke to me again:
6 יען כי מאס העם הזה את מי השלח ההלכים לאט ומשוש את־רצין ובן־רמליהו:	6 "Because this people has rejected the waters of Shiloh[61] that flow gently, and rejoice in Rezin and the son of Remaliah,
7 ולכן הנה אדני מעלה עליהם את־מי הנהר העצומים הרבים את־מלך אשור ואת־כל־כבודו ועלה על־כל־אפיקיו והלך על־כל־גדותיו:	7 Therefore, the Lord is now bringing upon them the mighty and great waters of the river—the King of Assyria and all his glory—and it will come up upon all its channels, and it will run over all its banks.
8 וחלף ביהודה שטף ועבר עד־צואר יגיע והיה מטות כנפיו מלא רחב־ארצך עמנו אל׳:	8 And it will sweep into Judah; it will flood and pass over; it will reach up to the neck, and the spreading of his wings will fill the breadth of your land, Immanuel."
9 רעו עמים וחתו והאזינו כל מרחקי־ארץ התאזרו וחתו התאזרו וחתו:	9 Come together,[62] people, and be dismayed! Give ear, all the ends of the earth! Gird

---

[61] Or, "the sending waters" (מֵי הַשִּׁלֹחַ, cf. 1QIsaᵃ, מי השולח).

[62] 4QIsaᶠ reads דעו, while in 4QIsaᵉ the ר is doubtful.

	yourselves and be dismayed, gird yourselves and be dismayed!
10 עצו עצה ותפר דברו דבר ולא יקום כי עמנו אל׃	10 Counsel a counsel, and it will be broken; speak a word, and it will not stand, for God is with us.[63]
11 כי כה אמר יהוה אלי כחזקת היד ויסרני מלכת בדרך העם־הזה לאמר׃	11 For thus said Yahweh to me, while his hand was strong[64] upon me, and he warned me[65] against walking in the way of this people:
12 לא־תאמרון קשר לכל אשר־יאמר העם הזה קשר ואת־מוראו לא־תיראו ולא תעריצו׃	12 Do not call conspiracy everything which this people calls conspiracy, and do not fear or be afraid of what they fear.
13 את־יהוה צבאות אתו תקדישו והוא מוראכם והוא מערצכם׃	13 Yahweh of Hosts—he is the one whom you should sanctify, he is your fear, and he is your dread.
14 והיה למקדש ולאבן נגף ולצור מכשול לשני בתי ישראל לפח ולמוקש ליושב ירושלם׃	14 He will be a sanctuary[66] and a stone of striking, and a rock of stumbling to the two

---

[63] Or, "Immanuel."

[64] Many manuscripts read בחזקת (instead of כחזקת), which seems to be behind the LXX's rendering below.

[65] ויסרני does seem to be the original reading, but the Hebrew tradition preserves multiple readings of this verb. 1QIsaᵃ reads יסירנו, while Reuchlinianus similarly reads ויסירני.

[66] The view of God simultaneously as a sanctuary and a stumbling block for the houses of Israel is odd, and it is worth noting that some Hebrew manuscripts try to resolve this tension. Manuscript 96 read למוקש instead of למקדש, while the Kennicott Bible reads והיה להם לאבן. BHS even proposes to emend למקדש to למקשיר, presumably to bring this in line with קשר in v. 12, though this has no manuscript support. This is not to suggest that these readings were in the *Vorlage*, but they do attest to a degree of discomfort with this verse, even within the Hebrew tradition.

houses of Israel; a trap and a snare for the inhabitant[67] of Jerusalem.

15 וכשלו בם רבים ונפלו ונשברו ונוקשו ונלכדו:	15 And many will stumble among them, and they will fall, they will be shattered, they will be snared, and they will be conquered.
16 צור תעודה חתום תורה בלמדי:	16 Bind up the testimony, seal up the teaching among my disciples.
17 וחכיתי ליהוה המסתיר פניו מבית יעקב וקויתי־לו:	17 I will wait upon Yahweh, who hides his face from the house of Jacob, and I will hope in him.
18 הנה אנכי והילדים אשר נתן־לי יהוה לאתות ולמופתים בישׂראל מעם יהוה צבאות השׁכן בהר ציון:	18 Behold, I and the children whom Yahweh has given me are for signs and wonders in Israel, from Yahweh of Hosts, who dwells on Mount Zion.
19 וכי־יאמרו אליכם דרשו אל־האבות ואל־הידענים המצפצפים והמהגים הלוא־עם אל־אלהיו ידרשׁ בעד החיים אל־המתים:	19 And if they say to you, "Consult spirits and mediums, who whisper and murmur"—should not a people consult its God/gods, on behalf of the living to the dead,

---

[67] There is sufficient evidence among Hebrew manuscripts and the Versions to call into question whether the original reading here was ליושׁב or ליושׁבי.

20 לתורה ולתעודה אם־לֹא יאמרו כדבר הזה אשר אין־ לו שׁחר:	20 for instruction and confirmation? Indeed, those who speak like[68] this will have no morning.
21 ועבר בה נקשה ורעב והיה כי־ירעב והתקצף וקלל במלכו ובאלהיו ופנה למעלה:	21 He will pass through it, in pain and hungry. And when he is hungry, he will get angry and curse his king and his God/gods. And he will turn upward,
22 ואל־ארץ יביט והנה צרה וחשׁכה מעוף צוקה ואפלה מנדח:	22 and he will look to the earth beneath, and behold: distress and darkness, darkness and oppression, scattered darkness.

The Greek reads:

5 Καὶ προσέθετο κύριος λαλῆσαί μοι ἔτι	5 The Lord spoke to me yet again:
6 Διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ Σιλωαμ τὸ πορευόμενον ἡσυχῇ, ἀλλὰ βούλεσθαι ἔχειν τὸν Ρααссων καὶ τὸν υἱὸν Ρομελίου **βασιλέα ἐφ' ὑμῶν,**	6 On account of this people's not wanting the water of Siloam that flows gently, but wanting to have Rasson and the son of Romeliou **as king[69] over you**,
7 διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἀνάγει κύριος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ τὸ πολύ, τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἀσσυρίων καὶ τὴν δόξαν	7 Therefore, behold, the Lord is bringing upon you[70] the many and strong waters of the river—the King of Assyria and his glory—

---

[68] Or, "who speak this word" (cf. Kennicott Bible and numerous rabbinic texts, כדבר).

[69] It is difficult to determine how this could have arisen from a Hebrew text such as MT. Perhaps the translator read ומשוש as משיח, but this is uncertain.

[70] The second-person address is different from the Hebrew tradition given above, but there is some rabbinic evidence for second-person pronouns in Hebrew here.

αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναβήσεται ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φάραγγα ὑμῶν καὶ περιπατήσει ἐπὶ πᾶν τεῖχος ὑμῶν	and he will go up upon all your valleys, and he will walk on all your walls.
8 καὶ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ιουδαίας ἄνθρωπον ὃς δυνήσεται κεφαλὴν ἆραι ἢ δυνατὸν συντελέσασθαί τι, καὶ ἔσται ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ ὥστε πληρῶσαι τὸ πλάτος τῆς χώρας σου· μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.	**8 And he will take away from Judah a man**[71] **who can lift the head or who can accomplish something,**[72] **and his encampment will be such as** to fill the breadth of your land; God is with us.
9 γνῶτε ἔθνη καὶ ἡττᾶσθε, ἐπακούσατε ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς, **ἰσχυκότες** ἡττᾶσθε· **ἐὰν γὰρ πάλιν ἰσχύσητε, πάλιν** ἡττηθήσεσθε.	9 "**Learn,**[73] peoples, and submit![74] Listen, to the ends of the earth! **O strong ones,** submit! **For if again you become strong, again you will** be brought to submission.[75]

---

[71] Or "any man."

[72] Again, this is difficult to trace back to the Hebrew text. Presumably the idea of a river overflowing would not have been negative in an Egyptian culture dependent upon the overflowing Nile, so the author may have taken more liberty than usual in translating the sense of the passage rather than focusing upon semantic equivalents. Although the translation of חלף with ἀφαιρέω does not occur elsewhere in the LXX, the equivalence fits within the semantic range of the Hebrew verb. The idea of a man who can lift his head and accomplish something evidently arose from שָׁטַף ועבר עד־צואר, but the translation is so stretched that *BHS* even proposes inserting ואיש לא יוכל לשאת ראשו ולעשות מעשׂה into the Hebrew text.

[73] Or perhaps, "Take note, peoples!" This clearly arose from reading רעו as דעו, a reading that is attested in 4QIsa^f and possibly 4QIsa^e.

[74] There is a general tendency to translate ἡττάομαι as "to be defeated," but the word has a much broader semantic range than simply defeat in battle. As one example, in a legal context the word can mean "to lose a lawsuit" or "to be the unsuccessful party" (per van der Meer, as judging "from the daily use of the verb ἡττάω in the documentary papyri from Greek and Roman Egypt" ["Papyrological Perspectives," 114]), and dictionaries list many other definitions, such as "to give way," "to yield," "to be proved inferior," and "to be overcome" (see, e.g., Lust, Hauspie, and Eynikel, *Greek-English Lexicon,* etc.). In light of the fact that the context of this passage is ambiguous, I chose to translate ἡττᾶσθε as "be brought to submission" and "submit" in order to leave open the possibility for multiple interpretations. ἡττάομαι is the most frequent equivalent of חתת in LXX-Isa.

[75] The translator evidently understood התאזרו as relating to strength, as seen in his rendering of מאזרי זיקות (Isa 50:11) with κατισχύετε φλόγα. A similar equivalent can be found in 2 Sam 22:40, which renders ותזרני חיל with καὶ ἐνισχύσεις με δυνάμει. As for the addition of ἐὰν γὰρ πάλιν… πάλιν, Klaus Baltzer et al. posit that the repetition of התאזרו וחתו suggested to the translator "eine Wiederholung des Vorgangs in späterer Zukunft (nicht nur z.Z. von Achaz und Ezekias)" (*Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2524).

10 καὶ ἣν ἂν βουλεύσησθε βουλήν, διασκεδάσει **κύριος**, καὶ λόγον ὃν ἐὰν λαλήσητε, οὐ μὴ ἐμμείνῃ **ὑμῖν**, ὅτι μεθ' ἡμῶν κύριος[76] ὁ θεός.	10 And whatever counsel you may counsel, **the Lord** will scatter;[77] and whatever word you may speak, it will surely not remain **with you**, for the Lord God is with us."
11 Οὕτως λέγει κύριος **Τῇ ἰσχυρᾷ χειρὶ ἀπειθοῦσι** τῇ πορείᾳ τῆς ὁδοῦ τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου λέγοντες	11 Thus says the Lord: **with a strong hand[78] they reject[79]** the course of the way of this people, saying:
12 Μήποτε εἴπητε **σκληρόν**· πᾶν γάρ, ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, **σκληρόν** ἐστι· τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ ταραχθῆτε·	12 "Do not say 'hard,'[80] for whatever this people says is **hard**. But do not fear their fear, nor be troubled.
13 κύριον αὐτὸν ἁγιάσατε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος.	13 Sanctify the Lord himself, and he will be your[81] fear.

[76] The Göttingen Septuagint leaves κύριος in the main text, but it is missing from almost the entire Lucianic recension, O, oI, oII, Marchalianus, the Catena texts, and a number of other manuscripts.

[77] The translator evidently construed ותפר as active and supplied the subject to clarify the sense.

[78] Taking כחזקת היד as בחזקת היד, as many Hebrew manuscripts attest.

[79] See the note above on the Hebrew's mixed attestations of ויסירני/יסירנו/יסירני/ויסרני. The translator evidently construed this verb as deriving from either סור or סרר, and it is possible that translator understood the verb as plural by taking the *nun* as being from the Aramaic ending *–ûn* (see Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 328). As Koenig points out, there is a rich tradition of 'misreading' this verb in Hebrew, Greek, and even daughter translations, and he concludes: "c'est que cette leçon n'était pas particulière à Qa. Elle représente donc une tradition exégétique qui a connu une certaine extension et une certaine autorité" (325). Van der Kooij illustrates this through 4QFlor, which "offers a 'sectarian' interpretation of Isa 8,11 which presupposes the reading of Qᵃ" (van der Kooij, "Accident or Method?" 375).

[80] Presumably reading קשֶׁר as if it were קשֶׁה. Alternative explanations have been put forward, such as that the translator understood קשֶׁר as קרס (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 131) or that קשֶׁר was understood as a passive participle (van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, VTSup 70.2 [Leiden: Brill, 1997], 524).

[81] The singular rendering here is odd, since the Hebrew witnesses are unanimous in reading מוראכם. In the Greek text, as I argue below, the addressee is envisioned as the ἔθνη, and the singular rendering of σου might be due to the ease with which groups can be addressed as a collective in Greek and Hebrew (cf. pentateuchal legislation). The

14 καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾗς, ἔσται σοι εἰς ἁγίασμα, καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι· ὁ δὲ οἶκος[82] Ιακωβ ἐν παγίδι, καὶ ἐν κοιλάσματι ἐγκαθήμενοι ἐν Ιερουσαλημ.	14 **And if you trust in him,**[83] he will be to you as a sanctuary, and **you will not encounter him**[84] as a rock of stumbling, **nor** as a stone of falling. But the house of Jacob[85] **is in** a trap, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem **are in** a pit.
15 διὰ τοῦτο **ἀδυνατήσουσιν** ἐν αὐτοῖς πολλοὶ καὶ πεσοῦνται καὶ συντριβήσονται,	15 Therefore many among them will **become weak,**[86] and they will fall, and they will be

---

singular rendering might have arisen due to the singular ᾗς in 8:14 (discussed below), though of course we cannot rule out the possibility that the translator's (real or imagined) *Vorlage* read מוראך.

[82] Or, οι δε οικοι (O''-Q^{c et mg} L'^{-93}-311-46-233-456 C 403′ Syp Tht.).

[83] This is derived from והוא מערצכם at the end of the previous verse. Ottley thought the translator may have read מערצכם as deriving from some form of עזר and that "πέποιθα is one of those words which the LXX. seem to have used as a stop-gap when in doubt" (*The Book of Isaiah,* 2:149). Most scholars today follow Koenig in seeing this as a derivation from the Aramaic רחץ, "to trust," arrived at through confusion of the gutturals ע/ח and metathesis (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 124; see also Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2525). As Wagner points out, the phrase seems to have been influenced by 8:17 (וקויתי-לו / καὶ πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ; see *Reading the Sealed Book*, 260), which likewise probably accounts for the switching between singular and plural in the LXX vv. 13–14. The influence of v. 17 here will be discussed below. The Targum to this verse reads similarly (ואם לא תקבלון ויהי), most likely reflecting another instantiation of this interpretive tradition.

[84] The mechanism by which the translator arrived at this rendering is unclear. Perhaps he read ולאבן as ולא לאבן through letter duplication, mirroring another potential change in 8:16 (where בלמדי seems to have been read as בל למד). As to why this change was made, Koenig claims that the differences "s'expliquent par le souci révérenciel d'éviter tout risque d'interprétation litholâtrique," which he claims also accounts for why the Hebrew phrase "he will be" has been rendered in Greek as "you will encounter him" (*L'herméneutique analogique,* 125). Johan Lust explains it as stemming from a general discomfort with how Yahweh is portrayed in this passage: "Through the insertion of a negation… the Septuagint not only seems to have smoothed out the text but also to have eliminated the theologically problematic presentation of Jahweh as a cause of sin for his own people" (Lust, "The Demonic Character of Jahweh and the Septuagint of Isaiah," *Bijdr* 40 [1979]: 9).

[85] The Hebrew tradition here reads לשני בתי ישראל, though I do not know of anyone who claims this difference was theologically motivated. Troxel writes that the difference "should be compared to τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ισραηλ | | בית יעקב in 2:6, which shows the reverse interchange. Moreover, the appearance of מבית יעקב in v. 18 [sic: 17] may have influenced a scribe" (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 244).

[86] The translator evidently understood the semantic range of כש"ל as encompassing weakness, as seen in his rendering of Isa 40:30 (ובחורים כשול יכשלו / καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ ἀνίσχυες ἔσονται). This is in keeping with the root's translation in the broader LXX, in which the most frequent equivalent for כש"ל is ἀσθενέω.

καὶ ἐγγιοῦσι καὶ ἁλώσονται **ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες.**	crushed, and **those in safety**[87] **will draw near**[88] and be taken.
16 **Τότε φανεροὶ** ἔσονται **οἱ** σφραγιζόμενοι τὸν νόμον **τοῦ μὴ μαθεῖν.**	16 **Then those who**[89] seal up the law, **so as not to learn**,[90] will be **made manifest.**"[91]
17 **καὶ ἐρεῖ** Μενῶ τὸν θεὸν **τὸν ἀποστρέψαντα** τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου Ιακωβ καὶ πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ.	17 **And one will say**,[92] "I will wait upon God, who has **turned** his face **away**[93] from the house of Jacob, and I will trust in him.
18 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία, ἅ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός, **καὶ ἔσται** εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῷ[94]	18 Here am I and the children which God gave me, and they will be[95] signs and

---

[87] This apparently derives from reading צור (the first word in the following verse) as the subject of the preceding verbs and taking the idea of "rock" to mean "a place of safety" or "a place of refuge." See Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah,* 2:149–50; and Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2525. As Troxel points out, "The fact that ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες follows Greek word order rather than Hebrew suggests that this is [the translator's] own formulation" (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 245).

[88] נוקשו was apparently taken as נגשו on the basis of these words' phonetic similarity. De Sousa sees the two changes in this verse primarily as "an explanatory note on the weakening and inability of the 'many' at the beginning of the verse. LXX Isaiah displays numerous examples of paraphrastic additions intended to clarify obscure passages" (*Eschatology and Messianism,* 38).

[89] Perhaps the translator read חתום as a participle, חותם.

[90] The Hebrew text (בלמדי) was evidently interpreted as בל למד, בל למוד (with the final י being read as ו and metathesizing with ד), בלי למד, or מלמד.

[91] This was possibly derived through reading תעודה as a Hiphil or Hophal of ידע, or perhaps as תעורה.

[92] It is difficult to see how this could have been derived from the Hebrew witnesses we have. As I will argue below, most likely it was inserted into the Greek text to help give the passage internal structure (cf. וכי יאמרו / καὶ ἐὰν εἴπωσι in verse 19), though in theory this change could have happened at the level of *Vorlage* as well.

[93] Although the translator does render סת"ר with κρύπτω elsewhere, he also seems to have seen ἀποστρέφω as a viable translation option for this root (e.g., Isa 50:6, 54:8, 57:17, 59:2, and 64:6).

[94] The Hexaplaric, Lucianic, and Catena traditions all attest ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ισραηλ here, though most see this as a later addition (see van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah,* 248–49).

[95] Although this differs from the English translation of the Hebrew given above ("I and the children whom Yahweh has given me are for signs"), this does represent a valid reading of the consonantal text.

Ισραηλ παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ, ὃς κατοικεῖ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιων.	wonders in Israel from the Lord Sabaoth, who dwells on Mount Zion."
19 καὶ ἐὰν εἴπωσι πρὸς ὑμᾶς Ζητήσατε τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους, τοὺς κενολογοῦντας οἳ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν, οὐκ ἔθνος πρὸς θεὸν αὐτοῦ; τί ἐκζητ**οῦσι** περὶ τῶν ζώντων τοὺς νεκρούς;	19 "And if they say to you, 'Seek those who speak from the earth, and ventriloquists, those who speak emptily from their belly;[96] is not a people to its god?'[97]—why do **they**[98] seek the dead among the living?
20 **νόμον γὰρ εἰς βοήθειαν ἔδωκεν**, **ἵνα** εἴπωσιν οὐχ ὡς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, περὶ οὗ οὐκ ἔστι **δῶρα δοῦναι** περὶ αὐτοῦ.	20 **For he gave the law as a help**,[99] **so that**[100] they may speak not as this word, concerning which there are no **gifts to give**.[101]
21 καὶ ἥξει ἐφ᾽ **ὑμᾶς** σκληρὰ λιμός, καὶ ἔσται, ὡς ἂν πεινάσ**ητε**, λυπηθήσ**εσθε** καὶ κακῶς	21 And a difficult famine[103] will come upon **you**, and when **you** are hungry, **you** will be grieved and **you** will speak evil of **the ruler**

---

[96] The Hebrew here is difficult, and Ottley notes that LXX-Isa "is more explanatory" in this section (*The Book of Isaiah,* 2:150). There is no reason to see any major divergence here, however.

[97] This divides the Hebrew text differently than MT does, but it is still (mostly) faithful to the consonantal text. MT takes this as הלוא־עם אל־אלהיו ידרש בעד החיים אל־המתים, whereas the Greek takes it as הלוא־עם אל־אלהיו ידרׁש בעד החיים אל־המתים. The only difference is in LXX-Isa's insertion of τί, which was probably done to make sense of the verse in this division.

[98] Reading ידרׁש as ידרשו. This was probably done to agree with the plural in the following verse (יאמרו/εἴπωσιν).

[99] Apparently reading לתעודה as some form of עזר, through ו/ז and ר/ד interchange. Cf. Targum: לאוריתא דאתיהיבת לנא לסהדו. Both γὰρ and ἔδωκεν seem to have been added to clarify the sense. Alternatively, as Klaus Baltzer et al. suggest in *Septuaginta Deutsch*, perhaps the translator read לתעודה as לתת עזרה.

[100] This is the only instance in which LXX-Isa translates אם as ἵνα, assuming this is what was in the *Vorlage*. Regardless, this fits well with LXX-Isa's tendency to add connecting words in order to smooth out the syntax in Greek.

[101] Reading ׁשחר as ׁשחד, "bribe."

[103] Reading רָעֵב instead of רָעֵב (MT).

ἐρεῖτε τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τὰ παταχρα,[102] καὶ ἀναβλέψονται εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄνω 22 καὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν κάτω ἐμβλέψονται, καὶ ἰδοὺ θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος, ἀπορία στενὴ καὶ σκότος ὥστε μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ οὐκ ἀπορηθήσεται ὁ ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ ὢν ἕως καιροῦ.	and **idol**.[104] And they will look **to the heaven above**, 22 and they will look to the earth **beneath**,[105] and behold: affliction, and distress, and darkness, narrow difficulty and darkness **so as not to see**.[106] **And he in distress will not be at a loss for a time**."[107]

The painstaking work of determining how the Greek text could have arisen from the available Hebrew witnesses has been done numerous times before, and it is easily accessible in a number of articles and monographs that deal with this pericope.[108] As a result, I have placed this information in the footnotes to the Greek text rather than discussing each case in detail. On the whole, while this passage is often noted for its divergence from the Hebrew, almost every change can be traced back to possible variants within or manipulations of the Hebrew text, much as we saw with the verses studied above. For example, רעו was read as דעו (8:9), קשׁר was read as קשׁה

---

[102] Many Greek manuscripts read πατρια here, though this seems to be a secondary correction stemming from confusion surrounding the transliterated παταχρα.

[104] If the translator read במלכו, as the Hebrew tradition unanimously attests, not only did he change the suffix from 3ms to 2mp, but he also understood "king" loosely to refer to a ruler. The transliterated παταχρα is from the Aramaic פתכרא, "idol," and it arose from understanding ובאלהיו—itself ambiguous in the Hebrew text—as referring to a pagan god. The Targum takes this verse similarly (וילוט ויבזי שום פתכריה וטעותיה).

[105] Both "beneath" and "to the heaven" (in the previous verse) were most likely added to increase the parallelism within this clause. As we saw in Chapter 1, this is typical of LXX-Isa.

[106] It is unclear how the author arrived at this. The idea of "going away" or "not being seen" is associated with the root נד"ה in LXX-Job 6:13 (=ἄπειμι), or perhaps מנדח was read as having to do with light (=נר, "lamp," per Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch*) or as מראה (per Scholz; see Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah,* 2:151).

[107] This translates 8:23, כי לא מועף לאשר מוצק לה כעת, understanding מועף as coming from עי"ף, "to be weary."

[108] See, for example, van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint"; de Sousa, *Eschatology and Messianism*, 31–40; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 234–46; Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 118–35; and Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 273–74.

(8:12), מערצכם was read as מרחצכם (8:14), נוקשו was read as נגשו (8:15), and בלמדי was read as בל

למד (8:16). These types of variations—all clustered within a few verses and taken together to

produce one coherent text—are clear examples of the type of scribal hermeneutic laid out in

Teeter's *Scribal Laws*, and modern scholars have been practically unanimous in ascribing these

divergences to the translator.[109]

Interpretations in Modern Scholarship

Nearly every modern commentator agrees that this passage shows a heightened concern

for the place of law (usually interpreted as Mosaic law).[110] The description of "those who seal up

the law, so as not to learn" in 8:16 is taken to provide an interpretive key for the entire pericope,

particularly the author's exhortation: "Do not say 'hard,' for whatever this people says is hard"

(8:12). In this view, the passage is an extended criticism of an unknown group which has called

for an abandonment (or relaxation) of Mosaic law and endeavored to prevent its study.

Beyond this basic agreement, modern scholars disagree over just about everything else

within the passage. Seeligmann saw the pericope as a case of fulfillment-interpretation regarding

"an anti-dogmatic movement" in Alexandria who "qualif[ied] the precepts of orthodox Judaism

as hard and oppressive, and consider[ed] those who adhered to these precepts as having been

caught in a snare."[111] Van der Kooij likewise sees this as fulfillment-interpretation, but he locates

---

[109] Van der Kooij's appraisal is typical: the Greek "presents itself as a coherent text with a meaning of its own. This points to a deliberate translation process" (Van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation," in Vermeylen, *The Book of Isaiah/Le livre d'Isaïe*, 133). The intimate connection between so many Hebrew variants and the Greek text argues against ascribing these changes to later Greek scribes, and the fact that this section fits so well with the author's theology as seen elsewhere in LXX-Isa, as I will argue below, further keeps us from ascribing the interpretive work of this section to the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

[110] See discussion below.

[111] Seeligmann writes, "Assuming that we are to explain this as being the words used by an anti-dogmatic movement, then such a movement would qualify the precepts of orthodox Judaism as hard and oppressive, and consider those who adhered to these precepts as having been caught in a snare, and in a cave; for men such as these,

the anti-nomian party in Jerusalem rather than Alexandria: "LXX Isa 8:11–16… makes perfect sense if understood as a prophecy that could (and should) be read as predicting the policy of Hellenistic leaders in Jerusalem, in the first half of the second century BCE, and its failure."[112] In van der Kooij's view, verse 11 ("with a strong hand they reject the course of the way of this people") is best understood as a description of the leaders in Jerusalem who advocated abandoning Mosaic law, who "seal up the law, so as not to learn" (8:16).[113]

Other scholars reject fulfillment-interpretation altogether. As Wagner points out, the supposed links between LXX-Isa 8:11–16 and the contemporary situation in Alexandria or Jerusalem are vague, and these features of the text can be better explained as "a serious effort to interpret the text… within the wider context of Isaiah."[114] Troxel agrees that "although [the translator's] translation reflects pervasive concern for the Torah, the argument that he read Isa 8:11–16 as condemnation of an antilegalist group in his day is based on little more than serendipitous associations in modern readers' minds."[115] For these authors, we need to be able to provide much more specific ties between the text and contemporaneous events before positing

---

God has become a stone of offence, a stumbling-block. Man should not let himself be confused and led into a superstitious fear (of all these precepts and laws)" (*The Septuagint Version*, 273–74).

[112] Van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint," 529. Florian Wilk takes a similar view in "Between Scripture and History: Technique and Hermeneutics of Interpreting Biblical Prophets in the Septuagint of Isaiah and the Letters of Paul," in van der Kooij and van der Meer, *The Old Greek of Isaiah,* 193.

[113] "So, in the view of the leaders, which is clearly rejected in our pericope, the only condition to live in security and safety is to honour God in his temple; the ethical demands of the law are considered as not being required" (van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation," 133).

[114] Wagner, "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies," 267. He writes, "When Isa 8:11–16 is read with attention to this broader context, the evidence for van der Kooij's claim that the translator has 'actualized' or 'updated' this prophecy in order to speak to a specific situation in his own day evaporates" (ibid.).

[115] *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 246.

fulfillment-interpretation, especially since, as Lust points out, "nothing is known of an anti-Law movement [within Judaism itself] in this period."[116]

Still others see this pericope as neither fulfillment-interpretation nor an example of contextual exegesis, but as the translator's best attempt to understand an opaque text. De Sousa writes, "the significant deviations between the LXX and MT versions of Isa 8:11–16 do not originate in an insightful rewriting of the oracle, *but in the misreading of a difficult Hebrew text. The translator's expectation that the prophecy was directed to his generation, his theological and ideological worldview, and actual encounters with opposition to the law, would have provided the necessary backdrop against which his reading would have made sense.*"[117] Koenig takes the exact opposite view, claiming that the control of the translator's approach, along the lines outlined elsewhere in Koenig's work, "proves understanding, whereby the Greek diverged from the Hebrew, not by confusion or error, but knowingly and deliberately."[118]

In line with what we have seen in the other passages so far, Koenig's thesis has been borne out in seeing these texts as intelligent and deliberate reworkings. And as we saw in Chapter 1, there is no reason a priori to exclude *Erfüllungsinterpretation* as a potential explanation for the text, but in this case, I agree with Wagner, Troxel, and Lust that we do not have enough specific ties between the text and contemporaneous events to make a compelling case for fulfilment interpretation. Instead, LXX-Isa 8 is best understood as a learned reworking of the Hebrew text, which draws from themes elsewhere in Isaiah to create a coherent message.

---

[116] Lust, "The Demonic Character," 10.

[117] De Sousa, *Eschatology and Messianism*, 31–32 (emphasis added).

[118] "Nous avons vu plus haut que ce contrôle prouve l'intellection, d'où il résulte que G a divergé par rapport à H, non par embarras ou erreur, mais en connaissance de cause et de propos délibéré" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 120).

And as we will see below, this message is central to the LXX-Isa's understanding of foreign

nations and their relation with the law.

Internal Structure

Part of the debate regarding LXX-Isa 8 deals with how we understand the passage's flow

and internal structure. If, for example, we understand verse 16 as belonging with the following

verses rather than the previous, this can have a large impact on whether we interpret the previous

verses in light of law-rejection or not.

Most scholars have seen LXX-Isa 8:5–10 as a separate unit from 8:11–16, and their

interpretations have tended to focus on either one unit or the other. This division is based on the

natural conclusion formed by the inclusio of verses 8 and 10 ("God is with us… for the Lord

God is with us"), as well as on the fact that verse 11 has an introductory formula, "Thus says the

Lord."[119] For the section beginning with verse 11, one of the most noticeable differences

between the Hebrew and Greek text is that in Greek, verse 16 has been more closely tied with the

preceding verses through the introduction of τότε.[120] Since van der Kooij's analysis of this

section, most scholars have thus focused exclusively on 8:11–16 as a unit of its own.

Wagner was the first to argue that taking 8:11–16 alone is insufficient for understanding

this text. He proposed that the section beginning in 8:11 actually extends through 8:22, as

indicated by the addition of καὶ ἐρεῖ in 8:17, "marking vv. 17–18 not simply as a 'new section'

unrelated to what precedes (as van der Kooij implies), but more importantly, as the prophet's

---

[119] See Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 240.

[120] Van der Kooij explains, "vs 16 is linked up with vs 15 (and not with vs 17 as in MT), because, first of all, τότε… refers to the situation described in vs 15, and secondly, the first words of vs 17 (καὶ ἐρεῖ, not in MT) mark the beginning of a new section" ("The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation," 129). See also Lust, "The Demonic Character," 9; and Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 273.

response to the oracle."[121] In addition, the phrase καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς in verse 14

seems to have been drawn from verse 17,[122] further indicating this section's close connection

with the preceding verses, and the debate between "they" and "you" in verses 19–22 "draws on

the key term contested by the parties in vv. 11–16: νόμος."[123] Thus, any analysis that excludes

verse 17–22 will be skewed, or at best incomplete.[124]

      I find Wagner's analysis convincing, but I believe the boundaries of this unit need to be

extended even further to include verses 5–10. As Wagner himself recognizes, the identification

of "this people" in verses 11–12 draws directly from the negative portrayal of "this people" in

verse 6—a connection that exists in Greek as well as Hebrew. And beyond the dependence of

one section upon another, 8:11–22 on its own does not make sense when cut off from the

previous verses. This can be seen in the endless debates about who "they" and "this people" are

in this passage, but the problem can be seen most clearly in verses 11–12. In LXX-Isa these

verses read,

> [11]Thus says the Lord: with a strong hand they reject the course of the way of this
> people, saying: [12]Do not say 'hard,' for whatever this people says is hard. But do
> not fear their fear, nor be troubled.

When the passage is taken on its own, who could the addressee of verse 12 be? It cannot be "this

people," since the addressee is warned against fearing "their" fear. Nor can it be those who reject

the way of this people, since they are the speakers of this verse. We might assume that the reader

is being addressed, but it would be highly unusual for a character within the book of Isaiah to

---

[121] Wagner, "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies," 259.

[122] Ibid., 260

[123] Ibid., 259.

[124] As Wagner points out, this is simply an extension of van der Kooij's "contextual approach," which is one reason why he believes the identification of this passage as *Erfüllungsinterpretation* fails, even using van der Kooij's own method.

address the reader directly. When we take verses 11–12 together with 8:5–10, however, this problem disappears, and the meaning of the pericope is cast in an entirely new light.

Analysis

To show the structure and flow when the entire pericope is taken together, I have reproduced and reformatted the text below, with each speaker marked. Following the text itself, I argue why this passage is best understood this way.

Account of Israel's Rebellion

[5]The Lord spoke to me yet again: [6]On account of this people's not wanting the water of Siloam that flows gently, but wanting to have Rasson and the son of Romeliou as king over you, [7]Therefore, behold, the Lord is bringing upon you the many and strong waters—the King of Assyria and his glory—and he will go up upon all your valleys, and he will walk on all your walls. [8]And he will take away from Judah a man who can lift his head or who can accomplish something, and his encampment will be such as to fill the breadth of your land; God is with us.

Exhortation from the Righteous[125] to the Gentiles: Learn from Israel's Rebellion, and Submit to God's Will

(The Righteous):
[9]"Learn, peoples, and submit! Listen, to the ends of the earth! O strong ones, submit! For if again you become strong, again you will be brought to submission. [10]And whatever counsel you may counsel, the Lord will scatter; and whatever word you may speak, it will surely not remain with you, for the Lord God is with us."

The Righteous Reject Israel's Rebellion against God and the Law, and Exhort the Gentiles to Submit to Both

[11]Thus says the Lord: with a strong hand they *[the righteous]* reject the course of the way of this people *[the wicked]*, saying:

(The Righteous):
[12]"Do not say 'hard,' for whatever this people says is hard. But do not fear their fear, nor be troubled. [13]Sanctify the Lord himself, and he will be your fear. [14]And if you *[Gentile]* trust in him, he will be to you as a sanctuary, and you will not encounter him as a rock of stumbling, nor as a stone of falling. But the house of Jacob is in a trap, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem are in a pit. [15]Therefore many

---

[125] See below for a detailed argument of why I label this group "the righteous," why it is best understood as an address to Gentiles, etc.

among them *[the unrighteous Israelites]* will become weak, and they will fall, and they will be crushed, and those in safety will draw near and be taken. [16]Then those who seal up the law, so as not to learn, will be made manifest."

A Gentile Responds

[17]And one will say, "I will wait upon God, who has turned his face away from the house of Jacob, and I will trust in him. [18]Here am I and the children which God gave me, and they will be signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord Sabaoth, who dwells on Mount Zion."

The Righteous Exhort the Gentiles not to Listen to the Rebellious in Israel or Transgress the Torah

[19]"And if they *[the unrighteous Israelites]* say to you, 'Seek those who speak from the earth, and ventriloquists, those who speak emptily from their belly; is not a people to its god?'—why do they seek the dead among the living? [20]For he gave the law as a help, so that they may speak not as this word, concerning which there are no gifts to give.

The Righteous Predict a Time when the Gentiles Will Give up Idolatry, and the Wicked Israelites Will be Punished

[21]"And a difficult famine will come upon you, and when you are hungry, you will be grieved and you will speak evil of the ruler and idol. And they will look to the heaven above, [22]and they will look to the earth beneath, and behold: affliction, and distress, and darkness, narrow difficulty and darkness so as not to see. And he in distress will not be at a loss for a time."

The opening section (8:5–8) begins with a description of Israel's rebellion against God and their desire for a foreign king, and immediately following, someone (or some group) addresses the ἔθνη and commands them to learn from Israel's example. "Learn, peoples, and submit!" (8:9). In wanting a foreign king, Israel had implicitly rejected God's sovereignty, but the Gentiles are commanded to submit to God, no matter how strong they may be. Israel had its own desires (Διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι, 8:6), but the Gentiles are told not to rely on their own counsel (ἣν ἂν βουλεύσησθε βουλήν, 8:10). Finally, the speaker is identified as a group on the Lord's side ("the Lord God is with us," 8:10), presumably the righteous Israelites. The command to learn and submit takes on new significance in this context, as the futility of foreign self-sufficiency is contrasted with God and righteous Israel as the true source of strength. Whatever

word the Gentiles might speak, they are told, "it will surely not remain *with you* [missing in Hebrew], for the Lord God is *with us*."

This section sets up a number of themes that will continue to appear throughout the pericope. First, "this people" (τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον) is introduced as rebellious, as a group that "do[es] not want" what God wants (8:6). The group called "this people" appears again in 8:11 and 8:12, and in both instances they are negatively portrayed. They say everything is "hard" (8:12), they "seal up the law" (8:16), "they seek the dead among the living" (8:19), and "they will look to the earth beneath, and behold: affliction" (8:22).

The second major theme introduced in this section is the idea of an address to the Gentiles. The Greek text shows numerous differences in verbs and pronouns, all of which function to make this chapter into a prolonged address "to you" (pl.), an address which will carry on into the verses that follow. Not only are Gentiles addressed in this section, but they are commanded to learn from the wicked. This happens again in 8:12 ("Do not say 'hard,' for whatever this people says is hard"), as well as in 8:19–20, where the wicked people's words "to you" are held up as an example of misunderstanding the law ("Why do they seek the dead among the living? For he gave the law as a help").

In the next section, the Lord introduces an unspecified "they" who reject the course of the way of "this people" (8:12).[126] The unspecified "they" go on to address a plural audience, warning this audience against the evil ways of "this people" (8:12) much as the speaker(s) of 8:9–10 had done earlier. It seems most reasonable, therefore, to assume that both 8:9–10 and

---

[126] In van der Kooij's interpretation, this unspecified "they" refers to the leaders in Jerusalem: "The expression 'with a strong hand' points to a position of power and might of those who 'disobey'. It is likely therefore that leaders of the people are meant." (Van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation," 130). In response, de Sousa rightly points out, "While this is certainly plausible, one must not forget that τῇ ἰσχυρᾷ χειρὶ simply represents כחזקת היד and one must, therefore, be careful about drawing specific conclusions" (*Eschatology and Messianism*, 34).

8:12–16 are spoken by the same group, which I label, "the righteous."[127] In this same vein, the most natural antecedent for the addressee of 8:12–16 is the ἔθνη addressed in 8:9–10.

In these verses, the righteous reject the way of "this [wicked] people," and they go on to urge their Gentile listeners not to call something hard, to sanctify the Lord, and to trust in him. If they do this, they are told, they will not encounter God as a stumbling block—unlike the wicked who have fallen into a pit and who will be crushed. What, then, is the primary referent of these verses? What might the Gentiles be in danger of calling "hard," and what might they otherwise encounter as a stumbling block? Modern scholars have been nearly unanimous in seeing these verses as referring to Mosaic law, in large degree based on the section's conclusion regarding "those who seal up the law, so as not to learn" (8:16).[128] The wicked do not want the addressees

---

[127] Van der Kooij argues that "the course of the way of this people" is positive and that the speakers' rejection is seen negatively by the translator. After comparing the use of πορεύομαι in Isa 65:2, he writes, "Just as in this text in 8:11 the right way is meant, as is indicated by the verb ἀπειθέω (in MT, quite the opposite is the case; there 'the way of this people' conveys a negative meaning)" ("The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation," 130). Wagner offers a convincing rebuttal through the translator's use of the phrase "this people" in LXX-Isa 8:6 and 9:16: "the appellation 'this people' underscores the sharp distancing of God from his people on account of their sin…. the Greek translator has not only recognized but even enhanced the contrast between 'this people' and 'my people'" (Wagner, "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies," 261–62; see also Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 242). The use of ἀπειθέω is similarly problematic as the basis for seeing "the course of the way of this people" as negative, since "it is the object against which one rebels that determines whether ἀπειθέω carries a positive or negative connotation. If 'this people' denotes the unfaithful in Israel, then to 'reject walking in the way of this people' must in this instance be a mark of fidelity to the Lord" (Wagner, "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies," 263). The identification of this group as "the righteous" is further bolstered by Wagner: "The absence of any explicit quotation formula indicating a shift of speakers after v. 12 (contrast καὶ ἐρεῖ in 8:17) would seem to favor this view, as it suggests that it was not important to the translator to distinguish sharply between the words of the unnamed speakers in vv. 12–14 and the words of the Lord" (ibid., 260).

[128] Lust, for example, writes: "Verse 16 states that God condemns those who refuse to study the law. Verses 11–15 are to be understood in the light of this statement. They articulate the point of view of that section of the people who in this period refused to study the law and who qualified the precepts of orthodox Judaism as 'hard'" ("The Demonic Character," 9). According to Koenig, this verse "contient une allusion à l'austérité de la vie sous le joug de la Loi : elle est «dure, difficile!»" (*L'herméneutique analogique,* 131; see also Wagner, "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies," 257, and Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 241). Klaus Baltzer et al. offer one of the main dissentions from this view, claiming that "mit ,hart' ist dabei wohl nicht das schwere Joch des Gesetzes benannt (so Seeligmann, 1948, 106; Koenig, 1982, 121; van der Kooij, 1989, 130), sondern die unnachgiebige Ausübung politischer Herrschaft" (*Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2525). In other words, they agree that "law" is still the referent of "hard," but they claim a political rather than religious view of law is meant. This latter interpretation seems less likely given that the wicked seal up the law "so as not to learn." What Klaus Baltzer et al. call "politischer Herrschaft" is usually something imposed upon a people, not willingly learned by them.

169

to learn the law, which they call "hard," but the Gentiles have been told back in 8:9–10: "Learn, peoples, and submit… for the Lord God is with us."

After the righteous describe the fall of the unrighteous,[129] their weakened state, and their sealing up the law, a new speaker is introduced in 8:17 with the words καὶ ἐρεῖ. If we take 8:9–22 as an extended dialogue between the Gentiles and righteous Israelites, as I propose here, καὶ ἐρεῖ in 8:17 would most naturally introduce a Gentile response to the Israelites' words. The previous section opened with a command to the Gentiles not to say certain words (Μήποτε εἴπητε, 8:12), and now we are given what the Gentile will say (καὶ ἐρεῖ, 8:17). The Gentile was earlier encouraged to trust in the Lord (καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς, 8:14), and here he expresses his trust in language drawing from the righteous' speech: πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ (8:17). As Wagner points out, these two sections have been deliberately brought into parallel in LXX-Isa, a relationship that does not exist in the Hebrew text.[130] The Gentile's description of his children as "signs and wonders in Israel" now takes on an entirely different meaning from the Hebrew text, where Isaiah and his children are the signs. In LXX-Isa, the sign and wonder is the future presence of Gentile children among Israel, trusting in God.

Following this response, 8:19 picks back up with an address to a plural audience, again exhorting them not to listen to what "they say" (ἐὰν εἴπωσι πρὸς ὑμᾶς…). The parallel to 8:12 is strong, where a plural audience is warned not to listen to what "this people" says (ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ ὁ

---

[129] The phrase "many among them" in 8:15 most likely refers back to "the house of Jacob… and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" from the previous verse, as Troxel points out. Troxel takes verses 14b–16 as being spoken by the Lord, but his broader point is still valid: "In this construal, the announcement of the Kyrios in 14b–16 *concurs* with the statements by the speakers in vv. 11–14a by acknowledging that 'the way of this people' has led them into a snare and trap" (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation,* 241–42).

[130] Wagner, "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies," 260. Another example of this is the description of God as one "who has turned his face away from the house of Jacob" (8:17), parallel to the righteous' claim that "the house of Jacob is in a trap" (8:14). Wagner writes, "This verbal connection is due to the translator's decision to render 'the two houses of Israel' in v. 14 (לִשְׁנֵי בָתֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל) as 'the House of Jacob,' borrowing the terminology of v. 17" (ibid., 260–61).

λαὸς οὗτος), and once again the overriding concern is for the status of the law (cf. 8:20, "he gave the law as a help"). On the basis of these parallels in content and form, it makes sense to see the addressee once again as the Gentiles, and the speakers as the righteous Israelites. This conclusion is reinforced by the unspecified "they" in verse 19. Note that in 8:16, the wicked are accused of sealing up the law, and here "they" try to persuade the addressee to seek out diviners and mediums—in direct contradiction to Mosaic law (cf. Lev 19:31, Deut 18:10–11, etc.). The righteous Israelites respond again by emphasizing the goodness of the law.

In the final section, the righteous continue their address to the plural audience and speak of a time when "you will speak evil of the ruler and idol" (8:21). The Hebrew אלהיו is ambiguous, for the word could refer to either Yahweh or foreign gods, but LXX-Isa specifies that this is an idol (παταχρα) that the addressees will one day curse. This change, in addition to change of suffix to second person plural, casts the addressees as foreigners, in line with the Gentile addressees of 8:9–10, 12–16, and 19–20. That these are not idolatrous Israelites is implied from the continued reference to the wicked "they" throughout this pericope: "whatever this people says is hard. But do not fear their fear…. the house of Jacob is in a trap, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem are in a pit. Therefore many among them will become weak…. And if they say to you…" (8:12–19). Immediately after the prediction that "you will speak evil of the ruler and idol," we learn that "they"—i.e., the wicked who have been spoken of in third person throughout this section—will be punished: "they will look to the heaven above, and they will look to the earth beneath, and behold: affliction, and distress" (8:21–22).

When taken together, LXX-Isa 8:5–22 presents one coherent conversation between the righteous and the Gentiles, and numerous changes have been made to make the passage fit this scheme. Someone—whether it be a Hebrew scribe working with the *Vorlage*, the translator, or a

later Greek scribe—has changed pronouns, introduced speakers, and brought internal sections into greater parallel in order to create a flowing discourse regarding the righteous, the example of the wicked, foreigners, and the law. In each case, the referents never change: "you" are the Gentiles explicitly addressed in 8:9, "they" are the wicked among the Israelites, and the speakers are the righteous whose view is endorsed by the author. In 8:9–22, the only time this pattern is broken is in 8:11, where the Lord speaks directly to affirm the righteous' view.

Implications

When LXX-Isa 8 is understood in this light, the passage takes on an entirely new meaning relative to foreigners and the law. In passages such as LXX-Isa 14:1–2, 26:8–9, and others studied above, we could see an increased concern for law and for the status of the Gentiles, but it was never entirely clear whether the author envisioned foreign *inclusion* in Israelite worship or foreigners' full *conversion*—including full observance of Israelite law. Here, the exegetical position of LXX-Isa comes into sharper focus. Now the nations are addressed directly, and they are commanded to learn and submit to the law. The wicked are portrayed as "sealing up the law, so as not to learn," and they try to convince the Gentiles to ignore certain statutes within the Pentateuch, but the righteous are unwavering in their defense of the law and their claim that the law should be embraced by foreigners as well. In this passage, the Gentiles are expected to observe all of the law—even those aspects that may be deemed "hard."

This interpretation also throws new light upon the passages studied above. We have already seen how law rejection was a primary concern in the rendering of LXX-Isa 24:16, "Woe to those who reject, those who reject the law." LXX-Isa 8 shows an additional concern, not only that Israelites might reject the law, but also that the nations might reject it on the grounds that it is "hard" or a "stumbling block." We also saw the semi-authorized change made to Isa 26:9 to

render this verse as, "your commands are light upon the earth. Learn righteousness, you who dwell on the earth!" The imperative directed at the earth's inhabitants to "learn righteousness" in the context of God's law looks strikingly similar to the imperative in LXX-Isa 8:9, to "Learn, peoples!" and twice in LXX-Isa God commands the nations: "Consecrate yourselves to me, islands" (41:1, 45:16). Individually, these commands could be interpreted in a number of different ways, but taken together with the overriding concern for law in LXX-Isa 8, they bespeak the author's desire that the nations come to God and observe his law.

The concepts of law, conversion, and observance repeatedly come to expression in LXX-Isa, whether this be in an extended dialogue between Gentiles and the righteous or minor changes such as the rendering, "Behold, proselytes/sojourners will come to you through me" (LXX-Isa 54:15). Many of these texts are connected or modified to clarify one of the most pressing questions left unanswered by the Hebrew text of Isaiah: should the foreigners who come to Israel in the last days observe Israelite law? This concern also extends to LXX-Isa's rendering of the Servant Songs, which we address next.

Chapter 5: The Servant Songs and the Septuagint of Isaiah

In the previous chapter we saw numerous instances in LXX-Isa where the author modified the text to ameliorate the position of foreigners and encourage their observance of the law. A similar network of changes can be seen throughout the Servant Songs in LXX-Isa, but here the alterations are much more subtle. Rather than warning the nations against "those who seal up the law" and commanding them to "learn" (8:9,16), in the Servant Songs the Greek text taps into a rich network of ideas surrounding law, light, and instruction to shape the reader's image of the Servant and to illustrate the Servant's unique relationship to the nations.

As I will show below, the concept of the Servant has been modified within LXX-Isa to fit with the idea of Mosaic law going out to the nations. This is brought about through a closer identification between the Servant, Moses, and Mosaic law, as well as through the Servant's role as the embodiment of "the peoples' covenant" (διαθήκην ἐθνῶν, Isa 49:8). The content of this covenant, as we will see, is construed in Mosaic terms throughout LXX-Isa's Servant Songs.

The Servant in the Hebrew Texts of Isaiah

When it comes to exegesis surrounding foreigners and their relationship with God, few areas provide more fertile ground for interpretation than the Servant Songs. In Chapter 3 we discussed how the Hebrew texts of Isaiah present the Servant as a "covenant of people" (ברית עם, 42:6; 49:8) and a "light to the nations" (אור גוים, 42:6; 49:6), and he is envisioned as a fulfillment of the prophecy of תורה going out to the nations (2:3), for the coastlands are said to wait for the Servant's תורה (42:4). As Fischer puts it, the Servant functions as a "Moses for the people,"

while Zion becomes a "Sinai for the people," the new source of law.[1] It should come as little surprise, therefore, that LXX-Isa should focus on these sections in its own interpretation of these themes.

Within the Hebrew texts, the Servant is not portrayed with any one consistent image, nor is it even clear that the Servant Songs themselves all stem from the same source. We should be careful, therefore, not to assume that the Servant has a single identity in the Hebrew texts and a different single identity in the Greek. Rather, in both traditions the Servant is a composite picture, one which simultaneously draws imagery from Moses, Jeremiah, Israel, Isaiah, Cyrus, the law, and generic prophetic themes. As Gordon Hugenberger notes, "the prophet may have drawn from such a rich diversity of sources for the composite picture he paints that any attempt to identify the servant figure is necessarily reductionistic."[2]

One aspect of the Servant's profile is particularly relevant to our discussion and therefore deserves highlighting, namely, the Servant's portrayal as a figure like Moses. As in the first exodus, DI begins with a call to prepare a way through the wilderness (Isa 40:3), and a particular density of exodus imagery can be found surrounding the Servant Songs. On a thematic level, the songs detail how "Yahweh will personally lead his people and turn their darkness into light (42:16; 52:12)," and "as the original exodus was intended to draw God's people into a covenant

---

[1] "Israel aber hat seine Tora durch die Vermittlung des Mose, in dessen Nachfolge die Propheten mit ihrem Wort treten. Die Völker erhalten ihre Tora durch die Vermittlung des Knechtes…. Der Knecht Israel wird dadurch zum ‚Mose für die Völker,' und der Zion wird so zum ‚Sinai für die Völker'" (Fischer, *Tora für Israel,* 110, 123).

[2] "The Servant of the Lord," 119. Blenkinsopp makes a similar point: "But if we accept, as most do, that Isa 40–55 has been subjected to several redactions, we must take seriously the possibility that these passages have in the course of time been assigned to several individuals or groups, with or without changes to the wording" (*Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:77).

with himself, so also this second exodus will result in an 'everlasting covenant.'"[3] The Songs describe God's dealing with Cyrus, "so that you may know I am Yahweh" (Isa 45:3), just as God had earlier dealt with Pharaoh to bring about this knowledge (Exod 14:4), and both texts deal with the overthrow of the wise (Exod 7:11 and Isa 44:25). In both, Yahweh goes out as a man of war (Exod 15:3 and Isa 42:13–16), and both focus on God's deliverance of his people from the house of bondage (Exod 13:3 and Isa 42:6–7). The Servant divides the land as an inheritance for Israel (Isa 49:8), as Moses had done earlier (Num 34), and he stands as an intercessor who "was wounded for our transgressions" (Isa 53:5) and "made his grave with the wicked" (Isa 53:9), just as Moses interceded for the people (Exod 32:32) and was buried in the wilderness with the rebellious Israelites (Deut 34:6).[4]

In short, the Servant in Isaiah has been deliberately cast as a type of Moses.[5] Even his title is reminiscent of Moses's own description as "God's servant" (e.g., Num 12:7, Josh 1:2, 2 Kgs 21:8, etc.).[6] Within the Bible more broadly, Moses's role as mediator of the Sinaitic covenant is so central that the law comes to be identified chiefly with him, such that in the New

---

[3] "The Servant of the Lord," 125. Hugenberger goes on to point out that this second exodus even eventuates in the calling of priests and Levites (Isa 61:6), just as happened after Sinai. This and all subsequent examples in this paragraph are drawn from Hugenberger, "The Servant of the Lord," 122–29.

[4] This connection was similarly made in *b. Soṭah* 14a. On the intertextual nature of these parallels, Blenkinsopp offers caution: "This often quite nuanced interplay of theme should not be placed under the rubric of intertextuality, as if the Exodus texts were already in place, waiting to be reread, reinterpreted, and reappropriated, since it is quite possible that, *in their present form*, they postdate the composition of Isa 40–55. It is more a case of typology" (*Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:112, emphasis in original).

[5] This effort even extends through TI, as seen for example in "59:21, in which the choice of language ('covenant,' 'words placed in the prophet's mouth,' 'words that will not depart from the prophet's mouth') suggests an intent to align the Deutero-Isaianic prophetic succession with the 'prophet like Moses' of Deut 18:15–18" (Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 3:37).

[6] "Apart from David, no individual is more frequently identifies as the 'servant' (עֶבֶד) of the Lord than Moses…. What makes this designation particularly characteristic of Moses is Numbers 12:6–8, where Yahweh twice distinguishes Moses as 'my servant' over against those who were merely prophets" (Hugenberger, "The Servant of the Lord," 129). See also Fischer, *Tora für Israel,* 80–81 and Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:118.

Testament period, interpreters of the law were said to sit "on Moses's seat" (Matt 23:2). In this same vein, the Servant of Isaiah likewise comes to be identified with the covenant mediated through him, such that God speaks of the Servant *as* a covenant: "I have given you as a covenant of people" (Isa 42:6). Although it would be a mistake to see the Servant as typifying only Moses, the Mosaic character of the Servant—including in his role as a mediator of covenant and law—is unmistakable.

The Servant in LXX-Isa

As we turn to LXX-Isa, we can see that much is the same between the conception of the Servant in the Hebrew and Greek texts. At the same time, there are also a number of significant differences that impact our understanding of the Servant, the law, and the role of both relative to the nations. The Servant's treatment in LXX-Isa can be broken into three categories, each of which will be treated in succession. In the first, we will address how the Servant's designation as a light to the nations and covenant to the people is modified in LXX-Isa; in the second, we will examine the increased density of allusions to Moses; and in the third, we will see how the Servant is aligned more closely with the idea of instruction, or παιδεία.

A Light and a Covenant

As in the Hebrew texts, the Servant in LXX-Isa is still identified as a light to nations (φῶς ἐθνῶν). While this translation equivalent is no innovation on the part of the author, in order to fully understand LXX-Isa we have to understand one of the subtle shifts taking place in the religious use of the word "light" in this period. As seen in Chapter 3, light was associated with the law in Second Temple Judaism, and though the two terms would hardly be considered

completely interchangeable, their connection was nevertheless much deeper than simple

association. This was based at least partially on the resemblance of the Hebrew and Aramaic

terms (e.g., אור and תורה), and partially on the deeper idea of תורה as a type of enlightenment.

The pseudepigraphic *Letter of Aristeas*, written around the time LXX-Isa was translated,

gives an account of how the Pentateuch was translated into Greek, and in *Aristeas* the description

of translation is deliberately recounted in a way to evoke the seventy elders on Sinai who receive

and promulgate the law of Moses.[7] In a real sense, the seventy-two translators of *Aristeas*

recompose that original group on Sinai as they bring the law of Moses to the nations,[8] and in so

doing they become both a second Moses and a type of Isaianic Servant. Koenig writes, "it is the

'Servant of Yahweh' who is destined to become the 'light of nations.' But, whatever the

Servant's identity might be… it is clearly inasmuch as he makes known the Law of Israel to the

nations that he is the light of nations. It is indeed the Law that is the source of that light, and it is

the Law which, in the prophetic doctrine from the end of exile, is 'light of the nations.'"[9]

This nexus of ideas—translating the Greek Pentateuch, bringing the law of Moses to the

nations, and embodying the Isaianic Servant as φῶς ἐθνῶν—reappears allusively in Philo, who

recounts the translation of the Pentateuch as occurring "to the end that the greater part, or even

the whole, of the human race might be profited and led to a better life by continuing to observe

---

[7] See Harry Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 94–98.

[8] "Les 70 auteurs de la Septante accomplissent eux aussi ce qui était typologiquement annoncé par les 70 anciens qui gravirent le mont Sinaï avec Moïse. « Faire connaître » la Loi aux nations… a donc certainement été un grand thème idéologique dans le milieu des Juifs alexandrins" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 40). See also Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ."

[9] "[C]'est le « Serviteur de Yahvé » qui est destiné à devenir « lumière des nations ». Mais, quelle que soit l'identité du Serviteur… c'est clairement en tant qu'il fait connaître la Loi d'Israël aux nations qu'il est lumière des nations. C'est bien la Loi qui est le foyer de cette lumière et c'est donc elle qui, dans la doctrine prophétique de fin d'exil, est « lumière des nations »" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 39, n. 19).

such wise and truly admirable ordinances."[10] In like vein he describes Pharos as "the place in which the light of that version first shone out,"[11] a depiction that is at least reminiscent of Isaiah's Servant, if not directly allusive.[12] As noted in Chapter 3, even the Targum of Isaiah makes this connection in its rendering of the Hebrew Isa 2:5 ("let us walk in the light of Yahweh") as "let us walk in *the study of the law* of the Lord."

Again, none of this is to say that the author of LXX-Isa saw the word "light" as a cipher for the law of Moses. But we would be remiss not to notice the interpretive possibilities opened up through this association, as well as the prominent role that light imagery plays throughout Isaiah. In Isa 51:4, both law (תורה/νόμος) and judgment (משפט/κρίσις) are referred to as a "light of peoples" (אור עמים / φῶς ἐθνῶν), further strengthening the association between these two ideas, and in Isa 60:3 God tells Israel that the nations will come to Israel's light.[13] As we saw in the previous chapter, LXX-Isa ties the concepts of light and law even closer together in its rendering of Isa 26:9 as "your commands are light upon the earth," marking a significant departure from the Hebrew of this verse. I would not venture as far as Jobes and Silva in claiming that the translator "had a theological preoccupation with the notion of light as knowledge,"[14] but an awareness of the interplay of these themes within LXX-Isa can hardly be disputed.

---

[10] *Moses* 2.36 (Colson, LCL).

[11] *Moses* 2.41 (Colson, LCL).

[12] Dines, for example, wonders, "Is Philo likening the LXX to Isaiah's prophecy of 'a light to the nations'?" (*The Septuagint,* 66).

[13] והלכו גוים לאורך ומלכים לנגה זרחך / καὶ πορεύσονται βασιλεῖς τῷ φωτί σου καὶ ἔθνη τῇ λαμπρότητί σου.

[14] Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 252; see also Seeligman, *The Septuagint Version*, 119.

Within the Servant Songs themselves, two differences between the Greek and Hebrew function to sharpen the identification between the Servant and light in LXX-Isa. The first occurs in Isa 49:6, which reads in Hebrew: ונתתיך לאור גוים להיות ישועתי עד־קצה הארץ.[15] Although the main idea of this text is clear, there is some ambiguity surrounding the phrase להיות ישועתי. On one reading, ישועתי could serve as the implied subject of להיות, so that the verse would read, "I have set you as a light to the nations, *that my salvation may be* to the end of the earth." Alternatively, the subject of להיות could be implied from the previous phrase, and ישועתי could be the predicate nominative of a purpose clause, so that the verse would read, "I have set you as a light to the nations, *to be my salvation* to the ends of the earth." The difference is subtle, but in the latter formulation it is the Servant/light who becomes God's salvation, whereas in the former the Servant/light serves only to facilitate that salvation.

LXX-Isa opts for the latter formulation:

49:6 ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε[16] εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί **σε** εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς	49:6 Behold, I have set you for a light of peoples, that **you** may be for salvation to the end of the earth.

Although the Greek represents a mostly-valid construal of the Hebrew, there are a few aspects of the translation whose origins are difficult to trace. Elsewhere in LXX-Isa, the Greek text tends to follow Hebrew word order fairly rigidly, and when it departs from one-to-one translation

---

[15] There are no major variants in the Hebrew tradition for this line.

[16] Vaticanus, Marchalianus (mg), and the Lucianic recension read δέδωκα σε, though the sense is the same. The tradition is surprisingly divided over the addition of εις διαθηκην γενους here (drawn from LXX-Isa 42:6), with those attesting the reading including Sinaiticus, Marchalianus (mg), the Lucianic recension, and part of the Catena and Hexaplaric groups. These witnesses notwithstanding, the addition does seem to be secondary.

equivalents it often does so following Greek style, not Hebrew.[17] The phrase τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς

σωτηρίαν, however, represents a Hebrew rather than Greek construction, and it presupposes a

Vorlage of להיותך לישועה, despite the fact that every surviving Hebrew witness reads להיות ישועתי:

ל	היות	ך	ל	ישועה
τοῦ	εἶναί	σε	εἰς	σωτηρίαν

The fact that this hews so closely to Hebrew syntax suggests that the difference was not

introduced in LXX-Isa's transmission history, but we are unfortunately at a dead end when it

comes to assigning this to either the translator or *Vorlage*. Even if we posit a variant *Vorlage*

reading להיותך לישועה, however, at the very least we can say that the translator chose this reading

over the alternative להיות ישועתי that survives in all of our witnesses. As discussed in Chapter 1,

the textual milieu of Second Temple Judaism lends itself to seeing scribes as highly sophisticated

tradents who would have been well aware of textual variants and alternative readings, and our

examination of LXX-Isa so far suggests that our translator fit comfortably within that tradition.

This way of understanding Isa 49:6, where it is the Servant/light which extends to the

ends of the earth, reinforces the idea of the Servant/light as an agent of God's worldwide

salvation. In this rendering, foreigners do not receive God's salvation directly (cf. the Hebrew

text, "that my salvation may be to the ends of the earth"), but rather they encounter the light

which *leads to* their salvation (cf. the Greek text, "that *you* may be *for* salvation"). Again, the

shift is subtle, but it fits well with LXX-Isa's broader theology, as shown in the next passage.

In the third Servant Song, Isa 50:10 speaks of the people's need to trust in the Servant.

The Greek text reads as follows:

---

[17] Cf. Isa 8:15 and the rendering of צור as ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες (see Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah,* 2:149–50;
Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2525; and discussion in the previous chapter, n. 86–88).

50:10 Τίς ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον; **ἀκουσάτω**[18] τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ· **οἱ πορευόμενοι** ἐν σκότει οὐκ ἔστιν αὐ**τοῖς** φῶς, **πεποίθατε** ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου καὶ **ἀντιστηρίσασθε** ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ.	50:10 Who among you is a fearer of the Lord? **Let him hearken** to the voice of his Servant. As for **those** walking in darkness, for whom there is no light: **trust** on the name of the Lord, and **lean** upon God.

The Hebrew text for this verse is obscure, not because the words are difficult, but because how one chooses to divide the verse and vocalize the text can lead to widely divergent translations. In the following rendering, I have tried to remain as close as possible to how the Greek text understood the Hebrew consonantal tradition, noting where this departs from MT's vocalization:

50:10 מי בכם ירא יהוה שמע בקול עבדו אשר הלך חשכים ואין נגה לו יבטח בשם יהוה וישען באלהיו[19]	50:10 Who among you is a fearer of Yahweh? Hearken[20] to the voice of his Servant. He who walks in darkness, for whom there is no brightness, let him trust in the name of Yahweh, and let him lean upon his God.

When the Hebrew is translated thus, LXX-Isa seems to hew fairly closely to the Hebrew text, with the only major differences being that שמע was taken as a third-person imperative (ἀκουσάτω), הלך was taken as plural (a reading that has support in 1QIsaᵃ),[21] and both יבטח and וישען were taken as plural imperatives rather than jussives.[22] But once again, it is important to

---

[18] The Lucianic and much of the Hexaplaric tradition here reads υπακουσατω.

[19] The only major variants for this verse are listed in the discussion below.

[20] MT points this as a participle, so most translations take this phrase as: "Who among you fears Yahweh and hearkens…"

[21] 1QIsaᵃ here reads הלכו חשוכים.

[22] The plural conjugation seems to be an attempt to harmonize this with the plural οἱ πορευόμενοι.

note that this rendering represents a choice among many different ways that one could understand the Hebrew text. Consider, for example, the NRSV of this verse: "Who among you fears the LORD and obeys the voice of his servant, who walks in darkness and has no light, yet trusts in the name of the LORD and relies upon his God?" By taking שמע, יבטח, and וישען as volitives, the translator has chosen a rendering that emphasizes the addressees' need to trust in God and their place "in darkness" with "no light"—despite their fear of the Lord.

When we compare this rendering with the differences noted in LXX-Isa 8, numerous similarities can be seen. In LXX-Isa 8:13, foreigners are told to sanctify the Lord, and "he will be your fear" (αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος), just as LXX-Isa 50:10 opens with an address to "the fearer of the Lord" (ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον). LXX-Isa 8:14 encourages the Gentiles to "trust" (πεποιθὼς), as are the addressees in 50:10 (πεποίθατε), and in both sections they are commanded to listen (ἐπακούσατε [8:9] and ἀκουσάτω [50:10]). In LXX-Isa 8, the overarching concern is with law observance, as discussed in the previous chapter, and in LXX-Isa 50:10 the concern is for "those walking in darkness, for whom there is no light." Given the close connection between these two sections, as well as the connection between the Servant/light and law seen elsewhere in LXX-Isa, it is not unreasonable to see this verse as a command for those currently without the law to trust and obey.

As mentioned above, these differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts are not large-scale, and there is significant room for disagreement regarding how they are best understood. When LXX-Isa 50:10 commands the listener to hearken to the voice of the Servant, one could understand the author's intent in many different ways—a problem that is compounded by the fact that the Greek keeps quite close to the Hebrew text, which is itself fluid (cf. 1QIsaᵃ) and open to multiple interpretations. Nevertheless, the light imagery within the text, the

identification of this light with law elsewhere in LXX-Isa, its connection to exhortations to "trust" and "hearken," and the later connections drawn between the Servant and promulgation of the law all point to the fact that the author sought to bring out the legalistic (in the sense of Mosaic law) aspect of the Servant.

It is further worth noting that, while the idea of the Servant as a light and a covenant is present within both the Hebrew and Greek texts, the covenant in Greek has a slightly different character. In Hebrew, the Servant is given לברית עם (42:6, 49:8), an expression perhaps best translated as "the people's covenant."[23] But עם is ambiguous in its referent, for it could describe the people of Israel just as well as it could a foreign people. In LXX-Isa 49:8, however, the singular עם is rendered as a plural: διαθήκην ἐθνῶν. The ἔθνη, unlike the singular Hebrew עם, unambiguously refers to foreigners, and as a result, in LXX-Isa the Servant is given not as "the people's covenant," but as "the peoples' covenant," or more clearly, "the Gentiles' covenant."[24] The Servant's role is thus recast as an embodiment of the covenant existing with the Gentiles, which makes the legalistic overtones of the Servant all the more meaningful.

A Prophet Like Moses

In addition to small differences in how light and covenant imagery are portrayed in LXX-Isa, the Greek text also deepens the Mosaic character of the Servant's work by identifying the

---

[23] See, e.g., John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, WBC 25 (Waco: World Books, 1987), 188 and discussion.

[24] There are no surviving Hebrew manuscripts that witness a plural עמים in either Isa 42:6 or 49:8, while the plural ἐθνῶν in 49:8 is nearly unanimously attested among the Greek witnesses. By the criteria laid out in Chapter 1, this would incline us to attribute the change to the translator, though we cannot be certain. LXX-Isa 42:6, unlike 49:8, translates ברית עם as διαθήκην γένους, "a covenant of race." Ekblad thinks that γένους refers to Israel, and he sees multiple connections between the Servant and Israel's messianic hopes (*Isaiah's Servant Poems,* 74 and passim). I generally find that Ekblad sees more connections than I am liable to attribute to the intent of the translator, but even if we grant his conclusions for the sake of argument, I see no reason why the Servant should not also be seen as an embodiment of the Gentiles' hope—especially given his function in 49:8 as διαθήκην ἐθνῶν.

Servant more strongly with Moses. We saw above how the Servant in the Hebrew tradition is already portrayed in terms similar to Moses, but the Greek text shows a number of differences that make the connection stronger.

The first such connection can be seen in Isa 48:21, a text that already contains imagery from the exodus. In Hebrew the text reads:

48:21 ולא צמאו בחרבות הוליכם מים מצור הזיל למו ויבקע־צור ויזבו מים[25]	48:21 And they did not thirst when he brought them through the desert. He caused water to flow from the rock for them; and he split the rock, and water flowed.

In Greek, the passage is rendered as follows:

48:21 καὶ ἐὰν διψήσωσι, δι᾽ ἐρήμου ἄξει αὐτούς,[26] ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας ἐξάξει αὐτοῖς· σχισθήσεται πέτρα, καὶ ῥυήσεται ὕδωρ, **καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου.**	48:21 And if[27] they thirst, he will[28] bring them through the desert, water from rock he will bring out to them; the rock will be rent,[29] and water will flow, **and my people will drink.**

The Hebrew text seems to describe a past event, described in perfect and *wayyiqtol* forms, when God led his people through the desert and brought forth water for them. The Greek

---

[25] There are no major variants attested in the Hebrew tradition that impact this verse's interpretation.

[26] The Lucianic recension and Theodoret change this to match the Hebrew text (ουκ ειασεν αυτον διψησαι δι ερημου αγων [αγαγων Tht.] αυτον), but this is secondary. Various strands of the Lucianic recension go even further and change multiple verbs to past tense.

[27] Taking ולא as ולוּא (see discussion below).

[28] The future tense throughout this verse is odd, but it is not an unreasonable interpretation of the Hebrew perfect, especially given an initial understanding of ולא as ולוּא.

[29] Understanding ויבקע as either a Niphal or Pual.

text, in contrast, seems to take this passage as referring to a future event, an interpretation probably derived from understanding ולא as ולוּא (cf. 1QIsaᵃ, ולוֹא), just as 48:18 begins a few verses earlier.[30] But the exodus themes are unmistakable, and most important for our purposes is the addition, καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου. The Greek witnesses are unanimous in this reading, for which there is no Hebrew counterpart, and while it is always possible that the addition should be traced back to a later scribe rather than the translator, nothing in the available evidence would indicate that this is the case.[31] What is striking about the plus, however, is not the fact that the Greek text contains an additional phrase; though such additions are rare in LXX-Isa, they are not unheard of. Rather, it is telling that this addition is taken from the exodus story itself, as it is a direct quotation of LXX-Exod 17:6.[32] In other words, either the translator or a scribe working on the *Vorlage* saw the connection between the Servant's description in Isa 48:21 and the story of the exodus, and he strengthened the tie between these pericopes by inserting a quotation from the latter into the former.[33] The dependence of LXX-Isaiah on LXX-Exodus in other areas has long been noted.[34]

---

[30] Isa 48:18 begins, לוא הקשבת למצותי..., "Had you listened to my commandments…"

[31] Ziegler places the addition in brackets, suggesting it was added by a later Greek scribe, but he provides no evidence to support this claim. His discussion of the passage in *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta* (75) simply directs the reader to Zillessen ("Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40—66)," *ZAW* 22 [1902]), whose discussion is likewise ambiguous (Zillessen simply notes that the addition does not likely stem from the *Vorlage*, 244). See also Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 190 and Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 70–73 for attribution of this addition to the translator.

[32] The Göttingen reconstruction of Exod 17:6 reads, καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὕδωρ, καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός. Even if we accept that the original translation did not contain μου, the reading καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου is sufficiently attested among the Greek manuscripts (Vaticanus, the f-group, etc.) that it is most likely that the version used by the translator of LXX-Isa did contain the longer formulation.

[33] Cf. Koenig: "L'analogie consiste ici, d'une part, dans le thème commun aux 2 textes. Cette analogie résulte de l'intention de la rédaction primitive de H Is, qui était de faire allusion à cette épisode de l'exode" (*L'herméneutique analogique,* 72).

[34] See Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 188.

This change, along with the shift from past (Hebrew) to future (LXX-Isa), is further remarkable for the way it modifies the reader's conception of who leads the people and causes them to drink in the desert. In the Hebrew text, the presumed speaker of 48:21 is the prophet, and the subject of these verbs is Yahweh, as can be seen from the broader context:

> 48:20Depart from Babylon, flee from Chaldea! With a voice of rejoicing proclaim it, announce it, send it forth to the ends of the earth, say, "Yahweh has redeemed his servant Jacob." 21And they did not thirst when he [i.e., Yahweh] brought them through the desert. He caused water to flow from the rock for them; and he split the rock, and water flowed. 22"There is no peace," says Yahweh, "for the wicked."

The people are told to leave Babylon, and they are encouraged by a recounting of how God cared for his people during the first exodus. In the Greek text, by contrast, the introduction of the first-person pronoun μου in 48:21 introduces a break, such that the speaker of verse 21 is now best identified as the Lord (per 48:22, "says the Lord"), while the subject of the verbs ("he will bring") is someone else. In Greek the verses read:

> 48:20Depart from Babylon, flee from the Chaldeans! With a voice of rejoicing proclaim it, and let this be heard, announce to the ends of the earth, say, "the Lord has saved his servant Jacob." 21"And if they thirst, he will bring them through the desert, water from rock he will bring out to them; the rock will be rent, and water will flow, and my people will drink. 22There is no greeting for the wicked," says the Lord.

No longer is Israel encouraged because of what God did in the past; now, the Lord[35] proclaims that someone ("he") in the future will lead Israel through the desert and bring water forth from a rock, just as Moses did anciently. In this passage's position introducing the Servant Song of Isa 49, this unnamed figure is none other than the Servant, whom the Lord introduces in 48:20 and whom he charges in 49:5 and 49:10 with "gathering Jacob and Israel" and leading them "through

---

[35] It is also possible that the speaker is the prophet, but this would be unusual. There are cases within the prophetic corpus where a prophet does refer to the people as "my people," even when not speaking in God's name (e.g., Isa 26:20), but the phrase "my people" is much more common in the mouth of the Lord. In addition, the next verse identifies the speaker as the Lord (οὐκ ἔστι χαίρειν τοῖς ἀσεβέσι, λέγει κύριος, 48:22), and nothing in the text indicates a change of speaker between verses 21 and 22.

springs of water." The future tense of LXX-Isa 48:21 makes this identification even more secure, as both the Greek and Hebrew texts envision the Servant as operating in a future day.[36]

In this interpretation, the Servant in LXX-Isa is seen as a second Moses. The Greek author has taken the allusions already present in the Hebrew text and shaped them to fit his own ends. Thus, while the Hebrew text alludes to Moses in its introduction of the Servant Song, LXX-Isa pushes this Mosaic action into the future and identifies the Servant as a new Moses.

A similar strengthening of the Servant's Mosaic character can be seen a few verses later, in Isa 49:7. The Hebrew reads,

49:7 כה אמר־יהוה גאל ישראל קדושו לבזה־נפש למתעב גוי לעבד משלים...	49:7 Thus says Yahweh, the redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, to the despised of life,[37] to him who is abhorred by nations, to the servant of rulers…

And the Greek reads as follows:

---

[36] The Greek text makes the future orientation of the Servant even more explicit than the Hebrew in its rendering of מרחוק as διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ στήσεται in Isa 49:1. See Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems,* 92 and van der Kooij, "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta," in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik*, ed. Hennig Graf Reventlow, Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 11 (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1997), 20 for discussion of this passage.

[37] The Hebrew here is difficult. MT points לבזה as if it were an infinitive construct, while the LXX, Aquila, Theodotion, and a manuscript from the Cairo Geniza take this to be an active participle. 1QIsaᵃ, 4QIsaᵈ, the Targum, Syriac, Vulgate, Symmachus, and other witnesses to Aquila and Theodotion either read or presuppose a Qal passive, לבזוי. The evidence is divided enough that no easy solution is apparent, and my choice of לבזה simply reflects the fact that this is what seems to have been in LXX-Isa's *Vorlage.* In addition, BHS recommends emending נפש to נפשו on the basis of the Septuagint and Syriac, but I see no compelling reason to emend the text. There are no Hebrew witnesses with the proposed reading, and the addition of the possessive pronoun in Greek and Syriac might be better explained as the translators' attempt to clarify the meaning of an obscure passage.

49:7 Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ **Ἁγιάσατε τὸν φαυλίζοντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ** τὸν βδελυσσόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν δούλων[38] τῶν ἀρχόντων…	49:7 Thus says the Lord who redeems you, the God of Israel.[39] **Sanctify[40] him who despises[41] his life**, he who is abhorred by the peoples, the slaves of rulers…

The footnotes detail how the Greek text could have arisen from the Hebrew, and while the differences in the first phrase seem most likely to have arisen from a variant *Vorlage*, the rendering, "sanctify him who despises his life," seems to go back to the translator's interpretation of קדושו לבזה־נפש.[42] This rendering is mostly authorized (using Baer's terminology), so we should not speak of the translator "changing" the text, but the rendering does represent one choice among many for how the Hebrew could have been interpreted. What, then, is accomplished by translating the verse in this way? And whom should the addressees sanctify, who "despises his life"?

Many have recognized a reference to Moses in this verse. Klaus Baltzer et al., for example, write: "That the Servant despises or rejects his 'soul' (φαυλίζοντα τὴν ψυχὴν) probably connects to Exod 32:32 (cf. Isa 48:19), with Moses's willingness to give up himself for the sins

---

[38] The plural here is odd, though it does seem to be original to LXX-Isa (*pace* Ziegler). The Targum also renders this plural (עבדין), but there is no support for this reading among Hebrew manuscripts. It is difficult to tell whether this reflects a variant *Vorlage* or an exegetical decision by the translator.

[39] Although this appears at first to be a significant departure from the Hebrew, it probably goes back to a *Vorlage* different from MT. 1QIsaᵃ here reads כוה אמר אדני יהוה גואלכה ישראל, which could give rise to the Greek text through a switch in word order and otherwise stereotypical rendering. The second *Biblia Rabbinica* and a manuscript of Tanhuma Mishpatim read אלהי ישראל, and if this reflects an ancient variant, there is no need to even posit a variation in word order. See van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah,* 329–30, esp. n. 54.

[40] This can be derived by pointing קדושו not as a noun (as in MT), but as an imperative.

[41] Reading לבזה as an active participle (see note above).

[42] Though the Greek tradition does show some minor variation, none is interpretively significant, and it all appears to go back to the phrase Ἁγιάσατε τὸν φαυλίζοντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ as an archetype.

of the people."[43] A reference to Exod 32:32 would be fitting in LXX-Isa's version of the Servant Songs, as Exod 32 speaks of Moses's intercession for the people, his request that God blot him from his book, and God's command that Moses lead the people (cf. LXX-Isa 53:4, "he bears our sins"; 42:6–7, "I have given you… to bring out from bonds those in bondage"). Such a reference is especially likely given the demonstrable dependence of LXX-Isa on LXX-Exod, especially the direct quotation from LXX-Exod 17:6 just a few verses earlier.[44]

LXX-Isa's rendering of Isa 49 further—and to my mind, more closely—evokes Moses's complaint LXX-Num 11. In Num 11:11, Moses identifies himself as God's servant and demands of God, "why have you dealt poorly with your servant" (Ἵνα τί ἐκάκωσας τὸν θεράποντά σου), and his complaint is echoed in the Servant's lament: "I have labored in vain, and for nothing and vainly have I given my strength" (Isa 49:4).[45] Both texts speak of being in the womb,[46] and in both, Moses/the Servant is tasked with bringing the people to the promised land.[47] In Num 11:13,

---

[43] "Dass der Knecht seine ‚Seele' gering achtet oder auch verwirft (φαυλίζοντα τὴν ψυχὴν), nimmt wahrscheinlich Ex 32,32 auf (vgl. Jes 48,19) mit der Bereitschaft des Mose, seine Person hinzugeben für die Sünde des Volkes" (*Septuaginta Deutsch,* 2:2629). Klaus Baltzer et al. say of LXX-Isa 49:3 as well: "Wenn diese Aussagen im Zusammenhang der Sinai-Tradition aufgenommen werden, so bedeutet es: Schon Mose, nicht erst David hat Israel/Jakob diese Aufgabe zuerkannt, ‚Knecht Gottes' zu sein" (ibid., 2:2628–29).

[44] Seeligmann notes the borrowing of the term γιώρας in Isa 14:1 (cf. Exod 12:19), the repeated refrain εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον (cf. Exod 14:13), the description of God as συντρίψει πόλεμον (cf. Exod 15:3), etc. (*The Septuagint Version*, 188).

[45] Moses's language from Num 11 is even repeated in LXX-Isa 53:4, where the people announce, "we accounted him [the Servant] as being… in poor treatment" (ἐν κακώσει)—a verbal connection that does not exist in Hebrew (in Num 11:11 Moses demands, למה הרעת לעבדך, but in Isa 53:4 the people say, ואנחנו חשבנהו ... מענה).

[46] In LXX-Num 11:12 Moses asks, "Did I take all this people in the womb, or did I give birth to them?" (μὴ ἐγὼ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβον τὸν πάντα λαὸν τοῦτον, ἢ ἐγὼ ἔτεκον αὐτούς), while in LXX-Isa it is the Servant who is called and formed from the womb: "From my mother's womb he called my name…. The Lord, who formed me from the womb" (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομά μου…. κύριος ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας, 49:1,5). The word for womb is different in both pericopes, and the image is used in different ways, but this connection still most likely helped to link the two passages in the author's mind.

[47] In LXX-Num 11:12, Moses recounts God's command: "You say to me, 'Take them to your bosom, as a nurse takes one that suckles, to the land which you swore to their fathers'" (λέγεις μοι Λάβε αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόλπον σου, ὡσεὶ ἄραι τιθηνὸς τὸν θηλάζοντα, εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ὤμοσας τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν). In LXX-Isa 49:6, the Servant uses this same structure to recount God's charge to lead the people back: "He said to me, 'It is a great thing for you… to turn back the dispersion of Israel'" (εἶπέ μοι Μέγα σοί ἐστι… τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ισραηλ ἐπιστρέψαι).

Moses laments his inability to feed the people, while Isa 49:10 describes how those led through the wilderness will neither hunger nor thirst.[48] In Num 11:14 Moses proclaims that bearing the Israelites "is too difficult for me" (βαρύτερόν μοί ἐστιν) while God tells the Servant in Isa 49:6 that returning the dispersion of Israel "is a great thing for you" (μέγα σοί ἐστι). And finally, just as Moses asks God to "kill me with destruction" (Num 11:15), so the Servant is described as "he who despises his life" (Isa 49:7). All of these parallels serve to reinforce the tie in the reader's mind between the Servant and Moses.

If we take seriously the idea that the Servant in LXX-Isa 49 is to be more closely identified with Moses—especially in the description of "he who despises his life"—this casts the entire chapter in a new light. LXX-Isa 49:1 begins with an address to foreigners: "Listen to me, islands, and pay attention, peoples!" No other addressee is mentioned in the Servant's ensuing monologue, and it follows that verse 7 should be addressed to these foreigners: God clarifies who he is ("the God of Israel") and commands them, "Thus says the Lord who redeems you, the God of Israel. Sanctify him who despises his life." Consonant with the Mosaic character of the Servant prevalent throughout this song, foreigners are commanded to sanctify Moses—and just as Moses comes to embody the Mosaic covenant, we could here see foreigners likewise being commanded to sanctify Mosaic law through metonymy.

As with so many other verses examined in this dissertation, this appears to be a call for foreigners to take seriously the law of Moses: to "learn" (LXX-Isa 8:9), "do not say 'hard'" (8:12), "sanctify" (8:13), "trust" (8:14), and "consecrate yourselves to me" (45:16). Simultaneously, the author of the Greek text makes no secret of his disdain for those "from the

---

[48] In the Septuagint, Num 11:13 reads, "Where is meat for me to give to all this people?" while Isa 49:10 speaks of those going through the wilderness and reads, "They shall neither hunger nor thirst."

ends of the earth… those who reject the law" (24:16) and "those who seal up the law, so as not to learn" (8:16). In this milieu, the idea of the Servant—"the Gentile's covenant" (49:8)—being in some sense an embodiment of the law of Moses is fitting. If we take seriously the notion that the Servant *is* "the Gentile's covenant," then it is this covenant that stands between God and the Gentiles, which they are commanded to sanctify, which is "placed as a light to the peoples, that you may be as salvation to the ends of the earth," as discussed in the previous section (49:6). Of this covenant/Servant, we are told that "the peoples will hope in his law" (42:4),[49] and "many peoples will be astonished at him… for to those to whom it has not been announced concerning him, they shall see, and those who have not heard will understand" (52:15).[50] In short, seeing the Servant as a representation of the law of Moses gives us a new lens through which to understand the Servant's function within LXX-Isa and the repeated calls to obedience extended to foreigners throughout this translation.

The Servant and παιδεία

The Servant's dual function as an embodiment of law and the Gentiles' covenant can be further seen in a Greek wordplay altogether absent from the Hebrew Servant Songs.[51] In LXX-

---

[49] Or, "The peoples will hope in his name." The Hebrew reads תורה, and the question of whether νόμῳ or ὀνόματι should be preferred is vexed, with Ziegler opting for the former while many scholars support the latter (e.g., Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah,* 2:307; and Evangelia G. Dafni, "Die sogenannten *'Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder in der Setpuaginta," in *XI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leiden, 2004*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters, SCS 54 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006], 192). I think it most likely that ὀνόματι arose through scribal error in the Greek transmission history (contra Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta*, 141), but the main thrust of my argument regarding the Servant's role as a new Moses is valid regardless of which reading we assume.

[50] Jobes and Silva connect this final verse with "the salvation of the Gentiles," for the Servant's work "will draw universal amazement: even kings will be speechless! Why? Because those who could not have been expected to know about God's work or about his servant are in fact the ones who will understand" (*Invitation to the Septuagint*, 243).

[51] This wordplay was first noticed by Ekblad; see *Isaiah's Servant Poems*, 133, 136, 140, and 221.

Isa, the Servant is frequently (though not exclusively) referred to as παῖς or παιδίον (e.g., Isa 42:1),[52] and he is three times described as having received παιδεία from the Lord. In LXX-Isa 50:4, the Servant claims that the Lord has given him γλῶσσαν παιδείας, and in the next verse he recounts that the παιδεία κυρίου has opened his ear. In LXX-Isa 53:5, the speakers lament that παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν is upon the Servant.

In the final instance (53:5), the translation παιδεία is hardly surprising; the Hebrew text here reads מוסר שלומנו עליו, and παιδεία is by far the most common translation equivalent for מוסר in the LXX.[53] The first two instances, however, are more ambiguous. In the Hebrew text of Isa 50:4–5, we read:

4 אדני יהוה נתן לי לשון למודים לדעת לעות את־יעף דבר יעיר בבקר בבקר יעיר לי אזן לשמע כלמודים	4 The Lord Yahweh has given me the tongue of the learned, to know how to sustain[54] the weary with a word. He awakens me morning

---

[52] While there does seem to have been a distinction in rank between παῖς and δοῦλος in the earliest Greek translations, by the time LXX-Isa was translated both words could be used to describe a generic "servant." LXX-Isa does still use δοῦλος to describe actual slavery (e.g., 14:2), but the word does not always carry this connotation, and as van der Kooij notes, in the Servant Songs "findet man beide Wörter nebeneinander in derselben Bedeutung von Knecht im Sinne von ‚Diener'" ("Zur Theologie," 20). Dafni echoes this sentiment, writing, "Darüber hinaus ist hier die Tatsache anzuführen, dass παῖς und παιδεία, die im Kontext der 'Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder in der LXX gezielt eingesetzt werden, nicht mit δουλεία als ‚Knechtshaft' und δοῦλος ‚Knecht/Sklave' gleichzusetzen sind. Denn παιδεία weist primär auf ‚Erziehung' hin und παῖς auf den ‚Zögling'" ("Die sogenannten *'Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder," 193). LXX-Isa's use of παῖς in describing a "servant of God" is hardly unusual, as Jong-Hoon Kim notes: "Für ‚Knecht Gottes' wird in den Samuel- und Königebüchern ausschließlich δοῦλος verwendet…. Diese Wiedergabe ist eine Besonderheit der Ur-Septuaginta der Samuel- und Königebücher, denn in anderen Büchern, besonders in Daniel, Chronik und Josua, wird παῖς auch für ‚Knecht Gottes' verwendet" ("Die Wiedergabe von עבד mit δοῦλος oder παῖς in der Septuaginta der Samuel- und Königebücher," in Kraus and Karrer, *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, 398; see also van der Kooij, "Servant or Slave?: The Various Equivalents of Hebrew *'Ebed* in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Ljubljana 2007*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters, SCS 55 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008]).

[53] Given the stereotypical rendering and the uniformity of both the Greek and Hebrew traditions here, there is no need to posit either variant *Vorlage* or subsequent changes in the Greek transmission history.

[54] לעות is difficult; many take the text to be corrupt (e.g., BHS proposes emending the text to לרעת), though others have proposed that the verb means "to sustain" (e.g., Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah,* 2:336).

	by morning, he rouses my ear to hear as the learned.
5 אדני יהוה פתח־לי אזן ואנכי לא מריתי אחור לא נסוגתי	5 The Lord Yahweh opened my ear, and I did not rebel, I did not turn back.

The Greek text divides the verse differently, and it reads:

4 Κύριος δίδωσί μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας[55] τοῦ γνῶναι[56] ἡνίκα δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον, ἔθηκέ μοι πρωί, προσέθηκέ μοι ὠτίον ἀκούειν·	4 The Lord gives me the tongue of instruction/reproof, to know when it is necessary to speak a word;[57] he gave[58] it to me early,[59] he added to me an ear to hear.
5 καὶ ἡ παιδεία κυρίου ἀνοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω.	5 And the instruction/reproof of the Lord opens my ears,[60] but I do not disobey nor oppose.[61]

---

[55] Alexandrinus alone here reads γλωσσαν σοφιας, and despite this codex's general reliability for reconstructing the original text, this reading seems to be secondary. Ottley writes that Alexandrinus's reading here "looks as if an explanation had taken the place of the text" (*The Book of Isaiah,* 2:336).

[56] Many manuscripts, including Alexandrinus and a subgroup of Catena texts, add εν καιρω after γνῶναι. This seems to be secondary, a double rendering of לעות (either understood or read as לֵעת, cf. ἡνίκα immediately following), though its widespread attestation leaves open the possibility that it was original to the translator.

[57] It is unclear how the translator arrived at this reading. Ottley suggests that this is a paraphrase of the Hebrew's sense, but this does not account for how the translator understood את־יעף.

[58] 1QIsaᵃ reads וייר here, which would account for the aorist of LXX-Isa.

[59] As to the lack of repetition of בבקר, this repetition is missing in part of the Hebrew tradition, and BHS recommends that the second בבקר be deleted. It is possible that the omission of the second בבקר arises from a desire for a smooth Greek text, but it may also have been missing in the *Vorlage*.

[60] The translator evidently understood כלמודים from the previous verse as being in construct with אדני, with these two words together forming the subject of פתח. This does not account for how the translator understood the כ and ם at the beginning and end of כלמודים, as these are unanimously attested in the Hebrew tradition, but perhaps he ignored them in favor of a more smoothly-flowing Greek sentence, as seems to have happened elsewhere in these verses.

[61] The origin of this translation is unclear. The translator elsewhere renders סוג in its normal sense of "turn back" (e.g., Isa 42:17, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω), and given the uniformity of the Hebrew tradition, it is probably best to understand this as contextually conditioned (cf. δεῖ εἰπεῖν λόγον in the previous verse).

There are a number of differences discussed in the footnotes between the Greek and Hebrew, but for our purposes, the most important difference is the two times that למודים is rendered with παιδεία. In general, the translator seems to have struggled with לִמֻּד ("pupil/learned"), but throughout LXX-Isa he renders it with a Greek word connected to learning: μαθεῖν in 8:16, παιδεία in 50:4–5, and διδακτοὺς in 54:13.[62] By choosing παιδεία here—as opposed to διδασκαλία or another noun connected to learning—and by reworking verse 5 to portray this παιδεία as bestowed by the Lord, he is playing off the idea of the Servant as God's chosen παῖς/παιδίον.

In Hellenistic culture, παιδεία primarily signified "instruction," "education," or "upbringing," as its etymological connection with παῖς suggests. It was not until the LXX that the semantic range of παιδεία expanded, coming to include "punishment" and "reproach" due to its position as the Greek equivalent of מוסר.[63] In addition, the LXX frequently uses παιδεία to describe God's revelation, as when LXX-Amos 3:7 states that God will not act unless he "reveals instruction" (ἀποκαλύψῃ παιδείαν) to the prophets.[64] This range makes it difficult to provide an exact English translation for these verses, but it also casts LXX-Isa's description of the Servant in an interesting light. In LXX-Isa, the Servant is still depicted receiving God's reproach (e.g., Isa 53:4), but he can also be seen as a teacher, one possessing God's instruction. As the Servant says, "the Lord gives me a tongue of παιδεία, to know when it is necessary to speak a word" (50:4), and it is in this very role as teacher that he is sent to the nations in 52:15 ("many peoples

---

[62] In this final instance, the translator evidently understood למודי as a passive participle.

[63] Jobes and Silva refer to this as "a clear example of semantic borrowing from Hebrew" (*Invitation to the Septuagint*, 247), and their observation is supported by the contrast between lexica of the Septuagint and lexica of the Greek language more broadly.

[64] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 74.

will be astonished at him… for to those to whom it has not been announced concerning him, they shall see, and those who have not heard will understand") and 42:4 ("the peoples will hope in his law").

Koenig's notion of "participation" is helpful in thinking about the relationship between the παῖς/παιδίον and παιδεία in LXX-Isa. As Koenig points out, relationships that we might be tempted to dismiss as "merely" etymological or "merely" phonological often held much greater significance within Second Temple Judaism. Koenig writes,

> Words participate one with another when they present a certain formal resemblance, and their meanings are therefore transferable, under the control and in the interests of religious tradition. In other words, verbal plurivalence is based both on strict equivalencies and on shifts toward other forms that are supposedly related and, therefore, substitutable…. A partial resemblance, which was already a sign of [linguistic] relation, by virtue of the principle of participation… could also become, if need be, a decisive relationship and an especially important divine revelation.[65]

And as we saw earlier with the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Isa 8, the author of LXX-Isa was very much engaged in just this sort of exegesis. Accordingly, in light of the wordplay within the Servant Songs, it would not be unreasonable to conclude that the author saw the Servant as "participating" in the Lord's παιδεία, such that the Servant and his instruction could be in some sense equated. While this may at first sound odd, it is no more surprising than the notion that the Servant might somehow "be" a covenant, or that he might "be" Moses.

To bring this all together, the wordplay between the Servant and the instruction the Lord bestows upon him provides yet another area in which LXX-Isa envisions the Servant as

---

[65] "Les mots participent les uns aux autres lorsqu'ils offrent une certaine ressemblance formelle, et leurs valeurs sont, de ce fait, transférables, sous le contrôle et selon les intérêts de la tradition religieuse. Autrement dit, la plurivalence verbale est fondée à la fois sur les équivalences strictes et sur les glissements vers d'autres formes, censées parentes et, à ce titre, substituables…. Une ressemblance partielle, qui était déjà signe de parenté, en vertu du principe de participation des semblables, a pu devenir ainsi, le cas échéant, relation décisive et révélation divine spécialement importante, en dépit de son imperfection formelle" (Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique,* 389).

embodying divine teaching. Just as with the Servant's identification as Moses and his portrayal as God's light to the nations, so his depiction as an embodiment of God's παιδεία reshapes our understanding of the command that the nations "hearken to the voice of his Servant" (50:10) and "sanctify him" (49:7). This is not to say that the παῖς/παιδεία wordplay proves that LXX-Isa envisions the foreign nations accepting Mosaic law; the connections drawn out in this section are more suggestive than conclusive, and we should be careful of overreaching what the evidence allows. Nevertheless, this does fit with the general trend we have seen elsewhere in LXX-Isa, where the author has repeatedly sharpened the notion of the Servant as an embodiment of law, whom the nations are obligated to accept and obey.

Conclusions

In this chapter, we have briefly explored three ways in which the Servant mediates and even embodies the covenant made between God and the Gentiles. In LXX-Isa, the Servant is more than "a covenant of people" (ברית עם)—he is "the Gentiles' covenant" (διαθήκην ἐθνῶν), a representation of God's new relationship with foreigners. At numerous points throughout the Servant Songs, the author has shaped the text to influence how we conceive of this covenant, and one way he has done so is by increasingly identifying the Servant with Moses. The Servant Songs now quote from Moses's story in Exodus, and the nations are explicitly commanded to "sanctify him who despises his life" (49:7). As in LXX-Isa 8:14, where the Gentiles are commanded to trust in the Lord and hold to his law, in the Servant Songs the Gentiles are likewise commanded to "trust on the name of the Lord" and "hearken to the voice of his Servant" (50:10).

This identification of the Servant with Moses and the law is strengthened by the Servant's role as φῶς ἐθνῶν (49:6). We have already seen how LXX-Isa extends the tie between light and God's law, especially in the context of foreign observance, as in LXX-Isa 26:9 ("Your commands are light upon the earth. Learn righteousness, you who dwell on the earth!"), and the Servant Songs carry this idea forward. In LXX-Isa 49:6, we read that it is the Servant in his role as light that is to be God's "salvation to the ends of the earth," while the Hebrew is ambiguous on this point. This connection is taken further by later authors, as in Philo's description of the Pentateuch as light, using ideas drawn from LXX-Isa.

Finally, the Servant's role—and the covenant's identification—as "teaching" or "instruction" is brought out through a connection drawn in the Greek between the Servant (παῖς) and the instruction with which the Lord endows him (παιδεία). Through Koenig's notion of verbal participation, we explored the possibility that the author intended an identification of the Servant with this instruction.

The connection between law and some future salvific figure is not unique to LXX-Isa. As Abi Ngunga has noted, this same relationship can be seen in Second Temple Judaism in instances where Torah is personified with messianic attributes.[66] Similarly in the New Testament, Isaiah's Servant is often spoken of "in the context of law-abidingness."[67] Nevertheless, we should be careful to note that, while the Servant's identification with Moses does lead naturally to the conclusions offered here, this is not the only way that these Songs can be understood. In speaking of the Hebrew text, Blenkinsopp notes, "No one with even a superficial knowledge of the history of the interpretation of these passages will harbor the

---

[66] See Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek,* 170, as well as John V. Chamberlain, "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll." *VT* 5.1 (1995): 367.

[67] Bart J. Koet, "Isaiah in Luke-Acts," in Moyise and Menken, *Isaiah in the New Testament*, 94.

illusion of having got it completely right, even supposing that any one solution can account for all the features of the passage."[68] While this is certainly true of the Hebrew texts, it is equally valid for the form these Songs take in the LXX.

As but one example of the multiple possible interpretations of the Servant, LXX-Isa 42:1 offers a clarification not seen in the Hebrew. In the LXX this text reads, "**Jacob** is my servant, I will help him; **Israel** my chosen, my soul accepts him." Commentators are practically unanimous in seeing "Jacob" and "Israel" as additions by the translator,[69] functioning to clarify the Servant's identity. The translation of עבד as παῖς (meaning both "servant" and "child") is often seen to strengthen the Servant's identification as Israel, particularly with Israel's role as God's firstborn (Exod 4:22).[70] Ngunga sees the translation of יונק as παιδίον in 53:2 as "intertextual exegesis that connects this text with the awaited messianic child described in LXX-Isa 9:5 and 7:14–16,"[71] and still other interpretations of the Servant's identity could be added. As Dafni so wonderfully understates, "the Septuagint translator seems not to have wanted to provide any direct statement" on the Servant's identity.[72]

But the fact that the text does not connect the Servant *only* with Moses need not discount this connection as a significant part of the author's goal. To approach the identity of the Servant as an "either…or" question is to close ourselves off to the way biblical exegesis frequently

---

[68] *Isaiah: A New Translation*, 2:211.

[69] See, e.g., Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems,* 62.

[70] See Dafni, "Die sogenannten *'Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder," 193: "diese Aussage aufgrund der Doppeldeutigkeit des Übersetzungsäquivalents παῖς sowohl mit ‚Du bist mein Knecht' als auch mit ‚Du bist mein Kind' oder sogar ‚mein Sohn' übersetzt werden kann."

[71] Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek,* 186.

[72] "Der LXX-Übersetzer scheint aber keine direkte Erklärung abgeben zu wollen" ("Die sogenannten *'Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder," 192).

functioned in this period. As we have seen, these changes dovetail nicely with the theme of Gentile law observance brought out elsewhere in LXX-Isa, and these changes even participate in the same nexus of ideas seen elsewhere, such as light, instruction, trust in the Lord, and a call to sanctification. It makes sense, therefore, to see the Servant as one more instantiation of LXX-Isa's call to the Gentiles to "learn," "sanctify," and "trust" in Mosaic law.

Conclusion

The previous five chapters have described a transformation in the way foreign law observance is envisioned in the book of Isaiah, from the 8th-century prophet through the translation of LXX-Isa in the 2nd century BCE. This description has occasionally been quite detailed, a necessity brought about due not only to the complex nature of the sources used, but also to the nuance needed in dealing with a multivocal work such as Isaiah. In the thicket of dealing with translation variants and text-critical problems, we are thus liable to miss the forest for the trees, and it is worth now taking a step back to draw together the various strands of argument from the previous chapters.

At the beginning of this dissertation, we noted the central role played by the book of Isaiah in discussions of foreign conversion in the end times, and we set out to trace the development of these ideas within the book of Isaiah itself from the eighth to second centuries. In Chapter 2, we laid the groundwork for this discussion by tracing the development of the concepts of "torah" and "conversion" from before the exile to early Second Temple Judaism, and we saw that torah underwent a radical shift in this period. Before the exile, תורה had a wide range of meanings, including instruction, legal statute, and the ideological valence conveyed by modern English phrases such as "law and order." With the formation of written legal codes and the rise of religious elites in the early post-exilic period, this range slowly shifted, and in time these various definitions were eclipsed by the role of the Pentateuch as *the* law. By the rabbinic period, the word תורה had become practically synonymous with "the" Torah.[1]

---

[1] Neusner, *Torah*, 28; emphasis in original.

Conversion over this same period underwent equally radical changes. Under Israel's pre-exilic tribal structure, the idea of conversion was practically non-existent, as there was no mechanism to incorporate pious foreigners fully into the religious/social life of Israel. With exile, the tribal system was irreparably damaged, and Judaism began a transformation in self-conception, from a national/ethnic community to one increasingly dominated by religious boundaries. This transformation was never complete, and to this day national and ethnic considerations remain a vital part of Judaism, but the period from exile to the Hasmonean monarchs witnessed a marked rise in religious concerns as a way to distinguish Jew from Gentile, and it is in this period that the boundaries surrounding Judaism opened to the incorporation of foreigners through conversion. By the second century BCE, when LXX-Isa was translated, this transition had opened new possibilities for understanding the text of Isaiah—possibilities that would have been inconceivable to Proto-Isaiah or many of the book's subsequent tradents.

The shift in meaning of torah and conversion can be seen not only in the larger society, but also in the Hebrew text of Isaiah itself. Within the writings of Proto-Isaiah, תורה primarily denotes instruction, and the author of this section seems to envision instruction going out from Zion to the foreign nations at the last day (e.g., Isa 2:2–3). In addition, there was no conversion in this period, and it seems highly unlikely that PI would have described foreigners observing those laws meant particularly for Israelites. This can be seen especially clearly in Isa 18:7 and 19:18–24, two passages of disputed authorship but which nevertheless depict foreign worship of Yahweh in non-monotheistic and non-law-observant terms. As was noted, even the very presence of "an altar to Yahweh in the midst of the land of Egypt" (Isa 19:19) presupposes that Deuteronomic regulations surrounding cult centralization do not apply to foreigners.

In Deutero-Isaiah, foreign worship is for the first time described in explicitly monotheistic terms, as in Isa 45:14 where the nations proclaim, "God is only among you, and there is no other god." Foreign law observance might be implied by verses such as Isa 52:1 ("the uncircumcised and unclean will no longer come into you"), but this is no more than implication. Deutero-Isaiah does introduce the figure of the Servant, who is given as "a light to nations" and "a covenant of people," but once again the content of this covenant is highly ambiguous (note references to the Davidic [55:3–5], Noahic [54:9–10], and Sinaitic [48:20–22] covenants throughout this section). Deutero-Isaiah opens up the possibility of foreign law observance, but this remains little more than a latent possibility within the text.

In Trito-Isaiah, foreigners are brought into the center of Israelite cult and worship. They are described as serving Yahweh (שר"ת, Isa 56:6), they offer sacrifice in the temple (56:6–7), and they are even taken as priests and Levites (66:21). Assuming that priests and Levites must obey at least some form of Israelite law, one can see here a quite radical shift in how foreign law observance was thought of in the eschaton. Over the course of composition from PI to TI, the trend is unmistakably toward greater foreign inclusion and observance, but again, much is left to the inferences and assumptions of the reader. In its final form, the Hebrew text of Isaiah preserves an astonishing array of voices on the ultimate role of foreigners and their relationship with the law. According to some passages, foreigners will be taken as slaves (e.g., Isa 14:1–2); in some, foreigners will explicitly break pentateuchal legislation (e.g., 19:18–24); and in some, they will serve as priests within the Jerusalem temple (66:21). The book of Isaiah is thus marked by a profound ambiguity surrounding the role of foreigners and to what degree they will ultimately observe Israel's religious laws.

Within LXX-Isa, we see this same trend continuing toward foreign inclusion and law observance, as in Isa 26:9, where the Hebrew ("when your judgments are upon the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness") has been rendered in Greek in a way that highlights the connection between law and light, while commanding the nations to learn: "your **commands are light** upon the earth. **Learn righteousness**, you who dwell on the earth!" This verse is in turn connected to LXX-Isa 51:4 ("law will go out from me, and my judgment as a light of peoples"), further strengthening the idea of the law as light and the nations' obligation to learn.

In Isa 14:1–2, the LXX notes that "the *gioras* will be joined to" Israel, and unlike the Hebrew text, where the nations are possessed by the house of Israel, now the nations "receive an inheritance and multiply on the land of God as male and female slaves." Through the phrase "male and female slaves," the author in turn connects this passage with LXX-Isa 56:4–7, which describes the blessings promised to foreigners who serve God. Further, in this pericope the blessings which the Hebrew text reserves only for eunuchs are extended to the foreign nations as well.

LXX-Isaiah's general concern for law observance and rejection can be seen in Isa 24:16, where the Hebrew text has been reworked to deal especially with this problem: while the Hebrew speaks of "glory to the righteous" and how "the treacherous deal treacherously," the Greek reads, "From the ends of the earth we have heard wonders—Hope for the pious. And they will say: Woe to those who reject, **those who reject the law**." That this concern is heard "from the ends of the earth" speaks to the Greek text's concern not only for general law rejection, but especially for rejection by foreigners. Gentiles are further invited to holiness when they are twice commanded, "Consecrate yourselves to me, islands" (LXX-Isa 41:1, 45:16), a rendering derived

from a (deliberate?) misreading of the root שׁ"חר. And finally, the eschatological *Völkerwallfahrt* is highlighted in LXX-Isa's rendering of the highly ambiguous Hebrew of 54:15 as "proselytes/sojourners will come to you through me, and they will take refuge in you."

LXX-Isa's concern for Gentile law observance can be seen not only in isolated renderings, but also in the way it reworks entire pericopes. LXX-Isaiah 8 shows significant differences from the Hebrew, and this entire chapter has been recast as an address from the righteous to the Gentiles focused on the law, telling them "learn" (8:9), "submit" (8:9), and "do not say 'hard'" (8:12). If the Gentiles trust, they are told they will not encounter God as a stumbling block (8:14), and the righteous conclude by stating that God "gave the law as a help" (8:20). The wicked, meanwhile, are described as "those who seal up the law, so as not to learn" (8:16), and they are condemned for saying that it (presumably the law) is "hard" (8:12). Almost every change in this chapter functions to focus the pericope on law and to encourage Gentiles to accept it.

Within the Servant Songs, differences between the Greek and Hebrew function to identify the Servant and "the Gentiles' covenant" (διαθήκην ἐθνῶν) with Mosaic law. This is most apparent in verses such as LXX-Isa 48:21 ("And if they thirst, he will bring them through the desert, water from rock he will bring out to them; the rock will be rent, and water will flow, **and my people will drink**"), where an already existing allusion to Moses is expanded, reworked, and projected into the future, such that the Servant is portrayed as a Moses redivivus. Through allusion to Exod 32 and Num 11, foreigners are commanded to "sanctify him who despises his own life" (LXX-Isa 49:7), a command that is echoed in the pronounced light imagery of 49:6 ("Behold, I have set you as a light to the peoples, that **you** may be as salvation to the ends of the earth") and 50:10 ("Who among you is a fearer of the Lord? **Let him hearken** to

the voice of his Servant. As for **those** walking in darkness, for whom there is no light: **trust** on the name of the Lord, and **lean** upon God"). According to LXX-Isa 26:9 and 51:4, this light for the Gentiles is identified as none other than God's law. The Servant's function as an embodiment of Mosaic law and the Gentiles' Covenant is further strengthened by the wordplay between the Servant (παῖς/παιδίον) and the instruction (παιδεία) he receives from the Lord (see LXX-Isa 50:4–5, 53:5).

Not every difference listed here can be securely attributed to the translator. In some cases, differences between the Greek and Hebrew most likely stem from a variant *Vorlage*, while in others the differences may best be attributed to the Greek text's transmission history. Nevertheless, the sheer number of such changes is striking, and it is equally noteworthy that they all point in the same direction of encouraging Gentile adherence to the law of Moses. Throughout LXX-Isa, the Gentiles are consistently commanded to "consecrate yourselves" (41:1, 45:16), "learn" (8:9, 26:9), "do not say 'hard'" (8:12), and "sanctify him who despises his own life" (49:7), while "those who seal up the law so as not to learn" (8:16) and "those who reject the law" (24:16) are condemned. As laid out in the previous chapters, and in line with the methodology outlined in Chapter 1, this all attests to an author—whether this be the translator, the author of the *Vorlage,* or a later Greek scribe—who thought deeply about how Gentiles should understand the law of Moses.

Of course, we must be careful not to overgeneralize about LXX-Isa. While the author's choices suggest an insistence that foreigners should one day observe Mosaic law, he did not obliterate all differences between Israelites and Gentiles, nor did he consistently elevate the Gentiles to an exalted eschatological role. As in the Hebrew text of Isaiah, foreigners are still occasionally portrayed as slaves, and there are even occasions where the LXX appears to exclude

Gentiles from titles elsewhere reserved for Israel, as in 19:25.[2] But the overall picture of Gentile law observance in LXX-Isa is clear, these texts notwithstanding.

While this dissertation has focused primarily on the book of Isaiah from the 8th to 2nd centuries BCE, the implications of this study extend well beyond Isaiah itself. On a methodological level, if the methodology used here for examining differences in translation were applied to the field of LXX studies more broadly, our notion of exegesis in translation would be quite different. Attested variations in *Vorlage*—especially those taking advantage of common scribal "mistakes"—would be seen as offering the translator a choice in rendering, whereas most scholars currently treat such variations as uniformly casting doubt on our ability to attribute differences in translation to authorial exegesis.

On the other hand, were this dissertation's methodology widely used, we would be much more cautious than scholars currently are in "jumping the Göttingen gap" and attributing differences in translation to the translator himself rather than to subsequent (often Christian) tradents of the Greek text. When making an attribution to the translator, I have repeatedly cautioned that this attribution is only as strong as the evidence we have, and this evidence is tenuous. The reconstruction of the Greek text—even if our reconstruction is 100% accurate—is only a reconstruction of a hypothetical *archetype*, which may be centuries removed from the original translation. Thus in all cases, the most we can say is that "the evidence we have" does not support the thesis that a particular verse's rendering should be attributed to subsequent transmission history. For this reason, I have consistently referred to the "author" of the text as the

---

[2] The Hebrew text here reads ברוך עמי מצרים, while the Greek text has Εὐλογημένος ὁ λαός μου ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ. Many scholars have taken this difference to signify that the translator did not want to apply the covenantal formula "my people" to a foreign nation (e.g., Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 333), though the text need not necessarily be read in this way. For a view of LXX-Isa 19:25 as a universalist text, see Monsengwo-Pasinya, "Isaïe xix 16-25 et universalisme," 203–6.

default locus of a given reading, rather than supposing that the translator is responsible "unless proven innocent." This may be imprecise, but it is the best we can do with the manuscripts we have. For eschatological Gentile law observance, I have made a case based on LXX-Isa's widespread and consistent tendency toward a certain interpretation, but barring this kind of widespread evidence, our conclusions should not overreach.

Beyond methods and approaches, the ideas studied in this dissertation also shed light on how certain groups within Hellenistic Judaism thought about the end times—an important topic in understanding later authors and groups such as the Qumran covenanters, Philo, Josephus, Christianity, and other early Jewish sects. By studying how LXX-Isa treats these themes, we can catch a glimpse of one strand of Hellenistic thought on the matter, and we can gain a better understanding of the evolving consideration of foreigners and their place in Judaism.[3]

LXX-Isa in Prospect

While I have focused mainly on transformations between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Isaiah, there is much more that could be done in the study of this complex text. Most notably, "one can also take one step further and interpret the Greek text *per se* without reference to the translator. One can then ask the questions: What possibilities of interpretation have been opened by this translation?"[4] These are precisely the questions asked in the first century CE by early

---

[3] Donaldson writes of conceptions of Gentile law observance in early Judaism: "While there has been considerable scholarly interest in the positive place of Gentiles in Jewish end-time scenarios, less attention has been paid to the precise status of these second-order participants in eschatological redemption. Are they fully incorporated into Israel, end-time proselytes, as it were?.... In the material itself… there is little evidence that the question was addressed in any direct or explicit way. As with the biblical material that preceded it, we encounter both a certain ambiguity and a sense that the focus of attention lies elsewhere" (*Judaism and the Gentiles*, 503). Donaldson examines LXX-Isa in the course of his study, and while he finds some passages to be suggestive of Gentile law observance (e.g., LXX-Isa 54:15), he ultimately dismisses the idea that the translation addresses the question with any directness or consistent agenda (see ibid., 504).

[4] Olofsson, "Law and Lawbreaking," 291.

Christians as they struggled to understand how to incorporate Gentiles into their vision of Israel. Christianity is hardly the only group to engage with these questions,[5] but the continuing scholarly debate surrounding this topic is ample reason to consider it briefly here.

The dispute between Paul and the "judaizers" over whether Gentiles should observe Mosaic law is well known, as is the eschatological self-understanding of the early Christian community.[6] For many early Christians, Jesus's ministry and death had either set the stage or fully inaugurated the final age, and with this inauguration the question became pressing: should the Gentiles who now convert observe Mosaic law as the Jews do, or should they observe some other law? While much has been said on this subject, what is often missing from these discussions is an acknowledgment of how early interpretation of LXX-Isa shaped the form and outcome of this debate.

Peter, James, some "false brothers" in Jerusalem (Gal 2:4), and Paul's otherwise unknown opponents seem to have advocated full Gentile observance of Mosaic law, but we have no direct evidence of their beliefs. What we do have comes filtered through sources such as Acts and Paul's letters, and a full examination of their reconstructed beliefs would take us far beyond the purview of this dissertation. We do, however, have direct access to Paul's own writing on the topic, and it is here that our study of LXX-Isa is especially useful.

As commentators have long noted, Paul's worldview is profoundly shaped by his understanding of scripture, and among biblical writers, Isaiah stands preeminent in influencing

---

[5] See, e.g., Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*, WUNT 2.16 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), 162–65 and passim; and McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles,* 35–47 for some of the ways in which later authors wrestled with these issues, often in terms reminiscent of (or borrowing directly from) LXX-Isa.

[6] See Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment,* 228–30; John Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 78–79; Theissen and Merz, *The Historical Jesus*, 240–80; Ehrman, *The New Testament,* 299; and Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 463–75.

Paul's thought. No other book is cited as frequently in Paul's letters, and as Florian Wilk has shown, Paul's use of Isaiah is a model of Second Temple Jewish interpretation, showing all the complexity and nuance one would expect from an exegete immersed in deep study of the book.[7] Paul's interpretation of Isaiah was influenced by a wide variety of factors, but among these influences is the LXX translation, from which Paul primarily (though not exclusively) worked and quoted.[8]

Given this dependence, it is interesting to note how the topics broached in LXX-Isa reappear as central themes in Paul's writing. In LXX-Isa, the Servant and the law are continually referred to as a light for those in darkness (e.g., LXX-Isa 26:9, 50:10, 51:4), and in Rom 2:17–20, Paul speaks of the Jew who "trusts in the law" as "a guide to the blind, a light to those in darkness, a teacher (παιδευτὴν) of the foolish" (cf. 2 Cor 4:6, where the Christian message is described in similar terms). LXX-Isaiah 8 speaks at great length of the law, and in 8:14, unlike in MT, the Gentiles are told that they will not encounter God as a stumbling block (οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε) if they have trust/faith (ἐὰν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς). Paul quotes this verse in Rom 9:33, but he reinterprets the passage to focus exclusively on the element of faith

---

[7] See Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches*, 265 and passim; and Wagner, "Isaiah in Romans and Galatians," 130.

[8] As Martin Karrer points out, by the New Testament period there were many changes and differences among LXX manuscripts, and "[o]ur concept of 'Septuagint' in that time, therefore, must be one of a loose, emerging sampling of texts" (Karrer, "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, SCS 53 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006] 344). Paul's citations of Isaiah show the textual variety we would expect in this milieu, but this does not negate the value of LXX-Isa in understanding his thought. Wilk provides an in-depth analysis of the text-form of Paul's citations of Isaiah, and he concludes: "In allen analysierten Fällen kann die Textgestalt der paulinischen Jesajazitate mit guten Gründen auf 𝔊* oder auf eine anhand des hebräischen Textes überarbeitete 𝔊-Fassung zurückgeführt werden" (Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches*, 42).

introduced by the author of LXX-Isa.[9] According to Paul, Israel encountered the law as a

stumbling block precisely "because [their striving] was not by faith" (Rom 9:32).

We have seen in the previous chapter how LXX-Isa treats the Servant as a new Moses

and as an extension of the Mosaic covenant with the Gentiles. Paul takes this imagery and

reapplies it to his own mission, casting himself as a "servant of the new covenant" (διάκονος

καινῆς διαθήκης, 2 Cor 3:6). The textual dependence runs throughout his letters, and Wagner

notes:

> [H]e narrates his call in terms reminiscent of Isa. 49:1–6. In this passage, an
> unnamed 'servant' (δοῦλος, 49:3, 5) of the Lord recounts his commissioning by
> God both to re-gather Israel's exiles (49:5–6) and to bring salvation to the ends of
> the earth (49:6). Just as the Servant has been called (καλέω, 49:1, cf. 49:6) from
> his mother's womb (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, 49:1; cf. 49:5), so Paul has been set
> apart from his mother's womb (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου) and called (καλέω) by
> God's grace (Gal 1:15).… Paul cites the first half of 49:8 in 2 Cor. 6:2, claiming
> that the "day of salvation" announced by Isaiah is "now", as God's grace
> confronts the Corinthians in the "message of reconciliation" that Paul proclaims
> (2 Cor 5:11–21). Finally, just as the Lord vows to his Servant, "I will be glorified
> in you" (ἐν σοὶ δοξασθήσομαι, Isa 49:3), so Paul reports the response of the
> churches of Judea to his transformation from persecutor to missionary: "They
> glorified God in me" (ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν θεόν, Gal 1:24).[10]

In similar vein, Paul describes his converts as "shining like stars in the world" (φωστῆρες ἐν

κόσμῳ), and he expresses hope that his work has not been in vain (οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα, Phil

2:15–16), just as the Servant describes his own mission as that of "a light… to the ends of the

earth" (φῶς… ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς) and laments that he has worked in vain (κενῶς ἐκοπίασα,

LXX-Isa 49:4–6). Even Paul's description of the law as a παιδ-αγωγὸς (Gal 3:24) given until

---

[9] Paul's quotation is a mix between Isa 8:14 and 28:6: "Behold, I am placing in Zion a stone of striking and a rock of stumbling, and all those who trust on him/it will not be ashamed."

[10] Wagner, "Isaiah in Romans and Galatians," 130–31. See also Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches*, 4 n. 22; and idem, "Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians," 152–53. Much as Paul repeatedly stresses his identification with the Isaianic Servant, so in 1 Cor 1:17 Paul quotes LXX-Isa 61:1 ("The Spirit of the Lord is upon me…"): "Paul has applied Isa. 61:1 to his own calling, identifying himself with the speaker of that verse" (Wilk, "Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians," 135).

"the fullness of time" (τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, Gal 4:4) is reminiscent of LXX-Isa's description of the Servant/law as a παῖς endowed with παιδεία, tasked with leading Israel (ἄγειν/συναγαγεῖν) during much time (διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ, Isa 49:1).[11]

The echoes of LXX-Isa throughout the letters of Paul are unmistakable, and it is no coincidence that quotations and allusions appear precisely in those moments when Paul describes the proper relationship between Gentiles and the law. As is well known, Paul did not advocate Gentile observance of Mosaic law, and it would be a mistake to claim that Paul adopted LXX-Isa's view on these matters wholesale. Nevertheless, his incorporation and reworking of select passages from LXX-Isa show that his use of this text was more profound than simply as a source of good quotations. Teasing out the exact relationship between Paul and LXX-Isa is a task well worth a monograph in its own right, and this falls far beyond the scope of my work, but any such analysis would need to take seriously the development of foreign eschatological law observance within the book of Isaiah itself. Understanding LXX-Isa in its own right is a crucial first step in interpreting Paul's theology, and it is this understanding which has been traced out over the previous five chapters.

Conclusions

---

[11] A final parallel between Paul and LXX-Isa is tantalizing, though it is highly speculative. J. Albert Harrill hypothesizes that Paul may have actually tried to bring a Gentile into the temple, a charge which the author of Acts presents as false in Acts 21:28 ("he has brought a Greek into the temple!"). According to Harrill, the idea of Gentiles entering the temple to offer sacrifice would have fit well within Paul's beliefs about the dawning of the final age (cf. Isa 56:6–7), and it would not be too much of a stretch to see Paul entering the temple "with an uncircumcised Gentile… to make his offering in solidarity with uncircumcised Gentiles as members of 'all Israel.'" He continues, "Yet the author of Acts presents this charge as *false*. The charge thus runs counter to the narrative agenda of the text, and its very oddness suggests it to be historical" (*Paul the Apostle: His Life and Legacy in their Roman Context* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012], 72–73).

In the *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus relates the story of a certain Izates, king of Adiabene, who converts to Judaism and desires to worship God properly. The missionary Ananias informs Izates that in his circumstances, "the king could… worship God even without being circumcised if indeed he had fully decided to be a devoted adherent of Judaism."[12] Izates accordingly defers circumcision, but he later comes across a certain Eleazar, who informs him, "In your ignorance, O king, you are guilty of the greatest offence against the law and thereby against God. For you ought not merely to read the law but also, and even more, to do what is commanded in it."[13]

In this case, the two competing claims of Ananias and Eleazar deal with proper Gentile law observance in the here-and-now, but their underlying ideas can be seen as paradigmatic for understanding the eschatological inclusion of Gentiles. As we trace the development of foreigners and law observance from Proto-Isaiah through the time of Paul, we can see an amazing breadth of opinions on what this relationship should entail. Even if we ignore diachronic approaches and focus on only a snapshot, such as the final form of the Hebrew text or the earliest reconstructable form of LXX-Isa, even here we see juxtaposed ideas of servitude and exaltation, complete inclusion and profound separation between Jew and Gentile. Everyone agrees that Gentiles will one day worship alongside Israelites—the religious analogue of the wolf lying down with the lamb—but the book of Isaiah contains in microcosm the deep disagreement about what this worship will look like.

As we have seen, LXX-Isa left a considerable imprint on the continuing tradition, and there are numerous places where we can see a consistent and pervasive attempt to encourage eschatological Gentile law observance. Yet LXX-Isa is only one *traditum* in a continuous

---

[12] Josephus, *Ant.* 20.41 (Feldman, LCL).

[13] Ibid., 20.45.

traditio, a *traditio* which encompasses a wide range of ideas.[14] Whether one's interest lies in pre-exilic Israelite religion or early Christianity, Hellenistic thought or Judaism in the early rabbinic period, it is my hope that this discussion can contribute to our understanding of the many approaches taken to this question.

---

[14] See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 1–19.

Bibliography

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators." Pages 295–312 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and expanded ed. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

————. "Von Sprache zur Theologie, Methodologische Überlegung zur Theologie der Septuaginta." Pages 21–48 in *The Septuagint and Messianism.* Edited by Michael Knibb. BETL 195. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2006.

Austermann, Frank. *Von der Tora zum Nomos: Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im Septuaginta-Psalter.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

————. "Von der Tora im hebräischen Psalm 119 zum Nomos im griechischen Psalm 118: was die Wiedergabe über die Gesetzestheologie des Übersetzers verrät und was nicht." Pages 331–37 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*. Edited by Erich Zenger. New York: Herder, 2001.

Baer, David A. *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66*. JSOTSup 318. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. MSU 15/*NAWG* 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Bauckham, Richard D. "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13–21)." Pages 154–84 in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Begg, Christopher T. "The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh in the Book of Isaiah." Pages 35–55 in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of John T. Willis*. Edited by M. Patrick Graham, Rick R. Marrs, and Steven L. McKenzie. JSOTSup 284. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Berges, Ulrich F. *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*. Translated by Millard C. Lind. Hebrew Bible Monographs 46. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 3 vols. AB 19–19B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2003.

————. *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Botterweck, G. J. and H. Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.

Brock, Sebastian P. "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint." Pages 11–36 in *The witness of tradition; papers read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference held at Woudschoten, 1970*. Edited by M. A. Beek et al. *OtSt* 17. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Cazelles, Henri. "Texte Massoretique et Septante en Is 2.1–5." Pages 51–59 in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: études biblique offertes à l'occasion de son 60ᵉ anniversaire*. Edited by Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel and Adrian Schenker. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Chamberlain, John V. "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll." *VT* 5.1 (1995): 366–72.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983–1985.

Cohen, Matty. "Le « ger » biblique et son statut socio-religieux." *RHR* 207.2 (1990): 131–58.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

———. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. 2nd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

Cook, Johann. "Towards the Formulation of a Theology of the Septuagint." Pages 621–40 in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*. Edited by A. Lemaire. VTSup 133. Boston: Brill, 2010.

——— and Arie van der Kooij. *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom: On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version*. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Cowey, James M. S. "Das ägyptische Judentum in hellenistischer Zeit – neue Erkenntnisse aus jüngst veröffentlichten Papyri." Pages 24–43 in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer and Jürgen Peter Lesch. 3 vols. BWA(N)T 161. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004.

Dafni, Evangelia G. "Die sogenannten *'Ebed-Jahwe*-Lieder in der Setpuaginta." Pages 187–200 in *XI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leiden, 2004*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. SCS 54. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Das Neves, J. C. M. *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías*. Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973.

Davies, Graham I. "The Destiny of the Nations in the Book of Isaiah." Pages 93–120 in *The Book of Isaiah/Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures: unité et complexité de l'ouvrage*. Edited by Jacques Vermeylen. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

De Angelo Cunha, Wilson. "Greek Isaiah 25:6–8 and the Issue of Coherence." Pages 277–90 in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. SCS 59. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

De Sousa, Rodrigo F. *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1–12*. LHBOTS 516. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Dines, Jennifer M. *The Septuagint*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Donaldson, Terence L. *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 5th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Eisenbaum, Pamela. *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle*. New York: Harper Collins, 2009.

Ekblad Jr., E. R. *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. CBET 23. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

Elliger, Karl and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.

Falk, Ze'ev W. *Hebrew Law in Biblical Times*: *An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press and Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson. Atlanta: The Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

——— and María Victoria Spottorno Díaz-Caro, eds. *La Biblia Griega Septuaginta. Vol. IV, Libros proféticos*. Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos 128. Salamanca: Ediciones Sígueme, 2015.

Feuillet, André. "La conversion et le salut des nations: chez le prophète Isaïe." *BVC* 22 (1958): 3–22.

Fischer, Irmtraud. *Tora für Israel – Tora für die Völker: Das Konzept des Jesajabuches*. SBS 164. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995.

Fischer, Johann. *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie*. BZAW 56. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Flamming, James. "The New Testament Use of Isaiah." *SwJT* 11 (Fall 1968): 89–103.

Flint, Peter W. "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1–14 and the Massoretic Text." *BIOSCS* 21 (1988): 35–54.

Gager, John. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Conversion." *ABD* 1:1131–33.

Gehrke, Hans-Joachim. "Das sozial- und religionsgeschichtliche Umfeld der Septuaginta." Pages 44–60 in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer and Jürgen Peter Lesch. 3 vols. BWA(N)T 161. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004.

Goldingay, John. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 56–66*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H., ed. *The Book of Isaiah*. 3 vols. *The Hebrew University Bible Project*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975–1993.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I–XXXIX*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.

Gross, Walter. "YHWH und die Religionen der Nicht-Israeliten." *TQ* 169 (1989): 34–44.

Haag, Herbert. *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja*. EdF 233. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985.

Hahn, Scott W. *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Hanhart, Robert. "Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung." Pages 331–46 in *The Bible and the Ancient World: Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume*. Vol 3. Edited by Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch. Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein's Publishing, 1983.

Hannah, Darrell D. "Isaiah within Judaism of the Second Temple Period." Pages 7–33 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Harner, Philip B. *Grace and Law in Second Isaiah: 'I am the Lord.'* Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 2. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1988.

Harrill, J. Albert. *Paul the Apostle: His Life and Legacy in their Roman Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hartman, Louis F. "Eschatology." *EncJud* 6:489–500.

Hayes, Christine E. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hebel, Udo J. "Towards a Descriptive Poetics of *Allusion*." Pages 135–64 in *Intertextuality*. Edited by Heinrich F. Plett. Research in Text Theory 15. New York: de Gruyter, 1991.

Hirshman, Marc. "Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries." *HTR* 93.2 (April 2000): 101–15.

Huber, Friedrich. *Jahwe, Juda und die anderen Völker beim Propheten Jesaja*. BZAW 137. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976.

Hugenberger, Gordon P. "The Servant of the Lord in the 'Servant Songs' of Isaiah: A Second Moses Figure." Pages 105–40 in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.

Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Bavli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, With an Index of Scriptural Quotations*. 2 vols. New York: Pardes, 1950.

Jensen, Joseph. *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah: His Debate with the Wisdom Tradition*. CBQMS 3. Arlington, VA: Information Products & Services Corp, 1973.

Jobes, Karen H. and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

Joosten, Jan. "Une théologie de la Septante? Réflexions méthodologiques sur l'interprétation de la version grecque." *RTP* 132 (2000): 31–46.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Joüon, Paul and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.* 2nd reprint of the 2nd ed. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009.

Jüngling, Hans-Winfried. "Das Buch Jesaja." Pages 521–47 in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* Edited by Erich Zenger et al. 8th ed. Studienbücher Theologie 1.1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012.

Kahle, Paul E. *The Cairo Geniza.* 2nd ed. New York: Praeger, 1959.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Karrer, Martin. "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Septuagint." Pages 335–53 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures.* SCS 53. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

——— and Wolfgang Kraus. *Septuaginta Deutsch.* 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009–2011.

Kim, Jong-Hoon. "Die Wiedergabe von עבד mit δοῦλος oder παῖς in der Septuaginta der Samuel- und Königebücher." Pages 391–403 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7.2008.* Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, with the assistance of Martin Meiser. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Knibb, Michael A. "The Septuagint and Messianism: Problems and Issues." Pages 3–19 in *The Septuagint and Messianism.* Edited by idem. BETL 195. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

Knight, Douglas A. *Law, Power, and Justice in Ancient Israel.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011.

Koenig, Jean. *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe.* VTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Koet, Bart J. "Isaiah in Luke-Acts." Pages 79–100 in *Isaiah in the New Testament.* Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Kratz, Reinhard Gregor. *Kyros im Deuterojesaja-Buch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55.* FAT 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.

Lauterbach, Jacob Z. *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael: A Critical Edition*. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2004.

Le Boulluec, Alain and Philippe le Moigne. *Vision que vit Isaïe: Traduction du texte du prophète Isaïe selon la Septante*. La Bible D'Alexandrie. Paris: Cerf, 2014.

Le Déaut, Roger. "La Septante, un Targum?" Pages 147–95 in *Etudes sur le Judaïsme hellénistique. Congrès de Strasbourg 1983*. Edited by Raymond Kuntzmann and Jacques Schlosser. LD 119. Paris: Cerf, 1984.

Lee, John A. L. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. SCS 14. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983.

Levy, Jacob. *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*. With contributions from Heinrich Leberecht. 4 vols. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876–1889.

Lightstone, Jack N. "Torah is *Nomos*—Except When it is Not: Prolegomena to the Study of the Law in Late Antique Judaism." *SR* 13.1 (1984): 29–38.

Litwak, Kenneth D. "The Use of Quotations from Isaiah 52:13–53:12 in the New Testament." *JETS* 26/4 (Dec 1983): 385–94.

Lohfink, Norbert and Erich Zenger. *Der Gott Israels und die Völker: Untersuchungen zum Jesajabuch und zu den Psalmen*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994.

Lust, Johan. "The Demonic Character of Jahweh and the Septuagint of Isaiah." *Bijdr* 40 (1979): 2–14.

———. "Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b–9:6 (9:1–7)." Pages 153–69 in *The Interpretation of the Bible*. Edited by Jože Krašovec. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

———, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Revised Edition*. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 2003.

Lyons, Michael A. "Transformation of Law: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26)." Pages 1–32 in *Transforming Visions: Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel*. Edited by idem and William A. Tooman. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 127. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.

McKnight, Scot. *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Melugin, Roy F. "Israel and the Nations in Isaiah 40–55." Pages 249–64 in *Problems in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Rolf Knierim.* Edited by Henry T. C. Sun and Keith L. Eades. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Miller, Patrick D. *The Religion of Ancient Israel.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.

Moffitt, David M. and C. Jacob Butera. "P.Duk. inv. 727r: New Evidence for the Meaning and Provenance of the Word Προσήλυτος." *JBL* 132.1 (2013):159–78.

Monsengwo-Pasinya, Laurent. "Isaïe xix 16-25 et universalisme dans la LXX." Pages 192–207 in *Congress Volume: Salmanca, 1983*. Edited by J.A. Emerton. VTSup 36. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

———. *La notion de* NOMOS *dans le Pentateuque Grec.* AnBib 52. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973.

Müller, Hans Peter. "Eschatology: Old Testament." *RPP* 4:534–39.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Neusner, Jacob. *Torah: From Scroll to Symbol in Formative Judaism*. BJS 136. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.

Ngunga, Abi T. *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis*. FRLANT 245. Bristol: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Olofsson, Staffan. "Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms – a Case of Theological Exegesis." Pages 291–330 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte.* Edited by Erich Zenger. BibS(F) 32. Frieburg: Herder, 2001.

Orlinsky, Harry. "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators." *HUCA* 46 (1975): 89–114.

Oswalt, John N. "The Nations in Isaiah: Friend or Foe; Servant or Partner." *BBR* 16.1 (2006): 41–51.

Ottley, Richard R. *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*. 2 vols. London: Cambridge University Press, 1904.

Patrick, Dale. *Old Testament Law*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1985.

Perri, Carmela. "On Alluding." *Poetics* 7.3 (1978): 289–307.

Petersen, David L. "Eschatology: Old Testament." *ABD* 2:575–79.

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and R. Marcus. 10 vols. (and 2 supplementary vols.) Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.

Pietersma, Albert. "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint." Pages 337–64 in *Bible and Computer—The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference, Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique, 'From Alpha to Byte,' University of Stellenbosch, 17-21 July 2000*. Edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

———. "LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies." Pages 273–82 in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor. BTS 14. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.

———. Review of J. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. *BO* 54 (1997): 185–90.

——— and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Pulikottil, Paulson. *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsaᵃ*. JSPSup 34. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.

Rabin, Chaim. "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint." *Text* 6 (1968): 1–26.

Reymond, Eric D. *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*. RBS 76. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

Rösel, Martin. "Towards a 'Theology of the Septuagint.'" Pages 239–52 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Rubenstein, Arie. "The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll." *JJS* 6.4 (1955): 187–200.

Safrai, Ze'ev. "The Origins of Reading the Aramaic Targum in Synagogue." Pages 187–93 in *The New Testament and Christian–Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser*. Edited by Malcolm Lowe. *Imm* 24/25. Jerusalem: Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel: 1990.

Sailhamer, John H. *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3–41*. Studies in Biblical Greek 2. New York: Peter Lang, 1990.

Sanders, E. P. "Law: Law in Judaism of the NT Period." *ABD* 4:254–63.

———. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*. WUNT 2.16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1993.

Schwartz, Seth. "Conversion to Judaism in the Second Temple Period: A Functionalist Approach." Pages 223–36 in *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume*. Edited by Shaye J.D. Cohen and Joshua J. Schwartz. Boston: Brill, 2007.

Schweitzer, Steven James. "Mythology in the Old Greek of Isaiah: The Technique of Translation." *CBQ* 66.2 (Apr 2004): 214–30.

Seeligmann, Isac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*. FAT 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

———. "δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς." *Text* 21 (2002): 107–28.

Segal, Alan F. "Torah and *Nomos* in Recent Scholarly Discussion." *SR* 13.1 (1984): 19–27.

Silva, Moisés. "Esaias: To the Reader." Pages 823–25 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Sim, David C. "Gentiles, God-Fearers and Proselytes." Pages 9–27 in *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by idem and James S. McLaren. LNTS 499. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Smelik, Willem F. *The Targum of Judges*. OtSt 36. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Smith, Louise Pettibone. "The Use of the Word תורה in Isaiah, Chapters 1–39." *AJSL* 46.1 (Oct. 1929): 1–21.

Sommer, Benjamin D. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Sonnet, Jean-Pierre. *The Book Within the Book: Writing in Deuteronomy*. BibInt 14. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Spencer, John R. "Sojourner." *ABD* 4:103–04.

Stanley, Christopher D. "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." Pages 18–27 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigation and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Steyn, Gert. "Which 'LXX' are we Talking About in NT Scholarship? Two Examples from Hebrews." Pages 697-707 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Contexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D).* Edited by Martin Karrer and W. Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Stromberg, Jacob. *An Introduction to the Study of Isaiah*. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

Stuhlmacher, Peter and Bernd Janowski, eds. *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Sweeney, Marvin A. "Eschatology in the Book of Isaiah." Pages 179–95 in *The Book of Isaiah: Enduring Questions Answered Anew*. Edited by Richard J. Bautch and J. Todd Hibbard. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the book of Isaiah." Pages 116–26 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by idem and Frank Moore Cross. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Teeter, David Andrew. *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*. FAT 92. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

———. "Torah, Wisdom, and the Composition of Rewritten Scripture: Jubilees and 11QPsa in Comparative Perspective." Pages 233–72 in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by idem and Bernd U. Schipper. JSJSup 163. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Theissen, Gerd and Annette Merz. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Translated by John Bowden. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Thiessen, Matthew. "Revisiting προσήλυτος in 'the LXX.'" *JBL* 132.2 (2013): 333–50.

Tov, Emanuel. "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX – Their Nature and Distribution." Pages 64–73 in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages.* Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Williams Wevers. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 190. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

———. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Boston: Brill, 1999.

———. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

———. "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran." Pages 42–56 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Troxel, Ronald. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. JSJSup 124. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008.

Ulrich, Eugene, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants. Volume 2: Isaiah–Twelve Minor Prophets*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Van der Louw, Theo A. W. "Linguistic or Ideological Shifts? The Problem-oriented Study of Transformations as a Methodological Filter." Pages 107–25 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Van der Kooij, Arie. "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIsᵃ." *BO* 43 (1986): 366–76.

———. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

———. "Isaiah in the Septuagint." Pages 513–29 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. VTSup 70.2. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. "The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah: Some General Comments." Pages 195–213 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester 1990)*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, S.S.F. SCS 33. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992.

———. *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*. VTSup 71. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1998.

———. "The Promulgation of the Pentateuch in Greek According to the Letter of Aristeas." Pages 179–92 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. "The Septuagint of Isaiah." Pages 63–85 in *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom: On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version*. Edited by idem and Johann Cook. CBET 68. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

———. "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism: Some Comments on LXX Isaiah 8–9." Pages 597–611 in *Die Septuaginta – Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, with assistance from Martin Meiser. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

———. "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation." Pages 127–33 in *The Book of Isaiah/Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures: unité et complexité de l'ouvrage*. Edited by Jacques Vermeylen. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

———. "Servant or Slave?: The Various Equivalents of Hebrew *'Ebed* in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch." Pages 225–38 in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Ljubljana 2007*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. SCS 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

———. "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta." Pages 9–25 in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik*. Edited by Hennig Graf Reventlow. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 11. Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1997.

Van der Meer, Michaël. "Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah." Pages 105–33 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives*. Edited by idem and Arie van der Kooij. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.

Van der Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. SCS 61. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

———. "LXX Isaiah and the Use of Rhetorical Figures." Pages 173–88 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michaël van der Meer. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.

Van Houten, Christiana. *The Alien in Israelite Law*. JSOTSup 107. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.

Vermes, Geza. "The Torah is a Light." *VT* 8 (1958): 436–38.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*. Edited by D. W. Gooding. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Wagner, J. Ross. "Identifying 'Updated' Prophecies in Old Greek (OG) Isaiah: Isaiah 8:11–16 as a Test Case." *JBL* 126.2 (2007): 251–69.

———. "Isaiah in Romans and Galatians." Pages 117–32 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

———. *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014.

Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34–66*. WBC 25. Waco: World Books, 1987.

Wells, Bruce. "What is Biblical Law? A Look at Pentateuchal Rules and Near Eastern Practice." *CBQ* 70.2 (Apr 2008): 223–43.

Westbrook, Raymond. "The Laws of Biblical Israel." Pages 99–119 in *The Hebrew Bible: New Insights and Scholarship, Jewish Studies in the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by Frederick E. Greenspahn. New York: New York University Press, 2007.

——— and Bruce Wells. *Everyday Law in Biblical Israel: An Introduction*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

Westerholm, Stephen. "*Torah*, *Nomos*, and Law: A Question of 'Meaning.'" *SR* 15.3 (1986): 327–36.

Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary*. Translated by David M. G. Stalker. OTL 19. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.

Wilk, Florian. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

———. "Between Scripture and History: Technique and Hermeneutics of Interpreting Biblical Prophets in the Septuagint of Isaiah and the Letters of Paul." Pages 189–209 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michaël van der Meer. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.

———. "Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians." Pages 133–58 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Williamson, H. G. M. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1–27*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

———. *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

———. *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah*. Carlisle, U.K.: Paternoster, 1998.

Wright, Benjamin G. III. "Transcribing, Translating, and Interpreting in the *Letter of Aristeas*: On the Nature of the Septuagint." Pages 147–62 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on*

Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Ziegler, Joseph. "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die Erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsᵃ)." *JBL* 78.1 (Mar 1959): 34–59.

———. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. ATA 12/3. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.

Zillessen, Alfred. "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40—66)." *ZAW* 22 (1902): 238–63.

Zipor, Moshe A. "The Use of the Septuagint as a Textual Witness: Further Considerations." Pages 553–81 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. SCS 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.