The fourth and most famous of the Suffering Servant songs in MT ends:
(Israel 53:11).
The LXX breaks the verse up differently from MT, and translates: καὶ
βούλεται Κύριος ἀφελείν ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς (v.l. τῆς ψυχῆς)1 αὐτοῦ,
dείξαι αὐτῷ φῶς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέχειᾳ δικαιώσαι δικαίον εὐθελεύοντα;
retroverted into Hebrew this would read: כְּשָׁמַע ה' לֹא-צָלַל בְּשַׁעַר לָאָר חַרְבָּה (and the Lord wished to take his
soul away from travail, to show him light, to form him with understanding,
and to justify the just one who serves well). As opposed to commentators
who prefer the LXX—Bernhard Duhm may well be the best known among
them, though he was not the first2—I postulated in 1948 that the Septuagint
integrates into the text a Hellenistic pre-gnostic idea which is basically

* Translated by Judith H. Seeligmann. The Hebrew original appeared in Tarbiz 27
(1957/8) 127-141, and was later reprinted in I. L. Seeligmann, Studies in Biblical

1 Though the version τῆς ψυχῆς is attested in late witnesses only, some among
them are of consequence such as Justinus and the Vetus Latina according to
Tyconius: auferre a dolore animam eius, and others; it is well possible that τῆς ψυχῆς is
but a late adaptation of the MT.

2 B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaja, übersetzt und erklärt (Göttingen, 1914)
ad loc. In n. 19 I will quote Houbigant, who preceded Duhm by one hundred and
fifty years. The LXX version is accepted, not only by Duhm but also by L. Koehler,
Deuterocodes (Giessen, 1923) 49; P. Voltz, Jesaja (Leipzig, 1932); C. R. North, The
neuendekten Jesajahandschrift (D5la),” ZAW 63 (1951) 235-248, at p. 246 (see
below n. 23). The MT version is followed by Ehrlich (see below n. 23); K. Budde,
Tübingen, 1922) 689; J. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterodesaja (Stuttgart, 1938) 59.

foreign to the subject matter, and therefore the MT reading should be adhered to. In the meantime the texts of two Hebrew Isaiah scrolls from Qumran Cave 1 have been published, one complete, the other fragmentary. The first has: מִוצֶּלֶנָּה בְּשָׁנָה וַתְּכָנְצַע בְּוַעַרְוַר עָרִיק עָבוֹר לִבְּכֵי הָעָרָמִים וְאוֹרָהּ יִסְפָּר. The second, whose readings usually do not differ from MT but for minor details, reads here: מִוצֶּלֶנָּה בְּשָׁנָה וַתְּכָנְצַע בְּוַעַרְוַר. The presence of the word הַיַּכֶּר in both manuscripts could seemingly support the LXX rendition as against that of the MT. Therefore, he, who even today doubts the correctness of the LXX rendition, must account for his stance and reservations in a study, the detailed character of which can possibly be justified by the importance of the texts and concepts under discussion. He will have to corroborate his interpretation of the obviously difficult MT (though without much hope of throwing any new light on texts that have puzzled generations of scholars). It would be imperative for his account to include a special analysis on the meaning of the expression הַיַּכֶּר in biblical Hebrew, even though in our song the phrase appears only in non-masoretic texts. As a next step he will have to weigh the Septuagint version and the Qumran readings in the light of their character and cultural background and ask whether the Qumran manuscripts held any tendentious sectarian readings. Finally he may wish to explain how such a tendentious text, deviating from the original tradition, became embedded in the manuscript which was in front of the translator, in other words: how did this reading find its way into the Alexandrian setting?

A scholar who does not specialize in Hellenistic, early Christian or Gnostic literature, perforce takes a risk when determining phenomena and parallels without being able to trace their origin or evaluate the full extent of their

---


4 At present further data concerning additional discoveries of MSS of Isaiah 53 are not available to us.

effect (I doubt whether the quality and state of the sources would yield a complete picture even to more experienced scholars). However, he can hope to clearly formulate legitimate questions, even in those cases in which he cannot demand the right to offer conclusive answers.

At the outset of our exegetical comments we should state that arguments supporting the reading of LXX and Qumran, מַעֲנֵלָתְךָ נָפַשׁ יָרוּ הָאָדָם, are not lacking. The preposition mem can express the turning of tables after a situation of anguish. A fine parallel example is: הימים והשמות מנהונים (Jer 31:13). And indeed, no small number of Middle Age commentators interpreted יָרוּ as an experience of bliss, not guessing that manuscripts or the Septuagint had such a divergent reading. R. David Kimhi comments: יָרוּ, he will see good fortune and be repleted. Abarbanel states this even more clearly: “which means that he will see the light of life, and be repleted with perfect joy, which is an implication of the spiritual reward the soul will experience in the world to come.” However, the one to phrase the idea most explicitly is R. Samuel Laniado: “the anguish of his soul will not bring him a thing in this world, all of the reward is hidden, to be experienced in the world to come, where he will enjoy the splendour of the Shechinah, which comes through the faculty of sight, and for his past anguish it will be granted to him to see spiritual good and be repleted with it.”

6 Several of the Jewish commentators interpret the letter ב as expiatory; Ibn Ezra: “the reward received for his suffering”; Ramban: “for the labours”; and see R. Samuel Laniado quoted further on. The commentators are cited according to A. Neubauer, The Fifty Third Chapter of Isaiah According to the Jewish Interpreters (Oxford, 1876).

7 It is not inconceivable that several of the interpreters whose commentaries we have just cited were influenced by notions of Greek origin, conveyed to them in ways unknown to us, and to them, and thus, unconsciously, they lent the text a slight Greek turn.
These quotations are all based on MT yet, in an indirect way, they introduce the hermeneutic problem regarding the character and history of the concept רָאָה אָרֶץ in the Hebrew Bible. There is no doubt that this phrase is attested to in the Bible; by the way, this fact is, at face value, an additional support for the correctness of the LXX version. We must here, though very briefly indeed, go into the meaning of this expression. It is well known that a metaphorical use of the word רָאָה almost imposes itself in every language, in many and various ways. Therefore, an attempt at classifying the diverse shades turns into an artificial categorization, foreign to the essence of the biblical way of thinking. Nevertheless, I feel that the primary meaning of רָאָה אָרֶץ was at a certain stage influenced by another concept from a different provenance. רָאָה אָרֶץ in substance means to see the light of the world, the light of life: רָאָה אָרֶץ (Job 3:16; in v. 20 אָרֶץ is parallel to רָאָה, and so Ps 49:20, and especially Job 33:28, 30: רָאָה, כְּלָלֵי גְּדוֹלָהוּ. ... לָאָרֶץ. בֵּית אָרֶץ). Ergo, רָאָה אָרֶץ and רָאָה אָרֶץ are parallel concepts in the Bible. The story of creation opens with the creation of light, perhaps because light is a prerequisite for the existence of all life. The many other concepts which are symbolized by the metaphorical use of light—such as joy (שמחה), redemption (_sanctification), the Lord as redeemer (משיח), righteousness (צדק)—should be seen, in my opinion, as deriving from the correspondence between light and life. The

8 In Ecclesiastes there are several instances of רָאָה אָרֶץ instead of רָאָה שָׁמַשׁ (6:5; 7:11; 11:7); in my opinion, this is not due to Greek influence (_κοίμησις καὶ ὁμορφὰ σώματος ἄγεις_). Homer, II. XXIV, 558 and more); see Ps 58:9: בָּל הָוֶר שַׁמָּשׁ.

9 The meaning of מַזְחֵר can often be: to survive thanks to divine succour. Thus, understandably the very salvation may be called רָאָה: Isa 9:1; Amos 5:18; Mic 7:8; Ps 139:11; the light of God’s salvation is joy; the Lord is called רָאָה since he comes to the aid of the nation of Israel as well as of the individual: Isa 10:17; Ps 27:1; see Ps 118:27 (לָאָרֶץ). In biblical Hebrew the notions of delivering a person and protecting him in legal affairs merge (the deliverers of Israel are called judges), thus no wonder that the light of deliverance and that of doing what is just and right are fused: Ps 37:6; Hos 6:5 (which should be read: מַמְשַׁפְּתָא כּאָרֶץ לָא); Isa 51:4; Zeph 3:5; Mic 7:8–9.
same parallelism of light and life appears in Greek philosophy. In a later period it takes on a new form in the special atmosphere of the gnostic literature. Side by side with the notion ἀραί ἡ τήμα (the light of life), the Bible is familiar with another concept, of a different provenance, ἀραί τήν (the light of the Lord’s countenance): ἀραί ἡ τήμα (Ps 4:7 and 44:4; 67:2; 80:4, 8, 20; and see Num 6:25; should we conclude from the texts in which these expressions appear, that this concept originated in circles connected with the cult and its rituals?) With time these two concepts interwound; actually there is hardly any difference between ἡ ἀραί ἡ τήμα (Ps 116:9) and ἡ ἀραί ἡ τήμα (Ps 56:14) or ἡ ἀραί ἡ τήμα (Ps 89:16; see Isa 2:5). The merging of these two concepts—which are, so I believe, of different origin—yields the common understanding of ἀραί, to attain the highest bliss. If indeed, the phrase ἀραί ἡ τήμα influenced the meaning of ἀραί as we have just surmised, we must presume that there is a correlation between ἀραί and ἀραί. There should be no doubt whatsoever that the meaning of the expression is first and foremost cultic, i.e., to appear before the Lord in the temple. In the psalm opening with the words לֵבָכוּ (Psalm 27) we find both phrases: לֶבָכוּ לֵבָכוּ (v. 4) and לֵבָכוּ לֵבָכוּ (v. 13). Here the link between ἀραί (life) and taking part in

10 On the link between ‘life’ and ‘seeing light’ in ancient Greek literature (though the conclusions reached differ from those in Jewish philosophy) see: R. Bultmann, “Zur Geschichte der Lichtsymbolik im Altertum,” Phil 99 (1948) 4ff.

11 The phrase ἀραί καὶ φως is frequent in the writings of Hermes, I, 17:26; XIII, 9:13, etc. Investigating the correlation between Greek elements and Oriental (Jewish) influences in this literature goes beyond the scope of the present paper.

12 The question rises whether the phrasing of the proverb (Prov 16:15) reflects the king of Israel as a super human being; cf: ποιμὴν τῶν βοσκίων (2 Sam 17:11).

13 Luzzatto’s version ἀραί μὴ ἄνθρωπος (instead of the niphal of the masoretic vocalization), is corroborated by the fact that in three instances we find ἀραί μὴ ἄνθρωπος (Exod 34:24; Deut 31:11; Isa 1:12). See F. Nötscher, Gottes Angesicht schauen (Würzburg, 1924).
the cult is obvious: the participation in the cult is rewarded with a life of truth. This facilitates our understanding of the famous verses in Ps 36:8-10, in which this development reaches its climax and conclusion:

מה יקר הסדר אשר, יברא אדם על זכר יᵤוש
ירוח מארשים יתיכ, יתחל עונך ואריך.
יכ ענפ מקר יתיכ, יברא ענפי יאדו.

What is described here is the good portion, the blessed fate, which befalls those who participate in the cult. No doubt the words ירוח מארשים יתיכ יתחל עונך ואריך echo a cultic reality, the sacrificial meal which is sublimated here into an atmosphere of exaltation and spiritual experience. Consequently v. 10 is to be interpreted as follows: in Your house we attain life, in the light of Your countenance our life becomes a fount of bliss! These texts, therefore, describe the purity and magnificence of life in the cultic experience. However, they do not express the idea of unio mystica.14

Having discussed these matters, we can now ask whether the version מיכל פְּשַׁי יְהוָה רָד does indeed fit into the main text of Isa 53:11 in which the bliss of the Suffering Servant is described (for our purpose we need not go into the person and previous fate of the Servant). Attention should be paid to the fact that this bliss is manifest in a threesome of materialistic life ideals known from other biblical texts: longevity, numerous descendants, and riches.15 I wonder whether דְּרַעְתָה יְבֵרָה or יְרָחָא רָד have a function in the

14 G. von Rad’s comments on Ps 36:10, and similar instances, are instructive; see G. von Rad, “Gerechtigkeit und Leben in der Kultsprache der Psalmen,” in Festchrift A. Bertholet (Tübingen, 1950) 418-437, though his starting point differs from that of the present paper. Not much can be learned from H. J. Franken, The Mystical Communion with YHWH in the Book of Psalms (Leiden, 1954). Schleusner’s remarks regarding our psalm are fine and to the point: “Per gratiam tuam... ad veram beatitudinem perveniemus.” See J. F. Schleusner, Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquis interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veleris Testamenti (Leipzig, 1821) 5:492. It is interesting, though almost surprising that he continues to explain gratiam as verbo patefactam!

15 Riches, longevity and sons as a triplex of ideals appears also when the ideals are split up between two cases, as in Eccl 6:2-3 and elsewhere.
context of blessings of this kind. These doubts are of special importance seeing that the parallel וּרְאָה and דּוּהַת are unknown to biblical language. I believe that this constitutes a strong argument, possibly a decisive one, against the version and exegesis of אָרָה אָרָה בִּרְכָּה יִצְכָּרַנְהַן!

A more extensive and no less serious argument against the form of the LXX version lies, to my mind, in its actually being no more than a very free paraphrase based on a division (completely departing from MT) of the last sentences of our song, which is altogether foreign to the song's structure. We know that the core of the last section of the Suffering Servant chapters is a chorus put into the mouth of the nations or into the mouth of Israel (this important question will not be dealt with here). This chorus, according to the majority of commentators, comprises Isa 53:1-10. Kaufmann, very appropriately, designates vv. 1-6 as a chorus and vv. 7-10 as the words of the prophet. In any case, it is clear that the composition opens and closes with the word of the Lord. The concluding word of the Lord starts in v. 11. In v. 10 the Servant is blessed (and for our purpose it is not important whether this is a description, as Kaufmann maintains, or a prayer); then v. 11 once more describes the Servant's suffering, through which he renders the many righteous and bears their punishment; the word לֶמֶן at the opening of v. 12 leaves no doubt that the subject of v. 11 is suffering, as indeed one of the medieval commentators says: "and the word is future with the sense of past, as in כֹּה יֵעָשֶׂה אֱ Yugoslavia."

The LXX reflects an

16 See Y. Kaufmann,滩ר החכמה והשאלה (8 vols.; Jerusalem/Tel Aviv, 1959-60) 8:131 (Heb.). A certain affinity to his remarks is found in H. Cazelles, "Les poèmes du Serviteur: Leur place, leur structure, leur théologie," RSR 43 (1955) 5-55, at p. 39, though he places the caesura after v. 7: אָרָה אָרָה בִּרְכָּה יִצְכָּרַנְהַן. It is interesting to note that among the early commentators there are those who adhere to the accepted view—R. Isaac from Troki comments ad v. 11: “So far the nations spoke, from now on the Lord” (Neubauer, The Fifty Third Chapter, 227)—whereas others, so it seems, comment the way Kaufmann does. On the verse in question, R. Moshe Alsheich writes, “And the Lord adds to the words of the prophet” (Neubauer, The Fifty Third Chapter, 241).

17 The words of R. Yitshak Eliyahu haCohen, are quoted from Neubauer, The Fifty Third Chapter, 135.
altogether different notion, according to which the word of the Lord starts already in v. 9 in the form of a consolation prophecy: “I will give the wicked as a substitute for his burial,” whereas in v. 10 the Lord tells the wicked, “if you give (a ransom) for sin, your soul [we should read ה ים ה עון פגוע יד] will see a long-living seed.” This way of expounding the text grossly neglects the structure of the song as set forth above, consequently those who followed it failed to understand v. 11. (Commentators who on the basis of the Septuagint preferred the version ראה ראה are an instance of the unworthy tendency to single out an isolated reading from the translation without heeding the context in MT).

We must, therefore, assume that the words משמא נפשו ראה ראה ישבתי depict suffering and grief. In fact, several of the modern commentators—such as Budde and Ehrlich—emend these רואים into רואים. And indeed the words משמא נפשו רואים have their parallel in רואים איצומ מים (Isa 34:7, and see Jer 46:10). However, it should be stressed that side by side with the parallel רשע רואים (Jer 31:14; 46:10; Lam 3:15) we find רשע קלים ראה עני: ראה/שכינת (Job 10:15); רשע הגדול (Ps 91:16). This is a phonetic phenomenon, not a textual one: רשע is but a derivative form of רואים, see Eccl 2:24, and 2:1 והראת אתי נמשו תוב, and especially Ps 60:5: והראת ענמי.

18 On variant readings in the LXX of this verse and the difficulties in its interpretation see: K. F. Euler, Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes. 53 in der griechischen Bibel (Stuttgart, 1934) 76–77.

19 The French Catholic priest Houbigant, the first—about two hundred years ago—to compile an extensive list of suggested textual emendations covering all the books of the Bible, already considered the possibility of reading here הרוח, but decided in favour of the Septuagint version. His phraseology is quite interesting reflecting as it does its unconcealed tendentiousness: Forte olim scriptum fuerit ה רוח inebriabitur, quod verbum commode jungi potest cum רשע—saturabitur. Tamen, ex auctoritate graecorum interpretum, qui δεινοί δυσμοί φτυάται, ostendere ei lumen, legimus רואים ראה videbit lumen, ut resurrectio Christi post eum mortem praenuntietur. See C. F. Houbigant, Notae Criticae (2 vols.; Frankfurt a.M., 1777) 2:403.

20 The first to call attention to this phenomenon was, so it seems, E. Z. Zweifel in HaMagid 10, 25 (14 Tammuz 5626; 1866) 205–206. His words are quoted in A. Geiger, “Umschau: 9. ראה ראה והראת,” Jüdische Zeitschrift 4 (1866) 283.
כͅחְשֶׁה יִשְׁכַּרְנְגוּ לְיִתְרָעִלָּה (maybe this last example should be added to the examples of double entendre collected by the late David Yellin; והיה, used in its primary meaning calls to mind a parallel to_VALUE_16; cf. Isa 5:11 and others). 21 In light of the adduced material we may suggest the parallel רָאָה/ישׁבֵּע in our verse as well. One question remains: do we have to read רָאָה יִשְׁכַּרְנְגוּ (IQIṣaא has as concluding the first part of the verse, or break up these words over both stichs as suggested by Abarbanel: רָאָה יִשְׁכַּרְנְגוּ.htm and especially Ps 88:4: It seems to me that this last quote renders our reading meshes with יִשְׁכַּרְנְגוּ most plausible, and particularly so considering the distinct psalmodic character of the fourth of the Suffering Servant songs.

21 See D. Yellin, Selected Papers (2 vols.; Tel Aviv, 1938-9) 2:92-93 (Heb.).

22 By the generous oral communication of Dr. Jacob Licht, there is no doubt that the second scroll, in which the word is damaged, read יִשְׁכַּרְנְגוּ, though there is an unclear annotation over the beginning of the word.

23 A. B. Ehrlich, Randglossen (7 vols.; Leipzig, 1912) 4:192. In n. 2 supra I mentioned that Lindblom is among those who read here יִשְׁכַּרְנְגוּ. Yet he writes, “knowledge, in its strict sense is not really appropriate to the Suffering Servant as he is depicted in MT. Not by means of his knowledge but by his undeserved suffering will he bring about full righteousness!” See J. Lindblom, “Die Ebed,” 246, n. 4. I do not believe it is of great import that יִשְׁכַּרְנְגוּ is also the version appearing in one of the MSS in the Kennicott Collection (89, from the 13th century); I do not know of any variants appearing in this MS which are borne out by ancient versions, thus the diversion should be regarded as a scribal error.

24 In Ezek 32:4 we find “...Mesh שֶׁבַע מַן”.
The sum total of our exegetical reasoning does not seem to favour the version רָאוּ עִמָּה. Already at the outset of the present article I mentioned that several years ago I explained the Septuagint version as expressing a pre-gnostic tendency, and tried, at the time, to substantiate my opinion at the hand of pre-gnostic notions obtaining in other instances in the Septuagint translation. The most outstanding example is Hos 10:12: לֹּא צַלֶּמָּה קֵצַר לְפַל בֵּית יָרָא נָר נִיר נַעֲרָא לְדוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר חַד יְבֵא יְרוּדָה צַרְצָר לְכֹם, which is translated: σπειρατε ἐαυτοῖς εἰς δικαιοσύνην, τρυφάσατε εἰς καρποῦ ζωῆς, φωτίσατε ἐαυτοῖς φῶς γνώσεως ἐκζητήσατε τὸν κύριον ἐός τοῦ ἐλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῖν. When I started checking this out in modern exegetical literature I was astonished to find that the version רָאוּ עִמָּה had been accepted by not a few of the modern commentators.²⁵ One should note that when following this exegesis, the words לְדוֹרָה are of no consequence at all. Yet, on the other hand, it is obvious that our translator had a problem: part of the text he was working on he did not understand, and of the second part he made a mess; be that as it may, there is no doubt that the whole translation outright evinces a pre-gnostic, Hellenistic ambience. Reitzenstein and Wetter pointed out that the words φῶς (ἡς) γνώσεως are prevalent in Hellenistic mysteries and Gnostic literature.²⁶ The phrase καρπός τῆς ζωῆς and γενήματα δικαιοσύνης originate within the same sphere as φῶς. In this context the translation of Jer 10:13–14 should be mentioned; see also Jer 51(28):16–17: בְּרֵכִים לְמָשָׁה עֲשֵׂה יָדְוָא וְרֹתֶהוּ וַתִּמְצָא נְעַר, αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἐπ᾽ ὑπὸν ἐπιθύμησιν καὶ ἐξηγαγεν φῶς ἐν θησαυρῶν αὐτοῦ, ἐμφανικὴ πάς ἀνθρώπου ἀπὸ γνώσεως. Ps 135(134):7 has been

²⁵ Such as van Hoonacker, Sellin and Robinson in their commentaries; the last did away with the word לְדוֹרָה!

²⁶ G. P. Wetter, PHOS: Eine Untersuchung über hellenistischen Frömmigkeit (Uppsala, 1915) 46ff.; R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (3rd ed.; Leipzig, 1927) 284ff. However, most of the conclusions are reconstructed from late Gnostic sources.
translated ὁ ἐξάγων ἄνεμους ἐκ θησαυρῶν αὐτοῦ. The question must be asked: Could it be that closeness of ἀπὸ γνώσεως in the verse in question in Jeremiah, caused the word ἀπὸ (=ἀνεμος) to be replaced by φῶς, and the meaning of the LXX, as we read it should be something like: “Only the mighty Lord can grant the light of true knowledge to the insignificant and ignorant human being.” (However, I cannot corroborate this hypothesis of mine by quoting from the relevant literature in which θησαυρός is the treasure house of spiritual gifts which the Lord bestows on human beings. The LXX ad Isa 33:6—ἐν θησαυροῖς ἡ σωτηρία ἡμῶν, ἐκεῖ σοφία καὶ ἐπιστήμη καὶ ἐυσέβεια πρὸς τὸν κύριον, δυτοὶ εἰς τὸν θησαυροὶ δικαιοσύνης—is too feeble a basis to support the conjectured existence of this hypothesis, the more so since the translation is very literal.) Even though the LXX ad Isa 53:11 does not have φῶς γνώσεως, ἡ σωτηρία, the comparative material here collected should suffice to render it credible that the words πλάσαι τὴν συνέσει (as I, following Grabe, believe we should read instead of πλάσαι τὴν συνέσει) in the text under discussion, refer to the knowledge of the Lord’s schemes and His being which results from seeing the light.

It is not easy to decide whether the LXX texts dealt with above originate with the first translator—which I am inclined to believe—or with subsequent editors. The only thing we can say is that no traces of our subject can be gleaned from them. In the translation of Hosea we found expressions most typically pertaining to our subject in the above quoted text; however, these or similar expressions are lacking from other instances where we would expect them. Moreover, we are in the dark as to the origin and

---

27 In Jer 10:13 we find the translation ἄνεμος in late manuscripts and late Greek translations, whereas in Jer 51(28):16 it appears in the late translations only. This fact points to φῶς being an early translation in these instances.

28 The Septuagint to Hos 6:2-3 (ἡ θεότης ἐπάνω ἐν χελώναις) is no more than a verbatim translation, and so Hos 6:5: 4:5. There are two instances in the LXX which may serve as a basis for Gnostic speculations: Isa 11:2 πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, which is read, among others, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας; Mic 7:9: ἐξέχει με εἰς τὸ φῶς, ὄψαι τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ. However, these as well are nothing but verbatim translations, they do not evince any special Hellenistic religious tendency (the
background of these notions in the LXX. The conjunction of a vision of light and the attainment of sublime knowledge appears in Greek philosophy in the works of Plato and in the mysteries; it is, however, questionable whether the circle of translators working in Alexandria was familiar with or influenced by such ideas. In any case, the text under discussion evinces no hint of Platonian terminology. On the other hand, the particular reading רָאוּי found in two of the Dead Sea Scrolls, points in the direction that Palestinian influences from a specific, distinct milieu possibly found their way to Alexandria.

In determining the background of the version רָאוּי in the Qumran manuscripts, taking into account the spiritual setting from which they derive, we know for certain that the concept of light was of central importance in the dualistic Weltanschauung of the members of the sect who called themselves בִּנֵי רָאוּ (sons of light). A study of the sect's manuscripts, in as far as they are presently known to us, submits that their preoccupation with light was less widespread than perhaps would be expected. The Lord grants the author of the Thanksgiving Scroll light, or He appears to him as light. At times, this concept is but a special form of a prevalent general idea, or it is the extension of a biblical concept, in which light is conceived of as

variant in Mic 7:8 is φωτιέει μοι, whereas in Origen's recension: φῶς μοι – is no more than textual).

29 On the combination of these outlooks in Hellenistic thought see Bultmann, "Zur Geschichte." Bultmann gives a profound analysis of the well-known discussion in the sixth book of Plato's Politeia. It should be noted that the number of instances in the LXX in which direct Greek or Hellenistic influence is in evidence are, in my opinion, very few.

30 Since the first publications of the Dead Sea Scrolls, scholars have dwelt on the correlation between this appellation and names such as τίκνα φωτός and υἱοὶ φωτός much used by the early Christians; see I. L. Seeligman, "The Epoch-making Discovery," 4. Regarding the notions of the members of the sect under discussion in this and the next section, the most typical are: τοὺς ... φωτισθέντας, γενομένους τῷ τῆς δοξῆς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γεννήθηται πνεύματος ἁγίου (Heb 6:4; compare 10:32; this was pointed out to me by Mr. H. Kosmala).
redemption (1QH IX, 26–28; VII, 23–25), whereas in a hymn about the Community the eschatological future is described by means of three images. In one of them it is a burning fire, consuming the wicked; the source of this fire is called מיעץ אוֹר (1QH VI, 18). Could this be an appellation of the sect in its present state, expressing the fact that the pre-eschatological function of the sect is the imparting of the true knowledge of the Lord, which is solely in their hands? Here we touch upon a point of central significance regarding our problem: the correlation between light and knowledge in the writings of the sect. One of the essential principles in the sect’s philosophy (as conveyed in particular by the Hodayot) is the idea that when a man is born, the Lord appoints his lot with the righteous or with the wicked; man is frail and devoid of insight, but occasionally, in an act of kindness (חסד) the Lord grants His chosen insight into His mysteries, i.e., an understanding of His being and His ordinances. This insight into the Lord’s secrets, which lifts a man above his being is called “knowledge” (חכמה). Thus we find sayings such as: בורח קדישתה אנני עביד תמרות ברוח דעה (1QH XIV, 25); [פְּתַחְת]ה צדקה צדקה וצו אים (1QH XII, 13); [פְּתַחְת]ה צדקה צדקה וצו אים (1QH XI, 28). The Lord is thought of as the fount of knowledge, and His chosen may become a fount of knowledge for his pupils and followers; he is called מלך דעה ברויה מקוה (II, 13); he addresses the Lord with thanks for enabling him to disclose this knowledge to all who understand: שומתה למחנה לדשא מקוה דעה ברויה מקוה (II, 18). In a number of passages in the sect’s writings the clear correlation between this knowledge and the sublime light is mentioned: man attains knowledge through his seeing the Lord’s wonders. In the closing hymn of the Community Rule we read: כי אני אחר אלConfigurationExceptionו וידיוה גה דורי יibir מידע אלי.

31 In 1QH VI, 17–18 we read: הרה מעין אור מקוה עדמה אנן מושך, בושיבי עונגה יערהוא כל. Licht in his commentary draws attention to the fact that the phrase מקוה עדמה obtains in several other instances in the Hodayot. Could it be that the very frequency of the phrase caused the copyist to err, and the original wording had been למקוה עדמה?

32 On the philosophy of the members of the sect, see for the time being J. Licht’s preface to his edition of the Hodayot (Jerusalem, 1957) 27–52.
We see that the author of the hymn is granted a vision of the godly light, and from this sublime fount he is inspired with knowledge of all the secrets of the world. Of even greater importance, and especially instructive for our discussion I find the blessing, which was apparently meant to be recited at the ordination rites of priests: וְאַחֲרַהּ כְּמָלָאָךְ וְגֶפֶן בָּעוֹשׁ קְדוֹשׁ לְכָּבוֹד אֲלוֹהִים צְבָאָוֹת שבִּירֵךְ עֵדֶת הַקְּדָשָׁתָהּ לְפֶּרֶס מְשֹׁרַת בְּחִדְלָהוּ וַיִּשְׁמָכֶה קְדוֹשׁ בֵּית לָנוּ בֵּית לָאָוְרָאָו יִלְּבָשׁ לַחַזֵּרָא וַיַּשְׁמֵר הַמֵּרִים. (May you be as an Angel of the Presence in the Abode of Holiness to the glory of the God of [hosts]. May you attend upon the service in the Temple of the Kingdom ... may He make you holy among His people, and an [eternal] light to illuminate the world with knowledge and to enlighten the face of the Congregation; IQSb IV, 25–27; and see 1QH IV, 27–28: יבים וְאֵין תָּאֵרוֹתָהּ פֶּרֶס ... כְּחֹדֶשֶׁה הֲוָאָוָא וַיִּשְׁמַךְ הַמְּרִים חַזֵּרָא וַיָּשָּׁמְרוּ הֶסֶתָּם ... בֵּית לָאוָאָו יִלָּבֵשׁ לַחַזֵּרָא וַיִּשָּׁמֶר הֶסֶתָּם. It may well be that the phrase המלך also manifest in the calendar of the sect, is characteristic of the Essenes as well. See Josephus, J.W. 2:8:5, (12); H. Mosbech, Essaerismen (København, 1916) 146ff.

33 However, the importance for our purpose is in the fact that we have here several of the terms essential to the sect’s teaching all in one sentence: רבי, ...) יריע, ...) אָוָר ... (כְּחֹדֶשֶׁה הֲוָאָוָא וַיִּשְׁמַךְ הַמְּרִים חַזֵּרָא וַיָּשָּׁמְרוּ הֶסֶתָּם ... בֵּית לָאוָאָו יִלָּבֵשׁ לַחַזֵּרָא וַיִּשָּׁמֶר הֶסֶתָּם. I cannot here go into the question of the extent of the רבי in the organization of the sect. However, no doubt the word is “a sort of technical term in the sect’s writings”; quoted from: A. Dupont-Sommer, “On a Passage from Josephus relating to the Essenes,” JS 1 (1956) 156. Dupont-Sommer counts thirty-six uses of the term in the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document. Interesting is his postulate that there is an echo of this term in Josephus, again, pertaining to the Essenes: τοὺς πλείστοις λεγόμενοις (Ant. 18:1:5 [22]; however, the version of the verse in question remains unclear). Milik suggests the same explanation for Josephus’ words: J. T. Milik, Dix ans de découvertes dans le désert de Juda (Paris, 1957) 65. In a similar way he interprets πλείστοις in Josephus’ writings (J.W. 2:8:9, [146]) comparing the text with the 2 Cor 2:6. It should be specified here, that this and the previous footnote reflect the idea—which is at the root of the present paper—of the correlation between the Essenes and the members of the sect, an idea systematically worked out by Milik. It seems to me that the concurrence of the topographical and
The same three terms appeared in the prophecy we are dealing with (according to the version which was already in front of the members of the sect). And here we should try to understand the verse as it was understood—in the light of the material at our disposal—by the members of the sect. It is possible that they associated one of their central leaders, such as the Teacher of Righteousness, the author of the Hymns of Thanksgiving or some other personage with the figure of the Suffering Servant. But even if this were not so, on reading in one verse from the Scriptures about the Lord’s chosen, who on the merit of his insight and knowledge (and there can be no doubt that they understood to mean the instruction of the many in the secrets of the Lord)—this was the only way they could construe these words since the sight (רואה) could be nothing else but seeing the light. I believe there is no choice but to accept the assumption that the reading issued almost naturally from the beliefs of the sect, and is indeed a tendentious lection.

archaeological data with a significant number of the sect’s habits and philosophies sustains this idea to a degree of certainty. For our discussion the words concluding W. Bauer’s paper about the Essenes over thirty years ago are significant: “If we want an expression of a complex phenomenon, the Essenes could be designated an earlier form of the Gnosis”; see A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (49 vols.; Stuttgart, 1924) Suppl. vol. IV, col. 429.

35 Lindblom, part of whose words were quoted in n. 23 supra, says: “‘knowledge’ in its strict sense is not really appropriate to the Suffering Servant as he is depicted in MT... the case is different with the author of the First Isaiah Scroll. For him, as a member of the proto-Damascus Covenant, knowledge of the Lord, in its fullest sense, was of central importance.”

36 Ginsberg keenly observed that at the base of Dan 12:3: is a collective illustration of the person of the Servant in Isa 53:1; see H. L. Ginsberg, “The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant,” VT 3 (1953) 400-404. However, Brownlee’s comment that according to the sect’s notion the person of the Servant was collective, did not convince me; see W. H. Brownlee, “The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls,” BASOR 132 (Dec. 1953) 8-15; 135 (Oct. 1954) 33-38. 1QS VIII, 1-3 describes the future sect along the lines of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.
This being so, the question rises whether aside from the pesharim, in
which the members of the sect expressed their viewpoints concerning the
Scriptures, they also inserted these ideas into the biblical text itself by means
of tendentious readings.\textsuperscript{37} The very fact that the reading we are looking into,
appears in both Isaiah manuscripts containing chapter 53 which have so far
come to light, strengthens, so I believe, our hypothesis that we are not
dealing with a mere variant—since $1QIsa^b$ evinces no variants at all!—but
with an expression of the sect’s teaching and ideas. Here we should produce
some parallel examples. Brownlee is of the opinion that this very chapter of
the Suffering Servant $1QIsa^a$ holds an instance of this phenomenon when
reading: נָכָ֣ן מִשָּׁמְשָׁתֵי֙ מַעְשֵׂהֽוֹ מַרְאֵ֣הוֹ הַמַּחֲרוּתָּ֔יָּו מַהְיָּ֖וֹב אֵֽרֶם (52:14).\textsuperscript{38} However, Brownlee
himself conjectures that מַשָּׁמְשָׁתֵי is no more than a reading composed of מַשָּׁמְשָׁת יֵ֖שׁ וַחֲרָֽו and מַשָּׁמְשָׁת.
Lessons of such composed type, which are not foreign to the
biblical text appear in $1QIsa^a$;\textsuperscript{39} this fact supports the mentioned
assumption, and besides it also explains the masoretic vocalization
טָשַׂ֖מָּה, which needs clarification. Therefore I doubt whether מַשָּׁמְשָׁת can be regarded
as a tendentious reading. Yet, such a lection may exist in another instance:
(1QpHab VIII, 3 to Hab 2:5; MT has וַחֲרָֽו. Indeed, Rabin’s
observation is acceptable: neither of the MT, nor of Pesher
Habakkuk, is correct, but we can reconstruct an original
וַחֲרָֽו בּוֹרֵ֖ד (meaning ‘dared’, see Deut 1:41), out of the witnesses of MT and the pesher, and thus
we have a basis for textual emendation.\textsuperscript{40} Nonetheless, it seems that the

\textsuperscript{37} Actually, in order to reach a conclusive answer to this question, we would need
the sect’s pesher to our verse, and additional pesharim, as well as an analysis of the
sect’s way of understanding the Bible; for the time being see what I have written in
n. 41 below.

\textsuperscript{38} Brownlee, “The Servant,” 10-11.

\textsuperscript{39} See I. L. Seeligmann, review of Elliger, 39-40.

\textsuperscript{40} C. Rabin, “Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll,” VT 5 (1955) 148-162, at pp. 152-153,
and even if the members of the sect did have private property, according to Rabin, it
seems permissible to argue that the “amassing of property” was negatively
sect's way of thinking influenced the emergence of the lection וּזְרוּ. The sect's disapproval of וּזְרוּ shows clearly at the end of the Community Rule: its members fight the גָּנֵס מֹשֶה שׁוֹרָהִי עֲבָדֵי מְדֻבָּרָי אִזְנֵי מְכֹעֵס מִהְוָה (IQS XI, 1–2). All three expressions רֵבֶר אָזַּר, שלָה עָבַר, and מַרְשָׁה (yoke), שִׁלְחֲא אֲדֻבָּה, and מַרְשָׁה (evil speech) are verbatim quotes from Isa 58:9; to these the author freely adds מְכֹעֵס מִהְוָה, as if he appends his own midrash to the verse saying: all the negative characteristics mentioned here mean acquisition of capital, קַנְיֵי הַזְּרוּ, which is as bad as all of them put together!

III

The suggestion to see some of the textual deviations found in the Qumran manuscripts as tendentious changes, and not as mere textual variants, forces us to ask: how do we explain the fact that these changes, or part of them, appear in the LXX? This section—which in a way is an appendix to the present article—will be devoted to this question.

Even though at times the same readings—diverging from MT—appear in both the Qumran mss and the LXX, I do not believe that we are entitled to assume any textual correlation between the scrolls and the Septuagint. On the other hand it should be investigated in how far some of the sect’s doctrines influenced Alexandrian Jewry and the Bible translators there. These are queries to which no definite answer can be given: we do not know enough regarding the background of Jewish-Hellenistic thought in Alexandria, and whether it underwent Palestinian influences. This problem cannot satisfactorily be dealt with within the framework of this appendix.

In any case, the LXX does not offer us a suitable starting point for such a discussion: the close-knit connection between translation and original does

41 This example is similar as to the way the biblical text is quoted: ולשׁות אַמָּה..." (IQS VIII, 2) the addition of זְרוּךְ מְשָׁפִּים אֶחְבָּא הָרֶשֶׁר הַצָּעְנוּג לְךָ אַשָּׁא תַּעַרְוָה... (IQS VII, 2) was interpolated (for tendentious reasons; see n. 51) into the very text of Mic 6:8. It is obvious that a quote of this type, expanding the text in order to append a midrash to it is very close to the assumed phenomenon of tendentious versions; see a comparison between Jub. 2:9 and Gen 1:14 in Seeligmann, review of Elliger, 45.
not allow for conceptual influences to be sufficiently expressed in any
translation. The correlation between Greek and Palestinian influences on
Philo of Alexandria is beyond the scope of this study,\textsuperscript{42} whereas concerning
the matter of our discussion the Alexandrian Wisdom of Solomon is of
special significance, and should be investigated. This book was influenced
by distinct Greek and Hellenistic concepts—apparently through the
Protrepticus of Poseidonius—the importance of which should not be
overrated.\textsuperscript{43} The biblical component in the book is stronger, however, it
seems that so far scholars have not yet fully uncovered it. In addition the
book evinces Palestinian elements from the postbiblical period. A number
of scholars believed certain parts (though opinions are divided as to which
parts exactly) to have been translated from Hebrew.\textsuperscript{44} These studies of the
Wisdom of Solomon based themselves on a distinction of documents,
though it seems more plausible to trace the contradictions in its content and

\textsuperscript{42} In regards to Philo we will make one remark only. If indeed the members of the
sect were Essenes, or close to them (\textit{supra} n. 34), we should not forget that according
to the witness of Philo there existed in the vicinity of Alexandria a sect allegedly
similar to the Essenes, the Therapeutae. See Philo, \textit{Contempl.} 22ff.; and see Milik, \textit{Dix}
\textit{ans découverts}, 61. However, the origin of the Therapeutae is unclear and no doubt
Philo attributes to them ideas and philosophies which in reality are... Philonian. On
the multitude of problems see P. Wendland, "Die Therapeutae und die philonische
Schrift von beschaulichen Leben," \textit{Jahrbuch der classischen Philologie} (Suppl. Bd. 22;
1896) 732ff.; 743ff.

\textsuperscript{43} On the Wisdom of Solomon see especially I. Heinemann, \textit{Poseidonios'}
\textit{metaphysische Schriften} (2 vols.; Breslau, 1921-1928) 1:136-153 (="Die griechische
Quelle der 'Weisheit Salomos,'" \textit{Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminar 1920}
[Breslau, 1921] viii–xxv). Heinemann warns against overestimating the existence of
Greek influences on the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon (p. 137); he tends to see the
book as uniform (p. 151), and above all he tries to establish the origin of the Greek
influence.

\textsuperscript{44} On chapters 1–5 see F. Focke, \textit{Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos} (Göttingen,
1913). Regarding 1:1–6:22; 8:1–9:18, see E. A. Speiser, "The Hebrew Origin of the
First Part of the Book of Wisdom," \textit{JQR} n.s. 14 (1923–1924) 455ff. Regarding 1:1–11:1
see C. E. Purinton, "Translation Greek in the Wisdom of Solomon," \textit{JBL} 47 (1928)
276ff.
style to the great number of influences on the book’s author. At some point the entire book was even conceived of as written by a Jew who escaped from Palestine to Alexandria in the days of Alexander Janaeus.\(^{45}\) Lately, it has been attempted to find the teaching of the Qumran Community in it. One scholar went as far as regarding parts of the Dead Sea Scrolls as the source of the Wisdom of Solomon.\(^{46}\) He based his theory (to which reactions were diverse)\(^ {47}\) exclusively on the analysis of the well-known theological tractate in the Manual of Discipline. In the meantime, additional texts are at our disposal, among which the Thanksgiving Hymns take pride of place. Though hazards lie in wait for every ideational comparison of two texts, and are particularly great in this case, since the general tendency exists, understandable but not always sound, to uncover influences of the Dead Sea Scrolls in every nook and cranny. Yet, it seems to me that an affinity exists between the Wisdom of Solomon and the philosophy of the sect. The phrase καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν μυστήρια θεοῦ (2:22; and see 6:22) calls to mind the Lord’s secrets and man’s knowledge of them which can admissibly be designated a distinctive feature of the sect’s writings; see especially: נמא אל לא ידע (IQM XVI, 14), (IQH IV, 27–28), (IQMyst [1Q27] 1 I, 3).\(^{48}\) The counterposing of the wicked and

\(^{45}\) Y. Klausner, *History of the Second Temple* (5 vols.; Jerusalem, 1951) 5:60 (Heb.).


\(^{47}\) For a positive though quite reserved reaction, see J. van der Ploeg, “Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda: Études et découvertes récentes,” *BO* 11 (1954) 145–160, at p. 157. For a negative reaction see G. Zienler, *Die theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit* (Bonn, 1956) 17–18, 140. H. Kosmala conveyed to me orally that in his opinion the ideas and terminology of the Wisdom of Solomon (especially chs. 2–5) were greatly and deeply influenced by the sect’s writings.

\(^{48}\) For a concise meaning to רד נביה which occurs more frequently. The first to expound רד נביה as the secrets of the future was Rabinowitz; see I. Rabinowitz, “The Authorship, Audience and Date of the de Vaux Fragment of an Unknown Work,” *JBL* 71 (1952) 19–32, at pp. 22–23.
righteous in itself does not prove much, even the more so since the very nature and background of this contrast in the Wisdom of Solomon is a matter of dispute. However, when we read that Satan—or Belial—is supposedly the one to have introduced death to the world and ever since the wicked are οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες (2:24; and see 1:16), we cannot but be reminded of the dualism of the members of the sect, which envisions the entire universe as two lots, and every man in the world belongs to one of them.⁴⁹ The wicked in the Wisdom of Solomon, who on the day of final judgment are compelled to concede to the superiority of the righteous answer in chorus: τῶν κατελογισθή ἐν υἱῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις ὁ κλήρος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν (5:5)—as if they know the words of the Hymn: ῥωμαίους λαλεῖ βασιλεὺς (1QH XI, 11); and again in 1QS XI, 7–8: βοὴν καὶ ὀνείδα ὑστερήσαντας βοὴν καὶ κρίνοντας ὑπὲρ τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῆς ἀνθρώπους (1QH VI, 3). It may well be that the most detailed and explicit statement of this idea appears in 1QH III, 21–23: οἱ λαλητέροι βοήθεοι υἱῶν τῶν ἄνθρωπων καὶ τῶν έν οἴκοις ἁγίοις καὶ σεπάσματι τῶν ἁγίων ἐπὶ γῆς (9:17–18). Three ideas are expressed here: man has no wisdom unless it is conferred upon him by the Lord; wisdom comes to man by the Holy Spirit; only by virtue of that kindness (εὐτυχία) which the Lord grants to him, will man be able to live a flawless life. These ideas are expressed in almost the same way in the 1QH XII, 32–34: ὡμοίως ἀναφέρεται καὶ ημᾶς τοὺς ἔνδοξας ἐν τῇ ψευτήρᾳ, καὶ πᾶσι πᾶσιν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἁγίων (1QH XII, 32–34): and also: γλυκῶς ὀνείδα ἐν οἴκοις ἁγίων καὶ διαρροή καὶ νεκρός καὶ ψυχή τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπων τῶν ἁγίων (1QH XII, 33–34).

⁴⁹ On the concept of the sect’s writings see J. Licht, “The Concept Goral in the Writings of the Judean Desert Sect,” Beit-Miṣra 2 (1956–7) 90–95 (Heb.).
In the Hodayot we also find the Holy Spirit as the force conveying godly wisdom to man: בורא קדושה [פ[חוה]ה לוחמי דעת ית ה中心城区 (IQH XII, 13; and see VII, 6-7).

Indeed, there is no explicit mention of ἀρ δόν την ἔργη, the light of knowledge, in the Wisdom of Solomon. Still, following the confession of the wicked out of which the above has been quoted we read: ἀρα ἐπλανήθημεν ἀπὸ οἴδοι ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης φῶς οὐκ ἐπέλαμψεν ἡμῖν καὶ ο ἡλιος οὐκ ἀνέτειλεν ἡμῖν (5:6). The sun parallels the sublime light, and it could be that the words proclaim the special place the sun held for the members of the sect, as mentioned in the previous section. Concerning the sublime light itself, taking into account the diversity and emphasis given to the notions ομο拟 (truth) and ζευγο (righteousness) in the sect’s philosophy, these may be likened to the ideal of true knowledge, and τὸ φῶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης, to the light of knowledge. If this assumption is correct, the Wisdom of Solomon echoes the very postulate to which we devoted our discussions in the present study. But even if not, the examples I have adduced—and no doubt more could be added—render it likely that the teaching of the


51 There is no stronger evidence regarding the underlying and central importance of the concepts έπαυει μαι and ζευγο in the teachings of the sect than the interpolation of the words λεπτον ομοιο ξερικα ανεμμεσται καθαραθει αὕτη λήμβαντων etc. (IQS VIII, 2).

52 In Wis 7:26 true wisdom is called ἀπανάγαμα φωτος αἰδίου and in 18:4 we read that through Israel το δθάριων νομιου φως will be given for all eternity. On the face of it, these texts are close to the matters we are dealing with. However, I believe they express a notion of a different origin and purport.
Qumran sect influenced the views of the Alexandrian Jewry giving it a very distinct stamp. At the end of his article “Une source,” Dubarle supplies references to Alexandrian Jewish literature as influenced by the sect’s writings and concludes: “Alexandria’s Jewry knew the writings of the sect.”