

⁵) *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran* (Rome, 1977).

⁶) Further support for the view that the history of dualism in 1QM is more complicated than either von der Osten-Sacken or Collins allows is afforded by the detailed study of 1QM XIII by J.-L. Duhaime, "La rédaction de 1QM XIII et l'évolution du dualisme à Qumran", *RB* 84 (1977), pp. 210-38. On p. 238 he draws the conclusion that "des courants différents ont coexisté dans la communauté et ont trouvé leur expression dans ses documents à des époques diverses, avec plus ou moins de fortune et plus ou moins de continuité". Cf. also A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* (Würzburg, 1971), who concludes: "... die Gemeinde von Qumran bei aller Wertschätzung des Daniel-Buches genügend frei war, um *theologisch eigene Wege* zu gehen; in ihren eschatologischen Vorstellungen folgt sie nicht jene Überlieferung, die sich im Buch Daniel niedergeschlagen hat, sondern anderen Strängen der alttestamentlichen Endzeiterwartung" (p. 164).

DA'AT "HUMILIATION" IN ISAIAH LIII 11 IN THE LIGHT OF ISAIAH LIII 3 AND DANIEL XII 4, AND THE OLDEST KNOWN INTERPRETATION OF THE SUFFERING SERVANT

In his article "Da'at in Isaiah liii 11", *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 118-22, H. G. M. Williamson has proposed that Isa. liii 11 should be rendered as follows: "After his deep suffering, he will see light, he will be satisfied with his rest; my servant will justify many, and he will bear their iniquities". In this translation Williamson agrees with D. Winton Thomas ¹) in rejecting the older view that *da'at* here has its common meaning "knowledge" and associating it rather with a second root *yāda'*, cognate with Arabic *wadu'a* "to be, to become still, quiet, submissive", but whereas the latter gave it the meaning "humiliation", Williamson renders it "rest", following a suggestion of P. A. H. de Boer ²). Williamson is surely right in rejecting the view that *da'at* here means "knowledge", since the introduction of a reference to the knowledge of the Servant in the present context seems abrupt, and it is not immediately obvious what knowledge is intended ³). However, Williamson's rejection of the translation "humiliation" in favour of "rest" must in all likelihood be rejected, since there are two passages evidently closely related to Isa. liii 11, namely Isa. liii 3 and Dan. xii 4, in which the presence of the related participial form *yēdūa'* "humble(d)" and the noun *da'at* "humiliation" respectively both tend to support the meaning "humiliation" for *da'at* in Isa. liii 11.

In Isa. liii 3 we read that the Servant was *yēdūa*‘ *hōli*. This has traditionally been rendered “acquainted with grief”. Such a translation, however, would rather require the active participle *yōdēa*‘⁴) and not the passive participle if the verb “to know” were really present here, and as G. R. Driver, *JTS* 38 (1937), p. 49, pointed out, a comparison with the use of the same form in Deut. i 13, 15, suggests that it would have to be translated “known, famous for sickness”, which obviously cannot be right here. Driver therefore suggested that we have here an example of the second root *yāda*‘, cognate with Arabic *wadu*‘a, and that *yēdūa*‘ *hōli* should be rendered “humbled by sickness”. This view removes the grammatical problem, makes excellent sense in the context and has been followed by many scholars, including D. Winton Thomas, *JTS* 38 (1937), p. 404, whilst J. A. Emerton has made a slight modification by suggesting the possibility that *yēdūa*‘ is pa‘ūl and that the phrase should be more precisely rendered “humble because of sickness” (p. 176). The presence of this second root *yāda*‘ in Isa. liii 3 makes it very natural to suppose that the allusion to the Servant’s *da*‘aṭ in v. 11 takes up the language of v. 3 and that it refers to his “humiliation”. That v. 11 does in fact take up v. 3 is strongly supported by the fact that there are several other examples of such repetition in the description of the Servant’s fate in Isa. liii: *nāgūa*‘ “stricken” in v. 4 is picked up by *nugga*‘ (so *nega*‘ should probably be revocalized) “stricken” in v. 8, *mē*‘*umneh* “afflicted” in v. 4 is repeated in *na*‘*aneh* “he was afflicted” in v. 7, and *mē*‘*dukka*’ “bruised” in v. 5 is taken up by *dakke*‘ō “to bruise him” in v. 10. However, unlike the view that *da*‘aṭ in v. 11 means “humiliation”, Williamson’s translation “rest” cannot be held to pick up the reference in v. 3, since it is clear that *yēdūa*‘ *hōli* alludes to the Servant’s affliction and not to his subsequent deliverance.

A further objection to Williamson’s translation of *da*‘aṭ by “rest” may now be noted. Williamson maintains that “since (so far as I am aware) the meaning ‘humiliation’ has not been proposed for *da*‘aṭ in any other passage, our understanding of it here as ‘rest’ does not run into the difficulty of identical nouns with different meanings being derived from the same root” (p. 120). However, Williamson has apparently overlooked the fact that the meaning “humiliation” has actually been proposed for *da*‘aṭ elsewhere in the Old Testament, namely by D. Winton Thomas in Dan. xii 4⁵), an oversight all the more surprising in that this view is alluded to and accepted by Emerton in an article (pp. 150, 177) to which Williamson himself

refers (p. 122, n. 13). In Dan. xii 4 we read *yēšōtēṭū rabbīm wēṭirbeb haddā'aṭ*, which is often rendered by some such translation as "many will search (the book) and knowledge will increase" ⁶), "many will be perplexed but knowledge will increase" ⁷), "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall increase" ⁸) or "many shall run to and fro that knowledge may increase" ⁹), the knowledge being knowledge of the eschatological events of which the vision in Daniel informs us. However, so far as the former two renderings of *yēšōtēṭū* are concerned, they are nowhere else attested for this verb and the other instances of its usage support the translation "many shall run to and fro" ¹⁰). Furthermore, it is difficult to see how one could search through a sealed up book (cf. Dan. xii 4a)! So far as the kind of translation presupposed by the latter two renderings is concerned it may be noted that even its proponents find it "etwas rätselhaft" (Plöger, p. 172). However, D. Winton Thomas's proposal that *da'aṭ* comes from the second root *yāda'* and means "humiliation" enables us to translate this passage as "many shall run to and fro and *humiliation* will increase", which makes excellent sense in the context as a reference to the persecution and tribulations of the last times (cf. Dan. xi 31-5, xii 1) and renders unnecessary the emendation of *haddā'aṭ* to *hārā'ōṭ* or *hārā'āb*, which some scholars had suggested on the basis of LXX καὶ πλησθήσῃ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας ¹¹). Furthermore, it may be noted that Thomas's translation of *haddā'aṭ* as "humiliation" enables us to make excellent sense of the preceding words *yēšōtēṭū rabbīm* "many shall run to and fro", which would very naturally refer to the panic and fleeing in the face of the persecution, but were never quite satisfactorily resolved by commentators who understood *haddā'aṭ* here to mean "knowledge".

Williamson's rendering of *da'aṭ* in Isa. liii 11 as "rest" is therefore open to objection precisely on the grounds that it *does* "run into the difficulty of identical nouns with different meanings being derived from the same root" (*contra* Williamson, p. 120). In fact, one can go further and argue that the reference to *haddā'aṭ* "humiliation" in Dan. xii 4 not merely parallels Isa. liii 11 in meaning but is very likely dependent on it, a point independently noted by the present writer, only subsequently to discover that he had been anticipated a number of years earlier in a little known article by L. C. Allen ¹²). The grounds for this are that there are other parallels between the description of the Suffering Servant in Isa. lii 13-liii 12 and that of the hasidim in Dan. xii which had already been noted by earlier scholars, such that

H. L. Ginsberg could refer to the latter as “the oldest interpretation of the Suffering Servant”¹³). The first example of the dependence of Dan. xii on Isa. lii 13-liii 12 to which attention has been drawn is Dan. xii 3, where the hasidim are referred to as *mašdiqē hārabīm* “those who make many righteous”, which may be compared with Isa. liii 11, where it is said of the Servant that “he will make many righteous” (*yašdiq lārabīm*). These are the only two occasions in the Old Testament where this expression occurs, and in both cases the context is that of the death and resurrection or vindication of the righteous, so that a very strong case can be made for the dependence of Daniel on Deutero-Isaiah here. A second parallel that has been noted also occurs in Dan. xii 3, where the hasidim are described as *hammaškilīm* “the wise ones”, which has been compared with Isa. lii 13, where we read that the Servant *yaškēl* “will be prosperous”. Ginsberg notes that since even a scholar of the stature of C. C. Torrey was of the opinion that *yaškēl* here means “will be wise”, “it is no cause for blame or wonder if the apocalyptist of Dan. xi-xii understood it in very much the same way” (p. 403)¹⁴) and points out that the fact that this description occurs in the very first verse of the Suffering Servant pericope would explain why Dan. xii does not speak of the hasidim as “Servants” or “Servants of God” but rather as “the wise ones”.

In view of these parallels, it is clear that Dan. xii has taken up language from Isa. lii 13-liii 12, and it is consequently highly plausible to suppose that the use of the word *haddā‘aṭ* “humiliation” in Dan. xii 4 is likewise derived from Isa. liii 11. This probability is further strengthened when we recall that the context in both passages is that of the suffering and resurrection or vindication of the righteous and that this noun is attested nowhere else in the whole of the Old Testament¹⁵). H. L. Ginsberg’s thesis that Dan. xii provides us with the earliest known interpretation of the Suffering Servant therefore receives further corroboration¹⁶).

In view of the fact that *da‘aṭ* means “humiliation”, it is clear that in Isa. liii 11 it cannot be taken with the preceding word *yīšbā‘* (which would have to be repointed as *yīšba‘*) so as to produce the translation “He shall be sated with his humiliation”¹⁷), since, as Allen and Gelston have pointed out¹⁸) it is inappropriate at this stage in the description of the Servant’s triumph to be plunged back into the Servant’s deep anguish and suffering. We must therefore read *bēda‘tō* with the following words *yašdiq ‘abdī lārabīm* “by his humiliation my Servant

will make many righteous" ¹⁹). This is thoroughly in keeping with the other references in this chapter to the vicarious effect of the Servant's suffering ²⁰). Similarly, the suffering of the *maskilim*, who fulfil the role of the Servant of Isa. liii, is to be understood as redemptive—this is the most probable meaning of Dan. xi 35, where we read that "some of those who are wise shall fall, to refine and to cleanse amongst them (*bābem*—i.e. amongst "the many") and to make them white, until the time of the end". That their suffering really is redemptive, which has been doubted ²¹), is made certain by the fact that the reference to "those who turn many to righteousness" (Dan. xii 3), is mentioned in close connection with "humiliation" (Dan. xii 4), both expressions taken over from Isa. liii 11, indicating that the making of many righteous is more than simply a result of ethical instruction.

Finally, although this is no place to discuss in detail the vexed question of the identity of the Servant in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah, it is interesting to note that Dan. xii interprets the Suffering Servant in terms of the righteous remnant within Israel. This may well be the original meaning—cf. Isa. xlix 3, 5, where the Servant is called Israel, yet has a mission to Israel, i.e. it is an Israel within Israel, the righteous remnant.

In conclusion, therefore, it may be argued that the presence of *yēdūa'* "humble(d)" in Isa. liii 3 and *haddā'aṭ* "humiliation" in Dan. xii 4, two passages closely related to Isa. liii 11, suggests that *da'aṭ* in the latter passage means "humiliation" and not "rest" as proposed by Williamson. The reference to *haddā'aṭ* in Dan. xii 4 not merely parallels Isa. liii 11 in meaning but is dependent on it, serving to support H. L. Ginsberg's thesis that the description of the suffering and resurrection of the hasidim in Dan. xii is the earliest known interpretation of the Suffering Servant ²²).

Durham

John Day

¹) "More notes on the root *yd'* in Hebrew", *JTS* 38 (1937), pp. 404-5, and "A consideration of Isaiah LIII in the light of recent textual and philological study", *Eph. Theol. Lovan.* 44 (1968), pp. 79-86 (see p. 86), reprinted in H. Cazelles (ed.), *De Mari à Qumran. Hommage à Mgr. J. Coppens* (Gembloux and Paris, 1969), pp. 119-26 (see p. 126). The many articles in which Thomas argued for the existence of a second root *yāda'* "to be still, humiliated" in the Old Testament are listed on pp. 148-50 of J. A. Emerton's article, "A consideration of some alleged meanings of *yd'* in Hebrew", *JSS* 15 (1970), pp. 145-80. Emerton's thorough study is generally favourable to Thomas's views on the existence of this root in Hebrew, which, it should be noted, can claim considerable versional,

rabbinic and contextual support, and he expresses cautious acceptance of Thomas's understanding of *da'at* in Isa. liii 11 on pp. 174-5 and 177.

²) *Second Isaiah's Message*, OTS 11 (1956), pp. 35, 55.

³) For example, would it mean "by his (the Servant's) knowledge" or "by (their) knowledge of him"? B. Reicke, "The knowledge of the Suffering Servant" in F. Maass (ed.), *Das ferne und nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonhard Rost, BZAW 105* (1967), pp. 186-92, suggests the translation "through his *obedience*". However, although "obedience" is part of what the "knowledge of God" involves, there is no evidence that the former term can simply be substituted for the latter.

⁴) 1QIs^a, LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate in fact all read or presuppose *yōdēa'*, whilst 1QIs^b is ambiguous, reading without the *mater lectionis*. However, the significant point is that the MT's *yēdūa'* still has to be explained, and it is more reasonable to suppose that *yēdūa'* is the original reading and that because of its rare form it was misunderstood and repointed as *yōdēa'* as if from *yādā'* "to know", rather than to suppose that the common form *yōdēa'* became corrupted to the unusual *yēdūa'*.

⁵) "Note on *baddā'at* in Daniel XII. 4", *JTS*, N.S. 6 (1955), p. 226.

⁶) Cf. M. Delcor, *Le livre de Daniel* (Paris, 1971), p. 254, "Beaucoup le scrutèrent et la connaissance s'accroîtra".

⁷) Cf. A. Lacocque, *Le livre de Daniel* (Neuchâtel-Paris, 1976), p. 177, "La multitude sera perplexe mais la connaissance augmentera".

⁸) Cf. R.S.V., which reads thus. Similarly, O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel* (Gütersloh, 1965), p. 169, "Viele werden umherirren, es möge aber die Erkenntnis zunehmen!"

⁹) Cf. J. A. Montgomery, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the book of Daniel* (Edinburgh, 1927), p. 473.

¹⁰) Cf. Jer. v 1; Amos viii 12; Zech. iv 10; 2 Chron. xvi 9. So correctly, A. A. Bevan, *A short commentary on the book of Daniel* (Cambridge, 1892), pp. 202-3, and R. H. Charles, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the book of Daniel* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 331-2.

¹¹) First proposed by A. A. Bevan, pp. 203-4. The more literal Theodotonic version, however, clearly read *baddā'at* "knowledge"—καὶ πλεθυνθήν ἡ γνῶσις. F. F. Bruce, "The oldest Greek version of Daniel", *OTS* 20 (1977), pp. 22-40 (see p. 26), is mistaken in thinking it possible that the N.E.B.'s translation "punishment" in Dan. xii 4 may depend on the emendation of *baddā'at* to *hārā'āb*, as a glance at L. H. Brockington, *The Hebrew text of the Old Testament* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1973), p. 245, would have shown, since no emendation in Dan. xii 4 is there proposed. Clearly the N.E.B.'s rendering "punishment" is dependent on Thomas's philological proposal that *baddā'at* here be connected with Arabic *wadu'a*.

¹²) "Isaiah LIII. 11 and its echoes", *Vox Evangelica* 1 (1962), pp. 24-8 (see pp. 25-6).

¹³) Cf. C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (Oxford, London, 1948), pp. 6-7; H. W. Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum* (3rd ed, Berlin, 1952), pp. 38-9; W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls I", *BAOR* 132 (Dec. 1953), pp. 8-15 (see pp. 12-13); H. L. Ginsberg, "The oldest interpretation of the Suffering Servant", *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 400-4. In addition to the parallels noted by these scholars and discussed above in the text, it may be noted that G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, immortality, and eternal life in intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1972), p. 26, has argued for a connection between the exaltation of the Servant in Isa. liii 13 and the allusion to the hasidim becoming like stars in Dan. xii 3. Similarly, J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the book of Daniel* (Missoula 1977), p. 171. Finally, more

generally, it may be noted that P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Die Apokalyptik in ihrem Verhältnis zu Prophetie und Weisheit* (Munich, 1969), pp. 23 ff., has emphasized the influence of Deutero-Isaiah elsewhere in the book of Daniel, specifically in chapter 2.

¹⁴) A point unnoted by Ginsberg is that the LXX does in fact render *yaskil* in Isa. lii 13 by συνήσει "(he) will understand, be wise".

¹⁵) Similarly, it is interesting to note, it is widely accepted that the use of the word *dērā'ōn* "contempt" in Dan. xii 2 to describe the fate of the wicked, is taken up from Isa. lxvi 24, the only other place in the Old Testament where this word occurs, and where, likewise, it describes the fate of the wicked.

¹⁶) It is as well at this point to reject the possible objection that, while Dan. xii 3 looks like an interpretation of Isa. liii 11, the reference to the "humiliation" in Dan. xii 4 is not and would, if anything, relate to the *rabbim*, not to the fulfillers of the role of the Servant. That this is not the case is indicated by the fact that the *rabbim* "run to and fro", i.e. flee in the face of the persecution, thus leaving the expiatory "humiliation" of death to be borne by the *maskilim* (cf. Dan. xi 33-5).

¹⁷) *Contra* D. W. Thomas, *Eph. Theol. Lovan.* 44 (1968), p. 86; also J. Blythin, "A consideration of difficulties in the Hebrew text of Isaiah 53:11", *The Bible Translator* 17 (1966), pp. 27-31 (see p. 30).

¹⁸) L. C. Allen, p. 25; A. Gelston, "Some notes on Second Isaiah", *VT* 21 (1971), pp. 517-27 (see p. 525).

¹⁹) Omitting *šaddiq* after *yašdīq* as a dittograph with many scholars and the support of three Hebrew MSS. (cf. *BH*³). The verse as a whole I would translate with Gelston, "He will deliver his soul from trouble; he will see light and be satisfied. By his humiliation will my servant justify many: and he will bear their iniquities". Besides the common insertion of 'ōr "light" after *yir'eb* following 1QIs^a, 1QIs^b and LXX, this rendering involves inserting *yašsil* at the beginning of the verse, which would have fallen out through haplography after *yis'lāh* at the end of v. 10. That *yašsil* originally stood at the beginning of v. 11 can claim the support of the LXX which, taking the end of v. 10 with the beginning of v. 11 reads καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ. However, Williamson objects to the double haplography which this view presupposes. However, there is nothing intrinsically improbable in this, and it should be noted that the Targum also gives support to Gelston's view, reading *yēšēzih* at the beginning of v. 11 as well as *yis'lē hūm* at the end of v. 10, a point not referred to by Williamson, although it must be admitted that the translation is very free. Furthermore, it should be noted that in view of the fact that it has been shown that *da'aš* means "humiliation" and that it must be taken with the following words and not the preceding word *yisbāš*, metrical reasons favour the suggestion that a word should be added at the beginning of the verse.

²⁰) R. N. Whybray, *Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet* (Sheffield, 1978) has recently argued that vicarious suffering is entirely lacking in Isa. liii. However, his argument is sometimes extremely forced, e.g., the reference in v. 10 to the Servant as an 'āšām "guilt offering", which would clearly imply vicarious suffering, is held to be textually corrupt, without versional support, and he does not even suggest what the original text might have read (p. 66).

²¹) Cf. R. N. Whybray, pp. 68-9.

²²) Ironically enough, Ginsberg himself failed to discern the parallel between Isa. liii 11 and Dan. xii 4, arbitrarily emending *bēda'itō* to *mērā'ātō* in Isa. liii 11 ("The arm of YHWH in Isaiah 51-63 and the text of Isa 53 10-11", *JBL* 77 [1958], pp. 152-6 [see p. 156]), whilst in Dan. xii 4 he rendered *haddā'aš* as "knowledge", although he candidly admitted of his translation of this verse, "12:4b is difficult. This is the best rendering I know", (*Studies in Daniel* [New York, 1948], pp. 30-31 and 76, n. 8).



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.