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The Wicked Wealthy in Isaiah 53:9

The meaning and pointing of לַשְׁנֵי רָעַם in Isa 53:9 (usually rendered “rich”) remain controversial subjects and need resolution because of the importance of this verse and chapter in the history of Old Testament (OT) messianic interpretation. One approach has been to emend it to “evil-doers” (לִשְׁנֵי רָעַם). Others leave the text as it stands in the MT, believing the text anticipates or predicts the burial of Jesus in the tomb of the rich Joseph of Arimathea. The fact that “rich” is a tri-consonantal reversal of its parallel term “wicked” (לִשְׁנֵי רָעַם) has been noticed by a few commentators. But since “rich” is not a normal parallel for “wicked,” they conclude emendation is the best solution. Most, however, do not mention this literary feature or see it as exegetically significant.

This article will argue that emendation is not required because “rich” can provide a proper synonym and semantic parallel to “wicked” in this text and within its OT context. These “rich” are the “wicked rich.” While rejecting the MT reading as the Hebrew word for “rich,” some in principle have agreed by proposing a sense like “rabble” based on an Arabic cognate. What follows will establish that Isa 53:9 is not a prophecy applicable to the wealthy Joseph in whose tomb Jesus was buried. A contribution to scholarly debate on this matter is made, not by discovery of the interplay of common letters for “wicked” and “rich,” but by demonstrating that this play on words is an intentional use of the word “rich” because it offers this pun and provides a suitable synonymous parallel to the “wicked ones” of the preceding poetic line. These “rich ones” in the OT cultural climate also would have been considered disreputable people. This study hopes to answer the challenge posed by Watts in his commentary on Isaiah: “With a rich one remains unexplained. The phrase has been applied to Jesus but it is difficult to find the meaning in its original setting.” Further it will challenge the answer given by Young’s commentary: “There is no need to assume that לַשְׁנֵי רָעַם necessarily connotes rich men who are evil.” Isaiah 53:9a (the first of two bicola in v. 9) will be shown to be a synonymous and symmetric parallelism: a-b-c // [a’]-b’-c’ with a 3:2 word-count meter. The translation of this text that will be defended is:

The Wicked Wealthy in Isaiah 53:9
Survey of Modern Interpretations/Translations of Isaiah 53:9a

The issues that divide interpreters and translators of Isaiah 53:9a are evident when versions and commentaries are compared. Many leave interpretation open to the reader while others are minimally or highly interpretive, but rarely is rendered other than “rich.” Others also have accepted “[the] rich [ones]” is a repetition of “[the] wicked ones” in Isa 53:9a. While concluding that “rich” is not a natural [parallel] to ‘wicked,” North makes reference to Nyberg’s work in 1942 which insists that these terms are synonymous and uses the OT prophets’ denunciations of the rich as proof. What follows will pick up where Nyberg left off and provide similar and additional, yet hopefully more convincing, support for the synonymous parallel of “rich” and “wicked” in Isa 53:9a. What is new is the conviction that the author purposefully employed to symbolize the “wicked” (מְשַׁנֶּה ), using this reversal of letters as a literary device to enable his readers to make the interchangeable connection between the wicked and the “wicked wealthy.” Childs rejects this approach by saying that a link between the burial of the rich and wicked “hardly offers a natural parallel within Israel.” This is true in terms of the burial customs for each class of citizens, but the concern of the text of Isaiah 53:9 is with the fact that the Servant undeservedly was treated like a criminal (which concept is identified as those who are “wicked” // “rich”). Even Childs helps on this point by noting that this juxtaposition (wicked // rich) continues the typology of the Servant as the righteous and innocent sufferer of the Psalter. Others, in line with Nyberg, as Childs points out, allow for “rich” to have, within its semantic range, the sense “rich through extortion.”

Exegesis of “Rich” in Isaiah 53:9a

The main controversy that surrounds Isa 53:9ai (וַיְתַמֵּר וְאֶלֶךָ עֲשָׂרָה וּשׁוֹאֵלָה) is the meaning of the opening verb based on the root יָתַמֵּר (“give”; “place”). Regardless of how this is resolved, it has little or no bearing on whether in 9aii means “a rich one” or “the rich ([oppressive] ones).”

The phrase (53:9aii) is the great challenge for the exegete of this verse. Who is this rich one or rich ones? Why the plural expression “in his deaths”? Is the initial waw antithetical? Since the verse begins with a wayyiqtol (preterite, past-tense) verb, and not a nif'al (so-called prophetic perfect), why do some say this text prophesies the death and/or burial of this servant with a rich man? Is he Israel or an individual? Was he associated in death with the wealthy and wicked (synthetic parallel) or just the wicked (synonymous parallel) or, contrary to expectation, with the rich (antithetic parallelism)? Our concern is with the meaning of this clause in its
The poetry and poetics of Isaiah 53:9a

The Hebrew consonantal text of Isaiah 53:9a may be schematized as follows (cf. the MT major disjunctive accents):

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
c' & b' & [a] & c & b \\
\text{יודֵי} & \text{חַשְׁעִים} & \text{כִּבְרֹת} & \text{יודֵי} & \text{חַשְׁעִים} (9\text{ai}) \\
\text{יודֵי} & \text{חַשְׁעִים} & \text{כִּבְרֹת} & \text{יודֵי} & \text{חַשְׁעִים} (9\text{ai})
\end{array}
\]

It forms one line of a synonymous, incomplete bi-colon with a 3:2 word-stress meter. As the mechanical layout of 53:9a above shows, 9a(ii) is a mirror image of 9a(i). Most telling is the fact that the words for “wicked” and “rich” share the same basic consonants but in reverse order, producing a kind of alliteration and assonance: +י / / +ר+ע+ב+ל+ר

\[ (\text{רְשָׁעִים} \text{l'\textendash} \text{אָשִׁיר}) \text{. This has been recognized previously by scholars.} \]

But the main contention here is that this phonetic and morphological similarity was a pun intended to clarify that these “rich ones” are related to the “wicked ones.” These are the wicked rich or wealthy oppressors. For those who interpret this oppressed servant messianically and individually, he would be treated like a criminal in his death and burial. He would be “assigned” by evil design a place with the dregs of society although he did not deserve it. This was the intention of the oppressors, regardless of what kind of tomb he actually received. For those who interpret this suffering servant as Israel (typologically messianic to some), the nation was unjustly treated as one deserving a dishonorable death or burial. This suffering servant, though not guilty of violence or verbal abuse (v. 9b, or if synonymous, only verbal violence), has a criminal’s tribute and tomb planned for him. This proposed synonymy of “wicked” and “wealthy oppressors” is further strengthened by the fact that other approaches to explain contextually this term (לְשׁוֹן לִשְׁתֵּם) are: (1) to emend to לְשׁוֹן לִשְׁתֵּם “doers of evil”; or (2) to defer to an Arabic cognate
Synonymous Parallelism of Isaiah 53:9b

The bi-colon in 53:9b does not have to be synonymous in order for the
one in 53:9a to be synonymous, but then the likelihood that 53:9a is synonymous is strengthened. Most have taken 53:9b as synthetic but an argument can and will be made that it is synonymous. The following will show that this second bi-colon of 53:9 is synonymous: he did no violence [with his mouth] // that is, no deceit [was] in his speech. The structure and poetry of this verse is suggestive of its synonymy:

```
[D] [with his mouth] C [he-did] B [no-wrong] A [Although

[D] [בָּהֵם] [עָשָׂה] [תָּשׁוּב] [תָּשׁוּב]

[with his mouth] [he-did] [no-wrong] [Although

[B] [B1 B2] [A] [B1 B2]

[B] [דָּרָךְ נָפַל] [וֹלַת מִרְמָה] [וֹלַת מִרְמָה]

This results in a line of synonymous bi-colon, with the pattern a-b-c-[d] // [a]-b1-b2- [c]-d, and a 3:3 word-stress meter. The nawo beginning the second half of this parallelism is to be understood not as co-ordinative ("also") but as pleonastic (stylistic) or explicative ("even") or emphatic ("especially").31 Reverse parallelism is perhaps less rare than often imagined.32 The second member of the parallelism may contribute to the first, whereas most often it happens the other way around. Not only poetically is synonymy supported but also lexically and contextually. The word often rendered "violence" (הָלִם) can just mean "wrong [especially ‘as a false witness’]." 33 In context 53:9b is a flashback to v. 7, where the servant’s mouth is first mentioned for its virtue: “He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth; like a lamb that is led to slaughter, and like a sheep that before its shearers is silent, so he did not open his mouth” (NRSV). The emphasis in context is on the lack of speech-related sins. He refused to be abusively defensive or to lash out verbally in revenge or anger at those who abused him. Isaiah 53:9b, then, may be read not as the servant’s avoidance of physical and verbal retaliation but as only the latter, restated as reverse parallelism. The “violence” of Isa 53:9bi is the verbal violence of a false or hostile witness.34 A key OT theme is the importance of knowing how and when to speak. OT wisdom literature abounds in advice about speaking seldom, sensibly, and sanely.35 The Apostle Peter (1 Pet 2:21-24) may have reflected upon this OT spirituality in the light of Jesus’ teachings,36 when he recalled the words of Isa 53:9b to illustrate the sinless life of Christ, who stood silent before his accusers and went willingly and quietly to his undeserved crucifixion.

New Testament Use of Isaiah 53:9b

The NT does make messianic use of Isa 53:9b (1 Pet 2:22) while it nowhere employs 53:9a. Such an argument from silence does not prove the interpretation of “rich” as “[wicked] rich” as opposed to “rich [man],” but why the Apostles would have by-passed such a precise proof-text if they saw
a parallel between it and the rich Joseph of Arimathea is very curious. Peter, apparently, was more impressed with the typology of the parallel between the Isa 53 servant’s silence than his burial, for whatever reasons. The interpretation being proposed merely clarifies that 53:9aiii is a restatement of what is said about him in 53:ai (that he was treated like a criminal at the time of his death). Isaiah 53:9b adds that he was not deserving of such abuse; although (or “because”) he had committed no violence or spoken deceitfully (as most versions have it). But as shown above this second bi-colon of 53:9 is likely synonymous, as is the previous one.

Immediately before Peter cites Isa 53:9b, he says that the way Jesus suffered is an example to believers (2:21), and immediately following he explains how this example is primarily in how he managed his mouth (2:23). Part of Matthew’s account of Jesus’ trial explains that he gave no answer to his accusers and refused to reply to a single charge from Pilate, to his amazement (Matt 27:12-14). Peter does not introduce this quotation with a formula of fulfillment or of it being a pronouncement of Scripture, and makes no reference to the OT author or book. He does employ it contextually, however, in a manner that indicates he understood Isa 53:9b (and presumably 9a et al.) as suitable for application to Jesus. But Peter’s version of Isa 53:9b is more reflective of the Greek than Hebrew OT. Instead of “he did no violence [or ‘devised no scheme’] “of the MT, 1 Peter 2:22 has “who committed no sin” (cf. LXX “because he practiced no lawlessness”). Apparently Peter wanted to emphasize that the Messiah (Jesus) was sinless not just innocent of particular types of wrongdoing or harm (physical or verbal). While the LXX uses “because,” Peter chooses to focus on this sinless character, and is not concerned with the connection to 53:9a.

Conclusion

Challenging the consensus of opinion that “rich” (יִשָּׁם) in Isa 53:9aiii is either synthetically or antithetically related to “wicked ones” (บาลע רע) in 53:9ai, this examination of Isa 53:9 has determined that the relationship is most likely synonymous, and that the best translation of יִשָּׁם is as a collective singular adjective functioning as a plural indirect object (the same as “wicked ones” in the previous colon): “rich [ones].” Further the common association of wealth and wickedness in the OT world suggests that within this synonymous parallelism, the full sense is “[the] wealthy [wicked].” The author’s intention in v. 9 was to tell about the servant’s undeserved suffering (v. 9b), wherein he was portrayed and processed as a criminal in his death and burial by his persecutors and prosecutors (v. 9a). The plan of these evil people (rich and reprobate) was to place him among the refuse of mankind (v. 9a), even though he had committed no violent and verbal crimes (v. 9b). The synonymy of “wicked” and “wealthy” is strengthened by the fact that these two Hebrew words share the same basic consonants, but in reverse order. The author intended his readers to take this as a sign that “wicked” of the preceding parallel line is intertwined with the “wealthy” of v. 9aii. Therefore
emendation of אֶשֶׁר לְעֵינֵיהֶן to "doers of evil" (אֶשֶׁר לְעֵינֵיהֶם) as often resorted to, in spite of no textual evidence, is unnecessary. The content, construction, and context of Isa 53:9 argue for a synonymous parallelism not only in v. 9a but also in 9b. This depends on accepting the presence of reverse parallelism in both cases in addition to observing how other structures and statements in the immediate and more distant contexts support the synonymous nature of these two bi-cola. Consequently the proposal being made is that "violent" of v. 9bi be understood as a counterpart to "no deceit was in his mouth" of v. 9bii. The synonymy of Isa 53:9a is not dependent on this but is strengthened by it. It was demonstrated that OT thought is replete with concepts about the frequent wickedness that comes from wealthy and powerful people, the servant's (or for some the Messiah's) verbal virtue, and the righteousness of speaking the right words at the right time. Silence or economy of words is highly praised. The servant especially is praised for being quiet before his enemies and not sinning verbally. A case has been made for the understanding of Isaiah 53:9 as a text that reveals that (1) the suffering servant would be handled by his opponents as a criminal in regard to his death and burial (53:9a); and (2) this treatment would be unfair and unjust because this servant had never sinned verbally or had never acted violently or retaliated verbally (53:9b).
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**End Notes**

1 TDOT recognizes this verse as “the most disputed text” (as regards this term in the OT) which many and especially older scholars consider corrupt. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds., *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament [TDOT],* vol. XI: 419 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001), s.v. יִבְּלָל by Sabo.


4 In this article parallelism of the verses concerned will be described in traditional terms as synonymous, synthetic, or antithetic for convenience sake. While the author is very aware of the modern trends and theories regarding the nature of parallelism, these do not prove that the categories of synonymy or antithesis are not valid in many cases. “Synthetic” masks the great variety and complexity and mystery of bi-cola that are not strictly synonymous or antithetical, but time and space do not allow me to discuss these matters here. Suffice it to say that the following essay is an argument for the recognition of synonymy in these verses, regardless of the fact that many OT poetic passages or verses are monocola, tricola, or simple statements of “A, also b.” It is well recognized that the OT poets could work apart from parallelism when desired or required; and that debate continues over the precise nature of meter and parallel thought, as well as the concept and character of Hebrew poetry. See e.g. publications by (see Selected Bibliography) A. Berlin, James Kugel, R. Alter, J. P. Fokkelman, A. Schökel, A. Cooper, M. O'Connor, F. Landy, W. Watson, and D. Clines, *inter alia*.


6 Young, 353, n. 34.

7 Among more recent and popular English versions, the NIV has “He was assigned a grave with the wicked [plural], and with the rich [singular] in his death” while NRSV has “tomb” instead of “death.” If this is a synonymous bi-colon then the singular “rich” would have to be taken as a collective singular (singular in form but plural in function). NASB interprets the text as an intentional messianic prediction: “His grave was assigned with wicked men, Yet He was with a rich man in His death.” But Blenkinsopp translates: “His grave was located with the wicked, his sepulcher with reprobates.” Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 345. Along similar lines North offered: “And they gave him burial among felons, And with the dregs of men when he died.” North, The Second Isaiah, 65. To move away from just English texts, and more traditional by contrast, Baltzer has “Und Er gab ihm bei Verbrechern sein Grab und bei einem Reichen seine Stätte.” Klaus Baltzer, Deutero-Jesaja (Gietersloh, GR: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 1999), 494. Luther’s text reads: “Und man gab ihm sein Grab bei Gottlosen und bei Uebeltätern, als er gestorben war.” *Die Heilige Schrift* (Philadelphia: The National Bible Press, 1967), 669.


10 Ibid.
Joseph's Death,” point practice, example, and quoted Cross, foreshadows 9; interpreted, uses Jesaja, 494. Mr. 2:4. PA: 19:38-42). 55, the function. and tense and subject, or 3rd person. It’s, Doubleday, 2002), 348. Blenkinsopp renders it “located.” Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 345. The LXX, interestingly, has the equivalent word but uses a future tense and 1st-person pronoun (“and I will give”), whereas the MT is unmistakably past tense and 3rd-person. Similarly the Vulgate employs the future tense but stays with the 3rd-person subject (“and he shall give”). Sapp has suggested that the consonantal text of MT or Qumran represents a present tense imperfect (they give”) or (they give”). Sapp takes the Qumran text as a corrective on the MT. David A. Sapp, “The LXX, IQIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53,” in Jesus and the Suffering Servant, ed. William H. Bellinger, Jr. and William R. Farmer (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 190. With simple now these could be interpreted, alternately, as future tense, since the morphology would be the same—context making the difference. Some argue for an active form with passive function. E.g. Macrae alludes to examples in Gen 11:9; 48:1; Am 6:12; and Mic 2:4. See Macrae, “With the Rich in His Death,” 70. But none of these examples uses מָעֲשֶׂה.

11 Ibid. But no footnote is offered to tell who these are.

12 KJV has the strange but literal “he made his grave,” which represents the kind of translation that lead to the desire for emendation. Cf. Baltzer, Deutero-Jesaja, 494. Childs, Isaiah, 408; C. C. Torrey, The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928), 253; North, The Second Isaiah, 65; Christopher R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, 2nd ed. (Oxford: University Press, 1956), 122; Claus Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja 40-66 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 205; Schoors, Jesaja II, 326; Koehler and Baumgartner, eds., Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, s.v. מַעֲשֶׂה. The verb as it stands has an indefinite subject, which apparently led Torrey to translate it “appoint.” See Torrey, 253, 420. Exegetes face the urge to re-point the verb as passive (“he/it was assigned”) or use a third plural subject (“they appointed”). Change מָעֲשֶׂה either to מָעָשִׂים or מָעֲשֶׂה. This latter option follows IQIsa מָעֲשֶׂה. Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, The Anchor Bible, vol. 19A (New York: Doubleday, 2002), 348. Blenkinsopp renders it “located.” Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 345. The LXX, interestingly, has the equivalent word but uses a future tense and 1st-person pronoun (“and I will give”), whereas the MT is unmistakably past tense and 3rd-person. Similarly the Vulgate employs the future tense but stays with the 3rd-person subject (“and he shall give”). Sapp has suggested that the consonantal text of MT or Qumran represents a present tense imperfect מָעֲשֶׂה “they give” or מָעֲשֶׂה “they give”). Sapp takes the Qumran text as a corrective on the MT. David A. Sapp, “The LXX, IQIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53,” in Jesus and the Suffering Servant, ed. William H. Bellinger, Jr. and William R. Farmer (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 190. With simple now these could be interpreted, alternately, as future tense, since the morphology would be the same—context making the difference. Some argue for an active form with passive function. E.g. Macrae alludes to examples in Gen 11:9; 48:1; Am 6:12; and Mic 2:4. See Macrae, “With the Rich in His Death,” 70. But none of these examples uses מַעֲשֶׂה.

13 Of interest is the fact that only Matthew finds it necessary to speak of Joseph’s wealth (cf. Matt 27:57-61; Mark 15:42-47; Luke 23:50-56; and John 19:38-42).

14 However, Peter does utilize Isaiah 53:9b (the second of the two bi-cola in v. 9; cf. 1 Pet 2:22), which suggests a mindset among the Apostles that the entire verse and perhaps chapter are Christological, at least by application. Peter calls Christian slaves to follow Christ’s example of not retaliating against those who mistreat them but rather fully trust in God (cf. 1 Pet 2:18-24). Isaiah 53:9b is quoted as a proof-text that Christ did not retaliate verbally when insulted on the Cross, what Peter calls “the tree” (1 Pet 2:21-24). The text, if messianic, only foreshadows or foretells that the S/servant will be treated in purpose, if not in practice, as a criminal when dead and buried, although he committed no crime.

15 This is handled in one of two ways by the versions. NRSV, KJV, NKJV, NIV, and JB (to name a few) all read “with the rich”; while the ASV and NASB, for example, have “with a rich man.” The former versions take this word as a collective singular while the latter ones as a numerical singular. LXX and Vulgate have “and the rich” (respectively, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους and et divinem) as well as Syriac (‘yvr) and Targum (דַּלְיָה ‘attire). Macrae’s argument (“With the Rich in His Death,” 70-71) that something must be added after “rich” is insightful, but this does not mean that “man” must be added. It is just as reasonable to add “ones.” His point that languages like German and Hebrew often use a singular adjective like...
rich to mean “rich man” applies equally to “rich men.” The definite use of anarthrous nouns in Greek or Hebrew is well documented. In OT poetry many nouns are definite without the definite article prefixed. Nothing in the Hebrew language indicates clearly that an anarthrous noun (as “wicked ones” in Isa 53:9ai) applies to a small number of people while if definite it would mean “a large group.” The surrounding context defines this wicked group as more than a few.

16 Cf. John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40–66*, NICOT, ed. R. K. Harrison and R. L. Hubbard, Jr. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 397. Oswalt urges that the text must not be made to say more than it does by forcing an antithetical parallelism onto a text that structurally is clearly synonymous. Delitzsch (*Isaiah*, II: 326-29) argues in much linguistic detail for the traditional “rich,” also compelled by the presupposition of Jesus’ fulfillment of the verse. Disagreement with Delitzsch is not on a linguistic and lexical basis but a poetical and hermeneutical one. He is bothered by Luther’s marginal gloss “a rich man who sets all his heart upon riches, i.e. a wicked man” (p. 327), the very view this article supports. Delitzsch wrote when conservative scholars had fewer hermeneutical options than today, especially with our expanded understanding of how the NT uses the OT in light of first-century Jewish exegesis. But as will be shown, the understanding of “rich” as synonymous with “wicked” does not remove a valid messianic application to Jesus, it just restricts the fulfillment to his being treated like a criminal rather than that plus being buried in a rich man’s tomb. The translation of רֶשֶׁה in Isa 53:9ai is properly “rich” as Delitzsch and others demonstrate. Its interpretation or application in the context of Isa 53, the poetry of v. 9, and biblical prophecy is that of “[the wicked] wealthy.” “Rich” here parallels “wicked ones” so is a figurative way to restate the latter (which is the first group named in Isa 53:9ai, followed by its counterpart “rich [ones]” in 53:9aii).

Word meanings (usages) are principally governed by context and in poetry to parallelism. Authors are not restricted to common lexical options especially when writing poetically.


18 See, e.g., North, *The Second Isaiah*, 231, who notes the alliteration; Baltzer, *Deuteronymia*, 527, who points out the reversal of the consonants לִשְׁנָה r-f-ך and לִשְׁנָה r-f-ך was previously observed by Gesenius. North makes no more out of this than to defer to an emendation to לָרִיתים “those doing evil.” Baltzer only
comments on this word-play in passing and agrees that the “rich” is somehow related to an “evil doer” (“Frevler”); then moves on to what he considers the most pressing exegetical matter for this verse, the plurality of “death” in 53:9.

19 The Arabic cognate ‘ṣr (“wicked”) could suggest a Hebrew consonantal homograph (דוב) that is used just this one time in the OT literary corpus. In transmission it could have been corrupted to דוב (and this form is a hapax in Isaiah). Of course this is highly conjectural. Cf. J. A. Alexander, The Prophecies of Isaiah, 2 vols. in one (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976 rpt. of 1953 ed.), II: 301-302; and Delitzsch, Isaiah, II: 327 North (The Second Isaiah, 231) cites A. Guillaume’s reference to Arabic: laO as “rabble” or “refuse of mankind.” Cf. A. Guillaume, “A Contribution to Hebrew Lexicography,” in Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies XVI/1 (1954): 10. For the “demons” hypothesis see D. W. Thomas, “A Consideration of Is 53 in the Light of Recent Textual and Philological Study,” Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 44 (1968), 79-86.

20 The entire phrase “and with a wealthy one [or ‘the wealthy’] in his death” is usually deemed unintelligible, so re-punctuation is resorted to automatically (ךובד bāmātō instead of ְךובד bēmōtaw), since the change affects only the removal of one letter, the yod from the MT. This changes the meaning to “his burial mound” or “his sepulcher” (following Albright’s proposal). Cf. Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 348 and R. N. Whybray, Isaiah 40-66, The New Century Bible (London: Marshall, Morgan, & Scott, 1975), 178, both who cite W. F. Albright’s 1957 essay in The High Place in Ancient Palestine, Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg, VTSup 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), 242-58, and noting that this option may also be supported by 1Q1sa. Since this approach preserves the consonantal text, with the minor exception of the removal of a vowel letter which may have been inserted later by the Naqdanim, it is arguable and plausible that here we are dealing with a lexical rather than transcriptional error (although accepting that the vowel points were applied to the wrong word, the authoritative consonantal text remains unchanged). Rather than reading preposition ז+ “death/s”(דוב) + possessive pronominal suffix 3ms (waw), the root is דוב “back, hill, high place”> דוב “high place(s)” or “great high place(s).” The ד suffix may be interpreted otherwise as feminine or abstract (Ugaritic cognate is bmt, “back”). One wonders why not just suggest דוב “in his death” as better alternative, since “[the] rich [one]” is singular morphologically if not functionally.

Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996) s.v. יִשְׂרֵאֵל by Martin J. Selman, where only Isa 6:13; 53:9; and Ezek 43:7 are possible supports.

22 Cf. “Is Isaiah 53:9 referring [sic] to Jesus?” (www.geocities.com/Athens/Agora/4229/isiah.html); but even if a collective plural or not, if the text is about the nation, the nation may be typological and, therefore, applicable to the Messiah as a retrospective historical parallel (picture or anticipation or foreshadowing). Plural collectives are known in the Hebrew OT, e.g. the well-known יִשְׂרֵאֵל “gods” used as the proper name of the one, true God. Other uses are for intensity or abstraction. Plural collectives are also common in Arabic (cf. Paul Joüon, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew; trans. and rev. T. Muraoka, Vol. 2, Part Three: Syntax (Rome: Editice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1991), 497-502. NRSV renders יִשְׂרֵאֵל as “tomb” following the proposal of the editors of BHS. Qumran reads יִשְׂרֵאֵל. Cf. Watts, Isaiah 34-66, 226; North, Second Isaiah, 231; Sapp, “The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53,” 178, n. 10. Singular “death” is found in Greek, Syriac, and Latin OT versions, as well as by Qumran and Targums.

23 Isa 53:9 (a or b) is not mentioned in Joč Krašovec, Antithetic Structure in Biblical Hebrew Poetry, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 35 (Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1984).

24 E.g. see Oswalt, The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66, 397-98. In support of the concessive use of the preposition יָבֶּן, Oswalt cites Job 10:7; 16:17; and 34:6.

25 The point of 53:9, for Oswalt, is to highlight the final irony of this Servant’s life. He was not buried with the poor, who had been his faithful companions in life but was surrounded in death (not burial) with those who oppressed him and whose sins he carried (Ibid., p. 398). In this way Oswalt tries to make sense out of the use of “grave” in 53:9ai and “death” in 53:9aii.


27 Gesenius speaks of both “good” and “bad” wealth as options of meanings for יִשְׂרֵאֵל. The latter is the sense of “haughty” or “impious” given that riches are a source of pride and pride in the OT is impiety. In relation to Isa 53:9 he cites Job 27:19, “They go to bed with wealth, but will do so no more; they open their eyes, and it is gone” (NRSV). Cf. Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament, transl. Samuel P. Tregelles (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949), s.v. יִשְׂרֵאֵל. DCH still lacks the volume containing this Hebrew term (cf. David J. A. Clines, gen. ed., The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, 5 vols. (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1993-2001), hereafter DCH. Vol. 6 is forthcoming (November 2007).

28 Exod 30:15 (where the arthrous and collective singular form appears for “rich” and “poor”); 2 Sam 12:1-2, 4; Jer 9:23 (22 MT); Mic 6:12; Psa 45:12 (13 MT); 49:3; Job 27:19; Prov 10:15; 14:20; 18:11, 23; 22:2, 7, 16; 28:6, 11; Ruth 3:10; Eccl 5:11; 10:6, 20.

30 Ibid.

31 NRSV, JB, and NEB have “and”; ASV, NASB, KJV, NKJV, NIV, NAB, Vulgate, and LXX have “nor” or “neither.”
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